

- Demolition of existing Columbia River bridges.

In summary, the new Columbia River crossing will carry traffic on two separate pier-supported bridges and will include a new light rail transit (LRT) line and improved bicycle/pedestrian facilities, using a stacked alignment to reduce the number of in-water piers in the Columbia River by approximately one-third. CRC proposes six in-water pier complexes for a total of 12 piers for the Columbia River bridges.

CRC proposes to widen the existing I-5 southbound bridge over North Portland Harbor, and will add three new bridges adjacent to the existing bridges. Starting from the east, these structures will carry:

- A three-lane northbound collector-distributor (CD) ramp carrying local traffic;
- Northbound and southbound I-5 on the widened existing bridge across the North Portland Harbor;
- A southbound CD ramp carrying local traffic; and
- LRT combined with a bicycle/pedestrian path.

Each bridge will have four or five in-water bents, consisting of one to three drilled shafts. The permanent in-water piers of both the Columbia River and North Portland Harbor crossings will be constructed using drilled shafts, rather than impact-driven piles. However, the project will include numerous temporary in-water structures to support equipment and materials during the course of construction which may require the use of temporary impact-driven piles. These structures will include work platforms, work bridges, and tower cranes.

The existing Columbia River bridges will be demolished after the new Columbia River bridges have been constructed and after associated interchanges are operating. The existing Columbia River bridges will be demolished in two stages: (1) Superstructure demolition and (2) substructure demolition. In-water demolition will be accomplished either within cofferdams or with the use of diamond wire/wire saw. A full description of the activities proposed by CRC is described in the application.

#### Information Solicited

Interested persons may submit information, suggestions, and comments concerning CRC's request (*see ADDRESSES*). All information, suggestions, and comments related to CRC's request and NMFS' potential development and implementation of regulations governing the incidental taking of marine mammals by CRC will

be considered by NMFS in developing, if appropriate, regulations governing the issuance of letters of authorization.

Dated: December 9, 2010.

**James H. Lecky,**

*Director, Office of Protected Resources,  
National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 2010-31528 Filed 12-14-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Navy

#### Record of Decision for the U.S. Marine Corps East Coast Basing of the F-35B Aircraft

**AGENCY:** Department of the Navy, DoD.

**ACTION:** Record of decision.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, 42 United States Code (U.S.C.) Section 4332(2)(c), the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] parts 1500-1508), the Department of the Navy (DoN) NEPA regulations (32 CFR part 775), and the Marine Corps Environmental Compliance and Protection Manual, which is Marine Corps Order P5090.2A with change 2 (MCO P5090.2A), the DoN announces its decision to base and operate 11 operational F-35B Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) squadrons (up to 16 aircraft per squadron, for a total of 176 aircraft) and one Pilot Training Center (PTC) (composed of two Fleet Replacement Squadrons [FRS]) (up to 20 aircraft per squadron, for a total of 40 aircraft) at two locations on the East Coast of the United States (U.S.). More specifically, the DoN has decided to implement Alternative 1, the Preferred Alternative, which includes basing three F-35B operational squadrons and the PTC at Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Beaufort in Beaufort, South Carolina, and eight operational squadrons at MCAS Cherry Point in Havelock, North Carolina. To support the basing action, the Marine Corps will: (1) Construct and/or renovate airfield facilities and infrastructure necessary to accommodate and maintain the F-35B squadrons; (2) change personnel to accommodate squadron staffing; and (3) conduct F-35B training operations to attain and maintain proficiency in the operational employment of the F-35B. The F-35B aircraft will replace 84 legacy Marine Corps F/A-18A/B/C/D Hornet and 68 AV-8B Harrier aircraft in the Second Marine Air Wing (2d MAW)

and the 4th MAW. All practical means to avoid or minimize environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Preferred Alternative have been adopted.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The complete text of the Record of Decision is available for public viewing on the project Web site at <http://www.usmcsjfeast.com> along with copies of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). For further information, contact the JSF East Coast EIS Project Manager, Environmental Planning & Conservation Division (Attn: Linda Blount); Naval Facilities Engineering Command Mid-Atlantic, Code EV21; 9742 Maryland Avenue, Z-144, 1st Floor; Norfolk, VA 23511; 757-341-0491.

Dated: December 9, 2010.

