

by the Council in its 2010 Annual Report to Congress.

### III. Brief Descriptions of Priority Issues

#### 1. Education and At-Risk Youth

The best way to keep young people out of trouble is to keep them in school. Without structure and supervision that school provides, young people often turn to delinquent or criminal behavior during school hours and end up in the juvenile justice system, with most not completing high school. A number of factors contribute to the failure of young people to complete schooling including: Chronic truancy, educational instability, "push out," issues of access, co-occurring factors, school connectedness, and the absences of positive activities for afterschool times.

#### 2. Juvenile Reentry and Transitions to Adulthood

Young people reentering the community from juvenile residential facilities often lack the support they need to change the course of their lives and avoid the destructive cycle of recidivism. The multiple needs of these young people (schooling, stable housing, skills to obtain meaningful employment, physical and mental health problems, etc.) require coordination of services, supervision, and support at the local level to help ensure each youth a successful transition back home and to adulthood. Youth aging out of foster care and youth who are homeless have similar needs for transitional support. A number of Federal policies, practices, programs, and legislation affect local and state capacity to provide solid support through transition.

#### 3. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the Juvenile Justice and Related Systems

Disproportionate contact of minorities (DMC) in juvenile justice has been a challenge for policymakers for decades. DMC is not an issue specific to the justice system; it is connected with inequities in other youth-serving systems and requires exploration of the relationship between child welfare, education, and youth's socioeconomic status. The team seeks to identify Federal legislation and practices that both assist States and those that function as barriers in reducing disparities in juvenile justice, child welfare, and education.

#### 4. Tribal Youth and Juvenile Justice

Tribal youth face a host of challenges—poverty, child abuse and neglect, exposure to family violence, substance abuse, the highest rate of suicides among all youth, and a weak

educational system. Without intervention and remediation these issues can lead to additional negative outcomes including delinquency. Multiple Federal agencies have specific responsibility for working with Indian Country, notably, the Departments of Agriculture, Justice, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, and Interior. The overlapping mosaic of policies, regulations, guidelines and programs can challenge achievement of desired results.

### IV. Guiding Questions for Commenters

The Council's issue teams have identified a number of questions to focus their examination, and the Council is particularly interested in receiving comments addressing some or all of these questions. The first question for three of the topic areas is listed by topic as follows:

*Education and At-Risk Youth:* What is the Federal role in preventing youth from entering the juvenile justice system and successfully graduating from high school prepared for adulthood?

*Juvenile Reentry and Transitions to Adulthood:* What is the Federal role in helping ensure youth graduate and successfully transition back home and into adulthood (from juvenile facilities, out of the foster care system, and in returning home and to their communities from runaway/thrown away/homeless status)?

*Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the Juvenile Justice and Related Systems:* How do you view the Federal role with regard to racial and ethnic disparities?

For these first three topic areas, all of the questions below also apply:

a. What does the Federal government do well? What needs to be changed?

b. Are there *Federal* practices, policies, legislation, and/or regulations that support or restrict the successful education of youth; reentry and/or transitions to adulthood; or addressing of racial/ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice and related systems? What role does technical/training support have in redressing restrictions?

c. Are there legislative challenges affecting this issue that should be brought to the attention of the Federal agencies? What ought Federal agencies do about them?

d. What results and/or consequences might occur from the enacted recommendations?

e. Is there anything else the Federal government should be aware of concerning this topic?

The Council's Tribal Youth issue team requests public comments addressing the following questions:

a. How do you view the Federal role with regard to tribal youth and their families?

b. What does the Federal government do well for tribal youth? What needs to be changed?

c. Describe what *Federal* practices, policies, or regulations support or fail to support Tribal youth and their families. What comes to mind when you think of barriers? Alternatively, areas of good practice (to meeting the needs for belonging, mastery, independence and generosity)?

d. Are there legislative challenges affecting issues related to Tribal youth and juvenile justice that should be brought to the attention of the Federal agencies? What ought Federal agencies do about them? Who are the key people to help with this issue?

e. What results and/or consequences might occur in Indian Country from enacted recommendations? Are there individuals, agencies or systems that might not welcome the recommendations or changes in policies (Tribal Youth, Tribes, and Agencies)?

f. Is there anything else the Federal government should be aware of concerning tribal youth justice, specifically in the areas of youth prevention, intervention, detention and reentry?

