supplies would consist of one or more treatment plants and well fields. The well fields would be in the Platte River alluvial (groundwater) aquifer. The three-way combination would also include a new surface water intake on the Missouri River. All the alternatives include implementation of a water conservation plan. For all the alternatives, significant environmental impacts requiring mitigation are predicted for flow in the Platte River, wetlands, private wells, property values, and recreation.

The well fields would pump water from the Platte River alluvial aquifer, which would lower the groundwater level around the well field and reduce the flow in the river. Lowering the water table is predicted to adversely impact about 5 to 30 private wells, cause the loss of 0.6 to 14.6 acres of wetlands, potentially alter 62 to 142 acres of wetlands, and remove subirrigation from 56 to 5,069 acres of land around the well fields. The loss of subirrigation could reduce property values because of impacts to crop yield and farm income. Recreation could be impacted by the lowering of water levels in private ponds and ponds and wetlands in the Two Rivers State Recreation Area. The impacts of flow depletion in the Platte River would be mitigated by the creation of a backwater habitat. Lost wetlands would be mitigated by the creation of new wetlands. Potential altered wetlands would be monitored for over 30 years and replaced if found to be changed by operation of the well field. The District would negotiate compensation with private property owners for reductions attributed to groundwater drawdown in well performance, subirrigation, and pond water levels. Impacts to the Two Rivers State Recreation Area would be mitigated by monetary compensation to the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission and the possible opening to the public of certain District properties for limited recreational use.

A public meeting and Section 404 hearing was held March 2, 1999 in Omaha, Nebraska to obtain comments on the original Draft EIS (DEIS), which was published in January 1999. Those comments and responses were included in the revised DEIS, which was published in February 2001. A public meeting to obtain comments on the revised DEIS was held March 21, 2001, in Omaha, Nebraska. These comments are addressed in the FEIS.

Luz D. Ortiz,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 02–9073 Filed 4–12–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–62–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Record of Decision for Ford Island Development, Pearl Harbor, HI

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy (DON) announces its decision to consolidate selected operations on and to pursue limited private development of Ford Island. The decision includes construction of new facilities and the adaptive reuse of existing facilities on Ford Island as well as the sale or lease of selected DON properties on Oahu, Hawaii, with the proceeds of such sale or lease to be used to develop DON facilities at Ford Island.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Stanley Uehara (PLN231), Pacific Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134, telephone (808) 471–9338, facsimile (808) 474–5909.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Record of Decision (ROD) in its entirety is provided as follows:

Pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, 42 U.S.C. Section 4332(2)(C), and regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) that implement NEPA, 40 CFR Parts 1500–1508, the Department of the Navy (DON) announces its decision to consolidate selected operations at Pearl Harbor onto Ford Island by constructing new facilities and adaptively reusing existing structures. This decision will include the sale or lease of selected DON properties on Oahu, Hawaii with the use of proceeds to develop DON facilities at Ford Island. This action will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its operations, make greater use of its properties, and improve the quality of life of sailors and their families. This will be accomplished as set out in Alternative B (Medium Intensity), described in the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) as the preferred alternative.

DON development on Ford Island may include new construction for up to 420 housing units, Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (BEQ) for up to 1,000 personnel, and infrastructure improvements such as roads and utilities. The development may also include a combination of new construction and adaptive reuse of existing structures for administrative space to accommodate 1,500 additional employees, and a consolidated training complex. Additionally, the action includes private development of up to 75 acres on Ford Island, which could include a historic visitor attraction, and allows for the lease of Halawa Landing and Iroquois Point/Pu‘uloa Housing, and sale of Waikele Branch, Naval Magazine (NAVMAG) Pearl Harbor and property at the former Naval Air Station (NAS) Barbers Point.

The action will be implemented through the Ford Island legislation (10 U.S.C. Section 2814), and other legislative authorities such as the annual Military Construction (MILCON) program, use of Non-Appropriated Funds (NAF), and the Military Housing Privatization Initiative (10 U.S.C. Sections 2871–2885).

Alternatives Considered: The PEIS evaluated four alternatives, including ‘‘no action,’’ that represent varying intensities of development on Ford Island. With the exception of ‘‘no action’’ (Alternative D), the alternatives provide for the conveyance and reuse—by either sale or lease—of selected DON properties on Oahu to support the Ford Island development.

Alternative A provides for both DON and private development on Ford Island. DON development would consist of new construction for up to 420 family housing units, Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (BEQ) for up to 1,000 personnel, and infrastructure improvements such as roads and utilities. Development would also include a combination of new construction and adaptive reuse of existing structures for administrative space to accommodate 1,500 additional employees, and a consolidated training complex. Private development envisioned includes an historic visitor attraction, commercial, and light industrial uses that could employ up to 5,600 workers and attract up to 15,000 daily visitors. The outlying properties will be conveyed or reused in the following ways in this alternative: The Halawa Landing property will be available for lease in support of an historic visitor attraction on Ford Island. The Iroquois Point/Pu‘uloa Housing will be available for lease for residential and directly related uses (e.g. playgrounds). Waikele Branch NAVMAG Pearl Harbor and the property at the former NAS Barbers Point will be offered for sale. Based on DON’s marketing analysis, it is anticipated that these properties will be reused for residential and related land uses.

Alternative B, Medium Intensity, is similar to Alternative A and provides for both DON and private development on Ford Island. DON development would be the same as that in Alternative

A. Private development includes an historic visitor attraction but assumes a lower intensity development for commercial and light industrial uses. Private development could have a population of 2,800 employees and 6,700 daily visitors. Halawa Landing will be leased in support of an historic visitor attraction on Ford Island. Other selected properties identified under Alternative A will be either leased or sold as noted to support the Ford Island Development Program.

Alternative C does not provide for private development on Ford Island. DON population could total 3,000 employees and 3,000 residents. In this alternative, the Halawa Landing property will not be leased. Selected properties identified under Alternative A will be either sold or leased as noted to support the Ford Island Development Program. Alternative C is the environmentally preferred action alternative due to limited private development.

Alternative D is the no action alternative.

Environmental Impacts: DON analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of each alternative on the environment. Potential significant impacts that could result from Alternative B are discussed below: There is potential for significant impacts on the wastewater collection system at Pearl Harbor. The main side sewage lift station, SY–001, which is currently at capacity, will be unable to accommodate additional sewage discharge flows. DON will initiate a utility study to determine what wastewater collection system improvements are necessary, including the additional capacity needed at lift station SY–001. DON will upgrade the SY–001 lift station to meet the additional capacity requirements.

There is potential for significant impacts on traffic. Projected traffic volumes at Kamehameha Highway and Ford Island Boulevard would exceed the intersection capacity during morning and afternoon peak hours. A combination of intersection improvements and travel demand management measures, such as mass transit and staggered work hours could mitigate the intersection impacts. For all areas leased by private developers, DON will require the developer to submit a Traffic Impact Analysis Report (TIAR) to identify what mitigation would be required so that traffic volumes would not exceed intersection capacities. DON will prepare follow-on NEPA documentation for future development projects on leased property that have adverse impacts on traffic in order to identify mitigation requirements.

There is a potential for impacts to marine species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act from project specific construction activities. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) chose to reserve comment until individual project specific actions are available for review. DON will review known data concerning marine species as specific projects are proposed and will consult with the NMFS as appropriate.

There is potential for significant impacts on cultural resources. The Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act has been concluded with the execution of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) between DON, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the State Historic Preservation Officer. Other consulting parties, including the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP), participated in development of the PA and signed the PA as interested parties. DON will carry out the Ford Island Development Program in accordance with the stipulations of the PA. The PA provides for the review of individual projects at Ford Island and contains provisions addressing potential effects of the lease and sale of lands with historic properties.

Response to Comments Received Regarding the PEIS: DON received comments from ten organizations and individuals on the Final PEIS. Most comments had been responded to in the Final PEIS. The following are new and substantive comments.

EPA commented that DON is responsible for oversight of environmental protection efforts on leased properties, especially related to the protection of water quality and implementation of pollution prevention measures. DON acknowledges that it will fulfill its responsibility as owner of leased properties pursuant to the specific environmental compliance requirements.

National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) notified DoN that NTHP's written comments prepared for submittal at the August 2, 2001 public hearing on the Draft PEIS were not included in the Final PEIS. This omission was unintentional. However, DON has carefully considered Mr. David Scott's summary of NTHP's written comments, presented at the August 2, 2001 public hearing. NTHP also commented about the lack of an Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) for the Pearl Harbor Naval Complex. DON has resolved this issue by releasing the Final ICRMP for Pearl Harbor Naval Complex dated March 2002. Issues addressing impacts to historic properties were resolved with the signing of the PA.

