

Comptroller  
BOYD, Jimmy W.  
Associate Director, Engineering and  
Maintenance Support Division  
BUCK, Irvin P.  
Associate Director, Customer Support  
Division  
COGHLAN, Thomas K.  
Director, Planning and Analysis  
CRUMPTON, Darryl E.  
Assistant Director, Data Generation  
Division Western Office  
GUSTIN, Russell T.  
Associate Director, Program Management  
Division  
HENNIG, Thomas A.  
Associate Director, Technology and  
Information  
HOGAN, William N.  
Director, Requirements and Policy  
Integration Directorate  
IVERY, Barbara A.  
Assistant Director, Source Management  
Division Western Office  
JACKSON, Mikel F.  
Assistant Director, Data Generation  
Division Eastern Office  
JOHNSON, James E.  
Associate Director, Support Staff  
LENCZOWSKI, Roberta E.  
Director, Acquisition and Technology  
Group  
MADISON, Harold W.  
Director, Installation and Management  
Group  
MUNCY, Larry N.  
Associate Director, Source Management  
Division  
PHILLIPS, Earl W.  
Director, Operations Group  
SCHNEIER, Jan S.  
Associate Director, Data Generation  
Division  
SCHULT, Mark E.  
Associate Director, Operations Support  
Division  
SMALLING, Marvin E.  
Director, Procurement  
SMITH, Kathleen M.  
Associate Director, Interoperability  
Division  
SMITH, Lon M.  
Associate Director, OG Support Staff  
SMITH Robert N.  
Associate Director, Customer Services  
Division  
SMITH, W. Douglas  
Deputy Director  
SORVIK, John R.  
Associate Director, International  
Operations Division  
WALLACH, Steven P.  
Assistant Director for Customer Support/  
Modeling and Simulation  
WARD, Curtis B.  
Associate Director, Customer Support  
Division  
Dated: August 28, 1996.

L.M. Bynum,  
*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison  
Officer, Department of Defense.*  
[FR Doc. 96-22529 Filed 9-4-96; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

## Department of the Air Force

### USAF Scientific Advisory Board Meeting

The USAF SAB 1996 Fall General Board Meeting, USAF Scientific Advisory Board, will meet on 16-17 October 1996 at the Embassy Suites, Old Towne, Alexandria, VA from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The purpose of the meeting is to conduct an informative session of high-level briefings, SAB Activity updates, and to welcome new members and honor departing members.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with Section 552b of Title 5, United States Code, specifically subparagraphs (1) and (4) thereof.

For further information, contact the Scientific Advisory Board Secretariat at (703) 697-8404.

Patsy J. Conner,

*Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 96-22659 Filed 9-4-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3910-01-W

## Department of the Navy

### Notice of Availability of Supplemental Information Report for Realignment of Naval Air Station Miramar to Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, CA

**SUMMARY:** DON has prepared a Supplemental Information Report (SIR) for realignment of Naval Air Station Miramar to Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, California, which further explains matters presented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and solicits public participation and written comment on the SIR. The comment period will close on October 7, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION OR TO OBTAIN A COPY OF THE SIR:** Contact Lieutenant Colonel George Martin at (619) 537-6678. Written comments should be sent to Timarie Seneca (Code 09M1.TS), Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, 1220 Pacific Highway, San Diego, CA 92132-5190, and must be received by 4:00 PM, October 7, 1996.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to Section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA procedures (40 CFR 1500-1508), the Department of the Navy (DON) prepared and published a FEIS analyzing the impacts associated with the proposal to realign Naval Air Station (NAS) Miramar, in accordance with the

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act (BRAC) of 1990 (Public Law 101-510). This SIR has been prepared in response to comments received on the FEIS during the comment period, which began May 10, 1996 and ended June 10, 1996, and to address the Biological Opinion issued by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Department of the Navy is committed to working with the communities who support its national defense mission by hosting its bases. That commitment includes protection of the environment. The Department of the Navy received over 200 additional comments expressing community concerns after publication of the FEIS. As a result, the Department of the Navy decided to publish this Supplemental Information Report to provide more information on the factors it is considering as part of the decision-making process and to provide a more thorough discussion of matters of concern to the community. Although use of a Supplemental Information Report to address comments on the FEIS is neither required by NEPA nor directed by CEQ Regulations, the Department of the Navy determined that such a document would serve as a vehicle for a more thorough discussion of matters over which there remains public concern. The Supplemental Information Report and the public comments it generates will also provide the decision maker with more detailed analysis for consideration in coming to a final decision, thereby furthering the purposes of NEPA. As the SIR does not present new circumstances or new information relevant to significant environmental impacts of the proposed action or alternatives, it is not intended as a supplement to the FEIS, as defined in section 1502.9(c) of the CEQ Regulations.

The majority of the information contained in this SIR is taken from reports, studies and analyses referenced in the FEIS, such as the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act (BRAC), the BRAC Commission Reports for 1993 and 1995 and supporting analyses, and a biological opinion prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). This SIR clarifies information concerning the alternatives analysis used in the FEIS, discusses issues raised in comments received on the FEIS that addressed specific environmental impacts, summarizes the USFWS Biological Opinion, and provides the public with the opportunity to review and comment on this information. It discusses the BRAC process, how that process led to the development of the purpose and need for the proposed

action, the bases for the criteria used to define the range of reasonable alternatives to be examined, the rationale for eliminating alternatives from detailed discussion, mitigation of noise impacts, and the biological opinion prepared by USFWS concerning endangered species. An outline of the issues addressed in this SIR is set out below .

#### Introduction

##### A. Effect of BRAC Recommendations

1. The Relationship Between the Proposed Action and the Purpose of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act (BRAC) of 1990 (Public Law 101-510).

2. Intent of BRAC.

3. Recommendations of the 1993 BRAC Commission.

4. Recommendations of the 1995 BRAC Commission.

5. Implications of the Purpose of BRAC on the Reasonableness of Alternatives.

##### B. Screening Potential Sites

1. Reasonableness of Alternative Sites.

2. Selection and Screening of Reasonable Sites.

a. Requirements of BRAC Recommendations.

b. Criteria for Selection and Screening.

(1) Operational Requirements.

(2) Infrastructure.

(3) Personnel Requirements.

c. Military Air Installations Initially Considered.

d. Application of the Criteria.

(1) MCAS Camp Pendleton.

(2) NAF El Centro.

(3) NAS North Island.

(4) March Air Reserve Base (ARB).

(5) NAS Miramar.

e. Summary of Comparative Costs, NAS Miramar and March ARB.

(1) Comparison of the Costs of Construction of Infrastructure.

(2) Comparison of Yearly Operating Costs.

(3) Cost of Construction and Operating for 20 Years.

##### C. Operations, Noise, and Safety Considerations

1. Operations at NAS Miramar.

a. Navy Operations at NAS Miramar.

(1) A History of Changing Operations.

(2) Aircraft Loading at NAS Miramar.

(3) Operational Tempo.

b. USMC Units Being Relocated to Miramar.

(1) Fixed-Wing Squadrons.

(2) Rotary-Wing Squadrons.

c. Existing F/A-18 Operations at Miramar.

d. Projected Operational Tempo at MCAS Miramar.

e. Analysis of Projected Operations.

f. Effect on Navy Operations at Miramar.

2. Noise Issues.

a. Noise Measurement.

b. Average Busy Day Versus Average Annual Day.

c. Mitigation of Aircraft Noise.

d. Continuing Community Involvement.

3. Safety Issues.

a. Combined Fixed- and Rotary-Wing Operations.

b. Interface with Class B Aircraft Operations and Local Airfields.

c. Community Involvement in Airspace Usage.

D. Other Environmental Issues at Miramar.

1. Endangered Species and Biological Resources.

a. Information in Biological Opinion and Multi-Species Habitat Management Plan.

b. Formal Consultation on Endangered Species.

c. Information in the Biological Opinion.

d. No Jeopardy Opinion.

e. Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement.

f. Reasonable and Prudent Measures.

g. Enhanced Mitigation Measures.

h. Additional Study of Effects of Noise on Gnatcatchers.

2. Wildlife Management.

3. Air Quality.

a. Concerns about Emissions Budgets.

b. Classification of Air Quality Regions for Non-Attainment.

c. Accuracy of Estimates Used in State Implementation Plans.

d. Accuracy of Data Used for Conformity Determination and Air Quality Analysis.

e. Conformity Analysis for NAS Miramar.

f. Differences Between Historical Emission Rates and Calculated Rates.

4. Traffic Congestion.

5. Ordnance Training Facility.

Where to Comment or Obtain Further Information.

Dated: August 30, 1996.

D. E. Koenig, Jr.

LCDR, JAGC, USN, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-22639 Filed 9-4-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-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 November 4, 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