

| Category      | Adjusted twelve-month limit <sup>1</sup>  |
|---------------|---|
| 347/348 ..... | 1,148,357 dozen of which not more than 717,722 dozen shall be in Category 347 and not more than 548,643 dozen shall be in Category 348. |

<sup>1</sup> The limits have not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1999.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that these actions fall within the foreign affairs exception to the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

D. Michael Hutchinson,

*Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.*

[FR Doc. 00-10998 Filed 5-2-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**SUMMARY:** The Leader, 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 July 3, 2000.

**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, 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 27, 2000.

**William Burrow,**

*Leader, Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

*Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services*

*Type of Review:* Extension.

*Title:* Written Request for Assistance or Application for Client Assistance Program.

*Frequency:* Three-year cycle for State Assurances or plan for CAP formula grant.

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

*Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden: Responses:* 1. Burden Hours: 9.

*Abstract:* This document is used by States to request funds to establish and carry out Client Assistance Programs (CAP). CAP is mandated by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Act), to assist vocational rehabilitation clients and applicants in their relationships with projects, programs, and services provided under the Act.

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 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202-4651. Requests may also be electronically mailed to the internet address [OCIO\\_IMG\\_Issues@ed.gov](mailto: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 Sheila Carey at (202) 708-6287 or via her internet address [Sheila\\_Carey@ed.gov](mailto:Sheila_Carey@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. 00-10960 Filed 5-2-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4001-01-U

## 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 17, 1998, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Hawaii Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Human Services v. U.S. Department of Defense, Department of the Army (Docket No. R-S/97-18)*. This panel was convened by the U.S. Department of Education pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 107d-1(b) upon receipt of a complaint filed by petitioner, Hawaii Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Human Services.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** A copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision may be obtained from George F. Arsnow, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 3230, Mary E. Switzer Building, Washington DC 20202-2738. Telephone: (202) 205-9317. 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 alternate format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotope, 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 either of the following sites:

<http://ocfo.ed.gov/fedreg.htm>  
<http://www.ed.gov/news.html>

To use the PDF you must have the Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at either of the previous sites. If you have questions about using the 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>

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to 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 U.S. Department of Defense, Department of the Army (Army), to award a priority under the Act to the Hawaii Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Human Services, the State licensing agency (SLA), for a contract to operate a cafeteria at Schofield Barracks, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.

A summary of the facts is as follows: On October 29, 1996, the SLA requested a meeting with the Army's Contracting Officer (CO) and Army staff to discuss the possibility of direct negotiations under the Act regarding the operation of a cafeteria facility at the Schofield Barracks in Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.

Subsequently, on November 6, 1996, a meeting was held between the SLA and the Army's CO. At the meeting, the CO mentioned that the previous cafeteria contract had been solicited pursuant to the Small Business Administration Section 8(a) set-aside program. In a May 6, 1997 letter from the Army, the SLA was informed that the Army would continue to rely upon a memorandum from the Office of the Assistant Secretary, Research Development and Acquisition, dated April 15, 1997. This memorandum stated that, because the Act did not apply to appropriated-fund contracts, military mess hall contracts would be awarded based upon general procurement principles, including preferences under the Section 8(a) set-aside program. On May 6, 1997, the Army solicited proposals under these general procurement principles, thereby not awarding a priority under the Act to the SLA. By letter dated August 21, 1997, the SLA filed with the Secretary of Education a request for arbitration of this dispute. A Federal arbitration hearing on this matter was held on July 9 and 10, 1998.

### Arbitration Panel Decision

The central issue before the arbitration panel was whether the Randolph-Sheppard Act, 20 U.S.C. 107d-3(e), is applicable to appropriated-fund contracts covering military dining facilities, which are basically used by military personnel. If so, is the Army

then required to permit the SLA an opportunity to bid on a contract covering military dining facilities in Hawaii on an unrestricted basis under the priority provisions of the Act?

The majority of the panel ruled that, as defined in the regulations of the Department of Education and Department of Defense, all of the facilities covered under the agreement provide cafeteria services, which include a broad variety of prepared foods and beverages. These foods are dispensed primarily through the use of a serving line where the customer serves or selects food items for himself or herself from displayed selections.

In this case, the military dining facilities covered under the Hawaii contract used contractor personnel to provide full food service, including food preparation, serving, and cleanup services. The use of the facilities was limited to authorized military personnel. On the other hand, Randolph-Sheppard vending facilities, whether a stand, automatic food dispensing machine, or cafeteria, are open for use by the general public. However, they are used most frequently by the employees working at the facility and are not supported by appropriated funds, but rather by payments for goods and services.

Further, the majority of the panel noted that the Federal Government's procurement process for goods and services to be paid for by appropriated funds is subject to procurement laws and regulations. These laws and regulations seek to standardize procedures for awarding contracts, thereby assuring quality in meeting specifications and economy of price. Exceptions are permitted by Congress for certain groups, such as those who qualify under the Small Business Administration or those who employ severely handicapped or blind individuals under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act.

The 1974 amendments to the Act expanded the opportunities for blind persons to operate vending facilities, including vending machines and cafeterias on Federal property, and required Federal agencies to provide locations for vending facilities to be operated by blind licensees.

The panel ruled that if Congress had intended the Act to apply to appropriated-fund contracts, it would have included very specific language authorizing those contracts because such a reading would substantially change the administration of Federal procurement law. Because that language is not included, the best reading of the statute is that it was not intended. Thus,

while not entitled to assert a priority under the Act in bidding on an appropriated-fund contract for dining facilities, the SLA would not be precluded from applying for a preference under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act.

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

Dated: April 28, 2000.

**Judith E. Heumann,**

*Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.*

[FR Doc. 00-11015 Filed 5-2-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4000-01-U**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Notice of Floodplain and Wetlands Involvement for the Floodplain Strip Adjoining the Boeing Property in Roane County, TN

**AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice of involvement.

**SUMMARY:** DOE proposes to convey to the abutting landowner, an approximate 182-acre parcel of land within the 500-year floodplain of the Clinch River, in Roane County, Tennessee. In accordance with 10 CFR 1022, Compliance with Floodplain Wetlands/Environmental Review Requirements, DOE will prepare a floodplain and wetlands assessment and will perform this proposed action in a manner that will avoid or minimize potential harm to or within the affected floodplain and wetlands.

**DATES:** Comments are due to the address below no later than May 18, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be directed to Katy Kates, Realty Officer, U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations Office, P.O. Box 2001, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831, or by facsimile at 865-576-9204.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Katy Kates, Realty Officer, U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations Office, P.O. Box 2001, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831.

*For Further Information on Floodplain/Wetlands Environmental Review Requirements, Contact:*

Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance, EH-42, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585  
Ms. Borgstrom can also be reached at 202-586-4600, or by leaving a message at 1-800-472-2756