The Commander Navy Region Hawaii determined that the discussion of jurisdiction for provision of police and security functions contained in the PEIS was incorrect. Jurisdiction is concurrent rather than exclusively federal as discussed in the PEIS. The issue of jurisdiction has no effect on the environmental analysis.

Conclusion: In determining whether or not to develop Ford Island and if so, to what level of intensity, I considered the following: DON operational and readiness requirements; anti-terrorism/force protection requirements; benefits to DoN; appropriate uses of historic resources; environmental impacts; costs associated with construction, operation, and maintenance; and comments received from the public on the Draft and Final PEIS. After carefully weighing all of these factors and analyzing the information presented in the Final PEIS, I have determined that the preferred alternative, Alternative B, best meets DON's needs. Alternative B meets DON's operational and readiness requirements with implementation of mitigation to minimize significant impacts on the environment. Alternative A was rejected because the additional private development intensity provided is not needed to satisfy DoN's Ford Island Development Program. Alternative C was rejected because there is limited economic return, which is needed to attract prospective developers to meet DoN's development needs on Ford Island. Alternative D was rejected as it would not enable DoN to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its operations, make greater use of its properties, and improve the quality of life of sailors and their families.

As specific projects are proposed during the development of Ford Island, additional project-specific environmental analyses will be prepared where necessary and, if appropriate, may be tiered from the Programmatic EIS. DoN will continue to coordinate with other Federal, State, and local entities as necessary to determine if any additional mitigation measures are appropriate.

Dated: April 9, 2002.

Duncan Holaday,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Facilities).

Dated: April 10, 2002.

T.J. Welsh,

Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corp, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 02–9082 Filed 4–12–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

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 June 14, 2002.

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 9, 2002.

John D. Tressler,

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

Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Type of Review: Reinstatement.

Title: 2004 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04): List Collection Procedures and Institution Questionnaire.

Frequency: One time.

Affected Public: Not-for-profit institutions.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 300.

Burden Hours: 448.

Abstract: The fourth cycle of the NSOPF is being conducted in response to a continuing need for data on faculty and instructors. The study will provide information about faculty in postsecondary institutions, which is key to learning about the quality of education and research in these institutions. This study will expand the information about faculty and instructional staff in two ways: allowing comparisions to be made over time and examining critical issues surrounding faculty that have developed since the first three studies. This clearance request covers field test and full scale activities for the first phase of the study—collection of lists of current faculty and instructors from sampled postsecondary institutions and a questionnaire to be completed by institution administrative officials to provide information about the context of the institution, such as hiring and promotion practices, policies on benefits, tenure, workload, etc. A second clearance request will be submitted shortly covering the faculty survey materials.

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 (540) 776–7742 or via 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. 02–9002 Filed 4–12–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Notice of Floodplain Involvement for Proposed Deactivation and Demolition of the Zone 13 Sewage Treatment Plant at the Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX

AGENCY: National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of floodplain involvement.

SUMMARY: DOE proposes the demolition of a decommissioned sewage treatment plant which is currently in a floodplain, located on the Pantex Plant in Carson County, 17 miles northeast of Amarillo, Texas. In accordance with 10 CFR Part 1022, DOE will prepare a floodplain assessment and perform this proposed action in a manner so as to avoid or minimize potential adverse affects to or within the floodplain.

DATES: Comments on the proposed action are due to the address below no later than April 30, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments concerning this Notice should be addressed to: Floodplain Comments, Craig Snider, Environmental Engineer, Environmental Compliance, U.S. DOE/NNSA, Office of Amarillo Site Operations, P.O. Box 30020, Amarillo, Texas 79120–0020, (806) 477–5906, (806) 477–6972 (FAX).

Information on this proposed action, including a map of proposed activity locations, is also available.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Information on general DOE floodplain and wetland environmental review requirements is available from: Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Compliance, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586–4600 (800) 472–2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Zone 13 Sewage Treatment Plant was constructed in 1942, and provided sewage treatment for both the Pantex Plant and the Amarillo Air Force Base. The facility was deactivated in 1946 and remained inactive until 1952. A