**D. J. Werner,**

*Lieutenant Commander, Office of the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2010-31469 Filed 12-14-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Navy

#### Record of Decision for the U.S. Marine Corps West Coast Basing of the F-35B Aircraft

**AGENCY:** Department of the Navy, DoD.

**ACTION:** Record of decision.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, 42 United States Code (U.S.C.) Section 4332(2)(c), the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] parts 1500-1508), the Department of the Navy (DoN) NEPA regulations (32 CFR part 775), and the Marine Corps Environmental Compliance and Protection Manual, which is Marine Corps Order P5090.2A with change 2 (MCO P5090.2A), the DoN announces its decision to base and operate 11 operational F-35B Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) squadrons (up to 16 aircraft per squadron, for a total of 176 aircraft), and 1 F-35B Operational Test and Evaluation (OT&E) squadron (8 aircraft) on the West Coast of the United States (U.S.). More specifically, the DoN has decided to implement Alternative 1, the Preferred Alternative, which includes basing six F-35B operational squadrons at Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar in San Diego, California, and five operational

squadrons plus one OT&E squadron at MCAS Yuma in Arizona. Each operational squadron will consist of up to 16 F-35B aircraft. To support the basing action, the DoN will: (1) Construct and/or renovate airfield facilities and infrastructure necessary to accommodate and maintain the F-35B squadrons; (2) change personnel to accommodate squadron staffing; and (3) conduct F-35B readiness and training operations to attain and maintain proficiency in the operational employment of the F-35B and special exercise operations. The Proposed Action also includes construction and operation of a new Auxiliary Landing Field (ALF) within the Goldwater Range, to accommodate Field Carrier Landing Practice for the F-35B. The F-35B aircraft will replace 126 legacy F/A-18A/B/C/D Hornet and 56 AV-8B Harrier aircraft in the Third Marine Air Wing (3D MAW) and 4th MAW. All practical means to avoid or minimize environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the Preferred Alternative have been adopted.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The complete text of the Record of Decision is available for public viewing on the project Web site at <http://www.usmcjswest.com> along with the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). For further information, contact the JSF West EIS Project Manager, 1220 Pacific Highway, San Diego, California 92132-5190. Telephone 619-532-4742.

Dated: December 10, 2010.

**D.J. Werner,**

*Lieutenant Commander, Office of the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2010-31468 Filed 12-14-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Comment request.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Education (the Department), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the reporting burden on the public and helps the public understand the Department's information collection

requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. The Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before February 14, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be electronically mailed to [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) or mailed to U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., LBJ, Washington, DC 20202-4537. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that Federal agencies provide interested parties an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. The Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management, publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests at the beginning of the Departmental review of the information collection. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (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: December 10, 2010.

**Darrin A. King,**

*Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of Management.*

*Institute of Education Sciences*

*Type of Review:* New.

*Title of Collection:* Impact Evaluation of Race to the Top (RTT) and School Improvement Grants (SIG).

*OMB Control Number:* 1850-NEW.

*Agency Form Number(s):* N/A.

*Frequency of Responses:* Once.

*Affected Public:* State, Local, or Tribal Government, State Educational Agencies, Local Educational Agencies.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses:* 591.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours:* 2,083.

**Abstract:** This Office of Management and Budget (OMB) package requests clearance for activities to recruit 50 states and the District of Columbia, and up to 825 schools across an estimated 170 districts for inclusion in an evaluation of Race to the Top (RTT) and School Improvement Grants (SIG). The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act contained substantial funding for systemic education reform. This included \$4.35 billion in RTT grants, which were awarded to 11 states and the District of Columbia based both on their education reform plans and their past success in creating the conditions for reform, and \$3 billion in additional funding for SIG, which is aimed at implementing one of four school turnaround models (STMs) in the lowest-performing schools. The evaluation is designed to (1) study the implementation of RTT and SIG; (2) analyze the impact of SIG-funded STMs on student outcomes using a regression discontinuity design; (3) analyze the impact of receipt of RTT funds on student outcomes using an interrupted time series design; and (4) investigate the relationship between STM turnaround models (and strategies within those models) and student outcomes in low-performing schools. No data are being collected or analyzed as part of recruitment activities. A second OMB submission will request clearance for the evaluation's data collection, analysis, and reporting activities. This future package will include data collection forms, and burden estimates of the number of respondents and hours of response time.

Requests for copies of the proposed information collection request may be accessed from <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, by selecting the "Browse Pending Collections" link and by clicking on link number 4468. 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., LBJ, Washington, DC 20202-4537. Requests may also be electronically mailed to [ICDocketMgr@ed.gov](mailto:ICDocketMgr@ed.gov) or faxed to 202-401-0920. Please specify the complete title of the information collection and OMB Control Number when making your request.

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information