

use of Government helium cannot be monitored and enforced effectively.

### B. Annual Reporting Burden

*Respondents:* 20.  
*Responses Per Respondent:* 1.  
*Total Responses:* 20.  
*Hours Per Response:* 1.  
*Total Burden Hours:* 20.

### Obtaining Copies of Proposals

Requester may obtain a copy of the proposal from the General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (MVP), Room 4035, 1800 F Street, Washington, DC 20405, telephone (202) 501-4755. Please cite OMB Control No. 9000-0113, Acquisition of Helium, in all correspondence.

Dated: May 29, 2001.

**Al Matera,**

*Director, Acquisition Policy Division.*

[FR Doc. 01-15188 Filed 6-14-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6820-34-U**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army; Army Corps of Engineers

#### Grant of Exclusive Licenses

**AGENCY:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DOD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with 37 CFR 404.7(b)(1)(i), announcement is made of a prospective exclusive license in each of the following countries covered by European Patent Office application number 94926514.4, title "Concrete Armor Unit to Protect Coastal and Hydraulic Structures and Shorelines." The countries are: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland.

**DATES:** Written objections must be filed not later than August 14, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** U.S. Army Waterways Experiment Station, 3909 Halls Ferry Road, Vicksburg, MS 39180-6199, ATTN: CEWES-OC.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Phil Stewart (601) 634-4113, e-mail [stewartp@exl.wes.army.mil](mailto:stewartp@exl.wes.army.mil).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Jeffrey A. Melby and George F. Turk invented The Concrete Armor Unit. Rights to the patent application identified above has been assigned to the United States of America as represented by the Secretary of the Army. The United States of America as represented by the Secretary of the Army intends to grant an exclusive license for all fields of use, in

the manufacture, use, and sale in the territories and possessions, including territorial waters of Russia to W.F. Baird and Associates, a Delaware corporation with principal offices at 2981 Yarmouth Greenway, Madison, Wisconsin 53711. Pursuant to 37 CFR 404.7(b)(1)(I), any interested party may file a written objection to this prospective exclusive license agreement.

**Richard L. Frenette,**

*Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 01-15189 Filed 6-14-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3710-92-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**SUMMARY:** The Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, 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 August 14, 2001.

**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 Leader, Regulatory 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.

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: June 11, 2001.

**John Tressler,**

*Leader, Regulatory Information Management, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

### Office of the Undersecretary

*Type of Review:* New.

*Title:* Study of State Administration of Even Start and Statewide Family Literacy Initiative Grants.

*Frequency:* On Occasion.

*Affected Public:* State, Local, or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs (primary).

*Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:* Responses: 94; Burden Hours: 240.

*Abstract:* The Study of State Administration of Even Start and Statewide Family Literacy Initiative Grants will systematically describe the structure and processes associated with all major areas of Even Start administration at the state level. This information is needed by the U.S. Department of Education to enhance its capacity to monitor the development and improvement of the Even Start program and provide guidance and assistance to the states. This study will involve two data collection components: (1) Survey of State Even Start Coordinators which will include Even Start state coordinators and (2) State Even Start Case Study Interviews (telephone interviews with six state coordinators, and site visit interviews with six additional state coordinators and up to five additional state staff per each of these six states).

Requests for copies of the proposed information collection request may be accessed from <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, or should be addressed to Vivian Reese, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 4050, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651. Requests may also be electronically mailed to the internet address [OCIO\\_RIMG@ed.gov](mailto:OCIO_RIMG@ed.gov) or faxed to 202-708-9346. Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request.

Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be directed to Jackie Montague at 202-708-5359. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf

(TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

[FR Doc. 01-15093 Filed 6-14-01; 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 October 20, 2000, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Alabama Department of Rehabilitation Services v. Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Canteen Service (Docket No. R-S/98-7)*. 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, the Alabama Department of 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, DC 20202-2738. Telephone: (202) 205-9317. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the TDD number at (202) 205-8298.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative 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 the following site: [www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister](http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister).

To use the PDF you must have the Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using 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 Act), 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 violation by the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA), Veterans Canteen Service (VCS), of the priority provisions of the Act (20 U.S.C. 107 *et seq.*) and implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395 at DVA/VCS Medical Centers in Alabama.

A summary of the facts is as follows: In 1995, the Alabama Department of Rehabilitation Services, the State licensing Agency (SLA), submitted permit applications to establish Randolph-Sheppard vending facilities on four Federal properties maintained and operated by DVA and VCS in Alabama. The permits were for the Veterans Administration Medical Center, Tuskegee; the Regional Office and DVA Medical Center, Montgomery; the Veterans Hospital, Birmingham; and the Veterans Administration Hospital, Tuscaloosa.

By letter dated July 11, 1996, DVA acknowledged receipt of the permit applications and informed the SLA that a decision would be made after a review had been conducted to determine whether there were any plans to acquire, occupy, or otherwise engage in any substantial alterations or renovations of the involved buildings. The SLA did not receive any further communication from DVA or VCS until March 4, 1998. On that date, DVA wrote to the SLA advising that the Montgomery and Tuskegee facilities did not plan any construction that would require notice to the SLA and indicating that there was no suitable existing space available for the location of blind vending facilities at those centers. The letter informed the SLA that the hospitals at Birmingham and Tuscaloosa planned substantial alterations and renovations. The DVA forwarded the SLA's applications for permits at these hospitals to the directors of those facilities.

Following receipt of DVA's March 4th letter, representatives of the SLA met with the Directors or their designees of the DVA Medical Centers located in Birmingham and Tuscaloosa. On May 21, 1998, the SLA wrote each Director asking for a response to the applications that had been pending since 1995. The SLA did not receive any response and in June 1998 filed with the Department

of Education a request for arbitration of the matter.

In July 1998, the Tuscaloosa Director notified the SLA that DVA/VCS intended to occupy a building that might contain a satisfactory site for the establishment of a vending location for a blind vendor. On July 20, 1998, the SLA responded that it would send a representative to develop a site specific survey. In September 1998, the attorney for the SLA contacted the attorney for DVA and requested a meeting to negotiate a resolution to the issues.

In a letter dated November 9, 1998, the DVA denied the SLA's second application filed in August 1998 to establish vending locations at the Tuscaloosa facility. Based upon information that the average income for its blind vendors was \$25,000, the SLA previously had determined that it would take \$100,000 in gross sales at the Tuscaloosa facility to provide a net income of \$25,000 for a blind vendor. In the letter, the DVA indicated to the SLA that the \$100,000 gross sales requirement for a possible vending location at the Tuscaloosa facility would include practically all of the gross sales, and the DVA would not give up the operation.

The SLA notified the Department of Education by letter dated December 8, 1998 that no decision had been issued by DVA on its request to establish vending facilities at the DVA Medical Centers. Therefore, the SLA requested that the arbitration should proceed. A hearing on this matter was held on January 11-12, 2000.

### Arbitration Panel Decision

The central issue before the arbitration panel was whether DVA/VCS's determination that no existing suitable space was available for blind vending facilities at DVA's Montgomery and Tuskegee locations and the failure of DVA's Medical Directors at the Birmingham and Tuscaloosa locations to approve the permit applications for blind vending facilities were contrary to and in violation of the Randolph-Sheppard Act, 20 U.S.C. 107 *et seq.*, and the implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395.

The arbitration panel found that DVA/VCS did not comply with the Act in processing the SLA's 1995 permit 1 applications. Nor did DVA/VCS give reasons for its denial of permits at the Montgomery and Tuskegee Medical Centers as required by the Act and regulations in 34 CFR 395.16.

The panel also concluded that, at the Tuscaloosa and Birmingham locations, DVA/VCS did not provide the SLA with timely notice of the substantial