DATES: Written public comments must be received on or before May 1, 1998.

ADDRESSES: The FEIS is available for review at three libraries: the Waterloo Library and Historical Society, ATTN: Ms. Mary Zingerella, 31 East Williams Street, Waterloo, NY 13165; Edith B. Ford Memorial Library, ATTN: Mr. & Ms. Henry Morris, 7169 North Main Street, Ovid, NY 14521; and Geneva Free Library, ATTN: Ms. Kim Iraci, 244 Main Street, Geneva, NY 14456. Comments can be addressed to and copies may be obtained by writing to Mr. Hugh McClellan, U.S. Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, ATTN: SAMPD, P.O. Box 2288, Mobile, Alabama 36628–0001 or by facsimile at (334) 690–2605.

Dated: March 25, 1998.

Raymond J. Fatz,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health) OASA (I, L&E).

[FR Doc. 98–8503 Filed 3–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Departmant of the Army

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the BRAC 95 Disposal and Reuse of Letterkenny Army Depot, Chambersburg, PA

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Army announces today the availability of the Environment Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) for the disposal and reuse of the Letterkenny Army Depot (LEAD), Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, in accordance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Public Law 101–510, as amended. The 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC) recommended the realignment of Letterkenny Army Depot. The proposed action is the disposal of property made available by the realignment of specified missions at LEAD.

The EA evaluates the environmental and socioeconomic effects associated with the disposal and subsequent reuse of the Letterkenny property. The Army proposes to dispose of approximately 1,450 acres of the 2,306-acre cantonment area, in the southeast corner of the installation, which was identified through the BRAC process as surplus property to the DOD needs.

Alternatives examined in the EA include encumbered disposal of the property, unencumbered disposal of the property and no action. The Army's preferred alternative for disposal of the LEAD property is encumbered disposal, which involves conveying the property with conditions imposed pertaining to historical resources, remedial activities, asbestos-containing material, easements and rights-of-way, groundwater use prohibition, lead-based paint, utility dependencies, and wetlands.

The EA, which is incorporated into the FNSI, examines potential impacts of the proposed action and alternatives on 14 resource areas and areas of environmental concern: land use, climate, air quality, noise, water resources, geology, infrastructure, hazardous and toxic materials, permits and regulatory authorizations, biological resources, cultural resources, the sociological environment, economic development, and quality of life.

The EA concludes that the disposal and subsequent reuse of the property will not have a significant impact on the human environment. Issuance of a FNSI would be appropriate. An Environmental Impact Statement is not required prior to implementation of the proposed actions.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before May 1, 1998.

ADDRESSES: A copy of the EA or inquiries into the FNSI may be obtained by writing to Mr. Ellis Pope. Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, ATTN: EN–GH, P.O. Box 2288, Mobile, Alabama 36628–0001, by calling (334) 690–3077, or by facsimile at (334) 690–2721.

Dated: March 25, 1998.

Raymond J. Fatz,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health) OASA(I, L&E).

[FR Doc. 98–8504 Filed 3–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Construction of a Rail Connector, Fort Campbell, KY

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Record of Decision (ROD) for the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) (February 1997) for the proposed construction of a rail connector for Fort Campbell, Kentucky, has been completed.

The ROD was developed in accordance with Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR 1505.2), and Army Regulation 200–2, Environmental Effects of Army Actions. The Notice of Availability of the FEIS for the Fort Campbell rail connector was published in the **Federal Register** on August 11 and August 15, 1997 (62 FR 42968 and 62 FR 43730, respectively). Following a 30 day post-filing waiting period, the Department of the Army prepared the ROD, which is part of the environmental documentation presented for the final decision. In addition to announcing the Army's decision, the ROD also identified the factors that went into the selection of its choice, and described mitigation measures the Army would implement to avoid or minimize environmental impacts associated with the action. Mitigation measures include consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office, adherence to Best Management Practices for Stormwater Runoff and Erosion Control, limiting clearance activities, and proper maintenance of locomotives, railcars, and rail lines. Decisions included in this ROD were made in consideration of information developed during a public scoping meeting, a public hearing, and written and oral comments received during the public comment periods associated with the preparation of the FEIS. The Hopkinsville Bypass South has been chosen as the preferred alternative for the construction of the rail connector.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Army action analyzed in the FEIS was the construction of a rail connector between the government-owned line and the CSX line in Christian County, Kentucky. The proposed rail connector is needed to meet outload deployment mobility requirements of the 101st Airborne Division at Fort Campbell, Kentucky. The primary mission of the 101st Airborne Division is to deploy rapidly during an emergency. A 1993 evaluation concluded that the present rail system, which can handle the transfer of only five cars at a time and goes through downtown Hopkinsville, severely limited the Division's ability to get its equipment to Jacksonville, Florida, within the required four days after notification to mobilize. The construction of a railroad conector between the government-owned railroad and the CSX line would substantially aid the 101st Airborne Division in meeting this requirement.

The FEIS identified and evaluated five alternative alignments: the No-Action Alternative, which would keep

the current alignment, Hopkinsville Interchange Upgrade; Hopkinsville Bypass North; Hopkinsville Bypass South; and Masonville-Casky. The ROD documents the decision to select Alternative 2S, the Hopkinsville Bypass South. Alternative 2S will involve the construction of a rail connector from the Branch Line directly to the CSX main line south of Hopkinsville and south of the Hopkinsville Bypass (KY 8546). It also incorporates a siding track parallel to the existing Branch Line south of Hopkinsville. This was the Army's preferred alternative, and was chosen based on economic, engineering, and operational considerations, as well as potential environmental impacts and public opinion.

Questions or Request for ROD: Questions regarding the ROD, or a request for copies of the document may be directed to Mr. William Ray Haynes, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District, P.O. 59, Louisville, Kentucky 40201–6475, or call (502) 582–6475.

Dated: March 26, 1998.

Raymond J. Fatz,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health) OASA (I, L&E).

[FR Doc. 98–8461 Filed 3–31–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[CFDA No. 84.116P]

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)—Special Focus Competition: Disseminating Proven Reforms Notice inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year (FY) 1998

Purpose of Program: To provide grants or enter into cooperative agreements to improve postsecondary education opportunities by focusing on problem areas or improvement approaches in postsecondary education.

Eligible Applicants: Institutions of higher education, combinations of those institutions, and other public and private nonprofit educational institutions and agencies.

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: June 5, 1998.

Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: August 4, 1998.

Applications Available: April 2, 1998.

Available Funds: $1,280,000.

Estimated Range of Awards: $120,000-$180,000.

Estimated Average Size of Awards: $160,000.

Estimated Number of Awards: 8.

Project Period: 27 months.

Note: The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

Applicable Regulations

The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR Parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 82, 85 and 86.

Priority

Invitational Priority

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications that meet the following invitational priority. However, an application that meets this invitational priority does not receive competitive or absolute preference over other applications (34 CFR 75.105(c)(1)).

Invitational Priority: Institutions with innovative postsecondary education programs that became fully institutionalized between 1988 and 1997 are invited to apply for funds to disseminate their practices to other campuses.

Methods for Applying Selection Criteria

The Secretary gives equal weight to the listed criteria. Within each of the criteria, the Secretary gives equal weight to each of the factors.

Selection Criteria

In evaluating applications for grants under this competition, the Secretary uses the following selection criteria chosen from those listed in 34 CFR 75.210:

(a) The need for the proposed project, as determined by—

(1) The magnitude or severity of the problem addressed by the proposed project; and

(2) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project.

(b) The significance of the proposed project, as determined by—

(1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies;

(2) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies;

(3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement; and

(4) The potential replicability of the proposed project or strategies, including, as appropriate, the potential for implementation in a variety of settings.

(c) The quality of the design of the proposed project, as determined by—

(1) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs;

(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable; and

(3) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

(d) The quality of the management plan for the proposed project, as determined by the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(e) The quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project, as determined by—

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel; and

(2) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

(f) The quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project, as determined by—

(1) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings;

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project; and

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(g) The adequacy of resources for the proposed project, as determined by—

(1) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project;

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives,