40 CFR Part 250

[FRL 1412-3]

Hazardous Waste: Notice of Availability of Information and Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of availability of information and extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is today extending for 18 days the public comment period on two reports on the environmental and economic impacts of various regulatory alternatives for generators of small quantities of hazardous waste. These reports, which were completed after the close of the original comment period on EPA's proposed regulations implementing Sections 3001–3004 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as amended, were previously noticed for public comment on January 10, 1980 at 45 FR 2059–2060.

DATES: Comments on these reports are now due no later than February 29, 1980.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to Deborah Vallari, Docket Clerk, Office of Solid Waste (WH-562), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, (202) 755–9173. Comments should identify the regulatory docket and subject as follows: "Sections 3001 and 3002: Small quantities".

Copies of these reports are available for reading at the EPA Library-Public Information Reference Unit (Room 2404) and the Subtitle C Docket Room (Room 2711), both located at 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C., and at all EPA Regional Office Libraries during the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Copies of these reports are also available from Ed Cox, Solid Waste Information, U.S. E.P.A., 26 W. Saint Clair Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45268, (513) 684–5362. If available copies run out, the Agency may charge $0.20 per page for photocopying.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Deborah Vallari, Docket Clerk, Office of Solid Waste (WH-562), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460, (202) 755–9173.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA is extending for 18 days the public comment period on two reports on hazardous waste which were previously noticed on January 10, 1980 at 45 FR 2059–2060. The two reports are: *Technical Environmental Impacts of Various Approaches for Regulating Small Volume Hazardous Waste Generators,* 2 Vols., December 1979, EPA Contract Numbers 68–02–2613 and 68–03–2560, TRW Environmental Engineering Division, Redondo Beach, CA. [SW–185c.1 and SW–185c.2], and *Economic Impacts of RCRA Approaches to the Regulation of Generator of Small Volumes of Hazardous Waste,* December 1979, EPA Contract Number 68–01–4778, Temple, Barker & Sloane, Inc., Lexington, MA. [SW–186c].

Because of unanticipated demand and resultant distribution problems, EPA has been unable to make these reports available to the public in a timely manner. Therefore, the comment period is being extended today to allow the public adequate time to receive, review and comment on the reports. This is not to be construed as a reopening of the comment period on the Agency's proposed regulations implementing Sections 3001–3004 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as amended.

Dated: February 7, 1980.

James N. Smith,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Water and Waste Management.

[FR Doc. 80–4569 Filed 2–12–80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Center for Disease Control

42 CFR Part 51g

Grants for Health Education-Risk Reduction

AGENCY: Center for Disease Control, Public Health Service, HEW.

ACTION: Notice of Decision to Develop Regulations.

SUMMARY: The Center proposes to amend regulations governing the Health Education-Risk Reduction Grants program to establish and administer grant programs to discourage children and youth from smoking and alcohol use as authorized under section 402(a)(2) of the Health Services and Centers Amendments of 1978. These new grant programs will be carried out in conjunction with the Health Education-Risk Reduction grants authorized under section 1703 of the Public health Service Act and initiated in 1979 with State and local health agencies. The grants will provide preventive health education services related to tobacco and alcohol to children and young people in selected community and school settings, and a portion of the funds will be specifically targeted for minority populations. The programs will be demonstrations with evaluation components to ensure their adaptability to a variety of community and school-based settings. The programs will be closely coordinated with other State and local education and alcohol agency programs.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Billy Griggs, Deputy Director, Bureau of Health Education, Center for Disease Control, PHS, HEW, Atlanta, Georgia 30333. Telephone: (404) 329–3111 or FTS: 236–3111.

Dated: January 24, 1980.

Julius B. Richmond,

Assistant Secretary for Health.

[FR Doc. 80–4649 Filed 2–12–80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4110-86-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[BC Docket No. 80-39; RM-3231]

FM Broadcast Station in Los Osos-Baywood Park, Calif.; Proposed Changes in Table of Assignments

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Rule Making.

SUMMARY: Action taken herein proposes the assignment of a Class B FM channel to Los Osos-Baywood Park, California, as that community's first FM assignment, in response to a petition filed by Thomas B. and Margrethe T. Friedman. The proposed channel could be used to provide a first local aural broadcast service to the community.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before March 31, 1980, and reply comments must be filed on or before April 21, 1980.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark N. Lipp, Broadcast Bureau, (202) 632–7792.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Adopted: January 29, 1980.

Released: February 4, 1980.

In the matter of amendment of § 73.202(b), Table of Assignments, FM Broadcast Stations, (Los Osos-Baywood Park, California).

By the Chief, Policy and Rules Division:

1. The Commission has before it a petition for rule making filed by Thomas B and Margrethe T. Friedman ("petitioners"), requesting the

assignment of Class B FM Channel 267 to Los Osos-Baywood Park, California, as a first FM assignment.[1] No comments have been filed.

2. Los Osos-Baywood Park (pop. 3,487) [2] is located in San Luis Obispo County (pop. 105,690) along the California coast. This community is approximately 345 kilometers (215 miles) north of Los Angeles and 385 Kilometers (239 miles) south of San Francisco. It has no local aural broadcast service.

3. Petitioners state that the population of Los Osos-Baywood Park has grown very rapidly since 1970 to approximately 9,200 in 1978.[3] Petitioners have submitted a community profile which supports a need for a first FM assignment to that community.

4. Channel 267 can be assigned to Los Osos-Baywood Park without affecting any existing FM assignments. Preclusion will occur on Channels 265A, 267 and 269A affecting thirteen communities of over 1,000 population. Of these, the following six communities have no local aural broadcast service with the affected channels listed: Cambria (pop. 1,716) (Channels 265A, 267, 269A); Cayucos (1,772) (Channels 267, 269A); Oceano (2,564) (Channel 269A); Nipomo (3,642) (Channel 269A); Guadalupe (3,145) (Channel 269A); Santa Maria South (7,129) (Channel 269A). Petitioners should submit a showing as to the availability of alternate channels for the above named communities.[4]

5. Although petitioners submitted a *Roanoke Rapids/Anamosa* showing which demonstrated the extent of first and second FM or aural service, the Commission's staff study found the showing to be in error. The proposed assignment will provide no service to any unserved or underserved areas.

6. Our usual policy is to require some additional justification for the allocation of a higher powered facility to a small community. We have determined that no first or second service areas pertain. However, the area in which Channel 267 can be assigned is a relatively thin strip of coastal land containing few communities. Of those precluded on the co-channel, none are as Los Osos-Baywood Park. Therefore, we find sufficient justification to propose for comments the Class B assignment to the requested community.

7. In view of the apparent need for a first local FM station in Los Osos-Baywood Park, California, the Commission finds that consideration of the proposal described above would be in the public interest.

8. Accordingly, IT IS PROPOSED TO AMEND, the FM Table of Assignments, Section 73.202(b) of the Commission's Rules, as follows:

City	Channel No. Present	Channel No. Proposed
Los Osos-Baywood Park, Calif.		267

9. The Commission's authority to institute rule making proceedings, showings required, cut-off procedures and filing requirements are contained in the attached Appendix and are incorporated by reference herein. *NOTE:* A showing of continuing interest is required by paragraph 2 of the Appendix before a channel will be assigned.

10. Interested parties may file comments on or before March 31, 1980, and reply comments on or before April 21, 1980.

11. For further information concerning this proceeding, contact Mark N. Lipp, Broadcast Bureau, (202) 632-7792. However, members of the public should note that from the time a notice of proposed rule making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings such as this one, which involve channel assignments. An *ex parte* contact is a message (spoken or written) concerning the merits of a pending rule making other than comments officially filed at the Commission or oral presentation required by the Commission.

Federal Communications Commission.

Henry L. Baumann,

Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Broadcast Bureau.

Appendix

1. Pursuant to authority found in Sections 4(i), 5(d)(1), 303(g) and (r), and 307(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and Section 0.281(b)(6) of the Commission's Rules, IT IS PROPOSED TO AMEND the FM Table of Assignments, Section 73.202(b) of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, as set forth in the *Notice of Proposed Rule Making* to which this Appendix is attached.

2. *Showings required.* Comments are invited on the proposal(s) discussed in the Notice of Proposed Rule Making to which this Appendix is attached. Proponent(s) will be expected to answer whatever questions are presented in initial comments. The proponent of a proposed assignment is also expected to file comments even if it only resubmits or incorporates by reference its former pleadings. It should also restate its present intention to apply for the channel if it is assigned, and, if authorized, to build the station promptly. Failure to file may lead to denial of the request.

3. *Cut-off procedures.* The following procedures will govern the consideration of filings in this proceeding.

(a) Counterproposals advanced in this proceeding itself will be considered, if advanced in initial comments, so that parties may comment on them in reply comments. They will not be considered if advanced in reply comments. (See § 1.420(d) of Commission Rules.)

(b) With respect to petitions for rule making which conflict with the proposal(s) in this Notice, they will be considered as comments in the proceeding, and Public Notice to this effect will be given as long as they are filed before the date for filing initial comments herein. If they are filed later than that, they will not be considered in connection with the decision in this docket.

4. *Comments and reply comments; service.* Pursuant to applicable procedures set out in Sections 1.415 and 1.420 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, interested parties may file comments and reply comments on or before the dates set forth in the *Notice of Proposed Rule Making* to which this Appendix is attached. All submissions by parties to this proceeding or persons acting on behalf of such parties must be made in written comments, reply comments, or other appropriate pleadings. Comments shall be served on the petitioner by the person filing the comments. Reply comments shall be served on the person(s) who filed comments to which the reply is directed. Such comments and reply comments shall be accompanied by a certificate of service. (See § 1.420(a), (b) and (c) of the Commission Rules.)

5. *Number of copies.* In accordance with the provisions of Section 1.420 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, an original and four copies of all comments, reply comments, pleadings, briefs, or other documents shall be furnished the Commission.

6. *Public inspection of filings.* All filings made in this proceeding will be available for examination by interested parties during regular business hours in the Commission's Public Reference Room at its headquarters, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

[FR Doc. 80-4578 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

[1] Public Notice of the petition was given on November 3, 1978, Rept. No. 1149.

[2] Population figures are taken from the 1970 U.S. Census.

[3] This estimate comes from an article in the Los Angeles Times newspaper that does not quote a source.

[4] Petitioner's preclusion showing did not contain all of these communities. Our staff study found certain errors in the showing and we have set forth this revised showing.

Notices

Federal Register
Vol. 45, No. 31
Wednesday, February 13, 1980

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Supplementary Guidance; Handicapped Access to Historic Properties

AGENCY: Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

ACTION: Supplementary Guidance.

SUMMARY: The Executive Director of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is publishing for the information of the public and government agencies this supplementary guidance for implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act pursuant to 36 CFR Sec. 800.14. It was developed in order to provide general guidance concerning the treatment of historic resources in programs designed to remove barriers to handicapped access. A draft version was published for public comment on June 13, 1979 (44 FR 34078). The final guidance has been substantially revised in light of comments received. Because of the special issues presented in rendering historic properties accessible to the handicapped while still maintaining the architectural features that are the basis for their significance, this guidance has been drafted in an effort to develop a workable approach to satisfactorily meet both Federal policies.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Smith, Chief, Division of Federal Program Review at 202-254-3886; Katherine Raub Ridley, General Attorney, Division of Federal Program Review, 202-254-3886.

Preamble: The Council is an independent Federal agency established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470) to advise the President and the Congress on matters relating to historic preservation. Under Section 106 of the Act, the Council must be afforded an opportunity for comment when Federal, federally licensed or assisted undertakings affect National Register or eligible properties. The process for obtaining the Council's comments is set forth in the regulations for "Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties" (36 CFR Part 800).

The Council is concerned with the special problems presented in making historic properties accessible to handicapped persons. Under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 706) and implementing regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (45 CFR Parts 84 and 85), Federal agencies are required to publish regulations to ensure that federally assisted programs are accessible to the handicapped. Because properties included in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places will be affected through activities undertaken pursuant to such agency regulations, there is a need to coordinate the Federal policies of access and historic preservation in order to meet the requirements of Section 106. Agency procedures that incorporate the approach set forth below would ensure that action undertaken to make an historic property accessible would give proper consideration to a historic property's significant features. This would also serve as a basis for determining that adoption of such procedures by the agency would have no adverse effect on properties included in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

The Council received 37 comments on the proposed guidance. Commenters expressed great interest in the concept of guidelines for the treatment of historic properties, as well as a degree of frustration with the lack of specific criteria supplied by the draft. In all but two cases, commenters supported the inclusion of a waiver provision, if carefully administered, for those rare instances in which a historic property could not be rendered accesible without substantially impairing significant historic features. The final guidance has been substantially revised in an effort to provide more concise and specific guidelines as to factors that should be considered in weighing the two Federal policies. Integration of Section 504 responsibilities with Section 106 responsibilities is also provided. It is the intent of the Council that this language serve as a basis for a section in each agency's handicapped access regulations reserved for the subject of access to historic properties.

Supplementary Guidance—Handicapped Access to Historic Properties

Incorporation of the following provisions into Federal agency regulations required by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. Sec. 70) and 45 CFR Parts 84 and 85 shall be the basis for a determination pursuant to 36 CFR Sec. 800.4(c) that the adoption of such regulations will have No Adverse Effect on properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

Access to Historic Properties

In the case of historic properties, program accessibility shall mean that, when viewed in their entirety, programs are accessible to and usable by handicapped persons. After all other methods of providing access have been examined and found unsatisfactory in achieving access, recipients of Federal assistance may find it necessary to make alterations to historic properties. Certain alterations may cause substantial impairment of significant historic features. Historic properties are those that are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Substantial impairment occurs when a permanent alteration is made which results in a significant loss of the integrity of finish materials, design quality or spatial character.

Where access cannot be achieved without causing a substantial impairment of significant historic features, the recipient may seek a modification or waiver of access standards from the responsible Federal agency. A decision to seek a modification or waiver should be based on consideration of the following factors.

a. Scale of the structure, reflecting its ability to absorb alterations;

b. Use of the structure, whether primarily for public or private purposes;

c. Importance of the historic features of the structure to the conduct of the program; and,

d. Costs of alterations in comparison to the increase in accessibility.

The decision by the responsible Federal agency to grant a modification or waiver of access standards is subject to Section 106 of the National Historic

Preservation Act and shall be made in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800. Where the structure is federally owned or where Federal funds may be used for alterations, the comments of the Council shall be obtained pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800 prior to the approval of such work by the responsible Federal agency.

Authorities: This Supplementary Guidance is developed under authority of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, 16 U.S.C. Sec. 470f, Executive Order 11593, "Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment," 36 FR 8921 (1971); and regulations for the "Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties," 36 CFR Part 800.

Dated: February 8, 1980.

Robert R. Garvey, Jr.,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 80-4579 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-10-M

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Establishment of Agency's Senior Executive Service Performance Review Board

As required by Title IV of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, the CAB has established a Performance Review Board (PRB) to review, evaluate and make a final recommendation on performance appraisals assigned to members of the agency's Senior Executive Service. The PRB also makes recommendations to the Chairman regarding SES Performance awards, ranks and bonuses. The Performance Review Board consists of the following members: Cressworth Lander, Michael Sherwin, Kenneth Caplan, Barbara Clark, and John Golden.

For Further Information Contact: Michael Sherwin, Director, Office of Human Resources, Civil Aeronautics Board, (202) 673-6140.

Patrick F. Bottone,

Assistant Director for Staffing, Office of Human Resources.

[FR Doc. 80-4647 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6320-01-M

[Docket 37588; Order 80-2-16]

Palm Beach Environmental Study; Order Instituting Study and Deferring Action

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C. on the 5th day of February, 1980.

We have pending before us requests by carriers for route authority between West Palm Beach, Florida, and other cities. We have listed all such dockets affected in Appendix A. The cities of West Palm Beach and the towns of Palm Beach, Golfview, Glen Ridge and Cloud Lake ("The Cities") have filed detailed formal objections in several pending proceedings on environmental grounds raising the basic question of whether there should be new route authority at Palm Beach. (See, for example, *Denver/Chicago-Florida Show-Cause Proceeding*, Docket 36499; *Northeast/Ohio Valley-Florida Show-Cause Proceeding*, Docket 36590; *Detroit-West Palm Beach Show-Cause Proceeding*, Docket 37188.)[1]

We have determined that our responsibility under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires that we undertake a careful analysis of the environmental factors bearing on increased route authority at West Palm Beach. Therefore, we have decided to defer action with respect to additional authority at West Palm Beach, pending completion of an assessment of the possible environmental effects of granting currently pending applications for authority at West Palm Beach, and are directing the staff to prepare this environmental assessment by May 15, 1980. During the deferral period, we will consider the merits of individual route applications for authority at West Palm Beach only in extraordinary circumstances. It does not appear that these circumstances are presented by any of the applications now before us.

In order to facilitate responses to this order, we have established Docket 37588. Carriers or civic parties wishing to petition for reconsideration shall do so within 20 days of the service date of this order. Answers to petitions are due 10 days after that.[2]

Accordingly,

1. We defer action on the West Palm Beach portions of the dockets listed in Appendix A;[3]

2. We direct the staff to complete an environmental assessment as described above no later than May 15, 1980;

3. Petitions for reconsideration of this order shall be filed in Docket 37588, which we have entitled the West Palm Beach Environmental Study, no later than February 27, 1980; answers should be filed by March 10, 1980; and

4. We will serve a copy of this order upon all carriers listed in Appendix A and on The Cities.

We will publish this order in the **Federal Register.**

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

Phyllis T. Kaylor,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 80-4648 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6320-01-M

[1] The cities have also raised these objections in a petition for reconsideration of Order 79-11-174, granting applications for authority in the White Plains-West Palm Beach market (*New York-Miami/West Palm Beach Show-Cause Proceeding*, Docket 35467).

[2] Petitions, answers, and all other pleadings and responses to this order should be filed with the Board in Docket 37588 and served on the parties listed in ordering paragraph 4 of this order.

[3] On file at the Office of the **Federal Register.**

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census

Estimates of the Voting Age Population for 1979

In accordance with the requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1976, title 2 U.S.C. 441a(e), notice is hereby given that the estimates of the voting age population (18 years of age and over) for July 1, 1979, for each state, congressional district, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands are as shown in the following table. These estimates have been certified to the Federal Election Commission.

Philip M. Klutznick,

Secretary of Commerce.

Estimates of the Population of Voting Age for States, Congressional Districts, and Selected Outlying Ages: July 1, 1979

[In thousands]

State and congressional district	Population 18 and over
United States	157,529
Alabama	2,644
1	379
2	377
3	386
4	412
5	362
6	372
7	357
Alaska	261
Arizona	1,697
1	408
2	420
3	449
4	420
Arkansas	1,542
1	355
2	403
3	440
4	344
California	16,475
1	456
2	441
3	401
4	380
5	375
6	340
7	376
8	353
9	366
10	366
11	376
12	366
13	379
14	428
15	395
16	444
17	394

Estimates of the Population of Voting Age for States, Congressional Districts, and Selected Outlying Ages: July 1, 1979—Continued

[In thousands]

Estimates of the Population of Voting Age for States, Congressional Districts, and Selected Outlying Ages: July 1, 1979—Continued

[In thousands]

Estimates of the Population of Voting Age for States, Congressional Districts, and Selected Outlying Ages: July 1, 1979—Continued

[In thousands]

State and congressional district	Population 18 and over
18	368
19	407
20	402
21	343
22	350
23	392
24	391
25	319
26	328
27	383
28	351
29	293
30	313
31	296
32	339
33	366
34	357
35	384
36	355
37	436
38	334
39	400
40	575
41	409
42	380
43	570
Colorado	1,972
1	331
2	429
3	358
4	443
5	411
Connecticut	2,295
1	369
2	394
3	383
4	357
5	398
6	394
Delaware	417
District of Columbia	487
Florida	6,633
1	362
2	390
3	323
4	474
5	552
6	478
7	399
8	487
9	367
10	565
11	567
12	459
13	394
14	412
15	406
Georgia	3,561
1	339
2	335
3	329
4	359
5	289
6	406
7	388
8	335
9	424
10	357
Hawaii	640
1	299
2	341
Idaho	612
1	313
2	299
Illinois	7,997
1	280
2	304
3	325
4	357
5	297
6	312
7	262
8	278
9	379
10	315
11	321
12	382
13	361
14	383
15	346
16	322
17	366
18	342
19	331
20	343
21	352
22	352
23	311
24	376
Indiana	3,807
1	300
2	386
3	342
4	346
5	352
6	351
7	365
8	347
9	363
10	341
11	313
Iowa	2,080
1	357
2	334
3	343
4	355
5	357
6	334
Kansas	1,724
1	337
2	357
3	345
4	328
5	358
Kentucky	2,485
1	379
2	358
3	287
4	348
5	377
6	369
7	368
Louisiana	2,723
1	339
2	338
3	348
4	338
5	333
6	366
7	342
8	319
Maine	779
1	398
2	381
Maryland	3,000
1	422
2	373
3	328
4	398
5	342
6	455
7	293
8	390
Massachusetts	4,253
1	357
2	346
3	345
4	346
5	347
6	338
7	337
8	365
9	325
10	373
11	350
12	425
Michigan	6,470
1	283
2	356
3	353
4	351
5	347
6	372
7	321
8	342
9	358
10	396
11	381
12	366
13	232
14	309
15	339
16	297
17	331
18	348
19	387
Minnesota	2,892
1	381
2	388
3	335
4	327
5	319
6	383
7	375
8	384
Mississippi	1,624
1	321
2	297
3	325
4	324
5	356
Missouri	3,524
1	252
2	341
3	311
4	379
5	305
6	367
7	418
8	395
9	383
10	373
Montana	551
1	286
2	265
Nebraska	1,125
1	380
2	375
3	370
Nevada	495
New Hampshire	634
1	324
2	310
New Jersey	5,332
1	368
2	444
3	377
4	351
5	342
6	403
7	332
8	341
9	353
10	280
11	347
12	329
13	399
14	324
15	341
New Mexico	836
1	422
2	413
New York	12,898
1	400
2	332
3	317
4	311
5	331
6	342
7	344
8	376
9	356
10	337
11	335
12	226
13	349
14	268
15	317
16	318
17	372
18	386
19	280

Estimates of the Population of Voting Age for States, Congressional Districts, and Selected Outlying Ages: July 1, 1979—Continued

[In thousands]

State and congressional district	Population 18 and over
20	352
21	161
22	368
23	332
24	332
25	360
26	367
27	356
28	335
29	360
30	340
31	328
32	346
33	325
34	319
35	334
36	325
37	278
38	353
39	329
North Carolina	3,992
1	351
2	344
3	361
4	399
5	365
6	348
7	365
8	356
9	354
10	366
11	384
North Dakota	462
Ohio	7,645
1	314
2	316
3	311
4	335
5	345
6	366
7	332
8	359
9	313
10	372
11	356
12	349
13	346
14	308
15	359
16	343
17	343
18	347
19	331
20	294
21	243
22	327
23	336
Oklahoma	2,076
1	331
2	361
3	352
4	365
5	309
6	358
Oregon	1,828
1	486
2	478
3	386
4	478
Pennsylvania	8,620
1	315
2	310
3	297
4	338
5	374
6	363
7	317
8	365
9	354
10	377
11	363
12	356
13	331
14	301
15	371
16	372
17	358
18	328
19	371
20	313
21	343
22	354
23	356
24	345
25	349
Rhode Island	683
1	326
2	358
South Carolina	2,026
1	349
2	368
3	343
4	336
5	325
6	305
South Dakota	484
1	245
2	238
Tennessee	3,134
1	404
2	413
3	387
4	431
5	363
6	430
7	390
8	318
Texas	9,291
1	384
2	449
3	462
4	409
5	333
6	404
7	554
8	378
9	373
10	443
11	433
12	334
13	351
14	337
15	369
16	375
17	356
18	307
19	346
20	307
21	434
22	424
23	373
24	357
Utah	862
1	436
2	426
Vermont	350
Virginia	3,758
1	369
2	365
3	360
4	354
5	373
6	361
7	427
8	377
9	392
10	380
Washington	2,829
1	380
2	411
3	453
4	426
5	411
6	398
7	351
West Virginia	1,339
1	324
2	357
3	327
4	331
Wisconsin	3,372
1	363
2	389
3	400
4	345
5	321
6	371
7	392
8	384
9	408
Wyoming	312
Outlying areas	
Puerto Rico	2,145
Guam	62
Virgin Islands	64

[FR Doc. 80-4565 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-M

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[A-2-80]

City of San Jose, Calif., Grantee, Foreign-Trade Zone No. 18; Petition for Permission To Withdraw Crushed Semiconductors in Zone Restricted Status From U.S. Foreign-Trade Zones

The City of San Jose, California, Grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 18, has submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (Board) a petition from the zone manager requesting permission under section 3 of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act (19 U.S.C. 81C) to withdraw from the zone for domestic entry certain crushed semiconductors entered into the zone in "zone restricted status" (19 CFR 146.25 and 146.47(3)) for purposes of drawback. Prior to entering the zone the items has been tested and found defective or sub-standard, and while in the zone they were crushed, converting them to scrap which has some valuable content, primarily gold residue.

