of identifying DoD beneficiaries eligible for health care who are enrolled in the Medicare Program, to coordinate insurance benefits provided by DoD with those provided by Medicare.

To other Federal agencies and state, local and territorial governments to identify fraud and abuse of the Federal agency's programs and to identify debtors and collect debts and overpayment in the DoD health care programs.

To each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia for the purpose of conducting an on going computer matching program with state Medicaid agencies to determine the extent to which state Medicaid beneficiaries may be eligible for Uniformed Services health care benefits, including CHAMPUS, TRICARE, and to recover Medicaid monies from the CHAMPUS program.

To provide dental care providers assurance of treatment eligibility.

The 'Blanket Routine Uses' published at the beginning of DLA's compilation of systems of records notices apply to this system.

POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR STORING, RETRIEVING, ACCESSING, RETAINING, AND DISPOSING OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:

STORAGE:

Records are maintained on magnetic tapes and disks, and are housed in a controlled computer media library.

RETRIEVABILITY:

Records about individuals are retrieved by an algorithm which uses name, Social Security Number, date of birth, rank, and duty location as possible inputs. Retrievals are made on summary basis by geographic characteristics and location and demographic characteristics. Information about individuals will not be distinguishable in summary retrievals. Retrievals for the purposes of generating address lists for direct mail distribution may be made using selection criteria based on geographic and demographic keys.

SAFEGUARDS:

Computerized records are maintained in a controlled area accessible only to authorized personnel. Entry to these areas is restricted to those personnel with a valid requirement and authorization to enter. Physical entry is restricted by the use of locks, guards, administrative procedures (e.g., fire protection regulations).

Access to personal information is restricted to those who require the records in the performance of their official duties, and to the individuals who are the subjects of the record or their authorized representatives. Access to personal information is further restricted by the use of passwords which are changed periodically.

RETENTION AND DISPOSAL:

Disposition pending.

SYSTEM MANAGER(S) AND ADDRESS:

Deputy Director, Defense Manpower Data Center, DoD Center Monterey Bay, 400 Gigling Road, Seaside, CA 93955–6771.

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE:

Individuals seeking to determine whether information about themselves is contained in this system should address written inquiries to the Privacy Act Officer, Headquarters, Defense Logistics Agency, CAAR, 8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 2533 Fort Belvoir, VA 22060–6221.

Written requests for the information should contain full name and Social Security Number of individual and sponsor, date of birth, rank, and duty location.

For personal visits the individual should be able to provide full name and Social Security Number of individual and sponsor, date of birth, rank, and duty location. Identification should be corroborated with a driver's license or other positive identification.

RECORD ACCESS PROCEDURES:

Individuals seeking access to information about themselves contained in this system should address written inquiries to the Privacy Act Officer, Headquarters, Defense Logistics Agency, CAAR, 8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 2533 Fort Belvoir, VA 22060–6221.

Written requests for the information should contain full name and Social Security Number of individual and sponsor, date of birth, rank, and duty location.

For personal visits the individual should be able to provide full name and Social Security Number of individual and sponsor, date of birth, rank, and duty location. Identification should be corroborated with a driver's license or other positive identification.

CONTESTING RECORD PROCEDURES:

The DLA rules for accessing records, for contesting contents and appealing initial agency determinations are contained in DLA Regulation 5400.21, 32 CFR part 323, or may be obtained from the Privacy Act Officer, Headquarters, Defense Logistics Agency, ATTN: CAAR, 8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 2533, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060–6221.

RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

Individuals, personnel pay, and benefit systems of the military and civilian departments and agencies of the Defense Department, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, Department of Commerce, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, and other Federal agencies.

EXEMPTIONS CLAIMED FOR THE SYSTEM:

None.

[FR Doc. 99–12535 Filed 5–18–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–10–F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Notice of Intent To Prepare and Notice of Preparation of a Joint Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report for Master Plans for Flood Damage Reduction and Integrated Ecosystem Restoration in the Sacramento River Basin and in the San Joaquin River Basins, California

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Sacramento District, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The action being taken is a feasibility-level investigation to formulate master plans for flood damage reduction and integrated ecosystem restoration in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins and develop a strategy for project implementation that will identify immediate and long-term implementation objectives for resolving flooding and interrelated ecosystem problems in the two basins. The need to formulate master plans for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration in these basins results from changed circumstances and new information. The study area encompasses the watersheds of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers but concentrates on problems associated with the channels and floodplains of these rivers and their major tributaries. A wide array of measures will be investigated. A combined Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) will be prepared to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will serve as the Federal lead agency for the EIS with The Reclamation Board of the

State of California, the non-Federal sponsor, serving as the State lead agency for the EIR.

DATES: The public is asked to submit any issues (points of concern, debate, dispute or disagreement) regarding potential effects of the proposed action or alternatives by July 2, 1999. Through a series of scoping meetings, the Comprehensive Study will seek public input on alternatives, concerns, and issues to be addressed in the EIS/EIR. Scoping meetings are scheduled for June 1999, as follows: June 21 in Yuba City; June 23 in Red Bluff, June 24 in Sacramento, June 28 in Fresno, and June 29 in Modesto. Interested parties are requested to call or write to be included on the mailing list for specific meeting locations and times.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions about the proposed action and EIS/EIR can be answered by Tanis Toland, Comprehensive Study Team, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1325 J Street, Sacramento, California, 95814–2922. Phone number—916–557–5140.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Background

Federal construction of the first components of the present flood management system for the Sacramento River began in 1918. Since that time, a number of large projects have been constructed to comprise the present system. The flood management system for the San Joaquin River began to develop at about the same time and consists of a series of large federal projects constructed through the 1970's. However, development in the San Joaquin River basin was generally more piecemeal and less coordinated than development in the Sacramento River basin.

From 1900 to 1997, the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins experienced 13 large floods. The latest floods—in 1983, 1986, 1995, and 1997—caused extensive damages in both basins and raised questions about the adequacy of the current flood management systems and land use in the floodplains. The flood of 1997 was one of the most geographically extensive in California's long history of flooding. Along with the floods of 1983, 1986, and 1995, the flood of 1997 emphasized the urgent need for comprehensive flood management plans that would integrate flood management within each of the two river basins as well as preserve and restore the ecosystem. In response to the devastation of the 1997 flood, the Governor of California formed the Flood Emergency Action Team (FEAT). In its report, dated May 10, 1997, the FEAT recommended the development of a new master plan for improved flood management in the Central Valley of California. Also in response to the 1997 flood, the U.S. House of Representatives directed the Corps of Engineers to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the entire flood control system and develop ''comprehensive plans for flood control and environmental restoration.''

2. Public Involvement

a. In 1998, stakeholder focus groups were formed by the study management group to encourage public participation in problem identification. The many meetings and forums enabled diverse groups to share their perceptions of the problems; in turn, agency representatives were able to achieve a better understanding of the concerns of the public and other agencies. Ten local support group meetings were held between November 5 and December 1, 1998, in Fresno, Merced, Modesto, Sacramento, Knights Landing, Colusa, Marysville, Red Bluff, Willows, and Chico. The Corps and The Reclamation Board held an additional support group meeting with the California Environmental Water Caucus in February 1999. Information from these meetings, together with the agency's analysis of existing and new technical and scientific information, and legal requirements, were used in framing the problems, planning objectives, potential measures, and approach to formulating and implementing the master plans for flood damage reduction and integrated ecosystem restoration presented in this Notice of Intent.

b. Agency and stakeholder comments received during this period reflected a wide range of social perspectives. Participants largely agreed on broad principles but had many different perspectives on how the principles might be implemented. The wide variation in community responses confirmed the need to include local residents, as well as regional and national interests, in the design and refinement of measures, alternatives, and the master plans. The recommendations and suggestions received during meetings will be reviewed again during the scoping period.

3. Scope

a. The preliminary selection of problems for inclusion in the EIS/EIR was based on the following criteria: (1) New technical and scientific information is available about the extent, intensity, or duration of the problems, (2) geographic scale is broad, (3) public perception of flooding and/or interrelated environmental risk, as judged by the technical and science communities, indicate action should be taken now, and (4) the problems are not adequately addressed from a geographic standpoint by other programs.

b. A single EIS/EIR is proposed because: (1) Some problems may only be addressed at a system-wide scale, (2) the public, Indian Tribes, other governmental agencies, the Corps and The Reclamation Board need to consider ways to meet flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration goals in an integrated, balanced, and system-wide scale, and (3) implementation can be made more efficient and effective.

c. Flood problems identified for action in this EIS/EIR are:

(1) *The flood management system lacks adequate capacity.* The flood management system was designed in the early 1900's based upon hydrologic information available at that time and does not have the capacity to convey peak floodflows recently experienced. In addition, since 1910, conditions such as levee subsidence, sediment transport, erosion, and deposition have changed.

(2) *Accurate information about flood risk is not available for parts of the system.* For many parts of the system, the level of flood protection is not known and may not be correlated to the value of property at risk of flooding.

(3) *The structural integrity of the flood management system is not reliable.* In some parts of the system, the structural integrity of the levees is not reliable.

(4) *System maintenance costs are high.* The cost to maintain the system is extremely high because erosive floodflows damage the levees, which must be continually protected, usually with rock riprap. In turn, the riprap may affect riparian habitat and aquatic habitat, and the costs to mitigate the loss of riparian habitat have risen dramatically.

(5) *Operating flexibility is limited.* There is little flexibility in operating the system to optimize flood protection because no system model for evaluating operational changes has been developed.

d. Ecosystem Problems identified for action in this EIS/EIR are:

(1) *Loss of natural hydrologic and geomorphic processes.* Confining floodflows in reservoirs and between levees has caused the loss of natural hydrologic and geomorphic processes.

(2) *Loss of fish and wildlife habitat.* Habitat for fish and wildlife has been lost or severely degraded as a result of loss of natural processes.

(3) *Mitigating for loss of habitat is difficult.* Mitigating for loss of habitat has been challenging because of funding constraints and impacts of mitigation measures to the structural integrity of the system and to the level of protection of the system (for instance, planting on the levees). Also, mitigation sites are sometimes either not available or are not suitable for creating habitat comparable to habitat at sites affected.

(4) *Ecosystem restoration opportunities are limited.* Restoration of habitats and critical ecosystems has been limited by the lack of natural stream processes.

(5) *Invasive nonnative species threaten native species.* Nonnative plants and animals threaten the survival of native species. Invasive nonnative plants can also decrease floodway capacity.

4. Purpose and Need for Action

a. The impacts of recent floods, together with changes in public values and priorities, and advances in scientific knowledge have led to the need for a comprehensive evaluation of the existing flood management systems and development of comprehensive master plans for flood damage reduction and integrated ecosystem restoration. The purpose of the proposed action is to develop and implement master plans to reduce flood damages and integrate ecosystem restoration in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins.

b. Three general planning objectives guide this feasibility-level investigation:

(1) improve flood risk management throughout the system; (2) integrate protection and restoration of ecosystem into the flood damage reduction measures; and (3) resolve policy issues and address limiting institutional procedures.

5. Proposed Action

a. The proposed action, which is the development and implementation of master plans for flood damage reduction and integrated ecosystem restoration, responds to the needs identified above, the Governor's FEAT Report, direction from Congress, and concerns raised during stakeholder and agency focus group meetings.

b. The proposed action calls for analysis of flood damage and interrelated ecosystem restoration problems and potential solutions at the watershed and sub-watershed scale to: (1) Link decisions at the project scale to larger scale decisions, (2) coordinate the master plans with the efforts of other agencies and interagency efforts, like CALFED, (3) prioritize and establish appropriate implementation sequencing within each of the two basins, and (4) facilitate collaborative planning and implementation.

c. The proposed action will be implemented using a collaborative process to ensure coordination and consideration of the needs of other federal agencies, Indian Tribes, state and local governments and individuals. This involvement will help shape the master plans for flood damage reduction and integrated ecosystem restoration so that flood damages are reduced and ecosystem values are restored and maintained while taking into consideration other needs including local and regional economics, agriculture, water supply, and others. Implementation is proposed to be staged. Spin-off projects will be developed and implemented under existing authorities throughout the study. Early implementation projects will be identified and developed to feasibility-level and recommended for Congressional authorization and implementation in the Comprehensive Study Final Report. Full implementation of the master plans is expected to extend beyond the early implementation projects. The master plans would serve as a guide for future project development and for decisions about emergency response activities. The master plans will ensure that site-specific projects and actions are fully coordinated and integrated.

6. Alternatives

The feasibility-level report and EIS/EIR will address an array of measures and alternatives for reducing flood damages and restoring interrelated ecosystem values. Alternatives analyzed during the feasibility-level investigation will be a combination of one or more measures identified from many sources, including early public involvement. Additional measures may be added and existing measures will be refined during public scoping. Potential measures: creating or modifying storage capacity and/or reservoir releases or otherwise affecting flow regimes; setting back or raising levees; constructing backup levees; improving or creating bypass systems; managing floodway vegetation and sediment; creating meanderbelts; and managing vegetation within exiting floodways; protecting streambanks; strengthening, raising, or repairing levees, and controlling seepage; modifying existing buildings to reduce future damage; discouraging future development in the flood plains; and redirecting incompatible land use and development out of the floodway/floodplain and other miscellaneous floodplain management actions.

7. Proposed Scoping Process

a. This Notice of Intent initiates the scoping process whereby the Corps and The Reclamation Board will identify the scope of issues to be addressed in the EIS/EIR and identify the significant environmental issues related to the proposed action. The Corps and The Reclamation Board have initiated a process of involving concerned individuals, local, state, and Federal agencies.

b. Public comment is invited on the proposal to prepare the EIS/EIR and on the scope of issues to be included in the EIS/EIR.

c. The Corps and The Reclamation Board will consult, local, State and Federal agencies with regulatory or implementation responsibility for, or expertise with, the resources in the area of investigation. These include local planning and zoning jurisdictions, the State Historic Preservation Officer, California Department of Fish and Game, Department of Food and Agriculture, Department of Water Resources, California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Parks and Recreation, Department of Boating and Waterways, Regional Water Quality Control Boards, Office of Emergency Services, State Lands Commission, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

d. Community meetings with interested publics will be held during scoping, after release of the Draft EIS/EIR, and after release of the Final EIS/EIR/ Coordination with Federal and State agencies, Tribal governments, and local governments will occur throughout the scoping process.

e. In June 1999, community scoping workshops will be held in Yuba City, Red Bluff, Sacramento, Fresno, and Modesto. Specific locations, dates, and times of the meetings will be posted on the Internet at *www.spk.usace.army.mil/civ/ssj* and in the newspaper of record for each region. The purpose of these meetings is to explain the Notice of Intent and the Notice of Preparation, and to solicit suggestions, recommendations, and comments to help refine the issues, measures, and alternatives to be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

f. A 45-day public review period will be provided for individuals and agencies to review and comment on the draft EIS/EIR. All interested parties should respond to this notice and

provide a current address if they wish to be notified of the draft EIS/EIR circulation.

8. Availability

The draft EIS/EIR is scheduled to be available for public review and comment in 2001.

9. Decision To Be Made and Responsible Official

The Commander, Sacramento District is the Corps NEPA official responsible for compliance with NEPA for actions within the District's boundaries. The Reclamation Board is responsible for CEQA actions for the Comprehensive Study. After completion of review, the Chief of Engineers will sign his final report and transmit the report and accompanying documents to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (ASA(CW)). After review, ASA(CW) will transmit the report to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requesting its views in relation to the programs of the President. After OMB provides its views, ASA(CW) will sign the record of decision (ROD) and transmit the report to Congress. The responsible officials are: COL Michael Walsh, District Engineer, Sacramento District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1325 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95814–2922; Ms. Barbara LaVake, President, The Reclamation Board of the State of California, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

10. Coordination With Other Agencies

While the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is the lead Federal agency and The Reclamation Board of California is the lead State agency with responsibility to prepare this EIS/EIR, 17 State and Federal Agencies and the interagency CALFED program participate on the Executive Committee for this feasibility-level investigation. The Executive Committee provides broad study direction, assists in resolving emerging policy issues, and ensures that the study effort and its results are consistent and coordinated. State agencies participating on the Executive Committee are the Department of Water Resources, Department of Food and Agriculture, Department of Fish and Game, State Water Resources Control Board, Department of Parks and Recreation, Department of Boating and Waterways, State Lands Commission, and Office of Emergency Services. Federal agencies participating on the Executive Committee are U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Marine Fisheries Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, and U.S. Geological Survey. The Environmental Protection Agency and Fish and Wildlife Service have regulatory responsibilities that could not efficiently be considered without direct involvement; guidance regarding formal consultation responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act will be provided by a Fish and Wildlife Service specialist who will participate as a member of the interdisciplinary team. Coordination with the California Department of Water Resources and the California Department of Fish and Game is necessary because some mission responsibilities overlap or are closely aligned with the flood and ecosystem management activities of the Corps and The Reclamation Board. Each agency will continue to participate as resources and competing demands permit. Other agencies, local and county governments will also be invited to participate, as appropriate.

11. Commenting

A draft EIS/EIR is expected to be available for public review and comment in 2001; and a final EIS/EIR in 2002. The comment period on the draft EIS/EIR will be 45 days from the date of availability published in the **Federal Register** by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Comments received in response to this solicitation, including names and addresses of those who comment, will be considered part of the public record on this proposed action and will be available for public inspection. Comments submitted anonymously will be accepted and considered. Additionally, pursuant to 7 CFR 1.27(d), any person may request the agency to withhold a submission from the public record by showing how the Freedom of Information (FOIA) permits such confidentiality. Persons requesting such confidentiality should be aware that, under the FOIA, confidentiality may be granted in only very limited circumstances, such as to protect trade secrets. The Corps will inform the requester of the agency's decision regarding the request for confidentiality, and where the request is denied, the agency will return the submission and notify the requester that the comments may be resubmitted with or without the name and address.

Dated: May 11, 1999.

Michael J. Walsh,

COL, EN, Commanding.

[FR Doc. 99–12619 Filed 5–18–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–EZ–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[CFDA No.: 84.033]

Office of Postsecondary Education; Federal Work-Study Programs

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of the closing date for institutions to submit a request for a waiver of the requirement that an institution must use at least five percent of the total amount of its Federal Work-Study (FWS) Federal funds granted for the 1999–2000 award year to compensate students employed in community service jobs.

SUMMARY: The Secretary gives notice to institutions of higher education of the deadline for an institution to submit a written request for a waiver of the statutory requirement that an institution must use at least five percent of its total FWS Federal funds granted for the 1999–2000 award year (July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000) to compensate students employed in community service jobs.

DATES: *Closing Date for submitting a Waiver Request and any Supporting Information or Documents.* To request a waiver, you must mail or hand-deliver your waiver request and any supporting information or documents to the Department on or before June 18, 1999. The Department will also accept a waiver request submitted by facsimile transmission to Ms. Sandra Donelson at (202) 401–0387 or (202) 260–0522 by 4:30 p.m. (Eastern time) on June 18, 1999. If you mail or hand-deliver your waiver request, you must submit the waiver request to the Institutional Financial Management Division at one of the addresses indicated below.

ADDRESSES: *Waiver Request and any Supporting Information or Documents Delivered by Mail.* You must address the waiver request and any supporting information or documents that you send by mail to Ms. Sandra Donelson, Institutional Financial Management Division, U.S. Department of Education, P.O. Box 23781, Washington, DC 20026–0781.

You must show proof of mailing your waiver request. Proof of mailing consists of one of the following: (1) A legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service, (2) a legibly dated U.S. Postal Service postmark, (3) a dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier, or (4) any other proof of mailing acceptable to the U.S. Secretary of Education.

If you send a waiver request through the U.S. Postal Service, the Secretary