

“Download Attachments” to view. Written requests for information should be addressed to U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Potomac Center, 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20202-4700. Requests may also be electronically mailed to the Internet address OCIO_RIMG@ed.gov or faxed to 202-245-6621. 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 her e-mail 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. 05-20942 Filed 10-18-05; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of Education.
SUMMARY: The Leader, Information Management Case Services Team, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of the Chief Information Officer invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before November 18, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Rachel Potter, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10222, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503 or faxed to (202) 395-6974.

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 Case Services Team, Regulatory Information

Management Services, 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.

Dated: October 13, 2005.

Angela C. Arrington,
Leader, Information Management Case Services Team, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Institute of Education Sciences

Type of Review: Revision.

Title: Education Longitudinal Study of 2002, Second Followup Full Scale.

Frequency: One time.

Affected Public: Individuals or household; Not-for-profit institutions; State, Local, or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 15,044.

Burden Hours: 7,021.

Abstract: The ELS:2002 second followup is the third time this cohort of students who were in 10th grade in 2002 will be interviewed and assessed. Data will be collected from students, dropouts, and school administrators. The field test for this study will be conducted in spring 2005. The full scale first followup study will be conducted in spring 2006. This longitudinal study is intended to measure school effectiveness and impact on postsecondary and labor market outcomes.

Requests for copies of the information collection submission for OMB review may be accessed from <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, by selecting the “Browse Pending Collections” link and by clicking on link number 2903. 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., Potomac Center, 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20202-4700. Requests may also be electronically mailed to the Internet address OCIO_RIMG@ed.gov or faxed to 202-245-6623. 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 Katrina Ingalls at her e-mail address Katrina.Ingalls@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. 05-20943 Filed 10-18-05; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

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: The Department gives notice that on June 17, 2005, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Arizona Department of Economic Security, Rehabilitation Services Division v. United States Postal Service (Docket No. R-S/03-4)*. This panel was convened by the U.S. Department of Education, under 20 U.S.C. 107d-1(b), after the Department received a complaint filed by the petitioner, Arizona Department of Economic Security, Rehabilitation Services Division.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You may obtain a copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision from Suzette E. Haynes, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 5022, Potomac Center Plaza, Washington, DC 20202-2800. Telephone: (202) 245-7374. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Relay Service (FRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 6(c) of 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 improper payment of commissions to the United States Postal Service (USPS) by two blind licensees in violation of the Act (20 U.S.C. 107 *et seq.*) and the

implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395.

A summary of the facts is as follows: The Arizona Department of Economic Security, Rehabilitation Services Division, the State licensing agency (SLA), alleged that between December 1995 and July 2001, Mr. Robert Kunau operated a vending facility at the Rio Salado Post Office and paid to USPS a 10 percent commission on his gross sales totaling \$116,684.02.

Similarly, the SLA alleged that since 1988 Mr. Scott Weber operated a vending facility at the Phoenix General Mail Facility (PGMF). In 1995, Mr. Weber assumed the operation of additional vending machines at PGMF. From October 1995 to May 2001, Mr. Weber also paid to USPS a 10 percent commission on his gross sales totaling \$88,444.57. Both vendors alleged that they paid the 10 percent commission to USPS as required by the agency until they were advised by their attorney to cease payment.

Arbitration Panel Decision

The issue heard by the panel was whether the actions taken by USPS violated the Act and implementing regulations concerning the placement and operation of vending facilities at the Rio Salado Post Office and the Phoenix General Mail Facility. If there was a violation, the panel was asked to determine the appropriate remedy.

After reviewing all of the records and hearing testimony of witnesses, the panel concluded that the Act requires Federal agencies to give priority to blind vendors in the operation of vending facilities on Federal properties. To accomplish this, Federal agencies and SLAs enter into permit agreements authorizing the operation of vending facilities by licensed blind vendors. However, the panel noted that the Act does not authorize Federal agencies to collect commissions from a blind vendor or the SLA without the authorization of the Secretary of Education. Moreover, Federal agencies are not permitted to go outside the Department of Education's regulations and substitute a negotiated vending agreement in place of the permit system.

Therefore, because USPS failed to obtain authorization from the Secretary of Education, the collection of commissions was a violation of the Act. Accordingly, the panel ruled that both Mr. Kunau and Mr. Weber were damaged by USPS's violation of the Act in the amounts of \$116,684.02 and \$88,444.57, respectively.

The panel further directed that, subject to any future finding by a court of competent jurisdiction that this order

exceeds the panel's authority under the Act, USPS must reimburse Mr. Kunau and Mr. Weber the amounts that they were damaged as a result of USPS's violation of the 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.

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 the following site: <http://www.ed.gov/news/fedregister>.

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using 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.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html>.

Dated: October 14, 2005.

John H. Hager,

Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

[FR Doc. 05-20929 Filed 10-18-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

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: The Department gives notice that on October 18, 2004, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Bert Hansen, et al. v. Nevada Department of Rehabilitation, Bureau of Services to the Blind (Docket No. R-S/03-05 and 03-07 consolidated)*. This panel was convened by the U.S. Department of Education, under 20 U.S.C. 107d-1(a), after the Department received a complaint filed by the petitioners, Bert Hansen, *et al.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You may obtain a copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision from Suzette E. Haynes, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 5022, Potomac Center Plaza,

Washington, DC 20202-2800.

Telephone: (202) 245-7374. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Relay Service (FRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (*e.g.*, Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 6(c) of 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 concerned two separate complaints that were consolidated into one case in the interest of judicial economy. The complainants alleged violations of the Act (20 U.S.C. 107 *et seq.*), the implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395, and State rules and regulations by the Nevada Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation, Bureau of Services to the Blind and Visually Impaired, the State licensing agency (SLA).

A summary of the facts in the first part of the complaint is as follows: On January 11, 2002, Mr. Bert Hansen, Chairman of the Nevada Committee of Blind Vendors, wishing to ensure that the 2002 election of Elected Committee of Blind Vendors (Committee) would be carried out in accordance with State rules and policy, wrote to the SLA on behalf of the Committee.

In his letter, Mr. Hansen noted that the 1999 bylaws of the Committee were not certified as required by the Nevada Administrative Code, section 426.080.2. Mr. Hansen suggested that, since clarification of the 1999 bylaws was needed, the 1983 certified bylaws be used for the 2002 election process. However, by memorandum dated January 30, 2002, the SLA rejected the Committee's proposal and indicated that the SLA would conduct its own Committee election. On February 24, 2002, under the leadership of Mr. Hansen, the Committee held the 2002 election.

Subsequently, the SLA informed the Committee it was holding a new election that took place on April 7, 2002. The complainants alleged that the SLA election was held without the participation of the Committee and that the individuals elected on April 7 were different from those elected on February 24. The complainants further alleged that the April 7 election was improperly