

imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

### Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in Commerce's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

We are issuing and publishing these results in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213 and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4).

Dated: July 3, 2018.

**Gary Taverman,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

### Appendix

#### List of Topics Discussed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum

1. Summary
2. Background
3. Scope of the Order
4. Non-Market Economy Country Status
5. Separate Rates
6. Surrogate Country
7. Date of Sale
8. Normal Value Comparisons
9. Factor Valuation Methodology
10. Surrogate Values
11. Comparisons to Normal Value
12. Adjustments for Countervailable Subsidies
13. Currency Conversion

[FR Doc. 2018-14728 Filed 7-9-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

#### Advisory Committee on Arlington National Cemetery; Notice of Federal Advisory Committee Meeting

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of Federal Advisory Committee meeting; cancellation.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Army published a Federal Advisory Committee meeting of the Advisory Committee on Arlington National Cemetery notice in the **Federal Register** on Tuesday, June 26, 2018. The meeting was to take place on July 26, 2018, but is now cancelled.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Timothy Keating; Alternate Designated

Federal Officer for the Committee, in writing at Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington VA 22211, or by email at [timothy.p.keating.civ@mail.mil](mailto:timothy.p.keating.civ@mail.mil), or by phone at 1-877-907-8585.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** None.

**Brenda S. Bowen,**

*Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2018-14713 Filed 7-9-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001-03-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

#### Charter Renewal of Department of Defense Federal Advisory Committees

**AGENCY:** Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Renewal of federal advisory committee.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Defense (DoD) is publishing this notice to announce that it is renewing the charter for the Defense Acquisition University Board of Visitors ("the Board").

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jim Freeman, Advisory Committee Management Officer for the Department of Defense, 703-692-5952.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This committee's charter is being renewed in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) of 1972 (5 U.S.C., Appendix, as amended) and 41 CFR 102-3.50(d). The charter and contact information for the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) can be obtained at <http://www.facadatabase.gov/>. The Board provides independent advice on the organizational management, curricula, methods of instruction, facilities, and other matters of interest relating to the Defense Acquisition University. The Board shall be composed of no more than 14 members who are former senior Defense officials familiar with the acquisition process or are eminent authorities in academia, business, or the defense industry. Members of the Board who are not full-time or permanent part-time Federal officers or employees will be appointed as experts or consultants pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109 to serve as special government employee members. Members of the Board who are full-time or permanent part-time Federal officers or employees will be appointed pursuant to 41 CFR 102-3.130(a) to serve as regular government employee members. Each Board member is appointed to provide advice on the basis of their best judgment without representing any particular point of

view and in a manner that is free from conflict of interest. Except for reimbursement of official Board-related travel and per diem, Board members serve without compensation. The DoD, as necessary and consistent with the Board's mission and DoD policies and procedures, may establish subcommittees, task forces, or working groups to support the Board, and all subcommittees must operate under the provisions of FACA and the Government in the Sunshine Act. Subcommittees will not work independently of the Board and must report all recommendations and advice solely to the Board for full deliberation and discussion. Subcommittees, task forces, or working groups have no authority to make decisions and recommendations, verbally or in writing, on behalf of the Board. No subcommittee or any of its members can update or report, verbally or in writing, directly to the DoD or any Federal officers or employees. The Board's DFO, pursuant to DoD policy, must be a full-time or permanent part-time DoD employee, and must be in attendance for the duration of each and every Board/subcommittee meeting. The public or interested organizations may submit written statements to the Board membership about the Board's mission and functions. Such statements may be submitted at any time or in response to the stated agenda of planned Board meetings. All written statements must be submitted to the Board's DFO who will ensure the written statements are provided to the membership for their consideration.

Dated: July 5, 2018.

**Shelly E. Finke,**

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

[FR Doc. 2018-14714 Filed 7-9-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5001-06-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

#### Applications for New Awards; Educational Technology, Media, and Materials for Individuals With Disabilities—Center on Technology Systems in Local Educational Agencies

**AGENCY:** Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Education (Department) is issuing a notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 2018 for Educational Technology, Media, and Materials for

Individuals with Disabilities—Center on Technology Systems in Local Educational Agencies, Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number 84.327T.

**DATES:**

*Applications Available:* July 10, 2018.

*Deadline for Transmittal of*

*Applications:* August 9, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** For the addresses for obtaining and submitting an application, please refer to our Common Instructions for Applicants to Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs, published in the **Federal Register** on February 12, 2018 (83 FR 6003) and available at [www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2018-02-12/pdf/2018-02558.pdf](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2018-02-12/pdf/2018-02558.pdf).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Carmen Sanchez, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW, Room 5175, Potomac Center Plaza, Washington, DC 20202–5076. Telephone: (202) 245–6595.

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a text telephone (TTY), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll free, at 1–800–877–8339.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Full Text of Announcement**

**I. Funding Opportunity Description**

*Purpose of Program:* The purposes of the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials for Individuals with Disabilities Program are to: (1) Improve results for students with disabilities by promoting the development, demonstration, and use of technology; (2) support educational activities designed to be of educational value in the classroom for students with disabilities; (3) provide support for captioning and video description that is appropriate for use in the classroom; and (4) provide accessible educational materials to students with disabilities in a timely manner.

*Priority:* In accordance with 34 CFR 75.105(b)(2)(v), this priority is from allowable activities specified in the statute (see sections 674(b)(2) and 681(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA); 20 U.S.C. 1474(b) and 1481(d)).

*Absolute Priority:* For FY 2018 and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applications from this competition, this priority is an absolute priority. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(3), we consider only applications that meet this priority.

This priority is:

*Center on Technology Systems in Local Educational Agencies.*

*Background:* The mission of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) is to improve early childhood, educational, and employment outcomes and raise expectations for all people with disabilities, their families, their communities, and the Nation.

Over 40 years of research and experience have demonstrated the benefits of assistive technology (AT)<sup>1</sup> and instructional technology (IT)<sup>2</sup> for the education and development of children with disabilities (see section 601(c)(5)(H) of IDEA). With the increased use of appropriate AT and IT, more children with disabilities will have access to the general education curriculum and be prepared to meet standards for academic success (Ahmad, 2015).

Despite these known benefits, teachers, related services personnel, and other professionals (collectively, “providers”) vary greatly in their knowledge of evidence-based (as defined in this notice) practices (EBPs) for effective use<sup>3</sup> of AT and IT (Bausch, Ault, Evmenova, & Behrmann, 2008; Lee & Vega, 2005; Smith & Robinson, 2003; U.S. Department of Education, 2010; Zhou, Parker, Smith, & Griffin-Shirley, 2011). At the same time, local educational agencies (LEAs) vary greatly in their ability to implement systems<sup>4</sup> that support the effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families. Some LEAs have robust systems in place that ensure the acquisition and effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities while others struggle to meet the AT and IT needs of children with disabilities. Moreover, the rapid evolution of technology often outstrips providers’ efforts to effectively support the use of technology (Bausch, Ault, & Hasselbring, 2015).

Technology planning to develop comprehensive and sustainable systems

<sup>1</sup> Section 602 of IDEA defines an “assistive technology device” as “any item, piece of equipment, or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified or customized, that is used to increase, maintain, or improve functional capabilities of a child with a disability.”

<sup>2</sup> IDEA does not provide a definition for IT, but for the purposes of this priority, “IT” is defined as technology processes and resources that facilitate learning and improve student performance for all students.

<sup>3</sup> For purposes of this priority, “effective use” refers to active use of technology to enable learning through creation, production, and problem-solving (U.S. Department of Education, 2017).

<sup>4</sup> For purposes of this priority, “systems” refers to interrelated components (e.g., funding, professional development, data collection, accountability, and quality improvement) that need to be in place to support the identification, procurement, deployment, and effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families.

for effective use of AT and IT should focus on sound frameworks<sup>5</sup> that provide a process for providers to understand and meet the AT and IT needs of children with disabilities and their families (Hartmann & Weismer, 2016). Comprehensive and sustainable systems in LEAs for the effective use of AT and IT must include: (1) A vision of how AT and IT can increase access to educational opportunities, improve outcomes, and lead to greater equity for children with disabilities; (2) practices rooted in strong knowledge of how children with disabilities can effectively use AT and IT even as the technology itself changes; (3) ongoing opportunities for professional development for providers, educators, administrators, and families in children’s use of AT and IT; (4) funding sources for appropriate low- and high-tech AT and IT devices and services; and (5) coordinated programs to acquire, maintain, and reuse AT and IT devices (U.S. Department of Education, 2017).

This priority will fund a cooperative agreement to establish and operate a Center on Technology Systems in Local Educational Agencies (Center). The Center will increase the effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families by building the capacity of LEAs to implement comprehensive and sustainable systems for the effective use of AT and IT. This priority is consistent with the following Secretary’s Supplemental Priorities: Priority 2—Promoting Innovation and Efficiency, Streamlining Education with an Increased Focus on Improving Student Outcomes, and Providing Increased Value to Students and Taxpayers; Priority 5—Meeting the Unique Needs of Students and Children With Disabilities and/or Those With Unique Gifts and Talents; Priority 7—Promoting Literacy; and Priority 8—Promoting Effective Instruction in Classrooms and Schools, published in the **Federal Register** on March 2, 2018 (83 FR 9096).

*Priority:* The purpose of this priority is to fund a cooperative agreement to establish and operate a Center on Technology Systems in Local Educational Agencies to achieve, at a minimum, the following expected outcomes:

(a) Development and refinement of a framework that incorporates theories, knowledge base, and effective practices, policies, and tools that LEAs can use to

<sup>5</sup> For purposes of this priority, “frameworks” refers to the theories, knowledge base, policies, and practices that form the basic conceptual structure of effective systems. A framework is a guide to increase the capacity of LEAs to understand, improve, and implement effective systems.

develop or enhance comprehensive and sustainable systems for the effective use of AT and IT;

(b) Increased knowledge of providers about evidence-based AT and IT practices for children with disabilities and their families;

(c) Increased capacity of LEAs to develop comprehensive and sustainable systems for the effective use of AT and IT; and

(d) Increased effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families in the LEAs that have comprehensive and sustainable systems for the effective use of AT and IT.

In addition to these programmatic requirements, to be considered for funding under this priority, applicants must meet the application and administrative requirements in this priority, which are:

(a) Demonstrate, in the narrative section of the application under “Significance,” how the project will—

(1) Address LEAs’ needs regarding useful, relevant, and current information and training to build their capacity to develop and sustain systems for the effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families. To meet this requirement the applicant must—

(i) Present applicable national data demonstrating the extent to which LEAs have comprehensive and sustainable systems for the effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families, including gaps in the resources available to support LEAs in the development of these systems;

(ii) Demonstrate knowledge of current educational issues and policy initiatives relating to the effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families;

(iii) Present information about the current capacity of—

(A) Providers to implement EBPs to improve the effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families; and

(B) LEAs to implement components of comprehensive and sustainable systems for the effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families;

(2) Improve the effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families, and indicate the likely magnitude or importance of the improvements.

(b) Demonstrate, in the narrative section of the application under “Quality of project services,” how the proposed project will—

(1) Ensure equal access and treatment for members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented

based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. To meet this requirement, the applicant must describe how it will—

(i) Identify the needs of the intended recipients for technical assistance (TA) and information; and

(ii) Ensure that services and products meet the needs of the intended recipients of the grant;

(2) Achieve its goals, objectives, and intended outcomes. To meet this requirement, the applicant must provide—

(i) Measurable intended project outcomes; and

(ii) In Appendix A, the logic model (as defined in this notice) by which the proposed project will achieve its intended outcomes that depicts, at a minimum, the goals, activities, outputs, and intended outcomes of the proposed project;

(3) Use a conceptual framework (and provide a copy in Appendix A) to develop project plans and activities, describing any underlying concepts, assumptions, expectations, beliefs, or theories, as well as the presumed relationships or linkages among these variables, and any empirical support for this framework;

*Note:* The following websites provide more information on logic models and conceptual frameworks:

[www.osepideasthatwork.org/logicModel](http://www.osepideasthatwork.org/logicModel) and [www.osepideasthatwork.org/resources-grantees/program-areas/ta-ta-tad-project-logic-model-and-conceptual-framework](http://www.osepideasthatwork.org/resources-grantees/program-areas/ta-ta-tad-project-logic-model-and-conceptual-framework).

(4) Be based on current research and make use of EBPs. To meet this requirement, the applicant must describe—

(i) The current research on practices to support the effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities;

(ii) The current research on components of LEA systems, including policies and practices, necessary to increase the effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families;

(iii) The current research about adult learning principles and implementation science that will inform the proposed TA;

(iv) How the proposed project will incorporate current research and EBPs in the development and dissemination of a framework of LEA policies and practices that are necessary for creating comprehensive and sustainable systems for the effective use of AT and IT by children with disabilities and their families; and

(v) How the proposed project will identify LEAs that have promising systems or policies and practices for

supporting children’s and families’ effective use of AT and IT and incorporate that information into the development of the framework;

(5) Develop products and provide services that are of high quality and sufficient intensity and duration to achieve the intended outcomes of the proposed project. To address this requirement, the applicant must describe—

(i) How it proposes to identify or develop the knowledge base related to children’s and families’ effective use of AT and IT and the development of comprehensive and sustainable systems in LEAs to support that use;

(ii) Its proposed approach to universal, general TA,<sup>6</sup> which must identify the intended recipients, including the type and number of recipients, that will receive the products and services under this approach and should include, at minimum—

(A) A plan to disseminate the framework and develop professional learning activities for LEAs to enhance their understanding and implementation of the framework; and

(B) A plan to identify and disseminate other relevant

resources, including those currently housed by the Center on Technology and Disability, on evidence-based AT and IT practices for children with disabilities and their families;

(iii) Its proposed approach to targeted, specialized TA<sup>7</sup> to support LEAs in implementing the framework, which must identify—

(A) The intended recipients, including the type and number of recipients, that will receive the products and services under this approach; and

(B) Its proposed approach to measure the readiness of potential TA recipients to work with the project, assessing, at a

<sup>6</sup> “Universal, general TA” means TA and information provided to independent users through their own initiative, resulting in minimal interaction with TA center staff and including one-time, invited or offered conference presentations by TA center staff. This category of TA also includes information or products, such as newsletters, guidebooks, or research syntheses, downloaded from the TA center’s website by independent users. Brief communications by TA center staff with recipients, either by telephone or email, are also considered universal, general TA.

<sup>7</sup> “Targeted, specialized TA” means TA services based on needs common to multiple recipients and not extensively individualized. A relationship is established between the TA recipient and one or more TA center staff. This category of TA includes one-time, labor-intensive events, such as facilitating strategic planning or hosting regional or national conferences. It can also include episodic, less labor-intensive events that extend over a period of time, such as facilitating a series of conference calls on single or multiple topics that are designed around the needs of the recipients. Facilitating communities of practice can also be considered targeted, specialized TA.

minimum, their current infrastructure, available resources, and ability to build capacity at the local level; and

(6) Develop products and implement services that maximize efficiency. To address this requirement, the applicant must describe—

(i) How the proposed project will use technology to achieve the intended project outcomes;

(ii) With whom the proposed project will collaborate and the intended outcomes of this collaboration; and

(iii) How the proposed project will use non-project resources to achieve the intended project outcomes.

(c) In the narrative section of the application under “Quality of the project evaluation,” include an evaluation plan for the project developed in consultation with and implemented by a third-party evaluator.<sup>8</sup> The evaluation plan must—

(1) Articulate formative and summative evaluation questions, including important process and outcome evaluation questions. These questions should be related to the project’s proposed logic model required in paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this notice;

(2) Describe how progress in and fidelity of implementation, as well as project outcomes will be measured to answer the evaluation questions. Specify the measures and associated instruments or sources for data appropriate to the evaluation questions. Include information regarding reliability and validity of measures where appropriate;

(3) Describe strategies for analyzing data and how data collected as part of this plan will be used to inform and improve service delivery over the course of the project and to refine the proposed logic model and evaluation plan, including subsequent data collection;

(4) Provide a timeline for conducting the evaluation, and include staff assignments for completing the plan. The timeline must indicate that the data will be available annually for the Annual Performance Report (APR) and at the end of Year 2 for the review process described under the heading, *Fourth and Fifth Years of the Project*;

(5) Dedicate sufficient funds in each budget year to cover the costs of developing or refining the evaluation plan in consultation with a “third-party” evaluator, as well as the costs

associated with the implementation of the evaluation plan by the third-party evaluator.

(d) Demonstrate, in the narrative section of the application under “Adequacy of resources,” how—

(1) The proposed project will encourage 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, as appropriate;

(2) The proposed key project personnel, consultants, and subcontractors have the qualifications and experience to carry out the proposed activities and achieve the project’s intended outcomes;

(3) The applicant and any key partners have adequate resources to carry out the proposed activities; and

(4) The proposed costs are reasonable in relation to the anticipated results and benefits.

(e) Demonstrate, in the narrative section of the application under “Quality of the management plan,” how—

(1) The proposed management plan will ensure that the project’s intended outcomes will be achieved on time and within budget. To address this requirement, the applicant must describe—

(i) Clearly defined responsibilities for key project personnel, consultants, and subcontractors, as applicable; and

(ii) Timelines and milestones for accomplishing the project tasks;

(2) Key project personnel and any consultants and subcontractors will be allocated and how these allocations are appropriate and adequate to achieve the project’s intended outcomes;

(3) The proposed management plan will ensure that the products and services provided are of high quality, relevant, and useful to recipients; and

(4) The proposed project will benefit from a diversity of perspectives, including those of families, educators, TA providers, researchers, and policy makers, among others, in its development and operation.

(f) Address the following application requirements. The applicant must—

(1) Include, in Appendix A, personnel-loading charts and timelines, as applicable, to illustrate the management plan described in the narrative;

(2) Include, in the budget, attendance at the following:

(i) A one and one-half day kick-off meeting in Washington, DC, after receipt of the award, and an annual planning meeting in Washington, DC, with the Office of Special Education Programs

(OSEP) project officer and other relevant staff during each subsequent year of the project period.

*Note:* Within 30 days of receipt of the award, a post-award teleconference must be held between the OSEP project officer and the grantee’s project director or other authorized representative;

(ii) A two and one-half day project directors’ conference in Washington, DC, during each year of the project period;

(iii) One annual two-day trip to attend Department briefings, Department-sponsored conferences, and other meetings, as requested by OSEP; and

(iv) A one-day intensive 3+2 review meeting in Washington, DC, during the last half of the second year of the project period;

(5) Include, in the budget, a line item for an annual set-aside of five percent of the grant amount to support emerging needs that are consistent with the proposed project’s intended outcomes, as those needs are identified in consultation with, and approved by, the OSEP project officer. With approval from the OSEP project officer, the project must reallocate any remaining funds from this annual set-aside no later than the end of the third quarter of each budget period;

(6) Maintain a high-quality website, with an easy-to-navigate design, that meets government or industry-recognized standards for accessibility; and

(7) Include, in Appendix A, an assurance to assist OSEP with the transfer of pertinent resources and products from the current Center for Technology and Disability and to maintain the continuity of services during the transition to this new Center and at the end of this award period, as appropriate.

#### *Fourth and Fifth Years of the Project:*

In deciding whether to continue funding the project for the fourth and fifth years, the Secretary will consider the requirements of 34 CFR 75.253(a), as well as—

(a) The recommendation of a 3+2 review team consisting of experts selected by the Secretary. This review will be conducted during a one-day intensive meeting that will be held during the last half of the second year of the project period;

(b) The timeliness with which, and how well, the requirements of the negotiated cooperative agreement have been or are being met by the project; and

(c) The quality, relevance, and usefulness of the project’s products and services and the extent to which the project’s products and services are aligned with the project’s objectives and

<sup>8</sup> A “third-party” evaluator is an independent and impartial program evaluator who is contracted by the grantee to conduct an objective evaluation of the project. This evaluator must not have participated in the development or implementation of any project activities, except for the evaluation activities, nor have any financial interest in the outcome of the evaluation.

likely to result in the project achieving its intended outcomes.

## References

- Ahmad, F. K. (2015). Use of assistive technology in inclusive education: Making room for diverse learning needs. *Transcience*, 6(2), 62–77.
- Bausch, M. E., Ault, M. J., Evmenova, A. S., & Behrmann, M. M. (2008). Going beyond AT devices: Are AT services being considered? *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 23(2), 1–16.
- Bausch, M. E., Ault, M. J., & Hasselbring, T. S. (2015). Assistive technology in schools: Lessons learned from the National Assistive Technology Research Institute. *Efficacy of Assistive Technology Interventions Advances in Special Education Technology*, 1, 13–15.
- Hartmann, E., & Weismer, P. (2016). Technology and curriculum engagement for children and youth who are deafblind. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 161(4), 462–473.
- Lee, Y., & Vega, L. A. (2005). Perceived knowledge, attitudes, and challenges of AT use in special education. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 20(2), 60–62.
- Smith, S. J., & Robinson, S. (2003). Technology integration through collaborative cohorts. *Remedial & Special Education*, 24(3), 154–159.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2010). Transforming American education: Learning powered by technology. Retrieved from [www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/netp2010.pdf](http://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/netp2010.pdf).
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2017). Reimagining the role of technology in education: 2017 National Education Technology Plan update. Retrieved from <https://tech.ed.gov/files/2017/01/NETP17.pdf>.
- Zhou, L., Parker, A. T., Smith, D. W., & Griffin-Shirley, N. (2011). Assistive technology for students with visual impairments: Challenges and needs in teachers' preparation programs and practice. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 105(4), 197–210.

**Definitions:** The following definitions are from 34 CFR 77.1:

**Demonstrates a rationale** means a key project component included in the project's logic model is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve relevant outcomes.

**Evidence-based** means the proposed project component is supported by one or more of strong evidence, moderate evidence, promising evidence, or evidence that demonstrates a rationale.

**Experimental study** means a study that is designed to compare outcomes between two groups of individuals (such as students) that are otherwise equivalent except for their assignment to either a treatment group receiving a

project component or a control group that does not. Randomized controlled trials, regression discontinuity design studies, and single-case design studies are the specific types of experimental studies that, depending on their design and implementation (e.g., sample attrition in randomized controlled trials and regression discontinuity design studies), can meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook:

(i) A randomized controlled trial employs random assignment of, for example, students, teachers, classrooms, or schools to receive the project component being evaluated (the treatment group) or not to receive the project component (the control group).

(ii) A regression discontinuity design study assigns the project component being evaluated using a measured variable (e.g., assigning students reading below a cutoff score to tutoring or developmental education classes) and controls for that variable in the analysis of outcomes.

(iii) A single-case design study uses observations of a single case (e.g., a student eligible for a behavioral intervention) over time in the absence and presence of a controlled treatment manipulation to determine whether the outcome is systematically related to the treatment.

**Logic model** (also referred to as a theory of action) means a framework that identifies key project components of the proposed project (i.e., the active “ingredients” that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the relevant outcomes) and describes the theoretical and operational relationships among the key project components and relevant outcomes.

**Moderate evidence** means that there is evidence of effectiveness of a key project component in improving a relevant outcome for a sample that overlaps with the populations or settings proposed to receive that component, based on a relevant finding from one of the following:

(i) A practice guide prepared by the WWC using version 2.1 or 3.0 of the WWC Handbook reporting a “strong evidence base” or “moderate evidence base” for the corresponding practice guide recommendation;

(ii) An intervention report prepared by the WWC using version 2.1 or 3.0 of the WWC Handbook reporting a “positive effect” or “potentially positive effect” on a relevant outcome based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence, with no reporting of a “negative effect” or “potentially negative effect” on a relevant outcome; or

(iii) A single experimental study or quasi-experimental design study reviewed and reported by the WWC using version 2.1 or 3.0 of the WWC Handbook, or otherwise assessed by the Department using version 3.0 of the WWC Handbook, as appropriate, and that—

(A) Meets WWC standards with or without reservations;

(B) Includes at least one statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect on a relevant outcome;

(C) Includes no overriding statistically significant and negative effects on relevant outcomes reported in the study or in a corresponding WWC intervention report prepared under version 2.1 or 3.0 of the WWC Handbook; and

(D) Is based on a sample from more than one site (e.g., State, county, city, school district, or postsecondary campus) and includes at least 350 students or other individuals across sites. Multiple studies of the same project component that each meet requirements in paragraphs (iii)(A), (B), and (C) of this definition may together satisfy this requirement.

**Project component** means an activity, strategy, intervention, process, product, practice, or policy included in a project. Evidence may pertain to an individual project component or to a combination of project components (e.g., training teachers on instructional practices for English learners and follow-on coaching for these teachers).

**Promising evidence** means that there is evidence of the effectiveness of a key project component in improving a relevant outcome, based on a relevant finding from one of the following:

(i) A practice guide prepared by WWC reporting a “strong evidence base” or “moderate evidence base” for the corresponding practice guide recommendation;

(ii) An intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “positive effect” or “potentially positive effect” on a relevant outcome with no reporting of a “negative effect” or “potentially negative effect” on a relevant outcome; or

(iii) A single study assessed by the Department, as appropriate, that—

(A) Is an experimental study, a quasi-experimental design study, or a well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias (e.g., a study using regression methods to account for differences between a treatment group and a comparison group); and

(B) Includes at least one statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect on a relevant outcome.

*Quasi-experimental design study* means a study using a design that attempts to approximate an experimental study by identifying a comparison group that is similar to the treatment group in important respects. This type of study, depending on design and implementation (e.g., establishment of baseline equivalence of the groups being compared), can meet WWC standards with reservations, but cannot meet WWC standards without reservations, as described in the WWC Handbook.

*Relevant outcome* means the student outcome(s) or other outcome(s) the key project component is designed to improve, consistent with the specific goals of the program.

*Strong evidence* means that there is evidence of the effectiveness of a key project component in improving a relevant outcome for a sample that overlaps with the populations and settings proposed to receive that component, based on a relevant finding from one of the following:

- (i) A practice guide prepared by the WWC using version 2.1 or 3.0 of the WWC Handbook reporting a “strong evidence base” for the corresponding practice guide recommendation;
- (ii) An intervention report prepared by the WWC using version 2.1 or 3.0 of the WWC Handbook reporting a “positive effect” on a relevant outcome based on a “medium to large” extent of evidence, with no reporting of a “negative effect” or “potentially negative effect” on a relevant outcome; or
- (iii) A single experimental study reviewed and reported by the WWC using version 2.1 or 3.0 of the WWC Handbook, or otherwise assessed by the Department using version 3.0 of the WWC Handbook, as appropriate, and that—

(A) Meets WWC standards without reservations;

(B) Includes at least one statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect on a relevant outcome;

(C) Includes no overriding statistically significant and negative effects on relevant outcomes reported in the study or in a corresponding WWC intervention report prepared under version 2.1 or 3.0 of the WWC Handbook; and

(D) Is based on a sample from more than one site (e.g., State, county, city, school district, or postsecondary campus) and includes at least 350 students or other individuals across sites. Multiple studies of the same project component that each meet requirements in paragraphs (iii)(A), (B),

and (C) of this definition may together satisfy this requirement.

*What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (WWC Handbook)* means the standards and procedures set forth in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Version 3.0 or Version 2.1 (incorporated by reference, see 34 CFR 77.2). Study findings eligible for review under WWC standards can meet WWC standards without reservations, meet WWC standards with reservations, or not meet WWC standards. WWC practice guides and intervention reports include findings from systematic reviews of evidence as described in the Handbook documentation.

*Waiver of Proposed Rulemaking:* Under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553) the Department generally offers interested parties the opportunity to comment on proposed priorities and requirements. Section 681(d) of IDEA, however, makes the public comment requirements of the APA inapplicable to the priority in this notice.

*Program Authority:* 20 U.S.C. 1474 and 1481.

*Applicable Regulations:* (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations in 34 CFR parts 75, 77, 79, 81, 82, 84, 86, 97, 98, and 99. (b) The Office of Management and Budget Guidelines to Agencies on Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) in 2 CFR part 180, as adopted and amended as regulations of the Department in 2 CFR part 3485. (c) The Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards in 2 CFR part 200, as adopted and amended as regulations of the Department in 2 CFR part 3474.

**Note:** The regulations in 34 CFR part 79 apply to all applicants except federally recognized Indian Tribes.

**Note:** The regulations in 34 CFR part 86 apply to institutions of education (IHEs) only.

## II. Award Information

*Type of Award:* Cooperative agreement.

*Estimated Available Funds:* \$700,000. Contingent upon the availability of funds and the quality of applications, we may make additional awards in FY 2019 from the list of unfunded applications from this competition.

*Maximum Award:* We will not make an award exceeding \$700,000 for a single budget period of 12 months.

*Estimated Number of Awards:* 1.

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

*Project Period:* Up to 60 months.

## III. Eligibility Information

1. *Eligible Applicants:* State educational agencies; LEAs, including public charter schools that operate as LEAs under State law; IHEs; other public agencies; private nonprofit organizations; freely associated States and outlying areas; Indian Tribes or Tribal organizations; and for-profit organizations.

2. *Cost Sharing or Matching:* This program does not require cost sharing or matching.

3. *Subgrantees:* Under 34 CFR 75.708(b) and (c) a grantee under this competition may award subgrants—to directly carry out project activities described in its application—to the following types of entities: IHEs and private nonprofit organizations suitable to carry out the activities proposed in the application. The grantee may award subgrants to entities it has identified in an approved application.

4. *Other General Requirements:* (a) Recipients of funding under this competition must make positive efforts to employ and advance in employment qualified individuals with disabilities (see section 606 of IDEA).

(b) Each applicant for, and recipient of, funding must, with respect to the aspects of their proposed project relating to the absolute priority, involve individuals with disabilities, or parents of individuals with disabilities ages birth through 26, in planning, implementing, and evaluating the project (see section 682(a)(1)(A) of IDEA).

## IV. Application and Submission Information

### 1. Application Submission

*Instructions:* For information on how to submit an application please refer to our Common Instructions for Applicants to Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs, published in the **Federal Register** on February 12, 2018 (83 FR 6003) and available at [www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2018-02-12/pdf/2018-02558.pdf](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2018-02-12/pdf/2018-02558.pdf).

2. *Intergovernmental Review:* This competition is subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79. However, under 34 CFR 79.8(a), we waive intergovernmental review in order to make an award by the end of FY 2018.

3. *Funding Restrictions:* We reference regulations outlining funding restrictions in the *Applicable Regulations* section of this notice.

4. *Recommended Page Limit:* The application narrative is where you, the applicant, address the selection criteria that reviewers use to evaluate your

application. We recommend that you (1) limit the application narrative to no more than 70 pages, and (2) use the following standards:

- A “page” is 8.5” x 11”, on one side only, with 1” margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.
- Double-space (no more than three lines per vertical inch) all text in the application narrative, including titles, headings, footnotes, quotations, reference citations, and captions, as well as all text in charts, tables, figures, graphs, and screen shots.

- Use a font that is 12 point or larger.

- Use one of the following fonts:

Times New Roman, Courier, Courier New, or Arial.

The recommended page limit does not apply to Part I, the cover sheet; Part II, the budget section, including the narrative budget justification; Part IV, the assurances and certifications; or the abstract (follow the guidance provided in the application package for completing the abstract), the table of contents, the list of priority requirements, the resumes, the reference list, the letters of support, or the appendices. However, the recommended page limit does apply to all of the application narrative, including all text in charts, tables, figures, graphs, and screen shots.

## V. Application Review Information

1. *Selection Criteria:* The selection criteria for this competition are from 34 CFR 75.210 and are as follows:

### (a) *Significance (15 points).*

(1) The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project.

(2) In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) 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;

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

(iii) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population; and

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

### (b) *Quality of project services (30 points).*

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project.

(2) In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

(3) In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(ii) The extent to which the design of the proposed project includes a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for project implementation, and the use of appropriate methodological tools to ensure successful achievement of project objectives;

(iii) 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;

(iv) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services;

(v) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services; and

(vi) The extent to which the technical assistance services to be provided by the proposed project involve the use of efficient strategies, including the use of technology, as appropriate, and the leveraging of non-project resources.

### (c) *Quality of the project evaluation (20 points).*

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.

(2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

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

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies;

(iii) 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;

(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes; and

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

### (d) *Adequacy of project resources and quality of project personnel (15 points).*

(1) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources and quality of project personnel for the proposed project.

(2) In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers 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) In determining the adequacy of resources and quality of the project personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator;

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

(iii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors;

(iv) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization;

(v) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project; and

(vi) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

### (e) *Quality of the management plan (20 points).*

(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.

(2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) 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;

(ii) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project;

(iii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project; and

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

2. *Review and Selection Process:* We remind potential applicants that in reviewing applications in any discretionary grant competition, the Secretary may consider, under 34 CFR 75.217(d)(3), the past performance of the applicant in carrying out a previous award, such as the applicant's use of funds, achievement of project objectives, and compliance with grant conditions. The Secretary may also consider whether the applicant failed to submit a timely performance report or submitted a report of unacceptable quality.

In addition, in making a competitive grant award, the Secretary requires various assurances, including those applicable to Federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department of Education (34 CFR 100.4, 104.5, 106.4, 108.8, and 110.23).

3. *Additional Review and Selection Process Factors:* In the past, the Department has had difficulty finding peer reviewers for certain competitions because so many individuals who are eligible to serve as peer reviewers have conflicts of interest. The standing panel requirements under section 682(b) of IDEA also have placed additional constraints on the availability of reviewers. Therefore, the Department has determined that for some discretionary grant competitions, applications may be separated into two or more groups and ranked and selected for funding within specific groups. This procedure will make it easier for the Department to find peer reviewers by ensuring that greater numbers of individuals who are eligible to serve as reviewers for any particular group of applicants will not have conflicts of interest. It also will increase the quality,

independence, and fairness of the review process, while permitting panel members to review applications under discretionary grant competitions for which they also have submitted applications.

4. *Risk Assessment and Specific Conditions:* Consistent with 2 CFR 200.205, before awarding grants under this competition the Department conducts a review of the risks posed by applicants. Under 2 CFR 3474.10, the Secretary may impose specific conditions and, in appropriate circumstances, high-risk conditions on a grant if the applicant or grantee is not financially stable; has a history of unsatisfactory performance; has a financial or other management system that does not meet the standards in 2 CFR part 200, subpart D; has not fulfilled the conditions of a prior grant; or is otherwise not responsible.

5. *Integrity and Performance System:* If you are selected under this competition to receive an award that over the course of the project period may exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (currently \$150,000), under 2 CFR 200.205(a)(2) we must make a judgment about your integrity, business ethics, and record of performance under Federal awards—that is, the risk posed by you as an applicant—before we make an award. In doing so, we must consider any information about you that is in the integrity and performance system (currently referred to as the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS)), accessible through the System for Award Management. You may review and comment on any information about yourself that a Federal agency previously entered and that is currently in FAPIIS.

Please note that, if the total value of your currently active grants, cooperative agreements, and procurement contracts from the Federal Government exceeds \$10,000,000, the reporting requirements in 2 CFR part 200, Appendix XII, require you to report certain integrity information to FAPIIS semiannually. Please review the requirements in 2 CFR part 200, Appendix XII, if this grant plus all the other Federal funds you receive exceed \$10,000,000.

## VI. Award Administration Information

1. *Award Notices:* If your application is successful, we notify your U.S. Representative and U.S. Senators and send you a Grant Award Notification (GAN); or we may send you an email containing a link to access an electronic version of your GAN. We may notify you informally, also.

If your application is not evaluated or not selected for funding, we notify you.

2. *Administrative and National Policy Requirements:* We identify administrative and national policy requirements in the application package and reference these and other requirements in the *Applicable Regulations* section of this notice.

We reference the regulations outlining the terms and conditions of an award in the *Applicable Regulations* section of this notice and include these and other specific conditions in the GAN. The GAN also incorporates your approved application as part of your binding commitments under the grant.

3. *Open Licensing Requirements:* Unless an exception applies, if you are awarded a grant under this competition, you will be required to openly license to the public grant deliverables created in whole, or in part, with Department grant funds. When the deliverable consists of modifications to pre-existing works, the license extends only to those modifications that can be separately identified and only to the extent that open licensing is permitted under the terms of any licenses or other legal restrictions on the use of pre-existing works. Additionally, a grantee or subgrantee that is awarded competitive grant funds must have a plan to disseminate these public grant deliverables. This dissemination plan can be developed and submitted after your application has been reviewed and selected for funding. For additional information on the open licensing requirements please refer to 2 CFR 3474.20.

4. *Reporting:* (a) If you apply for a grant under this competition, you must ensure that you have in place the necessary processes and systems to comply with the reporting requirements in 2 CFR part 170 should you receive funding under the competition. This does not apply if you have an exception under 2 CFR 170.110(b).

(b) At the end of your project period, you must submit a final performance report, including financial information, as directed by the Secretary. If you receive a multiyear award, you must submit an annual performance report that provides the most current performance and financial expenditure information as directed by the Secretary under 34 CFR 75.118. The Secretary may also require more frequent performance reports under 34 CFR 75.720(c). For specific requirements on reporting, please go to [www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html](http://www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html).

5. *Performance Measures:* Under the Government Performance and Results

Act of 1993, the Department has established a set of performance measures, including long-term measures, that are designed to yield information on various aspects of the effectiveness and quality of the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials for Individuals with Disabilities program. These measures are:

- Program Performance Measure #1: The percentage of Educational Technology, Media, and Materials Program products and services judged to be of high quality by an independent review panel of experts qualified to review the substantial content of the products and services.
- Program Performance Measure #2: The percentage of Educational Technology, Media, and Materials Program products and services judged to be of high relevance to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities.
- Program Performance Measure #3: The percentage of Educational Technology, Media, and Materials Program products and services judged to be useful in improving results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities.
- Program Performance Measure #4.1: The Federal cost per unit of accessible educational materials funded by the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials Program.
- Program Performance Measure #4.2: The Federal cost per unit of accessible educational materials from the National Instructional Materials Accessibility Center funded by the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials Program.
- Program Performance Measure #4.3: The Federal cost per unit of video description funded by the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials Program.

These measures apply to projects funded under this competition, and grantees are required to submit data on these measures as directed by OSEP.

Grantees will be required to report information on their project's performance in annual and final performance reports to the Department (34 CFR 75.590).

6. *Continuation Awards:* In making a continuation award under 34 CFR 75.253, the Secretary considers, among other things: Whether a grantee has made substantial progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the project; whether the grantee has expended funds in a manner that is consistent with its approved application and budget; and, if the Secretary has established performance measurement

requirements, the performance targets in the grantee's approved application.

In making a continuation award, the Secretary also considers whether the grantee is operating in compliance with the assurances in its approved application, including those applicable to Federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department (34 CFR 100.4, 104.5, 106.4, 108.8, and 110.23).

## VII. Other Information

*Accessible Format:* Individuals with disabilities can obtain this document and a copy of the application package in an accessible format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotope, or compact disc) by contacting the Management Support Services Team, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW, Room 5113, Potomac Center Plaza, Washington, DC 20202-2500. Telephone: (202) 245-7363. If you use a TDD or a TTY, call the FRS, toll free, at 1-800-877-8339.

*Electronic Access to This Document:* The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. You may access the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations via the Federal Digital System at: [www.gpo.gov/fdsys](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys). At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site.

You may also access documents of the Department published in the **Federal Register** by using the article search feature at: [www.federalregister.gov](http://www.federalregister.gov). Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.

Dated: July 3, 2018.

**Johnny W. Collett,**

*Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.*

[FR Doc. 2018-14692 Filed 7-9-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4000-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

#### Combined Notice of Filings

Take notice that the Commission has received the following Natural Gas Pipeline Rate and Refund Report filings:

#### Filings Instituting Proceedings

*Docket Numbers:* RP18-556-001.

*Applicants:* Southern Natural Gas Company, L.L.C.

*Description:* Compliance filing Rate Case Settlement—Aphabetize GT&C Definitions & Remove Sec 33

Compliance to be effective 8/28/2018.

*Filed Date:* 6/29/18.

*Accession Number:* 20180629-5043.

*Comments Due:* 5 p.m. ET 7/11/18.

*Docket Numbers:* RP18-921-000.

*Applicants:* Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America.

*Description:* § 4(d) Rate Filing: Amendment to Negotiated Rate Agreement—Peoples Gas Light and Coke to be effective 7/1/2018.

*Filed Date:* 6/29/18.

*Accession Number:* 20180629-5001.

*Comments Due:* 5 p.m. ET 7/11/18.

*Docket Numbers:* RP18-922-000.

*Applicants:* Trailblazer Pipeline Company LLC.

*Description:* § 4(d) Rate Filing: TPC Section 4 Rate Case Filing to be effective 8/1/2018.

*Filed Date:* 6/29/18.

*Accession Number:* 20180629-5003.

*Comments Due:* 5 p.m. ET 7/11/18.

*Docket Numbers:* RP18-923-000.

*Applicants:* Enable Mississippi River Transmission, LLC.

*Description:* § 4(d) Rate Filing: MRT Rate Case 2018 to be effective 8/1/2018.

*Filed Date:* 6/29/18.

*Accession Number:* 20180629-5004.

*Comments Due:* 5 p.m. ET 7/11/18.

*Docket Numbers:* RP18-925-000.

*Applicants:* ANR Pipeline Company.

*Description:* § 4(d) Rate Filing: ANR TVA Negotiated Rate Amendment to be effective 6/29/2018.

*Filed Date:* 6/29/18.

*Accession Number:* 20180629-5033.

*Comments Due:* 5 p.m. ET 7/11/18.

*Docket Numbers:* RP18-926-000.

*Applicants:* Guardian Pipeline, L.L.C.

*Description:* § 4(d) Rate Filing: Update to Reservation of Capacity to be effective 7/30/2018.

*Filed Date:* 6/29/18.

*Accession Number:* 20180629-5050.

*Comments Due:* 5 p.m. ET 7/11/18.

*Docket Numbers:* RP18-927-000.

*Applicants:* Destin Pipeline Company, L.L.C.

*Description:* § 4(d) Rate Filing: Destin Negotiated Rate to be effective 8/1/2018.

*Filed Date:* 6/29/18.

*Accession Number:* 20180629-5063.

*Comments Due:* 5 p.m. ET 7/11/18.

*Docket Numbers:* RP18-928-000.

*Applicants:* Texas Eastern Transmission, LP.

*Description:* § 4(d) Rate Filing: Negotiated Rate—Direct Energy 8951931 eff 7-1-2018 to be effective 7/1/2018.