

# Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 78, No. 213

Monday, November 4, 2013

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

## MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

### Solicitation of Written Comments by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; Correction

**AGENCY:** Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice; correction.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission published a document in the **Federal Register** of October 1, 2013, concerning request for comments on measures to modernize the military compensation and retirement systems. The document contained an incorrect telephone number.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christopher Nuneviller, 703-692-2080.

### Correction

In the **Federal Register** of October 1, 2013, in FR Doc. 2013-23969, on page 60243, in the first column, correct the information under the caption **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** to read:

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Christopher Nuneviller, Associate Director Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, P.O. Box 13170, Arlington, VA 22209, telephone 703-692-2080, fax 703-697-8330, email [christopher.nuneviller@mcrmc.gov](mailto:christopher.nuneviller@mcrmc.gov).

Dated: October 17, 2013.

**Christopher Nuneviller,**

*Associate Director, Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2013-26341 Filed 11-1-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION

### Sunshine Act Meetings

**TIME AND DATE:** 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Tuesday, November 12, 2013. (This meeting has been rescheduled from October 10, 2013, due to the lapse in appropriations and the federal government shutdown, and the Matters To Be Considered section has been updated.)

**PLACE:** The offices of the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation, 130 South Scott Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85701.

**STATUS:** This meeting of the Board of Trustees will be open to the public, unless it is necessary for the Board to consider items in executive session.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:** (1) Minutes of the June 10-11, 2013, Board of Trustees Meeting and resolution conferring upon David J. Hayes the position of Trustee Emeritus of the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation; (2) Appropriations Update; (3) Financial and Management Report and resolution to ratify the Executive Committee vote approving the new Udall Foundation Senior Management structure; (4) Ethics Training Update and General Counsel's Report; (5) U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution Report; (6) Education Programs Report; (7) Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy, Native Nations Institute, and Udall Archives Report 6, Work Plan and resolutions regarding allocation and transfer of funds; and (8) personnel matters.

**PORTIONS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC:** All agenda items except as noted below.

**PORTION CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC:** Executive session to review personnel matters.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:** Philip J. Lemanski, Executive Director, 130 South Scott Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85701, (520) 901-8500.

Dated: October 25, 2013.

**Philip J. Lemanski,**

*Executive Director, Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation, and Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2013-25866 Filed 11-1-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6820-FN-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Office of the Secretary

[Docket No. APHIS-2013-0047]

### Enhancing Agricultural Coexistence; Request for Public Input

**ACTION:** Request for information.

**SUMMARY:** We are informing the public that the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is soliciting comments to identify ways to foster communication and collaboration among those involved in diverse agricultural production systems in order to further agricultural coexistence. We are taking this action in response to recommendations from the USDA's Advisory Committee on Biotechnology & 21st Century Agriculture.

**DATES:** We will consider all comments that we receive on or before January 3, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by either of the following methods:

- Federal eRulemaking Portal: Go to <http://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=APHIS-2013-0047-0001>.

- Postal Mail/Commercial Delivery: Send your comment to Docket No. APHIS-2013-0047, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, Station 3A-03.8, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737-1238.

Supporting documents and any comments we receive on this docket may be viewed at <http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=APHIS-2013-0047> or in our reading room, which is located in room 1141 of the USDA South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. Normal reading room hours are 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. To be sure someone is there to help you, please call (202) 799-7039 before coming.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Meghan Klingel, Acting Advisor for State and Stakeholder Relations, Office of the Deputy Administrator, LPA, APHIS, 4700 River Road Unit 51, Riverdale, MD 20737-1231; (301) 851-4055, email: [meghan.k.klingel@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:meghan.k.klingel@aphis.usda.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## Background

Agricultural coexistence refers to the concurrent cultivation of crops produced through diverse agricultural systems, including traditionally produced, organic, identity preserved (IP),<sup>1</sup> and genetically engineered crops. As the complexity and diversity of U.S. agriculture increases, so does the importance of managing issues that affect agricultural coexistence, such as seed purity, gene flow, post-harvest mixing, identity testing, and market requirements.

On November 19, 2012, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Advisory Committee on Biotechnology & 21st Century Agriculture (AC21) presented a report<sup>2</sup> to Secretary Thomas J. Vilsack entitled, "Enhancing Coexistence: A Report of the AC21 to the Secretary of Agriculture." The AC21 report on coexistence made recommendations in five major areas regarding agricultural coexistence: (1) Potential compensation mechanisms, (2) stewardship, (3) education and outreach, (4) research, and (5) seed quality. In the area of education and outreach, we are seeking public input regarding the implementation of the recommendation that USDA foster communication and collaboration to strengthen coexistence. Following the comment period, USDA intends to hold a public forum to discuss input provided by commenters and further explore ways to implement the recommendations in the AC21 report on enhancing coexistence, particularly in the area of education and outreach.

