domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking. The PHA’s, owner’s, or manager’s request for documentation must be made in writing. On the certification form, the individual certifies that s/he is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking, and that the incident or inci- dences in question are bona fide incidences of such actual or threatened abuse. On the certification form, the individual must provide the name of the perpetrator only if the name of the perpetrator is safe to provide, and is known to the victim. PHAs are instructed that the delivery of the certification form to the tenant in response to an incident(s) via mail may place the victim at risk, e.g., the abuser may monitor the mail; consequently, PHAs, owners and management agents may require that the tenant come into the office to pick up the certification form. PHAs and owners are also encouraged to work with tenants to make delivery arrangements that do not place the tenant at risk. If the PHA, owner, or manager provides the individual with a written request for documentation of the abuse, and the individual does not provide the certification form, or alternate documentation as described on the certification form, within 14 business days from the date of receipt of the PHA’s, owner’s, or manager’s written request (or after any extension of that date provided by the PHA, owner or manager), the Victim cannot be assured s/he will receive VAWA protections.

Note, On August 6, 2013, HUD published in the Federal Register (Volume 78, Number 151, 47717) a notice describing the impacts of the VAWA 2013 on HUD programs. The notice provided an overview of the key ways in which VAWA 2013 would enhance existing VAWA protections for victims of domestic violence, dating violence and stalking in HUD’s public housing and Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) programs, listed the additional HUD programs that would now be covered by the statute, explained that VAWA protections would be extended to victims of sexual assault, and advised of HUD’s plans to issue rules and/or guidance on the new law at a later date. HUD also requested public comment on certain topics that VAWA 2013 left to HUD’s discretion. Included in that request was how HUD should adapt VAWA certification forms (HUD–50066 and HUD–91066) to document abuse covered by VAWA 2013 to include the newly covered programs. The current certification form HUD–50066 expires on February 28, 2014. HUD determined that the form HUD–50066 should be updated to include only the items required by VAWA 2013. HUD intends to issue at a later date a new form covering all HUD covered programs that conforms to VAWA 2013 and considers comments received on the notice (comments posted under docket number HUD–2013–0074 on www.regulations.gov). The new form would replace HUD–50066.

Respondents (i.e. affected public): Public Housing Authorities (PHAs), Owners, and Management Agents, participating in the Public Housing and Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher programs.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 200.

Estimated Number of Responses: 200.

Frequency of Response: Once.

Average Hours per Response: 60 minutes per applicant.

Total Estimated Burdens: 200.

B. Solicitation of Public Comment

This notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected parties concerning the collection of information described in Section A on the following:

(1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) The accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information;

(3) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including through the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses. HUD encourages interested parties to submit comment in response to these questions.


Colette Pollard,
Department Reports Management Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2014–04485 Filed 2–27–14; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[DOcket No. FR–5750–N–09]

Federal Property Suitable as Facilities To Assist the Homeless

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This Notice identifies unutilized, underutilized, excess, and surplus Federal property reviewed by HUD for suitability for possible use to assist the homeless.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Juanita Perry, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street SW., Room 7262, Washington, DC 20410; telephone (202) 402–3970; TTY number for the hearing- and speech-impaired (202) 708–2565, (these telephone numbers are not toll-free), or call the toll-free Title V information line at 800–927–7588.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with the December 12, 1988 court order in National Coalition for the Homeless v. Veterans Administration, No. 88–2503–OG (D.D.C.), HUD publishes a Notice, on a weekly basis, identifying unutilized, underutilized, excess and surplus Federal buildings and real property that HUD has reviewed for suitability for use to assist the homeless. Today’s Notice is for the purpose of announcing that no additional properties have been determined suitable or unsuitable this week.


Mark R. Johnston,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Needs.

[FR Doc. 2014–04186 Filed 2–27–14; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service


Information Collection Request Sent to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Approval: Federal Fish and Wildlife Permit Applications and Reports—Management Authority

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) have sent an Information Collection Request (ICR) to OMB for
review and approval. We summarize the ICR below and describe the nature of the collection and the estimated burden and cost. This information collection is scheduled to expire on February 28, 2014. We may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently validOMB control number. However, under OMB regulations, we may continue to conduct or sponsor this information collection while it is pending at OMB.

DATES: You must submit comments on or before March 31, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Send your comments and suggestions on this information collection to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior at OMB–OIRA at (202) 395–8606 (fax) or OIRA_submission@omb.eop.gov (email). Please provide a copy of your comments to the Service Information Collection Clearance Officer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, MS 2042–PDM, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington, VA 22203 (mail), or hope_grey@fws.gov (email). Please include “1018–0093” in the subject line of your comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request additional information about this ICR, contact Hope Grey at hope_grey@fws.gov (email) or 703–358–2482 (telephone). You may review the ICR online at http://www.reginfo.gov. Follow the instructions to review Department of the Interior collections under review by OMB.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Information Collection Request

OMB Control Number: 1018–0093.

Title: Federal Fish and Wildlife Permit Applications and Reports—Management Authority, 50 CFR 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, and 23.


Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Description of Respondents: Individuals; biomedical companies; circuses; zoological parks; botanical gardens; nurseries; museums; universities; antique dealers; exotic pet industry; hunters; taxidermists; commercial importers/exporters of wildlife and plants; freight forwarders/brokers; and State, tribal, local, and Federal governments.

Respondent’s Obligation: Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

Frequency of Collection: On occasion.

Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 13,360.

Estimated Completion Time per Response: Varies from 15 minutes to 43½ hours depending on the activity.

Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours: 9,806.

Estimated Annual Nonhour Burden Cost: $1,018,751 for application fees.

Abstract: This information collection covers permit applications and reports that our Division of Management Authority uses to determine the eligibility of applicants for permits requested in accordance with the criteria in various Federal wildlife conservation laws and international treaties. Service regulations implementing these statutes and treaties are in chapter I, subchapter B of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). These regulations stipulate general and specific requirements that when met allow us to issue permits to authorize activities that are otherwise prohibited. We are not proposing any major changes to the applications and reports currently approved under OMB Control Number 1018–0093. We are proposing a new application: FWS Form 3–200–88 (Musical Instrument (CITES)). The Musical Instrument application will be for multiple border crossings for noncommercial use (including, but not limited to, personal use, performance, display, or competition).

Comments Received and Our Responses

Comments: On December 17, 2013, we published in the Federal Register (78 FR 76313) a notice of our intent to request that OMB approve this information collection. In that notice, we solicited comments for 60 days, ending on February 18, 2014. We received one comment in response to that notice.

The commenter addressed the processing of applications under section 10(c) of the Endangered Species Act and the public comment period under that section. We actively support the elements of section 10(c) and the right of the public to review the merits of applications involving endangered species. We are currently reviewing mechanisms to ensure greater access to this material and ease of the public to supply substantial comments. These comments did not address the information collection requirements, and we did not make any changes to our requirement.

During the comment period for the proposed rule titled “Updates Following the Fifteenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES,” which was published in the Federal Register on March 8, 2012 (77 FR 14200), we received one comment pertaining to a form in this collection.

The commenter expressed dissatisfaction with the process for renewing a certificate of ownership for personally owned, live wildlife. The commenter objected to having to complete an entire application when only a few items needed to be updated, and to having to submit his original certificate along with the application for renewal, thus preventing cross-border travel while awaiting issuance of the new certificate. In addition, the commenter noted that having the renewed certificate issued before the end of the period of validity of his existing certificate effectively shortens the period of validity to less than 3 years. He also considered the estimated time of 30 minutes for completion of Form 3–200–64 to be “overly conservative,” and stated that “a more realistic, but still conservative estimate” would be at least 60 minutes.

FWS Form 3–200–64, the application form for issuance to the certificate of ownership for personally owned live wildlife, asks for detailed information regarding the animal to be covered under the certificate. When a certificate holder wishes to renew a certificate of ownership, he or she should complete and submit FWS Form 3–200–52, the application for reissuance or renewal of a permit. This is a simplified application on which the applicant can certify that there have been no changes to the original application or that there have been changes as noted on an attached page. We ask that individuals allow 30 to 60 days for processing of applications, and we do require submission of the original certificate before we will issue a new one. If applying well in advance (more than 60 days before expiration of the certificate), an applicant could submit a copy and continue to use the original certificate, keeping in mind that he or she must return to the United States before the certificate expires. Once travel is completed and the animal has reentered the United States, the original certificate must be returned to the Management Authority. As stated above, we will not issue a new certificate until we have received the original certificate. In some cases it may take longer than 30 minutes to complete FWS Form 3–200–64; however, we believe the average completion time for completing FWS Form 3–200–64 is 30 minutes.

Request for Public Comments

We again invite comments concerning this information collection on:

Whether or not the collection of information is necessary, including
whether or not the information will have practical utility;
• The accuracy of our estimate of the burden for this collection of information;
• Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
• Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment, including your personal identifying information, may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask OMB in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that it will be done.

Tina A. Campbell,
Chief, Division of Policy and Directives
Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

U.S. Geological Survey

[GX14MN00COM0000]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Request for Comments

AGENCY: United States Geological Survey (USGS), Interior.

ACTION: Notice of a new information collection, iCoast—Did the Coast Change?

SUMMARY: We (the U.S. Geological Survey) will ask the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve the information collection (IC) described below. As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995, and as part of our continuing efforts to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, we invite the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on this IC.

DATES: To ensure that your comments are considered, we must receive them on or before April 29, 2014.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on this information collection to the Information Collection Clearance Officer, U.S. Geological Survey, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive MS 807, Reston, VA 20192 (mail); (703) 648–7197 (fax); or dgovoni@usgs.gov (email). Please reference ‘Information Collection 1028–NEW, iCoast—Did the Coast Change?’ in all correspondence.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Sophia B. Liu, Research Geographer, at sophialiu@usgs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

As part of its mission to document coastal change, the USGS has been taking aerial photographs of the coast before and after each major storm for the past 18 years to assess damages to the natural landscape and the built environment. A typical mission consists of approximately 10,000 photographs. The digital photo-archive maintained by the USGS is a valuable environmental record containing approximately 100,000 photographs taken before and after 23 extreme storms along the Gulf and Atlantic Coasts. At the same time, the USGS has been developing mathematical models that predict the likely interactions between storm surge and coastal features, such as beaches and dunes, during extreme storms, with the aim of predicting areas that are vulnerable to storm damage. Currently the photographs are not used to inform the mathematical models. The models are based primarily on pre-storm dune height and predicted wave behavior.

If scientists could “ground truth” coastal damage by comparing before and after photographs of the coast, the predictive models might be improved. It is not physically or economically possible for USGS scientists to examine all aerial photographs related to each storm, however, and automation of this process is also problematic. Image analysis software is not yet sophisticated enough to automatically identify damages to the natural landscape and the built environment that are depicted in these photographs; human perception and local knowledge are required. ‘iCoast—Did the Coast Change?’ (hereafter referred to as ‘iCoast’) is a USGS research project to construct a web-based application that will allow citizen volunteers to compare these before and after photographs of the coast and identify changes that result from extreme storms through a process known as ‘crowdsourcing’ (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crowdsourcing). In concept, this application will be similar to those of other citizen science image comparison and classification projects such as the Citizen Science Alliance’s Cyclone Center project, (see www.cyclonecenter.org), which asks people to classify types of cyclones by comparing satellite images.

There are two distinct purposes to ‘iCoast’:
• To allow USGS scientists to ‘ground truth’ or validate their predictive storm surge models. These mathematical models, which are widely used in the emergency management community for locating areas of potential vulnerability to incoming storms, are currently based solely on pre-storm beach morphology as determined by high-resolution elevation data, and predicted wave behavior derived from parameters of the approaching storm. The on-the-ground post-storm observations provided by citizens using ‘iCoast’ will allow scientists to determine the accuracy of the models for future applications, and
• To serve as a repository of images that enables citizens to become more aware of their vulnerability to coastal change and to participate in the advancement of coastal science.

The application consists of sets of before-and-after photographs from each storm with accompanying educational material about coastal hazards. Since the photographs of a given area were taken on different dates following slightly different flight paths, the geographic orientation of before and after images may differ slightly. Often there will be more than one image covering approximately the same geographic area and showing the same coastal features. Participants are asked to identify which post-storm image best covers the same geographic area and shows the same natural and man-made features as the image taken after the storm. After the best match between before-and-after aerial photographs is established, participants will classify post-storm coastal damage using simple one-or-two word descriptive tags. This type of tagging is similar to that used in commercial photo-sharing Web sites such as Flickr (www.flickr.com). Each participant will classify photographs of their choice. They may classify as many photographs as they wish in as many sessions as they choose.

In order for a citizen to participate in classifying the photographs, the following information must be collected by this application:

(1) Participants will login to the ‘iCoast’ application using externally issued credentials via the Federally approved “Open Identity Exchange” (www.openid.net) method. This Federal Government program benefits users by accelerating their sign up, reducing the frustration of maintaining multiple passwords, allowing them to control their own identity, and minimizing password security risks. User