

scheme, could allow market participants greater control over the execution of their orders. Specifically, the proposal may help market participants avoid having orders cancelled as a result of a narrow one-MPV price protection limit, particularly in instances when the order's limit price expresses a willingness to trade more than one MPV away from the NBBO that prevailed at the time the order was received. The Commission notes, however, that such a result may still occur under the proposal, when either the default one-MPV price protection limit applies as a result of the member not providing customized instructions, or when a custom price protection limit sits between an order's limit price and the NBBO at the time the order is received. The Commission notes further that, in order to accommodate the amended price protection functionality, the proposal will allow orders to trigger pauses at multiple successive price points, either through the Route Timer or Liquidity Refresh mechanisms.

In addition to providing market participants greater control over the execution of their orders, the Commission believes that the proposal also could facilitate more order interaction. By allowing orders to execute at multiple price points, up or down to their price protection limit or limit price, and to route to away markets at multiple price points, the proposal will allow market participants to interact with greater liquidity both on MIAX and on away markets and increase the opportunity for their orders to receive an execution. Importantly, as is the case under the current price protection functionality, the Commission notes that under the revised process, MIAX will not execute incoming orders at prices inferior to the then-current NBBO.

The Commission believes that the change regarding terminating a Liquidity Refresh Pause when a new quote or order is received during a Liquidity Refresh Pause on the same side of the market as the initiating orders' remaining contracts that locks or crosses the original NBBO is consistent with the Act. The Commission notes that terminating the pause in such a situation allows the displayed opposite side of the MBBO to receive an immediate execution. Further, the Commission notes that, as under the current MIAX rules, orders will then be processed in the order in which they were received.

Finally, the Commission believes that the proposed change to permit immediate routing in an additional situation (*i.e.*, for Public Customer

orders resting on the book when an incoming Public Customer order has initiated a Route Mechanism) will benefit Public Customers by providing such orders with greater access to marketable away liquidity and will allow such orders more promptly to receive an execution instead of being restricted from immediately routing away. As the Commission noted in its approval of MIAX's application for registration as a national securities exchange, pursuant to MIAX's immediate routing process in Rule 529, orders have to meet a number of criteria to be eligible for immediate routing, and as such, many, if not most, orders are likely subject to the one second Route Timer, rather than immediately routing to an away exchange displaying the NBBO.¹⁹ While MIAX is not specifically required to route to away markets, the Commission believes that providing an additional opportunity for immediate routing should be beneficial to Public Customer orders.

IV. Conclusion

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act²⁰ that the proposed rule change (SR-MIAX-2014-08), is approved.

For the Commission, by the Division of Trading and Markets, pursuant to delegated authority.²¹

Kevin M. O'Neill,
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014-09211 Filed 4-22-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 500-1]

Valley Forge Composite Technologies, Inc.; Order of Suspension of Trading

April 21, 2014.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission that there is a lack of current and accurate information concerning the securities of Valley Forge Composite Technologies, Inc. because it has not filed any periodic reports since the period ended September 30, 2012.

The Commission is of the opinion that the public interest and the protection of

¹⁹ See Securities Exchange Act Release No. 68341 (December 3, 2012), 77 FR 73065, 73086-87 (December 7, 2012) (noting that broker-dealers have a duty of best execution and thus broker-dealers need to consider and evaluate the functioning of the MIAX routing mechanisms and the quality of any resulting executions in making their determination of whether to route customer orders to MIAX).

²⁰ 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(2).

²¹ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12).

investors require a suspension of trading in the securities of the above-listed company. Therefore, it is ordered, pursuant to Section 12(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that trading in the securities of the above-listed company is suspended for the period from 9:30 a.m. EDT on April 21, 2014, through 11:59 p.m. EDT on May 2, 2014.

By the Commission.

