Conservation Board (TSSWCB) initiated a study to determine the feasibility of implementing a brush control and management program to increase water yield. The goal is to restore large areas of brush to native grasses, but leave brush buffers and habitat corridors composed of mesquite and juniper. The results of the study revealed that implementation of the proposed brush control program may provide a net increase in watershed yield at Lake Kemp. The brush control program has currently been included in Texas Senate Bill 1 and the Region B Water Plan. The supplement has assumed a brush management factor of 50% implementation as its future condition without chloride control.

Fourteen alternatives were developed by the USACE for achieving lower concentrations of chlorides in the Wichita River. The objective of the 14 USACE action alternatives was to improve water quality in the Wichita River to a point where it may be economically useful for municipal, industrial, and agricultural water supply. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) developed an additional twelve (12) alternatives that were also considered by the USACE. The objectives of these alternatives were to lower chloride control impacts by reducing brines pumped to Truscott Brine Lake and eliminating potential selenium impacts, as well as replacing stream habitat and lessening the impact of zero flow days on fish populations.

From all the developed alternatives, USACE Alternative 7a was selected as having the greatest net NED benefits. However, concerns regarding this alternative have been raised by the USFWS and TPWD. Due to higher economic, technical, and regulatory viability, Alternative 7a best serves the purpose and need for the proposed action and is the proposed plan.

The DSFEIS has been coordinated and approved by offices and directorates affected by or interested in the subject matter, including the Office of Counsel and Executive Offices.

Stephen R. Zeltner,

Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army, Acting District Engineer.

[FR Doc. 02–15719 Filed 6–20–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–39–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Intent To Prepare a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Continuing Authorities Section 205 Flood Damage Reduction Project Along Irondequoit and Allen Creeks at Panorama Valley in the Town of Penfield, Monroe County, NY

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

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Buffalo District, State and local interests have resumed assessment/evaluation of a flood damage reduction project along Irondequoit and Allen Creeks in Panorama Valley in the Town of Penfield, Monroe County, NY. A Draft and Final Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) were previously prepared and coordinated for a project in 1981. The project was deferred due to lack of local funding. The current recommended plan consists of a combination of measures including: levees, floodwalls (setback from the creek, as possible), several non-structural measures, internal drainage measures, and environmental consideration/measures.

ADDRESSES: Correspondence should be addressed to: Mr. Tod Smith, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1776 Niagara Street, Buffalo, NY 14207–3199.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Tod Smith at (716) 879–4175.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority

The proposed project is authorized under Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended, which provides the Corps authority to assist local sponsors with small flood damage reduction projects.

Proposed Action

The current recommended plan consists of a combination of measures including: levees, floodwalls, several non-structural measures, and internal drainage measures. Natural environmental consideration measures that are included in the plan are: aligning levees and floodwalls setback from the creek, as possible; avoiding any in stream activity between September 1st and June 15th; implementing erosion run-off reduction measures; retaining existing vegetation, as possible; planting replacement and additional riparian and upland vegetation; and other minor stream environmental improvements.

Alternatives

Alternative considerations include: No Action; Non-Structural Measures (Flood Plain Management, Flood Insurance, Relocations, Flood Proofing, etc.); Reservoirs/Wetlands; Diversion Channels; Channelization; Channelization and Berms; and Levee/Floodwalls. Alternatives are assessed/evaluated from engineering, economic, and environmental (physical/natural, social/community, cultural resources) perspectives.

Scoping Process

Resumed study scoping letters were coordinated on August 24, 1999, October 5, 1999, and January 14, 2000. A number of agency and public workshops and meetings have been conducted. A local public meeting was held at the Penfield Town Hall on February 15, 2000.

Significant Issues

The initial public response to the current study was substantial. Many interests indicated the project should be looked at from a watershed perspective and that all interests be involved, and that natural restoration measures should be considered. Many want a watershed development management plan. Some are concerned about project impacts upstream and downstream of the Panorama Valley area. Others do not think that funding should be expended to protect interests which are built in a flood prone area; they think flood prone developments should move or be moved out of the flood prone areas. Flood prone development interest would like to see some form of community development flood protection. Most want to see the natural integrity of the streams maintained or improved, as possible, for fish and some wildlife to be able to continue to utilize and pass through the area.

Scoping Meeting

Since Federal, State, and local interests have been involved with reinitiation of the study and coordination is already being conducted and a local public meeting held; no new/additional formal initial scoping meeting is scheduled.

Availability

It is expected that the Supplemental Draft EIS will be made available to the agencies and public about October 2002.

Luz D. Ortiz,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 02–15716 Filed 6–20–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–GP–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Inland Waterways Users Board

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

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: In Accordance with 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463) announcement is made of the next meeting of the Inland Waterways Users Board (Board). The meting will be held on July 19, 2002, in Lisle, IL, at the Hilton Lisle/Naperville Hotel, 3003 Corporate West Drive (1–630–505–0900). The Board will hear briefings on navigation projects administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island District. Registration will begin at 7:30 a.m. and the meeting scheduled to adjourn at 1 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Norman T. Edwards, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CECW–PD, 441 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20314–1000; Ph: 202–761–4559.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting is open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the committee at the time and in the manner permitted by the committee.

Luz Ortiz,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 02–15717 Filed 6–20–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–92–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Request for Comments on the Draft Estuary Habitat Restoration Strategy Prepared by the Estuary Habitat Restoration Council

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Corps of Engineers on behalf of the interagency Estuary Habitat Restoration Council is extending the comment period for the draft ''Estuary Habitat Restoration Strategy.'' This extension will provide interested persons with additional time to prepare comments on the draft strategy.

DATES: Consideration will be given only to comments that are received on or before July 1, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Estuary Habitat Restoration Strategy, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, 7701 Telegraph Road, Casey Building, Alexandria, Virginia, 22315–3868. See Supplementary Information section for electronic filing address.

FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE CONTACT: Ms. Ellen Cummings, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, DC 20314–1000, (202) 761–4558; or Ms. Cynthia Garman-Squier, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Washington, DC, (703) 695–6791.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 3, 2002 we published in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 22415) the ''Draft Estuary Habitat Restoration Strategy'' for review and comment. Comments regarding the draft strategy were required to be received on or before June 17, 2002. During the comment period, we received a request to extend the comment period.

In response to this request, we are extending the comment period for the ''Draft Estuary Habitat Restoration Strategy'' through July 1, 2002.

Electronic Filing Address: You may submit comments by E-mail to *estuary@usace.army.mil.* Comments should be in one of the following formats: Word, WordPerfect, or ASCII. The subject line for submission of comments should begin with ''Estuary Habitat Restoration Strategy comments from [insert name of agency, organization, or individual].''

Luz D. Ortiz,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 02–15718 Filed 6–20–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–92–M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[CFDA No. 84.333]

Demonstration Projects To Ensure Students With Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education; Notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 2002

Purpose of Program: The Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education program provides grants to institutions of higher education (IHEs) to develop innovative demonstration projects. The purpose of the demonstration program is to provide technical assistance and professional development for faculty and administrators in IHEs in order to provide them with the skills and supports that they need to teach students with disabilities. The program will also be used to widely disseminate research and training to enable faculty and administrators in other IHEs to meet the educational needs of students with disabilities.

Eligible Applicants: Institutions of higher education.

Applications Available: June 21, 2002.

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: July 22, 2002.

Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: September 19, 2002.

Available Funds: $6,930,000.

Estimated Range of Awards: $100,000–$350,000.

Estimated Average Size of Awards: $100,000–$290,000.

Estimated Number of Awards: 24.

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

Project Period: Up to 36 months.

Page Limit: The application narrative is where you, the applicant, address the selection criteria that reviewers use to evaluate your application. While we encourage applicants to limit their narrative to no more than the equivalent of 25 pages, your application may not exceed the equivalent of more than 40 pages. For the application narrative, the following standards apply:

- 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, including titles, headings, quotations, references, and captions.
- Use a font that is either 12-point or larger or no smaller that 10 pitch (characters per inch).
- For tables, charts, or graphs also use a font that is either 12-point or larger or not smaller than 10 pitch.

Our reviewers will not read any pages of your application that—

- Exceed the page limit if you apply these standards; or
- Exceed the equivalent of the page limit if you apply other standards.

Applicable Regulations: The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 82, 85, 86, 97, 98 and 99.

Because there are no program specific regulations for the Demonstration