1093, by fax at 410–436–5122, or by email at gregory.mahall@pmcd.apgea.army.mil. For additional general information or questions on this process, please call 1–800–488–0648 to leave a message.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (Title 40, CFR, Parts 1500 through 1508), the Army will prepare an EIS to assess the health and environmental impacts of the design, construction, operation and closure of a facility to destroy all of the chemical agents and munitions stored at the BGAD. Federal law and an international treaty require that the chemical agents and munitions be destroyed. This EIS will analyze the impact of the various methods of destroying the BGAD stockpile. The ACWA Program is currently in the process of programmatically addressing pilot tests for alternative technologies at one or more Army chemical agent stockpile sites (FR 65 20139, April 14, 2000). These two separate and distinct analyses serve complementary but different purposes.

This site-specific EIS continues the process that began when Congress established the Program for Chemical Demilitarization in Pub. L. 99–145 in 1985. The law requires destruction of the chemical weapons stockpile by a deadline established by treaty; that date is April 2007. This requirement still exists, notwithstanding the establishment of the ACWA Program. The Chemical Demilitarization Program published a Programmatic EIS in January 1988. Its Records of Decision (ROD) states that the stockpile of chemical agents and munitions should be destroyed in a safe and environmentally acceptable manner by on-site incineration. Site-specific Environmental Impact Statements that tier off the Programmatic EIS have been prepared for Johnston Atoll Chemical Agent Disposal System, Tooele Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, Anniston Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, Umatilla Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, Pine Bluff Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, Aberdeen Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, and Newport Chemical Agent Disposal Facility. An updated report and Record of Environmental Consideration have also been done on the Tooele Chemical Agent Disposal Facility.

The specific purpose of the current analysis is to determine the environmental impacts of the methods that could accomplish the destruction of the stockpile at the BGAD by the required destruction date on April 2007. The environmental impact analysis will determine whether construction of a full-scale plant operated initially as a pilot facility and using one of the technologies successfully demonstrated in the ACWA Program is capable of destroying the stockpile at the BGAD by the reburied destruction date (or as soon thereafter as could be achieved by constructing a destruction facility using the baseline incineration technology), and if doing so is as safe as the baseline incineration technology. The 1988 Programmatic EIS ROD does not limit or predetermine the results of the selection of a destruction technology for the BGAD, and it does not dictate the decision to be made in the ROD following completion of the EIS for this action at the BGAD. The ACWA Program has already successfully demonstrated and validated neutralization followed by supercritical water oxidation. The ACWA Program is currently evaluating two additional technologies—electrochemical oxidation with nitric acid and neutralization/supercritical water oxidation/gas phase reduction. If one or more of these technologies are later considered to be a reasonable alternative, they will also be considered in this site-specific EIS. The ACWA Program EIS for potential follow-on pilot testing of successful ACWA Program demonstration tests pursuant to the process established by Congress in Pub. L. 104–208 and 105–261 addresses a separate but related purpose. That purpose is to determine if any ACWA Program technologies can be pilot tested, and, if so, at which site or sites. The ACWA Program EIS will be distinct from this site-specific EIS because its emphasis will be on the feasibility of pilot testing one or more of the successfully demonstrated and validated ACWA Program technologies considering the unique characteristics of various sites, where chemical weapons are currently stored, including the BGAD. At the conclusion of both of these Environmental Impact Statements, Records of Decision will be issued.

The Army will hold scoping meetings to aid in determining the significant issues related to the proposed action that will be addressed in the site-specific EIS. The scoping process will include public participation and seek input from Federal, Commonwealth of Kentucky, and local government agencies, as well as residents within the affected environment. The dates, times, and locations of scoping meetings will be announced in appropriate news media at least 15 days prior to these meetings.

Dated: November 28, 2000.

Raymond J. Fatz,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, (Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health), OASA(I&E).

[FR Doc. 00–30756 Filed 12–1–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Incorporation of the Overhills Property Into the Northern Training Area (NTA) of Fort Bragg, North Carolina

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The EIS will evaluate the Army's proposal to incorporate the Overhills property into Fort Bragg's NTA, and create a contiguous 22,000-acre area for training. Implementation of the proposed action would govern both military training and recreational land uses under a multiple land use concept.

ADDRESSES: Written comments concerning the scope of the EIS should be sent to the Commander, U.S. Army Engineer District, Savannah, ATTN: CESAS–PD–E (Mr. Seyle), P.O. Box 889, 100 West Oglethorpe Avenue, Savannah, GA 31402–0889.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Seyle at (912) 652–6017.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Army would conduct the same full-scale training on Overhills that it is now conducting on the NTA. This training includes ground and air maneuvers involving both mechanized and light infantry with attached combat support and combat service support. These units would operate tracked and wheeled vehicles, as well as rotary and fixed-wing aircraft. Soldiers would train with live, frangible ammunition (with a maximum range of 200 meters) in and around existing non-historic structures. All units would train according to the Installation Range Regulation and the Army's Red-Cockaded Woodpecker guidelines. Additionally, the Army would allow hunting and fishing on selected areas of the property and use the family estate area, known as ''The Hill,'' for youth oriented recreational activities such as golfing, horseback riding, hiking, swimming, and boating to the extent that these activities do not conflict with training.