Kevin M. O'Neill,
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014-09314 Filed 4-21-14; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 8011-01-P

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Request and Comment Request

The Social Security Administration (SSA) publishes a list of information collection packages requiring clearance by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in compliance with Public Law (Pub. L.) 104-13, the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, effective October 1, 1995. This notice includes revisions of OMB-approved information collections and one new information collection.

SSA is soliciting comments on the accuracy of the agency's burden estimate; the need for the information; its practical utility; ways to enhance its quality, utility, and clarity; and ways to minimize burden on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Mail, email, or fax your comments and recommendations on the information collection(s) to the OMB Desk Officer and SSA Reports Clearance Officer at the following addresses or fax numbers. (OMB)
Office of Management and Budget,
Attn: Desk Officer for SSA,
Fax: 202-395-6974,
Email address: OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov.

(SSA)
Social Security Administration, OLCA,
Attn: Reports Clearance Director,
3100 West High Rise,
6401 Security Blvd.,
Baltimore, MD 21235,
Fax: 410-966-2830,
Email address: OR.Reports.Clearance@ssa.gov.

I. The information collections below are pending at SSA. SSA will submit them to OMB within 60 days from the date of this notice. To be sure we consider your comments, we must

receive them no later than June 23, 2014. Individuals can obtain copies of the collection instruments by writing to the above email address.

1. Farm Arrangement Questionnaire—20 CFR 404.1082(c)—0960–0064. When self-employed workers submit earnings data to SSA, they cannot count rental income from a farm unless they

demonstrate “material participation” in the farm’s operation. A material participation arrangement means the farm owners must perform a combination of physical duties, management decisions, and capital investment in the farm they are renting out. SSA uses Form SSA–7157, the Farm Arrangement Questionnaire, to

document material participation. The respondents are workers who are renting farmland to others; are involved in the operation of the farm; and want to claim countable income from work they perform relating to the farm.

Type of Request: Revision of an OMB-approved information collection.

Modality of completion	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Average burden per response (minutes)	Estimated total annual burden (hours)
SSA–7157	38,000	1	30	19,000

2. Plan for Achieving Self-Support (PASS)—20 CFR 416.110(e), 416.1180–1182, 416.1225–1227—0960–0559. The Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program encourages recipients to return to work. One of the program’s objectives is to provide incentives and opportunities that help recipients work toward employment. The PASS provision allows individuals to use available income or resources (such as

business equipment, education, or specialized training) to enter or re-enter the workforce and become self-supporting. In turn, SSA does not count the income or resources recipients use to fund a PASS when determining an individual’s SSI eligibility or payment amount. An SSI recipient who wants to use available income and resources to obtain education or training to become self-supporting completes Form SSA–

545. SSA uses the information from the SSA–545 to evaluate the recipient’s PASS, and to determine eligibility under the provisions of the SSI program. The respondents are SSI recipients who are blind or disabled and want to develop a return-to-work plan.

Type of Request: Revision of an OMB-approved information collection.

Modality of completion	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Average burden per response (minutes)	Estimated total annual burden (hours)
SSA–545	7,000	1	120	14,000

3. Help America Vote Act—0960–0706. H.R. 3295, the Help America Vote Act of 2002, mandates that States verify the identities of newly registered voters. When newly registered voters do not have drivers’ licenses or State-issued ID cards, they must supply the last four digits of their Social Security Number to their local State election agencies for

verification. The election agencies forward this information to their State Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA), which inputs the data into the American Association of MVAs, a central consolidation system that routes the voter data to SSA’s Help America Vote Verification (HAVV) system. Once SSA’s HAVV system confirms the

identity of the voter, the information returns along the same route in reverse until it reaches the State election agency. The official respondents for this collection are the State MVAs.

Type of Request: Revision of an OMB-approved information collection.

Modality of completion	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Average burden per response (minutes)	Estimated total annual burden (hours)
HAVV	2,352,204	1	2	78,407

II. SSA submitted the information collections below to OMB for clearance. Your comments regarding the information collections would be most useful if OMB and SSA receive them 30 days from the date of this publication. To be sure we consider your comments, we must receive them no later than May 23, 2014. Individuals can obtain copies of the OMB clearance packages by writing to *OR.Reports.Clearance@ssa.gov*.

1. Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI (PROMISE) Evaluation—0960–NEW.

Background

The Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI (PROMISE) demonstration pursues positive outcomes for children with disabilities who receive SSI and their families by reducing dependency on SSI. The Department of Education (ED) awarded six cooperative agreements to states to improve the provision and coordination of services and support for

children with disabilities who receive SSI and their families to achieve improved education and employment outcomes. ED awarded PROMISE funds to five single-state projects, and to one six-state consortium.¹

With support from the Department of Labor (DOL) and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), SSA will evaluate the six PROMISE projects.

¹ The six-state consortium project goes by the name Achieving Success by Promoting Readiness for Education and Employment (ASPIRE) rather than by PROMISE.

SSA contracted with Mathematica Policy Research to conduct the evaluation.

Under PROMISE, targeted outcomes for youth include an enhanced sense of self-determination; achievement of secondary and post-secondary educational credentials; an attainment of early work experiences culminating with competitive employment in an integrated setting; and long-term reduction in reliance on SSI. Outcomes of interest for families include heightened expectations for and support of the long-term self-sufficiency of their youth; parent or guardian attainment of education and training credentials; and increases in earnings and total income. To achieve these outcomes, we expect the PROMISE projects to make better use of existing resources by improving service coordination among multiple state and local agencies and programs.

ED, SSA, DOL, and HHS intend the PROMISE projects to address key limitations in the existing service system for youth with disabilities. By intervening early in the lives of these young people, at ages 14–16, the projects will engage the youth and their families well before critical decisions regarding the age 18 redetermination are upon them. We expect the required partnerships among the various state and Federal agencies that serve youth with disabilities to result in improved integration of services and fewer dropped handoffs as youth move from one agency to another. By requiring the programs to engage and serve families and provide youth with paid work experiences, the initiative is mandating the adoption of critical best practices in promoting the independence of youth with disabilities.

Project Description

SSA is requesting clearance for the collection of data needed to implement

and evaluate PROMISE. The evaluation will provide empirical evidence on the impact of the intervention for youth and their families in several critical areas, including: (1) Improved educational attainment; (2) increased employment skills, experience, and earnings; and (3) long-term reduction in use of public benefits. We will base the PROMISE evaluation on a rigorous design that will entail the random assignment of approximately 2,000 youth in each of the six projects to treatment or control groups (12,000 total). Youth in the treatment groups will be eligible for enhanced services from the demonstration programs, whereas youth in the control groups will be eligible only for those services already available in their communities independent of the interventions.

The evaluation will assess the effect of PROMISE services on educational attainment, employment, earnings, and reduced receipt of disability payments. The three components of this evaluation include:

- The process analysis, which will document program models, assess the relationships among the partner organizations, document whether the programs are implemented as planned, identify features of the programs that may account for their impacts on youth and families, and identify lessons for future programs with similar objectives.
- The impact analysis, which will determine whether youth and families in the treatment groups receive more services than their counterparts in the control groups. It will also determine whether treatment group members have better results than control group members with respect to the targeted outcomes noted above.
- The cost-benefit analysis, which will assess whether the benefits of PROMISE, including increases in employment and reductions in benefit

receipt, are large enough to justify its costs. We will conduct this assessment from a range of perspectives, including those of the participants, state and Federal governments, SSA, and society as a whole.

SSA planned several data collection efforts for the evaluation. These include: (1) Follow-up interviews with youth and their parent or guardian 18 months and 5 years after enrollment; (2) phone and in-person interviews with local program administrators, program supervisors, and service delivery staff at two points in time over the course of the demonstration; (3) two rounds of focus groups with participating youth in the treatment group; (4) two rounds of focus groups with parents or guardians of participating youth; and (5) collection of administrative data.

At this time, SSA requests clearance only for the interviews we will conduct with program staff and the focus group discussions we will conduct with youth and parents or guardians. We will conduct these interviews and group discussions twice: Once in 2014, and once in 2016. SSA will request clearance for the 18-month and 5-year survey interviews in a future submission. The respondents are PROMISE program staff, the youth participants in the PROMISE program, and the parents or guardians of the youth participants.

Note: This is a correction notice. When we previously published this information on February 10, 2014, at 79 FR 7736, we inadvertently neglected to publish the cost burden on the respondents. We are correcting that oversight here.

Type of Request: This is a new information collection.

Time Burden on Respondents

2014 INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Modality of completion	Number of responses	Frequency of response	Average burden per response (minutes)	Estimated total annual burden (hours)
Staff Interviews with Administrators or Directors	75	1	66	83
Staff Interviews with PROMISE Project Staff	145	1	66	160
Youth Focus Groups—Non-participants	320	1	5	27
Youth Focus Groups—Participants	80	1	100	133
Parents or Guardian Focus Groups—Non-participants	320	1	5	27
Parents or Guardian Focus Groups—Participants	80	1	100	133
Totals	1,020			563

2016 INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Modality of completion	Number of responses	Frequency of response	Average burden per response (minutes)	Estimated total annual burden (hours)
Staff Interviews with Administrators or Directors	75	1	66	83
Staff Interviews with PROMISE Project Staff	145	1	66	160
Youth Focus Groups—Non-participants	320	1	5	27
Youth Focus Groups—Participants	80	1	100	133
Parents or Guardian Focus Groups—Non-participants	320	1	5	27
Parents or Guardian Focus Groups—Participants	80	1	100	133
Totals	1,020			563
Grand Total	2,040			1,126

Cost Burden on Respondents

2014 ANNUAL COST TO RESPONDENTS

Respondent type	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Average burden per response (minutes)	Median hourly wage rate (dollars)	Total respondent cost (dollars)
Parent or Guardian Focus Group—Non-Participants	320	1	5	\$7.38	\$196.01
Parent or Guardian Focus Group—Participants	80	1	100	7.38	984.20
Total	400				1,180.21

2016 ANNUAL COST TO RESPONDENTS

Respondent type	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Average burden per response (minutes)	Median hourly wage rate (dollars)	Total respondent cost (dollars)
Parent or Guardian Focus Group—Non-Participants	320	1	5	\$7.38	\$196.01
Parent or Guardian Focus Group—Participants	80	1	100	7.38	984.20
Total	400				1,180.21
Grand Total	800				2,360.42

2. Request for Medical Treatment in an SSA Employee Health Facility: Patient Self-Administered or Staff Administered Care—0960-0772. SSA operates onsite Employee Health Clinics (EHC) in eight different States. These clinics provide health care for all SSA employees including treatments of personal medical conditions when

authorized through a physician. Form SSA-5072 is the employee's personal physician's order form. The information we collect on Form SSA-5072 gives the nurses the guidance they need by law to perform certain medical procedures and to administer prescription medications such as allergy immunotherapy. In addition, the information allows the

SSA medical officer to determine whether the treatment can be administered safely and appropriately in the SSA EHCs. Respondents are physicians of SSA employees who need to have medical treatment in an SSA EHC.

Type of Request: Revision of an OMB-approved information collection.

Modality of completion	Number of respondents	Frequency of response	Number of responses	Average burden per response (minutes)	Estimated total annual burden (hours)
SSA-5072 Annually	25	1	25	5	2
SSA-5072 Bi-Annually	75	2	150	5	13
Totals	100		175		15

Dated: April 18, 2014.

Faye Lipsky,

Reports Clearance Director, Social Security Administration.

[FR Doc. 2014-09218 Filed 4-22-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4191-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Federal Environmental Statutes, Regulations, and Executive Orders Applicable to the Development and Review of Transportation Infrastructure Projects

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The United States Department of Transportation (Department) has prepared a document listing Federal environmental statutes, regulations, and Executive Orders that establish requirements applicable to the development and review of transportation infrastructure projects. The Department strives to ensure compliance with these requirements in a manner that is both environmentally sound and expeditious. The goal of this document is to contribute to this important effort by providing a brief description of the primary statutes, regulations, and Executive Orders applicable to the development and review of these transportation infrastructure projects.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Amy Coyle, Senior Attorney Advisor, U.S. Department of Transportation, Office of the General Counsel; 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590. Telephone 202-366-0691.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The United States Department of Transportation (Department or DOT) has prepared a document listing Federal environmental statutes, regulations, and Executive Orders that establish requirements applicable to the development and review of transportation infrastructure projects that receive financial support from the Department. DOT strives to meet these requirements in a manner that is both environmentally sound and expeditious. The goal of this list is to contribute to this important effort by providing a brief description of the primary statutes, regulations, and Executive Orders applicable to the development and review of these transportation infrastructure projects. Additionally, many agencies have developed guidance to assist in implementation of the law, and this document references certain

guidance. This summary is not, and should not be relied upon as, a complete list of statutes, regulations, and Executive Orders that could apply to a transportation infrastructure project or an official or independent interpretation or expression of policy on the matters summarized. This document replaces the notice, "Federal Environmental Laws and Executive Orders Applicable to Development and Review of Transportation Infrastructure Projects," 69 FR 25451, May 6, 2004.

The document is available online at <http://www.dot.gov/policy/transportation-policy/environment/laws>.

Issued in Washington, DC on April 10, 2014.

Kathryn B. Thomson,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2014-09219 Filed 4-22-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-9X-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

Notice To Rescind Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Transit Improvements to the Red and Purple Lines, Cook County, Illinois

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

ACTION: Rescind notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), in cooperation with the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA), is issuing this notice to advise the public that the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed transportation improvements on the Red and Purple lines between Belmont Station in Chicago and Linden terminal in Wilmette, Illinois is being rescinded.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Reginald Arkell, Community Planner, Federal Transit Administration, Region V, 200 West Adams Street, Suite 320, Chicago, IL 60606, phone 312-886-3704, email reginald.arkell@dot.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FTA, as the lead federal agency, in cooperation with the CTA published a NOI in the **Federal Register** on January 3, 2011 (76 FR 207-210) to prepare a Tier 1 EIS for the Red and Purple Modernization (RPM) project to bring 9.6 miles of the Red and Purple lines up to a state of good repair, from the track structure immediately north of Belmont Station in Chicago to the Linden

terminal in Wilmette, Illinois. On July 26, 2012, FTA in cooperation with CTA published a supplemental NOI in the **Federal Register** (77 FR 43903) to inform interested parties that the EIS would no longer be a Tier 1 EIS as originally proposed and instead would be a standard project-level EIS. Since that time, FTA and CTA have decided to pursue a more tailored approach of environmental review for each project of independent utility within the RPM corridor. FTA and CTA anticipate that environmental assessments, leading to Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSI), and categorical exclusions would be the appropriate classes of action under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for these projects. Therefore, the FTA has decided to rescind the NOI for the EIS.

Comments and questions concerning the proposed actions should be directed to FTA at the address provided above.

Marisol R. Simón,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2014-09273 Filed 4-22-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Maritime Administration

[Docket No. DOT-MARAD-2014-0063]

Agency Requests for Renewal of a Previously Approved Information Collection(s): Automated Mutual Assistance Vessel Rescue System (AMVER)

AGENCY: Maritime Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of Transportation (DOT) invites public comments about our intention to request the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval to renew an information collection. We are required to publish this notice in the **Federal Register** by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted by June 23, 2014.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments [identified by Docket No. DOT-MARAD-2014-0063] through one of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.
- *Fax:* 1-202-493-2251.
- *Mail or Hand Delivery:* Docket Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., West Building, Room W12-