holders are complying with fund deposit/withdrawal requirements established in program regulations and properly accounting for fund activity on their Federal income tax returns. The information collected must also be reported annually to the Secretary of Treasury in accordance with the Tax Reform Act, 1986.

II. Method of Collection

The collection of information will be collected on the Capital Construction Fund—Deposit/Withdrawal Report form which agreement holders are required to submit at the end of their tax year.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0648–0041.

Form Number: NOAA Form 34–82.

Type of Review: Regular Submission.

Affected Public: Businesses and other-for profit organizations—commercial fishermen, partnerships, and corporations with Capital Construction Fund agreements.

Estimated Number of Respondents: The universe of respondents is estimated at 4,000 annually. Number of responses is estimated at 5,000 due to some participants having more than one agreement.

Estimated Time Per Response: Preparation of reports is estimated at 20 minutes per report. The total annual burden of hours is estimated at 1,650 hours per year.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: No capital, operations, or maintenance costs are expected.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for 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 (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (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.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: October 7, 1996.

Linda Engelmeier,

Management Analyst, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 96–26997 Filed 10–21–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY: U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207.

"FEDERAL REGISTER" CITATION OF PREVIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT: [insert FR citation].

PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED TIME AND DATE OF MEETING: 10:30 a.m., October 23, 1996.

CHANGES IN MEETING: The meeting date and time concerning the FY 1997 Operating Plan has been changed to Thursday, October 24, 1996 at 10:00 a.m.

For a recorded message containing the latest agenda information, call (301) 504–0709.

CONTACT PERSON FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Sadye E. Dunn, Office of the Secretary 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20207 (301) 504–0800.

Dated: October 17, 1996.

Sadye E. Dunn,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–27194 Filed 10–18–96; 2:13 pm]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the M1 Breacher Life Cycle Environmental Assessment

AGENCY: U.S. Army Program Executive Office, Ground Combat & Support Systems.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and Army Regulation 200–2, the proposed FONSI for the M1 Breacher is being published for comment. The U.S. Army Program Executive Office, Ground Combat & Support Systems (PEO–GCSS) has prepared a Life Cycle Environmental Assessment (LCEA) which examines the potential impacts to the natural and human environment from the proposed development of the Breacher as a combat vehicle that combines capabilities to reduce both simple and complex obstacle systems into a single armored vehicle chassis. Based on the LCEA, PEO-GCSS and the Tank-automotive and Armaments Command (TACOM) have determined the proposed action is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, within the meaning of NEPA. Therefore the preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required and the Army is issuing this proposed FONSI.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions concerning the proposed action should be directed to Mr. Brian Bonkosky, Program Executive Office, Ground Combat & Support Systems, Breacher Product Manager's Office, ATTN: SFAE–GCSS–CV–B, Warren, Michigan 48397–5000, telephone number: (810) 574–7687, fax number: (810) 574–7822.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Note: PEO, GCSS absorbed the U.S. Army Program Executive Office, Armored Systems Modernization (PEO, ASM) in September 1996. The LCEA, upon which this FONSI is based, was conducted within PEO, ASM. Organizational references within the LCEA to PEO, ASM should be considered to be changed to PEO, GCSS.

Proposed Action

This LCEA examines the potential impacts to the natural and human environment from the proposed development of the M1 Breacher as a combat vehicle combining capabilities to reduce both simple and complex obstacle systems into a single armored vehicle chassis. The Breacher would meet the Army's Operational Requirements Document (ORD) specified requirements for increased capability in a single armored vehicle based on the M1 Abrams chassis. These requirements call for capability to remove and destroy obstacles to troop and vehicular movement (such as ditches, berms, barbed wire, and other natural or man-made obstacles). The Breacher also provides countermine capability, as well as more mobility and survivability than is currently available. In accordance with the Army's combat maintenance emphasis on designing for discard, Breacher combat components, to the maximum extent feasible, would be designed for discard at failure in the field. However, in non-combat situations, packaging, handling, and storage for transportation of Breacher systems would include the consideration of such recycling and pollution prevention measures as employing reusable containers and the breakdown and recycling of discarded components.

