

commercial and industrial uses. No decision on the proposed action will be made until the NEPA process has been completed. Potential impacts evaluated in the DEIS include, but are not limited to: water quality; terrestrial biota and habitats; aircraft noise; land use compatibility; traffic, infrastructure; air quality; socioeconomic; public health and safety; cultural resources; and environmental contamination. With two exceptions, all potentially significant impacts under all of the reuse alternatives can be mitigated to nonsignificant levels. Potentially significant but mitigable impacts include: future aircraft noise impacts on certain residential areas; inadequate infrastructure to support redevelopment; possible future impacts due to aircraft emissions; increase in demand for police and fire protection; and effects on an archaeological site eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The two exceptions are aircraft noise impacts on proposed housing in reuse areas north of the airport under one alternative (not the preferred alternative) and traffic impacts at two key intersections. For the noise impacts, no mitigation is available except to revise the land use plan. Predicted traffic volumes at the two intersections would exceed capacity even with mitigation.

The DEIS has been distributed to affected federal and Government of Guam agencies and other interested parties. In addition, copies of the DEIS are available for review at the Guam Public Library branches in the communities of Agana, Barrigada and Dededo.

A public hearing will be held to inform the public of the DEIS findings and to solicit and receive oral and written comments. The hearing will be held at 7:00 p.m. on May 13, 1999, at San Vicente/San Roke Catholic Church Social Hall, 229 San Roke Street, Barrigada, Guam. Government agencies and interested parties are invited to be present at the hearing. Oral comments will be heard and transcribed by a court recorder; written comments are also requested to ensure accuracy of the record. All comments, both oral and written, will become part of the official record. In the interest of available time, each speaker will be asked to limit oral comments to three minutes. Longer comments should be summarized at the public hearing and submitted in writing either at the hearing or mailed to Mr. John Bigay at the address given above. Written comments are requested not later than May 24, 1999.

Dated: April 19, 1999.

Ralph W. Corey,

*Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps,
U.S. Navy, Alternate Federal Liaison Officer.*
[FR Doc. 99-9891 Filed 4-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs—Federal Activities—State and Regional Coalition Grant Competition To Prevent High-Risk Drinking Among College Students

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of proposed priority, eligible applicants, and selection criteria for fiscal year 1999 and subsequent years.

SUMMARY: The Secretary announces a proposed priority, eligible applicants, and selection criteria for fiscal year (FY) 1999 and, at the discretion of the Secretary, for subsequent years under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs—Federal Activities—State and Regional Coalition Grant Competition to Prevent High-Risk Drinking Among College Students. The Secretary takes this action to focus Federal financial assistance on an identified national need. This competition seeks to reduce and prevent high-risk drinking among college students by funding State or regional coalitions for a two-year period to bring together institutions of higher education (IHEs) to share ideas and develop, implement, and evaluate collaborative strategies.

Invitation to Comment: Interested persons are invited to submit comments and recommendations regarding this proposed priority. All comments submitted in response to this notice will be available for public inspection, during and after the comment period, in Room 3E222, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, DC, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday of each week except Federal holidays.

On request the Department supplies an appropriate aid, such as a reader or print magnifier, to an individual with a disability that needs assistance to review the comments. An individual with a disability who wants to schedule an appointment for this type of aid may call (202) 205-8113 or (202) 260-9895. An individual who uses a TDD may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

DATES: Comments must be received by the Department on or before May 20, 1999.

ADDRESSES: All comments concerning these proposed priorities should be addressed to Kimberly Light, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E222, Washington, DC 20202-6123. Comments may be sent through the Internet: comments@ed.gov. You must include the term "Alcohol, Other Drug, and Violence Prevention for IHEs" in the subject line of your electronic message.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kimberly Light, (202) 260-2647.

Individuals who use a telecommunication device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service at 1-800-877-8339. Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternate format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed above.

Note: This notice of proposed priorities does not solicit applications. A notice inviting applications under this competition will be published in the **Federal Register** concurrent with or following the publication of the notice of final priorities.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: High-risk drinking, including "binge" drinking, continues to affect the health, learning, and safety of college students. Excessive use of alcohol has resulted in deaths, serious injuries, vandalism, and sexual assault on college campuses. There is strong evidence that environmental factors, including alcohol availability, high-risk alcohol use norms, and the restrictiveness of State drunk driving laws, play a major role in student alcohol use. Different IHEs may have high-risk drinking problems that are affected by similar environmental concerns; therefore, developing partnerships with other IHEs can provide a forum to develop common solutions as well as a mechanism to create the "critical mass" of concerned stakeholders needed to influence broader environmental changes. The recent development of a number of IHE coalitions across the country suggests that such partnerships may be an effective method for IHEs with common environmental concerns to build local capacity to address high-risk drinking within their campus-communities. In addition, these efforts can have an impact within a larger community context, such as geographic regions within States (e.g., a large metropolitan area), similar institutions within States (e.g., all public universities), or institutions in States that share common borders. This competition seeks to

encourage these collaborative efforts and evaluate their effectiveness so that other IHEs may adopt effective strategies.

Absolute Priority: Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(3) and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994, the Secretary gives an absolute preference to applications that meet the following priority. The Secretary funds under this competition *only* applications that meet the following absolute priority:

Implement and Evaluate the Impact of a State or Regional Coalition to Develop Strategies for Reducing and Preventing High-Risk Drinking Among College Students

Applicants proposing a project under this priority must:

(1) Propose to expand an existing or establish a new State or regional coalition of IHEs and other relevant organizations that includes key stakeholders who will have an impact on the development and implementation of State, local, and campus policies and programs to reduce and prevent high-risk drinking;

(2) Explain how coalition members will work together on a regular basis, including meeting to discuss common problems and share effective strategies;

(3) Use community collaboration prevention approaches, including involvement of students, that research or evaluation has shown to be effective in preventing or reducing high-risk drinking;

(4) Use a qualified evaluator to design and implement an evaluation of the project using outcomes-based (summative) performance indicators in addition to process (formative) measures that documents strategies used and measures the effectiveness of the coalition;

(5) Demonstrate the ability to start the project within 60 days after receiving Federal funding in order to maximize the time available to show impact within the grant period; and (6) Share information about their projects with the Department of Education or its agents.

Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants under this competition are IHEs and consortia of IHEs, and other public and private nonprofit organizations.

Selection Criteria

The following selection criteria will be used to evaluate applications for new grants under this competition. The maximum score for all of these criteria is 100 points. The maximum score for

each criterion or factor under that criterion is indicated in parentheses.

(1) *Need for project* (15 points).

In determining the need for the proposed project, the following factors are considered:

(a) The magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed project. (10 points)

(b) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses. (5 points)

(2) *Significance* (14 points).

In determining the significance of the proposed project, the following factors are considered:

(a) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement. (10 points)

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

(3) *Quality of the project design* (15 points).

In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the following factors are considered:

(a) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (4 points)

(b) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. (6 points)

(c) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. (5 points)

(4) *Quality of the project personnel* (15 points).

In determining the quality of project personnel, the following factors are considered:

(a) 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. (3 points)

(b) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (12 points)

(5) *Adequacy of resources* (16 points).

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the following factors are considered:

(a) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project the implementation and success of the project. (8 points)

(b) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. (4 points)

(c) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support. (4 points)

(6) *Quality of the management plan* (14 points).

In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the following factors are considered:

(a) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of students, faculty, parents, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate. (10 points)

(b) 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. (4 points)

(7) *Quality of the project evaluation* (11 points).

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the following factors are considered:

(a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives and outcomes of the proposed project. (4 points)

(b) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (3 points)

(c) 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. (4 points)

Electronic Access to This Document

Anyone may view this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the **Federal Register**, in text or portable document format (pdf) on the World Wide Web at either of the following sites:

<http://ocfo.ed.gov/fedreg.htm>

<http://www.ed.gov/news.html>

To use the pdf you must have the Adobe Acrobat Reader Program with Search,

which is available free at either of the preceding sites. If you have questions about using the pdf, call the U.S. Government Printing officer toll free at 1-888-293-6498.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**.

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 7131.

Dated: April 16, 1999.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 84.184H Office of Elementary and Secondary Education—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs—Federal Activities—State and Regional Coalition Grant Competition to Prevent High-Risk Drinking Among College Students)

Judith Johnson,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education.

[FR Doc. 99-10025 Filed 4-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Bonneville Power Administration

Delivery of the Canadian Entitlement

AGENCY: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of availability of Record of Decision (ROD).

SUMMARY: The Administrator and Chief Executive Officer of BPA, acting for BPA, and, as Chair of the United States Entity (which is the Administrator of BPA and the Division Engineer, North Pacific Division of the United States Army Corps of Engineers), acting for the United States Entity, has decided to supplement an earlier decision regarding the Canadian Entitlement. The decision is to enter into an agreement to enable disposal of the Canadian Entitlement directly in the United States. The Canadian Entitlement, established in the Columbia River Treaty of 1964, is the portion (one-half) of the downstream power benefits from three storage dams in Canada that is owed to Canada.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the documents discussed below are available from BPA's Public Information Office, P.O. Box 12999, Portland, Oregon 97212. They may also be obtained by calling BPA's toll-free document request line: 1-800-622-4520. The documents are: Delivery of the Canadian Entitlement Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) of January 1996, the March 1996 ROD, the November 1996 ROD, and the Supplement to the November 1996 ROD described in this notice.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The United States Entity (which is responsible for representing United States interests pursuant to the Columbia River Treaty) issued a Delivery of the Canadian Entitlement ROD on November 8, 1996. The ROD was based on the Delivery of the Canadian Entitlement EIS (DOE/EIS-0197, issued in January 1996). The November 1996 ROD announced the United States Entity decision to fulfill its obligation under the Columbia River Treaty between Canada and the United States of America by delivering the full Canadian Entitlement at existing transmission interconnections between the United States and Canada near Blaine, Washington, and Nelway, British Columbia. The November 1996 ROD also replaced an earlier March 12, 1996, ROD.

The November 1996 ROD did not address delivery of the Canadian Entitlement in the United States. It did, however, note that: "If the United States and Canadian Entities propose delivery in the United States, the United States Entity will review the Delivery of the Canadian Entitlement EIS to ensure that the impacts are adequately analyzed. A decision to dispose of the Entitlement in the United States would be the subject of an additional United States Entity ROD."

The Federal governments of Canada and the United States have exchanged diplomatic notes, as provided in the Columbia River Treaty, to permit disposal of all or part of the Canadian Entitlement directly in the United States. BPA and the Province of British Columbia have reached agreement on the terms and conditions of the disposal. The Administrator and Chief Executive Officer of BPA, as Administrator and also as Chair of the United States Entity, has decided to enter into an agreement to enable disposal of the Canadian Entitlement directly in the United States. As a result, the United States Entity is supplementing the November 1996 ROD to recognize the decision to enable disposal of the Canadian Entitlement in the United States through September 15, 2024, as well as delivery at Blaine and Nelway.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Katherine Semple Pierce—KECP, Bonneville Power Administration, P.O. Box 3621, Portland, Oregon, 97208-3621, phone number (503) 230-3962, fax number (503) 230-4089.

Issued in Portland, Oregon, on March 31, 1999.

Judith A. Johansen,

Administrator and Chief Executive Officer, Bonneville Power Administration, and Chair, United States Entity.

[FR Doc. 99-9886 Filed 4-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP99-262-001]

Algonquin Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Compliance Filing

April 14, 1999.

Take notice that on April 9, 1999, Algonquin Gas Transmission Company (Algonquin) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Fourth Revised Volume No. 1 and Original Volume No. 2, the following tariff sheets to become effective May 1, 1999:

Fourth Revised Volume No. 1

First Revised Sheet No. 102
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 103
First Revised Sheet No. 116
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 118
First Revised Sheet No. 136
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 137
First Revised Sheet No. 153
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 154

Original Volume No. 2

Twelfth Revised Sheet No. 343

Algonquin asserts that the purpose of this filing is to comply with the Joint Stipulation and Agreement filed on March 4, 1999 in Docket No. RP99-262-000 and approved by the Commission's letter order issued April 1, 1999.

Algonquin states that the filing revises its FERC Gas Tariff to implement Article II of the Joint Stipulation and Agreement regarding expanded secondary MATQ rights and to fulfill the commitment made in its Initial Comments on the Joint Stipulation and Agreement filed on March 12, 1999 to reduce rates for Rate Schedule X-37 as of May 1, 1999.

Algonquin states that copies of the filing were mailed to all parties on the service list in this proceeding and all other affected customers of Algonquin and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be filed as provided in section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests