31314–4928. Written comments may be mailed to this address or e-mailed to *Charles.Walden4@us.army.mil*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Dina McKain, Public Affairs Office, at (912) 435–9874 during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: To meet the needs of the Soldiers at Fort Stewart, additional ranges and garrison support facilities are required. This DEIS examines the potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts of the construction and operation of 12 ranges and 2 garrison support facilities to be constructed over a 4-year time period. It also examines potential impacts to surrounding lands and/or local communities.

The DEIS evaluates the following: A Multipurpose Machine Gun Range, an Infantry Platoon Battle Course, a Known Distance Range, two Modified Record Fire Ranges, a Qualification Training Range, an Infantry Squad Battle Course, a Fire and Movement Range, a Digital Multipurpose Training Range, a 25 Meter Zero Range, a Combat Pistol Range, and a Convoy Live-Fire Course and associated engagement boxes. The Garrison Support Facilities are a Sky Warrior Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) facility and a 10th Engineering Battalion Complex, which would be constructed in the cantonment area.

Three alternatives are considered: Alternative A—No Action, and two action alternatives (Alternatives B and C). The No Action Alternative is to continue the current mission and support activities already occurring at Fort Stewart. The action alternatives would greatly enhance Soldier training and overall unit readiness. Alternatives B and C offer different sitings for the ranges and garrison support facilities. Specified screening criteria were applied to each alternative to ascertain and rate the impact, from both an environmental and an operational perspective. Where possible, Alternative B sites tend to utilize footprints of existing ranges, limit the isolation of useful maneuver terrain, be located in relative close proximity to the cantonment area for operational tempo, and utilize the existing impact area without creating any new impact areas. Alternative C sites tend to locate ranges on new ground where there has not been a range in the past. Alternative C sites also have a greater impact on training, range operation, off-site noise, and environmental resources. Overall, Alternative B will not have as severe an environmental impact as Alternative C, although some individual sites may. After consideration of all anticipated operational and environmental impacts, Alternative B is the Army's preferred alternative.

Impacts are analyzed for a wide range of environmental resource areas including, but not limited to, air quality, noise, water resources, biological resources (to include protected species), cultural resources, socioeconomics, infrastructure (utilities and transportation), land use, solid and hazardous materials/waste, and cumulative environmental effects. No significant impacts are anticipated on any of these environmental resources.

The Army invites the public to comment on the DEIS and to participate in public meetings which will be announced in local news media. The DEIS is available at local libraries surrounding Fort Stewart and the document may also be accessed at *http://www.Fortstewart-mmp.eis.com*. Comments from the public will be considered before any decision is made regarding implementing the proposed action at Fort Stewart.

Dated: March 19, 2010.

Addison D. Davis, IV,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health).

[FR Doc. 2010–7452 Filed 4–2–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Broward County Shore Protection Project, North County Line to Hillsboro Inlet (Segment I) General Reevaluation Report, Located in Broward County, FL

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Jacksonville District, intends to prepare a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for the Broward County Shore Protection Project(Segment I) General Re-Evaluation Report. The project is being sponsored locally by the city of Deerfield Beach.

ADDRESSES: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Planning Division, Environmental Branch, P.O. Box 4970, Jacksonville, FL 32232–0019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Pat Griffin, by email *Patrick.M.Griffin@usace.army.mil* or by telephone at (904) 232–2286.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

a. The city of Deerfield Beach has secured the appropriation of Federal funds from Congress in the FY 03 and FY 04 Energy and Water Resources Development Act appropriations, respectively, for the USACE to initiate the preparation of the General Reevaluation Report (GRR). Preparation of a GRR for Segment I was authorized by the Conference Report for FY 2003 Appropriations (H.R. 108–10 pg. 808). The initial authorization for the overall project provided for construction by the local sponsor with reimbursement of the Federal share of eligible costs. This authorization was provided in House Document No. 91/89 dated February 18, 1965, as described in the Chief's Report dated June 15,1964.

