

recommended improve the accuracy of accident reports received?

5. Would the two-tiered accident reporting system that NBSAC has recommended improve the timeliness of accident reports received?

6. Would the two-tiered accident reporting system that NBSAC has recommended ease the burden of accident reporting on owners or operators of recreational vessels? If so, by how much?

7. Would the two-tiered accident reporting system that NBSAC has recommended increase the burden of accident reporting on State reporting authorities? If so, by how much?

8. Would any additional time (over the current system) be required for the owner/operator in a reporting system where the State had to contact him/her for information? If so, how many minutes of additional time per report would be required for the owner/operator?

9. Would any additional time (over the current system) and/or resources be required for a State employee to complete the report as opposed to the owner/operator? If so, how many minutes of additional time per report and/or what additional resources?

10. How many States currently use an electronic reporting system?

11. How many States are considering using an electronic reporting system?

12. Would the use of an Internet reporting system reduce the time required by the State to report information to the Coast Guard? If so, how many minutes of time per report would be saved?

13. Do any States collect data in addition to what is currently required in 33 CFR 173.57? If so, what additional information is collected?

14. How many boating accident report forms (BAR, CG-3865 or State equivalent forms) does a State receive from the public annually (approximately)?

15. How many boating accidents does a State investigate or cause to be investigated annually (approximately)?

16. How frequently (as a percentage) does a State collect data on an accident for which no BAR form is submitted by the public?

17. Under the current system, do States provide accident reporting information that is the responsibility of the recreational vessel owner or operator? If so, how many man-hours are required to collect this information (please give time as hours per week or month or as an average per accident report)?

18. If a State provides information that is the responsibility of the vessel

owner or operator, what is the average time required by a State employee to complete the entire accident report form under the current system?

19. Under the current system, how much time does a State reporting authority spend validating the accident report submitted by a recreational vessel owner or operator (please give time as hours per week or month or as an average per accident report)?

20. Under the current system, what percentage of reports that a State receives from owner/operators are illegible or otherwise unintelligible? How many man-hours are currently required to address these problems (please give time as hours per week or month or as an average per accident report)?

21. Under the current system, when there is missing information from the owner/operator, what is the average amount of time that passes before a State employee is able to contact him/her in order to complete the report? (please give time as hours per week or month or as an average per accident report).

22. Do boat owners/operators have enough information or expertise to provide some or all of the accident reporting data currently required by them in 33 CFR 173.57?

23. What is the average time required for the owner/operator to complete the report under the current system?

24. Does the reporting of some or all of the accident reporting data currently required in 33 CFR 173.57 result in adverse consequences for owners/operators?

25. How can owners or operators of recreational vessels be encouraged to comply with boating accident reporting requirements?

26. What is a reasonable amount of time for a State reporting authority to submit a complete accident investigation report to the Coast Guard?

27. What percentage of a State's accident reports are reported to Coast Guard within 30/60/90 days? What are the significant factors that cause a report to be delayed beyond the 30 days?

28. What is a good definition of an injury that required medical treatment beyond first aid? Should the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards for "medical treatment beyond first aid" be adopted as the standard for recreational boating injury reporting? (see 29 CFR 1904.7(b)(5) for the OSHA standards)

29. How should boating-related swimming incidents be defined? The NBSAC recommendation suggests that incidents where the vessel was being used as a swimming platform and/or a

person voluntarily leaves the vessel as the first event, whether the vessel was underway or not, should *not* be considered reportable boating accidents, although it would continue counting incidents involving carbon monoxide poisoning, in-water electrical shock or other boat-related caused accidents.

This notice is issued under authority of 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 33 CFR part 173.

Dated: August 26, 2011.

James A. Watson,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Director of Prevention Policy.

[FR Doc. 2011-22630 Filed 9-2-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-04-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Agency Information Collection Activities: Form I-129S; Extension of an Existing Information Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: 60-Day Notice of Information Collection Under Review; Form I-129S, Nonimmigrant Petition Based on Blanket L Petition.

The Department Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) will be submitting the following information collection request for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for sixty days until November 7, 2011.

During this 60 day period, USCIS will be evaluating whether to revise the Form I-129S. Should USCIS decide to revise Form I-129S we will advise the public when we publish the 30-day notice in the **Federal Register** in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act. The public will then have 30 days to comment on any revisions to the Form I-129S.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), USCIS, Chief, Regulatory Products Division, Office of the Executive Secretariat, 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20529-2020. Comments may also be submitted to DHS via facsimile to 202-272-0997 or via e-mail at uscisfrcomment@dhs.gov. When

submitting comments by e-mail, please make sure to add OMB Control No. 1615-0010 in the subject box.

Note: The address listed in this notice should only be used to submit comments concerning this information collection. Please do not submit requests for individual case status inquiries to this address. If you are seeking information about the status of your individual case, please check "My Case Status" online at: <https://egov.uscis.gov/cris/Dashboard.do>, or call the USCIS National Customer Service Center at 1-800-375-5283.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the collection of information should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate 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) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

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

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this Information Collection:

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of an existing information collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Nonimmigrant Petition Based on Blanket L Petition.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Homeland Security sponsoring the collection:* Form I-129S; U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS).

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Business or others for profit. This form is used by an employer to classify employees as L-1 nonimmigrant intracompany transferees under a blanket L petition approval. USCIS will use the data on this form to determine eligibility for the requested immigration benefit.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to*

respond: 42,000 responses at .583 hours (35 minutes) per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 24,486 annual burden hours.

If you need a copy of the information collection instrument, please visit the Web site at: <http://www.regulations.gov/>.

We may also be contacted at: USCIS, Regulatory Products Division, Office of the Executive Secretariat, 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20529-2020, Telephone number 202-272-8377.

Dated: August 30, 2011.

Evadne Hagigal,

Management and Program Analyst, Regulatory Products Division, Office of the Executive Secretariat, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

[FR Doc. 2011-22619 Filed 9-2-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111-97-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Bureau of Customs and Border Protection

Re-Accreditation and Re-Approval of SGS North America, Inc. as a Commercial Gauger

AGENCY: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Notice of re-approval of SGS North America, Inc., Baytown, Texas, as a commercial gauger.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to 19 CFR 151.13, SGS North America, Inc., Baytown, Texas 77408, has been re-approved to gauge petroleum and petroleum products, organic chemicals and vegetable oils, for customs purposes, in accordance with the provisions of 19 CFR 151.12 and 151.13. Anyone wishing to employ this entity to conduct laboratory analysis or gauger services should request and receive written assurances from the entity that it is accredited or approved by the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection to conduct the gauger service requested. Alternatively, inquiries regarding the gauger services this entity is accredited or approved to perform may be directed to the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection by calling (202) 344-1060. The inquiry may also be sent to http://www.cbp.gov/xp/cgov/import/operations_support/labs_scientific_svcs/org_and_operations.xml.

DATES: The re-approval of SGS North America, Inc. as a commercial gauger became effective on April 2011. The next triennial inspection date will be scheduled for April 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Donald Cousins, Director, Scientific Services, Laboratories and Scientific Services, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Suite 1500N, Washington, DC 20229, 202-344-1295.

Dated: August 16, 2011.

Ira S. Reese,

Executive Director, Laboratories and Scientific Services.

[FR Doc. 2011-22717 Filed 9-2-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9111-14-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Bureau of Customs and Border Protection

Re-Accreditation and Re-Approval Intertek Testing Services as a Commercial Gauger and Laboratory

AGENCY: Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Notice of re-approval of Intertek Testing Services, Corpus Christi, Texas, as a commercial gauger and laboratory.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to 19 CFR 151.12 and 151.13, Intertek Testing Services/Caleb Brett, Corpus Christi, Texas 77406, has been re-approved to gauge petroleum and petroleum products, organic chemicals and vegetable oils, and to test petroleum and petroleum products for customs purposes, in accordance with the provisions of 19 CFR 151.12 and 151.13. Anyone wishing to employ this entity to conduct laboratory analysis or gauger services should request and receive written assurances from the entity that it is accredited or approved by the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection to conduct the specific test or gauger service requested. Alternatively, inquiries regarding the specific tests or gauger services this entity is accredited or approved to perform may be directed to the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection by calling (202) 344-1060. The inquiry may also be sent to http://www.cbp.gov/xp/cgov/import/operations_support/labs_scientific_svcs/org_and_operations.xml.

DATES: The re-approval of Intertek Testing Services as a commercial gauger and laboratory became effective on April, 2011. The next triennial