Comment 11. Advisory Council members should answer the questions only with a "yes" or "no."

Response—Several of the instrument questions were simplified as suggested.

Comment 12. Not all methodology and assumptions are valid.

Response—We have reviewed the methodology and assumptions as you suggest to ensure accuracy.

Comment 13. In order to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected, certain terms used in the questions should be better defined.

Response—We clarified general terms as defined by Senior Corps. We cannot enhance the definition of most terms used beyond what is stated in the tool as they will be interpreted from each respondent's perspective and that is okay for this assessment.

Comment 14. To minimize the burden of the collection of information tool should be shortened; be user friendly; and be filled out by project director not Advisory Council.

Response—We have adjusted the length of the instrument and have expanded deployment via electronic survey and email attachment. The purpose tool is to assess how the project is interacting with its community partners and impacting the community from the community partners' perspective so it is not appropriate for the project director to fill out the survey.

Comment 15. Two commenters suggested that an Assessment Tool is not needed for the performance of the projects that already have a high rating, but only for those that are weak or satisfactory.

Response—Corporation disagrees because an assessment of all programs is needed to properly evaluate RSVP.

Comment 10. We believe that one way to enhance the quality of information to be collected is to ask questions that require community partners to provide the Corporation with information it currently lacks.

Response—The instructions for the instrument have been edited to clarify that the purpose of the instrument is to measure community impact of RSVP grantees and to clarify that the benefit of the survey depends on its use by the grantee not the Corporation for National and Community Service.

Comment 17. The assessment misses the substance of what RSVP is all about.

Response—A team of RSVP projects have been consulted and the instructions for the instrument have been edited to clarify that the purpose of the instrument is to measure community impact of RSVP grantees.

Comment 18. One way to minimize the burden of information collection on all concerned is to collect it only once.

Response—We concur.

Comment 19. Assume that community partners who are disappointed in their experience with RSVP "will walk with their feet" and that those community partners who remain affiliated with RSVP are, by definition, satisfied and not have to fill out the assessment.

Response—The instructions for the instrument have been edited to clarify that the purpose of the instrument is to measure community impact of RSVP grantees.

Comment 20. To minimize the burden of collecting this information would be to design a survey instrument that would sample the universe rather than distribute it to the Community Advisory Councils.

Response—The instrument is required to be completed by all grantees.

Comment 21. Concerned with the level of knowledge that advisory council members would need to complete this assessment.

Response—Program regulations require that grantee advisory councils be knowledgeable in the areas covered by the instrument.

Comment 22. For continuity, it would also be helpful if the format was a response to a statement versus a response to a question—there's a mix in this document.

Response—In order to procure the most useful responses the tool best lends itself to a variety of query and response formats.

Comment 23. The [respondents] will be partial to their RSVP program and answer the question to support their program and the RSVP Director needs to help explain and give advice to the [respondents] to be able to answer the questions.

Response—The instructions for the instrument have been edited to clarify that the benefit of the survey depends on its use by the grantee. Program regulations require that grantee advisory councils be knowledgeable in the areas covered by the instrument.

Description

The Corporation is seeking approval of Community Stakeholder Assessment of Senior Corps RSVP Grantees. The information collection is intended to be completed by the Community Participation Groups of current RSVP grantees. The information collection will be used to collect data to assist

grantees in self-improvement and to enhance technical assistance for current grantees. The Corporation will not use the results of this information collection for decision-making purposes regarding grant awards.

Type of Review: New.

Agency: Corporation for National and Community Service.

Title: Community Stakeholder Assessment of Senior Corps RSVP Grantees.

OMB Number: None.
Agency Number: None.
Affected Public: Community
Participation Groups of current
recipients of Senior Corps RSVP Grants.
Total Respondents: 700.

Frequency: Annual.

Average Time per Response: 2.5

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 1750 hours.

Total Burden Cost (capital/startup): None.

Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance): None.

Dated: April 14, 2010.

Angela Roberts,

Acting Director, Senior Corps.

