

required under section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and is intended to notify the public of their opportunity to attend.

Date and Time: Monday, February 24, 2003, the hour to be determined.

Purpose: For approval of the Commission's final report to the President.

ADDRESSES: The Commission will hold a teleconference meeting in Washington, DC, on Monday, February 24, 2003. A room will be made available to the public to listen to the Commission's discussion. The specific location has not been determined at this time, but it is anticipated that space will be limited. You are encouraged to contact the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans staff no later than Friday, February 21, 2003, if you wish to attend.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Leslie Sanchez, Executive Director, or Adam Chavarria, Associate Director, White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20202, (202) 401-1411.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans is established under Executive Order 13230, dated October 12, 2001. The Commission is established to provide advice to the Secretary of Education (Secretary) and issue reports to the President concerning: (a) The progress of Hispanic Americans in closing the academic achievement gap and attaining the goals established by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002; (b) the development, monitoring, and coordination of Federal efforts to promote high-quality education for Hispanic Americans; (c) ways to increase parental, State and local, private sector, and community involvement in improving education; and (d) ways to maximize the effectiveness of Federal education initiatives within the Hispanic community.

Individuals who will need accommodations for a disability (e.g., interpreting services, assistive listening devices, materials in alternative format) should notify Adam Chavarria at (202) 401-1411 by no later than February 14, 2003. We will attempt to meet requests after this date but cannot guarantee availability of the requested accommodation. The site will be accessible to individuals with disabilities.

Records are kept of all Commission proceedings and are available for public inspection at the office of the White

House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans from the hours of 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Dated: February 6, 2003.

William D. Hansen,

Deputy Secretary, Department of Education.

[FR Doc. 03-3648 Filed 2-13-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Federal Interagency Coordinating Council Meeting

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of a public meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice describes the schedule and agenda of the forthcoming meeting of the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council (FICC). Notice of this meeting is intended to inform members of the general public of their opportunity to attend the meeting. The FICC will engage in policy discussions related to mental health services for young children with disabilities and their families. The meeting will be open and accessible to the general public.

DATE AND TIME: FICC Meeting: Thursday, March 13, 2003 from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

ADDRESSES: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 200 Independence Avenue, SW., Room 505A, Washington, DC 20201.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Obral Vance, U.S. Department of Education, 330 C Street, SW., Room 3090, Switzer Building, Washington, DC 20202. Telephone: (202) 205-5507 (press 3). Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call (202) 205-5637.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FICC is established under section 644 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1444). The FICC is established to: (1) Minimize duplication across Federal, State, and local agencies of programs and activities relating to early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and preschool services for children with disabilities; (2) ensure effective coordination of Federal early intervention and preschool programs, including Federal technical assistance and support activities; and (3) identify gaps in Federal agency programs and services and barriers to Federal interagency cooperation. To meet these purposes, the FICC seeks to: (1) Identify areas of conflict, overlap, and omissions in interagency policies related to the provision of services to infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities; (2) develop and implement

joint policy interpretations on issues related to infants, toddlers, and preschoolers that cut across Federal agencies, including modifications of regulations to eliminate barriers to interagency programs and activities; and (3) coordinate the provision of technical assistance and dissemination of best practice information. The FICC is chaired by Dr. Robert H. Pasternack, Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Individuals who need accommodations for a disability in order to attend the meeting (i.e., interpreting services, assistive listening devices, material in alternative format) should notify Obral Vance at (202) 205-5507 (press 3) or (202) 205-5637 (TDD) ten days in advance of the meeting. The meeting location is accessible to individuals with disabilities.

Summary minutes of the FICC meetings will be maintained and available for public inspection at the U.S. Department of Education, 330 C Street, SW., Room 3090, Switzer Building, Washington, DC 2002, from the hours of 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., weekdays, except Federal holidays.

Robert H. Pasternack,

Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

[FR Doc. 03-3615 Filed 2-13-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Arbitration Panel Decision Under the Randolph-Sheppard Act

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of arbitration panel decision under the Randolph-Sheppard Act.

SUMMARY: The Department gives notice that on January 31, 2002, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Richard Bird v. Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission, Bureau of Services for the Visually Impaired (Docket No. R-S/00-9)*. This panel was convened by the U.S. Department of Education, under 20 U.S.C. 107d-1(a), after the Department received a complaint filed by petitioner, Richard Bird.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 6(c) of the Randolph-Sheppard Act (the Act), 20 U.S.C. 107d-2(c), the Secretary publishes in the **Federal Register** a synopsis of each arbitration panel decision affecting the administration of vending facilities on Federal and other property.

Background

This dispute concerns the alleged failure of the Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission, Bureau of Services for the Visually Impaired, the designated State licensing agency (SLA), to properly administer the Randolph-Sheppard vending facility program regarding vending machine income-sharing by a Federal property managing agency in violation of the Act (20 U.S.C. 107 *et seq.*) and the implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395.

A summary of the facts is as follows: since February 1994, the complainant, Richard Bird, operated a snack bar and three rooms with vending machines at the Cleveland, Ohio, Main Post Office under a permit agreement issued to the SLA by the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) in accordance with 34 CFR 395.16 and 395.34. In addition to the complainant's three rooms with vending machines, there are five rooms with vending machines at the Main Post Office that were not included within USPS's permit agreement because they are operated by a private vendor.

Complainant receives 30 percent of the commissions paid to USPS by the private vendor from the operation of its vending machines as provided by the Act (20 U.S.C. 107d-3) and 34 CFR 395.32. USPS had determined that those vending machines were not in direct competition, but rather indirect competition, with the vending machines operated by the complainant. One hundred percent of the commissions paid to USPS would be paid to the complainant if the vending machines of the private vendor were considered to be in direct competition with complainant's vending machines.

Since 1996, complainant contended that the vending machines of the private vendor were in direct competition with his vending machines. Complainant further alleged that income from the operation of his vending facility had declined since 1994 due in large part to employees at the Main Post Office being moved to other locations and a reduction in the commission rate paid by the private vendor to USPS. To offset this decline, complainant requested that vending machines located in the Parking, Vehicle Maintenance, and Administration Building of the Main Post Office Complex operated by a private vendor be added to his vending facility.

In 1997, the SLA requested that USPS issue permits to operate the vending machines in the Parking, Vehicle Maintenance, and Administration Building in the Main Post Office Complex. USPS denied the SLA's

request. Since 1998, SLA personnel have maintained that the vending machines at the Main Post Office operated by the private vendor were in direct, not indirect, competition with the complainant's vending machines. However, the SLA did not file a complaint with the U.S. Department of Education seeking Federal arbitration on the 1997 denial of the permits for the Parking, Vehicle Maintenance, and Administration Building or the direct versus indirect competition issue until June 1999. The SLA had requested that the June 1999 complaint be held in abeyance pending the outcome of this arbitration decision.

Complainant filed a grievance in October 1999 with the SLA. He alleged that the SLA failed to perform as his advocate by not aggressively challenging the actions of USPS to protect the value of his vending facility because of declining income. Complainant sought to be represented at the State of Ohio fair hearing on his grievance by a nonattorney. The Hearing Examiner ruled prior to the hearing that Ohio Law prohibited the nonattorney from representing complainant. The parties agreed to postpone the State fair hearing so that complainant could obtain proper representation.

Subsequently, complainant filed a complaint seeking Federal arbitration of his grievance. A hearing of this matter was held on July 19 and 20, 2001.

Arbitration Panel Decision

The issues heard by the panel were— (1) Whether the SLA prevented complainant from having access to the State administrative remedy procedures provided by the Act; (2) whether the SLA properly distributed unassigned vending machine income to complainant; (3) whether the SLA has the right to establish new vending facilities that continue to serve customers, who were originally assigned to complainant's building, after they have relocated to other USPS buildings; and (4) whether the SLA attempted to limit complainant's income by installing a second vending facility at the Cleveland Main Post Office Building.

Concerning issue number one, the panel ruled that complainant voluntarily chose to bypass the SLA State fair hearing process and sought remedy from a Federal arbitration panel.

The panel determined regarding issue number two that the SLA did not properly advocate for the complainant to ensure him the appropriate income from the vending machines in the five vending rooms not assigned to him. Further, the panel concluded that the vending machines at issue operated by

the private vendor were in direct, not indirect, competition with complainant's vending machines.

Regarding issue number three, the panel found that the complainant established at the hearing that it was the practice of the SLA to allow blind vendors to "follow" their customers when they relocate. Therefore, the panel concluded that the SLA should aggressively pursue obtaining a permit for the postal facilities where complainant's customers have relocated.

Concerning issue number four, after consideration of the SLA's testimony that they were simply considering the establishment of a second vending facility at the Cleveland Post Office, but had not made a formal decision to do so, the panel ruled that issue number four was not ripe for consideration by the panel. However, the panel cautioned the SLA to consider complainant's declining income before making any decision to place another vendor at the Cleveland Post Office.

Finally, the panel ruled that the SLA owed complainant a duty to preserve the value of his vending facility and income derived from it. The panel concluded that the SLA had not properly performed that duty by its failure to assert the priority provisions of the Act.

