

occurring at the facilities involved. To that extent these impacts would be generally positive. Since no new facilities need to be constructed and no facilities will be closed as a result of the proposed action there would be very little chance of any negative socioeconomic impacts occurring. Likewise, no significant cultural resources impacts would be expected. (See pp. 20, 26, 35).

(7) Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts would be very unlikely because of the modest intensity of all activities involved in the Breacher life cycle and the dispersed nature of those activities. Coupled with their low intensity and widespread nature, the lack of general environmental compliance problems at any of the facilities involved in the Breacher life cycle reinforces this conclusion. (See pp. 23, 27, 36, 39, 46, 49).

(8) Mitigation of Impacts. The use of readily available pollution prevention measures in place at the facilities that would be involved in the proposed action would be likely to mitigate the environmental impacts of all life cycle stages to the point of being undetectable, or at the most negligible. (See pp. 23, 27, 36-37, 46, 49).

c. Summary of the Significance of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Opportunities. Because of the relatively modest number of Breacher vehicles anticipated to be constructed, existing and anticipated environmental compliance at the various Breacher facilities, and the availability of mitigation measures such as in-place pollution prevention and nonpoint source control programs, these impacts are not expected to be significant. All military and civilian facilities have in-place pollution prevention, pollution control, and emergency preparedness programs. None of these facilities have extensive environmental compliance problems. Thus, the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the proposed action or alternatives would not be expected to cause significant adverse impacts to the human environment.

*Alternatives Considered:* Alternatives considered in this environmental assessment include: (1) the proposed action (preferred alternative) of manufacturing 313 Breacher vehicles by tearing down and recycling existing M1 Abrams tanks; (2) a "no-action" alternative halting the current program as of June 1966; (3) a "location alternative" that would consist of carrying out the proposed action at a different facility; (4) a "higher-production" alternative of 500 vehicles rather than the 313 vehicles proposed in the preferred alternative; and (5) an

"unrecycled alternative" that would involve carrying out the proposed action using all new components rather than recycling M1 Abrams tank chassis. No other alternatives have been considered because the demonstrated need for the Breacher system to carry out the minefield breaching and countermine missions makes the five alternatives considered above a reasonable range of alternatives.

#### Determination

Based on the analyses in the LCEA, production and deployment of the Breacher do not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of NEPA. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed action is not required.

Gregory D. Showalter,

*Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 96-27013 Filed 10-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-P

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Notice Of Proposed Information Collection Requests

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Proposed collection; comment request.

**SUMMARY:** The Director, Information Resources Group, 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 December 23, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments and requests for copies of the proposed information collection requests should be addressed to Patrick J. Sherrill, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202-4651.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Patrick J. Sherrill (202) 708-8196. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

**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 Director of the Information Resources Group publishes this 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 at the address specified above. Copies of the requests are available from Patrick J. Sherrill at the address specified above.

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: October 16, 1996.

Gloria Parker,

*Director, Information Resources Group.*

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

*Type of Review:* Reinstatement.

*Title:* Case Service Report.

*Frequency:* Annually.

*Affected Public:* State, local or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

*Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:*

Responses: 82.

Burden Hours: 3,690.

*Abstract:* As required by Section 13 of the Rehabilitation Act, the data are submitted by State rehabilitation agencies each year. They contain the personal and program related characteristics, including economic outcomes, of disabled persons whose cases are closed.

[FR Doc. 96-26951 Filed 10-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P