**Robin Delany-Shabazz,**

*Designated Federal Official, Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.*

[FR Doc. 2010-16696 Filed 7-7-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-18-P**

## CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

### Information Collection; Submission for OMB Review, Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Corporation for National and Community Service.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Corporation for National and Community Service (hereinafter the "Corporation"), has submitted a public information collection request (ICR) entitled the Peer Reviewer Application Instructions to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13, (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). Copies of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Corporation for National and Community Service, James Willie at (202) 606-6845. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TTY-TDD) may call (202)

606–3472 between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted, identified by the title of the information collection activity, to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: Ms. Sharon Mar, OMB Desk Officer for the Corporation for National and Community Service, by any of the following two methods within 30 days from the date of publication in this **Federal Register**.

(1) *By fax to:* (202) 395–6974, Attention: Ms. Sharon Mar, OMB Desk Officer for the Corporation for National and Community Service; and

(2) *Electronically by e-mail to:* smar@omb.eop.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** *The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:*

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Corporation, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Propose ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Propose ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submissions of responses.

#### Comments

A 60-day public comment Notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 28, 2010. This comment period ended June 29, 2010. No public comments were received from this Notice.

*Description:* The Corporation seeks to renew the current information collection. Minor revisions are proposed to clarify eGrants instructions and reflect adjustments to the Corporation for National and Community Service eGrants system.

The information collection will otherwise be used in the same manner as the existing application. The Corporation also seeks to continue using the current application until the revised application is approved by OMB. The current application is due to expire on October 31, 2010.

*Type of Review:* Renewal.

*Agency:* Corporation for National and Community Service.

*Title:* Peer Reviewer Application Instructions.

*OMB Number:* 3045–0090.

*Agency Number:* None.

*Affected Public:* Individuals who are interested in serving as peer reviewers and peer review panel facilitators for the Corporation.

*Total Respondents:* 2,500 responses annually.

*Frequency:* One time to complete.

*Average Time per Response:* Averages 40 minutes.

*Estimated Total Burden Hours:* 1,666 hours.

*Total Burden Cost (capital/startup):* None.

*Total Burden Cost (operating/maintenance):* None.

Dated: June 30, 2010.

**Vielka Garibaldi,**

*Director, Office of Grants Policy and Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2010–16575 Filed 7–7–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6050–SS–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

#### **Establishment of Department of Defense Federal Advisory Committee; Independent Panel Review of Judge Advocate Requirements of the Department of the Navy**

**AGENCY:** Department of Defense (DoD).

**ACTION:** Establishment of Federal advisory committee.

**SUMMARY:** Under the provisions of section 506 of Public Law 111–84, the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, (5 U.S.C. Appendix, as amended), the Government in the Sunshine Act of 1976 (5 U.S.C. 552b, as amended), and 41 CFR 102–3.50, the Department of Defense gives notice that it is establishing the charter for the Independent Panel Review of Judge Advocate Requirements of the Department of the Navy (hereafter referred to as the Panel).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jim Freeman, Deputy Committee Management Officer for the Department of Defense, 703–601–6128.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Panel is a non-discretionary Federal advisory committee established to review the judge advocate requirement of the Department of the Navy. The Panel shall:

a. Carry out a study of the policies and management and organizational

practices of the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps with respect to the responsibilities, assignment, and career development of judge advocates for purposes of determining the number of judge advocates required to fulfill the legal mission of the Department of the Navy.

b. In carrying out the study, the Panel shall review the following:

i. The emergent operational law requirements of the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps, including requirements for judge advocates on joint task forces, in support of rule of law objectives in Iraq and Afghanistan, and in operational units;

ii. New requirements to support the Office of Military Commissions and to support the disability evaluation system for members of the U.S. Armed Forces;

iii. The judge advocate requirements of the Department of the Navy for the military justice mission, including assignment policies, training and education, increasing complexity of court-martial litigation, and the performance of the U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps in providing legally sufficient post-trial processing of cases in general courts-martial and special courts-martial.

iv. The role of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, as the senior uniformed legal officer of the Department of the Navy, to determine whether additional authority for the Judge Advocate General over manpower policies and assignments of judge advocates in the U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps is warranted;

v. Directives issued by the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps pertaining to jointly-shared missions requiring legal support;

vi. Career patterns for U.S. Marine Corps judge advocates in order to identify and validate assignments to non-legal billets required for professional development and promotion; and

In addition, the Panel will review, evaluate and assess such other matters and materials as the Panel considers appropriate for purposes of the study.

In carrying out its study the Panel may review, and incorporate as appropriate, the findings of applicable on-going and completed studies in future manpower requirements, including the two-part study by CNA Analysis and Solutions® entitled, “An Analysis of Navy JAG Corps Future Manpower Requirements”.

The Panel, no later than 120 days after its first meeting, shall submit a report of its study. The report, as a minimum, shall include the following: