

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: May 22, 2000.

**Patricia L. Toppings,**

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

[FR Doc. 00-13287 Filed 5-25-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001-10-M**

## 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, Form Number, and OMB Number:* Medical Screening of Military Personnel; DD Forms 2807-1, 2807-2; OMB Number 0704-[To Be Determined].

*Type of Request:* New Collection.

*Number of Respondents:* 850,000.

*Responses per Respondent:* 1.

*Annual Responses:* 850,000.

*Average Burden per Response:* 9.6 minutes.

*Annual Burden Hours:* 135,833.

*Needs and Uses:* Title 10 USC 504, 505, 507, 532, 978, 1201, 1202, and 4346, require military applicants to meet medical accession standards for enlistment, induction, and appointment to the Armed Forces. This information collection is the basis for determining medical eligibility of applicants based upon their current and past medical history. The General Accounting Office report, "Military Attrition—DoD Could Save Millions by Better Screening Enlisted Personnel," dated January 1997, instructed the Department of Defense to develop a better method for medically screening military applicants. As a result, the DD Form 2807-1, "Report of Medical History" and the DD Form 2807-2, "Medical Prescreen of Medical History Report," will be the forms used to collect the necessary data needed from the military applicants to elicit a more accurate picture of their

well being and medical history. The information obtained on the DD Form 2807-2 will also identify any medical disqualifying condition(s) prior to the application process and meets the Congressional requirements to obtain the applicant's health care provider and insurance provider.

*Affected Public Individuals or Households;* Not-For-Profit Institutions.  
*Frequency:* On Occasion.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Voluntary.

*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: May 22, 2000.

**Patricia L. Toppings,**

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

[FR Doc. 00-13288 Filed 5-25-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001-10-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Air Force

#### Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement; Airfield Repairs, Landing Systems Improvements, and Adjustments to Aircrew Training at Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma

The United States Air Force intends to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to evaluate potential environmental impacts of the following proposed actions at the 97th Air Mobility Wing, Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma:

- Repair of the west runway (Runway 17 Right/35 Left) and associated taxiways;
- Installation of an Instrument Landing System (ILS) for the east runway (Runway 17 Left/35 Right) and a Microwave Landing System (MLS) on the assault landing strip;
- Increase C-17 and KC-135 training while phasing out C-141 aircrew training and reducing C-5 training.

Deterioration of airfield pavements over the years has increased the potential for loose material damage to the aircraft that use the west runway

and associated taxiways. During the nearly three-year phased runway repair program, some increased use of the east runway would be necessary. During an approximate four-month period, the west runway would be closed and the east runway would be used for all essential aircraft operations.

An instrument approach is a series of predetermined maneuvers for the orderly transfer of an aircraft from the beginning of the initial approach to a landing, or to a point from which a landing may be made visually or a missed approach is executed. Currently, Altus AFB has ILS approaches only to each end of the west runway. ILS equipment transmits information to aircraft to guide the aircraft to the runway. This ILS approach capability would be lost during the repair phase when the west runway would be closed. Thus, installing ILS equipment on the east runway before the west runway is closed for repair would allow continued ILS approach training at Altus AFB. Over the long-term, the increased availability of ILS approaches on both runways, as opposed to only the west runway, would improve aircrew training efficiency at the base. Aircrews currently use simulators for MLS approaches since the base does not have MLS equipment on the airfield. MLS approach capability to the assault landing strip would allow aircrews to perform MLS approaches in the C-17 aircraft. This equipment would also complement simulator training.

As C-141 aircraft are phased out of the Air Force inventory, the Air Force's need for C-17 and KC-135 aircrew training will increase and need for C-5 aircrew training will decrease from levels previously forecast and environmentally assessed. The net effect will be an increased need for flying training at Altus AFB. Altus AFB aircrews would continue using Clinton-Sherman Industrial Airpark, Burns Flat, Oklahoma, for practice approaches, takeoffs, landings, and closed patterns.

In addition to the Proposed Action, the EIS will evaluate the potential environmental impacts of alternatives. One alternative is identical to the Proposed Action except that C-5 aircraft operations at the base would be reduced during the period when the west runway is closed. A second alternative is identical to the Proposed Action except that KC-135 aircraft operations at the base would be reduced during the period when the west runway is closed. These two alternatives would result in increased operations at Clinton-Sherman Industrial Airpark during the period of runway repair. The flying training adjustments identified for the

Proposed Action would occur under a third alternative; however, the runway repair and landing systems installations would not occur. A fourth alternative would be the same as the Proposed Action except that the C-141 aircraft would not be phased out. Therefore, this alternative would include C-141 aircraft operations. The EIS will also evaluate the No Action alternative.

The EIS is being prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act. The Air Force invites government agency representatives and members of the community to hear a presentation on the proposal and to identify environmental issues to be analyzed in the EIS that will be used in the decision-making process.

A public scoping meeting on the proposal will be held Tuesday, June 13, 2000. An Open House will be held at 6:30 p.m. The meeting begins at 7:30 p.m. in Herschel H. Crow Auditorium, Western Oklahoma State College, 2801 N. Main, Altus, Oklahoma.

Comments on this proposed action may be sent (postmarked by June 30, 2000) to Linda C. Stokes, 97 AMW/PA, 100 Inez Blvd., Suite 2, Altus AFB, OK 73523-5047. Ms. Stokes can be reached at (580) 481-7229 or by facsimile at (580) 481-5966.

**Janet A. Long,**

*Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00-13305 Filed 5-25-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-05-P

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[CFDA No. 84.295A]

### Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI); Ready-To-Learn (RTL) Television Program

Notice of selection criteria and extension of deadline for transmittal of applications for a new award for fiscal year (FY) 2000.

**SUMMARY:** On May 3, 2000, we published in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 25815-25817) a notice inviting applications for a new award for FY 2000 for the RTL Television Program. This notice explains the Selection Criteria that the Secretary will use to evaluate your application.

**Note:** This notice also extends the deadline for transmittal of applications as follows:

*Deadline for Transmittal of Applications:* June 26, 2000.

*Selection Criteria:* The Secretary uses the following selection criteria in 34 CFR 700.30 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 is indicated in parentheses.

(a) *National significance* (30 points). The Secretary considers the national significance of the proposed project. In determining the national significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The importance of the problem or issue to be addressed.

(2) The nature of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) likely to result from the project and the potential for their effective use in a variety of other settings.

(3) The extent and quality of plans for disseminating results in ways that will allow others to use the information.

(b) *Quality of the project design* (30 points). The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the research design includes a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for research activities, and the use of appropriate theoretical and methodological tools, including those of a variety of disciplines, where appropriate.

(2) The quality of the plan for evaluating the functioning and impact of the project, including the objectivity of the evaluation and the extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project.

(3) The quality of the demonstration design and procedures for documenting project activities and results.

(4) The likelihood that the design of the project will successfully address the intended, demonstrated educational need or needs.

(5) How well and innovatively the project addresses statutory purposes, requirements, and any priority or priorities announced for the program.

(c) *Quality and potential contributions of personnel* (10 points). The Secretary considers the quality and potential contributions of personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality and potential contributions of personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The qualifications, including training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.

(2) The qualifications, including training and experience, of key project personnel.

(3) The qualifications, including training and experience, of proposed consultants or subcontractors.

(d) *Adequacy of resources* (10 points). The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The adequacy of support from the lead applicant organization.

(2) The relevance and commitment of each partner in the project to the implementation and success of the project.

(3) Whether the budget is adequate to support the project.

(e) *Quality of the management plan* (20 points). The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the project, including the specification of staff responsibility, timelines, and benchmarks for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The adequacy of plans for ensuring high-quality products and services.

(3) The adequacy of plans for ensuring continuous improvement in the operation of the project.

(4) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the project, including those of parents and teachers, where appropriate.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joe Caliguro, U.S. Department of Education, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW., room 604-I, Washington, DC 20202-5520. Telephone: (202) 219-1596. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternative format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the program contact person listed in the previous paragraph.

### Electronic Access to This Document

You may view this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet 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, which is available free at either of the previous sites. If you have questions about using