

comments submitted in support of the conclusions drawn in the EA and seven comments opposed to the conclusions drawn in the EA. APHIS' responses to these comments can be found in an attachment to the finding of no significant impact (FONSI).

#### Determination

Based on APHIS' analysis of field, greenhouse, and laboratory data submitted by Syngenta, references provided in the petition, other relevant information described in the EA, and comments provided by the public, APHIS has determined that MIR604 will not pose a plant pest risk for the following reasons: (1) Gene introgression from MIR604 corn into wild relatives in the United States and its territories is extremely unlikely and is not likely to increase the weediness potential of any resulting progeny nor adversely affect genetic diversity of related plants any more than would introgression from traditional corn hybrids; (2) it exhibits no characteristics that would cause it to be weedier than the non-genetically engineered parent corn line or other cultivated corn; (3) it does not pose a risk to non-target organisms, including beneficial organisms and threatened or endangered species, because the insecticidal activity of the mCry3A protein is limited to target pest species, namely corn rootworm; (4) it does not pose a threat to biodiversity as it does not exhibit traits that increase its weediness and its unconfined cultivation should not lead to increased weediness of other cultivated corn, it exhibits no changes in disease susceptibility, and it is unlikely to harm non-target organisms common to the agricultural ecosystem or threatened or endangered species recognized by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; (5) compared to current corn pest and weed management practices, cultivation of MIR604 corn should not impact standard agricultural practices in corn cultivation and controlling volunteer corn, including those for organic farmers; and (6) disease susceptibility and compositional profiles of MIR604 corn are similar to those of its parent variety and other corn cultivars grown in the United States, therefore no direct or indirect plant pest effects on raw or processed plant commodities are expected.

#### National Environmental Policy Act

To provide the public with documentation of APHIS' review and analysis of any potential environmental impacts associated with the determination of nonregulated status for MIR604, an EA was prepared. The EA

was prepared in accordance with (1) The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), (2) regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), (3) USDA regulations implementing NEPA (7 CFR part 1b), and (4) APHIS' NEPA Implementing Procedures (7 CFR part 372). Based on that EA, APHIS has reached a FONSI with regard to the determination that Syngenta corn line MIR604 and lines developed from it are no longer regulated articles under its regulations in 7 CFR part 340. Copies of the EA and FONSI are available as indicated in the **ADDRESSES** and **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** sections of this notice.

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 7701–7772 and 7781–7786; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.3.

Done in Washington, DC, this 20th day of March 2007.

**W. Ron DeHaven,**

*Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*

[FR Doc. E7–5345 Filed 3–22–07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–34–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Food and Nutrition Service

#### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Food Stamp Program Regulations, Part 275—Quality Control

**AGENCY:** Food and Nutrition Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice invites the general public and other public agencies to comment on the proposed information collection for Food Stamp Program Regulations, Part 275—Quality Control. Specifically, this is the burden associated with the collection of information for the sampling plan, the arbitration process, and the good cause process. This proposed collection is a revision of a collection currently approved under OMB No. 0584–0303.

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted on or before May 22, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate

of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Send comments and requests for copies of this information collection to: Daniel Wilusz, Chief, Quality Control Branch, Program Accountability Division, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 3101 Park Center Drive, Room 822, Alexandria, VA 22302. You may FAX comments on this notice to (703) 305–0928. You may also download an electronic version of this notice at <http://www.fns.usda.gov/fsp/rules/Regulations/default.htm> and comment via e-mail at [Daniel.Wilusz@fns.usda.gov](mailto:Daniel.Wilusz@fns.usda.gov).

All responses to this notice will be included in the request for OMB approval.

All comments will also become a matter of public record.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection should be directed to Daniel Wilusz at (703) 305–2460.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Title:* Food Stamp Program Regulations, Part 275—Quality Control.  
*OMB Number:* 0584–0303.

*Expiration Date:* August 31, 2007.

*Type of Request:* Revision of a currently approved collection of information.

*Abstract:* There are three components of the Quality Control (QC) system that are covered in this proposed information collection. They are: (1) The sampling plan; (2) the arbitration process; and (3) the good cause process. Each State is required to develop a sampling plan that demonstrates the integrity of its case selection procedures. The QC system is designed to measure each State agency's payment error rate based on a statistically valid sample of food stamp cases. A State agency's payment error rate represents the proportion of cases that were reported through a QC review as being ineligible, overissued and underissued food stamp benefits.

The QC system contains procedures for resolving differences in review findings between State agencies and FNS. This is referred to as the arbitration process. The QC system also

contains procedures that provide relief for State agencies from all or a part of a QC liability when a State agency can demonstrate that a part or all of an excessive error rate was due to an unusual event that had an uncontrollable impact on the State agency's payment error rate. This is referred to as the good cause process.

