Printing Office (GPO), toll free, at 1–888–293–6498; or in Washington, DC, area at (202) 512–1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at: http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers: 84.007 Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant; 84.032 Federal Family Education Loan Program; 84.033 Federal Work-Study Program; 84.038 Federal Perkins Loan Program; 84.063 Federal Pell Grant Program; William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, 84.268)

Dated: May 25, 2001.

Greg Woods,

Chief Operating Officer, Student Financial Assistance.

[FR Doc. 01–13636 Filed 5–30–01; 8:45am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Arbitration Panel Decision Under the Randolph-Sheppard Act

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of arbitration panel decision under the Randolph-Sheppard Act.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that on March 17, 2000, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired* v. *United States Postal Service (Docket No. R–S/99–7).* This panel was convened by the U.S. Department of Education pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 107d–1(b) upon receipt of a complaint filed by petitioner, the Idaho Commission for the Blind.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: A copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision may be obtained from George F. Arsnow, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 3230, Mary E. Switzer Building, Washington, DC 20202–2738. Telephone: (202) 205–9317. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), you may call the TDD number at (202) 205–8298.

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

Electronic Access to This Document: You may view this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site: www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free, at 1–888–293–6498; or in the Washington, DC, area at (202) 512–1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at: http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Randolph-Sheppard Act (20 U.S.C. 107d–2(c)) (the Act), the Secretary publishes in the **Federal Register** a synopsis of each arbitration panel decision affecting the administration of vending facilities on Federal and other property.

Background

In 1998, the Idaho Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, the State licensing agency (SLA), alleged that it made repeated requests for information to the United States Postal Service (USPS) concerning the construction of the new U.S. Postal Service Processing and Distribution Center located at 2201 South Cole Road in Boise, Idaho. Receiving no response to its inquiries or notice of a possible vending facility location as required by the Act, the SLA submitted a letter to the Postal Service District Manager requesting information about the Processing and Distribution Center.

On December 2, 1998, the Postal Service District Manager responded to the SLA's letter requesting information and apologized for the lack of notification. On March 17, 1999, the SLA submitted an application for a vending facility at the Processing and Distribution Center. USPS responded to the SLA's application on March 23, 1999, indicating that they would not agree to the terms of the SLA's application for the permit. On March 29, 1999, representatives from the SLA and USPS met to discuss the application.

USPS's position concerning the application was that the vendor selected for the location at the Processing and Distribution Center would be required to physically be present at the facility 40 hours per week (the ''on-site support'' provision), and the vendor would be precluded from operating any other vending facility location on the property (the ''exclusivity'' provision). USPS further indicated that these terms were non-negotiable and would be required to be included in the application and the resulting vending permit.

On March 30, 1999, the SLA contacted USPS about the pending negotiations on the vending permit and was informed that the on-site support and exclusivity provisions were new permit terms required of blind vendors, but not commercial vendors.

On April 16, 1999, the SLA requested in writing that USPS either approve or deny its application for a vending permit at the Processing and Distribution Center. The SLA did not receive a response from USPS and subsequently filed a request with the Secretary of the Department of Education (Department) to convene a Federal arbitration panel. The SLA alleged that the priority provisions of the Act and its implementing regulations had been violated. An arbitration pre-hearing on this matter was held on December 7, 1999, which resulted in a Stipulated Agreement concerning the issues and facts of the dispute. The parties agreed that the arbitration panel's written award on the stipulated issues would dispose of the dispute without the need for an arbitration hearing. The panel submitted a Final Award and Decision to the Department on March 17, 2000. On May 16, 2000, the Department received a copy, signed by all parties, of the Stipulated Agreement.

Arbitration Panel Decision

The stipulated issues addressed by the arbitration panel were:

1(A). Have limitations been placed on blind vendors as defined by the Randolph-Sheppard Act?

(B). If so, does the U.S. Postal Service have a legal requirement to submit those limitations to the U.S. Department of Education for the Secretary's determination that they are justified?

2. Is the Postal Service in violation of the Act and the U.S. Constitution by requiring on-site support and exclusivity provisions of Randolph-Sheppard vendors, but not of commercial vendors?

3. If the Postal Service did violate the Randolph-Sheppard Act on any of these issues, what is the authority of the arbitration panel to determine the appropriate remedy or remedies?

The arbitration panel ruled that the on-site support and exclusivity provisions required by USPS were limitations as provided in the Act and must be approved by the Secretary of Education and published in the **Federal Register** before they could be required as conditions of approval for the SLA's application. The panel further ruled that by requiring the on-site support and

exclusivity provisions of blind vendors represented by the SLA, USPS was in violation of the Act.

The panel stated that it is the obligation of the head of the United States Postal Service to cause the improper acts or practices to be terminated promptly and to take any other action that is necessary to carry out the Arbitration Panel's award.

