

delegated authority has been withheld. Such deviations or changes may be discussed with the Board at the commander's request. However, any deviation or change must meet all legal and procedural requirements.

d. When major differences prevail among the Board members and cannot be resolved, the issue shall be raised on an expedient basis to the Commanding General, to allow for a decision in a timely manner.

e. When needed, convene routine meetings of the Technical Committee sufficient to: ensure inter-division coordination and situational awareness; coordinate with the HQUSACE Dam and Levee Safety Officer; and inform the Board of decisions requiring Command Authority.

f. Terms of Reference will be developed for operation of the Board and Technical Committee for approval by the Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations.

g. The Board and Technical Committee will collaborate with the Mississippi River Commission (MRC) and other impacted stakeholder groups to ensure effective synchronization between the missions of the Board and the MRC in the development of basin-wide management activities for projects within the Greater Mississippi River Basin System.

h. The records of all Board proceedings will be preserved and maintained pursuant to the Army recordkeeping requirements in the Army Records Information Management System regulation (ARIMS—AR25-1-400). The Board will designate an individual responsible for maintaining records of all board proceedings. The designated individual shall be copied on all electronic messages concerning Board proceedings. Records of the Board include, and the Board members shall retain, any emails or other electronic records which the Board members generate or receive concerning Board proceedings. The Board recognizes that recommendations made by the Board and the information generated therefore, are of critical importance to the Corps if litigation is brought against the Corps. Litigation holds will be issued when litigation is reasonably anticipated. When a litigation hold is issued, specific instructions will be provided on preservation of electronically stored information and paper documents.

8. Funding. Routine activities of the Greater Mississippi River Basin Water Management Board and its committees, such as travel and meeting expenses, are funded by the separate members' offices. Major expenses connected with special studies are funded through the normal budgetary process. Budget requests will be supported by appropriate justification material.

[FR Doc. 2013-06591 Filed 3-21-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3720-58-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Navy

#### Notice of Availability for the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Modernization and Expansion of Townsend Bombing Range, Georgia

**AGENCY:** Department of the Navy, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section (102)(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and regulations implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500–1508), Department of the Navy (DoN) NEPA regulations (32 CFR part 775) and United States Marine Corps (USMC) NEPA directives (Marine Corps Order P5090.2A, changes 1 and 2), the USMC has prepared and filed with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) a Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) that evaluated potential environmental impacts of acquiring additional property and constructing the necessary infrastructure to allow the use of precision-guided munitions (PGMs) at Townsend Bombing Range (TBR), Georgia. Through the use of PGMs at TBR, the USMC can more efficiently meet current training requirements for pilots by significantly increasing air-to-ground training capabilities at Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Beaufort, South Carolina.

**DATES AND ADDRESSES:** The USEPA's Notice of Availability (NOA) and Notice of Public Meeting for the Draft EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on July 13, 2012 (77 FR 41402). Federal, state, and local agencies, citizens groups and associations, and other interested parties provided oral and written comments to the USMC and identified specific issues or topics of environmental concern that should be addressed in the Final EIS. The USMC responded to all these comments and updated portions of the Final EIS, where appropriate.

The Final EIS has been distributed to federal, state, and local agencies, citizens groups and associations, and other interested parties. In addition, a copy of the Final EIS was distributed to the following libraries:

1. Ida Hilton Public Library, 1105 North Way, Darien, GA 31305.
2. Long County Public Library, 28 South Main Street, Ludowici, GA 31316.
3. Hog Hammock Public Library, 1023 Hillery Lane, Sapelo Island, GA 31327.

An electronic version of the Final EIS can be viewed or downloaded from the project Web site: <http://www.townsendbombingrangeeis.com>.

**FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE CONTACT:** Capt. Cochran, 596 Geiger Blvd. MCAS Beaufort, SC 29904 at 843-228-6123.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Through the preparation of a Universal Need Statement (UNS), Marine Aircraft Group 31 (MAG-31) identified its requirement for an air-to-ground training range that allows aircrews to utilize PGMs in a realistic training environment. Following the preparation of the UNS, the USMC began the process to certify the requirement to establish an air-to-ground training range to support MAG-31's aviation training needs and develop the approach to accommodate this requirement. MAG-31's need for an air-to-ground range that can accommodate realistic PGM training allowed the USMC and the DoN to request the DoD's approval to study the land acquisition alternatives that could support the creation of a modernized air-to-ground training range. The USMC then initiated the preparation of the EIS to examine the potential impacts of the proposed land acquisition and airspace modification alternatives that could meet the training requirement.

The USMC conducted a multi-step screening process to identify candidate ranges and alternatives that meet the purpose and need. To achieve this, the USMC: (1) Developed range evaluation criteria by identifying key physical and operational attributes required to support training with PGMs; (2) identified existing candidate DoD ranges in the Southeastern United States; and (3) evaluated the candidate ranges against the range evaluation criteria. As a result of the evaluations, seven candidate ranges were identified and subjected to initial analysis; however, only TBR satisfied all of the screening criteria and was carried forward for full analysis in the EIS.

**Purpose and Need:** The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide an air-to-ground training range capable of providing a wider variety of air-to-ground operations, including the use of PGMs, to meet current training requirements. The Proposed Action is needed to more efficiently meet current training requirements for USMC aviation assets by significantly increasing air-to-ground training capabilities in the Beaufort, South Carolina Region.

**Proposed Action:** The Proposed Action in the FEIS evaluated potential environmental impacts of acquiring additional property and constructing the

necessary infrastructure to allow the use of PGMs at TBR, Georgia.

The Proposed Action includes five interrelated components:

- (1) Acquisition of land;
- (2) Acquisition of a timber easement;
- (3) Modification of existing airspace;
- (4) Construction of infrastructure to support PGM training; and
- (5) Improvement of training capabilities.

*Alternatives Evaluated in the FEIS:* The USMC analyzed four action alternatives and a No Action Alternative. All four action alternatives involved the acquisition and management of land and a timber easement, the modification of existing airspace, and the construction of infrastructure to support PGM training, and would result in the improvement of training capabilities. The land acquired under each action alternative involved different strategic combinations of three possible land acquisition areas (referred to as "Acquisition Area 1A," "Acquisition Area 1B," and "Acquisition Area 3"). Similarly under all four action alternatives, the USMC proposed to modify the existing airspace based on the amount of land acquired. Any combination of the land proposed to be acquired would be under the current Restricted Area R-3007. All the action alternatives involved the installation of target scoring equipment, facility and/or tower construction, and roadway construction/improvement. The USMC identified Alternative 4 as the Preferred Alternative, which includes acquisition of Areas 1B and 3 (28,630 acres) and construction of six new target areas.

*Environmental Compliance:* The USMC prepared the Final EIS per the guidance provided in 40 CFR 1502.9, with the purpose of fully analyzing environmental impacts as a result of implementing the Proposed Action through selection of the Preferred Alternative. Impacts were assessed for the following resource areas: Land use; socioeconomic; recreation; wetlands; water resources; airspace; noise; biological resources; cultural resources; air quality; transportation; noise; topography, geology, and soils; utilities and infrastructure; and hazardous materials and waste. However, it was determined through the EIS analysis that only socioeconomic would be significantly impacted as a result of the Proposed Action.

*Schedule:* Publication of the USEPA's NOA signifies the beginning of a 30-day waiting period (No Action Period). In accordance with NEPA, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Environment) will publish the Record of

Decision in the **Federal Register** after the 30-day waiting period has ended.

Dated: March 8, 2013.

**C.K. Chiappetta,**

*Lieutenant Commander, Office of the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2013-06588 Filed 3-21-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[Docket No. ED-2012-ICCD-0070]

### Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to the Office of Management and Budget for Review and Approval; Comment Request; School Attendance Boundary Survey (SABS) 2013-2015

**AGENCY:** Institute of Education Sciences (IES), National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Department of Education (ED).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, ED is proposing a new information collection.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before April 22, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov> by selecting Docket ID number ED-2012-ICCD-0070 or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. Please note that comments submitted by fax or email and those submitted after the comment period will not be accepted. Written requests for information or comments submitted by postal mail or delivery should be addressed to the Director of the Information Collection Clearance Division, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., LBJ, Room 2E105, Washington, DC 20202-4537.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Electronically mail [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov). Please do not send comments here.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department of Education (ED), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public's reporting burden. It also

helps the public understand the Department's information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. ED is soliciting comments on the proposed information collection request (ICR) that is described below. 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. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

*Title of Collection:* School Attendance Boundary Survey (SABS) 2013-2015.

*OMB Control Number:* 1850-NEW.

*Type of Review:* New collection.

*Respondents/Affected Public:* State, Local, or Tribal Governments.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses:* 13,600.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours:* 13,600.

*Abstract:* The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), within the U.S. Department of Education, is requesting clearance to collect the boundaries for all public school service areas in the 50 states and the District of Columbia in 2013 and 2015. The School Attendance Boundary Survey (SABS), to be collected on a two year cycle, will assign geographic school attendance boundaries for the public elementary and secondary schools included in the Common Core of Data (CCD) universe. NCES will then disseminate data from sources such as the American Community Survey (e.g. demographics and poverty information) mapped against the school boundaries. The NCES mapping system is the only system in the United States to nationally visually link school exact geographic locations to their demographic and economic information.

Dated: March 18, 2013.

**Stephanie Valentine,**

*Acting Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Privacy, Information and Records Management Services, Office of Management.*

[FR Doc. 2013-06573 Filed 3-21-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4000-01-P**