

and additional monitoring; notifying each worker of their exposure monitoring results either in writing or by posting; implementing a written compliance program; and establishing a respiratory protection program in accordance with OSHA's Respiratory Protection Standard (29 CFR 1910.134).

II. Special Issues for Comment

OSHA has a particular interest in comments on the following issues:

- Whether the proposed information collection requirements are necessary for the proper performance of the Agency's functions, including whether the information is useful;
- The accuracy of OSHA's estimate of the burden (time and costs) of the information collection requirements, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- The quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden on employers who must comply; for example, by using automated or other technological information collection and transmission techniques.

III. Proposed Actions

OSHA is requesting an adjustment decrease in burden hours from 35,739 to 20,558 (a total decrease of 15,181 hours). The adjustment is primarily due to a decrease in covered workers.

Type of Review: Extension of a Currently Approved Collection.

Title: Cotton Dust Standard (29 CFR 1910.1043).

OMB Number: 1218-0061.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profits; Federal Government; State, Local or Tribal Government.

Number of Respondents: 281.

Frequency of Response: Annually; semi-annually; on occasion.

Total Responses: 53,622.

Average Time per Response: Varies from 5 minutes (.08 hour) for a secretary to maintain a record to 2 hours to conduct exposure monitoring.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 20,558.

Estimated Cost (Operation and Maintenance): \$2,449,194.

IV. Public Participation—Submission of Comments on this Notice and Internet Access to Comments and Submissions

You may submit comments in response to this document as follows:

- (1) Electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>, which is the Federal eRulemaking Portal; (2) by facsimile (fax); or (3) by hard copy. All comments, attachments, and other material must identify the Agency name and the OSHA docket number for the

ICR (Docket No. OSHA-2011-0194). You may supplement electronic submissions by uploading document files electronically. If you wish to mail additional materials in reference to an electronic or facsimile submission, you must submit them to the OSHA Docket Office (see the section of this notice titled **ADDRESSES**). The additional materials must clearly identify your electronic comments by your name, date, and the docket number so the Agency can attach them to your comments.

Because of security procedures, the use of regular mail may cause a significant delay in the receipt of comments. For information about security procedures concerning the delivery of materials by hand, express delivery, messenger, or courier service, please contact the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693-2350, (TTY) (877) 889-5627.

Comments and submissions are posted without change at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Therefore, OSHA cautions commenters about submitting personal information such as social security numbers and dates of birth. Although all submissions are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index, some information (e.g., copyrighted material) is not publicly available to read or download through this Web site. All submissions, including copyrighted material, are available for inspection and copying at the OSHA Docket Office. Information on using the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site to submit comments and access the docket is available at the Web site's "User Tips" link. Contact the OSHA Docket Office for information about materials not available through the Web site and for assistance in using the Internet to locate docket submissions.

V. Authority and Signature

David Michaels, PhD, MPH, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, directed the preparation of this notice. The authority for this notice is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3506 *et seq.*) and Secretary of Labor's Order No. 4-2010 (75 FR 55355).

Signed at Washington, DC, on September 30, 2011.

David Michaels, PhD, MPH,

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 2011-25664 Filed 10-4-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-26-P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; the Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation Pilot Idea Template

AGENCY: Office of Management and Budget.

ACTION: Notice and request for public comments.

SUMMARY: The Office of Federal Financial Management (OFFM) within the Office of Management and Budget is proposing for approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) the attached template for pilot idea summaries submitted to the Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation (Partnership Fund). This notice announces that OFFM intends to submit this collection to OMB for approval and solicits comments on specific aspects for the proposed collection. The first notice of this information collection request, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act, was published in the **Federal Register** on June 6, 2011 [76 FR 32375]. There were no comments on the first notice.

The Partnership Fund seeks to identify pilot projects to improve the service delivery, payment accuracy, and administrative efficiency of state-administered Federal assistance programs, while also reducing access barriers for eligible beneficiaries.

The proposed pilot idea summary template is intended for use by those wishing to submit pilot ideas for consideration. It outlines the specific information required by the Partnership Fund to make informed decisions in the pilot selection process. Pilot ideas to advance the Partnership Fund's goals are being solicited from all stakeholders, including the general public. The template is currently in use by Federal agencies based on OMB guidance. If approved under the Paperwork Reduction Act, it will be used to solicit ideas from stakeholders outside the Federal government both as a general template and as an online form for idea solicitations through the Partnership Fund web site, <http://www.partner4solutions.gov>. Currently, general ideas may be submitted via e-mail to partner4solutions@omb.eop.gov, or through <http://www.partner4solutions.gov>. The Partnership Fund is funded through FY 2012 and will continue to accept pilot idea proposals on a rolling basis until funding is exhausted. The Partnership Fund must

comply with a statutory requirement that all pilot projects, when taken together, be cost neutral.

DATES: Submit comments on or before November 4, 2011. Late comments will be considered to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES: Due to potential delays in OMB's receipt and processing of mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, we encourage respondents to submit comments electronically to ensure timely receipt. We cannot guarantee that comments mailed will be received before the comment closing date.

Comments may be e-mailed to: mmassey@omb.eop.gov and/or FN-OMB-OIRA-Submission@omb.eop.gov. Please include the full body of your comments in the text of the electronic message, as well as in an attachment. Please include your name, title, organization, postal address, telephone number, and e-mail address in the text of the message. Comments may also be submitted via facsimile to (202) 395-3242.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Please visit our web site at www.partner4solutions.gov or contact Meg Massey at (202) 395-7552 or mmassey@omb.eop.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation (Partnership Fund) was established by the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010 (Pub. L. 111-117). An appropriation of \$32.5 million¹ provides money to pilot and evaluate promising innovations that confront these challenges in Federal, state and/or local administration. The purpose of the Partnership Fund is to identify and evaluate innovations in programs jointly administered by Federal and state agencies and in other program areas where Federal-state cooperation would be beneficial. OMB coordinates and manages the Partnership Fund for the purpose of conducting pilot projects that test these innovations. The pilots will emphasize the Partnership Fund's four goals: service delivery, program integrity, administrative efficiency, and program access.

Ideas submitted by the public are shared with the Collaborative Forum, a self-directed stakeholder group (<http://www.collaborativeforumonline.com>) established to fulfill the statutory

requirement that the OMB Director consult with an "interagency council of stakeholders" in determining which pilots will receive Partnership Fund funding. The Collaborative Forum identifies pilot ideas that show the greatest potential for meeting the Partnership Fund's four goals and convenes work groups to further develop these ideas into feasible, measurable pilot concepts. Collaborative Forum work groups include state and other stakeholders with relevant expertise. Work groups produce pilot concept papers describing the goals, methods, resource requirements, and anticipated outcomes of proposed pilots. Ideas sent to the Collaborative Forum may be developed into pilot concept papers to send to OMB for funding consideration.

Federal agencies may also develop ideas into pilot concept papers that are shared with the Collaborative Forum for consultation. Pilot concepts are then submitted for funding approval by OMB, which takes into account the consultation provided by the Collaborative Forum and by the Partnership Fund's Federal Steering Committee, which consists of senior policy officials from Federal agencies that administer the major benefits programs.

Funds for each approved pilot concept are transferred to a lead Federal agency, which in turn selects specific states, localities, and/or other relevant entities to participate in the pilot by implementing specific pilot projects using pilot funds. The lead agency also conducts a cost-effective evaluation of the pilot projects. Based on evaluation findings, successful pilots will serve as models for other states and local agencies. Evaluation results may also be used to inform future administrative or legislative changes to the affected programs, including broader implementation of the innovations tested.

Examples of Programs and Pilots: Examples of Federally funded, state-administered assistance programs relevant to the goals of the Partnership Fund are listed below. Other programs will also be included in concept idea submissions.

- Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)
- Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP—formerly Food Stamps)
- Medicaid
- Unemployment Insurance (UI)
- Child Welfare
- Child Care

- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Examples of the types of pilots that could be supported include:

- Pilots that simplify or streamline processes for application, eligibility determination, and confirmation of continued eligibility
 - Pilots that promote or utilize data matching and information sharing across programs
 - Pilots that test integrated applications, screening, and verification for multiple benefit programs
- Components of an ideal pilot are listed below. Not every pilot concept considered for funding will meet all of these criteria, and the size and scope of the pilot projects funded may vary widely:

- Yield reliable data that can be captured in the pilot evaluation to suggest replication or expansion and demonstrate how successfully the pilot meets the Partnership Fund's four goals
- Have the potential to be replicated and sustained on a larger scale
- Address multiple elements of the Partnership Fund's four goals
- Address multiple programs and/or otherwise bridge organizational silos
- Yield measurable results in nine to 18 months
- Support the statutory requirement that Partnership Fund pilot projects be cost neutral when looked at as a whole

Current Actions: New collection of information.

Type of Review: New collection.

Affected Public: Individuals and households, businesses and organizations, State, Local, or Tribal Government.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 300.

Frequency of Response: We expect that most respondents will use the form to submit one idea, while some respondents may submit more than one idea.

Average minutes per response: 2 hours.

Burden Hours: 600.

Needs and Uses: The template is currently being used by Federal agencies, per OMB guidance, to submit pilot ideas to the Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation, and as a useful reference for other organizations or individuals wishing to submit pilot ideas. If approved, the template will be made available for use by all agencies, individuals, and organizations wishing to submit pilot concept proposals for consideration.

Obligation to respond: Voluntary. However, if Federal agencies wish to pursue a pilot through the Partnership Fund, they should use this template.

¹ The initial FY 2010 appropriation for the Partnership Fund was for \$37.5 million. This appropriation has been reduced to \$32.5 million due to a \$5 million rescission in Public Law 112-10.

Nature and extent of confidentiality: All pilot ideas submitted to the Partnership Fund may be posted on the Collaborative Forum web site, <http://www.collaborativeforumonline.com>, for comment and feedback. Individuals and organizations that submit ideas, regardless of whether they elect to use the template, may submit contact information if they wish to be contacted by the Collaborative Forum about their idea. Contact information, if submitted, will not be shared or used for any other purpose.

Privacy Impact Assessment: All ideas submitted to the Partnership Fund may be posted on the Collaborative Forum web site for comment and feedback. The template makes clear that the ideas submitted will be shared.

Requests for Comments: Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the 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 collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of services to provide information. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; to develop, acquire, install and utilize technology and systems for the purpose of collecting, validating and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; to train personnel and to be able to respond to a collection of information, to search data sources, to complete and review the collection of information; and to transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

All written comments will be available for public inspection on Regulations.gov.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid

Office of Management and Budget control number.

Debra J. Bond,
Deputy Controller.

Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation Template Instructions for Pilot Idea Summary

The first step in the Partnership Fund pilot selection process is the submission of a pilot idea summary. Pilot idea summaries may be submitted by anyone through the partner4solutions.gov website, <http://www.partner4solutions.gov>, or the partner4solutions@omb.eop.gov email address. Pilot ideas may be sent to an independent Collaborative Forum for further development into more detailed concept papers. OMB consults with the Federal Steering Committee in selecting pilot concepts and making funding decisions.

Below are instructions for completing a pilot idea summary. Completed pilot idea summaries should not be more than two pages in length.

PARTNERSHIP FUND FOR PROGRAM INTEGRITY INNOVATION

PILOT IDEA: *Name of Pilot Idea*

1. Pilot Idea: *Summarize the idea in 2–3 sentences.*

2. Programs Affected:

- *Which programs are affected, either directly or indirectly? Ideally, an idea would address multiple programs and bridge multiple programmatic silos.*
- *Are these federal, state, and/or local programs? An ideal submission would involve multiple states and/or communities in the development or eventual implementation of a pilot.*

3. Measurable Impacts: *How does the pilot impact each of the four goals of the Partnership Fund? A pilot should address as many of these goals as possible across multiple programs or test a solution that could later be applied to multiple programs.*

- (a) Improving payment accuracy*
- (b) Improving administrative efficiency*
- (c) Improving service delivery*
- (d) Reducing access barriers for eligible beneficiaries*

4. Expected Outcomes and Measurement Methodologies:

- *What are the expectations and measures of success in relation to the four goals?*
- *What are the possible quantitative and qualitative measures?*
- *Could these outcomes be extrapolated to a larger environment?*

5. Potential Partners or Sponsors:

- *Which stakeholders and/or key organizations are involved?*
- *Does the proposed pilot have sufficient stakeholder buy-in? Stakeholders could include federal, state, and local governments, and non-governmental organizations.*

6. Estimated Operating Cost of Pilot:

- *How much would the pilot cost to implement?*
- *Are there resources of matching or leveraged funds that could be used to support this pilot?*
- *Is the Partnership Fund the most appropriate funding source for the pilot? All pilot ideas will be considered, but the Partnership Fund is targeting ideas that attempt to cut across multiple programs with multiple objectives, but have struggled to gain footing in existing program silos.*

7. Estimated Impact on Program Costs:

- *What are the anticipated costs and/or savings for the various programs involved in the pilot?*
- *If the pilot were to be scaled up, what are the anticipated costs/savings? Pilot ideas that increase program costs will be considered, but the Partnership Fund must comply with our statutory requirement to maintain overall cost neutrality.*

8. Pilot Implementation Issues:

- *Is this pilot idea ready for immediate implementation, or does it require further refinement?*
- *What is the timeframe in which the pilot would be conducted? The target time period for conducting the first round of pilots is nine-18 months.*
- *What are possible implementation barriers (e.g., privacy issues)?*
- *Is this pilot scalable? Successful ideas will demonstrate strong external validity and scalability.*
- *Could this pilot be implemented under existing legislative authorities or mechanisms?*
- *Are any administrative waivers required?*

PARTNERSHIP FUND FOR PROGRAM INTEGRITY INNOVATION

PILOT IDEA SUMMARY: *Name of Pilot Idea*

1. Pilot Idea:

2. Programs Affected:

3. Measurable Impacts:

- (a) Improving payment accuracy*
- (b) Improving administrative efficiency*
- (c) Improving service delivery*
- (d) Reducing access barriers for beneficiaries*

4. Expected Outcomes and Measurement Methodologies:

**5. Potential Partners or Sponsors:
6. Estimated Operating Cost of Pilot:
7. Estimated Impact on Program Costs:
8. Pilot Implementation Issues:**

[FR Doc. 2011-25651 Filed 10-4-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Final Guidance on Appointment of Lobbyists to Federal Boards and Commissions

AGENCY: Office of Management and Budget.

ACTION: Notice of Final Guidance.

SUMMARY: The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is issuing final guidance to Executive Departments and agencies concerning the appointment of federally registered lobbyists to boards and commissions. On June 18, 2010, President Obama issued "Lobbyists on Agency Boards and Commissions," a memorandum directing agencies and departments in the Executive Branch not to appoint or re-appoint federally registered lobbyists to advisory committees and other boards and commissions. The Presidential Memorandum further directed the Director of OMB to "issue proposed guidance to implement this policy to the full extent permitted by law." Proposed guidance was posted on November 2, 2010 and the final guidance was formulated after review of the comments received to the proposed guidance. The Presidential Memorandum is available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/presidential-memorandum-lobbyists-agency-boards-and-commissions>.

DATES: *Effective Date:* The final guidance will be effective 30 days from the date of issuance in the **Federal Register**.

A. Final Guidance

On June 18, 2010, President Obama signed a Presidential Memorandum directing agencies in the Executive Branch not to appoint or re-appoint federally registered lobbyists to advisory committees and other boards and commissions. That memorandum directed the Office of Management and Budget to propose implementing guidance, which follows in the form of questions and answers:

Q1: Who is affected by the policy directed in the June 18, 2010 Presidential Memorandum (the "Memorandum")?

A1: This policy applies to federally registered lobbyists and does not apply to individuals who are registered as lobbyists only at the state level. A lobbyist for

purposes of the Memorandum is any individual who is subject to the registration and reporting requirements of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (LDA), as amended, 2 U.S.C. 1605, at the time of appointment or reappointment to an advisory board or commission. Agencies may rely on appropriate searches of databases maintained by the House of Representatives and the Senate in identifying federally registered lobbyists.¹ Alternatively, agencies may consider including in their recruitment process for appointing members a way of obtaining written certification from the individual that he or she is not a federally registered lobbyist.

Any individual who previously served as a federally registered lobbyist may be appointed or re-appointed only if he or she has either filed a bona fide de-registration or has been de-listed by his or her employer as an active lobbyist reflecting the actual cessation of lobbying activities or if they have not appeared on a quarterly lobbying report for three consecutive quarters as a result of their actual cessation of lobbying activities.

Q2: Does the policy restrict the appointment of individuals who are themselves not federally registered lobbyists but are employed by organizations that engage in lobbying activities?

A2: No, the policy established by the Memorandum applies only to federally registered lobbyists and does not apply to non-lobbyists employed by organizations that lobby.

Q3: What entities constitute "boards and commissions" under the policy?

A3: The policy directed in the Memorandum applies to any committee, board, commission, council, delegation, conference, panel, task force, or other similar group (or subgroup) created by the President, the Congress, or an Executive Branch department or agency to serve a specific function to which appointment is required, regardless of whether it is subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.). Appointment includes appointment required or permitted by law or regulation, including appointment at the discretion of the department or agency. Additionally, the ban also applies to established workgroups and subcommittees for boards and commissions, which may or may not require formal appointment.

Q4: Does the policy apply to non-Federal members of delegations to international bodies?

A4: Yes, delegations organized to present the United States' position to international bodies are considered to be boards or commissions for the purposes of this policy, regardless of whether they constitute advisory committees for purposes of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.). Therefore, agencies should not appoint federally registered lobbyists to these delegations.

Q5: Which "members" of those boards and commissions are covered by the policy?

¹ Lobbying Disclosure, Office of the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives: <http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov>; LDA Reports, U.S. Senate: http://www.senate.gov/legislative/Public_Disclosure/LDA_reports.htm.

A5: The policy applies to all members of boards and commissions who are not full-time Federal employees, including both those who have been designated to serve in a representative capacity on behalf of an interested group or constituency and those who have been designated to serve as Special Government Employees, and who are appointed by the President or an Executive Branch agency or official. However, the policy is not intended to be inconsistent with provisions of Federal law or international agreements. Accordingly, even where provisions exist that allow private organizations to designate their representatives or require their consultation on appointments, the appointing authority should, to the extent permissible by law, require such organizations to agree to the appointment of individuals who are not federally registered lobbyists.

Members of boards and commissions do not include individuals who are invited to attend meetings of boards or commissions on an ad hoc basis.

Q6: How does the policy apply if a statute or presidential directive provides for appointments to be made by State Governors or by members of Congress?

A6: While the discretion of appointing authorities outside of the Executive Branch will be respected, those appointing authorities should be encouraged to appoint individuals who are not federally registered lobbyists whenever possible.

Q7: How does the policy apply when a statute or presidential directive requires the appointment of a specific representative from an organization and that representative is a federally registered lobbyist?

A7: The policy does not supersede board or commission membership requirements established by statute or presidential directive. However, committee charters in effect at the time of the new policy that require a lobbyist to be appointed as a member of the committee should, wherever possible and at the earliest possible time, be amended to conform to the policy, consistent with statutes and presidential directives.

Q8: How will the guidance affect lobbyists who were serving on boards and commissions at the time the policy was established?

A8: The prohibition on the appointment of federally registered lobbyists to boards and commissions established by the Memorandum applies to appointments and re-appointments made after June 18, 2010. In order to ensure that there is no disruption of ongoing work of boards and commissions, federally registered lobbyists who already were serving on boards and commissions on that date may serve out the remainder of their terms, but may not be reappointed so long as they remain registered lobbyists.

Q9: Does this policy also restrict the participation of lobbyists as members of a subcommittee or other work group that performs preparatory work for its parent board or commission?

A9: Yes, the policy does not permit the appointment of federally registered lobbyists to a subcommittee or any other subgroup that performs preparatory work for a parent board or commission, whether or not its members