The views and opinions expressed by the panel do not necessarily represent the views and opinions of the U.S. Department of Education.

Dated: May 25, 2001.

Francis V. Corrigan,

Deputy Director, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.

[FR Doc. 01–13637 Filed 5–30–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–U

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Docket No. EA–239]

Application to Export Electric Energy; Aroostook Valley Electric Company

AGENCY: Office of Fossil Energy, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of application.

SUMMARY: Aroostook Valley Electric Company (AVEC) has applied for authority to transmit electric energy from the United States to Canada pursuant to section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act.

DATES: Comments, protests or requests to intervene must be submitted on or before June 15, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments, protests or requests to intervene should be addressed as follows: Office of Coal & Power Im/Ex (FE–27), Office of Fossil Energy, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585–0350 (FAX 202–287–5736).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Mintz (Program Office) 202–586–9506 or Michael Skinker (Program Attorney) 202–586–6667.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Exports of electricity from the United States to a foreign country are regulated and require authorization under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (FPA) (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)).

On April 27, 2001, the Office of Fossil Energy (FE) of the Department of Energy (DOE) received an application from AVEC to transmit electric energy from the United States to Canada. AVEC, a Maine corporation, owns and operates a 31–MW wood-burning generation facility located in Fort Fairfield, Maine (''the Plant''). This Plant originally was owned by Fairfield Energy Venture (Fairfield).

On October 8, 1985, DOE issued an order (ERA Docket PP–83EA) authorizing Fairfield and Maine Public Service Company (MPSC) jointly to export the electrical output of the Plant to Canada over the MPSC electric system. On December 4, 1985, DOE approved a request by Fairfield to remove its name from that export authorization, leaving MPSC the sole entity authorized to export the Plant's electrical output to Canada. On October 26, 1994, Fairfield sold the Plant to AVEC; however, the Plant remained connected to the MPSC electric system and AVEC continued to rely upon MPSC's export authorization for delivery of the Plant's electrical output to Canada. AVEC now requests its own and separate authority to export the output of the Plant to Canada using the existing MPSC transmission facilities.

Procedural Matters

Any person desiring to become a party to this proceeding or to be heard by filing comments or protests to this application should file a petition to intervene, comment or protest at the address provided above in accordance with §§ 385.211 or 385.214 of the FERC's Rules of Practice and Procedures (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). Fifteen copies of each petition and protest should be filed with the DOE on or before the date listed above.

Comments on the AVEC application to export electric energy to Canada should be clearly marked with Docket EA–239. Additional copies are to be filed directly with Edward F. Tancer, Secretary, Aroostook Valley Electric Company, c/o FPL Energy, LLC, 700 Universe Blvd., Juno Beach, Florida 33408, and Glenn J. Berger, Victor A. Contract, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP, 1440 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20005–2111.

A final decision will be made on this application after the environmental impacts have been evaluated pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and a determination is made by the DOE that the proposed action will not adversely impact on the reliability of the U.S. electric power supply system.

Copies of this application will be made available, upon request, for public inspection and copying at the address provided above or by accessing the Fossil Energy Home Page at http://www.fe.doe.gov. Upon reaching the Fossil Energy Home page, select ''Regulatory Programs,'' then ''Electricity Regulation,'' and then ''Pending Proceedings'' from the options menus.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 23, 2001.

Anthony J. Como,

Deputy Director, Electric Power Regulation, Office of Coal & Power Im/Ex, Office of Coal & Power Systems, Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 01–13627 Filed 5–30–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. RP98–44–000 and GP98–38–000]

EL Paso Natural Gas Company, Vastar Gas Marketing, Inc. and Atlantic Richfield Company; Notice of Settlement Agreement

May 24, 2001.

Take notice that on May 16, 2001, El Paso Natural Gas Company (El Paso), Vastar Gas Marketing, Inc. (Vastar) and Atlantic Richfield Company (ARCO) (collectively referred to as the Signatory Parties) filed, for the Commission's approval a Settlement Agreement (Settlement) under Rule 602 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure in the captioned dockets. A copy of the Settlement is available for public inspection in the Commission's Public Reference Room and may be viewed on the web at *http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm* (call 202–208–2222 for assistance).

Signatory Parties state that the Settlement resolves the Kansas *ad valorem* refund claims raised by El Paso against Vastar and ARCO. El Paso originally sought refunds of approximately $6.6 million from Vastar and/or ARCO. The Settlement resolves these claims, and the related defense of Vastar and ARCO, in exchange for Vastar's and ARCO's lump sum payment of $4.1 million. In addition, the Settlement will result in the full and complete release of Vastar's and ARCO's claims against its royalty owners with respect to Kansas *ad valorem* tax refunds on El Paso's system, and the termination of all related proceedings pending before the Commission as they relate to EL Paso's claims.

Initial comments are due June 5, 2001; relay comments are due June 15, 2001.

Davis P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–13593 Filed 5–30–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M