Environmental Impacts

The Breacher vehicle life cycle includes design and manufacture, transport of vehicles to test sites, testing, production vehicle manufacturing, deployment and operations of production vehicles, and eventual demilitarization. Potential environmental impacts of these life cycle stages may include air, water, hazardous waste, noise, biotic, and socioeconomic (social, economic, historical, archaeological, and cultural) impacts at each of these life cycle phases.

Constructing and assembling Breacher units involves working with a variety of industrial processes and materials, and would involve the generation of air emissions, wastewater discharges, and limited quantities of solid and hazardous wastes at various facilities, which in turn may result in impacts to air, water, biotic, and socioeconomic resources at those facilities. Transport of assembled vehicles can result in minor environmental impacts along the various transport routes.

Breacher units would receive preliminary testing at the production facilities and then be transported to a number of other Army facilities for various stages of testing before deployment. Testing of the Breacher would involve determining its transportability, performance capabilities, and vulnerability/survivability to various combat threats. Simulated field training and combat conditions would be employed during this testing. Testing phase environmental impacts may involve modest amounts of various emissions (particularly air emissions) resulting from truck and rail transport between the production facilities and the testing facilities. These emissions could result in modest impacts to air, water, biotic, and socioeconomic resources along the travel routes. Testing of the Breacher units would result in air emissions from the Breacher, smoke, dust, and other materials from field testing, as well as land disturbance from the Breacher tracks and from breaching operations. This land disturbance could result in some habitat destruction and nonpoint source runoff at the test ranges, particularly at more vulnerable sites.

Operational impacts are likely to be quite similar to, somewhat more extensive, and greatly more dispersed in place and time than the impacts described for the manufacture and testing described above. Demilitarization impacts would be similar to manufacturing impacts, but would likely involve more extensive generation of solid and hazardous waste. Recycling of components and alternative end uses could reduce this waste generation.

a. Comparison of Environmental Consequences of the Alternatives (Including the Proposed Action). None of the alternatives would result in significant impacts to the human environment. There would be some modest differences in intensity of impacts between the alternatives in the design and manufacturing, deployment and operations, and demilitarization phases of the Breacher life cycle due to the larger number of vehicles produced in the higher production alternative and the use of new materials to produce the vehicle chassis in the unrecycled alternative. All of the alternatives would have the same level of impacts in the transport to test site, testing, and transport to deployment site life cycle stages because the activities in those phases would be identical for all alternatives.

The proposed action would be likely to have the least impacts of all of the alternatives considered because the Breacher vehicle would eliminate the use of various types of equipment that are less well suited to its mission. The Breacher would thus be less likely to suffer the type of accidents, breakdowns, and leakage during operations that could result in substantial releases of hazardous substances into the air and water or onto the ground. Such impacts will continue to occur under the no action alternative, and likely increase in the future as the current inventory of equipment ages. This factor would likely more than offset the modest emissions, discharges, and potential releases that result from the production of the Breacher vehicles. The location alternative would be likely to have greater impacts than the proposed action because the UDLP San Jose, California plant is located in a more sensitive environmental setting than the UDLP York, Pennsylvania plant. The higher production alternative would have a greater impact than the proposed action because the increased production would result in more emissions, discharges, and releases. The unrecycled alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed action because the reliance on new materials and the absence of recycling of existing M1 Abrams vehicles would result in the generation of considerably more solid and hazardous waste.

b. Summary of Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action. Impacts from the proposed action would be minimal and not significant for the following reasons (references in the parentheses refer to pages in the LCEA):

(1) Solid and Hazardous Waste Impacts. Solid and hazardous waste impacts would not be significant because even though measurable environmental impacts would be likely to occur during the design and manufacture stage there is no evidence of any environmental violation history at either Anniston Army Depot or the UDLP plant at York, Pennsylvania. In addition, during the transport to test facility and test phases no measurable environmental impacts would be likely under normal conditions and while there might be some likelihood of measurable environmental impacts from accidents they would still be likely to be minor. (See pp. 18–19, 25, 33, 47–48, 50).

(2) Water Quality Impacts. Water quality impacts would not be significant because the amounts of both point source and nonpoint pollutants from all of the life cycle stages would likely result in no measurable environmental impacts under normal conditions and there would be little likelihood of measurable impacts even under accidents. (See pp. 19–20, 24–25, 33–35, 38, 45, 47–49).

(3) Air Quality Impacts. Air quality impacts would not be significant because the very minor amount of air emissions from all of the life cycle stages would likely result in no measurable environmental impacts under normal conditions and there would be little likelihood of measurable impacts even under accidents. (See pp. 20, 26, 32, 47, 48–49).

(4) Noise impacts. Noise impacts would not be significant to either human or wildlife populations because noise-producing activities would be of short duration under all life cycle stages and the facilities where the activities would take place are well-buffered from sensitive human populations. (See pp. 20, 26, 32–33).

(5) Biotic Resources Impacts. Biotic resources impacts would not be significant because only negligible wildlife disturbance would result from any direct disturbance or from nonpoint source runoff associated with soil disturbance during any of the life cycle stages. Additionally, such disturbance would be widely dispersed at a number of facilities and thus even less significant at any one of the facilities. (See pp. 20, 26, 32–35, 38, 45, 48–49).

(6) Socioeconomic Resources Impacts. Socioeconomic resources impacts would not be significant because the economic activity involved would simply supplement or replace other activities that might otherwise be

occurring at the facilities involved. To that extent these impacts would be generally positive. Since no new facilities need to be constructed and no facilities will be closed as a result of the proposed action there would be very little chance of any negative socioeconomic impacts occurring. Likewise, no significant cultural resources impacts would be expected. (See pp. 20, 26, 35).

(7) Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts would be very unlikely because of the modest intensity of all activities involved in the Breacher life cycle and the dispersed nature of those activities. Coupled with their low intensity and widespread nature, the lack of general environmental compliance problems at any of the facilities involved in the Breacher life cycle reinforces this conclusion. (See pp. 23, 27, 36, 39, 46, 49).

(8) Mitigation of Impacts. The use of readily available pollution prevention measures in place at the facilities that would be involved in the proposed action would be likely to mitigate the environmental impacts of all life cycle stages to the point of being undetectable, or at the most negligible. (See pp. 23, 27, 36–37, 46, 49).

c. Summary of the Significance of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Opportunities. Because of the relatively modest number of Breacher vehicles anticipated to be constructed, existing and anticipated environmental compliance at the various Breacher facilities, and the availability of mitigation measures such as in-place pollution prevention and nonpoint source control programs, these impacts are not expected to be significant. All military and civilian facilities have in-place pollution prevention, pollution control, and emergency preparedness programs. None of these facilities have extensive environmental compliance problems. Thus, the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the proposed action or alternatives would not be expected to cause significant adverse impacts to the human environment.

Alternatives Considered: Alternatives considered in this environmental assessment include: (1) the proposed action (preferred alternative) of manufacturing 313 Breacher vehicles by tearing down and recycling existing M1 Abrams tanks; (2) a ''no-action'' alternative halting the current program as of June 1966; (3) a ''location alternative'' that would consist of carrying out the proposed action at a different facility; (4) a ''higher-production'' alternative of 500 vehicles rather than the 313 vehicles proposed in the preferred alternative; and (5) an ''unrecycled alternative'' that would involve carrying out the proposed action using all new components rather than recycling M1 Abrams tank chassis. No other alternatives have been considered because the demonstrated need for the Breacher system to carry out the minefield breaching and countermine missions makes the five alternatives considered above a reasonable range of alternatives.

Determination

Based on the analyses in the LCEA, production and deployment of the Breacher do not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of NEPA. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed action is not required.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–27013 Filed 10–21–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice Of Proposed Information Collection Requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Proposed collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Director, Information Resources Group, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before December 23, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and requests for copies of the proposed information collection requests should be addressed to Patrick J. Sherrill, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202–4651.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick J. Sherrill (202) 708–8196. Individuals who use a telecommunications device 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Director of the Information Resources Group publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g., new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment at the address specified above. Copies of the requests are available from Patrick J. Sherrill at the address specified above.

The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department, (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner, (3) is the estimate of burden accurate, (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected, and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Dated: October 16, 1996.

Gloria Parker,

Director, Information Resources Group.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Type of Review: Reinstatement.

Title: Case Service Report.

Frequency: Annually.

Affected Public: State, local or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 82.

Burden Hours: 3,690.

Abstract: As required by Section 13 of the Rehabilitation Act, the data are submitted by State rehabilitation agencies each year. They contain the personal and program related characteristics, including economic outcomes, of disabled persons whose cases are closed.

[FR Doc. 96–26951 Filed 10–21–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P