

in the December notification relating to the CBT wheat futures contract. The Commission is of the view that the public has an important role to fulfill and a critical interest in a full airing of these issues. Accordingly, the Commission is hereby separately requesting written data and views from interested members of the public relating to the CBT wheat contract. The submission of data relating to cash market flows of No. 2 soft red winter wheat, relevant locational price differentials, and other relevant economic evidence would be especially useful. Commenters are specifically requested to address the following issues:

1. Does a problem exist with regard to the current delivery specifications of the CBT wheat contract? If so, to what extent is the problem a lack of adequate deliverable supplies at Chicago, Toledo, and St. Louis? With respect to Toledo and St. Louis, are the differentials on the contract set appropriately to reflect cash market price differentials? What is the economic deliverable capacity at St. Louis in light of the through-put nature of the facilities located there?

2. To what extent do the current CBT delivery specifications for wheat reflect flows of wheat in the cash market? To the extent that the delivery terms of the futures contract differ from the wheat flows in the cash market, does this have any detrimental impact on the trading of the wheat futures contract or on the cash market for wheat?

3. What is the likely effect of a failure to modify the current delivery terms of the contract?

4. What alternative delivery specifications are available to increase deliverable supplies on the contract?

In this respect, commenters are requested to address the following questions, supplying, to the extent available, economic data or studies in support of their conclusions:

a. Given the declining role of Chicago as a cash market for wheat, should it be retained as a delivery point on the futures contract?

b. What are the advantages and disadvantages of expanding the Toledo, Ohio delivery point to encompass off-water elevators in neighboring counties?

c. What are the advantages and disadvantages of expanding the St. Louis, Missouri delivery point to encompass river stations and off-water elevators in neighboring counties?

d. What are the advantages and disadvantages of permitting delivery at St. Louis via shipping certificates, rather than warehouse receipts? Should such shipping certificates be backed by warehouse receipts at or near that

location or by financial guarantees of performance?

e. If delivery at St. Louis by shipping certificate is advisable, should other delivery points on the contract also provide for delivery by shipping certificate? Is consistency of delivery instrument among delivery points necessary or desirable? What is the likely effect of lack of consistency in the type of delivery instrument for different delivery points?

f. What are the advantages and disadvantages of providing for delivery via shipping certificates at elevators located: (i) On the Mississippi River located between St. Louis and Memphis or (ii) on the Mississippi River between St. Louis and Cairo and (iii) on the Ohio River between Cairo and Louisville, Kentucky?

g. What are the advantages and disadvantages of specifying delivery to lower Mississippi River export elevators?

5. Is there a single location, or a limited number of locations, that offer either sufficient stocks or receive sufficient flows of one class of wheat adequate to support futures trading and to tend to prevent or diminish price manipulation, market congestion or the abnormal movement of such commodity in interstate commerce?

Issued in Washington, D.C., this 1st day of July, 1997 by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

**Jean A. Webb,**

*Secretary of the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 97-17721 Filed 7-7-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

#### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**ACTION:** Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

*Title and Associated Form:* Direct Deposit Authorization, DD Form X311, OMB Number 0730—[To Be Determined].

*Type of Request:* New Collection.

*Number of Respondents:* 252,000.

*Responses per Respondent:* 1.

*Annual Responses:* 252,000.

*Average Burden per Response:* 30 minutes.

*Annual Burden Hours:* 126,000.

*Needs and Uses:* This collection of information is necessary to meet the Department of Defense and the Department of Treasury's requirements to process civilian and military personnel requests to authorize direct deposits of net payments, travel payments, and savings allotments to financial institutions to which payment is to be directed. The information is required by the Treasury Financial Manual, Bulletin No. 95-07, dated December 16, 1994, and DoD Financial Management Regulation, Volume 5. The Direct Deposit Authorization form will be used for all DoD personnel including civilians, active and retired military, and annuitants. The form will be completed and signed by the payee and forwarded to their paying office. The information can be obtained from the payee's banking documents. The paying office will enter the Direct Deposit enrollment information into the payroll system, and at the same time assure proper identification of the payee. The data will be forwarded to the payee's financial institution by the servicing Federal Reserve Bank.

*Affected Public:* Individuals or Households.

*Frequency:* On Occasion.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Required to Obtain or Retain Benefits.

*OMB Desk Officer:* Mr. Edward C. Springer.

Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Mr. Springer at the Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer for DoD, Room 10236, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

*DOD Clearance Officer:* Mr. Robert Cushing.

Written requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Mr. Cushing, WHS/DIOR, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302.

Dated: July 1, 1997.

**Patricia L. Toppings,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 97-17711 Filed 7-7-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

#### Defense Science Board Task Force on Underground Facilities

**ACTION:** Notice of advisory committee meetings.

**SUMMARY:** The Defense Science Board Task Force on Underground Facilities

will meet in closed session on August 26–28, 1997 at Strategic Analysis, Inc., 4001 N. Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense through the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. At this meeting the Task Force will address the threat to U.S. interests posed by the growth of underground facilities in unfriendly nations. The Task Force should investigate technologies and techniques to meet the international security and military strategy challenges posed by these facilities.

In accordance with Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, P.L. No. 92–463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. II, (1994)), it has been determined that this DSB Task Force meeting concerns matters listed in 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c)(1) (1994), and that accordingly this meeting will be closed to the public.

Dated: July 1, 1997.

**L.M. Bynum,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 97–17710 Filed 7–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–M

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Submission for OMB review; comment request.

**SUMMARY:** The Director, Information Resources Management Group, invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before August 7, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Dan Chenok, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503. Requests for copies of the proposed information collection requests should be addressed to Patrick J. Sherrill, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW., Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202–4651.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Patrick J. Sherrill (202) 708–8196.

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Director of the Information Resources Management Group publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g., new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment at the address specified above. Copies of the requests are available from Patrick J. Sherrill at the address specified above.

Dated: July 1, 1997.

**Gloria Parker,**

*Director, Information Resources Management Group.*

### Office of Postsecondary Education

**Title:** Student Assistance General Provisions—Subpart E (Verification of Student Aid Application Information).

**Frequency:** Annually.

**Affected Public:** Individuals or households; Businesses or other for-profit; Not-for-profit institutions.

**Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:**

Responses: 2,099,000.

Burden Hours: 365,833.

**Abstract:** Verification of Application Information for Title IV Student Financial Assistance Programs. Applicants, and in some cases, the applicant's parents must provide

documentation to support data listed on the Application for assistance.

[FR Doc. 97–17687 Filed 7–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP97–601–000]

### Northern Natural Gas Company; Notice of Application for Abandonment

July 1, 1997.

Take notice that on June 23, 1997, Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern), 1111 South 103rd Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68124, filed in Docket No. CP97–601–000, an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Part 157 of the Commission's Regulations for permission and approval to abandon a total of fourteen compressor units and stations, with appurtenances, located in Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Michigan, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Northern states that the compressor units and stations proposed to be abandoned in the instant application, identified in Exhibit T, are not being utilized due to changes in operating conditions which have eliminated the need for these facilities. Northern asserts that the abandonment of these facilities will not result in the abandonment of service to any of Northern's existing shippers, nor will the proposed abandonment adversely affect capacity since the compression is no longer needed to meet current firm service obligations.

Northern proposes to abandon these units and stations in-place. However, Northern indicates that it may utilize the units or parts from these units in the future at other locations on its system as the need may arise or they might be salvaged. At the time these units are utilized, Northern says it will seek any required Commission authority in order to install and operate these compressor facilities at a new location.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before July 22, 1997, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 and 385.211) and the