

months prior to the initiation of fog oil training at FLW.

5.15 Installation Agreements

The FEIS concludes that implementation of the Army's Preferred Alternative will result in a requirement to develop new Intraservice and Interservice Support Agreements among the various components to conduct operations at FLW. No adverse impacts are anticipated, since these agreements are designed to ensure that all parties are aware of, and comply with all applicable procedures governing ongoing operations at FLW.

Installation Agreement Impact Mitigation Commitments

No adverse impacts are expected, and therefore, no mitigation is required.

5.16 Operational Efficiency

The collocation and consolidation of the U.S. Army Engineer School (existing at FLW) with the relocated Chemical School and Military Police School as specified in the Army's Preferred Alternative provides for the maximum amount of interaction among the school staff and students. This increased positive interaction will substantially improve the synergism (operational efficiency and effectiveness) as described in applicable sections of the FEIS.

Operational Efficiency Impact Mitigation Commitments

No adverse impacts are expected, and therefore, no mitigation is required.

6. Conclusions

On behalf of the department of the Army, I have decided to proceed with actions required to relocate the U.S. Army Chemical School and the U.S. Army Military Police School to FLW. I have carefully considered the FEIS, supporting studies, all comments provided during formal comment and waiting periods throughout the EIS process, and the NAS Committee report. Based on this review, I have determined that the Army's Preferred Action (including implementation of the Optimum Training Method Alternative, the Army's Proposed Land Use and Facility Plan (Combined Headquarters and Instruction), and the Phased Move Alternative) strikes the proper balance between the necessary protection of the environment, and the national defense interest of maintaining the ability of the Chemical School and Military Police School to complete mission essential training activities. Furthermore, I have determined that the Army has identified and adopted all practicable means to

avoid or minimize harm to the environment that may be caused by implementation of the planned action.

Dated: May 15, 1997.

Robert M. Walker,

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Logistics & Environment).

[FR Doc. 97-13802 Filed 5-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy, DoD

Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy; Closed Meeting

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 2), notice is hereby given that a special subcommittee of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy will meet on May 28 and 29, 1997, at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD, at 8:30 a.m. This meeting will be closed to the public.

The purpose of the meeting is to make such inquiry as the Board shall deem necessary into the state of morale and discipline, the curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, and academic methods of the Naval Academy. During this meeting inquiries will relate to the internal personnel rules and practices of the Academy, may involve on-going criminal investigations, and include discussions of personal information on the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. Accordingly, the Secretary of the Navy has determined in writing that the special subcommittee meeting shall be closed to the public because they will be concerned with matters as outlined in section 552(b) (2), (5), (6), (7), and (9) of Title 5, United States Code.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONCERNING

THIS MEETING CONTACT: Lieutenant Commander Adam S. Levitt, U.S. Navy, Secretary to the Board of Visitors, Office of the Superintendent, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD 21402-5000, telephone number (410) 293-1503.

Dated: May 15, 1997.

Donald E. Koenig, Jr.,

LCDR, JAGC, USN, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 97-13788 Filed 5-23-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Submission for OMB review; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Director, Information Resources Management Group, invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before June 26, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Dan Chenok, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503. 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 Management 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)