RDD methods were used, the sample size objective would be 500 completed interviews instead of 1,000 because of the small percentage of households that have ATVs (only two to three percent of households). This smaller sample for the RDD method would be done to keep the cost of the survey to a reasonable level and still provide reliable statistical results.

Thus, the Commission staff estimates that the number of interviews would range from about 500 (RDD) to 1,000 (mail panel). The length of each interview would be approximately 20 minutes. Therefore, the total burden hours for respondents would be about 165 hours (500 x .33 hrs.) for the RDD survey or about 330 hours (1000 \times .33 hrs.) for the mail panel.

The Commission staff estimates the costs of the time to respond to this collection of information at \$12 an hour. This is the average hourly wage for all private industry workers reported by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in the 1996 edition of the Statistical Abstract of the United States. At this valuation, the estimated cost of this survey to the public would be about \$1,980 (165 hours X \$12/hour) to \$3,960 (330 hours \times \$12/hour).

The Commission staff estimates that this collection of information would require approximately 18 weeks of professional staff time. That estimate includes five weeks to negotiate contracts, and to prepare questionnaires, interviewer guidelines, and other instruments and instructions used to collect the information. After the information collection, an additional 13 weeks would be required to edit and analyze the data and write the reports. Based on the average professional level, the 18 weeks of staff time would be valued at approximately \$30,000.

C. Requests for Comments

The Commission solicits written comments from all interested persons about the proposed survey. The Commission specifically solicits information about the hourly burden and monetary costs imposed by this collection of information. The Commission also seeks information relevant to the following topics:

- Whether the exposure survey described above is necessary for the proper performance of the Commission's functions;
- Whether the information would have practical utility for the Commission;
- Whether the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected could be enhanced; and
- Whether the burden imposed by the collection of information could be minimized by use of automated, electronic or other

technological collection techniques, or other forms of information technology.

Dated: April 10, 1997.

Sadye E. Dunn,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 97–9696 Filed 4–14–97; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel; Human Resources Development Division (HQ USAF/ DPCH).

ACTION: Notice.

In compliance with Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Human Resources Development Division announces the proposed revision to AF Form 2800, Family Support Center Individual/Family Data Card; Family Support Center Interview and Follow Up Summary, AF Form 2801; Family Support Center Volunteer Data and Service Record, AF Form 2805. Comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by June 16, 1997. ADDRESSES: Written comment and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to HQ USAF/DPCH, 1040 Air Force Pentagon-5C238, Washington, DC 20330-1040, ATTN: Lt Col David

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on this revised data collection instrument, please write to the above address, or call (703) 697–4720.

Wolpert.

Title and Associated Form: Family Support Center Individual/Family Data Card, AF Form 2800; Family Support Center Interview and Follow Up Summary, AF Form 2801; Family Support Center Volunteer Data and Service Record, AF Form 2805 (OMB No. 0701–0070).

Needs and Uses: The information collection requirement is necessary to obtain demographic data about individuals and family members who utilize the services offered by the Family Support Center. It also is a mechanism for tracking the services provided so we can keep a history of services provided as well as gathering data about the services provided. It also maintains the demographic data on volunteers and tracks their volunteer efforts.

Affected Public: All those eligible for services provided by Family Support Centers (all Department of Defense personnel and their families) and those who volunteer in the Family Support Center.

Annual Burden Hours: 1000. Number of Respondents: 10,000. Responses Per Respondent: 3. Average Burden Per Response: 5 Minutes.

Frequency: Once.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Summary of Information Collection

Respondents could be all those eligible for services, i.e., all Department of Defense personnel and their families. The completed form is used to gather demographic data on those who use Family Support Centers, track what programs or services they use and how often. The data elements in this form are the basis for quarterly data gathering that is forwarded through Major Commands to the Air Staff. This form is essential for record keeping and data gathering.

Carolyn A. Lunsford,

Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer. [FR Doc. 97–9597 Filed 4–14–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3910–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Corps of Engineers

Intent to Prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) in Conjunction with Proposed Changes in Operation of Chicago Area Confined Disposal Facility at Chicago, Cook County, Illinois

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

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Project involves changes in the operation of a confined disposal facility (CDF) built in 1984 to hold

contaminated sediment dredged from the Chicago River, Chicago Harbor, and Calumet River and Harbor. The CDF was discussed in a Final Environmental Impact Statement released in May 1982.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Keith Ryder, 312/353–6400 ext. 2020; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District; 111 North Canal Street; Chicago, Illinois 60606–7206.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 1. The Supplement Environmental Impact Statement will document deviations (in construction and operation) from the project as it was discussed in the 1982 impact statement; proposed improvements to the project's operating plan (regarding water quality monitoring, vegetation control, sediment management, and endangered species); and interagency coordination during 1984–1996.

2. The SEIS is expected to be available to the public in June 1997.

Dated: March 26, 1997.

Roger A. Gerber,

Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army, District Engineer.

[FR Doc. 97–9652 Filed 4–14–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3710–HN–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Intent to Prepare a Draft Revised Final Supplement to the Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for the St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway Project, East Prairie Phase

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this reevaluation is to develop a plan that provides flood control in the St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway Basins, Missouri. This project was authorized for construction by the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-662), Section 401(a). The authorized project is based on the Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated January 4, 1983, which is part of the Phase I General Design Memorandum (GDM) documents prepared in response to Section 101(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (P.L. 94–587). The Phase II GDM is based on the Phase I GDM project recommendations, and it was prepared under the Chief's authority for continuing planning and engineering studies on a viable project while awaiting project authorization.

Revisions were made in the Phase II GDM to indicate the non-Federal cost sharing requirements reflected in the authorizing Act PL 99–662. The original EIS was filed with the Council of Environmental Quality in 1976, and the supplement was filed in 1981. The purpose of this DSEIS is to revise and supplement previous environmental documentation. The recent designation of East Prairie, Missouri, as an Enterprise Community by the President has provided the momentum to move the East Prairie Phase of the overall project toward implementation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Eddie Belk, telephone (901) 544–3798, CELMM–DD–PM, 167 North Main Street B–202, Memphis, TN 38103–1894. Questions regarding the DSEIS may be directed to Mr. John Rumancik, telephone (901) 544–3975, CELMM–PD–R.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Proposed Action

The St. Johns Bayou Basin and New Madrid Floodway are located in southeast Missouri and include all or portions of New Madrid, Scott and Mississippi Counties. The basis are adjacent to the Mississippi River, extending from the vicinity of Commerce, Missouri, to New Madrid, Missouri. The recommended plan of improvement for the East Prairie Phase work, which this DSEIS will address. includes about 28 miles of channel modification, a 1,000 cfs pumping station for the St. Johns Bayou area, a 1,500 cfs pumping station for the New Madrid Floodway area, and a 1,500 foot closure levee at the southern end of the New Madrid Floodway.

2. Alternatives

Alternatives were evaluated in the previous EIS. The purpose of this DSEIS is to evaluate and provide updated documentation and coordination for the selected plan for flood control and compare it to the No Action alternative.

3. Scoping Process

An intensive public involvement program has been set up to (1) Solicit input from individuals and interested parties so that problems, needs, and opportunities within the project area can be properly identified and addressed and (2) provide status updates to concerned organizations and the public. Meetings with the local sponsor, public coordination meetings, interagency environmental meetings, and public project briefings/ presentations have been conducted. A public scoping meeting will be scheduled for May 1997, and

interagency environmental meetings will continue to be held as needed. Significant issues being analyzed include potential project impacts (negative and positive) to fisheries, water quality, wetlands, waterfowl, endangered species, and cultural resources. It is anticipated that the DSEIS will be available for public review early 1998. A public meeting will be held during the review period to receive comments and address questions concerning the DSEIS.

Dated: April 4, 1997.

Gregory G. Bean,

Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer. [FR Doc. 97–9653 Filed 4–14–97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3710–KS–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: Notice is hereby given that on November 20, 1996, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Chester Smalley v. New York State Commission for the Blind and Visually Handicapped (Docket No. R-S/95–7).* This panel was convened by the U. S. Department of Education pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 107d-1(a), upon receipt of a complaint filed by petitioner, Chester Smalley.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: A copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision may be obtained from George F. Arsnow, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 3230, Mary E. Switzer Building, Washington D.C. 20202–2738. Telephone: (202) 205–9317. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the TDD number at (202) 205–8298.

supplementary information: Pursuant to the Randolph-Sheppard 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

Mr. Chester Smalley, complainant, has operated a vending facility at the Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Buffalo, New York, from January 1981 to the present. Until September 1993, complainant's vending facility operation