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 Acting Leader, Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes that 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 Joseph Schubart at the address specified above.

Dated: June 9, 1999.

William E. Burrow,

Acting Leader, Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Type of Review: Extension.

Title: Title I State Plan for Vocational Rehabilitation Services and Title VI—Part B Supplement for Supported Employment Services.

Frequency: Annually.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; Not-for-profit institutions; State, local or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 82

Burden Hours: 1,002,050

Abstract: The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA) requires the submittal of a Title I State plan for vocational rehabilitation services and a supplement to the plan for supported employment services on the same date that the State submits its State plan under WIA. Some States submitted WIA plans as early as April 1, 1999; other States can submit WIA plans anytime up to and including April 1, 2000. Program funding is contingent on Departmental approval of the plan and its supplement.

[FR Doc. 99–15079 Filed 6–14–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Arbitration Panel Decision Under the Randolph-Sheppard Act

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of arbitration panel decision under the Randolph-Sheppard Act.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that on May 21, 1998, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Louisiana Department of Social Services, Rehabilitation Services* v. *U.S. Department of Defense, Department of the Air Force (Case No. R–S/97–3.* This panel was convened by the U. S. Department of Education pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 107d–1(b), upon receipt of a complaint filed by petitioner, Louisiana Department of Social Services, Rehabilitation Services.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: A copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision may be obtained from George F. Arsnow, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 3230, Mary E. Switzer Building, Washington D.C. 20202–2738. Telephone: (202) 205–9317. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the TDD number at (202) 205–8298.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternate format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

Electronic Access to This Document

You may view this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at either of the following sites:

http://ocfo.ed.gov/fedreg.htm

http://www.ed.gov/news.html

To use the PDF you must have the Adobe Acrobat Reader Program with Search, which is available free at either of the previous sites. If you have questions about using the PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free, at 1–888–293–6498; or in the Washington, DC, area at (202) 512–1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at: http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Randolph-Sheppard Act (20 U.S.C. 107d–2(c)), the Secretary publishes in the **Federal Register** a synopsis of each arbitration panel decision affecting the administration of vending facilities on Federal and other property.

Background

This dispute concerns the alleged failure of the United States Department of Defense, Department of the Air Force (Air Force) to renew an expiring food service contract with the Louisiana Department of Social Services, Rehabilitation Services, the State licensing agency (SLA).

The Air Force operates Barksdale Air Force Base (Barksdale) in Louisiana. On March 29, 1994, the Air Force awarded a food service attendant services contract to the SLA. The contract was awarded on a non-competitive basis pursuant to the Randolph-Sheppard Act (20 U.S.C. 107 *et seq.*) The contract was for a six-month period with two one-year options. A blind licensee was chosen to manage the facility.

By memorandum dated July 8, 1996 the Air Force proposed ''to offer the reprocurement solicitation'' for the food service attendant services contract to the SLA as a non-competitive acquisition. The period for this reprocurement was from October 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997 with four one-year options. However, on August 23, 1996, the Contracting Officer for the Air Force sent the blind licensee a memorandum stating that the Air Force viewed the priority provisions of the Randolph-Sheppard Act (the Act) as not being applicable to the contract. The Air Force further stated that the solicitation for the contract would be issued as a competitive acquisition set-aside for small businesses.

Thereafter, the SLA's current contract was extended for an additional six-month period until March 31, 1997 to allow a solicitation for the contract to be issued on a competitive basis, with a set-aside for small businesses. The SLA filed a protest of this action with the Air Force. The Air Force rejected the protest by memorandum dated September 24, 1996. The Air Force's objection stated in part that the contract merely supported the Air Force's operation of the dining facility. The Air Force concluded that the operation of the dining hall resided with the Air Force. The Air Force's position was that the Randolph-

Sheppard Act did not apply to food service mess attendant services. Specifically, the Air Force said that individual tasks such as mess attendant, janitorial services, or grounds maintenance that support the Air Force's operation of a dining facility are not covered by the Randolph-Sheppard Act.

On October 4, 1996, the SLA lodged a protest with the General Accounting Office. The Air Force responded to this protest on October 9, 1996 seeking its dismissal. The General Accounting Office dismissed the protest on the basis that the appropriate method for resolution of the SLA's dispute was through the arbitration process pursuant to section 107d–2 of the Randolph-Sheppard Act and its implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395.

