

an index value of 161.2 in September 1997 to a value of 226.889 in September 2011. An increase of 40.75 percent in the \$8.00 base figure would lead to a new figure of \$11.26. However, because the statute directs that the resulting figure be rounded to the nearest \$0.50, the maximum allowable charge is \$11.50. The Bureau therefore determines that the maximum allowable charge for the year 2012 will be \$11.50, effective April 3, 2012.

Dated: March 26, 2012.

Richard Cordray,

Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

[FR Doc. 2012-7916 Filed 4-2-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-AM-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[OMB Control No. 9000-0079; Docket 2012-0076; Sequence 13]

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Information Collection; Corporate Aircraft Costs

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DOD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of request for public comments regarding an extension to an existing OMB clearance.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act, the Regulatory Secretariat will be submitting to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request to review and approve an extension of a previously approved information collection requirement concerning corporate aircraft costs.

Public comments are particularly invited on: Whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the FAR, and whether it will have practical utility; whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection of information is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Submit comments on or before June 4, 2012.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments identified by Information Collection 9000-0079, Corporate Aircraft Costs, by any of the following methods:

- *Regulations.gov:* <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Submit comments via the Federal eRulemaking portal by inputting "Information Collection 9000-0079, Corporate Aircraft Costs" under the heading "Enter Keyword or ID" and selecting "Search". Select the link "Submit a Comment" that corresponds with "Information Collection 9000-0079, Corporate Aircraft Costs". Follow the instructions provided at the "Submit a Comment" screen. Please include your name, company name (if any), and "Information Collection 9000-0079, Corporate Aircraft Costs" on your attached document.

- *Fax:* 202-501-4067.
- *Mail:* General Services

Administration, Regulatory Secretariat (MVCB), 1275 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20417. ATTN: Hada Flowers/IC 9000-0079, Corporate Aircraft Costs.

Instructions: Please submit comments only and cite Information Collection 9000-0079, Corporate Aircraft Costs, in all correspondence related to this collection. All comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal and/or business confidential information provided.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward Chambers, Contract Policy Division, GSA, (202) 501-3221 or via email edward.chambers@gsa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Purpose

Government contractors that use company aircraft must maintain logs of flights containing specified information (e.g., destination, passenger name, purpose of trip, etc.). This information, as required by FAR 31.205-46, Travel Costs, is used to ensure that costs of owned, leased or chartered aircraft are properly charged against Government contracts and that directly associated costs of unallowable activities are not charged to such contracts.

B. Annual Reporting Burden

Number of Respondents: 3,000.
Responses per Respondent: 1.
Total Responses: 3,000.
Average Burden per Response: 6 hours.
Total Burden Hours: 18,000.
Obtaining Copies of Proposals: Requesters may obtain a copy of the

information collection documents from the General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat Division (MVCB), 1275 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20417, telephone (202) 501-4755. Please cite OMB Control No. 9000-0079, Corporate Aircraft Costs, in all correspondence.

Dated: March 27, 2012.

Laura Auletta,

Director, Office of Governmentwide Acquisition Policy, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Governmentwide Policy.

[FR Doc. 2012-7944 Filed 4-2-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-EP-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Arbitration Panel Decision Under the Randolph-Sheppard Act

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of decision.

SUMMARY: The Department of Education (Department) gives notice that, on May 23, 2011, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Carole Morris v. Kentucky Office for the Blind*, Case No. R-S/09-5. This panel was convened by the Department under the Randolph-Sheppard Act (Act) after the Department received a complaint filed by Carole Morris (Complainant).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You may obtain a copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision from Mary Yang, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., room 5162, Potomac Center Plaza, Washington, DC 20202-2800. Telephone: (202) 245-6327. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll-free, at 1-800-877-8339.

Individuals with disabilities can obtain this document in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or compact disc) on request to the contact person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 6(c) of the Act, 20 U.S.C. 107d-2(c), the Secretary publishes in the **Federal Register** a synopsis of each arbitration panel decision affecting the administration of vending facilities on Federal and other property.

Background

Complainant alleged that the Kentucky Office for the Blind, the State licensing agency (SLA), violated the Act and its implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395. Complainant alleged that the SLA violated the Act, implementing regulations and State rules and