

of the Army announces the following committee meeting:

Name of Committee: Army Science Board (ASB).

Date(s) of Meeting: August 10, 2011.

Time(s) of Meeting: 0800–1200.

Location: Newport News Marriott at City Center, 740 Town Center Drive, Newport News, VA 23606.

Purpose: Adopt the findings and recommendations for phase one of the following studies: *Strengthening Sustainability and Resiliency of a Future Force and Tactical Non-cooperative Biometric Systems.*

Proposed Agenda:

Wednesday 10 August:

0830–1130 Study results for *Strengthening Sustainability and Resiliency of a Future Force and Tactical Non-Cooperative Biometric Systems* are presented to the ASB. The ASB deliberates and votes to adopt the findings and recommendations on the studies.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information please contact Mr. Justin Bringham at justin.bringhurst@us.army.mil or (703) 617–0263 or Carolyn German at carolyn.t.german@us.army.mil or (703) 617–0258.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: None.

Brenda S. Bowen,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011–18521 Filed 7–21–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Termination of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Proposed Regional Watershed Supply Project in Wyoming and Colorado

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District, Regulatory Branch is notifying interested parties that it has terminated the process to develop a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and has withdrawn the Section 404 Clean Water Act permit application for the proposed ‘Regional Watershed Supply Project’ submitted in 2008 by a private water development entity known as Million Conservation Resource Group (MCRG). The original Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on Friday, March 20, 2009 (74 FR 11920),

with subsequent amended announcements on May 8, 2009 (74 FR 21665) and August 11, 2009 (74 FR 40171).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Questions regarding the termination of this EIS process should be addressed to Ms. Rena Brand, Project Manager, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Denver Regulatory Office, 9307 S. Wadsworth Blvd., Littleton, CO 80128–6901; (303)–979–4120; mcrgeis@usace.army.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: After the initial public scoping process in 2009, the Corps received 7,409 substantive comments related to the applicant’s proposal to construct a 558 mile water pipeline from Flaming Gorge Reservoir in Southwest Wyoming to a terminating storage reservoir near Pueblo, Colorado, designed to supply up to 250,000 acre feet of water annually to various municipal and agricultural entities in Eastern Wyoming and the Front Range of Colorado. A common concern expressed dealt with the need for the water, what entities would be using the water, and for what purposes. On April 1, 2011, MCRG expressed to the Corps that they wished to change the primary purpose of the project to power generation. When the EIS process started in 2009, it was understood that the project purpose was water supply, so all EIS work done to date, to include public scoping was related to that purpose. The project now has an uncertain and variable purpose, which technically makes the applicant’s permit application incomplete. Additionally, Corps’ regulations require that applicants be provided sufficient time to respond to requests from the Corps for information, normally not to exceed 30 days. At the close of a recent 60-day stop work request by MCRG, the Corps decided to withdraw the permit application, as MCRG did not officially respond with a decision about how the EIS was to proceed, as requested by the Corps. The Corps decided that now is the appropriate time to officially terminate the EIS. The Corps’ neutral role in this EIS process was to evaluate the environmental consequences of proposed projects such as these under authority of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The preparation of the EIS was being conducted by a third-party contractor directed by the Corps, and funded by the permit applicant, which is typical of Corps Regulatory EIS studies. Withdrawal of the permit application and termination of the EIS process will not prevent MCRG from re-applying at a later date, and will not

affect other ongoing Corps water supply studies along the Colorado Front Range.

Brenda S. Bowen,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2011–18523 Filed 7–21–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3720–58–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of Submission for OMB Review

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Comment request.

SUMMARY: The Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Privacy, Information and Records Management Services, Office of Management, invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13).

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before August 22, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Education Desk Officer, 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 oir_submission@omb.eop.gov with a cc: to ICDocketMgr@ed.gov. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

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. The OMB is particularly interested in comments which: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.