Fort Bragg is the Headquarters of the XVIII Airborne Corps, the command element for America's contingency

corps, and the U.S. Army Special Operations Command. The military units stationed at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base (AFB) comprise approximately 44,000 soldiers and airmen. Major elements based at Fort Bragg include XVIII Airborne Corps, 82d Airborne Division, and Special Operations Forces. In addition to these units, Fort Bragg supports the training of soldiers from the Reserve Components of the U.S. Army. The 1995 Land Use Requirements Study identified a shortage of 125,512 acres needed to support training. The Army purchased the approximately 11,000-acre Overhills property in 1997 to help alleviate that training land deficit and protect the military missions of Fort Bragg and Pope AFB from encroachment by incompatible civilian development. The Army is in the process of acquiring the remaining private properties within Overhills, which are eight small parcels totaling 148.7 acres. Overhills is located in Cumberland and Harnett Counties in southeastern North Carolina and adjoins the northern boundaries of Fort Bragg and Pope AFB.

The EIS will consider several alternatives: (1) Incorporate Overhills into the NTA and use it only for military training. The Army would fence off and maintain at their current conditions the historical structures on ''The Hill'' and train on the golf course; (2) train on Overhills; Army would manage Overhills' facilities and resources solely as a caretaker; (3) no action alternative, which is to continue the status quo of permitting only low-impact military training at company level and not incorporating Overhills into the NTA while continuing caretaker operations for the rest of the property and facilities. Currently, units are conducting only light infantry training and driving only wheeled vehicles on roads and established trails.

During the scoping process, the Army will use any comments it receives as a result of this notice to identify potential impacts to the quality of the human environment. Individuals or organizations may participate in the scoping process by written comment or by attending a public scoping meeting. The date, time, and location of the public scoping meeting will be announced in the ''Fayetteville Observer Times,'' ''Charlotte Observer,'' ''Raleigh News-Observer,'' and the ''Paraglide'' newspapers. The EIS will only consider comments received no later than 15 days following the public meeting.

Dated: November 28, 2000.

Raymond J. Fatz,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health), OASA(I&E).

[FR Doc. 00–30702 Filed 12–1–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Education requests comments on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) that the Secretary proposes to use for the 2002–2003 year. The FAFSA is completed by students and their families and the information submitted on the form is used to determine the students' eligibility and financial need for financial aid under the student financial assistance programs authorized under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, (Title IV, HEA Programs). The Secretary also requests comments on changes under consideration for the 2002–2003 FAFSA.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before February 2, 2001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA), requires the Secretary, ''in cooperation with agencies and organizations involved in providing student financial assistance,'' to ''produce, distribute and process free of charge a common financial reporting form to be used to determine the need and eligibility of a student under'' the Title IV, HEA Programs. This form is the FAFSA. In addition, Section 483 authorizes the Secretary to include non-financial data items that assist States in awarding State student financial assistance.

The Secretary requests comments on the draft 2002–2003 FAFSA that has been posted to the IFAP website (see below). In particular, in an effort to continually improve the application for students, parents, and schools, the Secretary seeks comments to further simplify the FAFSA form and reduce burden hours, including removing, replacing or combining data elements.

The Secretary is publishing this request for comment under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* Under that Act, ED must obtain the review and approval of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) before it may use a form to collect information. However, under procedure for obtaining approval from OMB, ED must first obtain public comment of the proposed form, and to obtain that comment, ED must publish this notice in the **Federal Register**.

In addition to comments requested above, to accommodate the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Secretary is interested in receiving comments with regard to the following matters: (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: November 28, 2000.

John Tressler,

Leader, Regulatory Information Management, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Office of Postsecondary Education

Type of Review: Revision.

Title: Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).

Frequency: Annually.

Affected Public: Individuals and families.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 10,979,031.

Burden Hours: 6,670,932.

Abstract: The FAFSA collects identifying and financial information about a student applying for Title IV, Higher Education Act (HEA) Program funds. This information is used to calculate the student's expected family contribution, which is used to determine a student's financial need. The information is also used to determine the student's eligibility for grants and loans under the Title IV, HEA Programs. It is further used for determining a student's eligibility for State and institutional financial aid programs.

ADDRESSES: 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 4050, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, D.C. 20202–4651. Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request. In addition, interested persons can access this document on the Internet: