personnel for the ordinary use of facilities, furnishing, or equipment purchased with grant funds. The Grantee shall administer and supervise implementation of the project, maintaining competent architectural supervision and inspection at the project site to ensure the work conforms to the approved drawings and specifications.

(m) *Administrative and National Policy Requirements*—The Grantee and any consultant/contractor operating under the terms of a grant shall comply with all Federal, State, and local laws applicable to its activities including the following: National Environmental Policy Act; National Historic Preservation Act; 32 CFR part 33, ''Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments''; OMB Circulars A–87, ''Cost Principles for State and Local Governments'' and the revised A–133, ''Audits of States, Local Governments and Non-Profit Organizations''; 32 CFR part 25, ''Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Non-procurement)''; 32 CFR part 26,''Drug-free Workplace''; and 32 CFR part 28, ''New Restrictions on Lobbying (Grants).''

(n) *Reporting*—OEA requires interim performance reports and one final performance report for each award. The performance reports will contain information on the following:

- A comparison of actual accomplishments to the objectives established for the reporting period;
- Reasons for any slippage and proposed plan to mitigate;
- Additional pertinent information when appropriate;
- A comparison of actual and projected expenditures for the period;
- The amount of awarded funds on hand at the beginning and end of the reporting period.

The final performance report must contain a summary of activities for the entire award period. An SF 425, ''Financial Status Report,'' must be submitted to OEA within ninety (90) days after the end date of the award. Any grant funds actually advanced and not needed for grant purposes shall be returned immediately to the Office of Economic Adjustment.

OEA will provide a schedule for reporting periods and report due dates in the Award Agreement.

2. Agency Contacts

For further information, to answer questions regarding this notice, or for help with problems, contact: David F. Witschi, OEA Associate Director, *telephone:* (703) 604–6020, *e-mail: david.witschi@wso.whs.mil* or regular mail at 400 Army Navy Drive, Suite 200, Arlington, VA 22202–4704. Specific questions concerning the Department's Public Schools on Military Installations Priority List should be directed to the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, attention: Russell Roberts, Chief, Logistics Division, Department of Defense Education Activity at (703) 588–3502 or *psmischools@hq.dodea.edu.*

3. Other Information

The OEA Internet address is *http://www.oea.gov.*

Dated: September 6, 2011.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2011–23065 Filed 9–8–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Selection Criteria—Transportation Infrastructure Improvements Associated With Medical Facilities Related to Recommendations of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

AGENCY: Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Final notice.

SUMMARY: This notice responds to comments on the selection criteria to be used to select grant applicants for funding from the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) for construction of Transportation Infrastructure Improvements associated with medical facilities related to recommendations of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The July 21, 2011, **Federal Register** notice announced proposal requirements, the deadline for submitting proposals, and the criteria that will be used to select proposals. Because this is a new one-time program, however, the July 21, 2011, notice also requested comments on the proposed selection criteria for these grants, as provided in Section V, paragraph 1, of that notice. This notice responds to the comments that were received and issues the final selection criteria for the program.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David F. Witschi, Associate Director, OEA, *telephone:* (703) 604–6020, *e-mail: david.witschi@wso.whs.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Federal Funding Opportunity Title:* Transportation Infrastructure Improvements associated with medical facilities related to recommendations of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Announcement Type: Federal Funding Opportunity.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 12.600.

Background—Funding Opportunity Description

OEA, a DoD Field Activity, is authorized by Section 8110 of Public Law 112–10, the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011, to provide up to $300 million ''for transportation infrastructure improvements associated with medical facilities related to recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.'' On July 21, 2011, OEA issued a Federal Funding Opportunity notice for these funds in the **Federal Register** that announced proposal requirements, the deadline for submitting proposals, and the criteria that will be used to select proposals. Because this is a new one-time program, however, the July 21, 2011, notice also requested comments on the proposed selection criteria for these grants. This notice responds to comments that were received and issues the final selection criteria for the program (Section V, paragraphs 1.(a) through 1.(d) of the July 21, 2011 notice). All other information, including the proposal submission date and application and submission information announced in the July 21, 2011, notice, remains unchanged. The 30-day comment period for the selection criteria ended on August 19, 2011.

Comments and Responses—Seven respondents provided a total of four different comments. The public comments were considered by OEA in determining the final selection criteria for the program.

Comment 1: One commenter agreed with the selection criteria and proposed no changes.

Comment 2: One commenter proposed no changes to the selection criteria, but requested additional information regarding the disbursement process to be used both for direct OEA grants and if the funds are to be passed through another Federal agency for implementation.

Response: For direct OEA construction grants, disbursement to the grantee will be by the reimbursement method. In the event OEA chooses to enter into an interagency agreement with another Federal agency to implement a particular project, OEA will transfer those funds directly to the

other Federal agency after execution of an interagency agreement.

Comment 3: Four commenters noted that selection criterion (b) does not clearly address the transportation impacts on the community, noting that any expenditure of funds related to BRAC-affected areas should expressly take into consideration the larger effects on the community outside the perimeter of a military facility. They requested that the medical facility and its needs be considered in the broader context of the larger community—business and residential—in which it resides.

Response: Although selection criterion (b) was intended to capture the overall magnitude of the transportation problem, to include its effect on the surrounding community, we agree that this criterion lacked sufficient clarity on that point. Therefore, selection criterion (b) has been modified to state more clearly that the effect on the surrounding community is also being considered.

Comment 4: One commenter requested the addition of three new criteria addressing: (i) The extent to which the project contributes to on-base parking demand (negative factor) or relieves parking demand (positive factor); (ii) the effect of a project on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access to the DoD facility; and (iii) the degree of mitigation (positive factor) or contribution to vulnerability to a terrorist attack or major accident (negative factor) of an existing or proposed transportation facility.

Response: The commenter raises several valid issues pertaining to specific design considerations/effects that may be relevant to a project depending on the nature of the transportation problem and the proposed solution. Rather than create additional criteria, however, we believe these issues can be adequately addressed with a modification to selection criterion (d) that addresses the degree to which a project resolves a transportation issue. We have, therefore, added these issues as examples in selection criterion (d) of how a project might resolve a transportation issue.

Final Selection Criteria—Accordingly, Section V, paragraphs 1.(a) through 1.(d) of the July 21, 2011, notice are revised and re-issued as follows:

1. *Selection Criteria*—Upon validating the eligibility of the interested respondent to apply for assistance, an evaluation panel, designated by OEA, evaluates proposal content conforming to this notice as the basis for inviting a formal grant application. The proposed selection criteria, with relative weights, are:

(a) The extent to which the transportation issue impedes the provision of care, i.e., the military medical mission (e.g., the greater the number of patients, patient visitors and patient care workers impacted, the more serious the consequences to patients, etc., the higher the score), 25%;

(b) The magnitude (e.g. overall number of people affected, degree of failure, etc.) of the transportation issue that affects the military medical facility and its surrounding community, expressed in terms of accepted and appropriate transportation planning and assessment techniques (the greater the magnitude of the issue, the higher the score), 25%;

(c) The applicant's ability to execute the proposed project, including the extent of other funding for the project and the ability to meet project timelines and budgets, acquire site control, permits or concurrences of affected parties, etc. (the greater the demonstration of the applicant's ability, the greater the score), 25%; and

(d) The extent to which the proposed construction project resolves the transportation issue (e.g., improves both vehicular and non-vehicular access to the facility; reduces parking demand; improves public safety and mitigates potential vulnerability to a major accident or incident, etc. The more the project does to resolve the transportation issue, the higher the score), 25%.

All other information announced in the July 21, 2011 notice, including the proposal submission deadline and application and submission information, remains unchanged.

Dated: September 2, 2011.

Aaron Siegel,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 2011–23041 Filed 9–8–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Proposed Highway Between Bush, LA and I–12 in St. Tammany Parish, LA

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is issuing this notice to advise the public that a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) has been completed and is available for review and comment.

DATES: Comments on the DEIS must be received no later than 5 p.m. Central Standard Time, Monday, October 24, 2011.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to U.S. Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, LA 70188.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions about the proposed action and the DEIS should be addressed to James A. Barlow, Jr., PhD, Regulatory Branch, phone (504) 862–2250 or e-mail at *james.a.barlow@usace.army.mil,* or Ms. Brenda Archer, Regulatory Branch, phone (504) 862–2046 or e-mail at *brenda.a.archer@usace.army.mil.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The DEIS has been prepared to address the NEPA, environmental and cultural resource laws, USACE Regulatory Program Regulations (Title 33 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR] parts 320–332), including the 33 CFR part 325, Appendix B, and the requirements of the section 404(b)(1) guidelines (40 CFR part 230), to gather information needed for the USACE permit decision-making process regarding a permit application submitted by the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD). LADOTD proposes construction of a high-speed, four-lane arterial highway from the southern terminus of the current, modern four-lane arterial portion of LA 21 in Bush, Louisiana, to I–12, a distance between 17.4 and 21 miles. The majority of the proposed highway would be designed as a rural arterial road RA–3 with a design speed of 70 miles per hour, which, according to LADOTD, generally equates to a posted speed limit of 65 miles per hour. The typical cross section would have two 12-foot travel lanes, an 8- to 10-foot outside shoulder, and a 4-foot inside shoulder in each direction. The median width would vary depending on highway design class used ranging between 40 and 60 feet, and a maximum ROW requirement of 250 feet. The exception to that design could be as the proposed project transitions into existing roadways (*i.e.* intersections), and where alternative alignments follow the existing LA 21.

The proposed I–12 to Bush highway is an effort planned by LADOTD and funded by the Transportation Infrastructure Model for Economic Development (TIMED) program (Louisiana Revised Statute 48:820.2). The stated mission of the TIMED program is to, ''foster economic development throughout the state of