Subsequently, the SLA requested that a Federal arbitration panel be convened to hear this dispute. A hearing of this matter was held on December 17, 1997.

Arbitration Panel Decision

The issue before the arbitration panel was whether the contract for the food service attendant services at Barksdale represented a contract for the operation of a cafeteria pursuant to the Randolph-Sheppard Act and implementing regulations.

The arbitration panel ruled in a majority opinion that the contract was not for the operation of a cafeteria. Referencing the language in the priority section of the Act, and applying a plain meaning approach to the word ''operation,'' the arbitration panel reasoned that the issue should be based on a determination of who controls food cost and food quality. The panel determined that this must be done on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, after careful and detailed comparison of the responsibilities of the blind licensee and of the Air Force, the panel concluded that the Air Force was operator of the cafeteria at Barksdale and that the priority provisions under the Act did not apply.

One panel member dissented.

The views and opinions expressed by the panel do not necessarily represent the views and opinions of the U.S. Department of Education.

Dated: June 9, 1999.

Curtis L. Richards,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

[FR Doc. 99–15063 Filed 6–14–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Arbitration Panel Decision Under the Randolph-Sheppard Act

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of Arbitration Panel Decision Under the Randolph-Sheppard Act.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that on June 25, 1998, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Michael R. Underhill* v. *Texas Commission for the Blind (Docket No. R–S/97–16).* This panel was convened by the U.S. Department of Education pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 107d–1(a), upon receipt of a complaint filed by petitioner, Michael Underhill.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: A copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision may be obtained from George F. Arsnow, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 3230, Mary E. Switzer Building, Washington DC 20202–2738. Telephone: (202) 205–9317. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the TDD number at (202) 205–8298.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternate format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

Electronic Access to This Document

You may view this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at either of the following sites:

http://ocfo.ed.gov/fedreg.htm
http://www.ed.gov/news.html

To use the PDF you must have the Adobe Acrobat Reader Program with Search, which is available free at either of the previous sites. If you have questions about using the PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free, at 1–888–293–6498; or in the Washington, DC, area at (202) 512–1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at: http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Randolph-Sheppard Act (the Act) (20 U.S.C. 107d–2(c)), the Secretary publishes in the **Federal Register** a synopsis of each arbitration panel decision affecting the administration of vending facilities on Federal and other property.

Background

This dispute concerns the alleged improper application by the Texas Commission for the Blind, the State licensing agency (SLA), of its transfer and promotion policies. Specifically, the complainant, Michael Underhill, alleges that he was denied an opportunity to bid on a military base food service contract under the SLA's special assignment process.

A summary of the facts is as follows. Complainant is a licensed manager under the SLA's Randolph-Sheppard vending facility program. In March, 1995, complainant was selected to receive a prospective military base food service assignment. Complainant ranked fourth on a list of five managers who qualified for such an assignment based on a special selection process to receive military base food service contracts. This special selection process was developed by the SLA in conjunction with the Elected Committee of Blind Managers.

In January 1997, the SLA allegedly ended the special assignment process for these military base contracts over the objections of the Elected Committee of Blind Managers, thus terminating complainant's eligibility to bid on the next available military base contract.

The SLA alleged that it had the authority to end the special assignment process because the unusual circumstances that merited use of the special assignment process no longer existed.

The complainant requested and received a full evidentiary hearing, which was held on May 19, 1997. In a decision dated June 2, 1997, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruled that the SLA's decision to end the special assignment process for the military base contract should be reversed and that the special assignment process should be reinstated until all of the licensed managers who qualified for such an assignment received a military base assignment or withdrew from consideration.

In a letter dated June 23, 1997, to the complainant, the SLA adopted the ALJ's decision in part by reinstating the special assignment process for Fort Bliss, Reese Air Force Base, and Fort Hood and stipulated that this process would remain in effect until one of the military base contracts was available. At that time, the SLA would determine whether it was in the best interest of the Randolph-Sheppard vending program to eliminate this special assignment process. In addition, the SLA affirmed