Accordingly, the panel awarded the complainant \$30,000 as compensation for vending machine income lost from 1996 through 2001 due to USPS's determination that the five areas with vending machines operated by the private vendor were not in direct competition with complainant's vending machines. The panel arrived at the \$30,000 figure by calculating the difference between the commission compensation complainant actually received during those years and the commission compensation the panel believed he should have received given the panel's belief that the private vendor's machines are in direct competition with complainant's vending machines.

The views and opinions expressed by the panel do not necessarily represent the views and opinions of the U.S. Department of Education.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You may obtain a copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision from Suzette E. Haynes, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 3232, Mary E. Switzer Building, Washington, DC 20202-2738. Telephone: (202) 205-8536. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the TDD number at (202) 205-8298.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

Electronic Access to This Document

You may view this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site: www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister.

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free, at 1-888-293-6498; or in the Washington, DC, area at (202) 512-1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html>.

Dated: February 11, 2003.

Robert H. Pasternack,

Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

[FR Doc. 03-3747 Filed 2-13-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Energy Information Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Energy Information Administration, DOE.

ACTION: Agency information collection activities: proposed collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Energy Information Administration (EIA) is soliciting comments on proposed modifications and a three-year extension to the Form EIA-28, Financial Reporting System (FRS).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted within 60 days of the publication of this notice. If you anticipate difficulty in submitting comments within that period, contact the person identified below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to Gregory P. Filas of EIA. To ensure receipt of the comments by the due date, submission by FAX (202-586-

9753) or e-mail (greg.filas@eia.doe.gov) is recommended. Mr. Filas' mailing address is Energy Information Administration (EI-62), Financial Analysis Team, Forrestal Building, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20585. Mr. Filas may be telephoned at (202) 586-1347.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the proposed form and instructions should be directed to Mr. Filas at the address listed above.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

- I. Background
- II. Current Actions
- III. Request for Comments

I. Background

The Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-275, 15 U.S.C. 761 *et seq.*), and the Department of Energy Organization Act (Pub. L. 95-91, 42 U.S.C. 7101 *et seq.*), require the Energy Information Administration (EIA) to carry out a centralized, comprehensive, and unified energy information program. This program collects, evaluates, assembles, analyzes, and disseminates information on energy resource reserves, production, demand, technology, and related economic and statistical information. This information is used to assess the adequacy of energy resources to meet near and longer-term domestic demands.

The EIA, as part of its effort to comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. chapter 35), provides the general public and other Federal agencies with opportunities to comment on collections of energy information conducted by or in conjunction with the EIA. Any comments received help the EIA to prepare data requests that maximize the utility of the information collected, and to assess the impact of collection requirements on the public. Also, the EIA will later seek approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) of the collections under Section 3507(h) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

Under Pub. L. 95-91, section 205(h), the Administrator of the EIA is required to "identify and designate" the major energy companies who must annually file Form EIA-28, Financial Reporting System (FRS), to ensure that the data collected provide "a statistically accurate profile of each line of commerce in the energy industry in the United States." The standardized reporting and data content allow comparisons on a uniform basis among major energy companies. Data collected on Form EIA-28 are published in

aggregate form to protect confidentiality and are used in analyses of the energy industry.

II. Current Actions

For the FRS survey to be conducted in 2004 collecting information for 2003, EIA proposes to revise the Form EIA-28. Major energy companies have become increasingly involved in the supply and disposition of natural gas and electricity as both industries have deregulated. The current FRS is not currently designed to collect detailed information necessary for analyzing major energy companies' activities in electric power and downstream natural gas. Therefore, it is necessary for the FRS to revise its program in order to collect accurate information as mandated.

The mandate (Pub. L. 95-91, section 205(h)) requires EIA to provide data to evaluate the competitive environment within which energy products are supplied and developed and to analyze the nature of institutional arrangements as they relate to energy resource development, supply, and distribution. EIA has consulted with data providers and data users to design a modified FRS that reflects the suggestions of both groups.

The proposed modifications include the addition of the following schedules: Electric Power Income Statement, Electric Power Operating Expenses, Purchases and Sales of Fuel and Electric Power, Electric Power Capacity Measures, Electric Power Output Measures, Downstream Natural Gas Income Statement, Downstream Natural Gas Operating Expenses, Purchases and Sales of Natural Gas and Natural Gas Liquids, Downstream Natural Gas Capacity Measures, and Downstream Natural Gas Output Measures. These schedules will be similar in format to existing schedules used by major energy companies for reporting on petroleum operations. Copies of the proposed new schedules and the instructions are available from Mr. Filas. In addition to the proposed modifications in the FRS form and instructions, EIA will request an extension of OMB approval.

III. Request for Comments

Prospective respondents and other interested persons are invited to comment on the actions discussed in item II. The following guidelines are provided to assist in the preparation of comments.

General Issues

A. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency and does the information have