USDA's goal in seeking comment is to determine how we can best foster communication and collaboration among those involved in diverse agricultural systems on the topic of coexistence as well as how USDA can best communicate and collaborate with those entities. To do this, USDA needs to better understand our stakeholders' needs and the challenges they face when it comes to communicating and collaborating about coexistence. Specific topics for input are discussed below. To aid in our evaluation of comments, we request that commenters identify which topic number(s) they are addressing in their comment when practicable. We also request that commenters indicate where any tools or

information that they identify in their comment can be obtained.

1. As we seek improved communication and collaboration among agricultural stakeholders, we are interested in identifying information needs and exploring successful communication methods.

- When you or members of your organization seek information related to coexistence, what type of information are you seeking and where do you go to get it? Why?

- What information regarding coexistence, in what format, is currently available (printed or electronic brochures, factsheets, blog posts, Web sites, discussion forums, etc.)? Is this information useful? Why or why not? What additional information, in what format, would be useful to you or members of your organization?

- Please indicate your preferences with respect to receiving information or communications from USDA. Would you be interested in receiving information or communications from non-USDA sources? How might you or your organization, as agricultural stakeholders, want to be involved in disseminating information?

- Where should USDA focus its efforts to best foster communication and collaboration amongst stakeholders? What would best facilitate farmer-to-farmer communication and collaboration?

- Please share any examples of and feedback regarding successful communication models, including those that have worked well for other issues.

2. As part of USDA's outreach and education efforts, we are interested in identifying education needs and exploring the creation of "outreach toolkits" that will encourage communication, planning, and crop-specific practices to facilitate successful coexistence.

- What tools and educational services are already available? Are these tools and services useful? What tools and educational services would be useful to you?

- How might USDA assist farmers to better understand the contracts they enter into (e.g., contracts to provide organic products and IP products for specialty markets) and their commitments with respect to coexistence?

- What geographic information, in what format, is available regarding the location of crops that are planted and grown using different types of agricultural systems (e.g., pinning maps)? Is the information updated regularly? What are stakeholders doing to make this type of geographic

information more widely available? What can USDA do to assist in these efforts?

- Would a decision support system, i.e., a computer-based information system that could be used to support data-based, planting-related decisions, with topics such as when and where to plant, suitable isolation distances, and gene flow, be useful? Why or why not? If such a decision support system would be useful, what data would be needed for the system to be effective?

3. Farmers and others in the food and feed production chain have an important role in collaborating to make coexistence work, particularly with reference to stewardship, contracting, and attention to gene flow. As we seek to improve collaboration among those involved in diverse agricultural systems, we are interested in hearing what practices and activities that support collaboration are available or in use and how USDA can help make collaboration and coexistence work for everyone involved.

- What are factors that might prevent or promote the broad adoption of local, voluntary solutions aimed at facilitating coexistence?

- Please provide examples of effective coexistence practices (e.g., between neighboring farmers or among regional networks of farms) and on-farm and off-farm techniques for mitigating the potential economic risks from occurrences that affect successful coexistence. How might they be made to be more effective?

- What types of coexistence practices could be supported in potential joint coexistence plans,<sup>3</sup> i.e., voluntary written plans specifying farming practices (such as farmer-to-farmer communication, cropping plans, temporal and physical isolation, and harvesting techniques) that can be used to support coexistence and identity-preserved production? What might an effective, supportable, joint coexistence plan look like? How might USDA encourage adoption of joint coexistence plans?

4. We also welcome any recommendations regarding collaborative meeting formats that would best ensure coexistence issues will be frankly and fully explored at the public forum that USDA intends to hold following the close of the public comment period.

Any comments submitted will be available for review as indicated under **ADDRESSES** above. USDA will evaluate

<sup>1</sup> An identity preserved crop is a crop of an assured quality in which the identity of the material is maintained from the germplasm or breeding stock to the processed product on a retail shelf.

<sup>2</sup> To view the report and learn more about the AC21, go to <http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?contentidonly=true&contentid=AC21Main.xml>.

<sup>3</sup> The AC21 report (see footnote 2) recommends that USDA consider supporting the development of such plans among neighboring farmers.

all the comments received during the comment period. Input provided by commenters and ways to implement the recommendations in the AC21 report on enhancing coexistence (see footnote 2), particularly in the area of education and outreach, will be further explored at a public forum that USDA intends to hold following the close of the public comment period. The time and place of the public forum will be announced in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: October 28, 2013.

