8. MG Geoffrey D. Miller, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel & Installation Management (FORSCOM).
9. Mr. William R. Lucas, Deputy to the Commander, U.S. Army Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC).
10. BG Daniel Doherty, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Base Operations Support, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC).
11. Mr. Robert J. Jefferis, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Resource Management (TRADOC).
12. Mr. Philip Sakowitz, Jr., Deputy Chief of Staff for Base Operations Support (TRADOC).
13. Mr. John Kohler, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Resource Management, U.S. Army, Europe (USAREUR).
14. Mr. Walter W. Hollis, Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (Operations Research).

The members of the Performance Review Board for the U.S. Army Materiel Command are:

1. MG Larry G. Smith, Commander, U.S. Army Security Assistance Command, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
2. MG David Gust, PEO-Intelligence and Electronic Warfare.
3. BG John Geis, Commanding General, U.S. Army Armaments Research, Development and Engineering Center, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
4. Mr. Gary A. Tull, Principal Deputy for Acquisition, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
5. Mr. Douglas R. Newberry, Deputy to Commander, U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
6. Mr. Michael A. Parker, Deputy to Commander, U.S. Army Soldier and Biological Chemical Command, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
7. Ms. Kathryn T. Szymanski, Chief Counsel, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
8. Dr. Clarence W. Kitchens, Jr., Principal Deputy for Technology, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
9. Ms. Renata F. Price, ADCS for RDA-Science, Technology and Engineering, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
10. Dr. Chine I. Chang, Director, Army Research Office.
11. Mr. Anthony A. LaPlaca, Director, Logistics & Readiness Center, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
12. Mr. Robert Doto, Director, Intelligence and Information Warfare Directorate, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command, RDE Center, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
13. Mr. Dennis J. Turner, Director, Center for Software Engineering, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command RDE Center, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
14. Mr. James J. Barbarello, Director, C2 & Systems Integration Directorate, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command RDE Center.
15. Mr. Robert R. Lehnes, Deputy PEO-Communications Systems, Army Acquisition Executive PEO.
16. Mr. James L. Flinn III, Executive Director, Integrated Materiel Management Center, U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
17. Mr. Paul Bogosian, Deputy PEO-Aviation, Army Acquisition Executive PEO.
18. Mr. Barry J. Baskett, Director of Aviation Engineering, Aviation RDE Center, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
19. Ms. Vicky R. Armbruster, Deputy PEO-Tactical Missiles, Army Acquisition Executive PEO.
20. Dr. Larry O. Daniel, Director for System Engineering and Production, Missile RDE Center, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
21. Mr. Robert J. Spazzarini, Chief Counsel, U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
22. Mr. A.Q. Oldacre, Deputy PEO-Air and Missile Defense Army Acquisition Executive PEO.
23. Mr. Joseph T. Lehman, Deputy Director, Fire Support Center, U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
24. Mr. Jimmy C. Morgan, Director, Armament and Chemical Acquisition & Logistics Agency, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
25. Mr. Vemula P. Rao, Vice President for Customer Engineering, U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
26. Mr. Brian M. Simmons, Technical Director, U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
27. Mr. David J. Shaffer, Director, U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
28. Dr. Paul H. Dietz, Chief, Combat Integration Division, U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
29. Dr. Robert E. Singleton, Director, Engineering Sciences Directorate, U.S. Army Research Office.
30. Dr. James J. Wade, Director, Survivability, Lethality Analysis Directorate, U.S. Army Research Laboratory.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 99–21540 Filed 8–18–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of Army, Army Corps of Engineers

Notice of Intent to Prepare a Joint Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Proposed Rock Creek-Keefer Slough Flood Control Project, Butte County, CA

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

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act, intends to prepare a draft and final EIS/EIR evaluating the environmental effects of flood control and environmental restoration for the Rock Creek-Keefer Slough watershed in Butte County, California. The Corps is working with Butte County and the Rock Creek Reclamation District to provide this protection.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions about the proposed action and EIS/EIR can be answered by Steve Tuggle at (916) 557–6638 or by mail at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Planning Division, ATTN: Steve Tuggle, 1325 J Street, Sacramento, California 95814–2922.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Project Location

The project area is located in Butte County approximately 90 miles north of Sacramento. The area of primary interest includes portions of the town of Nord and agricultural lands affected by flooding from Rock Creek and Keefer Slough. The streams of interest in this evaluation include portions of Rock Creek, Keefer Slough, Mud Creek, Pine Creek, Kusal Slough, and the Sacramento River. The project area is also interconnected within the Big Chico Creek Ecological Unit of the Butte Basin, a tributary of the Sacramento River. This project covers the area of Rock Creek and Keefer Slough between Highway 32 and ½ mile above the confluence of Rock Creek with the Anderson Branch of Rock Creek, all within Butte County.

2. Proposed Action and Alternatives

The Corps, in cooperation with the State of California (Department of Water Resources) and the local sponsor (Butte County), is conducting a feasibility investigation of the flood control and environmental restoration measures identified during the reconnaissance phase and described in the Rock Creek-Keefer Slough Initial Assessment dated February 1999. This feasibility investigation proposes to develop and evaluate alternative flood control and environmental restoration plans that would alleviate flooding for the 100-year storm event and enhance the existing environment along the Rock Creek-Keefer Slough system.

The feasibility report will address an array of alternatives and resource problems. Alternatives analyzed during the feasibility investigation will be a combination of one or more flood control and ecosystem restoration measures identified during the reconnaissance phase; additional measures maybe considered. These alternative measures include (1) setback levees and stream channel improvements, (2) environmental restoration measures, (3) bypass and diversion structures, and (4) detention storage measures.

The goal of this project is to provide the greatest environmental benefits possible in conjunction with the proposed flood control project. Primary objectives include reducing flood risk and property damages, preserving existing resources, improving water quality, restoring wetlands, increasing riparian and riverine habitat, and reducing cobble and sediment transport. Significant issues to be analyzed in depth in the EIS/EIR include appropriate levels of the flood damage reduction, adverse effects on vegetation and wildlife resources, special-status species, esthetics, cultural resources, recreation, and cumulative effects of related projects in the study area.

3. Scoping Process

''Scoping'' is a process to identify the actions, alternative, and effects to be evaluated in an environmental document. The project study plan provides for public scoping meeting and comments.

The Corps has initiated a process of involving Federal, State, and local agencies, and concerned individuals. After the draft EIS/EIR is prepared, a 45-day public review period will be provided for individuals and agencies to review and comment on the EIS/EIR. All interested parties should respond to this notice and provide a current address if they wish to be notified of the EIS/EIR circulation and future scoping meeting dates. Public meetings will be held to receive verbal and written comments. All comments will be considered and responded to in the final EIS/EIR.

4. Public Meetings

A public scoping meeting will be held in January 2000. Individuals are also encouraged to submit written scoping comments by December 31, 1999, to *http://www.buttecounty.net/publicworks/* or by mail to U.S Army Corps of Engineers, Planning Division, ATTN: Steve Tuggle, 1325 J Street, Sacramento, California 95814–2922.

5. Availability

The EIS/EIR is scheduled to be available for public review and comment in the summer of 2000.

Dated: August 9, 1999.

Michael J. Walsh,

COL, EN, Commanding.

[FR Doc. 99–21542 Filed 8–18–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–EZ–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Proposed Information Collection; Chief of Naval Education and Training

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Chief of Naval Education and Training announces a proposed extension of an approved public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. 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 October 18, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection to LT D. Brown (OTE6/0813), 250 Dallas Street, Pensacola, FL 32508–5220.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request additional information or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, contact LT D. Brown at (850) 452–4941 (X319).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Form Title and OMB Number: Application Forms Booklet, Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps Scholarship Program; OMB Control Number 0703–0026.

Needs and Uses: This collection of information is used to make a determination of an applicant's academic and/or leadership potential and eligibility for an NROTC scholarship. The information collected is used to select the best qualified candidates.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Annual Burden Hours: 56,000.

Number of Respondents: 14,000.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Average Burden per Response: 4 hours.

Frequency: On occasion.

(Authority: 44 U.S.C. Sec. 3506(c)(2)(A))

Dated: August 12, 1999.

J.L. Roth,

Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 99–21551 Filed 8–18–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Proposed Information Collection; U.S. Marine Corps

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Marine Corps announces a proposed extension of an approved public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. 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 October 18, 1999.