whether or not the HSA desires to review the application. If so, a copy of the application must be submitted to each HSA for review no later than April 4, 1986. Applicants are advised to contact the local HSA as soon as a decision is made to apply for a grant for detailed information on meeting this review requirement. Applications will not receive a formal review by OAPP without satisfying this requirement.

Application Consideration and Assessment

Applications which are judged to be late or which do not conform to the requirements of this program announcement will not be accepted for review. Applicants will be so notified, and the applications will be returned.

All other applications will be subjected to a competitive review and assessment by qualified persons. The results of this review will assist the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs in considering competing applications and in making the final funding decisions.

All eligible applications will be reviewed and assessed according to the following criteria:

1. The applicant's provision for the requirements set forth in section 2006(a) of Title XX of the Public Health Service Act (10 points).
2. The capacity of the proposed applicant organization to provide the resources needed to conduct the project, collect data and evaluate it. This includes personnel, time and facilities (20 points)
3. The applicant's presentation of the project methodology, including a statement of goals and objectives, the methods for achieving the objectives, a workplan and timetable, and results or benefits expected (20 points)
4. The applicant's provision for complying with the legislation's requirements to involve families in the delivery of services, to promote adoption as a viable alternative to early parenting, and in the case of prevention programs, to promote postponement of early sexual activity (20 points)
5. The applicant's documentation of the innovativeness of the program approach, and its worth for testing and replication (10 points)
6. The applicant's presentation of a detailed evaluation plan, indicating an understanding of program evaluation methods and reflecting a practical technically sound approach to assessing the project's achievement of program objectives. A workplan should be included to indicate the extent and nature of the involvement of a local State college or university in this effort (15 points)
7. The estimated cost of the project to the government is reasonable considering the anticipated results (5 points).

In making grant award decisions, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs will take into account the extent to which grants approved for funding will provide an appropriate distribution of resources throughout the country, considering the priorities in section 2005(a) of Title XX of the Public Health Service Act and focusing on:

1. The incidence of adolescent pregnancy and the availability of services in the geographic area to be served.
2. The community commitment to and involvement in planning and implementation of the demonstration project
3. The nature of the organization applying.
4. The population to be served.
5. The organizational model(s) for delivery of service.
6. The usefulness for policymakers and service providers of the proposed project and its potential for complementing existing AFL demonstration models.
7. The applicant's proposed plans to access continued community funding as Federal funds decrease and end.
8. The applicant's capacity to administer funds responsibly.
9. Where projects are of approximate equal quality and there are insufficient funds to support all, priority will be given to those that can be completed in three years.

The Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs does not release information about individual applications during the review process until final funding decisions have been made. These decisions will be made by September 30, 1986. When these decisions have been made, applicants will be notified by letter of the outcome of their applications. The official document notifying an applicant that an application has been approved for funding is the Notice of Grant Award, which specifies to the grantee the amount of money awarded, the purpose of the grant, the terms and conditions of the grant award, the budget period for which support is being given, and the amount of funding to be contributed by the grantee to project costs.

Dated: January 6, 1986.

Jerry Bennett,

Deputy Director, Office of Population Affairs.

[FR Doc. 86-949 Filed 1-15-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160-17-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Final Determination That the Tchinouk Indians of Oregon Do Not Exist as an Indian Tribe

January 6, 1986.

This notice is published in the exercise of authority delegated by the Secretary of the Interior to the Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs by 209 DM 8.

Pursuant to 25 CFR 83.9(f) (formerly 25 CFR 54.9(f)), notice is hereby given that the Assistant Secretary has determined that the: Tchinouk Indians, c/o Ms. Karleen Parazoo, 5621 Altamount Drive, Klamath Falls, Oregon 97601, do not exist as an Indian tribe within the meaning of Federal law.

This notice is based on a determination following a review of public comments on the proposed finding that this group does not meet four of the criteria set forth in 25 CFR 83.7 and, therefore, does not meet the requirements necessary for a government-to-government relationship with the United States.

A notice of the proposed finding to decline to acknowledge the Tchinouk Indians was published in the **Federal Register** on Wednesday, June 12, 1985 (page 24709, Vol. 50, No. 113). Interested parties were given 120 days in which to submit factual or legal arguments to rebut the evidence used to support the proposed finding.

Two written comments with limited documentation were received from the petitioner opposing the proposed finding. One comment supporting the finding was received from an individual scholar.

Comments were received from the Tchinouk chairman, by letters dated September 5 and October 7, 1985. The documentation submitted with these letters consisted almost entirely of government documents or correspondence from the petitioner or its members concerning applications made in 1955 for the Western Oregon Judgment Fund and the rejection of these applications based on a determination that the applicants' ancestors were of Chinook, Crise or Cree ancestry, and therefore not eligible. All but two of the submitted documents were either previously submitted as part of the petition or its supplements or were examined by the Acknowledgment staff in the course of their research on the petition. The documents submitted presented no new evidence concerning the history or character of the group and

thus no significant new evidence concerning the proposed finding.

The petitioner's letters also contained several arguments intended to refute various conclusions reached in the proposed finding. Most of these restated arguments that were made in the original petition and were presented without additional evidence, description or documentation to support them. The petitioner stated that the early 19th-century French-Canadian settlement of Champoeg (referred to as French Prairie in proposed finding) was an Indian community and that the Tchinouk were part of it. No evidence or argument was included to rebut the conclusion in the proposed finding that Champoeg was not a distinct Indian community but a French-Canadian community which included many Indians from a wide variety of tribes and many individuals of mixed French-Indian ancestry.

The petitioner also stated that "we were always people that held meetings" and provided comments which implied that meetings had been held regularly since the 1940's. A small amount of additional detail was provided about meetings in the 1950's. No documentation and no additional detail was provided about these meetings in particular or concerning the general conclusion in the proposed finding that the group had not functioned continuously as a political unit or as an organization of any character throughout the twentieth century or earlier.

The Tchinouk comments argued that court cases such as *Duwamish et al.* which pertain to historical claims of the Chinook or various Lower Chinook bands do not pertain to the Tchinouk. The argument appeared to be based on the difference in spelling, since these cases used the more common spelling "Chinook" rather than the French rendering as "Tchinouk," which the petitioner adopted soon after they organized in 1974. The proposed finding concluded that there were no differences between Tchinouk and Chinook, other than as alternative spellings. The Tchinouk comments stated that the ancestors of the group lived along the lower Columbia River, while also stating that they are not descended from the Lower Chinook bands whose members were paid in 1913 on the McChesney Roll. The Tchinouk in their petition and in various other documents had previously asserted common ancestry with the Lower Chinook bands whose aboriginal lands were on the Lower Columbia River.

In responding to the conclusion in the proposed finding that there was no known leadership or other political structure, the petitioner asserted, without detail or documentation, that such leadership had existed. Regarding the conclusion that the tribal identity of the group's members and ancestors had changed, the comments stated only that there had been many hardships and it had been "hard to identify ourselves when we needed to."

A comment supporting the proposed finding was received on July 23, 1985, from Dr. Verne Ray, an anthropologist who has conducted extensive research on the Chinook Indians of the lower Columbia River. Dr. Ray stated in part that "Nothing in the totality of scientific, historical, archival and documentary data on the area in question and the ethnology of the Chinook Tribe supports the claims of the "Tchinouk."

No additional comments were received from the Chinook Tribe of Washington, the Klamath Tribe, the attorney for the Tchinouk or Dr. Steven Beckham, all of whom commented on the Tchinouk petition during the period of consideration before the proposed finding was issued. The Chinook Tribe denied that the Tchinouk had any common history with them or any organizational affiliation. The proposed finding concluded that it was not possible to determine, using the currently available evidence, from which Chinookan band the Tchinouk are descended. The Tchinouk attorney presented arguments that the Western Oregon Termination Act of 1954 did not apply to the Tchinouk because it was not a recognized tribe at that time. The proposed finding concluded, after a review of the act and historical materials relating to it and its implementation, that the Tchinouk were forbidden the Federal relationship by that act and therefore did not meet criterion § 83.7(g) of the regulations. Beckham provided copies of comments he prepared for the Oregon Commission on Indian Services which asserted that he had seen no documentary evidence during his research on Indians of western Oregon which showed the existence of a Tchinouk tribe.

Based on information originally provided by the petitioner, on independent research conducted by the Acknowledgment staff, on comments by others on the petition before the proposed finding was issued, and on comments and supporting evidence received from the Tchinouk petitioner and one other person in response to the proposed finding, we conclude that the Tchinouk Indians of Oregon do not meet the requirements necessary under Federal law for a government-to-government relationship with the United States.

In accordance with 25 CFR 83.9(j) of the Acknowledgment regulations, an analysis was made to determine what, if any, option other than acknowledgment would be available under which the petitioning group could make application for services and other benefits. No viable alternative could be found due to the lack of inherent social and political cohesion and continuity of the group.

This determination is final and will become effective 60 days after the date on which this notice appears in the **Federal Register** unless the Secretary of the Interior requests reconsideration pursuant to 25 CFR 83.10.

Ross O. Swimmer,

Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs.

[FR Doc. 86-921 Filed 1-15-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-02-M

Bureau of Land Management

[Coal Lease Application ES 35269]

Public Hearing and Availability of Draft Environmental Assessment; Bell County, KY

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Public Hearing and Availability of Draft Environmental Assessment.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Eastern States Office, 350 South Pickett Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22304, hereby gives notice that a public hearing will be held on February 26, 1986, at 7:00 p.m. in the Burt Combs Forestry Building, Highway 25 East, Pineville, Kentucky 40977. Application has been made to the United States under the emergency coal leasing regulation, 43 CFR 3425.1-4, that it offer for lease certain coal resources in the public lands hereinafter described. The purpose of the hearing is to obtain public comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment prepared and on the following items:

1. The method of mining to be employed to obtain maximum economic recovery of the coal;

2. The impact that mining the coal in the proposed leasehold may have on the area including but not limited to impacts on the environment; and

3. Methods of determining the fair market value of the coal to be offered.

Written requests to testify orally at the February 26, 1986 public hearing should be received at the Jackson