

and lower but about equal at Mayport and Pascagoula.

Considering all components of the physical, biological, and socioeconomic environment, potential impacts would be less at Mayport or Pascagoula than at Norfolk.

Mitigation

A detailed Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Protection/Mitigation Plan is presented in the FEIS. The plan includes the same type of mitigation and monitoring efforts that were used successfully during the shock trial of USS JOHN PAUL JONES in 1994 off the coast the southern California where marine mammal population densities are significantly greater than at the Mayport, Norfolk, or Pascagoula test areas. No deaths or injuries of marine mammals were detected during the USS JOHN PAUL JONES shock trial. The mitigation plan for the shock trial would avoid impacts and minimize risk to marine mammals and sea turtles in three ways:

Site selection. Initial, general site selection would be based on operational requirements and surveys. Within the test area selected for the shock trial, aerial surveys would be conducted and satellite imagery would be analyzed to select a small test site having low densities of marine mammals and turtles.

Pre-detonation monitoring. Prior to each detonation, aerial and shipboard observers would search for marine mammals and turtles at the selected test site. Passive acoustic surveys would also be used to detect marine mammal calls. If any marine mammal or sea turtle were detected within the Safety Range (a 2 nm radius around the detonation point), testing would be postponed. Testing would also be postponed if large.

Sargassum rafts, debris lines, or jellyfish concentrations (indicators that turtles may be present) were detected in the Safety Range, or if flocks of seabirds or large fish schools were detected within 1 nm of the detonation point. Postponement would also occur in certain circumstances when a marine mammal or turtle is detected in a Buffer Zone extending from 2 to 3 nm from the detonation point. Detonation would not occur until monitoring indicated that the Safety Range is clear of detectable marine mammals, sea turtles, large *Sargassum* rafts and debris lines, and large concentrations of jellyfish.

Post-detonation monitoring. After the explosion, aerial and shipboard observers would survey the test site. A Marine Animal Recovery Team led by a marine mammal veterinarian would

document and attempt to recover any dead animals and monitor any animals that appear to be injured. If the survey showed that marine mammals or turtles were killed or injured or if any marine mammals or turtles are detected in the Safety Range immediately following a detonation, testing would be halted until procedures for subsequent detonations could be reviewed and changed as necessary. Communications with stranding network personnel would be maintained throughout the shock trial period.

Coordination and Consultation with the NMFS

Because the NMFS has jurisdiction by law with respect to issues related to endangered species and marine mammals, the NMFS acted as a cooperating agency on the EIS. In addition to a review and comment role, the NMFS had two regulatory roles relative to the proposed shock trial. First, the NMF is responsible for administering the Endangered Species Act as it applies to listed sea turtles and marine mammals. The DEIS served as the Biological Assessment which the Navy submitted to the NMFS, requesting formal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), (16 USC 1531 *et seq.*). The NMFS subsequently issued a Biological Opinion, dated October 10, 2000, which completed the consultation process under ESA. The NMFS also has a regulatory role under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) (16 USC 1361 *et seq.*) When the DEIS was published, the Navy submitted a separate application to the NMFS for an "incidental take authorization" under section 101(a)(5)(A) of the MMPA. The NMFS published a Proposed Rule in the **Federal Register** on December 12, 2000 (65 FR 77546). The Proposed Rule specified mitigation, monitoring, and reporting requirements for the shock trial. A Final Rule must be issued by NMFS before the shock trial can proceed.

Comments Received on the FEIS

After the FEIS was distributed to the public for a 30-day review period ending on March 26, 2001, the Navy received one comment letter. Environmental Protection Agency commented that with properly executed mitigation as discussed in the EIS, that Mayport represents the best compromise among the three testing locations.

Conclusion

Shock testing the WINSTON S. CHURCHILL in an area offshore of Mayport, Florida is the alternative that

best meets the project purpose and need, satisfies operational criteria, and minimizes environmental impacts. Potentially significant direct impacts resulting from the test include mortality, injury, and acoustic harassment of marine mammals and sea turtles. While numbers have been calculated to define the potential lethal, injurious, and harassment take that might occur, it is expected that the mitigation and monitoring program will minimize the risk to marine mammals and sea turtles.

The "No Action" alternative would avoid all environmental impacts of a shock trial and is the environmentally preferred alternative. It does not, however, support the development of the best assessment of the survivability characteristics of the ship.

Dated: April 27, 2001.

Paul A. Schneider,

Assistant Secretary of the Navy, (Research, Development and Acquisition) (Acting).

[FR Doc. 01-11270 Filed 5-3-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.

SUMMARY: The Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before July 3, 2001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision,

extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment.

The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Dated: April 30, 2001.

John Tressler,

Leader, Regulatory Information Management, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Type of Review: Revision.

Title: Field Test Activities and the 2003–2004 Full-Scale Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS): Local Educational Agency (LEA), Principal, School, Teacher, Library.

Frequency: 2 series of field tests and the full-scale SASS.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit; Not-for-profit institutions; State, Local, or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 2,764.

Burden Hours: 2,232.

Abstract: The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) will use the field test to assess data collection procedures that are planned for the next full-scale SASS in 2003–2004. Policymakers, researchers and practitioners at the national, state and local levels use SASS data which are representative at the national and state levels. Respondents include public and private school principals, teachers and school and LEA staff persons.

Requests for copies of the proposed information collection request may be accessed from <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, or should be addressed to Vivian Reese, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Room 4050, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202–4651. Requests may also be electronically mailed to the internet address OCIO_IMG_Issues@ed.gov or

faxed to 202–708–9346. Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request. Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be directed to Kathy Axt at her internet address Kathy.Axt@ed.gov. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339.

[FR Doc. 01–11203 Filed 5–3–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–U

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests.

SUMMARY: The Leader, Regulatory Information Management, Office of the Chief Information Officer, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: An emergency review has been requested in accordance with the Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 3507(j)), since public harm is reasonably likely to result if normal clearance procedures are followed. Approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has been requested by May 7, 2001. A regular clearance process is also beginning. Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before July 3, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Written comments regarding the emergency review should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Lauren Wittenberg, Desk Officer: Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, N.W., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503 or should be electronically mailed to the internet address Lauren_Wittenberg@omb.eop.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Director of OMB provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection,

violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Leader, Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests at the beginning of the Departmental review of the information collection. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g., new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. ED invites public comment. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Dated: April 30, 2001.

John Tressler,

Leader, Regulatory Information Management, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Type of Review: New.

Title: School Renovation, IDEA, and Technology Grant Application.

Abstract: ED will use the information collected through this application to award grants to approximately 52 State educational agencies that will conduct competitive grant processes to award subgrants to eligible local educational agencies (LEAs). The information will also be used to describe to the Congress and the public how these grants are being used.

Additional Information: The Department of Education is requesting emergency clearance from OMB for the School Renovation, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and Technology Grant Application due to an unanticipated event and possibly causing public harm. Since the passage of the FY 2001 Appropriations Act with this program's enactment, the Department has been meeting with interested groups and with contact persons in the States to determine how