[FR Doc. 2010–9059 Filed 4–19–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6050–\$\$–P

SILLING CODE 0030-33-F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

[Transmittal Nos. 10-04 and 10-14]

36(b)(1) Arms Sales Notification

AGENCY: Defense Security Cooperation Agency, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Defense is publishing the unclassified text of two section 36(b)(1) arms sales notifications to fulfill the requirements of section 155 of Public Law 104–164 dated 21 July 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. B. English, DSCA/DBO/CFM, (703) 601–3740.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following are copies of letters to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Transmittals 10–04 and 10–14 with associated attachments.

Dated: April 14, 2010.

Mitchell S. Bryman,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P



DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY 201 12TH STREET SOUTH, STE 203 ARLINGTON, VA 22202-5408

APR 0 2 2010

The Honorable Nancy Pelosi Speaker U.S. House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515

Dear Madam Speaker:

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export

Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 10-04, concerning
the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to France for
defense articles and services estimated to cost \$69 million. After this letter is delivered to
your office, we plan to issue a press statement to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Jettrey A. Wieringa Vice Admiral, USN Director

Enclosures:

- 1. Transmittal
- 2. Policy Justification
- 3. Sensitivity of Technology

Transmittal No. 10-04

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) Of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: France

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$ 55 million
Other \$ 14 million
TOTAL \$ 69 million

- (iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: 260 JAVELIN Anti-Tank Guided Missiles, 76 Command Launch Units with Integrated Day/Thermal Sight, containers, missile simulation rounds, Enhanced Basic Skills Trainer, JAVELIN Weapon Effects Simulator Trainers, two-level maintenance, batteries, battery dischargers and chargers, battery coolant units, spare and repair parts, test and tool sets, personnel training and equipment, publications, U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics personnel services, and other related elements of logistics support.
- (iv) Military Department: US Army (WAE)
- (v) Prior Related Cases: None
- (vi) <u>Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, offered, or Agreed to be Paid:</u> None
- (vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex
- (viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: 2 April 2010
- as defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

France - JAVELIN Anti-Tank Guided Missiles

The Government of France has requested a possible sale of 260 JAVELIN Anti-Tank Guided Missiles, 76 Command Launch Units with Integrated Day/Thermal Sight, containers, missile simulation rounds, Enhanced Basic Skills Trainer, JAVELIN Weapon Effects Simulator Trainers, two-level maintenance, batteries, battery dischargers and chargers, battery coolant units, spare and repair parts, test and tool sets, personnel training and equipment, publications, U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics personnel services, and other related elements of logistics support. The estimated cost is \$69 million.

France is one of the major political and economic powers in Europe and NATO and an ally of the United States in ensuring peace and stability. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist France to develop and maintain a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed sale will improve France's capability to meet current and future threats of enemy tanks and ground forces. France will use the enhanced capability to deter regional threats, to strengthen its homeland defense, and to contribute to overseas contingencies and NATO operations. France will have no difficulty absorbing these missiles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Javelin Joint Venture of Raytheon in Tucson, Arizona, and Lockheed Martin in Orlando, Florida. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to France.

There will be no adverse impact on the U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

Transmittal No. 10-04

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) Of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

> Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

- 1. The Javelin Weapon System hardware and the documentation provided with the sale thereof are Unclassified. However, sensitive technology is contained within the system itself. This sensitivity is primarily in the software programs which instruct the system how to operate in the presence of countermeasures. Programs are contained in the system in the form of microprocessors with Read Out memory maps being available, which do not provide the software program itself. The overall hardware is also considered sensitive in that the modulation frequency and infrared wavelengths could be useful in attempted countermeasure development. The benefits to be derived from the sale, as outlined in the policy justification of the notification, outweigh the potential damage that could result if sensitive technology was revealed to unauthorized persons.
- If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

Transmittal No. 10-04

The following is a copy of a letter to the Speaker of the House of

Representatives, Transmittals 10–04 with attached transmittal, and policy justification.



DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY 201 12TH STREET SOUTH, STE 203 ARLINGTON, VA 22202-5408

APR 8 2010

The Honorable Nancy Pelosi Speaker U.S. House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515

Dear Madam Speaker:

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export

Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 10-14, concerning
the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Canada for
defense articles and services estimated to cost \$71 million. After this letter is delivered to
your office, we plan to issue a press statement to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

Joanno L. Fermer

Apanne Farmer

Enclosures:

- 1. Transmittal
- 2. Policy Justification



Transmittal No. 10-14

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Canada

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$ 36 million
Other \$ 35 million
TOTAL \$ 71 million

- (iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under
 Consideration for Purchase: 36 T55-GA-714A engines, spare and repairs parts,
 support and test equipment, personnel training and training equipment,
 publications and technical data, engine qualification review, U.S. Government
 and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other
 related elements of logistics support.
 - (iv) Military Department: Army (ZYM)
 - (v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None
 - (vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None
 - (vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services
 Proposed to be Sold: None
 - (viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: 8 April 2010

^{*} as defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Canada - T55-GA-714A Engines

The Government of Canada has requested a possible sale of 36 T55-GA-714A engines, spare and repairs parts, support and test equipment, personnel training and training equipment, publications and technical data, engine qualification review, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics support. The estimated cost is \$71 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the military capabilities of Canada and the Canadian military's interoperability with U.S. forces. Canadian deployments in support of peacekeeping and humanitarian operations have enhanced global political and economic stability and have served U.S. national security interests.

This proposed sale will allow Canada to strengthen its homeland defense, deter regional threats, and improve humanitarian and disaster mobilization and response. The proposed sale would improve Canada's ability to meet current and future requirements for troop movement, medical evacuations, aircraft recovery, parachute drops, search and rescue, disaster relief, fire-fighting, and heavy construction. Canada will have no difficulty absorbing these helicopter engines into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Honeywell International in Phoenix, Arizona. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Canada.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

[FR Doc. 2010–9005 Filed 4–19–10; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 5001–06–C

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Availability of the Fiscal Year 2008 Defense Threat Reduction Agency Services Contracts Inventory

AGENCY: Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), DoD. **ACTION:** Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 2330a of title 10 United States Code as amended by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (NDAA 08) section 807, the Director of DTRA and the Office of the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Office of Strategic Sourcing (DPAP/SS) will make available to the public the first inventory of activities performed pursuant to contracts for services.

The inventory will be published to the DTRA Web site at the following location: http://www.dtra.mil/Business/ DoingBusiness/

CurrentSolicitations.aspx.

DATES: Inventory to be made publically available within 60 days after publication of this notice.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments and suggestions concerning this inventory to David Braxton, Senior Procurement Analyst, Defense Threat Reduction Agency/BC–BCP, 8725 John J. Kingman Road, MSC 6201, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060–6201.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Braxton at (703) 767–4603 or email at *David.Braxton@Dtra.Mil.*

Dated: April 14, 2010. Mitchell S. Bryman,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2010-8999 Filed 4-19-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-06-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Federal Advisory Committee; Defense Health Board (DHB); Department of Defense Task Force on the Prevention of Suicide by Members of the Armed Forces

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (5 U.S.C., Appendix as amended), the Sunshine in the Government Act of 1976 (5 U.S.C. 552b, as amended), and 41 CFR 102–3.150, and in accordance with section 10(a)(2) of Public Law, DoD announces a meeting of the Department of Defense Task Force on the Prevention of Suicide by Members of the Armed Forces will meet on May 11, 2010. Subject to the availability of space, the meeting is open to the public.

DATES: The meeting will be held on May 11, 2010, from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. **ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Crowne Plaza Washington National

the Crowne Plaza Washington National Airport, 1480 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202.

Written statements may be mailed to the address under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**, e-mailed to *dhb@ha.osd.mil* or faxed to (703) 681–3317.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Col. JoAnne McPherson, Executive Secretary, Department of Defense Task Force on the Prevention of Suicide by Members of the Armed Forces, One Skyline Place, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite