

The Bureau seeks information responsive to the following questions about such covered person or third-party claims.

i. The Bureau is not aware of recent practice by covered persons to bring claims against consumers in arbitration.⁵ Do such arbitrations, in fact, exist at this point? If there are such arbitrations, should the Bureau determine their frequency? If there are no longer such arbitrations, should the Bureau analyze whether covered persons will, in the future, return to bringing claims against consumers in arbitration?

ii. Should the Bureau analyze the types of claims that covered persons bring in arbitration? If covered persons no longer bring claims in arbitration, should the Bureau seek to answer this question for a period in which they did?

iii. For claims that covered persons have brought in arbitration, should the Bureau seek to analyze: (a) the cost and speed of dispute resolution; and/or (b) the outcome of disputes? If covered persons no longer bring claims in arbitration, should the Bureau seek to answer these questions for a period in which they did?

iv. For consumers involved in any such cases, should the Bureau seek to assess their understanding of, and satisfaction with, the resulting arbitration process? If covered persons no longer bring claims in arbitration, should the Bureau seek to answer this question for a period in which they did?

v. If the Bureau should address some or all of the issues identified in 2.B.i–iv above, what methods of study should it use? What new data, if any, should the Bureau seek and from which entities? What existing studies or empirical data, if any, should the Bureau use? Should the Bureau focus on particular product markets? Should the Bureau focus on the impact to arbitral

invoked that agreement to bring claims against a consumer in arbitration. The Bureau intends the following set of questions to cover such third-party claims as well.

⁵Prior to July 2009, the National Arbitration Forum (“NAF”) administered each year a significant number of debt collection arbitrations that various covered persons or third-parties brought against consumers. In July 2009, however, NAF agreed that it would no longer handle consumer arbitrations, including debt collection cases brought against consumers. NAF reached this agreement to settle claims by the Minnesota Attorney General that NAF violated Minnesota’s consumer-fraud, deceptive-trade-practices, and false-advertising statutes. Following the NAF settlement, the American Arbitration Association (“AAA”) announced that it would not administer any consumer finance debt collection arbitrations filed by companies. The AAA’s policy is still in effect according to a “Notice on Consumer Debt Collection Arbitrations” that is available on the organization’s Web site, www.adr.org.

proceedings of particular terms in pre-dispute arbitration agreements?

3. Impact and Use Outside Particular Arbitral Proceedings

Independent of their role in particular arbitral proceedings, pre-dispute arbitration agreements may impact consumers and/or covered persons in other ways. Thus, academics and other parties have claimed that the existence of pre-dispute arbitration agreements may impact:

- The incidence and nature of consumer claims against covered persons;
- The price and availability of financial services products to consumers;
- Compliance with consumer financial protection laws;
- Consumer awareness of potential legal claims against covered persons;
- Consumer awareness and understanding of how potential legal claims against covered persons may be resolved; and
- The development, interpretation, and application of the rule of law.

i. Should the Bureau seek to evaluate how the use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements impacts consumers and/or covered persons in one or more of these ways?

ii. Should the Bureau seek to evaluate how the use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements impacts consumers and/or covered persons in any other ways that are independent of their role in particular arbitral proceedings?

iii. If so, and in either case, what methods of study should the Bureau use? What new data, if any, should the Bureau seek and from which entities? What existing studies or empirical data, if any, should the Bureau use? Should the Bureau focus on particular product markets? Should the Bureau focus on the impact of particular terms in pre-dispute arbitration agreements?

Dated: April 23, 2012.

Meredith Fuchs,

Chief of Staff, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

[FR Doc. 2012–10189 Filed 4–26–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-AM-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Notification of an Open Meeting of the National Defense University Board of Visitors (BOV); Correction

AGENCY: National Defense University, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting; correction.

SUMMARY: On March 30, 2012 (77 FR 19265–19266), the National Defense University Board of Visitors gave notice of a meeting to be held on May 2 and 3, 2012, from 11:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. on May 2 and continuing on May 3 from 8 a.m. to 1 p.m. The Department of Defense announces that the meeting date and time have been changed. All other information in the notice remains the same.

DATES: The new meeting date and time is May 2, 2012 from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. The meeting originally scheduled for May 3, 2012 has been cancelled.

ADDRESSES: The Board of Visitors meeting will be held at Marshall Hall, Building 62, Room 155, the National Defense University, 300 5th Avenue SW., Fort McNair, Washington, DC 20319–5066.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The point of contact for this notice is Ms. Dolores Hodge at (202) 685–0082, Fax (202) 685–3748 or HodgeD@ndu.edu.

Dated: April 24, 2012.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2012–10226 Filed 4–26–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

GPS Satellite Simulator Working Group; Notice of Meeting

AGENCY: The United States Air Force, DoD.

ACTION: Amending GPS Simulator Working group Meeting Notice.

SUMMARY: We are requesting to amend the date of the GPS Simulator Working group meeting notice published on April 20, 2012 under 77 FR 23668. The date of the meeting will now be 15 May 2012 from 0730–1600 (Pacific Standard Time). This meeting notice is to inform the public that the Global Positioning Systems (GPS) Directorate will be hosting an open GPS Satellite Simulator Working Group (SSWG) meeting for manufacturers of GPS constellation simulators utilized by the federal government on 15 May 2012 from 0730–1600 (Pacific Standard Time). The purpose of this meeting is to disseminate information about GPS simulators, discuss current and on-going efforts related to simulators and form a functioning GPS Satellite Simulator

Working Group with industry and government participation.

The GPS Satellite Simulator Working Group is open to any current manufacturer of GPS constellation satellite simulators who supply products to the Department of Defense. Please note that participants must possess a SECRET clearance to attend. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** We request that you register for this event no later than 8 May 2012. Please send the registration to justin.deifel@losangeles.af.mil and wayne.urubio@losangeles.af.mil and provide your name, organization, telephone number, address and security clearance information.

Henry Williams Jr.,

Acting Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer, DAF.

[FR Doc. 2012-10148 Filed 4-26-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-10-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Notice of Intent To Grant Exclusive Patent Licenses to TroCept Micro Ltd. L.L.C.

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: In compliance with 35 U.S.C. 209(e) and 37 CFR 404.7(a)(1)(i), the Department of the Army hereby gives notice of its intent to grant to TroCept Micro Ltd. L.L.C., a corporation having its principle place of business at 2711 Centerville Rd, Suite 400, Wilmington, DE 19808, exclusive licenses relative to the following U.S. Patents:

- 6,501,099; “Modified-anode gate turn-off thyristor;” December 31, 2002.
- 6,703,642; “Silicon carbide (SiC) gate turn-off (GTO) thyristor structure for higher turn-off gain and larger voltage blocking when in the off-state;” March 9, 2004.
- 6,734,462; “Silicon carbide (SiC) gate turn-off (GTO) thyristor structure for higher turn-off gain and larger voltage blocking when in the off-state;” February 8, 2000.
- 6,759,683; “Formulation and fabrication of an improved Ni based composite Ohmic contact to n-SiC for high temperature and high power device applications;” July 6, 2004.
- 6,900,477; “Processing technique to improve the turn-off gain of a silicon carbide gate turn-off thyristor and an article of manufacture;” May 31, 2005.
- 7,297,626; “Process for nickel silicide Ohmic contacts to n-SiC;” November 20, 2007.

- 7,304,363; “Interacting current spreader and junction extender to increase the voltage blocked in the off state of a high power semiconductor device;” December 4, 2007.

- 7,851,274; “Processing technique to improve the turn-off gain of a silicon carbide gate turn-off thyristor;” December 14, 2010.

DATES: The prospective exclusive licenses may be granted unless within fifteen (15) days from the date of this published notice, the U.S. Army Research Laboratory receives written objections including evidence and argument that establish that the grant of the licenses would not be consistent with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 209 and 37 CFR 404.7. Competing applications completed and received by the U.S. Army Research Laboratory within fifteen (15) days from the date of this published notice will also be treated as objections to the grant of the contemplated exclusive licenses.

Objections submitted in response to this notice will not be made available to the public for inspection and, to the extent permitted by law, will not be released under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552.

ADDRESSES: Send written objections to Michael D. Rausa, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, Office of Research and Technology Applications, Attn: RDRL-DB/Bldg. 434, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5425.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael D. Rausa, telephone (410) 278-5028.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: None.

Brenda S. Bowen,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2012-10169 Filed 4-26-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Notice of Availability for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed San Acacia to Bosque del Apache Project, Socorro County, NM

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

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Albuquerque District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) has prepared a draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) on the findings of a flood risk management study along the Rio Grande

from San Acacia downstream to San Marcial in Socorro County, New Mexico. The recommended plan is to replace the existing embankment between the Low Flow Conveyance Channel and the Rio Grande with a structurally competent levee capable of containing high-volume, long-duration flows. This engineered levee would substantially reduce the risk of damage from floods emanating from the Rio Grande. The local cost-sharing sponsors of the proposed project are the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District and the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission.

DATES: All comments must be submitted or postmarked no later than June 11, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Comments, questions, requests for copies of the draft SEIS, and requests for notification of the public meeting can be addressed to: William DeRagon, email: william.r.deragon@usace.army.mil; or Mark Doles, email: mark.w.doles@usace.army.mil; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 4101 Jefferson Plaza NE., Albuquerque, New Mexico 87109.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. William DeRagon, telephone: (505) 342-3358; or Mark Doles, telephone: (505) 342-3364.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Previously, an environmental impact statement (1992) and a supplement (1977) were published regarding this project. Currently, a new draft SEIS has been prepared to evaluate effects of revised levee design and additional alternatives. The draft SEIS is integrated with a draft General Reevaluation Report, and the integrated document is entitled: *Draft General Reevaluation Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement II: Rio Grande Floodway, San Acacia to Bosque del Apache Unit, Socorro County, New Mexico* (hereafter referred to as the draft GRR/SEIS-II).

Alternatives developed and evaluated during the current and previous studies consist of levee reconstruction; flood and sediment control dams; local levees; intermittent levee replacement; watershed land treatment; floodproofing of buildings; levee-alignment setbacks; and no action. Issues analyzed in the development of the draft GRR/SEIS-II included the effect of alternatives on flood risk, developed lands and structures, water quality, ecological resources, endangered species, social welfare, cultural resources, and aesthetic qualities.

Public Review: The 45-day long review public review period for the