Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10222, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503, be faxed to (202) 395–5806 or e-mailed to oira_submission@omb.eop.gov with a cc: to ICDOcketMgr@ed.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 35) requires that the Director of OMB provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. The Office of Management and Budget (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, Information Collection Clearance Division, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management, publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests at the beginning of the Departmental review of the information collection. 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. ED 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 respondents, including through the use of information technology.


Darrin A. King,
Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management.

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Type of Review: New.
Title: Education Jobs Fund Program Application.

OMB #: 1810–NEW.
Agency Form(s) #: N/A.
Abstract: On August 10, 2010, President Barack Obama signed H.R. 1586, which authorizes the Education Jobs Fund Program. This economic recovery bill provides an investment in education to retain or create education jobs. It provides needed aid to school districts for the support of early childhood, elementary and secondary education. Under the Education Jobs Fund (Education Jobs), the U.S. Department of Education (Department) will award grants to Governors according to a formula based on their relative population of individuals aged 5 to 24 (sixty-one percent) and based on relative total population (thirty-nine percent).

Additional Information: In order to provide immediate assistance to help alleviate the substantial budget shortfalls that school districts are facing, the Department is committed to providing the Education Jobs allocations within a very short timeframe, necessitating emergency clearance of the Education Jobs program application. Specifically, the statute directs the Department to award each State the total amount that it is to receive within 45 days after the date of enactment.

Frequency: One time.
Affected Public: State, Local, or Tribal Government, State Educational Agencies (SEAs) or Local Educational Agencies (LEAs).

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:
Responses: 51.
Burden Hours: 107.

Requests for copies of the proposed information collection request may be accessed from http://edinsweb.ed.gov, by selecting the “Browse Pending Collections” link and by clicking on link number 4377. When you access the information collection, click on “Download Attachments” to view. Written requests for information should be addressed to U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., LBJ, Washington, DC 20202–4537. Requests may also be electronically mailed to the Internet address ICDOcketMgr@ed.gov or faxed to 202–401–0920. Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request.

Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be electronically mailed to ICDOcketMgr@ed.gov. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339.

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: The U.S. Department of Education (Department) gives notice that on February 4, 2010, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission, Bureau of Services for the Visually Impaired v. United States Department of Defense, Department of the Air Force, Case no. R–S/07–5. This panel was convened by the Department under 20 U.S.C. 107d–1(b) after the Department received a complaint filed by the petitioner, the Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission, Bureau of Services for the Visually Impaired.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You may obtain a copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision from Suzette E. Haynes, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Room 5022, Potomac Center Plaza, Washington, DC 20202–2800. Telephone: (202) 245–7374. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll-free, at 1–800–877–8339.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an accessible format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 6(c) of 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

The Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission, Bureau of Services for the Visually Impaired, the State licensing agency (SLA), alleged violations by the United States Department of Defense, Department of the Air Force (Air Force) of the Randolph-Sheppard Act (Act) and...
the implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395. Specifically, the SLA alleged that the Air Force violated the Act and its implementing regulations concerning the food services at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Montgomery County, Ohio.

According to the arbitration panel, the issues to be resolved were: (1) The Air Force’s alleged failure to comply with the Act by denying the SLA’s June 13, 2006, application for a permit to operate snack and beverage vending machines throughout the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base; and (2) the Air Force’s alleged failure to properly report and pay the SLA or its designated vendors income from the vending machines at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base pursuant to the Act and implementing regulations.

Arbitration Panel Decision

After hearing testimony and reviewing all of the evidence, the panel majority ruled as follows:

(1) The Air Force violated the Act by denying the SLA’s vending machine permit application. The panel concluded that nothing in the Act or the implementing regulations authorizes a Federal agency to reject an SLA’s vending permit application on the grounds that the Federal agency would lose income or prefer to tie the vending machine service to some other service. The panel declined, however, to prescribe a remedy for this violation based upon the requirement in 34 CFR 395.37(d) that it is the agency’s responsibility to “cause such acts or practices to be terminated promptly and [to] take such other action as may be necessary to carry out the decision of the panel.”

(2) The Air Force did not violate the Act or implementing regulations in 34 CFR 395.32 concerning the collection and distribution of vending machine income on Federal property by paying the two blind vendors at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base fifty percent instead of 100 percent of vending machine income. Rather, the panel majority ruled that the evidence presented did not show that the Air Force’s vending machines were located in an area of proximity that posed “direct competition” to either or both of the two blind vendors.

(3) The SLA failed to show that the Air Force’s accounting of vending machine income varied from established procedures or that the vending machine income, which the Air Force reported quarterly to the SLA, was inaccurate.

(4) The Air Force did not violate the Act by failing to share vending machine income with the SLA when the vending machine income from each separate building did not exceed $3,000.

In drawing this conclusion, the panel majority noted that there was no evidence presented at the hearing that showed that any of the single buildings at the Wright-Patterson Air Force base were in close proximity to each other or that a majority of the Federal workers in any of the buildings regularly moved from one building to another in the course of official business during a normal work day. This is what is required to trigger the vending machine income sharing requirements under sections 395.1(b) and 395.32(i) of the regulations.

One panel member dissented from the panel majority regarding item one. The panel member concluded that the Air Force included both the food service operations and the vending machines as a package in the solicitation and thus denied the SLA’s permit application on the basis that a vending machines “only” permit did not exist.

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

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

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site.


Dated: August 9, 2010.
Alexa Posny,
Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.
[FR Doc. 2010–19947 Filed 8–11–10; 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: The Department of Education (Department) gives notice that on July 17, 2009, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of the Illinois Department of Human Services, Division of Rehabilitation Services v. United States Postal Service, Case No. R–S/06–14. This panel was convened by the Department under 20 U.S.C. 107d–1(b) after the Department received a complaint filed by the petitioner, the Illinois Department of Human Services, Division of Rehabilitation Services.


Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an accessible format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 6(c) of 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

The Illinois Department of Human Services, Division of Rehabilitation Services, the State licensing agency (SLA) alleged violations by the United States Postal Service (USPS) of the Act and the implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395. Specifically, the SLA alleged that USPS violated the Act, the implementing regulations, and the vending permits held by the SLA concerning a vending machine facility operated by a blind vendor at the USPS’s Chicago Processing and Distribution Center.

According to the arbitration panel, the issues to be resolved were: (1) Whether the USPS cafeteria operations are exempt from the Act and whether the vending machines operated by a private vendor at the Chicago Processing and Distribution Center in direct competition with the vending machines operated by the SLA’s blind vendor; (2) Whether the no-commission contracts let by USPS for cafeteria vending violated the Act, and what compensatory damages, if any are due the SLA; and (3) Whether the SLA may amend its complaint against USPS to