The petition refers to a specific shipment of such merchandise presently held in the zone by Monolithic Memories Incorporated (Zone Lot SJ01607); however, because the situation is a common one experienced by the semiconductor industry, it is requested that the Board's approval allow the practice at all U.S. foreign-trade zones under like circumstances. It is asserted by the petitioner that present procedures result in firms sending their scrap abroad in order to reclaim the precious metals remaining as residue, and that allowing this reclamation to take place in the U.S. would be beneficial to the domestic electronics industry. A letter from the American Electronics Association reiterating this point was submitted as an appendix to the petition.

The Customs Service has ruled that the crushing process is sufficient to render the items "destroyed" for drawback purposes, despite the fact that some valuable scrap remains (U.S. Customs Service, DRA-1-R:CD:D 210735, July 31, 1979). The ruling states that in order to bring the scrap into customs territory permission of the Board is necessary. It is understood that any items entering customs territory under these circumstances would be subject to Customs entry procedures.

A report and recommendation will be prepared on this matter for the Board. Since a general Board order is being requested to allow a general practice under like circumstances, all interested parties are invited to submit their views on the proposal. Because the Board must determine whether the practice in question is in the public interest comments on this point should be included. Submissions should be postmarked before March 14, 1980 and addressed to the: Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 6886-B, Main Commerce Building, Washington, D.C. 20230, Phone (202) 377-2862.

Persons wishing to review the petition may do so at the above address during the comments period.

Dated: February 8, 1980.

John J. Da Ponte,

Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

[FR Doc. 80-4632 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-35-M

International Trade Administration

Export Promotion Subcommittee of the President's Export Council

Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, 5 U.S.C. App. (1976) notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Export Promotion Subcommittee of the President's Export Council will be held on Monday, March 3, at 9:00 a.m. in room 6802, Main Commerce Building, Washington, D.C. The Council was initially established by Executive Order 11753 of December 20, 1973, subsequently extended by Executive Order 11827 of January 4, 1975, Executive Order 11948 of December 20, 1976, and Executive Order 12110 of December 28, 1978. The Council was reconstituted by Executive Order 12131 of May 4, 1979, to advise the President on matters relating to United States export trade. The Subcommittee has been formed to make recommendations to the Council regarding programs to promote U.S. exports and to create greater export awareness in the U.S. The Subcommittee is composed solely of members of the Council.

The purpose of the meeting is to continue work on ongoing projects of the Subcommittee.

The agenda for the meeting will be as follows:

Introduction by the Chairman
Discussion of Multiplier Programs
Discussion of Strike Force concept
Discussion of Advertising Campaign
Discussion of Trading Company concept
Other organizational business, announcements and plans for next meeting.

A limited number of seats at the meeting will be available to the public on a first-come basis. The public may file written statements with the Subcommittee before or after each meeting. Oral statements may be presented at the end of the meeting to the extent that time is available.

Copies of the minutes of the meeting and further information concerning the President's Export Council may be obtained from Ms. Wendy Haimes or Ms. Elizabeth Ruskin, room 4015B, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 377-5719.

Date: February 8, 1980.

Peter G. Gould,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Development.

[FR Doc. 80-4636 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-25-M

Semiconductor Technical Advisory Committee; Partially Closed Meeting

February 8, 1980.

Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, 5 U.S.C. App. 10(a)(2) (1976), notice is hereby given that meeting of the Semiconductor Technical Advisory Committee will be held on Thursday, Fedruary 28, 1980, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 6802, Main Commerce Building, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. The meeting will continue, to its conclusion, on February 29, in Room B841, Main Commerce Building.

The Semiconductor Technical Advisory Committee was initially established on January 3, 1973. On December 20, 1974, January 13, 1977, and August 28, 1978, the Assistant Secretary for Administration approved the recharter and extension of the Committee, pursuant to Section 5(c)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1969, as amended, 50 U.S.C. App. sec. 2404(c)(1) (1976 and Supp. I 1977), and the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

The Committee advises the Office of Export Administration with respect to questions involving (A) technical matters, (B) worldwide availability and actual utilization of production technology, (C) licensing procedures which affect the level of export controls applicable to semiconductor products, including technical data or other information related thereto, and (D) exports of the aforementioned commodities and technical data subject to multilateral controls in which the United States participates including proposed revisions of any such multilateral controls.

The Committee meeting agenda had six parts:

General Session

1. Opening remarks by the Chairman.
2. Presentation of papers or comments by the public.
3. Commitee consideration of the $500 GLV limit.
4. Consideration of the Committee's recommendation of the Qualified Product License.
5. Committee and subcommittee reports.

Exective Session

6. Discussion of matters properly classified under Executive Order 11652, 3 CFR 678 (1971-1975 Compilation), or 12065, 3 CFR 191 (1979), dealing with the U.S. and COCOM control program and strategic criteria related thereto.

The General Session of the meeting is open to the public, at which a limited number of seats will be available. To the extent time permits members of the public may present oral statements to the Committee. Written statements may be presented at any time before or after the meeting.

With respect to agenda item (6), the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Administration, with the concurrence of the delegate of the General Counsel, formally determined on September 6, 1978, pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended by Section 5(c) of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Pub. L. 94-409, that the matters to be discussed in the Executive Session should be exempt from the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act relating to open meetings and public participation therein, because the Executive Session will be concerned with matters listed in 5 U.S.C. Sec. 552b(c)(1) (1976). Such matters are specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive Order to be kept secret in the interests of the national defense or foreign policy. All materials to be reviewed and discussed by the Committee during the Executive Session of the meeting have been properly classified under Executive

Order 11652 or 12065. All Committee members have appropriate security clearances.

The complete Notice of Determination to close meetings or portions thereof of the series of meetings of the Semiconductor Technical Advisory Committee and of any subcommittee thereof, was published in the **Federal Register** on December 21, 1978 (43 FR 59537).

Copies of the minutes of the open portion of the meeting can be obtained by calling Mrs. Margaret Cornejo, Policy Planning Division, Office of Export Administration, International Trade Administration, Room 1617 M, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone. 202–377–2583.

For further information contact Mrs. Cornejo either in writing or by phone at the address or number shown above.

Dated: February 8, 1980.

Kent Knowles,

Director, Office of Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

[FR Doc. 80–4656 Filed 2–12–80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–25–M

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Marine Mammals; Receipt of Application for Permit

Notice is hereby given that an Applicant has applied in due form for a permit to take marine mammals as authorized by the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361–1407), and the Regulations Governing the Taking and Importing of Marine Mammals (50 CFR Part 216).

1. Applicant: a. Name: USAF—HQ Space Division, L. A. Air Force Station (P228).

b. Address: P.O. Box 92960 Worldway Postal Center, Los Angeles, California 90009.

2. Type of Permit: Scientific Research.

3. Name and Number of Animals: Northern elephant seal (mirounga angustirostris), 300. California sea lion (Zalophus californianus), 1,600.

4. Type of Take: Ten mother-pup pairs of each species will be paint-marked. Noise experiments will be conducted up to 10 times near colonies of the two species which may cause harassment of all the marine mammals listed above. Reactions to noises especially those of the mother-pup pairs will be monitored on videotape.

5. Location of Activity: San Nicolas.

6. Period of Activity: 2 years.

The arrangements and facilities for transporting and maintaining the marine mammals requested in the above described application have been inspected by a licensed veterinarian, who has certified that such arrangements and facilities are adequate to provide for the well-being of the marine mammals involved.

Concurrent with the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** the Secretary of Commerce is forwarding copies of this application to the Marine Mammal Commission and the Committee of Scientific Advisors.

Written data or views, or requests for a public hearing on this application should be submitted to the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20235, on or before March 14, 1980. Those individuals requesting a hearing should set forth the specific reasons why a hearing on this particular application would be appropriate. The holding of such hearing is at the discretion of the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries.

All statements and opinions contained in this application are summaries of those of the Applicant and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Documents submitted in connection with the above application are available for review in the following offices:

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, 3300 Whitehaven Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.; and

Regional Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, 300 South Ferry street, Terminal Island, California 90731.

William Aron,

Director, Office of Marine Mammals and Endangered Species, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 80–4661 Filed 2–12–80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army

Intent To prepare a Draft Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana, project. (Deep Draft Access to the Ports of News Orleans and Baton Rouge, Louisiana)

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DOD, New Orleans District.

ACTION: Notice of Intent To Prepare a Draft Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY:

1. *Proposed Action.* The proposed work to be discussed in the supplemental statement is the enlargement and maintenance of the deep draft navigation channel in the Mississippi River and Southwest Pass between Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and the Gulf of Mexico. The existing project, which provides for a channel with a 40-foot project depth and varying width, would be enlarged to provide a channel with a project depth of 45, 50 or 55 feet and a width of 750 feet. A turning basin 1,500 feet wide and 4,000 feet long with a project depth of 45, 50, or 55 feet would be provided at the upstream end of the enlarged channel at Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Training works consisting of spur dikes along South Pass and Pass a Loutre would be constructed to redistribute flows to the Southwest Pass of the Mississippi River to reduce dredging maintenance requirements.

2. *Alternatives.* Alternatives to the proposed action include no action and several structural plans for providing a larger deep draft channel between the Gulf of Mexico and the Port of New Orleans. Alternative channel sizes are also being addressed. There are no practicable structural alternatives to the proposed action for providing a larger channel to the Port of Baton Rouge. Alternatives for providing a larger deep draft channel to the Port of New Orleans include: (1) enlarging the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana, project channel to the Industrial Canal lock in New Orleans, constructing a new lock to provide access to the Mississippi River and enlargement of the Mississippi River from Venice, Louisiana, through the Port of New Orleans; and (2) providing a new lock and tidewater channel between the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico at either Grand Pass, South Pass, and Pass a Loutre and enlarging the Mississippi River channel from the lock through the Port of New Orleans.

3. *Scoping Process.*

a. A public meeting was held 31 August 1973 in New Orleans, Louisiana, to discuss alternative plans. Coordination is being maintained with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, and other interested Federal and state agencies. Informal meetings have been held to discuss the alternatives. In September 1973, information on the increase in saltwater intrusion in the Mississippi River which would be caused by the proposed action was furnished municipal and industrial

users of Mississippi River water. Subsequent meetings were held to discuss this information. Representatives of Federal, state, and local agencies, industries, environmental groups, and other organizations and interested individuals who desire input to the scoping process should contact Dr. Beckert at the address furnished below.

b. Significant issues to be addressed in the draft supplemental EIS include the effects of disposal of dredged material in the Mississippi River and on adjacent land, marsh, and open water areas; the effects of the enlargement of navigation channels on saltwater intrusion in the Mississippi River; the effects of alternations of flows in Southwest and South Passes on the aquatic ecosystem; and the costs and economic benefits of the proposed action.

c. It will be necessary for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to perform a Habitat Evaluation Procedure of the proposed action for inclusion in the DEIS.

d. Coordination will be maintained with interested agencies and other interested entities to keep them apprised of progress.

4. *Scoping Meetings.* No formal scoping meetings will be held.

5. *Availability.* The draft supplemental EIS is scheduled to be available to the public in July 1980.

ADDRESS: Questions concerning the proposed action and draft supplemental EIS can be directed to Dr. Heino Beckert, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Quality Section (LMNPD-RE), P.O. Box 60267, New Orleans, Louisiana, 70160, telephone (504) 838-2519.

Charles E. DeWeese,

Lt. Colonel, CE

Deputy District Engineer.

January 28, 1980.

[FR Doc. 4630 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-84-M

Office of the Secretary

Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS); Meeting

Pursuant to Pub. L. 92-463, notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS) is scheduled to be held from 1:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., 17 March 1980, Rm. 3D318 and from 9:30 a.m. to approximately 1:00 p.m., 18 March 1980 in Room 1E801, The Pentagon. Meeting sessions will be open to the public.

The purpose of the meeting is to review responses to earlier recommendations made by the Committee, discuss current issues relevant to women in the Services, and plan the itinerary/program for the next semi-annual meeting scheduled for 21-25 April 1980 in Washington, D.C.

Persons desiring to make oral presentations or submit written statements for consideration at the Executive Committee Meeting must contact Captain Mary J. Mayer, Executive Secretary, DACOWITS, OASD (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics), Rm. 3D322, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301, telephone 202-697-5655 no later than March 7, 1980.

H. E. Lofdahl,

Director, Correspondence and Directives, Washington Headquarters Service, Department of Defense.

February 7, 1980.

[FR Doc. 80-4597 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-70-M

Defense Systems Management College, Board of Visitors Meeting

A meeting of the Defense Systems Management College (DSMC) Board of Visitors will be held in Building 202, Fort Belvoir, VA, on Wednesday, 26 March 1980, from 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. The agenda will include a review of accomplishments related to the system acquisition education, system acquisition research, and information collection and dissemination missions. It will also include a review of the DSMC plans, resources and operations. The meeting is open to the public; however, because of limitations on the space available, allocation of seating will be made on a first-come, first-served basis. Persons desiring to attend the meeting should call Lieutenant Commander Judy Ray (703-664-1175) to reserve a seat.

H. E. Lofdahl,

Director.

[FR Doc. 80-4665 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-70-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy

Long-Term Management of Defense High-Level Radioactive Wastes (Research and Development Program for Immobilization), Savannah River Plant; Record of Decision

Decision

The decision has been made to continue a large Federal research and development (R&D) program directed toward the immobilization of the high-level radioactive wastes at the Savannah River Plant (SRP) and not to undertake an R&D program on direct disposal of the wastes in bedrock.

Background

The SRP near Aiken, South Carolina, is a major installation of the Department of Energy (DOE) for the production of nuclear materials for national defense. It began operations in the early 1950's and is currently the Nation's primary source of reactor-produced defense materials. The SRP operations also produce liquid high-level radioactive waste from the chemical processing of fuel and target materials after irradiation in the SRP nuclear reactors. The high-level waste has been and is continuing to be stored safely in underground tanks that are engineered to provide reliable storage of the waste isolated from the environment. DOE is developing methods for permanent disposal of these wastes.

DOE published the final environmental impact statement "Long-Term Management of Defense High-Level Radioactive Wastes (Research and Development Program for Immobilization), Savannah River Plant, Aiken, South Carolina," (DOE/EIS-0023) in November 1979. Notices of its availability were published in the **Federal Register** by DOE on December 3, 1979 (44 FR 69320) and by the Environmental Protection Agency on December 7, 1979 (44 FR 70563).

Description of Action

The multi-year R&D program being continued is aimed at developing the technology for removing the wastes from the tanks, concentrating them into a high activity fraction, and immobilizing the radioactive nuclides in a high integrity form for subsequent disposal. Since the method of disposal has not been chosen, the R&D program is sufficiently broad in its initial stages so that it can be modified in later stages as appropriate, to satisfy the immobilization requirements of a variety of disposal techniques. Moreover, the R&D program provides for the development of a variety of waste forms, to permit the ultimate waste form to be specifically tailored to the exigencies of the disposal method ultimately selected.

Description of Alternatives

The alternatives to carrying out the immobilization R&D program considered by DOE in reaching this decision are:

1. terminate the immobilization R&D program and continue tank storage of the wastes indefinitely with transfer to

new tanks about every 50 years (no action alternative).

2. fund an R&D program for direct disposal of the waste in bedrock under the Savannah River Plant.

Basic for Decision

Orientation of the Savannah River technology development program toward conversion of the waste to a high-integrity form for subsequent disposal has been influenced by public opinion and perception of risks, as expressed through governmental bodies and special interest groups. For example, comment letters on DOE/EIS-0023D were received from the Governor of the State of Georgia indicating opposition to bedrock disposal of waste under the SRP site, and from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency categorizing any bedrock disposal option at SRP as Environmentally Unsatisfactory.

The decision to continue the R&D program is consistent with the recommendation of the Interagency Review Group on Nuclear Waste Management (IRG) that:

"DOE accelerate its R&D activities oriented toward improving immobilization and waste forms and review its current immobilization programs in the light of the latest views of the scientific and technical community. Since final processing of defense waste has been deferred for three decades the IRG also recommends that remedial action, including immobilization of the waste, should begin as soon as practicable."

A great deal of uncertainty is associated with the prediction of the environmental impacts which could result over very long periods of time from the disposal of radioactive wastes. Accordingly, DOE has selected the conservative approach of proceeding with the immobilization R&D program. Although the environmental impacts which are predicted to result from implementing any of the alternatives are small, proceeding with the immobilization R&D program is the most conservative approach to provide an option to help assure that the waste will not enter the biosphere and will pose no significant threat to public health and safety.

The most significant quantifiable differences between the alternatives are the differences in budgetary costs. The estimated capital and operating cost of the alternatives in constant 1980 dollars are: perpetual tank storage, $510 million; bedrock disposal, $755 million; and immobilization for disposal, $3600 to $3750 million. Although implementation of the immobilization R&D program is the costliest alternative, retaining SRP waste disposal method flexibility and responding to the expressed public concern to minimize the risk of exposure to the general population from radioactive waste disposal justify continuation of the immobilization R&D program.

Discussion of Environmentally Preferred Alternatives

There are no substantial environmental impacts arising from nuclear radiation for any of the alternatives. The offsite population exposure risk from the alternative with the highest risk (liquid waste stored in SRP bedrock cavern) is more than one-thousand fold lower than natural radiation exposure to the same population. Nonnuclear fatalities to be expected from construction and operating activities related to each alternative are greater than those that would be expected for radiation effects, but are no larger than the risks voluntarily accepted by industrial workers. Off-site radiation risks, occupational exposures, nonnuclear risks, and other environmental effects are small in absolute magnitude for all options analyzed.

On a relative basis, some differences in environmental impact among the alternatives are evident. The no action alternative would result in lower occupational exposures but higher offsite population dose risk and more nonnuclear accidental fatalities than would implementation of the immobilization R&D program. Alternative 2 (bedrock disposal) is estimated to result in the lowest occupational radiation exposure and the lowest estimated fatality rate from nonnuclear accidents but the highest offsite population dose risk. Based on the judgment that offsite population radiation dose risk over time is a more important consideration than either occupational dose risk or fatalities from nonnuclear accidents, the analysis in DOE/EIS-0023 indicates that the immobilization R&D program with the lowest potential offsite population dose risk is the environmentally preferable alternative. This is primarily due to the degree of isolation afforded by rendering the wastes less mobile in the environment.

Occupational related risks such as occupational radiation exposure and nonnuclear accidents generally are voluntary in nature; conversely, offsite radiation exposures are involuntary in nature and involve a greater number of people. Accordingly, the offsite population dose was the controlling consideration in selecting continuation of the immobilization R&D program as the environmentally-preferred alternative.

Considerations in Implementation of the Decision

The continuation of the DOE R&D program to immobilize the SRP liquid high-level radioactive waste will not pose any significant adverse environmental impact prior to a proposal for a specific facility which would be addressed in a separate NEPA review. No mitigation activities are anticipated.

For the United States Department of Energy.

Dated: February 1, 1980.

George W. Cunningham,

Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy.

[FR Doc. 80-4626 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Office of Special Counsel for Compliance

Consent Order With Union Oil Co. of California Made Final

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of action taken on consent order.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to 10 CFR 205.199J, the Office of Special Counsel (OSC) of the Department of Energy hereby gives notice that the Proposed Consent Order executed between OSC and Union Oil Company of California (Union) and noticed in the **Federal Register** on October 18, 1979, is final effective upon publication of this Notice.

The Consent Order addresses Union's computation of increased product and non-product costs for natural gas liquids and natural gas liquid products for the period August 1973 through December 1978 and therefore concerns only discrete components of maximum lawful selling prices and not a determination of possible overcharges. However, the Consent Order contains a reservation of the right of the OSC to take further remedial action if warranted by the continuing examination of Union.

On October 18, 1979, notice was published in the **Federal Register** at 44 FR 60143, that the proposed Consent Order had been signed. The notice set out the background of the Consent Order, summarized its terms and conditions and provided 30 days for the receipt of comments before determining whether to make the Consent Order final.

OSC has considered a comment received subsequent to the period specified for submission of comments in the Notice and has determined to adopt the proposed Consent Order without modification.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: R. Avon Jackson, Branch Manager, Houston Branch Office, NGL Audit Division, Office of Special Counsel, Department of Energy, 500 Dallas Avenue, Suite 660, Houston, Texas 77002.

Copies of the Consent Order may be received by written request to the same address. Copies are also available at the Freedom of Information Reading Room, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C., Room GA-152.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: DOE regulatons provide that notice must be given of the signing of a consent order. In the notice, published in the **Federal Register** on October 18, 1979, at 44 FR 60143, OSC summarized the Consent Order and the facts relevant thereto, as required by regulation. A 30 day period was established for the filing of comments. One comment was received, after the specified 30 day period and was considered by OSC.

The terms and conditions of the Consent Order are, in summary:

1. OSC and Union agree that $2,413,516.77 represents the effect on increased product cost reporting of Union's failure to include volumes of "dry gas circulated" in shrinkage calculations for Union's SCV Plant for the period January 1975 through January 1979.

2. Union agrees to adjust its increased product costs claimed for each month of the period January 1975 through January 1979, according to recalculations submitted to OSC and attached to the Consent Order, and in accordance with instructions applicable to FEO-96, P-110-M-1 and EIA-14 by December 31, 1979, with certified copies of such refilings provided to OSC.

3. OSC is not precluded by this Order from taking such further remedial action as determined necessary to bring Union into compliance with this Order or with applicable DOE rules and regulations regarding its gas processing operations at its SCV plant.

4. This Consent Order shall be a final Order of the DOE and Union expressly waived its right to appeal or obtain judicial review thereof.

No comments were received by DOE within the 30 day period specified in the Notice of Proposed Consent Order. Subsequent to the specified period for comments, the Consumer Energy Council of America (CECA) objected to the method employed by DOE in determining Union's liability. CECA argued that DOE's methodology precludes consideration of Union's liability to consumers and that possible overcharges should be determined in the first instance rather than reserving the right to take further remedial action at a later date.

As stated in the Notice, the subject examination concerned only discrete components of maximum lawful prices. A determination of possible overcharges made by Union can be made only upon analysis of the refilings directed by this Order in conjunction with results of other audit segments examining Union's compliance with the Mandatory Price and Allocation Regulations. Accordingly, OSC has determined the comments submitted by CECA to be irrelevant to the issues addressed in this Order.

OSC has complied with the requirements of 10 CFR 205.199J by publicizing the terms of the proposed Consent Order, making copies available, and by reviewing and considering the comment received in response to the Notice. OSC has concluded that the Consent Order entered into with Union is proper, appropriate, and should be made effective. Therefore, the Consent Order is made final by publication of this notice.

Issued in Washington, D.C., January 18, 1980.

Paul L. Bloom,

Special Counsel for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 80-4625 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[OPP-50445A; FRL 1412-5]

Amendment to Experimental Use Permit Issued to Rohm & Haas Co.

On Friday, November 23, 1979, (44 FR 67223), information appeared pertaining to the issuance of an experimental use permit, No. 707-EUP-95, to Rohm and Haas Company. At the request of the company, that permit has been amended. The experimental use permit now allows the use of a total of 800 pounds of the chemical hybridizing agent potassium 1-(*p*-chlorophenyl)-1,4-dihydro-6-methyl-4-oxopyridazine-3-carboxylate on wheat to evaluate hybridizing potential. A total of 268 acres is now involved; the program is authorized only in the States of Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahama, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. The original permit allowed the use of 130 pounds of the chemical hybridizing agent sodium 1-(*p*-chlorophenyl)-1,4-dihydro-6-methyl-4-oxopyridazine-3-carboxylate on wheat. The experimental use permit is effective from October 18, 1979, to October 18, 1980. This permit is being issued with the limitation that all treated crops will be destroyed or used for research purposes only. (PM-25, Robert Taylor, Room: E-359, Telephone: 202/755-2196.)

(Section 5 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended in 1972, 1975, and 1978 (92 Stat. 819; 7 U.S.C. 136))

Dated: February 6, 1980.

Douglas D. Campt,

Director, Registration Division.

[FR Doc. 80-4557 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-01-M

[FRL 1413-3]

Diamond International Corp.; Issuance of PSD Permit

Notice is hereby given that on January 18, 1980 the Environmental Protection Agency issued a Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit to Diamond International Corporation to construct a boiler replacement in Hyde Park, Massachusetts. This permit has been issued under EPA's Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality regulations (40 CFR Part 52.21) subject to certain conditions, including:

1. The boiler shall not burn fueld oils with a sulfur content higher than 0.5% by weight.

2. The mill shall not burn more than 1340 gallons of oil per hour (net heat value).

The PSD permit approval is reviewable under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act only in the First Circuit Court of Appeals. A petition for review must be filed on or before April 14, 1980.

Copies of the PSD permit are available for public inspection upon request at the following locations:

Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, Room 1903, J.F.K. Federal Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203

Department of Environmental Quality Engineering, Air and Hazardous Materials Division, 600 Washington Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02111

Dated: February 5, 1980.

Robert C. Thomas,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region I.

[FR Doc. 80-4634 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-01-M

[Docket No. ECAO-HA-78-3; FRL 1413-2]

Health Assessment Document for Tetrachloroethylene (Perchloroethylene); Availability of Second External Review Draft

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency will make available on February 4, 1980, a second external review draft of a Health Assessment Document for Tetrachloroethylene (Perchloroethylene). Address all written requests for copies to Ms. Diane Chappell, Environmental Criteria and Assessment Office, MD-52, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27711. To place a telephone request dial (919) 541-3746.

The Agency welcomes all comments pertaining to this document. Direct comments to Mr. Mark M. Greenberg at the address given above. The deadline for receipt of comments is April 4, 1980.

Dated: February 5, 1980.

Courtney Riordan,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc. 80-4633 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-01-M

[PP 9G2143/T228; FRL 1411-3]

Pesticide Programs Establishment of a Temporary Tolerance; Cyano (3-Phenoxyphenyl) Methyl-4-Chloro-Alpha- (1-Methylethyl) Benzeneacetate

Shell Chemical Co., 1025 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, submitted a pesticide petition (PP 9G2143) to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This petition requested that a temporary tolerance be established for residues of the insecticide cyano (3-phenoxyphenyl) methyl-4-chloro-alpha-(1-methylethyl) benzeneacetate in or on the raw agricultural commodity celery at 3 parts per million (ppm).

This temporary tolerance will permit the marketing of the above raw agricultural commodity when treated in accordance with an experimental use permit (201-EUP-65) that has been issued under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended in 1972, 1975, and 1978 (92 Stat. 819; 7 U.S.C. 136).

An evaluation of the scientific data reported and other relevant material showed that the requested tolerance was adequate to cover residues resulting from the proposed experimental use, and it was determined that the temporary tolerance would protect the public health. The temporary tolerance has been established for the pesticide, therefore, with the following provisions:

1. The total amount of the pesticide to be used must not exceed the quantity authority by the experimental use permit.

2. Shell Chemical Co. must immediately notify the EPA of any findings from the experimental use that have a bearing on safety. The firm must also keep records of production, distribution, and performance and on request make the records available to any authorized officer or employee of the EPA or the Food and Drug Administration.

This temporary tolerance expires November 6, 1981. Residues not in excess of 3 ppm remaining in or on celery after this expiration date will not be considered actionable if the pesticide is legally applied during the term of and in accordance with the provisions of the experimental use permit and temporary tolerance. This temporary tolerance may be revoked if the experimental use permit is revoked or if any scientific data or experience with this pesticide indicate such revocation is necessary to protect the public health. Inquiries concerning this notice may be directed to Mr. Franklin Gee, Product Manager 17, Registration Division (TS-767), Office of Pesticide Programs, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC 20460 (202/426-9417).

(Section 408(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act [21 U.S.C. 346a(j)].)

Dated: February 4, 1980.

Douglas D. Campt,

Director, Registration Division.

[FR Doc. 80-4556 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-01-M

[FRL 1411-1]

Fuels and Fuel Additives

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice—Disclosure of chemical composition of fuel additive and initiation of 90-day petitioning period.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the conditions contained in the waiver granted to Sun Petroleum Products Company (Sun) for its proprietary oxygenated hydrocarbon fuel additive, (See 44 FR 37074, June 25, 1979), Sun no longer claims business confidentiality over the fuel additive's chemical composition as of December 15, 1979. The fuel additive may not exceed 5.5 percent, by volume, in unleaded gasoline and consists, in equal parts, of tertiary butyl alcohol (TBA) and methanol. Sun recommends that the gasoline contain a corrosion inhibitor, detergent, and dehaze additive as specified by Sun or their equivalent. The methanol portion of the fuel may not exceed 2.75 percent, by volume.

As provided in the conditional waiver, anyone may petition the Administrator to reconsider the waiver granted Sun based on new data and information not available prior to the public disclosure of the fuel additive's chemical composition. Petitions must be received on or before May 13, 1980. The information and comments received and considered in granting this conditional waiver are contained in Public Docket EN-79-12.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The 90-day period for submitting petitions begins on February 13, 1980.

ADDRESS: Petitions, information, and comments should be submitted to Public Docket EN-79-12, Central Docket Section (A-130), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. Information submitted to this docket is available for inspection in Room 2903-B, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. As provided in 40 CFR Part 2, a reasonable fee may be charged for copying services.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Gelman, Acting Chief, Fuels Section, Field Operations and Support Division (EN-340), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, (202) 472-9367.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 13, 1979, the Administrator of EPA conditionally waived the Clean Air Act's section 211(f) prohibitions on the introduction into commerce of Sun's proprietary oxygenated hydrocarbon fuel additive which provides no more than two percent oxygen to the fuel. Notice of this waiver was published in the **Federal Register** of June 25, 1979, 44 FR 37074.

One of the conditions of the waiver required Sun to notify EPA by December 15, 1979, or within fifteen days of when Sun makes the chemical composition known or becomes aware that the chemical composition is no longer confidential, whichever occurs first, that the proprietary additive's chemical composition is no longer confidential so that a **Federal Register** notice may be published initiating the 90-day petitioning period.

Sun, by letter dated December 14, 1979, notified EPA that the chemical composition is no longer confidential. Accordingly, notice is hereby given that Sun's oxygenated hydrocarbon fuel additive, which may be used in unleaded gasoline from zero to 5.5 percent, by volume, consists, in equal parts, of tertiary butyl alcohol (TBA) and methanol with methanol not exceeding 2.75 percent, by volume. Sun recommends that the gasoline contain a rust inhibitor, detergent, and dehaze additive as specified by Suntech, Inc. or their equivalent.

As provided by another condition of the waiver, the Administrator may revoke the waiver if, after receiving a petition for reconsideration, he determines that based on new data and information not available prior to the public disclosure of the proprietary additive's chemical composition, the applicant is not entitled to the waiver. Petitions for reconsideration must be received on or before 90 days following publication of the proprietary additive's chemical composition in the **Federal Register**. The Administrator shall review any petitions for reconsideration to determine whether to revoke the waiver. If no petition is submitted or if upon review of the petitions the Administrator does not revoke the waiver only the following conditions will apply:

1. The additive is used such that it provides no more than two percent oxygen, by weight, to the resulting fuel.

2. The additive is blended in fuel such that the resulting fuel meets the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) fuel volatility specifications.[1]

Petitions for reconsideration and supporting data should be submitted to Public Docket EN–79–12, with a copy sent to Richard G. Kozlowski, Director, Field Operations and Support Division (EN–340), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. The information and comments received in granting the conditional waiver are contained in Public Docket EN–79–12. Petitions must be received or before May 13, 1980.

Dated: February 4, 1980.

Jeffrey G. Miller,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 80–4555 Filed 2–12–80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–01–M

[FRL 1413–7]

Control of Oxides of Nitrogen from Motor Vehicles; Waiver of 1981 NOx Emission Standards for Diesel Engine Technology; Public Hearing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of receipt of an Automobiles Peugeot (Peugeot) letter of intent to reapply under section 202(b)(6)(B) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, for a waiver of the 1981 model year light-duty vehicle emission standard for oxides of nitrogen (NOx) to permit use of diesel engine technology, and notice of a public hearing.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to announce Peugeot's plans to reapply on or about February 6, 1980, for a waiver of the 1981 model year NOx emission standard for light-duty diesel engines. In a Consolidated Decision published in the **Federal Register**, 45 FR 5480, January 23, 1980, the Administrator denied Peugeot's original request for a waiver for two of its engine families because Peugeot had provided insufficient information to establish the need for waiving the 1.0 grams per mile (gpm) NOx standard applicable beginning in the 1981 model year to permit use of diesel engine technology in these engine families.

This notice is also intended to announce that EPA plans to hold a public hearing on February 27, 1980, on Peugeot's waiver reapplication. Other manufacturers planning to apply or reapply for a diesel NOx waiver are encouraged to submit their waiver requests on or before February 20, 1980, in order to facilitate consolidated EPA review of all applications.

ADDRESSES: The hearing will be held at the auditorium of the General Services Administration at 7th & D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20407. Copies of Peugeot's letter are available for public inspection during normal working hours (8:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m.) Monday through Friday at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Central Docket Section (Docket No. EN–80–3), Room 2903B, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Stern, Attorney-Advisor, Manufacturers Operations Division (EN–340), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, (202) 472–9421.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 202(b)(6)(B) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 7521(b)(6)(B) (1977), allows any manufacturer to petition the Administrator of EPA for a waiver of the 1981 model year NOx standard of 1.0 gpm. The Administrator, after notice and opportunity for public hearing, may waive the standard for any class or category of light-duty vehicles manufactured during the four model year period, beginning in model year 1981, up to a maximum level of 1.5 gpm, if the manufacturer can show that the waiver is necessary to permit diesel engine technology to be used on the subject vehicles. Such waiver may be granted if the Administrator determines:

(i) That such waiver will not endanger public health,

(ii) That such waiver will result in significant fuel savings at least equal to the fuel economy standard applicable in each year under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, and

(iii) That the technology has a potential for long-term air quality benefit and has the potential to meet or exceed the average fuel economy standard applicable under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act at the expiration of the waiver.

Guidelines for waiver applications were published in the **Federal Register**, 43 FR 30341, July 14, 1978, apprising manufacturers of the information deemed necessary to demonstrate that a waiver should be granted.

Peugeot submitted a letter dated January 25, 1980, to the Director of EPA's Manufacturers Operations Division advising EPA of its plans to submit a new diesel NOx waiver request on or about February 6, 1980.

EPA has scheduled a public hearing on Peugeot's application in Washington, D.C. on February 27, 1980. For this reason, other manufacturers intending to request such a waiver for the 1981 model year are encouraged to submit their applications by February 20, 1980. This would enable EPA to conduct a single hearing on all diesel NOx waiver requests received by that time, thereby expediting final decisions on all such requests.

PROCEDURES: The public hearing is intended to provide an opportunity for interested persons to state their views or arguments, or to provide pertinent information concerning the action requested of the Administrator by the applicant. Any person desiring to make an oral statement at the hearing should file a notice of such intention and 10 copies of the proposed testimony and other relevant material in the Central Docket Section at the address listed above not later than February 20, 1980. If feasible at least 50 copies of such statement or material for the hearing record and for general circulation should be submitted to the Presiding Officer at the time of the hearing. In addition, any person may submit written questions at any time during the hearing to be propounded to the witnesses by the hearing panel to the extent practicable. Relevant statements and information not specifically required by the hearing

[1] Standard Specifications for Automotive Gasoline, Annual Book of ASTM Standards—1978, D 439–78, p. 226.

panel may be filed in the public docket until March 7, 1980.

The Presiding Officer will have the responsibility for maintaining order, excluding irrelevant or repetitious materials, scheduling presentations, directing that corroborative material be submitted in writing and, to the extent possible, notifying participants of the time at which they may appear.

Presentations by the participants should be addressed to the considerations set forth in detail by the guidelines for submission of waiver requests published in the **Federal Register**, 43 FR 30341, July 14, 1978. Participants should be prepared to respond to questions propounded by the Hearing Panel on the following issues:

1. Whether a waiver is necessary to permit the use of diesel engine technology in the class or category of vehicles or engines for which a waiver is requested;

2. Whether the waiver would endanger the public health;

3. Whether the waiver would result in significant fuel savings at least equal to the fuel economy standard applicable under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act ("EPCA");

4. Whether the technology utilized in the class or category for which a waiver is sought: (a) has a potential for long-term air quality benefit, and (b) has the potential to meet or exceed the average fuel economy standard applicable under EPCA at the expiration of the waiver; and

5. The level of NOx emissions, not to exceed 1.5 gpm, which could be met in each of the model years for which a waiver is requested.

A verbatim record of the proceedings will be made and will be available for public inspection. A copy of the transcript may be requested from the reporter during the hearing and will be made at the expense of the person so requesting. Copies of other documents in the public record also may be obtained in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2.

Dated: February 8, 1980.

Jeffrey, G. Miller,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Encorcement (EN-329).

[FR Doc. 80-4713 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-01-M.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[FEMA REP-1, NUREG-0654]

Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Powerplants

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) signed a Memorandum of Understanding effective on January 14, 1980, aimed at immediate improvement in radiological emergency planning and preparedness at and around nuclear power plant sites (45 FR 5847).

The FEMA/NRC Steering Committee, established to coordinate activities under the Memorandum of Understanding, has developed revised interim guidance and acceptance criteria for use by NRC licensees and State and local officials in their radiological emergency planning and preparedness. (FEMA REP-1, NUREG-0654.) This document is now available for interim use and comment.

Comments on this document should be forwarded to Mr. Robert G. Ryan, Director, Radiological Emergency Preparedness Division, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 1725 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20472, with copies to the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555; Attention: Docketing and Service Branch. Comments should be mailed or delivered on or before May 13, 1980.

Single copies of this document will be available after February 15, 1980. Requests for single copies of this document should be made in writing to the Director, Division of Technical Information and Document Control, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555; or to Headquarters, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 1725 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20472, Attention: Administrative Services Division. Copies will also be available in the NRC Public Document Room, Washington, D.C. and in local Public Document Rooms and at FEMA Headquarters, Administrative Services Division and their Regional Offices.

Dated this 6th day of February, 1980 at Washington, D.C.

William J. Dircks,

Acting Executive Director for Operations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Frank A. Camm,

Associate Director for Plans and Preparedness, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 80-4580 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45]

BILLING CODE 6718-01-M

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

[FEMA-3078-EM]

California; Notice of Emergency and Related Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This is a Notice of the Presidential declaration of an emergency for the State of California (FEMA-3078-EM), dated February 1, 1980, and related determinations.

DATED: February 1, 1980.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sewall H. E. Johnson, Disaster Response and Recovery, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, D.C. 20472 (202) 634-7845.

NOTICE: Pursuant to the authority vested in the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency by the President under Executive Order 12148 effective July 15, 1979, and delegated to me by the Director under Federal Emergency Management Agency Delegation of Authority, and by virtue of the Act of May 22, 1974, entitled "Disaster Relief Act of 1974" (88 Stat. 143); notice is hereby given that, in a letter of February 1, 1980, the President declared an emergency as follows:

> I have determined that a threat to public health and safety and property exists in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta area of the State of California brought about by torrential rains, high tides and strong winds beginning on or about January 13, 1980. I therefore declare that such an emergency exists in the State of California.
>
> I expect appropriate Federal agencies to cooperate with State and local governments in undertaking effective hazard-mitigation activities with respect to this emergency.

The time period prescribed for the implementation of section 313(a), Priority to Certain Applications for Public Facility and Public Housing assistance, shall be for a period not to exceed six months after the date of this declaration.

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the authority vested in the Director of Federal Emergency Management Agency under Executive Order 12148, and delegated to me by the Director under Federal Emergency Management Agency Delegation of Authority, I hereby appoint Mr. Robert C. Stevens of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to act as the Federal Coordinating Officer for this declared emergency.

I do hereby determine the following areas of the State of California to have been affected adversely by this declared emergency.

Webb Tract and Holland Tract in Contra Costa County for emergency repair work to the damaged levees and subsequent dewatering of the inundated tracts.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 14.701, Disaster Assistance)

William H. Wilcox,

Associate Director, Disaster Response and Recovery, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 80-4581 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-02-M

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

County Bancshares, Inc.; Formation of Bank Holding Company

County Bancshares, Inc., Troy, Alabama, has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(1)) to become a bank holding company by acquiring 90 percent or more of the voting shares of Pike County Bank, Troy, Alabama. The factors that are considered in acting on the application are set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

The application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta. Any person wishing to comment on the application should submit views in writing to the Reserve Bank, to be received not later than March 10, 1980. Any comment on an application that requests a hearing must include a statement of why a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute and summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, February 7, 1980.

William N. McDonough,

Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 80-4587 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-M

Oklahoma State Bancshares, Inc.; Formation of Bank Holding Company

Oklahoma State Bancshares, Inc., Vinita, Oklahoma, has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(1)) to become a bank holding company by acquiring 80 percent or more of the voting shares of Oklahoma State Bank & Trust Company, Vinita, Oklahoma. The factors that are considered in acting on the application are set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

The application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. Any person wishing to comment on the application should submit views in writing to the Reserve Bank, to be received not later than March 5, 1980. Any comment on any application that requests a hearing must include a statement of why a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute and summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, February 7, 1980.

William N. McDonough,

Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 80-4588 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-M

Security Pacific Corp.; Proposed Expansion of General Fidelity Life Insurance Company

Security Pacific Corporation, Los Angeles, California, has applied, pursuant to section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8)) and § 225.4(b)(2) of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.4(b)(2)), for permission to expand the activities of its indirect subsidiary, General Fidelity Life Insurance Company ("General Fidelity"), Richmond, Virginia. General Fidelity is a wholly-owned subsidiary of American Finance System Incorporated, San Diego, California, a Deleware corporation and wholly-owned subsidiary of Applicant.

Applicant states that General Fidelity would engage in the underwriting or reinsurance of credit life and credit accident and health insurance in the State of New York, which insurance is to be underwritten in connection with extensions of credit by Applicant and its subsidiaries. These activities would be performed from offices of General Fidelity in Richmond, Virginia, and the geographic area to be served is the State of New York. Such activities have been specified by the Board in § 225.4(a) or Regulation Y as permissible for bank holding companies, subject to Board approval of individual proposals in accordance with the procedures of § 225.4(b).

Interested persons may express their views on the question whether consummation of the proposal can "reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency, that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices." Any request for a hearing on this question must be accompanied by a statement of the reasons a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute, summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing, and indicating how the party commenting would be aggrieved by approval of the proposal.

The application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Any views or requests for hearing should be submitted in writing and received by the Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, not later than March 7, 1980.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, February 6, 1980.

William N. McDonough,

Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 80-4589 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Health Care Financing Administration

National Professional Standards Review Council; Meeting

In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 USC App. I), announcement is made of the following Council meeting:

Name: National Professional Standards Review Council.

Date and Time: March 10, 1980 (10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.) March 11, 1980 (9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.)

Place: Auditorium (first floor), HEW North Building, 330 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C.

Purpose of Meeting: The Council was established to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the administration of Professional Standards Review (Title XI), Part B, Social Security Act). Professional Standards Review is the procedure to assure that the services for which payment may be made under the Social Security Act are medically necessary and conform to appropriate professional standards for the provision of quality health care. The Council's agenda will include discussion of a variety of issues relevant to the implementation of the PSRO program. On February 25, 1980 a tentative agenda will be available to the public.

Meeting of the Council is open to the public. Public attendance is limited to space available.

Any member of the public may file a written statement with the Council before, during, or after the meeting. To the extent that time permits, the Council Chairman will allow public presentation of oral statements at the meeting.

All communications regarding this Council should be addressed to Cleo E. Hancock, Staff Director, National Professional Standards Review Council, Health Standards and Quality Bureau, Room 5329-S, Switzer Building, 330 "C" Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201, (202) 245-0348.

Dated: February 8, 1980.

Cleo E. Hancock,

Staff Director, National Professional Standards Review Council.

[FR Doc. 80-4590 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4110-35-M

Office of Assistant Secretary for Education

Data Acquisition Activities

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ACTION: Notice of Data Acquisition Activities Involving Educational Agencies and Institutions.

SUMMARY: The paperwork control requirements in section 400A of the General Education Provisions Act, added by Pub. L. 95-561, require public announcement of certain data requests that Federal agencies address to educational agencies and institutions. Federal agencies propose to collect the data described below from educational agencies or institutions during School Year 1980-81.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mrs. Elizabeth M. Proctor, FEDAC Staff, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C. 20202. Phone (202) 245-1022.

The contact persons listed in conjunction with the individual summaries are the ones to whom specific comments or questions concerning a data acquisition activity should be directed.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Paperwork Control Amendments of 1978, section 400A of the General Education Provisions Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is responsible for reviewing and approving collection of information and data acquisition activities of all Federal agencies:

(1) Whenever the respondents are primarily educational agencies or institutions; and

(2) Whenever the purpose of the activities is to request information needed for the management of, or the formulation of, policy related to Federal education programs or research or evaluation studies related to the implementation of Federal education programs. The Secretary has delegated authority to the Assistant Secretary for Education.

We published interim FEDAC review procedures on August 8, 1979 (44 FR 46535), which are now effective. The Council is considering revisions to these procedures based on the public, Federal agency, and Congressional comments received. Revisions, as necessary, will be made and the procedures will be republished. One requirement is that "no information or data will be requested of any educational agency or institution unless that request has been approved and publicly announced by the February 15 immediately preceding the beginning of the new school year, unless there is an urgent need for this information or a very unusual circumstance exists regarding it."

Data activity plan summaries of proposed data acquisition activities for School Year 1980-81 are being published for comment. Each agency or institution subject to the request for data, its representative organizations, or any member of the public, may comment on the proposed data acquisition activity. Comments should be addressed to the project sponsor listed in item (r) of each of the data activity plan summaries. Comments should refer to the specific sponsoring agency and form number and they must be received on or before March 14, 1980. After the public comment period ends, each project sponsor must submit copies of the comments and a summary of them to the FEDAC staff for review.

In addition to these specific summaries, a composite listing of known data acquisition activities planned for school year 1980-81 will be published by February 15, 1980.

Dated: February 7, 1980.

Peter D. Relic,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Education.

The proposed data activity plan summaries follow:

Data Activity Plan Summary

A. Title of Proposed Activity

1980-81 Common Core of Data (CCD)

B. Name of the Sponsoring Agency/Bureau/Office

National Center for Education Statistics, (NCES)

Division of Elementary and Secondary Education Statistics, DESES

Institutional Surveys Branch, ISB

C. Agency Form Numbers

NCES 2350-5, NCES 2350-6, NCES 2350-7, NCES 2350-8, NCES 2350-8-1, NCES 2350-9, NCES 2350-11, NCES 2350-13, NCES 2393-2, NCES 2393-2A, NCES 2393-4.

D. Justification

(1) Section 406(b)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act provides that NCES shall "collect, collate, and from time to time, report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; . . . ."

In the mid 1960's NCES developed a survey system which it called the Elementary Secondary General Information System (ELSEGIS). It was designed to collect certain education statistics at both the LEA and State aggregate levels. This original design included an annual sample survey of LEAs which collect selected data on employment, public membership, and revenues and expenditures for public education. In 1970 NCES undertook a long range project to further systematize its data collected efforts in the elementary secondary public sector and used the common core concept as described in *Handbook I, The Common Core of State Education Data, 1953* as the underlying premise upon which the new system would rest.

The Common Core of Data (CCD) project was developed jointly by staff from NCES, the SEAs, and selected LEAs. As an alternative to redundant data collections, excessive detail, and lack of agreement among data collectors on standard terminology and measures, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and its Committee on Evaluation and Information Systems (CEIS) encourage NCES to complete the development and plan full-scale implementation of CCD. The CCSSO, in formal resolution, has encouraged each of its members to develop the capacity to report all of the data included in the CCD data base for school year 1980-81. NCES intends to assist each SEA, within the limits of its resources, to achieve comparability of reported data and improve timeliness of reporting. This assistance will be in the form of workshops, on site visits, and Technical Assistance where needed.

(2) When fully implemented CCD data base will:

a. Contain much of the general statistical data needed about public education agencies.

b. Supply much of the data needed in the tabulations that will appear in the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* and the *Digest of Education Statistics*.

c. Serve as the basis for many estimates and projections of elementary and secondary education generated by NCES.

d. Include some information needed by some Federal program managers to administer some assistance programs. Hence, they may no longer need to ask for such data on some administrative applications and annual report forms. The availability of the CCD data base could contribute to a reduction in the respondent burden which has resulted in redundant requests of the same data.

The CCD data base has been designed to include reports from each SEA, each Sub-State agency, and certain other data in State-aggregate form. The updated/automated system will provide a core of fiscal and nonfiscal data for Federal analysis purposes.

(3) The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission now collects employment data annually from a simple of LEAs. These data represent head counts of employees by major asignment category. It is known that upwards of 40 percent of LEA employes have more than one assignment appearing in more than one assignment category. Head counts based upon major assignment thus create voids in some categories and overstate the numbers in other categories. This problem is accute and affected primarily the teaching and pupil support categories.