b. *Objectives.* As the local sponsor for this study, it is the city of Deerfield Beach's expectation and desire that the USACE will in a cost effective manner conduct the GRR and the NEPA document for Segment I (north county line to Hillsboro Inlet), Broward County, FL and associated studies on behalf of the communities of Deerfield Beach and the Town of Hillsboro Beach and citizens of Broward County, FL. The city anticipates that the study will provide valuable economic, hurricane, storm and erosion data and related environmental and biological information regarding Deerfield's beaches and those in Segment I. This information will assist the city in its on-going efforts to provide a healthy and sustainable beach to residents and visitors. Additionally, the city expects the GRR and associated studies will provide in-depth analysis on the condition of the beaches within the study area and a determination as to whether or not the beaches within Segment I are eligible to receive Federal funding assistance for on-going and routine beach nourishment and to provide the recommended and appropriate levels and schedule necessary to conduct activities which will maintain a healthy beach profile.

c. *Alternatives.* Alternatives will be developed during this scoping period. Information on the proposed alternatives will be included in future documents and will be available for review during public meetings and document comment periods. Ideas on potential alternatives are welcome and will be considered.

d. *Issues.* The DEIS will consider the possible effects of placing compatible material on the beaches located within the boundaries of Segment I, impacts of dredging materials from an offshore borrow area, coral reefs and other hardbottom communities, as well as

other project related impacts on protected species, water quality, fish and wildlife resources, cultural resources, essential fish habitat, socio-economic resources, coastal processes, aesthetics and recreation, cumulative impacts, and other impacts identified through scoping, public involvement, and agency coordination.

e. *Scoping Process.* The scoping process as outlined by the Council on Environmental Quality would be utilized to involve Federal, State, and local agencies, and other interested persons and organizations. A scoping letter would be sent to the appropriate parties requesting comments and concerns regarding issues to consider during the study. Public scoping meetings would be held. Exact dates, times, and locations would be published in local papers.

f. *Coordination.* The proposed action is being coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, with the FWS under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and with the State Historic Preservation Officer.

g. *Other Environmental Review and Consultation.* The proposed action would involve evaluation for compliance with guidelines pursuant to section 404(b) of the Clean Water Act; application (to the State of Florida) for Water Quality Certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act; certification of state lands, easements, and rights of way; Essential Fish Habitat with National Marine Fisheries Service; and determination of Coastal Zone Management Act consistency.

h. *Agency Role.* The non-Federal sponsor (city of Deerfield Beach) will provide extensive information and assistance on the resources to be impacted, mitigation measures if warranted, and alternatives.

i. *DSEIS Preparation.* It is estimated that the DEIS will be available to the public on or about May 2012.

Dated: March 24, 2010.

Eric P. Summa,

Chief, Environmental Branch.

[FR Doc. 2010–7599 Filed 4–2–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3720–58–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.

SUMMARY: The Acting Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management, 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 4, 2010.

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 Acting Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management, 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: March 30, 2010.

Stephanie Valentine,

Acting Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management.

Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development

Type of Review: Revision.

Title: Evaluation of the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Program.

Frequency: On Occasion.

Affected Public: State, Local, or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 2,841.

Burden Hours: 2,044.

Abstract: In 2006, the U.S. Department of Education launched the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF), which awards competitive grants to develop and implement performance-based compensation systems in high-need schools. The purpose of the evaluation is to describe the implementation of the program and its relationship to any increases in recruitment and retention of effective teachers and principals. If feasible, this evaluation will also seek to analyze TIF's relationship to increasing student achievement.

This evaluation of the TIF program includes an implementation study of the Cohort 1 and 2 TIF grantees. The implementation study will describe the central features of the local TIF performance-pay programs, the implementation of the programs, and similarities and differences in performance pay programs. Data collection activities will be iterative, beginning with telephone interviews of key stakeholders in all the TIF sites (completed winter 2010), followed by two rounds of more in-depth case studies in a sample of sites. Representative surveys of principals and teachers will also be conducted to represent the full range of program knowledge and experiences in each grantee program. The implementation study may be used in conjunction with outcomes data (if the Department exercises optional outcomes tasks) to help explain the relationship between program characteristics and system supports and program outcomes.

Requests for copies of the proposed information collection request may be accessed from *http://edicsweb.ed.gov,* by selecting the "Browse Pending Collections" link and by clicking on link number 4249. When you access the information collection, click on "Download Attachments" to view. Written requests for information should be addressed to U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., LBJ, Washington, DC 20202–4537. Requests may also be electronically mailed to *ICDocketMgr@ed.gov* or faxed to 202–401–0920. Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request.

Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be electronically mailed to *ICDocketMgr@ed.gov.* Individuals who