The approved burden for the QC system includes the burden for the QC sampling plan, the arbitration process, and the good cause process. The annual reporting burden associated with the QC sampling plan remains at 265 hours. We estimate the annual reporting burdens associated with arbitration and good cause processes to total 350 hours and 160 hours respectively. The decrease in the proposed burden from the currently approved 1643 to 350 hours for the arbitration process is due to a re-determination in the number of State agencies estimated to respond from 53 to 14 and to the estimated number of responses per State agency from 3.1 to 2.5. These decreases are a result of State agencies more frequently agreeing with FNS' findings. The proposed annual reporting burden for the good cause process is unchanged from the currently approved burden of 160 hours.

The proposed annual recordkeeping burden associated with the QC sampling plan is 1.25 hours per year. The proposed annual recordkeeping burdens associated with arbitration and good cause processes are estimated to total .83 and .0236 hours respectively. The recordkeeping burden for the arbitration process decreased from 3.89 hours to .83 hours due to a re-determination in the estimated number of affected State agencies from 53 to 14 and the estimated number of responses per State decreased from 3.1 to 2.5. The recordkeeping burden for the good cause process decreased from 1.25 to .0236 hours due to a re-determination in the estimated number of affected State agencies from 53 to 1 per year. The total annual burden for the QC system, as proposed by this notice, decreased from 2074 to 777 hours.

#### **Quality Control System Reporting Burden Associated With the Sampling Plan, Arbitration, and Good Cause**

##### *1. Sampling Plan*

*Affected Public:* State agencies.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 53.

*Estimated Number of Responses Per Respondent:* 1.

*Estimated Time Per Response:* 5 hours.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 265.

##### *2. Arbitration Process*

*Affected Public:* State agencies.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 14.

*Estimated Number of Responses Per Respondent:* 2.5.

*Estimated Time Per Response:* 10 hours.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 350.

##### *3. Good Cause Process*

*Affected Public:* State agencies.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 1.

*Estimated Number of Responses:* 1.

*Estimated Time Per Response:* 160 hours.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 160.

#### **Quality Control System Recordkeeping Burden Associated With the Sampling Plan, Arbitration, and Good Cause**

##### *1. Sampling Plan*

*Estimated Number of Recordkeepers:* 53.

*Estimated Number of Records Per Respondent:* 1.

*Estimated Staff Hours Per Recordkeeping:* .0236.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 1.25.

##### *2. Arbitration Process*

*Estimated Number of Recordkeepers:* 14.

*Estimated Number of Records Per Respondent:* 2.5

*Estimated Staff Hours Per Recordkeeping:* .0236

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* .83

##### *3. Good Cause Process*

*Estimated Number of Recordkeepers:* 1.

*Estimated Number of Records:* 1.

*Estimated Staff Hours Per Recordkeeping:* .0236.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* .0236.

*The Combined Quality Control System Burden (includes the burdens associated with the Sampling Plan, Arbitration and Good Cause):* 777 hours.

Dated: March 16, 2007.

**George A. Braley,**

*Acting Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service.*

[FR Doc. E7-5333 Filed 3-22-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-30-P**

## **DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

### **Foreign Agricultural Service**

#### **WTO Agricultural Safeguard Trigger Levels**

**AGENCY:** Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of product coverage and trigger levels for safeguard measures provides for in the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on Agriculture.

**SUMMARY:** This notice lists the updated quantity trigger levels for products, which may be subject to additional import duties under the safeguard provisions of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture. This notice also includes the relevant period applicable for the trigger levels on each of the listed products.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* March 23, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lana Bennett, Import and Trade Support Programs Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Stop 1047, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-1047, telephone at (202) 720-0638, or e-mail [itspd@fas.usda.gov](mailto:itspd@fas.usda.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Article 5 of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture provides that additional import duties may be imposed on imports of products subject to tariffication as a result of the Uruguay Round if certain conditions are met. The agreement permits additional duties to be charged if the price of an individual shipment of imported products falls below the average price for similar goods imported during the years 1986-88 by a specified percentage. It also permits additional duties to be imposed if the volume of imports of an article exceeds the average of the most recent 3 years for which data are available by 5, 10, or 25 percent, depending on the article. These additional duties may not be imposed on quantities for which minimum or current access commitments were made during the Uruguay Round negotiations, and only one type of safeguard, price or quantity, may be applied at any given time to an article. Section 405 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act requires that the President cause to be published in the **Federal Register** information regarding the price and quantity safeguards, including the quantity trigger levels, which must be updated annually based upon import levels during the most recent 3 years. The President delegated this duty to the Secretary of Agriculture in Presidential Proclamation No. 6763, dated December