For many years NCES has collected employee data in full-time equivalent numbers by assignment category. The purposes of this collection is to measure the allocation of personnel resources to functions performed by employees. The data collected by EEOC do not satisfy this purpose, nor do the data collected by NCES satisfy the EEOC purpose—that of identifying potential employment discrimination based on race or sex. The two pruposes are basically incompatible and thus far have not been satisfied by a single survey.

E. Description of Survey Plan

(1) The universe of respondents is the 57 State education agencies. Each SEA requires annual statistical reports from each LEA. These data are examined and verified and become a matter of record in each SEA. The SEAs compile all of the data requested by NCES from their records. If any data items does not reside in SEA records, the SEA is directed not to attempt to collect it from the LEAs.

(2) The CCD design consists of basically three components:

a. a group of State aggregate reports on pupils, employees, revenues and expenditures, and selected other data, (NCES Forms 2350–5, 2350–6, 2350–7, 2350–9, and 2350–11).

b. an LEA nonfiscal report on public membership, employees, and a universe of schools operated by each LEA in each State, (NCES Form 2350–2, 2350–8, 2350–8–1, 2393–2, and 2393–2A).

c. a report from each SEA on its revenue, expenditures, and employees, (NCES Form 2350–13, and 2393–4).

The State-aggregate reports were drawn from ELSEGIS and its predecessor surveys, some of which date back almost 25 years. These data have been found to be valid and reliable, hence no pretest has been done on the current forms. The LEA aggregate reports are expected to be completed for each LEA in each State, hence no sampling problems are involved. Nonresponse has not been a problem, since each SEA has provided most of the requested data for all sub-State agencies.

F. Tabulation and Publication Plans

(1) The following series or reports will continue to be published: Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education; Education Directory: Local Public School Systems; Education Directory: State Education Agency Personnel.

In addition, several topical reports are being planned for publication based upon the LEA aggregate data. This series will include at least one report on measures of disparity among LEAs in each State in terms of size, number of schools operated, and staff/pupil ratios.

(2) Most of the tabulations will be of the several data components reported for each State. The tables used in the several reports cited above will continue to be used. A series of summary tabulations of LEA aggregate data is being planned. This series will included tables such as number of schools in each State by type and by size intervals, pupil/staff ratio tables by size of LEA by State, etc. Also planned is a set of tables that show summary data about the operations of the SEAs; revenues by source, expenditures by agency function, and employees by agency function.

G. Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication

(1) The due date for each of the nine parts of this survey is printed on the survey form. It is planned that mailing will be accomplished two months prior to the due date. The first due date is scheduled for August 15, 1980 and the last due date is scheduled for May 15, 1981.

(2) Contingent upon the availability of processing support resources, the lapsed time between survey close out and publication should not exceed five months. This also assumes that each of the SEAs will have reported on or before the due date. Should this not be the case, it will be necessary to extend publication dates until a sufficient number of SEAs have reported the data to make the report useful.

H. Consultations Outside the Agency

(1) Since all of the components included within this survey project are continuations of serveys previously conducted (some components having been modified to reflect findings for prior surveys) no special consultations outside the agency other than several reviews by the CCD Task Force and the NCES Task Force of CEIS have been accomplished.

It should be pointed out, however, that as ELSEGIS and CCD were developed since the mid-1960's, many developmental and review conferences were conducted by NCES. These conferences involved hundred, of SEA, LEA, and user group representatives. Various drafts of the forms included in this project were sent for review to:

Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning & Evaluation, HEW
Bureau of the Handicapped, USOE
Governments Division, Bureau of the Census
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, USOE
Education Policy Research Institute, ETS
Each of the State education agencies

(2) Data included on the State-aggregate reports have been collected from the SEAs since the mid-1960's and in some cases for almost 25 years. This would indicate that these data are available and accessible.

Forms 2393–2 and 2393–4 were subjected to a feasibility study in 1976 in which 40 SEAs participated. The forms that were subjected in this study were modified to reflect the findings of this study. As they now exist, some SEAs can furnish all of the data requested and several of the SEAs can furnish almost all of the requested data.

(3) As indicated above, each of these forms has been exhaustively reviewed, first by task force groups formed within

the CEIS organization, and subsequently by each SEA. The CCSSO has formally endorsed the entire package at its 1977 annual conference.

I. Estimation of Respondent Burden

(1) There are extreme variations in the number of schools and school districts in each State. The estimates provided in items 15c and 15e must be interpreted carefully. One State is expected to prepare only nine reports while another State is asked to prepare 1,340 reports. Burden estimates for each form are provided.

(2) Based upon prior experience with ELSEGIS in the 60's and the three previous CCD's, the following estimates for completing each form by form number are provided below:

*2350-5	20 hours × 57 SEAs	1,140 hours
2350-6	20 hours × 57 SEAs	1,140 hours
*2350-7	4 hours × 57 SEAs	228 hours
2350-8	10 hours × 57 SEAs	570 hours
2350-9	10 hours × 57 SEAs	570 hours
2350-11	30 hours × 57 SEAs	1,710 hours
2350-13	3 hours × 57 SEAs	171 hours
**2393-2	2.5 hours × 16,000 LEAs	40,000 hours
**2393-2A	.083 hours × 90,000 Schools.	7,500 hours
2393-4	25 hours × 57 SEAs	1,425 hours
		54,454 hours

*These forms will be discontinued when the LEA data are reported timely and accurately with a burden reduction of 1,368 hours.

**Each SEA compiles data on the survey form or on magnetic tape for each LEA and school in the States. The estimate is of the amount of time required to compile data for one LEA and one school based on previous years preparation and experiences.

This is a voluntary response survey. NCES propose to offer contracts to each SEA for data preparation. The total amount will be approximately $545,000. It should be noted that LEAs are not expected to complete any of the survey forms, since the data have already been reported to the SEA. The burden is then essentially that of accession and data preparation at the SEA office. The SEAs are recompensed for the work done in the preparation of these survey forms. If the total number of estimated hours of burden is reasonably accurate, the cost will average out to approximately $10.00 per hour, for a total of $545,000.00.

J. Sensitive Questions

Not applicable, none asked.

K. Estimated Cost to Federal Government

$150,000	salaries and expenses for NCES staff (includes travel to workshops and site visits as needed)
544,900	data acquisition contracts to the SEAs (includes an amount for travel for workshops)
150,000	ADP support, printing, etc.
$844,900	Total

L. Detailed Justification on How Information Once Collected Will Be Used

In addition to the tabulation and publication plan explained in section (F) NCES plans to publish two directories, one listing public officers and officials of State Education Agencies. In addition, the Center plans to publish a series of statistical reports providing State and U.S. totals for pupil membership, staff employed by public school districts, revenues and expenditures for public education, and characteristics of public schools. These directories and reports will be widely disseminated to individuals and organizations interested in public elementary and secondary education in the United States. The Center will also make available for dissemination a series of data tapes for use by educational planners, analysts, and researcher. It is expected that these data based will be used as the sampling frame for many special purpose surveys.

M. Methods of Analysis

Analysis will be mainly aggregations to generate tables of State and the area totals, distributions of large city school systems, and institutional data as permitted on items such as pupil teacher ratios, staff ratios, expenditure per pupil, etc.

N. Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data Collection

Refer to section (D), (1).

O. Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data

Refer to section G. (1) and (2).

P. Estimate of the Total Person-Hour and Cost Required To Complete the Request

Estimates of the hours and cost to complete the data request have been addressed in sections (l) and (k) of this summary. Again, the reader should interpret this estimate carefully. The burden is not the same for all respondents; burden depends on the ability level of the research centers in each State to quickly summarize detailed data.

Q. Evidence of Any Urgent Need or Very Unusual Circumstance Requiring the Data

Not applicable.

R. Copy of the Exact Data Instruments

Copies may be obtained from—
Warren A. Hughes, FOB 6, Room 3017, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

S. Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communications With Respondent Population

The development of the survey has been thru the joint efforts of NCES staff, the State agencies, and some local education agencies. The Council of Chief State School Officers, through its Committee on Evaluation and Information Systems, has encouraged all States to help in full implementing the survey.

T. Assurance That Respondents Will Have Sufficient Lead Time To Comply With Request

Each SEA is apprised six to seven months in advance of the request for data. Additionally, these data returned to NCES have already been collected by the SEA for much of its on-going work.

U. Specific Justification for a Multiyear Approval

Not applicable.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of Proposed Activity: Career Information Systems in Secondary Schools: A Comparative Assessment of Alternative Types.

(b) Name of the Sponsoring Agency/Bureau/Office: National Institute of Education.

(c) Agency Form Number: NIE 200C.

(d) Justification: The study described in this notice is a sequel to the Survey of Career Information in Secondary Schools, which is awaiting final approval by FEDAC but which has not yet been executed. Notice of both studies, including justification of them, appeared in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 44, No. 21 (June 21, 1979), pp. 36258–36260. Briefly, the data produced by the study are needed to assist the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC) in determining policy with respect to making grants to establish state occupational information systems and in formulating criteria for the evaluation of such systems. Moreover, the data will augment NIE's current program of research on the relationship between young people and the aspects of their education that contribute to successful career development. In addition, the study will produce information of use to school administrators and to any professional or practitioner who works with career information systems.

The first study seeks information to answer the question, "What career information is currently being disseminated to secondary schools; what is the quality of such information; and what is its value to students?" This second study is a comparative assessment of alternative types (as determined by the first study) of career information systems. It attempts to answer the question, "What is the effectiveness of alternative types of career information delivery systems on the career awareness of secondary students?"

Although many different kinds of occupational information resources exist, almost nothing is known about their usage on a national scale (Study 1). Even less is known about the effects of their use. Consequently, the information from the studies should fill a great need on the part of NIE and NOICC in fulfilling their legislative mandates, and should ultimately result in better career guidance for all youth.

(e) Description of Survey Plan: The research design calls for the assessment of different types of career information delivery systems at 12 public secondary schools. The number of different types will be determined by data from Study 1, the national survey. The selection of schools embodying the different types also depends on the result of the first study. From the review of the literature it seems likely that six types will emerge. (If fewer than six emerge, the general outline of the research design will not be affected.)

The six expected types are: 1. Computer-based career information delivery system. 2 Experience-based system. 3. Noncomputer materials-based system. 4. Comprehensive library-based system. 5. Instruction-based system. 6. System with no special provision.

Secondary schools vary in many different ways, such as location, size, setting (urban, suburban, rural), ethnic composition, types of programs (general, academic, vocational), and poverty level of student body. With only 12 schools to study, it is clearly impossible to produce a design that will yield statistically trustworthy information about all these dimensions. Therefore a design was chosen that would provide information about the dimensions of paramount interest to NIE and NOICC—poverty level and setting, as well as the six types.

The criteria for poverty level and setting will necessarily be the same for this study as for Study 1, since the 12 schools will be a subset of those previously sampled in that study. "Low poverty level" is defined in Study 1 as less than 12 percent of the student body in poverty as reported on the computerized mailing list of schools maintained by Market Data Retrieval, Inc. (MDR) of Westport, Connecticut. "High poverty level" is 12 percent or more in poverty. Poverty level on the MDR tape is determined by the Orshansky Poverty Index. Similarly, "Metropolitan" setting means that the school was so classified on the MDR tape; MDR derived the classification from the 1970 Census definition of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. "Nonmetropolitan" is any setting not designated Metropolitan on the MDR tape.

Using two levels of poverty (High, Low) and two settings (Metropolitan, Nonmetropolitan), together with the six types, results in a $2\times2\times6$ design with 24 cells. Since only 12 schools are involved, only 12 cells can be filled—3 types in High Poverty, Metropolitan Setting (3 cells) and in Low Poverty, Nonmetropolitan Setting (3 cells), and the other 3 types in High Poverty, Nonmetropolitan Setting (3 cells) and Low Poverty, Metropolitan Setting (3 cells).

A sample of 100 students (with allowance for refusals and nonresponse) will be drawn at each school, 90 of whom have been users of the system and 10 nonusers. Grades 10, 11, and 12 and type of curriculum will be represented equally in the sample of users. Students will then respond to a questionnaire especially designed to explore their grasp of occupational information, changes that have occurred in their career plans and behaviors as a result of using the system, and their awareness of their own values with regard to career choice.

At each of the 12 schools, follow-up interviews with 12 students who responded to the questionnaire will be employed to pinpoint, if possible, the relationship between use of the systems and the effects observed from the questionnaire, and to identify which information resources produced which effects.

Before the selected schools are invited to participate, the chief state school officer and district superintendents will be asked for permission to approach the school principal, and contact with the school will be made in whatever fashion the chief state officer or district superintendent directs. All officials will be fully informed about the nature and purpose of the study, its voluntary nature, the confidentiality of data, and the burden placed on school personnel. Help from the school will be necessary for the selection of the sample and provision of space, but administration of the questionnaire and interviews will be done by the research team. No school will be asked to participate that is also participating in the National Longitudinal Surveys (i.e., the National Longitudinal Study of the Class of 1972).

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: Summary statistics for all questionnaire items for the total sample and appropriate subsamples will be presented, with means and standard deviations, in tabular form. Results of analyses of variance and covariance, factor analyses, and regression analysis will be reported in commonly accepted formats. Text will explain the analyses and discuss the implications. In general, the report will follow the guidelines of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association for the preparation of manuscripts for journals that follow the guidelines.

Publication of the final report is scheduled for September 1981. In addition to the report, the study will undoubtedly generate a number of journal articles, seminars, and reports to the profession. Reports will be submitted to ERIC.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: Data collection will begin on or about February 16, 1981, and will extend to about May 7, 1981. Two trained research teams of two members each will visit the schools in accordance with the following tentative schedule:

Date (1981)	Team 1	Team 2
Feb. 16–19	School 1	School 2.
Mar. 2–5	School 3	School 4.
Mar. 16–19	School 5	School 6.
Mar. 30–Apr. 2	School 7	School 8.
Apr. 20–23	School 9	School 10.
May 4–7	School 11	School 12.

Since the visits have been scheduled for every other week, the time plan is quite flexible and can be adjusted to suit activities at the schools.

Publication of the results of the study is scheduled for September 30, 1981.

(h) Consultations Outside the Agency: Twenty-two experts outside the sponsoring agency (National Institute of Education) and the contracting organization (Educational Testing Service) have been actively consulted on the study design, instrument development, sampling plans, and plans for analysis. These experts are members of the NIE Technical Advisory Board and the project Research Advisory Council; some are state officials involved in activities closely related to the dissemination of career information.

In addition, the questionnaire was pretested on a small number of high school students (the respondent group) and was revised in light of their observations.

The research design and instrument are scheduled for review by the Committee on Evaluation and Information Service (CEIS) of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). CEIS has already recommended to CCSSO positive action on Study 1; the review process included discussion of this study.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden: The respondent reporting burden can estimated from the following table:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of average person-hours
Students, public secondary schools	1200	0.75
Students, public secondary schools	144	.50

NOTE.—The 144 students on line 2 are a subset of the 1200 on line 1.

(j) Sensitive Questions: The questionnaire contains no questions that are commonly considered private. The interview is a follow up of the questionnaire and does not explore new areas. Members of the study team are bound by the policy of the contractor (Educational Testing Service) not to ask sensitive questions without prior review.

(k) Estimate of Cost to the Federal Government: The estimated cost of the study is $295,219 for contracted services. This figure includes the cost of research design, instrument development and clearance, data collection and analysis, and report writing and dissemination. In addition to the $295,219, estimated administrative salary and expense costs to the Federal Government will total $54,700. Funds for the study have been transferred to NIE from the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC) as partial funding for the study of which this comparative assessment is a part. The amount transferred is $425,000; this includes the cost of data collection, processing, and analysis.

(l) Detailed Justification of How Information Once Collected Will Be Used: Background: The NOICC Steering Committee agreed in a memorandum dated December 9, 1977, to fund a number of research activities proposed by the Office of Youth Programs of the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration. Two of the efforts proposed by the Office of Youth Programs included (1) a national survey of how career information is being provided at the secondary school level so as to determine the quality of this information and its value to youth, and (2) a well-structured comparative test of the effectiveness of different information delivery systems on the career awareness of youth. The purpose of these research activities is to promote the fulfillment of the need for knowledge development of the Office of Youth Programs, as well as to provide an information base for NOICC's own initiatives in this area of inquiry. NIE's mission statement clearly complements both NOICC and DOL's concerns. One of NIE's primary focuses is the relationship between school and work and how schools can prepare students for successful career development, including the development of career awareness and decision-making skills.

At the request of NOICC, and realizing that a unique opportunity existed for NIE to augment its current program of research in this area, NIE submitted a research prospectus to NOICC's Technical Advisory Board on April 28, 1977, which outlined a program of research specifically directed at conducting studies of career information sources and systems for secondary schools. The prospectus was received and approved by the NOICC Technical Advisory Board on May 4, 1977 with an agreement of a transfer of funds from NOICC to NIE. NIE has agreed to undertake this research endeavor.

The motivating assumption for this study is that youth need better information about potential occupations and work opportunities. However, the kind and quality of career information presently available to youth have not been well documented, and the comparative effectiveness of different ways of providing career information has been minimally studied. The findings of these studies should contribute to a better understanding of the career information needs of youth and means to meet the needs.

In addition, with respect to both program management and program evaluation, the study will assist NOICC in meeting its legislative mandate to improve coordination and communication between educators and those who plan training and research in information systems, to develop and implement an occupational information system, to assist in the planning and implementation of each State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee and to give special attention to the problems of unemployed youths.

With respect to research, the results of the studies will also assist NIE in fulfilling its legislative mandate. The specific findings will help explain how high school students make decisions about careers, what kind of information is available to them, and ways to improve the delivery of career information to improve student career decisions. Finally, the studies address the knowledge development needs of the U.S. Department of Labor's Youth Program.

(m) Methods of Analysis: Means and standard deviations will be computed for data that yield summary statistics to be presented in tabular form.

Factor analyses will be made of questionnaire items to examine the structure of the items and to develop coherent scales for criterion measures.

Analyses of variance (ANOVA) and covariance (ANCOVA) will be conducted separately for each uncorrected criterion score, and for the score as adjusted to reflect between-school differences observed for nonusers. The ANOVA variables are poverty level of the student body (high, low), school setting (metropolitan, nonmetropolitan), and career information system type. Within each cell, students will be classified according to grade level and program type. If appropriate, the data will also be examined by race and sex. The sample is large enough to permit analysis by sex, and, if each of the categories of race has sufficient representation, as expected, the analysis by race will also be possible. The extent of usage of available resources and reading level of the respondent (as determined by the vocabulary section of the instrument) may be used as covariates in the ANCOVA. The vocabulary items are a selection from the STEP vocabulary test for grades 10–12 and constitute a surrogate for the complete test with an inevitable decrease in reliability. Despite this decrease in reliability, the shortened test, by helping to partial out one aspect of reading ability, should improve the validity of scores on one of the measures of effectiveness, namely, familiarity with the vocabulary and concepts commonly used to describe occupations.

Depending on the findings from the ANOVA, a regression analysis will be conducted to determine the contribution of independent variables in explaining each of the criterion measures.

Student interviews will be treated as individual case studies.

(n) Legislative Authority: "The Institute (National Institute of Education) shall, in accordance with the provisions of this section, seek to improve education in the United States through concentrating the resources of the institute on the following priority research and development needs * * *

"(d) preparation of youths and adults for entering and progressing in careers: * * *

"In order to carry out the objectives of the Institute, the Director is authorized, through the Institute, to conduct educational research; collect and disseminate the findings of educational research; * * * assist and foster such research collection, dissemination, or training through grants, or technical assistance to, or jointly finance cooperative arrangements with public or private organizations, institutions, agencies, individuals; * * *" [Section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1221e.]

"There is hereby established a National Occupational Information

Coordinating Committee which * * * shall develop and implement * * * an occupational information system to meet the common occupational information needs of vocational education programs and employment and training programs at the national, State, and local levels, which system shall include data on occupational demand and supply based on uniform definitions, standardized estimating procedures, and standardized occupational classification; * * *" [Section 161(b)(1) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 2391.]

Highlights from the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, relating to the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee are summarized below; included are examples of occupational information system related activities that the Committee should be conducting in the spirit of this legislation:

(1) "In carrying out its responsibilities under this subsection [section 348(c)(1)] and under section 161 of the Vocational Education Act, the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee shall give special attention to the problems of unemployed youths * * *"

(2) "Assisting and encouraging the development of state occupational information systems, to be used in the maintenance of local job banks and job vacancy reports, accessible to local schools and including pilot programs in the use of computers to facilitate such access."

(3) "Providing technical assistance for programs of computer online terminals and other facilities to utilize and implement occupational and career outlook information and projections supplied by State employment services offices and to improve the match of youth career desires with available and anticipated labor demand."

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: The final report, which will include the data as tabulated and analyzed, will be published on or about September 30, 1981. Data will be further disseminated in journal articles and at professional meetings and workshops, as appropriate. Publications will be submitted for inclusion in the ERIC system. NOICC plans to distribute copies of the final report to all the statutory agencies that comprise NOICC (Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, and the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor). The data may also appear in a publication by NOICC reporting on the status of occupational information resources in this country.

(p) Estimate of Total Person Hours and Costs: Total person/hours of the respondents are estimated as 972. There will be no costs to respondents (students, public secondary schools).

(q) Evidence of Urgent Need: NA.

(r) Copy of the Exact Data Instrument: Available from: Warren Chapman, ETS, Princeton, New Jersey 08541.

(s) Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communication With Respondent Populations: In the summer of 1979 contact was made with the Committee on Evaluation and Information Services (CEIS) of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) for review of plans and instruments related to Study 1 and assistance in their development. There were several meetings and telephone conferences with CEIS at which the overall design of the two studies was discussed, together with the implications of the studies for the respondents and modifications of the instruments for Study 1. These discussions resulted in recommendations from CEIS for positive action on both studies.

(t) Leadtime for Respondents: Data collection is tentatively scheduled for the period from February to May, 1981. Data from Study 1 sufficient to determine types of career information delivery systems and to identify schools that meet the requirements of the research design will become available in late May 1980. If three months are allowed for analysis of those data, the identification of schools can take place beginning in September 1980. This leaves five months leadtime to invite participation of the schools and to coordinate the research activities with them.

(u) Multiyear Approval: No multiyear approval is sought.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of Proposed Activity: Application for Grants—Foreign Language and Area Studies Programs: 1. International Studies Centers and Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships. 2. Undergraduate International Studies Program. 3. Graduate International Studies Program. 4. Foreign Language and Area Studies Research Program. 5. Foreign Curriculum Consultant Program. 6. Group Projects Abroad Program.

(b) Agency/Bureau/Office: Office of Education/Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education/Division of International Education.

(c) Agency Form Number: OE 324.

(d) Justification: 1. Because activities 1, 2 and 3 above are institution-based the form collects data necessary for a comparative assessment of the capabilities and needs of institutions in developing and sustaining specialists in modern foreign languages and area studies. Activity 4 must comparatively assess the capabilities and materials dissemination potential of institutions and/or individuals to perform and implements the results of needed research, the results of which are basic tools to activities 1, 2 and 3.

The nature of the data collected is determined by the authorizing legislation and the General Provisions of the DHEW for grant administration.

2. The data will be used by the Division of International Education for awarding grants on a competitive basis.

3. Similar data already in existence would not suffice because data must be current in order to assure validity to the competition because resources and competitiveness change.

(e) Description of Survey Plan: N/A.

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: N/A

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: Data collected late 1980 and awards will be announced Spring and Summer of 1981.

(h) Consultations Outside the Agency:

1. The material was discussed outside the bureau with the Office of Education's OMB liaison person.

2. Over a period of time feedback from the respondents led to the present version of the form.

3. N/A.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate average person-hours
Colleges and universities	304	140
Individuals	6	40
Local education agencies	1	60
Nonpublic junior colleges	2	60
Nonprofit organizations	10	160
Public junior colleges	12	120
State education agencies	6	160

(j) Sensitive Questions: N/A.

(k) Estimate of Cost to Federal Government: N/A

(l) Detailed Information on How Information Once Collected Will Be Used: Program management—The data collected will determine grant eligibility and amount of grant award as well as providing an assessment of program capability compared with other applicants. The institutions or individual tendering the application will be accountable for grant funds.

Although funded applications are in the public domain and open to public scrutiny safeguards are employed to protect proprietary information such as faculty salaries.

Applications not funded are returned to the applicant and/or destroyed.

(m) Method of Analysis: N/A.

(n) Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data Collection: Title VI of the National Defense Education Act (Pub. L. 85–864). For International Studies Centers, the Graduate International Studies Program and the Undergraduate International Studies Program:

Section 601. (a) "The Secretary is authorized to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education for the purpose of establishing, equipping, and operating graduate and undergraduate centers and programs for the teaching of any modern foreign language, for instruction in other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such language is commonly used, or for research and training in international studies and the international aspects of professional and other fields of study * * *"

For Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships: Section 601. (b) "The Secretary is also authorized to pay stipends to individuals undergoing advanced training in any center or under any program receiving Federal financial assistance under this title, * * *"

For the Foreign Language and Area Studies Research Program: Section 602. "The Commissioner is authorized, directly or by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign languages and other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions or countries in which such languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more effective methods of teaching such languages and in such other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in such training, or in training teachers of such languages or in such fields."

The Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Pub. L. 87–256) For the Group Projects Abroad Program and the Foreign Curriculum Consultant Program:

Section 102. (b) "In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the President is further authorized to provide for * * *. (6) promoting modern foreign language training and area studies in United States schools, colleges, and universities by supporting visits and study in foreign countries by teachers and prospective teachers in such schools, colleges, and universities for the purpose of improving their skill in lanugages and their knowledge of the culture of the people of these countries, and by financing visits by teachers from those countries to the United States for the purpose of participating in foreign language training and area studies in United States schools, colleges, and universities; * * *."

In addition, certain U.S.-owned foreign currency funds are provided for programs operating under the authorities named above by Section 104(b)(2) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Pub. L. 83–480) "* * * the President may use or enter into agreements with foreign countries or international organizations to use the foreign currencies, including principal and interest from loan repayments, which accrue in connection with sales for foreign currencies under this title for one or more of the following purposes: * * * For carrying out programs of United States Government agencies to— * * * finance with not less than 2 per centum of the total sales proceeds received each year in each country activities to assist international educational and cultural exchange and to provide for the strengthening of the resources of American schools, colleges, universities, and other public and nonprofit educational agencies for international studies and research under the programs authorized by title VI of the National Defense Education Act, the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, the International Education Act of 1966, the Higher Education Act of 1965, * * *"

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: Data are not disseminated but are used by sponsoring agency on an annual cycle.

(p) Estimate of the Total Person Hours and Costs Required to Complete the Request: Total Person Hours—46,980; total costs to all Respondents—$375,840 (@ average of $8.00 per hour).

(q) Evidence of any Urgent Need or Very Unusual Circumstance Requiring the Data: N/A.

(r) Copy of the Exact Data Instrument Available From: Dr. Richard T. Thompson, Division of International Education, Room 3923 ROB–3, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communications With Respondent Populations: In past years, the interaction of the submission process provided the feedback which led to the present version of the form.

(t) Assurance That Respondents Will Have Sufficient Time to Comply With Request: Responses are requested in fall or early winter each year. First-time applicants are assured the response time required by **Federal Register** procedures, in addition continuation applications enjoy liaison with staff and are notified through the special terms and conditions of the previous grant.

(u) Specific Justification for Multi-year Approval: This application form is used annually by the programs listed above. The Foreign Language and Area Studies Research Program, the Foreign Curriculum Consultant Program and Group Projects Abroad Program hold annual competitions. The Graduate and Undergraduate International Studies programs hold annual competitions and also utilize the form each year for non-competing continuation grant applications. The International Studies Centers and Language and Area Studies Fellowships programs hold triennial competitions but also utilize the form for non-competing continuation grants in the intervening years.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of the Proposed Activity: Application for Teacher Exchange Program

(b) Name of the Sponsoring Agency/ Bureau/Office: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, Division of International Education, Teacher Exchange Section

(c) Agency Form Number: OE Forms 356, 356–1, 356–2, 365–3

(d) Justification: The Office of Education cooperates with the International Communication Agency in administering the teacher exchange program as provided under the authority of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. In accordance with an agreement between the International Communication Agency and the Office of Education, funds are transferred to the Office to administer the program under policies established by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, a 12-member body appointed by the President. Section 106(a)(1) of the Act established the Board "for the purpose of selecting students, scholars, teachers, trainees, and other persons to participate in the programs * * *." The Office of Education, therefore, annually publishes a brochure in August announcing opportunities to teach or attend a summer seminar abroad during the following year. Recruitment of U.S. teachers takes place between September 1 and November 1.

(e) Description of Survey Plan: N.A.

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: N.A.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: Material distributed September through October; collected on November 1, 1980 for programs conducted in summer 1981 and academic year 1981–82.

(h) Consultations Outside the Agency: None.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of person-hours
Individual U.S. teachers	2,100	One half hour each.

(j) Sensitive Questions: Selection criteria established by the Board of Foreign Scholarships for teachers selected to participate in the Government-sponsored international educational exchange program require ascertainment of some sensitive information. For example, participants must be responsible U.S. citizens, emotionally stable, in good health, have demonstrated ability to work effectively with students and colleagues, have interest and background to represent well our system of education abroad, be acceptable to the host country's school which may be of religious origin and only accept teachers of a particular denomination.

(k) Estimate of Cost to Federal Government: $10,000.

(l) Detailed Justification of How Information Once Collected Will Be Used: Each application for the Teacher Exchange Program is reviewed carefully by a program specialist according to country involved to determine whether announced basic qualifications for consideration are met. If so, the applicant is requested to report to one of 65 regional interviewing committees, comprised of highly qualified, volunteer educators, for a personal interview. If recommended by the Interviewing Committee and three referees, and has concurrence of his/her school administrator as required:

a. The applications of those desiring to interchange positions are referred to the appropriate country's screening committee to be matched, if possible, with one of its applicants. Taken into consideration are similarity of respective teachers' particular assignments and responsibilities; type of school system, i.e., urban, rural or denominational; personal recommendations; academic background; language ability where required, and numerous other factors. If a match can be proposed, each applicant and respective school administrator is advised of it and requested to indicate concurrence of the exchange. When all parties concur to a proposed match, it is recommended by OE to the Board of Foreign Scholarships for final approval. Teachers who have applied to teach abroad are notified of the Board's action in April or May. There are no OE funded grants; American teachers take their home salaries and pay their own travel costs, or are provided maintenance and round-trip travel by binational commissions abroad in the currency of the host country.

b. The applications from those wishing to attend a summar seminar abroad are reviewed by an appropriate committee comprised of OE staff and, usually, one or two outside specialists in the area of the particular country project, and by staff of the binational commission abroad. Consideration is given to candidates' training and experience, current assignment, numbers of students and colleagues likely to benefit from the recipient's experience, and to geographical distribution. The funding of seminar grants varies from country to country and year to year. For example, in FY 1980, the following grants were scheduled: bilaterally funded with Italy were three seminars, 15 grantees in each—U.S. Government share for the three, $132,000; bilaterally funded with Israel were two seminars, 10 grantees in each—U.S. Government share, $90,000; bilaterally funded with the People's Republic of China were two seminars, 10 grantees in each—U.S. Government share, approximately $30,000. Grand total—about $252,000. Using foreign currency in Egypt, 15 grants were scheduled for one seminar for $60,000; in India, 45 grants were scheduled for three seminars for $180,000, using Egyptian pounds and Indian rupees respectively. In all cases, the grants included round-trip travel, partial maintenance and course fees.

A primary purpose of these programs is to broaden the educator's understanding of another culture. This understanding, in turn, is expected to be shared with students, colleagues, members of civic and professional organizations, and other interested parties in his/her respective community here and abroad. With the cooperation of American schools, teachers from other countries teach for an academic year in the United States. All of those who participate in these programs have opportunities to develop a better understanding of themselves and their society through the perspectives gained by cross-cultural experiences.

(m) Methods of Analysis: N.A.

(n) Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data Collection: Public Law 87–256, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and Public Law 83–480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, section 104(b)(2) and (3). See (d) above.

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: Teachers who apply for seminars are notified in March or April of the Board of Foreign Scholarship's action; those who apply to teach abroad are notified of the Board's action in April or May.

(p) Estimate of Total Person-Hours and Costs Required To Complete Request: 1050 person hours.

(q) Evidence of Urgent Need or Very Unusual Circumstance Requiring the Data: N.A.

(r) Copy of the Exact Data Instrument: May be obtained from Mrs. Dorothy L. Stewart, Chief, Teacher Exchange Section, Division of International Education, BHCE, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communications with Respondent Populations: In August-September each year, 19,000 announcements of opportunities available under the Teacher Exchange Program are sent to public and private school, junior college and university administrators for circulation among their respective staffs. An additional 23,500 announcements are sent to foreign language and area studies professional groups and as requested by other groups.

(t) Assurance That Respondents Will Have Sufficient Lead Time To Comply with Request: This on-going program is announced regularly in Spring and Fall issues of professional journals.

(u) Specific Justification for Multi-Year Approval: The Teacher Exchange Program has been in existence since 1947. The information needed from individual teacher applicants varies little, if at all, each year. In order to maintain the necessary supply to serve public requests promptly, it is desirable to reprint the same form each July for the recruitment period of September 1–November 1.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of the Proposed Activity: Validation Form—Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program.

(b) Name of the sponsoring Agency/Bureau/Office: Office of Education/Bureau of Student Financial Assistance/Division of Certification and Program Review.

(c) Agency Form Number: OE–623.

(d) Justification: Prior to the 1978–79 academic year none of the information supplied on the application for a Basic Grant was verified before making payment of the award, unless an educational institution requested documentation from a student. The General Accounting Office and the Office of Education issued studies in 1977 which indicated that as a result of this laxity in verification many students were submitting incorrect data and receiving overpayments. This misreporting was estimated to have cost the Federal government as much as $150 million.

Consequently, starting with the 1978–79 academic year the Office of Education developed criteria designed to identify potentially misreported data on original Basic Grant applications, as well as on subsequently processed revisions of information on the Student Eligibility Report. Applicants meeting certain of these criteria, as well as applicants randomly chosen as a control group, are selected for validation of the information submitted for Basic Grant awards. These applicants are to provide their school financial aid offices with documentation to verify certain items used in the determination of Basic Grant eligibility. Financial aid administrators will then compare the documentation with the information on the Student Eligibility Reports, and request that the students and parents of dependent students, make any necessary corrections and sign the certification statement on its reverse side. Eligible students will receive payment when the data on the verified Student Eligibility Reports are found acceptable, or when reprocessed Student Eligibility Reports showing the corrected data are submitted by these students to their school financial aid offices.

While a completed Validation Form is in itself sufficient documentation for some items, an applicant must also supply other documents requested on this Form, such as Federal Income Tax Returns, in order to complete the validation procedures. In this context the Validation Form is an instrument allowing for the uniform collection of necessary data and an important tool for the standardization of institutional validation procedures. With the magnitude of the Basic Grant program, the Validation Form is a necessary reference for maintaining clarity in communication and minimizing the effort required to complete validation.

Although educational institutions were initially encouraged to participate in the validation effort, there was no requirement for them to validate applicant data during the first half of the 1978–79 academic year. Program regulations requiring the submission of documentation to verify applicant information as shown on the Student Eligibility Report finally became effective in early 1979.

Recently Westat Inc. prepared a quality control study which found applicant reporting errors amounting to $119 million during the 1978–79 academic year. Not only did it confirm the results of previous studies concerning error rates, but it also demonstrated the necessity for continuing the validation process. Although this report did not examine the effectiveness of institutional validation in identifying and correcting errors, preliminary studies of the applicant data bases for the 1978–79 and 1979–80 academic years showed, that after selection for validation, applicants made significant changes to the information critical in the calculation of Basic Grant eligibility. In addition, many of those involved with student financial assistance believe, that as an incidental effect of validation applicants have become more serious about correctly completing their Basic Grant applications. Moreover, encouraging correspondence from educational institutions has stated, that as a result of Office of Education mandated validation, they have successfully initiated efforts to validate the information of all their Basic Grant recipients.

(e) Description of Survey Plan: N/A. The primary purpose for conducting the validation is to improve the accuracy of data reported on Basic Grant applications by selecting, for the most part, applicants who have a high probability of having misreported data. The form for which we are requesting clearance will not be a vehicle for centrally collecting data. These forms will remain in files in the financial aid office. Analysis will be done as part of the application processing and the payment information systems maintained by the Office of Education, and will be based on Student Eligibility Reports generated through the normal corrections process.

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: N/A.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: N/A.

(h) Consultations Outside the Agency:

Claire Matthews, Wesleyan University
Judy Maloney, Bloomfield College
Joel Bryers, University of Pennsylvania
Bob Evans, Oglethorpe University
Edward Harkenrider, Western Michigan University
Clifford Baker, West Texas State University
Mike Novak, University of Texas
Gregg Walker, Colorado State University
Paul Swaim, Pasadena City College
Wayne Sparks, Western Washington University
Charlie Callender, Social Security Administration
Pauline Adams, Social Security Administration
Willie J. Polk, Social Security Administration
Brian Cronin, Social Security Administration

Discussions with representatives of the Social Security Administration were held to arrange the details concerning the records which they are to supply, and to coordinate the design of the Social Security Verification Form with the procedures regarding its use.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of average person-hours
Students in postsecondary education	200,000	0.33
Financial aid administrators	6,000	33.5

(j) Sensitive Questions: N/A.

(k) Estimate of Cost to Federal Government:

Development	$450
Design	350
Printing	18,000
Distribution (including postage)	28,000
Total	$46,800

(l) Detailed Justification of How Information Once Collected Will Be Used: The data collected by the institutions will be used only to verify information on the respondent's Student Eligibility Report. This data will remain in the regular student-aid files at the institutions. Any corrections necessary as a result of validation will be made through the normal Basic Grant corrections process.

(m) Methods of Analysis: N/A.

(n) Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data Collection:

"Sec. 411(b) * * *

(2) Each student desiring a basic grant for any year must file an application therefore containing such information and assurances as the Commissioner may deem necessary to enable him to carry out his functions and responsibilities under this subpart.

Sec. 411(b)

(3)(A) Payments under this section shall be made in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioner for such purpose, in such manner as will best accomplish the purposes of this section.

(20 U.S.C. 1070a) (Pub. L. 92–318)

Sec. 411(b)

(d)(1) In addition to payments made with respect to entitlements under this subpart, each institution of higher education shall be eligible to receive from the Commissioner the payment of $10 per academic year for each student enrolled in that institution who is receiving a Basic Grant under this subpart for that year.

Payment received by an institution under this subsection shall be used first to carry out the provision of section 493A of this Act and then for such additional administrative costs as the institution of higher education determines necessary.

(20 U.S.C. 1070a) (Pub. L. 92–318)

Sec. 190.14

The Commissioner will send to each eligible applicant a "Student Eligibility Report" (SER) which states the amount of the applicant's expected family contribution and information used in that calculation.

(20 U.S.C. 1070a)

(CFR Title 45, Part 190, Subpart B)

(FR Vol. 44, January 25, 1979, page 5264)

Sec. 190.77(a)

(1) The Commissioner may require that a student verify the information submitted on the application and included on the SER, by submitting appropriate documentation to the institution or to the Commissioner.

Sec. 190.77(b)

If an institution believes that any information on the SER used in calculating the student's expected family contribution is inaccurate, or if the application is chosen by the Commissioner for verification, the institution must request that the student verify the information on the SER.

(20 U.S.C. 1070a)

(CFR. Title 45, Part 190, Subpart G)

(FR. Vol. 44, January 25, 1979, page 5267)

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: The data collected will not be disseminated.

(p) Estimate of the total Person-Hours and Costs Required To Complete the Request Students in postsecondary education: Total Person-Hours: 66,000; Total Cost: $200,000; Data required to complete the Validation Form is available to the respondent at no cost. Only a time cost is involved.

Financial aid administrators: Total Person-Hours: 200,000; Total Cost: $1,000,000.

(q) Evidence of any Urgent Need or Very Unusual Circumstance Requiring the Data: N/A.

(r) Copy of the Exact Data Instrument. The exact data instrument will be available for public review and comment from: Jeanne B. Saunders, Chief, Student Validation Branch, Division of Certification and Program Review, ROB–3, Room 462, Washington, D.C. 20202, 245–9423. Copies of the exact data instrument will be available after February 15, 1980.

(s) Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communications With Respondent Populations: Financial aid administrators were chosen by region to participate in telephone conferences to discuss proposed changes in validation. Many especially supported the idea of comments appearing on the Student Eligibility Report requesting documentation for particular data items, and found this strategy effective in focusing their validation efforts to detect misreporting. Several mentioned that they routinely requested documentation from all Basic Grant recipients at their schools, and that they foresaw no substantial difficulty with expanding the list of items for which documentation could be specially requested.

(t) Assurance That Respondents Will Have Sufficient Lead Time To Comply With Request: Data collection will be conducted throughout the academic year by mail and/or personal interview. Validation Forms will accompany the Student Eligibility Reports sent to selected applicants or will be available at school financial aid offices as necessary. Selected applicants should have copies of the Form when they are informed of their selection for validation. The completed Validation Form must be submitted so that any necessary corrections may be processed, and a corrected Student Eligibility Report may be presented to the postsecondary school before attendance ends during the academic year, or within 90 days thereafter under extenuating circumstances. In most instances selected applicants will submit the completed Validation Forms when they present their Student Eligibility Reports for payment. Since selection for validation will cease at the midpoint of the 1980–81 academic year, all selected applicants should have sufficient time to assemble and submit the necessary documentation.

(u) Specific Justification for a Multi-Year Approval: N/A.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of the Proposed Activity: Application for Federal Assistance under Title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

(b) Name of the Sponsoring Agency/Bureau/Office: DHEW/OE/Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education/Division of Training and Facilities/Academic Facilities Branch.

(c) Agency Form Number: OE 668.

(d) Justification: 1. Submission of application will be required to compete for grant benefits under Title VII for the purpose of removing architectural barriers for compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The statutory and regulatory requirements are such that benefits cannot be obtained under Title VII without an application form. 2. The information will be used by State Commissions and by the Office of Education in the grant selection and approval process.

(e) Description of Survey Plan: N/A.

(f) Tabulation and Publications Plans: N/A.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: N/A.

(h) Consultations Outside the Agency: The following individuals were contacted early in the development stage of the form:

S. C. Hychka, Director of Management Programs, National Association of College and University Business Officers, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Charles J. Wheeler, Director, North Carolina Commission on Higher Education Facilities, 320 West Jones Street, P.O. Box 27322, Raleigh, North Carolina 27611.

Gordon R. Flack, Head, Division of Campus Planning and Physical Facilities Development, Texas Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, P.O. Box 12788, Capital Station, Austin, Texas 78711.

Aaron M. Feirson, Program Liaison Staff, Office of Facilities Engineering, DHEW, Washington, D.C. 20202.

The National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) has already endorsed the form. In addition, the form has been used on a trial basis. None of the institutions of higher education exposed to the form have indicated any problems in meeting the requirements of the form.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of average person-hour
Colleges and Universities	800	8

1. From past experience, since the beginning of the program in 1963, the contacts that the Office of Education has had with respondents concerning other Title VII applications, indicate that the average person-hour would be as shown above.

2. Allowances were made for time needed to gather and compile data needed, as well as clerical time needed to complete the form.

3. The reporting burden is not expected to vary to any considerable degree.

(j) Sensitive Questions: There are no questions of a sensitive nature. The information is used only by the State Commissions and the Office of Education.

(k) Estimate of Cost to Federal Government: N/A.

(l) Detailed Justification of How Information Once Collected Will Be Used: For determination of grant eligibility and/or amount of grant award.

(m) Methods of Analysis: N/A.

(n) Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data

Collection: "Any institution of higher education which desires to receive a grant under this part shall submit an application therefor at such time or times, in such manner, and containing such information as the Commissioner shall prescribe by regulation." Section 707, Title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: The data is used only by the State Commissions and the Office of Education. Since $24 million of Fiscal Year 1980 funds are available, the information must be made available to the users in time to finalize awards before the end of Fiscal Year 1980.

(p) Estimate of the Total Person-Hours and Costs Required To Complete the Request: $96,000 at 6,400 person-hours.

(q) Evidence of Any Urgent Need or Very Unusual Circumstance Requiring the Data: The program funds did not become available until fall, 1979. Accordingly, the data is urgently needed for the current fiscal year 1980 grant competition.

(r) Copy of the Exact Data Instrument: Thomas F. McAnallen, Chief, academic Facilities Branch, Division of Training and Facilities, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, U.S. Office of Education/DHEW, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communications With Respondent Populations: Notification of intent to use the form was published in the **Federal Register** on September 1, 1978. However, program was unable to obtain Departmental approval of the form, without an appropriation of funds. Please note statement in (q) above.

(t) Assurance That Respondents Will Have Sufficient Lead Time To Comply With Request: The applications are first submitted to the State Commission. By regulation the State Commission is required to provide sufficient lead time for the respondents. At least two closing dates must be provided for each fiscal year.

(u) Specific Justification for a Multi-Year Approval: Multi-year approval of the form should be provided because of the possibility that funds will be appropriated for more than one fiscal year.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of The Proposed Activity: Analysis of Alternative Comparability Measures

(b) Agency/Bureau/Office: U.S. Office of Education, Office of Evaluation and Dissemination.

(c) Agency Form Number: OE 677

(d) Justification: Part F, Section 102 of Pub. L. 95-561 states that "the Commissioner shall * * * make a study of * * * alternative comparability requirements." (20 U.S.C. 2701) The purpose of the data collection effort is to inform Congress of the impact of alternative comparability requirements on the allocations of resources among Title I and non-Title I schools within a school district. In addition preceptions of respondents concerning the desirability and feasibility of alternatives will also be collected. Since the data generated must be particular to the 1980-81 school year, as prescribed by the statute, and will be generated by school districts adopting alternative requirements, the data collected will be unique.

(e) Description of the Survey Plan: From a list of school districts currently filing comparability reports, 500 school districts will be contacted to determine whether they are interested in volunteering to participate in the study. It is expected that from the list of 500 school districts initially contacted, only approximately 150 will express an initial interest in participating in the experiment and many of these may drop out as they become aware of the requirements for participation. Approximately 46 school districts will be involved with the study: 36 adopting an alternative comparability requirement and 10 using the current comparability requirement. Of the 36, 20 will be geographically distributed throughout the nation and 16 will be found in one over sampled State.

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: Information collected will be presented in the report to Congress, due September 30, 1981.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: Information will be collected in November and December, 1980 and will be summarized in a report to Congress, September 30, 1981.

(h) Consultations Outside the Agency: All data collection will be coordinated with local coordinators (e.g. district Title I coordinators) who will indicate the least burdensome method by which data may be collected. Data will be collected in whatever format the school district finds least burdensome.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden:

a. Type: Local Education Agencies.

b. Number: 46.

c. Estimated Average Man-Hours Per Respondent: 16.0 hours.

a. Type: Principals.

b. Number: 80.

c. Estimated Average Man-Hours Per Respondent: 0.5 hours.

a. Type: State Education Agencies.

b. Number: 12.

c. Estimated Average Man-Hours Per Respondent: 2.0 hours.

(j) Sensitive Questions: None.

(k) Estimate of Cost to Federal Government: Contract: $350,000; sponsoring Federal Agency $50,000.

(l) Detailed Justification of How Information Once Collected Will Be Used: Congress will use the information to decide if and how the current comparability requirement of Title I should be changed. In particular Congress's desire to change the requirement and the direction of the change will depend upon information collected concerning the flexibility and desirability of alternative requirement as ascertained through interviews with LEA officials, the administrative burden of demonstrating compliance under an alternative requirements as ascertained through both quantitative and qualitative data, and the ability of the alternative requirement to encourage the provision of additional educational services as ascertained through quantitative data.

(m) Methods of Analysis: Data will be aggregated to the school and school district (LEA) levels. Cross-tabulations, correlations, tests of significance, analysis of variance, etc. will be employed where appropriate.

(n) Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data Collection "The Commissioner shall . . . make a study of the feasibility and desirability of alternative criteria for demonstrating the comparability of services provided with State and local funds in each (Title I) project area * * * to those provided outside such areas * * *" (Part F, Section 102(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by Pub. L. 95-561, 20 U.S.C.

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: Data will be disseminated in summary form in the mandated report to Congress on September 30, 1981.

(p) Estimate of the Total Person-Hours and Costs Required To Complete the Request: Total person hours of respondents: 790; Total dollar costs to respondents: 10,000.

(q) Evidence of Any Urgent Need or Very Unusual Circumstance Requiring the Data: None.

(r) Copy of the Exact Data Instrument: Since quantitative data will be collected in the format most suitable to the school district, no "exact data instrument" will be employed. Information on the *type* of quantitative data requested and the exact data instrument for qualitative data collection may be obtained by June 1, 1980 upon request to Peter Stowe.

Room 3040, FOB6, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W. Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communications With Respondent Populations: The Chief State School Officer, the State Title I Coordinator, and the State CEIS Representative for each State have received a memorandum describing the reasons for the study, a solicitation of their participation in the study and a project summary of the study. At the LEA level superintendents and district Title I coordinators have received memoranda explaining the study and seeking their participation. These latter memoranda were also sent to the above mentioned State representatives. Each participating school district will be contacted to establish the least burdensome method by which information may be collected from that school district.

(t) Assurance That Respondents Will Have Sufficient Lead Time To Comply With Request: Data collection will occur in the months of November and December 1980. School districts volunteering to participate in the study will be aware of the data to be collected before they make their budgetary allocations according to their alternative criteria which they must do in April or May of 1980. A substantial portion of the quantitative data are already collected by participating school in demonstrating compliance with the current comparability requirement.

(u) Special Justification for a Multi-Year Approval: No multi-year approval is requested.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of the Proposed Activity: Program Objectives of SAFA Construction.

(b) Agency/Bureau/Office: U.S. Office of Education, Office of Evaluation and Dissemination.

(c) Agency Form Number: OE 758.

(d) Justification: Section 417(a)(1) of Pub. L. 93-380 states that "the Secretary shall transmit to (Congress) * * * an annual evaluation report * * * (which) shall—

(A) set forth goals and specific objectives in qualitative and quantitative terms for all programs and projects . . . and relate those goals and objectives to the purposes of such program * * *" (20 U.S.C. 1226c).

The purpose of the data collection effort is to determine the program goals and objectives for the SAFA construction program and to develop measures by which the progress of the program towards meeting those objectives may be obtained. No previous activity of this nature has been undertaken for the SAFA construction program.

This project is part of an OE-wide, multi-year effort to set forth specific goals and objectives for each federal education program.

(e) Description of the Survey Plan: The SAFA construction program authorizes funds for four major categories of Federally-connected districts: those experiencing substantial increases in enrollments of Federally-connected pupils, those needing temporary facilities, on-base schools and schools located on Indian lands. Interviews will be conducted at approximately four school districts from each of the above four categories. Methods for selection of school districts to represent each of the four funding categories will be based on a number of considerations yet to be determined but will include the number of applications and the amount requested which the school districts have submitted under the relevant sections in the past.

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: Information concerning program objectives and procedures will be presented in a report expected to be completed in October, 1980.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: Information will be collected in May 1980 and will be presented in a report to the Secretary in October 1980.

(h) Consultation Outside the Agency: Collected information will be qualitative, involving perceptions of the local and State education officials involved with the application for SAFA construction funds.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden Respondents:

a. Type: Local Education Agency.
b. Number: 16.
c. Estimated Average Man-Hours per Respondent: 1.0.

a. Type: Principals.
b. Number: 30.
c. Estimated Average Man-Hours Per Respondent: 0.5.

a. Type: Public Elementary/Secondary Schools.
b. Number: 30.
c. Estimated Average Man-Hours Per Respondent: 1.0.

a. Type: School Administrators and Supervisors.
b. Number: 15.
c. Estimated Average Man-Hours Per Respondent: 1.0.

a. Type: State Education Agency.
b. Number: 16.
c. Estimated Average Man-Hours Per Respondent: 1.5.

(j) Sensitive Questions: None.

(k) Estimate of Costs to Federal Government $50,000.

(l) Detailed Justification of How Information Once Collected Will Be Used.

The purpose of the information collection effort is to obtain from school districts and State officials their perceptions of (a) the goals and objectives of the SAFA construction program, and (b) the activities involved in achieving these goals and objectives. This information will be used to ensure that a concensus with respect to program objectives and assumptions is reached, that program objectives and assumptions are well defined and plausible, and that further program evaluation is feasible and likely to be useful. This information will also be used to provide program management with methods by which success in meeting program objectives may be measured to aid them in managing the program.

(m) Methods of Analysis: Analytical methods of data analysis are not expected to be employed. Information collected will be used to articulate the goals of the program and the program activities. No inferential analysis will be conducted and very little if any descriptive statistical analysis is expected to be conducted.

(n) Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data Collection: "The Secretary shall transmit to (Congress) * * * an annual evaluation report * * * (which shall—

(A) set forth goals and specific objectives in qualitative and quantitative terms for all programs and projects * * * and relate those goals and objectives to the purposes of such programs * * *" (Section 417(a)(1) of Pub. L. 93-380, 20 U.S.C. 1226c.)

(o) Timetable for Dissenmination of Collected Data: Information on program goals, objectives, and activities will be presented in summary form in a report to be released in October 1980.

(p) Estimate of the Total Person-Hours and Costs Required To Complete the Request: Total person hours of respondents: 100. Total dollar costs to respondents: $1,200.

(q) Evidence of any Urgent Need or Very Unusual Circumstances Requiring the Data: The study has been requested by Congress. Unless the OE Evaluation Plan priorities should change, data will be collected in late Spring 1980 and a waiver of the February 15 announcement deadline will be sought. Otherwise, data will be collected in the Fall 1980.

(r) Copy of the Exact Data Instrument: Information on the exact data instrument may be obtained by April 1, 1980 upon request to Peter Stowe, Room

3040, FOB6, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communications with the Respondent Population: It is anticipated that respondent populations will make input to the study.

(t) Assurance That Respondents Will Have Sufficient Lead Time To Comply With Request: Information collected in this study will involve individual program participants' perceptions of program goals, objectives, and activities. This information will be collected in May 1980. School district officials providing this information will be contacted one month in advance.

(u) Specific Justification for a Multi-Year Approval: No multi-year approval is requested.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of the Proposed Activity: An Assessment of Inservice Training of Regular Classroom Teachers.

(b) Agency/Bureau/Office: Department of Health, Education and Welfare/U.S. Office of Education/Office of Evaluation and Dissemination.

(c) Agency Form Number: OE 759.

(d) Justification: (1) The implementation of Pub. L. 94–142 has resulted in thousands of handicapped children being placed in regular classroom situations. As a result there is a need to provide regular classroom teachers with inservice training to enable them to provide appropriate education for the handicapped children in their classrooms. Programs to develop and implement inservice training for regular educators teaching handicapped children in regular classrooms settings are provided for under the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) requirements of Pub. L. 94–142 as well as by Pub. L. 91–230. At present there exists no nationwide, comprehensive understanding of: (1) The status of implementation by the States of the Pub. L. 94–142 CSPD requirements, or the problems the States are encountering in attempting to implement them; (2) The nature and effectiveness of the inservice training for regular educators (REGI) programs being funded under Pub. L. 91–230; or (3) the extent of the compatibility and coordination of the inservice training efforts for regular educators being provided through CSPD and REGI activities. The present study is designed to address these three areas to provide the information base for informed policy and program management decisions.

(2) The data collected in this study will be used by program managers to improve the management of the involved programs, by the Secretary to assess the need for changes in relevant regulations, and will be presented to Congressional committees and their staffs for consideration in making policy and legislative decisions.

(3) No similar data exists relevant to the national status of these programs and the issues listed above.

(e) Description of Survey Plan: (1) The potential respondent universes consist of: (a) all State Departments of Special Education; (b) all State Manpower Planning Committees organized as a result of Pub. L. 94–142 CSPD requirements; (c) all LEAs; (d) all public school educators and administrators; and (d) all REGI projects funded under Pub. L. 91–230.

(2) The survey will use a national stratified multistage clustered probability sampling design. (a) A probability sample of 25 States and Trust Territories will be selected. Within selected States the following respondents will be selected: the State Director of Special Education; two members of the State Pub. L. 94–142 Manpower Planning Committee (where one exists); the State coordinator of inservice training; the State CSPD coordinator; and an SEA financial officer. (b) An average of three REGI projects will be randomly selected from within each sampled State. At each REGI project, the Project Director and one staff member will be selected as respondents. (c) From among all LEAs that have personnel who have participated in the training provided by a REGI project, one LEA will be randomly selected for participation. The respondents from the selected LEA will be the Director of Special Education, the coordinator of inservice training and the financial officer. (d) From within the selected LEA three schools will be randomly selected—two schools from among those schools having teachers participating in the REGI project, and one school from among those with no teachers participating in the REGI training. (e) From within the participating schools the following respondents will be selected: four teachers participating in the REGI training and two teachers not participating, randomly selected, and the principal. From within the non-participating schools, four teachers will be randomly selected as respondents, along with the principal. Each data collection instrument will be pretested on fewer than nine respondents. Pretesting is scheduled to take place March–April 1980.

(3) Data will be collected by Applied Management Sciences, which is responsible for the design and implementation of the study. Individual data will be kept strictly confidential and no personally identifiable data will be disclosed. The data tape delivered to the Government will be stripped of all personal identifiers.

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: Data will be available in the form of a final report and executive summary by October 1, 1981. These documents will be placed in ERIC as well as distributed to appropriate audiences.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: (1) Data will be collected from October 1980 through March 1981. (2) Elapsed time between completion of data collection and publication of results will be approximately six months.

(h) Consultation Outside the Agency: Availability and reportability of data have been discussed with respondent groups in four States.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of Average person-hours
State Director of Special Education	25	1.00
State CSPD Coordinator	25	1.00
State Inservice Training Coordinator	25	.75
PL94–142 Manpower Planning Committee member	50	.75
SEA financial officer	25	1.00
REGI Project Director and Staff	150	2.00
LEA Director of Special Education	75	.75
LEA Director of Inservice Training	75	.75
LEA Financial Officer	75	1.00
Principals, School	225	.50
Teachers, elementary/secondary	1,425	1.00

(j) Sensitive Questions: None.

(k) Estimate of Cost to the Federal Government: $469,656.00.

(l) Justification of How Information Once Collected Will Be Used: The objectives of this evaluation are to: (1) provide a national description of the status of implementation by the States of the CSPD requirements of Pub. L. 94–142, along with the problems being encountered in attempting to implement these requirements; (2) provide a national description of the program of regular inservice training (REGI) projects funded under Pub. L. 91–230; and (3) assess the coordination between, and relative effectiveness of, inservice training for regular educators provided under REGI projects and CSPD activities. The results of the study will be used to enhance the effectiveness of program management, identify problems which may indicate a need for changes in regulations or policy, and to identify "best practices" for national dissemination.

(m) Methods of Analysis: Data will be aggregated at the national level. A wide variety of analytic methods will be applied, ranging from simple tabulations and crosstabulations for descriptive purposes, to multidimensional scaling techniques and analysis of covariance in a multiple regression/correlation format. Tests of significance of difference of means will be employed to compare the effectiveness of regular inservice training provided under various conditions.

(n) Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data Collection: Planning and evaluation activities are authorized under the General Education Provisions Act which states in part: "* * * the Secretary shall transmit to (appropriate Congressional committees) an annual evaluation report which evaluates the effectiveness of applicable programs * * * such report shall * * * contain information on progress being made * * * describe the cost and benefits of the applicable program * * * identify which sectors of the public recieve the benefits of such program * * *" (20 U.S.C. 1226C.)

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: Data will be available to users by October 1, 1981 in the form of a project final report and executive summary.

(p) Estimate of Person-Hours and Costs Required to Complete the Request: Total respondent burden is estimated to be 2,156 person hours. Total dollar cost to respondents beyond costs normally (2,156 hrs. x $12.00/hr.=$25,872 incurred is estimated to be none.

(q) No urgent need or very unusual circumstance requiring the data.

(r) Data instruments will be available for public review and comment by May 1, 1980, from: Dr. Emmett L. Fleming, Project Officer, Office of Evaluation and Dissemination/USOE/DHEW, FOB #6, Room 4083, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communications With Respondent Populations: Through the use of unstructured personal interviews communications regarding this study have been held with State Directors of Special Education and relevant staff, REGI project directors, LEA Directors of Special Education and directors of inservice training, and regular classroom teachers in the States of Kentucky, New Jersey, Ohio and Oregon.

(t) Assurance that Respondents Will Have Sufficient Lead Time to Comply With Request: Data collection will be conducted between October 1980 and May 1981. Respondents selected for the sample will be notified a minimum of three months before data will be collected from them, with an average lead time of six to seven months. No preparation by respondents is necessary.

(u) No justification for a multi-year approval.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of Proposed Activity: Assessment of the ESEA Title I Programs for the Handicapped.

(b) AGENCY/BUREAU/OFFICE: U.S. Office of Education/Office of Resources and Operations/Office of Evaluation and Dissemination.

(c) AGENCY FORM NUMBER: OE 760.

(d) JUSTIFICATION: This program was first authorized in November 1965; since funding began in 1966, over $937 million were provided in grants to State Agencies through FY 1979. There has, however, been no evaluation of the impact of this program during this time. Thus, the study is needed in order to satisfy the information needs of program managers and agency policy makers. In addition, the Congress has indicated its desire for evidence of impact each year since 1977. The impact evaluation was delayed until a study initiated by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) was completed so that duplication of effort and data collection could be avoided. The BEH study (now completed) did not collect impact data and, in addition, did not study a representative sample of provider institutions (State-supported or State-operated institutions for the handicapped).

(e) Description of Survey Plan: Data will be collected from Federal program personnel and from legislative staff through interviews and record searches. A mail survey will go to the 58 State Education Agencies and 140 other State Agencies administering Title I funds for the handicapped. In addition, on-site interviews will be conducted in SEAs and SAs in 25 States. Data will also be collected on-site, a representative sample of provider institutions through interviews and data collections to be designed when the study is initiated. The sampling design has not yet been developed; the universe to be sampled was 3,754 providers in FY 1978. Accordingly, a sample of approximately 500 provider institutions is probable.

(f) TABULATION AND PUBLICATION PLANS: The information from this study will be published in the form of a Final Report and Executive Summary to be delivered when the contract is completed. This is expected to be completed in October 1981. The report will consist of the tabulated data and accompanying narrative which will describe:

• The management of the program at Federal, State and local levels.

• The extent and type of services to the handicapped that result from Title I support.

• The effect that these services have on the providers and the recipients.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication:

Event and Date

Contract Award, June 1980.
Forms Clearance Package, November 1980.
Forms Clearance, January 1981.
Data Collection, February-April 1981.
Data Analysis and Interpretation, May-August 1981.
Draft Final Report, September 1981.
Final Report, October 1981.

(h) Consultations Outside the Agency: Officials of SEAs, SAs, and provider institutions will be consulted during the development of the data collection forms and of the research design for the study. In addition, individuals with expertise in educational services to the handicapped and evaluation methodology will be consulted.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of average person-hours
State Education Agencies (Mail Survey)	58	1
State Education Agencies (Interviews)	30	2
Other State Agencies (Depts. of Health, Human Services, Welfare, etc.) (Mail Survey)	140	1
Other State Agencies (Interviews)	50	2
Other Organizations: Directors, Provider Institutions	500	1
Other Organizations: Financial Officers, Provider Institutions	500	1
Other Organizations: Education Directors, Provider Institutions	500	1

(j) Sensitive Questions: Not Applicable.

(k) Estimate of Cost to Federal Government: $700,000.

(l) Detailed Justification of How Information Will be Used: Data collected in this study will have multiple uses:

Program Management and Policy Makers, Data will be available to determine the extent of compliance for the whole program. There will also be evidence of the degree of program effectiveness. Policy makers will be able to determine if a revision of regulations is needed and/or if new legislation is required. Program managers will have information on any needs for technical assistance.

Evaluation. The objectives of this study are:

• To determine the effectiveness of Federal program management.

• To determine the degree to which Title I has contributed to organization and support of services to the severely handicapped at State and local level.

• To identify the types of services and resources Title I funds have provided at the State and local level.

• To determine how the legislative objectives are constrained and affected by the State and local service delivery structure.

General Purpose. These data will also be used by the Congress to determine if new legislation is needed.

(m) Methods of Analysis: Most data will be aggregated at the national level but some may be aggregated at the State level, e.g., descriptive information about provider institutions and practices within a state. Several methods of analysis will be used, e.g., tabulations of descriptive data, cross-tabulations, regression, analysis, and univariate and multivariate analysis of variance.

(n) Legislative Authority Allowing Data Collection: Evaluation activities are authorized under the General Education Provisions Act which states in part: "* * * the Secretary shall transmit to (appropriate Congressional committees) an annual evaluation report which elvaluates the effectiveness of applicable programs * * * such report shall * * * contain information on progress being made * * * describe the cost and benefits of the applicable program * * * identify which sectors of the public receive the benefits of such program." (20 U.S.C. 1226C).

"Sec. 183. (a) Independent Evaluations.—The Commissioner shall provide for independent evaluations which describe and measure the impact of programs and projects assisted under this title. Such evaluations may be provided by contract or other arrangements, and all such evaluations shall be made by competent and independent persons, and shall include, whenever possible, opinions obtained from program or project participants about the strengths and weaknesses of such programs and projects.

"(b) Evaluation Standards and Schedule.—The Commissioner shall (1) develop and publish standards for evaluation of program or project effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title, and (2) develop, in consultation with State educational agencies and representatives of local educational agencies, a schedule for conducting evaluations under section 124(g) designed to ensure that evaluations are conducted in representative samples of the local educational agencies in any State each year. Such standards will be developed only after widespread consultation and hearings with practicing State and local agency evaluators, and the Commissioner's standards will reflect the input of these groups.

"(c) Jointly Sponsored Studies.—The Commissioner shall consult with State and local educational agencies in order to provide for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies of programs and projects assisted under this title within a State.

"(d) Evaluation Models.—The Commissioner shall provide to State educational agencies, models for evaluations of all programs conducted under this title, for their use in carrying out their functions under section 172, which shall include uniform procedures and criteria to be utilized by local educational agencies and State agencies, as well as by the State educational agency in the evaluation of such programs. In developing evaluation design models the Commissioner shall consult with State and local evaluators experienced in conducting such evaluations.

"(e) Technical Assistance.—The Commissioner shall provide such technical and other assistance as may be necessary to State educational agencies to enable them to assist local educational agenices and State agencies in the development and application of a systematic evaluation of programs in accordance with the models developed by the Commissioner.

"(f) Specifications of Objective Criteria.—The models developed by the Commissioner shall specify objective criteria which shall be utilized in the evaluation of all programs and shall outline techniques (such as longitudinal studies of children involved in such programs) and methodology (such as the use of tests which yield comparable results) for producing data which are comparable on a statewide and nationwide basis.

"(g) Report to Congress.—The Commissioner shall make a report to the respective committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over programs authorized by this title and the respective Committees on Appropriations no later than February 1, 1980, 1982, and 1984 concerning the results of evaluations of programs and projects required under this section, which shall be comprehensive and detailed, as up-to-date as possible, and based to the maximum extent possible on objective measurements, together with other related findings and evaluations and his recommendations with respect to legislation.

"(h) Information Dissemination.—The Commissioner shall also develop a system for the gathering and dissemination of results of evaluations and for the identification of exemplary programs and projects, or of particularly effective elements of programs and projects, and for the dissemination of information concerning such programs and projects or such elements thereof to State agencies and local educational agencies responsible for the design and conduct of programs and projects under this title, and to the education profession and the general public.

"(i) Maximum expenditures.—The Commissioner is authorized, out of funds appropriated to carry out this title in any fiscal year, to expend such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, but not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the amount appropriated for such programs. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Commissioner shall place priority on assisting States, local edutional agencies, and State agencies to conduct evaluations and shall, only as funds are available after fulfilling that purpose, seek to conduct any national evaluation of the program.

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: The data will be disseminated within 30 days of receipt of the Final Report. The Report will be delivered to the appropriate Congressional committees and to interested Federal personnel. The Executive Summary will be mailed to appropriate State and local officials.

(p) Estimate of Total Person-Hours and Costs Required To Complete Request: This request will require a total of 1,858 person hours. There are $22,296 (1858 hrs. × $12.00/hr.) dollar costs to respondents.

(q) Evidence of Urgent Need or Very Unusual Circumstances Requiring the Data: No urgent need or very unusual circumstances requiring the data.

(r) Copy of Exact Data Instrument: The exact data instrument is not available at this time. When it is available, a notice will be published in the **Federal Register.** The instrument can be obtained from: Dr. Emmett L. Fleming, Project Officer, Office of Evaluation and Dissemination/USOE/DHEW, FOR #6, Room 4083, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Early Involvement and Communications With Respondent Populations: The data collection instruments will be pretested on up to nine respondents from each population. In addition, a CEIS representative will be involved in all stages of the project and substantive experts will be consulted as appropriate.

(t) Assurance of Sufficient Lead Time To Comply With Request: Data will be collected February-April 1981. All respondents will be notified a month in advance of site visits or will be given one month to respond to and return mail surveys. Since all data collected will be either readily available data or data collected on a one-time only basis, this lead time has proven to be sufficient in past studies.

(u) Specific Justification for Multi-Year Approval: No justification for multi-year approval.

Data Activity Summary Plan

(a) Title of the Proposed Activiry: An Impact Evaluation Study of Programs and Projects Funded under Pub. L. 92-318, Indian Education Act—Part A.

(b) Agency/Bureau /Office: U.S. Office of Education/Office of Resources and Operations/Office of Evaluation and Dissemination.

(c) Agency Form Number: OE 761.

(d) Justification: Interested in and demand for impact evaluation information on Part A Programs' effectiveness has grown steadily during the past two years. During the 1980 appropriation hearings by the Interior Subcommittees, both Subcommittees opened their hearings with a request for information on the impact of these programs and projects. Impact evaluation information is also needed for the 1983 legislative reauthorization of the Indian Education Act. If an impact evaluation study is to be implemented in time, it must commence this fiscal year. Furthermore, no national impact data exist on these programs and projects to date. However, descriptive information on these Part A programs and projects was collected in the recently completed study which will be utilized as a planning data source in this impact evaluation study. It should be noted that project evaluation summaries prepared by participants will not serve the purpose of this national evaluation.

(e) Description of Survey Plan: (1) Potential respondent groups for this evaluation study include: Local Education Agencies, Project Directors, Project Staff, Indian Parents, and Indian Students.

(2) The tentative survey design calls for a systematic random sample of local education agencies funded with Part A funds at the end of 1979. The population to be sampled consists of approximately 1148 local education agencies (LEAs). The Office of Indian Education shall provide a list of these funded projects which provides the LEA information for sampling. Using this information, the programs and projects will be stratified by grant size, region, and Indian enrollment. It is also proposed that projects be stratified by type (academic, cultural, or mixed), using information from a small exploratory feasibility study which is part of Phase I of this evaluation study. It is estimated that a sample of approximately 325 local education agencies will be selected for this evaluation study. Data will be collected on site through interviews and students in the sample will be requested to take a battery of pre and post tests. The survey design of the study is not yet completed.

(3) The agency statistician who will review the statistical aspects of the survey design is Dr. Emmett L. Fleming, Jr.

(4) No contractor has yet been selected to perform this evaluation study.

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: The information from this study will be published in the form of a Final Report and Executive Summary to be delivered when the contract is completed. This is expected to be completed in March 1983. The report will consist of the tabulated data and accompanying narrative which will describe:

- The management of the program at Federal and local levels.
- The extent and type of services to Indian children that result from Title IV, Part A.
- The impact that these services have on the participants and staff.

The final report shall also be placed in the ERIC system for greater dissemination. Also Executive Summaries and policy implication memorandum shall be prepared and disseminated to USOE policy makers and Congressional staff members.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication:

Event and Date

Contract Award, September 1980.
Forms Clearance Package, May 1981.
Forms Clearance, July 1981.
Data Collection, September 1981, and May 1982.
Data Analysis and Interpretation, November 1982.
Draft Final Report, January 1983.
Final Report, March 1983.

(h) Consultation Outside the Agency: Officials of LEAs and Part A Projects will be consulted during the development of the data collection forms and of the research design for the study. In addition, individuals with expertise in educational services to Indians and evaluation methodology will be consulted.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of Average person-hours
Project Directors (Interviews)	325	2.00
Project Staff (Interviews)	650	1.00
Parents (Mail Questionnaires)	3250	0.30
Students (Test batteries)	6500	1.50

(j) Sensitive Questions: No sensitive questions.

(k) Estimate of Cost to Federal Government: $1,300,000.

(1) Detailed Justification of How Information Will be Used: Data collected in this study will have multiple uses: *Program Management and Policy Makers.* Data will be available to determine the effectiveness and impact of current projects funded under Part A. Policy makers will be able to determine if a revision of regulations is needed and/or if new legislation is required. Program managers will have information on any needs for technical assistance.

Evaluation. The study is expected to provide answers to the following questions: (1) How effective have programs funded under Part A been in achieving their educational objectives and the purposes of Part A? Have children in programs focused on basic skills improved their academic performance? Have programs designed to increase the relevance of school curriculums to the culture and heritage of the children involved improved student retention and attendance rates?
(2) What process, management, or administrative improvements are needed?
(3) What improvements need to be made in the delivery of financial aid in LEAs?
(4) What improvements need to be made in instructional techniques and materials and in staff training activities?
(5) What improvements need to be made in the required project evaluations for Part A?

General Purpose. These data will also be used by the Congress to determine if new legislation is needed.

(m) Methods of Analysis: Data will be aggregated at the national level. A wide variety of analytic methods will be applied, ranging from simple tabulations and crosstabulations for descriptive purposes, to multidimensional scaling techniques, analysis of covariance in a multiple regressional/correlation format, and other appropriate multivariate techniques. Test of significance of difference of means shall be employed to compare the impact of Part A programs on Indian students.

(n) Legislative Authority Allowing Data Collection: Evaluation activities are authorized under the General Education Provisions Act which states in part: "* * * the Secretary shall transmit to (appropriate Congressional committees) an annual evaluation report which evaluates the effectiveness of applicable programs * * * such report shall * * * contain information on progress being made * * * describe the cost and benefits of the applicable program * * * identify which sectors of the public receive the benefits of such program." (20 U.S.C. 1226C).

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: The data will be disseminated within 30 days of receipt of the Final Report. The Report will be delivered to the appropriate Congressional committees and to interested Federal personnel. The Executive Summary will be mailed to appropriate State and local officials.

(p) Estimate of Total Person-Hours and Costs Required To Complete Request: This request will require a total of 12,025 person hours. There are 1300 school personnel hours and an approximate cost of 1300 hrs. × $12.00/hr. =$31,200.00.

(q) Evidence of Urgent need or Very Unusual Circumstances Requiring the Data: No urgent need or unusual circumstances.

(r) Copy of Exact Data Instrument: The exact data instrument is not available at this time. When it is available, a notice will be published in the Federal Register. Instruments can be obtained as follows: Dr. Emmett L. Fleming, Project Officer, Office of Evaluation and Dissemination, OHDPD, 400 Maryland Avenue, Southwest, Room 4079, FOB #6, Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Early Involvement and Communications With Respondent Populations: The data collection instruments will be pretested on up to nine respondents from each population. In addition, a CEIS representative will be involved in all stages of the project and substantive experts will be consulted as appropriate.

(t) Assurance of Sufficient Lead Time To Comply With Request: Data will be collected September 1981 and May 1982. All respondents will be notified a month in advance of site visits or will be given one month to respond to and return mail surveys. Since all data collected on a one-time only basis, this lead time has proven to be sufficient in past studies.

(u) Specific Justification for Multi-Year Approval: No multi-year approval necessary.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of the Proposed Activity: Equipment list for construction, reconstruction or renovation projects authorized under Title VII of the Higher Education Act 1965, as amended.

(b) Name of the Sponsoring Agency/Bureau/Office: DHEW/OE/Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education/Division of Training and Facilities/Academic Facilities Branch.

(c) Agency Form Number: OE Form 1136-1.

(d) Justificaiton: 1. The equipment lists are required to ascertain that recipients of Federal funds do not purchase elaborate and costly initial equipment above and beyond that needed for Title VII approved projects. In addition to costs expended for construction, reconstruction or renovation, the Title VII program authorizes financial assistance to meet the cost for initial equipment. However, all such costs must meet the statutory and regulatory costs eligibility requirements. Accordingly, program uses the lists to determine the extent of Federal cost participation for the Title VII approved projects.

2. The data are used only by the Office of Education program for the sole purpose of computing the amount of Federal Financial assistance that has been earned on Title VII approved projects.

3. The information requested in the equipment list is not available from any other source.

(e) Description of Survey Plan: 1. Respondents are limited to institutions of higher education with Title VII approved projects that have not been closed out.

2. Information sufficient to identify the institution and the project, and the Title VII grant or loan recipient will be requested to indicate if the list constitutes an inventory of items already purchased, or if the items on the list have not been purchased. Also, information is requested to indicate if the list is a complete or partial listing of all initial equipment items for the project. In addition, specific information is requested with regard to the description of the items, the purchase dates, quantities, unit prices, and total costs. The Title VII grant or loan recipient will be requested to certify that the equipment listed will be housed and used in the Title VII supported facilities. Submission of equipment list will be required to maintain project grant or loan eligibility.

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: N/A.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: The equipment list must be submitted to the Office of Education before the project closeout. A Title VII grant or loan recipient will be required to submit and itemized equipment list only once and in connection with the project closeout. However, some Title VII recipients may want to seek equipment list approval from the Office of Education several times during the life of the project, to make sure eligible items are being purchased.

(h) Consultations Outside the Agency: None were consulted since only the basic, minimum information required is requested.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of Average Person-hours
Colleges & Universities	150	1.5

1. The estimated average person-hours required per response was arrived at after a review of the size of equipment lists submitted in the past on Title VII projects.

2. Respondents keep records of costs for Title VII supported facilities. Accordingly, there is no unusual delay in gathering or compiling the data.

3. There is not any considerable variation in the reporting burden. This would depend on the size of the project.

(j) Sensitive Questions: There are no sensitive questions. The equipment list is kept by the Office of Education. However, one copy may be returned to the respondent, if equipment items are declared ineligible for Federal cost participation purposes:

(k) Estimate of Cost to Federal Government: $4,500.

(l) Detailed Justification of How Information Once Collected Will Be Used: The equipment list is used to determine the extent of grant or loan eligibility of projects funded under Title VII.

(m) Method of Analysis: The equipment list will be used to ascertain that Federal funds are expended only for initial equipment meeting the regulatory requirements.

(n) Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data Collection: "The term 'development cost', with respect to an academic facility, means the amount found by the Commissioner to be the cost, to the applicant for a grant or loan under this title, of the construction, reconstruction, or renovation involved * * * to permit its use for such facility." (Section 782(3)(A) of Title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

" 'Equipment' means manufactured items which have an extended useful life and are not consumed in use and which have an identity and function which are not lost through incorporation into a different or more complex unit or substance." (Paragraph 170.1, Part 170 of Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations).

" 'Initial equipment' means all items of equipment other than built-in equipment, which are necessary and appropriate for the initial functioning of a particular academic facility for its specific purpose. No equipment shall be considered as initial equipment unless it has been acquired or contracted for prior to the date on which the facility is first used for education of students." (Paragraph 170.1, Part 170 of Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations).

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: The information is used only by the Office of Education program. Thus, there is no dissemination of collected data.

(p) Estimate of the Total Person-Hours and Costs Required to Complete the Request: 225 person-hours for $3,375.

(q) Evidence of Any Urgent Need for Very Unusual Circumstances Requiring the Data: The equipment list is needed by the Office of Education program only in connection with closeouts of projects funded under Title VII.

(r) Copy of the Exact Data Instrument: Thomas F. McAnallen, Chief, Academic Facilities Branch, Division of Training and Facilities, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, Office of Education/DHEW, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communication with Respondent Populations: No contact has been made since only data required to meet regulatory and statutory requirements is to be collected.

(t) Assurance that Respondents Will Have Sufficient Lead Time to Comply with Request: The respondents have sufficient time since the information is required only once in connection with project closeouts.

(u) Specific Justification for a Multi-Year Approval: Several years may be involved from the time of a Title VII award until the completion of a project and the closeout. Accordingly, multi-year approval is required, especially in view of the fact that all Title VII awards are not made in the same year. This data collection instrument has been used, substantially in its existing form, since 1965 for all Title VII projects and will continue to be needed as long as there are Title VII projects which have not been completed and closed out.

Data Acitivity Plan Summary

(a) Title of the Proposed Activity: Certificate of Project Costs.

(b) Name of Sponsoring Agency/Bureau/Office: DHEW/OE/Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, Division of Training and Facilities/Academic Facilities Branch.

(c) Agency Form Number: OE Form 1143.

(d) Justification: 1. The purpose of the form is to gather information sufficient to determine the eligibility of costs incurred on projects funded under Title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. Before closing out projects and making final payments, the Office of Education program must ascertain that costs meet the statutory and regulatory requirements.

2. The form has been designed specifically for the program use to determine the eligibility of construction, reconstruction, or renovation costs of approved Title VII projects.

3. There are no similar data which can be used to meet the program requirements for verification of cost eligibility.

(e) Description of Survey Plan: 1. In connection with project closeouts, institutions are required to submit information relating to (1) the project number, (2) name and address of grantee, (3) project description, (4) the facilities cost, (5) reimbursable sales taxes, and (6) certification as to the correctness of the statements.

2. In the event an institution fails to respond, the full amount of the grant may not be earned, since the Office of Education may not be able to determine the eligibility of costs incurred.

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: N/A.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: There is no specific date of the data collection, since it is done only once in connection with the project closeout.

(h) Consultations Outside the Agency: 1. There was no need to consult with anyone outside the agency, since only the basic, minimum information required by statute and regulation is requested, in order that a determination of cost eligibility can be made.

2. All Title VII recipients maintain records of costs expended for the Federally-assisted projects.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of average person-hours
Colleges & Universities	400	1

1. Through years of experience in using the form and working with respondents, the Office of Education has estimated that the average person-hour for completing the form is one person-hour.

2. The estimate takes into consideration the time needed to gather and compile the data.

3. As a rule, the reporting burden will vary only because of the size of the project.

(j) Sensitive Questions: There are no sensitive questions. All information pertains strictly to costs which are used only by the Office of Education is calculating the extent of Federal participation.

(k) Estimate of Cost to Federal Government: $4,500.

(l) Detailed Justification of How Information Once Collected Will Be Used: The information will be used to determine the eligibility of project costs for Federal participation.

(m) Methods of Analysis: Only tabulations of cost data are to be reported.

(n) Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data Collection: "The term 'development cost,' * * * means the amount found by the Commissioner to be the cost, to the applicant for a grant or loan under this title, of the construction, reconstruction, or renovation involved." (Section 782(3)(A) of Title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended).

"No equipment shall be considered as initial equipment unless it has been acquired or contracted for prior to the date on which the facility is first used for education of students." (Section 170.1, Part 170 of Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations)

"For a project for which an application is filed for the first time under any program of the Act on or after July 1, 1972, the following shall be excluded from the eligible development cost: (1) Any cost for the acquisition of land which was incurred more than 2 years prior to the date an application is filed; (2) Any cost for the acquisition of an existing structure incurred more than 1 year prior to the date an application is filed; (3) Any cost for initial equipment incurred before the date an application is filed; or (4) Any cost for construction (including new construction, remodeling, rehabilitation, or conversion) or for built-in equipment where the contract has been entered into prior to the date an application is filed and prior to the concurrence of the Commissioner in the award of the contract." (Section 170.6(b), Part 170 of Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations)

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: The information is collected only once from the respondent. The information is used only by the Office of Education for project closeout procedures.

(p) Estimate of the Total Person-Hours and Costs Required To Complete the Request: 400 person-hours for $3,500.

(q) Evidence of Any Urgent Need or Very Unusual Circumstance Requiring the Data: There is no urgent need of specific time for the data since it is used only in connection with project closeouts.

(r) Copy of the Exact Data Instrument: Thomas F. McAnallen, Chief, Academic Facilities Branch, Division of Training and Facilities, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, U.S. Office of Education/DHEW, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communications With Respondent Populations: Continuous contact is made with respondents during the life of a project.

(t) Assurance That Respondents Will Have Sufficient Lead Time To Comply With Request: During contacts with the Office of Education during the life of the project, respondents become fully awar of the reporting requirements of the closeout of projects.

(u) Specific Justification for a Multi-Year Approval: The form has been used since the existence of the program, dating back to the 1960's. It will be continued to be required as long as Title VII projects remain to be closed. Accordingly, multi-year approval is essential.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of the proposed activity: Special Programs for the Disadvantaged: Financial Status and Performance Reports.

(b) Name of the sponsoring agency/bureau/office: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, Division of Student Services and Veterans Programs.

(c) Agency form number: OE 1231.

(d) Justification: The Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–329 as amended by Public Law 90–575) authorizes the awarding of grants "to assist in enabling youths from low-income families who have academic potential, but who may lack adequate secondary school preparation or who may be physically handicapped, to enter, continue, or resume a program of postsecondary education," including in part:

(1) Programs, to be known as "Talent Search" designed to: a. Identify qualified youths of financial or cultural need with an exceptional potential for postsecondary educational training and encourage them to complete secondary school and undertake postsecondary educational training.

b. Publicize existing forms of student financial aid, including aid furnished under Title IV.

c. Encourage secondary school or college dropouts of demonstrated aptitude to reenter educational programs, including postsecondary school programs.

(2) Programs to be known as "Special Services for Disadvantaged Students," of remedial and other special services for students with academic potential: a. Who are enrolled or accepted for enrollment at the institution which is the beneficiary of the grant or contract.

b. Who, by reason of deprived educational, cultural, or economic background, or physical handicap, are in need of such services to assist them to initiate, continue, or resume their postsecondary education.

c. Who, by reason of limited English-speaking ability, are in need of bilingual educational teaching, guidance, and counseling in order to enable them to pursue a postsecondary education.

Grants are awarded to institutions of higher education, including those with vocational and career education programs, combinations of such institutions, public and private agencies, and organizations (includng professional and scholarly associations), and, in exceptional cases, secondary schools and secondary vocational schools, to operate projects providing the services authorized as indicated above.

In order to assure accountability for Federal funds (currently $70.5 million) invested in these projects, data should be collected from each project relative to client eligibility and project activities. To assist the Talent Search and Special Services project staffs in program management, project monitoring, and responsiveness to Congressional, HEW, OE, and other reporting needs, the above data plus additional data on client characteristics are needed. Regulations for the Talent Search Program are found in 45 CFR 159, published May 24, 1977 and regulations for Special Services are found in 45 CFR 157, published May 24, 1977. In accordance with subpart I of OMB Circular A–110, Standard Form 269 is included in order to report on a project's financial status. There are no similar data already available in the subject field which could be used for these purposes.

(e) Description of survey plan: (1) Each Talent Search and Special Services project receiving a federally funded grant is required to submit a *Financial Status Report* and a *Performance Report* which must be signed and dated by the Project Director. In program year 1980–81 an estimated 160 Talent Search grants and 484 Special Services grants will be funded.

(2) Computer Sciences Corporation, our current data preparation contractor, is responsible for mailing report forms, logging in and editing reports, keypunching, and compiling data. CSC is aware of the impact of the Privacy Act of 1974 on the handling of OE data, and is in full compliance with it. Strict confidentiality is observed in the processing and filing of sensitive material, and reproduction of such material is performed according to Industrial Security Manual (ISM) standards in a locked room, with only those persons with appropriate clearance and need-to-know permitted. Requests for information, if any, are referred to OE.

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: (1) Separate computer generated reports for Talent Search and Special Services will be published in January.

(2) The reports will give data for each individual project and State and national summarys.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: (1) Report forms are sent to the project directors in May. Reports are due on a staggered basis depending on the ending date of the grant period. In accordance with the Education Division General Administrative Regulations the Talent Search and Special Services projects are required to submit the *Financial Status Report* and the *Performance Report* as follows:

Report	Form	Period covered	Due date	Projects required to report
Annual Performance	1231	Beginning to end of budget year just completed	30 days after end of budget period	Multiyear projects not in final year.
Financial Status		Beginning to end of budget year just completed	30 days after end of budget period	Multiyear projects not in final year.
Final Performance	1231	Beginning to end of budget year just completed	90 days after end of budget period	Multiyear projects in final year and single-year projects.
Financal Status		Cumulative for entire single or multiyear grant period.	90 days after end of budget period	Multiyear projects in final year and single year projects.

(2) The summary report is completed in January which is one month after the last reports are due.

(h) Consultations outside the agency: (1) Annual workshops are held for project directors at which time the completion of required forms is discussed. The Office of Education welcomes any suggestions that these persons may have. There have not been any problems on which agreement could not be reached.

(i) Estimation of respondent reporting burden: It is estimated that 160 Talent Search projects and 484 Special Services projects will be funded for program year 1980–81. Since these are discretionary grants that will not be funded until May, there is no accurate way to predict the respondent types. Therefore, an estimated breakdown by respondent type for program year 1980–81 is given below which uses percentage breakdowns that occurred in program year 1979–80.

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of average person-hours
Colleges and Universities	402	.5
Local education agencies	4	.5
Non-public junior colleges	12	.5
Nonprofit organizations	66	.5
Organizations other than schools or education agencies	4	.5
Public junior colleges	125	.5
State Institutions	3	.5
Vocational/technical/career postsecondary institutions	28	.5

Since the reports call for no data beyond that which good project management would require project directors to maintain, their completion is a simple matter of computing and recording totals. Average completion time is estimated to be one-half hour.

(j) Sensitive questions: Because no individual student data are collected, and no questions of a sensitive nature are asked, this section is not applicable to the report form.

(k) Estimate of cost to Federal Government: (1) It is estimated that the annual cost of this form is $20,200. This includes $18,200 for editing, coding, tabulating, and publishing of results and $2,000 for printing and mailing.

(l) Detailed justification of how information once collected will be used: *Program Management:* Information collected will be used in determining project compliance with eligibility criteria imposed by program legislation. The data will check compliance with the Special Services regulation to have the ethno/racial composition of the students served reflect within a maximum 10 percent variance the ethno/racial composition of the students eligible to be served. The data collected also serve as an effective measure of project accountability to Congress under Pub. L. 89–329, IV Section 417B.

General Purpose: Detailed summary information maintained in the Program office serves as a data base from which to prepare budget reports and to respond to program information requests from Congress, Office of Management and Budget, the Department, various other Bureau programs, and other sources. An example of an issue that the data illuminates is the number of clients served as compared with the number proposed to be served. The data highlight client retention and dropout prevention.

(m) Methods of analysis: Data are published by project and then summarized in a national total. Proposed methods of analysis include: correlations, test of significance, and analysis of variance.

(n) Legislative authority specifically requiring or allowing the data collection: Legislative authority comes from the General Education Provisions Act, Section 434(b)(3)(C) which states:

In the case of any application for assistance under any applicable program to which paragraph (1) does not apply and with respect to which the Commissioner determines that this section would simplify the administration of an applicable program, each such application shall be submitted to the Commissioner at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Commissioner shall prescribe by regulation and, as a precondition for approval, shall— . . .

(C) provide for making such reports as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions.

Administrative authority comes from Part 100a.720 of Education Division General Administrative Regulations which states:

(a) This section applies to the reports required under Subpart I (Financial reporting) and J (Performance reporting) or Part 74 of this title.

(b) A grantee shall submit these reports annually, unless the appropriate official of the Education Division allows less frequent reporting.

(o) Timetable for dissemination of collected data: Data should be available in January. Currently there is no dissemination other than in-house distribution of summary reports; however, the data are widely disseminated as needed in response to requests.

(p) Estimate of the total person-hours and costs required to complete the request: The estimated average person-hours per respondent is .5 hours. It is estimated that a total of 644 Talent Search and Special Services grants will be funded. The completion of the reports will require a total of 322 person-hours at a total cost of $4,000.

(q) Evidence of any urgent need or very unusual circumstance requiring the data: N/A.

(r) Copy of the exact data instrument: The report forms may be obtained from: Arnold H. Silver, Management Information Specialist, ISPSB/ Information Systems Section, Education Department, Room 3514, ROB–3, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief account of early involvement and communications with respondent populations: A "welcome aboard letter" is mailed to project directors at the beginning of the project year along with copies of the reports that are required to be filed at the end of the project year. The letter indicates the names and telephone numbers of individuals who can answer any questions. Each year workshops are held for project directors in which the report forms are thoroughly discussed.

(t) Assurance that respondents will have sufficient lead time to comply with request: Data is collected on a staggered basis depending on project expiration dates and will take place from May through December. Project directors are sent copies of the reports at the beginning of the project year and are notified when they will be due. Report forms are again sent to all project directors six weeks before they are due.

(u) Specific justification for a multi-year approval: The report forms have been used successfully in the past. Multi-year approval is justifiable as it would minimize the burden for the project directors to use the same forms throughout the grant.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of the proposed activity: Comprehensive Planning Grants Program and State Administration—Application.

(b) Name of the sponsoring agency/ bureau/office: U.S. Office of Education/ Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education/Division of Training and Facilities/Community Service and Continuing Education Branch.

(c) Agency form number: OE 1279.

(d) Justification: To make grants to State Postsecondary Education Commissions to conduct State-wide comprehensive planning, both public and private, to State education agencies so that all persons within the State who desire, and who can benefit from such planning may have an opportunity to do so.

To make State administrative funds available to HEFA Commissions to pay for the proper and efficient administration of State plans.

(e) Description of survey plan: Application data will be forwarded to both State Postsecondary Education HEFA Commissions in the United States which have been designated to conduct planning and carry out State plans.

(f) Tabulation and publication plans: The information in the application packages will be used in the evaluation of applications from the State agencies.

(g) Time schedule for data collection and publication: Application packages will be sent out in March; closing date for applications will be April 15, and awards for the Comprehensive Planning Program will be approved by June 30. There is no deadline date of award for State Administration grants.

(h) Consultations outside the agency: N/A.

(i) Estimation of respondent reporting burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of average person-hours
SEA	57	13

(j) Sensitive questions: N/A.

(k) Estimate of cost to Federal Government: N/A.

(l) Detailed justification of how information once collected will be used: Information will be used by the staff to evaluate the eligibility of applicants for grants. Each application (comprehensive planning) will be reviewed and evaluated on the basis of the data published in the **Federal Register** and in accordance with the requirements of the law.

(m) Methods of analysis: N/A.

(n) Legislative authority specifically requiring or allowing the data collection: Sec. 1203. (a). "The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to any State Commission established pursuant to section 1202(a) to enable it to expand the scope of the studies and planning required in title X through comprehensive inventories of, and studies with respect to, all public and private postsecondary educational resources in the State, * * *" (20 U.S.C. 1142b) Pub. L. 92–318.

(o) Timetable for dissemination of collected data: Awards will be made by June 30, 1980 for academic year 1980–81.

(p) Estimate of the total person-hours and costs required to complete the request: 741 total person-hours: Cost $13,338.

(q) Evidence of any urgent need or very unusual circumstance requiring the data: N/A.

(r) Copy of the exact data instrument: May be obtained from Charles I. Griffith, Chief, Community Service and Continuing Education Branch, Room 3717, ROB–3, Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief account of early involvement and communications with respondent populations: The Comprehensive Planning Program has been in operation for six years, and the State Administration Program since 1964. Staff and State agency personnel are in constant contact with each other as the need arises. Technical assistance and site visits to monitor programs are also performed.

(t) Assurance that respondents will have sufficient lead time to comply with request: Respondents will have 45 days after receiving application package to meet the closing date for submission of their applications.

(u) Specific justification for a multiyear approval: N/A.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of the proposed activity: Financial Status and Performance Report for Community Service and Continuing Education Programs, Title IA, HEA (State Grant Program at designated State Agency).

(b) Name of sponsoring agency/bureau/office: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, Community Service and Continuing Education Branch.

(c) Agency Form number: OE 3092.

(d) Justification: Pub. L. 89–329, Section 105(a); 20 U.S.C. 1005: (1) Funds will be expended solely for community service and continuing education programs including resource materials sharing programs (Sec. 105(a)(2), HEA).

(2) Funds will be used not to supplant State and local funds or funds of institutions of higher education, but to supplement and increase the amounts of such funds (Sec. 105(a)(4), HEA).

(3) There will be fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State (Sec. 105(a)(5), HEA).

(4) It is required that each State submit a report on the use of Federal funds in that State under any applicable program for which the State is responsible for administration (Sec. 437(a) of Pub. L. 93–380, General Education Provisions Act).

(e) Description of survey plan: Not applicable.

(f) Tabulation and publication plans: Not applicable.

(g) Time schedule for data collection and publication: December 31 each year.

(h) Consultations outside the agency: None.

(i) Estimation of respondent reporting burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of average person-hours
Postsecondary Education Commissions or Universities	[1] 55	[2] 16

[1] One per State.
[2] Per State.

(j) Sensitive questions: None.

(k) Estimate of cost to Federal Government: $2,750.

(l) Detailed justification of how information once collected will be used: Program management; determining the use of funds, assuring compliance with the legislation requirements for matching funds, supplementing rather than supplanting of funds, and assessment of new, expanded or improved community service and continuing education programs, including resource sharing programs.

(m) Methods of analysis: Not applicable.

(n) Legislative authority specifically requiring or allowing the data collection: "* * * Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as not to supplant State or local funds, * * * but to supplement and, to the extent practicable, to increase the amount of such funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available * * *" Sec. 105(a)(4), Pub. L. 89–329.

"* * * Such Fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State * * * under this title." Sec 105(a)(5).

"* * * funds paid to the State * * * will be expended solely for community service programs and continuing education programs * * *" Sec. 105(a)(2), Pub. L. 89–329, (20 U.S.C. 1005).

"* * * The Commissioner shall require that each State submit to him * * * a report on the uses of Federal funds in that State under any applicable program * * *" Sec. 437(a), Pub. L. 93–380.

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of collected data: Section 437(b) of the General Education Provision Act, Pub. L. 93–380 as amended (88 Stat. 571) states "* * * On or before March 31 of each year, the Commissioner shall submit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives an analysis of these reports and a compilation of data derived * * *" Section 422(b) of GEPA also states that "* * * The Commissioner's report shall be submitted to the Congress no later than June 30 of each calendar year * * *" Data is made available to the States and others at that time.

(p) Estimate of the total person-hours and costs required to complete the request: 880 Person-hours total.

Estimated $500 per State for an overall total of $27,500 nationwide for 55 States and Territories.

(q) Evidence of any urgent need or very unusual circumstance requiring the data: None.

(r) Copy of the exact data instrument: Form may be obtained from: John D. Adams, CSCE Branch, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief account of early involvement and communications with respondent populations: Telephone contacts, and personal conversations with CSCE State Program Administrators plus mailout of form including instructions no less than thirty days prior to the end of the fiscal year.

(t) Assurance that respondents will have sufficient lead time to comply with request: Discussions with each State Agency has prepared them for planning and completing their financial information, statistical data and evaluation of operations. This report is due 90 days after the end of the fiscal year as required by statute, or December 31 of each calendar year.

(u) Specific justification for a multi-year approval: Due to the routine nature of the form and its data, the consistency of the request, and the successful use of the form in the past coupled with the law requiring the information, a multi-year approval should be made. Such a standardization indicates to the State agencies what information to collect in advance and leads to a much better relationship due to familiarity with the data collection form.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of proposed activity: Terminal Report for Holders of Foreign Language and Area Studies Graduate Fellowships.

(b) Agency bureau office: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, International Studies Branch, Centers and Fellowships Section.

(c) Agency form number: OE Form 7614.

(d) Justification: The Followship recipients are to submit the Student Terminal Reports about 3 months after the end of their awards under Title VI Section 601(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended (20 U.S.C. 511). Additional monies or other benefits may be withheld under this program unless this report is completed and filed as required by existing regulations (45 C.F.R. 146.40). Program staff use the information in the Report as an indicator of progress and achievements of awardees and as a means of program evaluation.

(e) Description of survey plan: N/A.

(f) Tabulation and publication plans: N/A.

(g) Time schedule for data collection and publication: N/A.

(h) Consultations outside the agency: None.

(i) Estimation of respondent reporting burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of average person-hours
Students in post-secondary education	1,000	½ hour.

(j) Sensitive questions: N/A.

(k) Estimate of cost to Federal Government: N/A.

(l) Detailed information on how information once collected will be used: Collected information will be used for Program Management: compliance review, assessment of program effectiveness.

Evaluation: determine the number of students who received instruction of the appropriate foreign language(s) and the number of students in priority languages and disciplines as published in the **Federal Register**; identify the number of students by MA or Ph.D degree with their career and employment plans; and review such data with the information requested by the original student application.

(m) Methods of analysis: N/A.

(n) Legislative authority specifically requiring or allowing the data collection: This information is required from all fellowship applicants under Title VI, Section 601(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended, in order to assure that recipients will be available upon completion of their training for teaching or other service of a public nature. No fellowship will be awarded unless the application is completed and filed according to the law and regulations (20 U.S.C. 511).

(o) Timetable for dissemination of collected data: Collected data used to review program compliance and when appropriate relevant findings may be communicated by phone or letter in 11/80.

(p) Estimate of the total person hours and costs required to complete the request: 500 total Person-Hours; COSTS—none.

(q) Evidence of any urgent need or very unusual circumstance requiring the data: N/A.

(r) Copy of the exact data instrument: Copies of the data instrument may be obtained form Richard Thompson, Division of International Education, Room 3923, ROB3, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Brief account of early involvement and communications with respondent populations: None.

(t) Assurance that respondents will have sufficient time to comply with request: The Report forms are sent in March or April to the institution and they in turn distribute them to the respondents. Responses are to be completed and returned by September.

(u) Specific justification for multiyear approval: N/A.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of the Proposed Activity: Foreign Languages and Area Studies Fellowships Institutional List of Principal/Alternate Candidates.

(b) Name of the sponsoring Agency/Bureau/Office: U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, Division of International Education.

(c) Agency Form Number: OE 7632.

(d) Justification: This is necessary to comply with the selection process as put forth in the rules and regulations (45 CFR 146.36). This form lists fellowship nominees in ranked order together with the nominees' language of award and major discipline. It is filled out by the fellowships office of the institution and is used by the staff of DIE to award fellowships as well as monitor the results of the awards at the end of the academic year.

(e) Description of Survey Plan: NA

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plans: (See Section M).

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: The institutional list and individual student applications are sent out to participating schools in April and they are returned to us by August in order to be informed of the approved list of eligibles before the beginning of the academic year.

(h) Consultations Outside the Agency: None.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of average person-hours
Financial Aid Officers at Colleges & Universities	100 (est)	1

(j) Sensitive Questions: NA.

(k) Estimate of Cost to Federal Government: NA.

(l) Detailed Justification of How Information Once Collected Will Be Used Program Management—Data will be used to determine grant eligibility and at the end of the academic year will be compiled for assessment of program effectiveness.

Evaluation—The primary objective of the final evaluation of the data is to determine which languages and academic disciplines are receiving what portion of Federal funds.

General Purpose—This data is for use by the staff of DIE to monitor program effectiveness. An assessment will be made as to the success of the Fellowships program in meeting the needs of the less commonly taught languages as set forth in the regulations.

(m) Methods of Analysis: Upon completion of the final evaluation descriptive data will be tabulated and knowledge gained is used to determine the extent to which fellowships have been awarded in priority disciplines and languages, in accordance with the rules and regulations (45 CFR 146.36).

(n) Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data Collection: "The Commissioner shall select fellows and alternates from nominees submitted by institutions receiving quotas of fellowships for particular world areas. The Commissioner shall select, and the institutions shall nominate fellows and alternates on the basis of * * * whether the applicant will major in an area of the world listed in 146.33 (a); * * * Whether the applicant's study program includes those disciplines listed in 146.33 (a) for the language and area to be studied." (Sec. 146.36 (b), (2), (3), Modern Foreign Language and Area Studies, Federal Register, vol. 42, No. 99, Monday May 23, 1977). "The Secretary shall advise and consult with * * * educational programs with a view to securing full information concerning all specialized scholarships, fellowship, and programs * * * which will strengthen the educational programs and objectives of the institutions of higher education utilized for such purposes by any department or agency." Sec. 1001 (c) Title X of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: List of eligibles sent to institutions before the beginning of the academic year.

(p) Estimate of the total Person-Hours and Costs Required to Complete the Request: 100 man hours, $800.00.

(q) Evidence of any Urgent Need or Very Unusual Circumstance Requiring the Data: Information needs to be collected by June in order to make awards by August.

(r) Copy of the Exact Data Instrument: Office of Education, Division of International Education, Centers Section, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C.

(s) Brief Account of Early Involvement and Communications With Respondent Populations: None.

(t) Assurance That Respondents Will Have Sufficient Lead Time to Comply With Request: April–August (see item g).

(u) Specific Justification for a Multi-Year Approval: This is considered a routine administrative form necessary to the Division of International Education in successfully completing the awards process of the Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships according to the rules and regulations of the aforementioned program. Since the data collected from this form is required by the rules and regulations we request that a multi-year approval be granted.

Data Activity Plan Summary

(a) Title of Proposed Activity: Application for Discretionary Grants under the Gifted and Talented Children's Education Program.

(b) Agency/Bureau/Office: U.S. Office of Education/Office for the Gifted and Talented.

(c) Agency Form Number: OE Form 9048

(d) Justification: (1) Public Law 95–561, Part A, Title IX, Section 905, authorized the Commissioner of Education to establish discretionary grant and contract programs for professional development, model projects, information dissemination, statewide educational activities, and research. Only professional development, statewide educational activities and model projects proposals are solicited under this application. OE Form 9048 is the approved instrument for the funding and support of programs established under the authority of Pub. L. 95–561, Part A, Title IX, section 905.

(2) The application package for the discretionary program covered by OE Form 9048 provides instruction and information necessary to submit a request for Federal assistance. The information submitted by potential grantees will be used by the Federal government (OGT) to determine grant eligibility, technical acceptability of applications, and/or amount of grant award. The technical acceptability of proposals is determined through a set of selection criteria addressing various aspects of the application proposals such as plan of operation, quality of key personnel, budget and cost effectiveness, evaluation plan, adequacy of resources, level and quality of program, selection of participants, specially trained personnel, mentors or advisors, replication, dissemination, and needs assessment. Procedures for the review of applications and a description of the grant award process may be found in the Education Division General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR).

(3) The submission of the OE Form 9048 package is the only method through which the above cited discretionary activities may be established; similar information/data are not available in any other form or from any other source.

(4) The submission of an application (proposal) containing an appropriate project description and budget is the only means by which the OGT can evaluate an applicant's intent, objectives, and proposed activities in submitting a proposal for support. Proposals must be prepared in sufficient detail to permit the OGT to make an accurate and objective determination of the quality and feasibility of the proposed effort. Such a requirement must necessitate a respondent burden in excess of the 0.5 hours generally accepted as the limit for reporting requirements.

(e) Description of Survey Plan: Not Applicable.

(f) Tabulation and Publication Plan: Not Applicable.

(g) Time Schedule for Data Collection and Publication: Not Applicable.

(h) Consultations Outside Agency: None.

(i) Estimation of Respondent Reporting Burden:

Respondent type	Number	Estimate of Average Person-hours
Local Education Agencies	100	37
State Education Agencies	30	37
Colleges and Universities	75	37
Non-profit Organizations	15	37
Other (Museums, orchestras, etc.)	5	37

(j) Sensitive Questions: There are no questions or requirements of a sensitive nature contained in the application form.

(k) Estimate of Cost to Federal Government: Not Applicable.

(l) Justification of How Information Once Collected Will be Used: The information submitted by applicants will be used by the OGT to determine grant eligibility, technical acceptability of applications and/or amount of grant award. (Additional justification may be found in part (d)).

(m) Method of Analysis: Not Applicable.

(n) Legislative Authority Specifically Requiring or Allowing the Data Collection: (1) "The Commissioner may make grants to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public and private agencies and organizations to assist them in establishing or maintaining programs or projects designed to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented children including the training of personnel in educating gifted and talented children or in supervising such personnel." (Pub. L. 95-561, Part A, Title IX, section 905(1); 20 USC 3315; 45 CFR 195.53)

(2) "The Commissioner may enter into contracts with, and make grants to public agencies and private organizations including State and local educational agencies, to establish and operate model projects for the identification and education of gifted and talented children." (Pub. L. 95-561, Part A, Title IX, section 905 (3); 20 USC 3315; 45 CFR 195.52)

(3) "The Commissioner may make grants to State educational agencies to assist them in the statewide planning, development, operation, and improvement of programs and projects designed to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented children." (Pub. L. 95-561, Part A, Title IX, section 905.5; 20 USC 3315; 45 CFR 195.51)

(o) Timetable for Dissemination of Collected Data: Applicants will be notified by mail of grant award decisions within six months of the closing date for each grant activity identified in part (d).

(p) Estimate of Total Person-Hours and Costs Required to Complete the Request: Total Person-Hours, 8,325; Cost, $81,169.

(q) Evidence of Any Urgent Need: Not Applicable.

(r) Copy of the Exact Data Instrument: A copy of the exact data instrument may be obtained from: Melvin R. Ladson, Jr., Deputy Director, Office for the Gifted and Talented, Donohoe Building, Room 3831, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

(s) Involvement and Communications with Respondent Population: This revision to OE Form 9048 is required by the promulgation of the new EDGAR. The proposed regulations were published on June 25, 1979; public meetings were held in each of the ten HEW regional office cities on August 1, 1979, and written comments were received to August 24, 1979. In general, EDGAR required a modification to the program narrative section of the application form, which in turn necessitated restructuring of the selection criteria used to determine the technical acceptability of proposals (applications).

(t) Assurance That Respondents Will Have Sufficient Lead Time to Comply With Request: The closing date for the preparation and transmittal of applications in response to the program covered by OE Form 9048 is published in the **Federal Register** prior to the start of the fiscal year in which applications are actually processed. Application packages are distributed to interested parties approximately 60 days prior to the published closing date.

(u) Justification for Multi-Year Approval: Multi-year approval is requested for OE Form 9048. This application form has been developed to ensure clarity and readability, and to eliminate unnecessary and burdensome requirements. As noted in part (s), the current submission responds to requirements of EDGAR, and once these changes are made, there should be no need to modify the application form in the near future. The form is required on an annual basis to fulfill legislative mandates and, therefore, should be considered a routine program management form justifying multi-year approval by FEDAC.

[FR Doc. 80-4594 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4110-89-M

National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, Subcommittee on Environmental Health Statistics; Meeting

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Act (Pub. L. 92-463) notice is hereby given that the Subcommittee on Environmental Health Statistics of the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, pursuant to functions established by Section 306 (K), Paragraph (4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242K) will convene on Friday, February 29, 1980 at 9:00 a.m., in Room 1137 of the HEW North Building, 330 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20201.

Principal consideration and discussion will be devoted to issues which grew out of the last meeting of the full committee; the development and implementation of the environmental studies required by Pub. L. 95-623; the coordination of environmental, epidemiologic and other related health studies; and the statistical validity and reliability of statistics and studies related to the effects of the environment on health.

Further information regarding this meeting of the subcommittee or other matters pertaining to the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics may be obtained by contacting Samuel P. Korper, Ph.D, M.P.H., Executive Secretary, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, Room 17A-31, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20857.

Dated: February 7, 1980.

Wayne C. Richey, Jr.,

Associate Director for Program Support, Office of Health Research, Statistics, and Technology.

[FR Doc. 80-4591 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4110-85-M

Office of Education

Commission on the Review of the Federal Impact Aid Program; Hearing, Correction

AGENCY: Commission on the Review of the Federal Impact Aid Program.

ACTION: Notice of hearing; location correction.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Commission on the Review of the Federal Impact Aid Program has recently published notice in 45 FR 6838-39 of its intention to hold a hearing in Chicago, Illinois on March 7, 1980. This notice announces that the hearing location has been changed and will be held at the Galaxy Ballroom, O'Hare Hilton Hotel, O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois 60666.

DATE: March 7, 1980. The Commission will meet at 9:30 a.m. and continue until 4:30.

ADDRESS: Galaxy Ballroom, O'Hare Hilton Hotel, O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois 60666.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard Dallas Smith, Executive Director, Commission on the Review of the Federal Impact Aid Program, 1832 M Street, N.W., Suite 837, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Signed at Washington, D.C. on the 6th day of February, 1980.

Richard Dallas Smith,

Executive Director, Commission on the Review of the Federal Impact Aid Program.

[FR Doc. 80-4662 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4110-02-M

Education Appeal Board; Summaries of Final Decisions

AGENCY: Office of Education, HEW.

ACTION: Summaries of Final Decisions of the Education Appeal Board.

SUMMARY: This notice contains summaries of the three decisions of the Education Appeal Board which were adopted as the final decisions of the Office of Education, HEW, between June 29, 1979, and January 4, 1980.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. David S. Pollen, Chairman, Education Appeal Board, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 2141, FOB-6) Washington, D.C. 20202. Telephone (202) 245-7835.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 29, 1979, the Education Appeal Board succeeded the Title I Audit Hearing Board in the Office of Education, HEW, under interim final regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 25, 1979 (44 FR 30528). For more information concerning the Education Appeal Board and its procedures, see the interim final regulations or contact the person named above.

A notice summarizing the fourteen decisions of the Title I Audit Hearing Board that were adopted as final decisions of the Office of Education before June 29, 1979, was published in the **Federal Register** on December 27, 1979 (44 FR 76592). This notice summarizes the three decisions of the Education Appeal Board that were adopted as the final decisions of the Office of Education between June 29, 1979, and January 4, 1980. Summaries of the Board's decisions will be published on a semi-annual basis, beginning with this notice, in order to keep the public informed as to the Board's activities.

The summaries are prepared as a convenience to the public and are intended only to highlight the holdings of the Education Appeal Board. The summaries are not official parts of the decisions and should not be relied upon as guidance from the Office of Education or legal precedent. Copies of the full decisions of the Education Appeal Board are available at the address given above on request and with payment of the costs of reproduction.

SUMMARY OF FINAL DECISION: *Appeal of the State of New Mexico,* Docket No. 5-(20)-76, August 17, 1979.

New Mexico appealed final audit determinations, made by the Deputy Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, that local education agencies within the State had misspent Federal funds in migrant programs conducted under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. After the application of the statute of limitations and the Hearing Board's dismissal of two items on the motion of the Deputy Commission, the amount in dispute was reduced to $98,124.00.

Before reaching the merits of the final audit determinations, the Hearing Panel ruled that the Commissioner of Education was authorized to seek the recovery of the Title I funds that the Commissioner determined had been misspent. The Hearing Panel also ruled that it was bound to enforce all applicable laws and regulations.

The Hearing Panel noted that for each audit determination, the controversy revolved around whether the State and local education agencies kept adequate records to document the use of Title I migrant funds. The Hearing Panel upheld two of the Deputy Commissioner's three audit determinations, finding that data submitted by the State did not prove that four local education agencies used Title I migrant funds solely to provide services to eligible migrant children, or that an area director who received approximately one-half of his salary from Title I migrant funds spent time in migrant education work.

However, the Hearing Panel found that bilingual instructional aides who provided assistance to teachers who were not bilingual were there to assist in the local education agency's migrant program. The Panel found that whatever benefits may have fallen to nonmigrant children were incidental, and ruled that the State did not have to refund the Title I migrant funds used to pay the instructional aides.

On May 25, 1979, the Hearing Panel issued a decision requiring New Mexico to refund $93,020 to the U.S. Office of Education. On August 17, 1979, the Panel's decision was adopted as the final decision of the U.S. Office of Education.

SUMMARY OF FINAL DECISION: *Appeal of the State of Illinois,* Docket No. 3-(18)-76, August 29, 1979.

Illinois appealed a final audit determination, made by the Deputy Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, that a local education agency had improperly used Federal funds under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to pay salaries.

The Hearing Panel found that the payroll vouchers of the local education agency showed that ten school community representatives under a school community identification program at nine schools were paid with Title I funds. The Panel noted that the State had introduced no documentary evidence to show that any subsequent correction or adjustment was made so that the salaries were paid from local funds. The Panel further found that three of the nine schools did not appear on the list of schools eligible to receive Title I services, and that none of the schools were listed among the schools for which the State had approved the payment of school community representatives from Title I funds.

On June 26, 1979, the Hearing Panel issued a decision requiring Illinois to refund $30,495.75 to the U.S. Office of Education, noting that by operation of the statute of limitations and corrections in the record, the amount in dispute had been reduced. On August 29, 1979, the Panel's decision was adopted as the final decision of the Office of Education.

SUMMARY OF FINAL DECISION: *Appeal of the State of Wisconsin,* Docket No. 8-(23)-76, December 4, 1979.

Wisconsin appealed final audit determinations, made by the Deputy Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, that four local education agencies in the State had misspent $3,319,989 in Federal funds under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The amount in dispute was subsequently reduced through the application of the statute of limitations and the Hearing's Panel dismissal, on the motion of the Deputy Commissioner, of a portion of the appeal.

The Hearing Panel sustained the Deputy Commissioner's position with regard to five of seven disputed expenditures. The Panel found that a local education agency's use of Title I funds to support 15 summer school projects serving 23 elementary schools participating in Title I programs, while using local funds to operate 15 summer school projects for 98 elementary schools that were not Title I participating schools, violated the requirement that Title I funds be used to supplement, not supplant, State and local funds. The Panel concluded that neither Title I-funded field trips nor an environmental education mobile laboratory available to all children in certain grades were tailored to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children, because the benefits of the projects were not shown to be concentrated on the Title I eligible children. Where the salaries of an educational media specialist and a fiscal officer were prorated between Title I and local funds, and neither individual kept contemporaneous records of his activities, the Panel found that the State had not carried its burden of proving that the individuals spent an appropriate amount of time on unique Title I activities.

The Panel ruled in favor of the State on the two remaining audit determinations. First, the Panel found that diagnostic special educational services operated by a local education agency on a referral basis for preschool and elementary school children with special learning problems was tailored to meet the needs of Title I children. Since the local education agency had made a good faith planning effort and served all the Title I eligible children who needed the service, the Panel found that referrals of ineligible children did not dilute the effectiveness of the program.

Second, the Panel found that even though a local education agency's project application indicated that Title I funds would be used to pay portions of the salaries of 13 teachers who provided Title I remedial reading services on a part-time basis, and 12 of the teachers named spent no time on the remedial reading project, the State had proved that the promised teacher time was in fact provided to the intended children through some contemporaneous records and other detailed information.

On September 26, 1979, the Hearing Panel issued a decision requiring Wisconsin to refund $157,490 to the U.S. Office of Education. On December 4, 1979, the Panel's decision was adopted as the final decision of the Office of Education.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number not applicable)

Dated: February 2, 1980.

William L. Smith,

Commissioner of Education.

[FR Doc. 80-4593 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4110-02-M

Applications for Review Accepted for Hearing by the Education Appeal Board

AGENCY: Office of Education, HEW.

ACTION: Notice of applications for review accepted for hearing by the Education Appeal Board.

SUMMARY: This notice lists applications for review that were received and accepted for hearing by the Education Appeal Board between May 1, 1979, and January 4, 1980.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 13, 1980.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. David S. Pollen, Chairman, Education Appeal Board, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 2141, FOB-6), Washington, D.C. 20202. Telephone (202) 245-7835.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 25, 1979, interim final regulations published in the **Federal Register** established the Education Appeal Board as the successor to the Title I Audit Hearing Board in the Office of Education, HEW (44 FR 30528).

For information concerning the Education Appeal Board and its procedures, see the interim final regulations. For a list of appeals accepted for review by the Title I Audit Hearing Board before May 1, 1979, over which the Education Appeal Board assumed jurisdiction, see the notice of jurisdiction published in the **Federal Register** on July 26, 1979 (44 FR 43807).

This notice lists the applications for review that were received and accepted by the Education Appeal Board for hearing between May 1, 1979, and January 4, 1980. Three applications for review involved Federal audits of programs conducted under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended:

(1) *Appeal of the State of Oregon,* Docket No. 5-(51)-79, Audit Control No. 10-70003. The State appealed a final audit determination involving a teacher training project at Eastern Oregon State College that had been funded as a Title I migrant project. The amount in dispute is $148,555.00 for fiscal years 1977 and 1978.

(2) *Appeal of the State of Indiana,* Docket No. 7-(53)-79, Audit Control No. 05-80002. The State appealed final audit determinations regarding State and local administration of Title I migrant programs for the period July 1, 1972, to August 31, 1975. The amount in dispute is $240,493.00.

(3) *Appeal of the District of Columbia,* Docket No. 1-(56)-80, Audit Control No. 03-90000. The District of Columbia appealed final audit determinations regarding its procedures for controlling Title I grant expenditures for the period July 1, 1973, through September 30, 1977. The amount in dispute is $585,733.79.

One application for review involved a Federal audit of programs conducted under Title VI, Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act:

(1) *Appeal of the State of Nebraska,* Docket No. 4-(40)-78, Audit Control No. 07-70002. The State appealed audit determinations regarding the planning activities of 31 needs assessment projects during fiscal years 1973 and 1974. The amount in dispute is $94,274.00.

Two applications for review involved Federal audits of programs conducted under the Elementary and Secondary Education, Vocational Education, and other Acts.

(1) *Appeal of the State of Nevada,* Docket No. 6-(52)-79, Audit Control No. 80102-09. The State appealed final audit determinations regarding its financial reporting system for the period July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1976. The amount in dispute is $746,010.00.

(2) *Appeal of the State of California,* Docket No. 8-(54)-79, Audit Control No. 09-60451. The State appealed audit determinations regarding its procedures for charging to Federal grants and contracts the personal services costs of staff assigned to teams having multiprogram responsibilities. The amount in dispute is $967,128.00.

Section 100e.43 of the interim final regulations establishing the Education Appeal Board provides that an interested person, group, or agency may, upon application to the Board Chairperson, intervene in appeals before the Education Appeal Board.

The application must indicate to the satisfaction of the Board Chairperson or, as appropriate, the Panel Chairperson, that the intervenor has an interest in and information relevant to the specific issues raised in the appeals. If an application to intervene is approved, the intervenor becomes a party to the proceedings.

All such applications or questions should be addressed to Dr. David S. Pollen, Chairman, Education Appeal Board, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Room 2141, FOB-6), Washington, D.C. 20202, telephone (202) 245-7835.

(20 U.S.C. 1234)

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number not applicable)

Dated: February 1, 1980.

William L. Smith,

Commissioner of Education.

[FR Doc. 80-4592 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4110-02-M

National Advisory Council on Adult Education, Program Effectiveness and Evaluation Committee; Change of Meeting Dates

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. 92-463, sec. 10(a)(2), notice is hereby given that the Program Effectiveness and Evaluation Committee of the National Advisory Council on Adult Education will meet on March 6-7, 1980, rather than March 5-6, 1980, which was announced in the **Federal Register** of Tuesday, January 22, 1979, page 4472.

All other meeting arrangements will remain as announced January 22, 1980.