have elected to issue a guaranty of compliance with the FFA, or they are required to certify compliance of products intended for children under the CPSA (as amended by the CPSIA). The number of tests that a firm issuing a guaranty of compliance would be required to perform each year varies, depending upon the number of carpet styles and the annual volume of production. CPSC staff estimates that the average firm issuing a continuing guarantee under the FFA is required to conduct a maximum of 200 tests per year. The actual number of tests required by a given firm may vary from one to 200, depending upon the number of carpet styles and the annual production volume. For example, if a firm manufactures 100,000 linear yards of carpet each year, and it consistently has obtained passing test results, then only one test per year is required. For purposes of estimating burden, we have used the midpoint, 100 tests per year. The time required to conduct each test is estimated to be 2.5 hours, plus the time required to establish and maintain the test record. We estimate the total annualized cost/burden to respondents could be as high as 12,000 tests per year at 2.5 hours per test or 30,000 hours.

The annualized costs to respondents for the hour burden for collection of information is estimated to be as high as $1,837,200, using a mean hourly employer cost-per-hour-worked of $61.24 (Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS): Total compensation rates for management, professional, and related occupations in private goods-producing industries, December 2011) (30,000 hours × $61.24).

The estimated annual cost to the federal government of the information and collection requirements is approximately $42,900. This sum includes three staff months expended for examination of the information in records required to be maintained by the enforcement rules. This estimate uses an average wage rate of $57.13 per hour (the equivalent of a GS–14 Step 5 employee), with an additional 30.2 percent added for benefits (BLS, Percentage of total compensation comprised by benefits for all civilian management, professional, and related employees, December 2011) or $82.56 per hour × 520 hours.

C. Request for Comments

The Commission solicits written comments from all interested persons about the proposed collection of information. The Commission specifically solicits information relevant to the following topics:

—Whether the collection of information described above is necessary for the proper performance of the Commission's functions, including whether the information would have practical utility;
—Whether the estimated burden of the proposed collection of information is accurate;
—Whether the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected could be enhanced; and
—Whether the burden imposed by the collection of information could be minimized by use of automated, electronic, or other technological collection techniques, or other forms of information technology.

Dated: June 5, 2012.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–13935 Filed 6–7–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Notice of Teleconference of the Chronic Hazard Advisory Panel on Phthalates and Phthalate Substitutes

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Consumer Product Safety Commission (''CPSC'' or ''Commission'') is announcing a teleconference and the seventh meeting of the Chronic Hazard Advisory Panel (''CHAP'') on phthalates and phthalate substitutes. The Commission appointed this CHAP on April 14, 2010, to study the effects on children's health of all phthalates and phthalate alternatives, as used in children's toys and child care articles, pursuant to section 108 of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (CPSIA) (Pub. L. 110–314). The CHAP will discuss its progress toward completing its analysis of potential risks from phthalates and phthalate substitutes.

DATES: The teleconference will take place from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. EDT (15 to 17 GMT) on Friday, June 29, 2012. Interested members of the public may listen to the CHAP's discussion. Members of the public will not have the opportunity to ask questions, comment, or otherwise participate in the teleconference. Interested parties should contact the CPSC project manager, Michael Babich, by email (*mbabich@cpsc.gov*), for call-in instructions no later than Wednesday, June 27, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Babich, Directorate for Health Sciences, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Bethesda, MD 20814; telephone (301) 504–7253; email: *mbabich@cpsc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 108 of the CPSIA permanently prohibits the sale of any ''children's toy or child care article'' containing more than 0.1 percent of each of three specified phthalates: di- (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP), dibutyl phthalate (DBP), and benzyl butyl phthalate (BBP). Section 108 of the CPSIA also prohibits, on an interim basis, the sale of any ''children's toy that can be placed in a child's mouth'' or ''child care article'' containing more than 0.1 percent of each of three additional phthalates: diisononyl phthalate (DINP), diisodecyl phthalate (DIDP), and di-*n*-octyl phthalate (DnOP).

Moreover, section 108 of the CPSIA requires the Commission to convene a CHAP ''to study the effects on children's health of all phthalates and phthalate alternatives as used in children's toys and child care articles.'' The CPSIA requires the CHAP to complete an examination of the full range of phthalates that are used in products for children and:

- Examine all of the potential health effects (including endocrine-disrupting effects) of the full range of phthalates;
- Consider the potential health effects of each of these phthalates, both in isolation, and in combination with other phthalates;
- Examine the likely levels of children's, pregnant women's, and others' exposure to phthalates, based upon a reasonable estimation of normal and foreseeable use and abuse of such products;
- Consider the cumulative effect of total exposure to phthalates, both from children's products and from other sources, such as personal care products;
- Review all relevant data, including the most recent, best-available, peer-reviewed, scientific studies of these phthalates and phthalate alternatives that employ objective data-collection practices or employ other objective methods;
- Consider the health effects of phthalates not only from ingestion, but also as a result of dermal, hand-to-mouth, or other exposure;
- Consider the level at which there is a reasonable certainty of no harm to children, pregnant women, or other susceptible individuals and their offspring, considering the best available science, and using sufficient safety factors to account for uncertainties

regarding exposure and susceptibility of children, pregnant women, and other potentially susceptible individuals; and

• Consider possible similar health effects of phthalate alternatives used in children's toys and child care articles.

The CHAP must review prior work on phthalates by the Commission, but it is not to be considered determinative because the CHAP's examination must be conducted *de novo.*

The CHAP must make recommendations to the Commission regarding any phthalates (or combinations of phthalates), in addition to those identified in section 108 of the CPSIA, or phthalate alternatives that the panel determines should be prohibited from use in children's toys or child care articles, or otherwise restricted. The CHAP members were selected by the Commission from scientists nominated by the National Academy of Sciences. *See* 15 U.S.C. 2077, 2030(b).

The CHAP met previously in April, July, and December 2010, March, July, and November 2011, and in February 2012, at the CPSC's offices in Bethesda, MD, and by teleconference in November 2010, September 2011, December 2011, and February and April 2012. The CHAP heard testimony from interested parties at the July 2010, and November 2011, meetings. There will not be any opportunity for public comment during the June 2012 teleconference.

Dated: June 5, 2012.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012–13934 Filed 6–7–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

National Security Education Board Members Meeting; Cancellation of Meeting

AGENCY: Under Secretary of Defense Personnel and Readiness, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of meeting; cancellation.

SUMMARY: On May 11, 2012 (77 FR 27739), Department of Defense announced a meeting of the National Security Education Board. This meeting was to be held on June 20, 2012, from 8:30 a.m. to 2 p.m. at Defense Language and National Security Education Office, 1101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1210, Arlington, VA 22209.

Pursuant to Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given of the cancellation of the June 20, 2012 National Security Education Board meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to review and make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense concerning requirements established by the David L. Boren National Security Education Act, Title VII of Public Law 102–183, as amended. The meeting will be postponed until fall 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Alison Patz, Program Analyst, Defense Language and National Security Education Office (DLNSEO), 1101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1210, Arlington, Virginia 22209–2248; (703) 696–1991. Electronic mail address: *Alison.patz@wso.whs.mil.*

Dated: June 5, 2012.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2012–13942 Filed 6–7–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT of DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Notice of Availability of the Draft Feasibility Study/Environmental Impact Statement for the Chatfield Reservoir Storage Reallocation, Littleton, CO

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

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has prepared a Draft Feasibility Study/Environmental Impact Statement (FR/EIS) for the Chatfield Reservoir Storage Reallocation, Littleton, Colorado and by this notice is announcing the opening of the comment period.

DATES: The comment period will be open from June 8, 2012 to August 7, 2012. Public meetings will take place in June, 2012. The specific schedule is provided under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers, Omaha District; CENWO–PM–AA; ATTN: Chatfield Reservoir Storage Reallocation FR/EIS; 1616 Capitol Avenue; Omaha, NE 68102–4901. Comments can also be emailed to: *chatfieldstudy@usace.army.mil.* Comments on the Draft FR/EIS for the Chatfield Reservoir Storage Reallocation must be postmarked, emailed, or otherwise submitted no later than August 7, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information and/or questions about the Chatfield Reservoir Storage Reallocation FR/EIS, please contact Ms. Gwyn Jarrett, Project Manager, by telephone: (402) 995–2717, by mail: 1616 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, NE 68102–4901, or by email: *chatfieldstudy@usace.army.mil.* For inquiries from the media, please contact the USACE Omaha District Public Affairs Officer (PAO), Ms. Monique Farmer by telephone (402) 995–2416, by mail: 1616 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, NE 68102–4901, or by email: *Monique.l.Farmer@usace.army.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Background. Population growth within the Denver, Colorado, metropolitan area continues to create a demand on water providers. Colorado's population is projected to be between 8.6 and 10.3 million in 2050. The Statewide Water Supply Initiative (SWSI), commissioned by the State Legislature, estimates that by 2050, Colorado will need between 600,000 and 1 million acre-feet/year of additional municipal and industrial water. There is also a strong need for additional water supplies for the agricultural community in the South Platte Basin as thousands of acres of previously irrigated land has not been farmed in recent years due to widespread irrigation well curtailments. The purpose and need of the Chatfield Reservoir Storage Reallocation study is to increase availability of water, sustainable over the 50-year period of analysis, in the greater Denver area so that a larger proportion of existing and future (increasing) water needs can be met.

By authority provided under Section 808 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99–622), as amended by Section 3042 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Pub. L. 110–114), the Secretary of the Army, upon request of and in coordination with, the Colorado Department of Natural Resources (CDNR), and upon the Chief of Engineers' finding of feasibility and economic justification, may reassign a portion of the storage space in the Chatfield Lake project to joint flood control-conservation purposes, including storage for municipal and industrial water supply, agriculture, environmental restoration, and recreation and fishery habitat protection and enhancement. The reallocation was conditioned upon the appropriate non-Federal interests agreeing to repay the