**Thomas J. Vilsack,**

*Secretary of Agriculture.*

[FR Doc. 2013-26288 Filed 11-1-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-34-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Revision of the Land Management Plan for the Flathead National Forest

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of initiating the development of a land management plan revision for the Flathead National Forest.

**SUMMARY:** The Flathead National Forest, located in Montana, is initiating the forest planning process pursuant to the 2012 Forest Planning Rule. This process results in a Forest Land Management Plan which describes the strategic direction for management of forest resources for the next ten to fifteen years on the Flathead National Forest. The first phase of the process, the assessment phase, has begun and interested parties have been invited to contribute in the development of the assessment (36 CFR 219.6). The Forest has posted preliminary assessment information to its Web site as well as hosted field tours and an open house. The assessment is expected to be completed in December 2013. The trends and conditions identified in the assessment will help in identifying the need for plan components. The Forest is inviting the public to help us identify the appropriate plan components that will become a proposed action for the land management plan revision.

**DATES:** The assessment for the Flathead National Forest is expected to be completed by December 31, 2013 and will be posted on the following Web site at [www.fs.usda.gov/goto/flathead/forestplanrevision](http://www.fs.usda.gov/goto/flathead/forestplanrevision).

From October 2013 through June 2014, the public is invited to engage in a collaborative process to identify appropriate plan components to be considered for the proposed action. The

Forest will then initiate procedures pursuant to the NEPA and prepare a forest plan revision.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments or questions concerning this notice should be addressed to Flathead National Forest, Attn.: Plan Revision, 650 Wolfpack Way, Kalispell, Montana, 59901.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joe Krueger, Planning Team Leader, 406-758-5243. Individuals who use telecommunication devices for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday.

More information on the planning process can also be found on the Flathead National Forest Web site at [www.fs.usda.gov/goto/flathead/forestplanrevision](http://www.fs.usda.gov/goto/flathead/forestplanrevision).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The National Forest Management Act (NFMA) of 1976 requires that every National Forest System (NFS) unit develop a land management plan. On April 9, 2012, the Forest Service finalized its land management planning rule (2012 Planning Rule), which provides broad programmatic direction to National Forests and National Grasslands for developing and implementing their land management plans. Forest plans describe the strategic direction for management of forest resources for ten to fifteen years, and are adaptive and amendable as conditions change over time.

Under the 2012 Planning Rule, the assessment of ecological, social, and economic trends and conditions is the first stage of the planning process. The second stage is a development and decision process guided, in part, by the National Environment Policy Act (NEPA) and includes the preparation of a draft environmental impact statement and revised Forest Plan for public review and comment, and the preparation of the final environmental impact statement and revised Forest Plan. The third stage of the process is monitoring and feedback, which is ongoing over the life of the revised forest plans.

With this notice, the agency invites other governments, non-governmental parties, and the public to contribute to the development of the proposed action. The intent of public engagement during development of the proposed action is to identify the appropriate plan components that the Forest Service should consider in developing its land management plan. We encourage contributors to share material about desired conditions, standards and

guidelines, land suitability determinations, management area designations, and plan monitoring. Collaboration in the development of the proposed action supports the development of relationships of key stakeholders throughout the plan development process and is an essential step to understanding current conditions, available data, and feedback needed to support a strategic, efficient planning process.

As public meetings, other opportunities for public engagement, and public review and comment opportunities are identified to assist with the development of the forest plan revision, public announcements will be made, notifications will be posted on the Forest's Web site at [www.fs.usda.gov/goto/flathead/forestplanrevision](http://www.fs.usda.gov/goto/flathead/forestplanrevision) and information will be sent out to the Forest's mailing list. If anyone is interested in being on the Forest's mailing list to receive these notifications, please contact Joe Krueger, Planning Team Leader, at the mailing address identified above, by sending an email to [flatheadplanrevision@fs.fed.us](mailto:flatheadplanrevision@fs.fed.us), or by telephone 406-758-5243.

#### Responsible Official

The responsible official for the revision of the land management plan for the Flathead National Forest is Chip Weber, Forest Supervisor, Flathead National Forest, 650 Wolfpack Way, Kalispell, MT 59901.

Dated: October 28, 2013.

**Chip Weber,**

*Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 2013-26289 Filed 11-1-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-83-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Forest Service

#### Black Hills National Forest Advisory Board

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of cancellation of meeting of the Black Hills National Forest Advisory Board.

**SUMMARY:** The U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Black Hills National Forest cancelled the October 16, 2013 meeting of the Black Hills National Forest Advisory Board (Board), due to the Federal Government furlough which began on October 1, 2013. The original Notice of Meeting for the October 16, 2013 meeting was published in the **Federal Register**, Volume 78, Number 187, Thursday, September 26, 2013, pages 59337-59338.