

RECORD ACCESS PROCEDURES:

See "Notification Procedures" above.

CONTESTING RECORD PROCEDURES:

See "Notification Procedures" above.

RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

Information contained in the system will be collected from a variety of sources, including, without limitation, individuals who submit correspondence, or who have correspondence submitted on their behalf to the CFPB, or who have requested to receive correspondence from the Bureau, and CFPB employees responsible for processing, reviewing, and/or responding to such correspondence.

EXEMPTIONS CLAIMED FOR THE SYSTEM:

None.

[FR Doc. 2013-29969 Filed 12-16-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-AM-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers****Notice of Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Dam Safety Modification Study Report for the Cherry Creek Project, Arapahoe County, Colorado**

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; DoD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District (Corps) intends to prepare a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the federal action to remediate dam safety concerns at Cherry Creek Dam. The dam safety concerns are primarily related to a hydrologic deficiency resulting from an extreme precipitation event and the large population that could be affected by such an event. Cherry Creek Dam and Lake is located on Cherry Creek, 11.4 miles upstream of its confluence with the South Platte River, in Aurora, Colorado (southeast Denver metropolitan area). The remediation actions will be identified through a Dam Safety Modification Study (DSMS) being conducted in accordance with Corps policy as described in Engineering Regulation 1110-2-1156 "Safety of Dams—Policy and Procedures."

ADDRESSES: Omaha District Corps of Engineers, 1616 Capitol Ave, Omaha, NE 68102-4926 (Attn: Margaret Oldham CENWO-PAO).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Current and archival information regarding Cherry Creek Dam may be obtained by contacting the Omaha District. The point of contact is Margaret Oldham, Phone: (402) 995-2416; email: Margaret.E.Oldham@usace.army.mil. Questions or comments regarding the upcoming studies at Cherry Creek Dam should also be directed to Ms. Oldham.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. *Background Information.* The Cherry Creek Dam project was authorized in the 1940s for the primary purpose of protecting the city of Denver against floods from Cherry Creek. The dam is located in a densely populated area and provides flood protection to over 200,000 people. Starting in 2005, the Corps sought to better categorize the risk at all of its dams. Risk considers both the probability and consequences of a dam failure. Cherry Creek Dam received an elevated risk rating primarily because of the hydraulic deficiency resulting from an extreme precipitation event and the large population which is protected by the dam. Estimation of extreme precipitation events is based on the Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP) for a given location. A PMP is an extremely rare event and is defined as the maximum amount of precipitation that could occur if all meteorological elements were optimal to allow a perfect environment for forming precipitation. The resulting stream flow from a PMP is a flood defined as the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF).

Multiple past studies have indicated that Cherry Creek may not be able to adequately pass a PMF event. Hydrologic deficiency issues associated with Cherry Creek Dam were initially brought to light in 1970 after the National Weather Service (NWS) completed a site-specific PMP study of the upper South Platte River basin for the design of Chatfield Dam (a nearby dam on the South Platte River). Applying the 1970 PMP criteria to the Cherry Creek basin resulted in a larger stream flow than used in the project's original design and indicated the dam had a potential hydrologic deficiency. Since 1970, the NWS and the Corps have completed several PMP and PMF estimates including a Cherry Creek basin, site-specific PMP study completed by the NWS in 1995. Applying the current estimate of the PMF, which is also based on the 1995 PMP study, Cherry Creek Dam has a hydrologic deficiency even if the pool elevation at the start of the PMF was at normal operating levels.

Because of the risk rating, Omaha District completed an Issue Evaluation Study (IES) in 2011 to further evaluate Cherry Creek Dam's safety issues and corresponding risk. The IES findings were presented to a Senior Oversight Group (SOG) appointed by the Corps' Headquarters. The SOG reviewed the IES and confirmed the risk rating for the dam. Omaha District was directed to proceed into a DSMS, which is currently under way, with the task of defining in detail the risk associated with the Cherry Creek Dam's safety issues and assessing possible options for mitigating the risk. Those options may include federal actions which will be the subject of the EIS.

2. *Remediation Alternatives.* The draft EIS will address an array of remediation alternatives that could reduce the risk of life loss, extensive downstream damage, functional loss of the project, and the loss of all project benefits. The nature and extent of the remediation alternatives will be determined based on the results of on-going engineering studies, public and agency input during the scoping period, and preparation of the draft EIS.

3. *Issues To Be Addressed.* The draft EIS will address environmental issues concerning the remediation alternatives proposed. Issues will be identified based on public input during the scoping process and during preparation of the draft EIS. Environmental issues initially identified as potentially significant include, but are not limited to: hydrology and water quality, noise and vibration, air quality, socioeconomics, water supply, land use, recreation, visual and aesthetic resources, traffic and transportation, historical and cultural resources, vegetation and wildlife, special status species, and fisheries.

4. *Public Involvement.* Public scoping meetings will be held in 2014 at specific locations to be announced within the local Cherry Creek Dam project area. The purpose of the public scoping meetings will be to present information to the public regarding the array of remediation alternatives that may be addressed in the draft EIS, receive public comments, and solicit input regarding dam safety issues, remediation alternatives to consider, and environmental issues of concern to the public. These meetings are intended to initiate the process to involve concerned individuals, and local, state, and federal agencies. The public scoping meeting place, date, and time will be advertised in advance in local newspapers, and meeting announcement letters will be sent to interested parties.

5. *Availability of the Draft EIS.* The Corps intends to issue the draft EIS in the 2015/2016 time frame. The Corps will announce availability of the draft EIS in the **Federal Register** and other media, and will provide the public, organizations, and agencies with an opportunity to submit comments to be addressed in the final EIS.

Dated: December 4, 2013.

John Palensky,

Project Manager, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

[FR Doc. 2013-29984 Filed 12-16-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3720-58-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[Docket ID ED-2013-IES-0151]

Request for Information To Gather Technical Expertise Pertaining to Data Elements, Metrics, Data Collection, Weighting, Scoring, and Presentation of a Postsecondary Institution Ratings System

AGENCY: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, Department of Education.

ACTION: Request for information.

SUMMARY: To assist the Department of Education (Department) in its efforts to develop a Postsecondary Institution Ratings System (PIRS), the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) invites the submission of information about data elements, metrics, methods of data collection, methods of weighting or scoring, and presentation frameworks for a PIRS for assessing the performance of institutions of higher education (IHEs) and advancing institutional accountability while also enhancing consumer access to useful information.

DATES: Written submissions must be received by the Department on or before January 31, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. We will not accept comments by fax or by email. To ensure that we do not receive duplicate copies, please submit your comments only one time. In addition, please include the Docket ID and the term "Postsecondary Institution Ratings response" at the top of your comments.

• *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> to submit your comments electronically. Information on using [Regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), including instructions for accessing agency documents, submitting comments, and viewing the docket, is

available on the site under "Are you new to this site?"

• *Postal Mail, Commercial Delivery, or Hand Delivery:* If you mail or deliver your comments, address them to Richard Reeves, National Center for Education Statistics, Attention: Postsecondary Institution Ratings System RFI, U.S. Department of Education, 1990 K Street NW., 8th Floor, Washington, DC 20006.

• *Privacy Note:* The Department's policy for comments received from members of the public (including comments submitted by mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery) is to make these submissions available for public viewing in their entirety on the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Therefore, commenters should be careful to include only information that they wish to make publicly available on the Internet.

Submission of Proprietary Information: Given the subject matter, some comments may include proprietary information as it relates to confidential commercial information. The Freedom of Information Act defines "confidential commercial information" as information the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to cause substantial competitive harm. You may wish to request that we not disclose what you regard as confidential commercial information.

To assist us in making a determination on your request, we encourage you to identify any specific information in your comments that you consider confidential commercial information. Please list the information by page and paragraph numbers.

This is a request for information (RFI) only. This RFI is not a request for proposals (RFP) or a promise to issue an RFP or a notice inviting applications (NIA). This RFI does not commit the Department to contract for any supply or service whatsoever. Further, the Department is not seeking proposals and will not accept unsolicited proposals. The Department will not pay for any information or administrative costs that you may incur in responding to this RFI. If you do not respond to this RFI, you may still apply for future contracts and grants. The Department posts RFPs on the Federal Business Opportunities Web site (<http://www.fbo.gov>). The Department announces grant competitions in the **Federal Register** (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys>). It is your responsibility to monitor these sites to determine whether the Department issues an RFP or NIA after considering the information received in response to this RFI. The documents and

information submitted in response to this RFI become the property of the U.S. Government and will not be returned.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Richard Reeves, (202) 502-7436, Richard.Reeves@ed.gov. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a text telephone (TTY), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll free, at 1-800-877-8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

A postsecondary education is among the most important investments students can make in their own futures. However, obtaining such an education has grown increasingly expensive. The average tuition at a public four-year college has increased by more than 300 percent over the past three decades, while incomes for typical families grew by only 16 percent, according to Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and Bureau of Labor Statistics data. Declining State funding has moved an increasing share of the cost of postsecondary education from State taxpayers to students; tuition has almost doubled as a share of public college revenues over the past 25 years, from 25 percent to 47 percent. While a college education remains a valuable investment overall, the average borrower with a bachelor's degree now graduates with more than \$29,400 in debt, according to 2012 data from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study. Moreover, college completion rates are relatively low: only 58 percent of full-time students who began college in 2004 earned a four-year degree within six years. Loan default rates are rising, and many young adults are burdened with debt as they seek to start a family, buy a home, launch a business, or save for retirement.

The Department provides over \$150 billion each year in student financial aid, while States collectively invest over \$70 billion in public colleges and universities. Almost all of these resources are allocated based on the number of students who enroll, not the number of students who earn degrees, how much students learn, or the return on investment to the students and society for the cost of their degrees.

In August 2013, President Obama announced a new agenda that will increase college value and affordability for American families. As part of this plan, the President has directed the Department to develop and publish a new college ratings system before the 2015-16 school year.

The ratings system will help students compare the value and affordability of