written inquiries to the Chief of Naval Personnel (Pers-661) 2 Navy Annex, Washington, DC 20370–6610.

Requests should contain the full name and Social Security Number of the individual.

CONTESTING RECORD PROCEDURES:

The Navy's rules for accessing records, and for contesting contents and appealing initial agency determinations are published in Secretary of the Navy Instruction 5211.5; 32 CFR part 701; or may be obtained from the system manager.

RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

Victim; offender; medical and dental records; educational institutions; medical institutions; private practitioners; law enforcement agencies; public and private health and welfare agencies; and witnesses.

EXEMPTIONS CLAIMED FOR THE SYSTEM:

Parts of this system may be exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(2) and (k)(5), as applicable.

An exemption rule for this system has been promulgated in accordance with requirements of 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(1), (2), and 3, (c) and (e) and published in 32 CFR part 701, subpart G. For additional information contact the system manager.

[FR Doc. 96–10979 Filed 05–02–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–F

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Federal Interagency Coordinating Council Meeting (FICC)

AGENCY: Federal Interagency Coordinating Council, Education.

ACTION: Notice of a public meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice describes the schedule and agenda of a forthcoming meeting of the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council. Notice of this meeting is required under section 685(c) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as amended, and is intended to notify the general public of their opportunity to attend the meeting. The meeting will be accessible to individuals with disabilities.

DATE AND TIME: May 23, 1996, from 1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: Hubert H. Humphrey Building, Room 503A/529A, 200 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Connie Garner, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 3127, Switzer Building, Washington, D.C. 20202–2644. Telephone: (202) 205–8124. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call (202) 205–8170.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Federal Interagency Coordinating Council (FICC) is established under section 685 of the Individuals with disabilities Education Act, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1484a). The Council is established to: (1) Minimize duplication across Federal, State and local agencies of programs and activities relating to early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and preschool services for children with disabilities; (2) ensure effective coordination of Federal early intervention and preschool programs, including Federal technical assistance and support activities; and (3) identify gaps in Federal agency programs and services and barriers to Federal interagency cooperation. To meet these purposes, the FICC seeks to: (1) Identify areas of conflict, overlap, and omissions in interagency policies related to the provision of services to infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities; (2) develop and implement joint policy interpretations on issues related to infants, toddlers, and preschoolers that cut across Federal agencies, including modifications of regulations to eliminate barriers to interagency programs and activities; and (3) coordinate the provisions of technical assistance and dissemination of best practice information. The FICC is chaired by the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

At this meeting the FICC plans to: (1) Update the membership on the issue of Champus and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and (2) discuss the findings of the national survey on service integration in home visiting programs serving Part H eligible children and their families.

The meeting of the FICC is open to the public. Written public comment will be accepted at the conclusion of the meeting. These comments will be included in the summary minutes of the meeting. The meeting will be physically accessible with meeting materials provided in both braille and large print. Interpreters for persons who are hearing impaired will be available. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend and need other reasonable accommodations should contact the contact person named above in advance of the meeting.

Summary minutes of the FICC meetings will be maintained and available for public inspection at the U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 3127, Switzer Building, Washington, D.C. 20202–2644, from the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., weekdays, except Federal Holidays.

Judith E. Heumann,

Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

[FR Doc. 96–11085 Filed 5–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Plutonium Finishing Plant Stabilization Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Limited Reopening of Public Comment Period.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is evaluating alternatives for stabilizing plutonium-bearing materials at the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Facility, located at the Hanford Site near Richland, Washington. On December 5, 1995 (60 FR 62244), the DOE announced the availability of the Plutonium Finishing Plant Stabilization Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS–0244–D). The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and its implementing regulations. Subsequent to issuing the Draft EIS, DOE issued a proposed policy for comment regarding the treatment and disposition of excess residues with plutonium concentrations below 50 weight-percent. Following an analysis using this draft policy, DOE has concluded that it may be cost-effective to immobilize up to 280 kg (617 lb) of the plutonium-bearing materials at the PFP Facility and transport it to Hanford Site solid waste management facilities for storage. The EIS is therefore being revised to include an evaluation of the environmental impacts of implementing this alternative. A determination that this plutonium-bearing material lacks a beneficial use has not been made and this alternative would only be selected subsequent to such a decision. The intent of this notice is to notify the public of an additional alternative that would immobilize certain plutonium-bearing materials, and to reopen the comment period for 21 days in order to solicit comments on the proposed alternative.

DATES: DOE invites written and oral comments on the immobilization alternative from all interested parties. Comments or suggestions regarding the adequacy, accuracy, and completeness of the immobilization alternative will be

considered in preparing the Record of Decision, and should be submitted (postmarked) by May 24, 1996. Comments received after that date will be considered to the degree practicable.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the immobilization alternative may be made during the comment period by calling DOE toll free at 1–888–946–3700; by facsimile to 509/946–3734; by electronic mail to InterNet address ''b____ f____ jr____ ben____ burton@rl.gov''; or by writing to PFP Stabilization EIS, Attn: Mr. Ben Burton, PO Box 550, MSIN B1–42, Richland, WA 99352.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information on the DOE NEPA process, please contact: Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director of NEPA Policy and Assistance, EH–42, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585, 202/586–4600 or 1–800–472–2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In two Notices of Intent published in the Federal Register on October 27, 1994 (59 FR 53969) and November 23, 1994 (59 FR 60358), the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) announced its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to resolve safety issues associated with the continued presence of relatively large quantities of chemically reactive materials at the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Facility. A Draft EIS was prepared pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA in order to provide an objective, technical basis for decision makers and the public to evaluate alternatives to: (1) Convert plutonium-bearing materials at the PFP Facility into a more stable, safer form; (2) reduce radiation exposure to PFP Facility workers; and (3) reduce the cost of maintaining the PFP Facility and its contents. A preferred alternative for resolving the safety issue was identified to remove readily retrievable plutonium-bearing material in hold-up at the PFP Facility and stabilize these and other plutonium-bearing materials at the PFP Facility through four treatment processes: (1) Ion exchange, vertical calcination, and thermal stabilization of plutonium-bearing solutions; (2) thermal stabilization using a continuous furnace for oxides, fluorides, and process residues; (3) repackaging of metals and alloys; and (4) pyrolysis of polycubes and combustibles. The availability of this Draft EIS was announced in a Federal Register notice on December 5, 1995 (60 FR 62244).

Subsequent to issuing the Draft EIS, DOE issued a proposed policy for comment regarding the treatment and disposition of excess plutonium-bearing residues. This draft policy specifies that materials with plutonium concentrations less than 50 weight-percent are candidates for processing as waste for disposal, or separation from its residue matrix and packaging for storage according to DOE's safe storage criteria. Each responsible field office would evaluate which end state would be more cost-effective for each quantity, batch or category of plutonium-bearing residues. The performance factors for cost-effectiveness include worker exposure, waste generation, and cost. In addition, commentors during the public hearing requested that DOE consider an alternative of disposing of plutonium bearing material as waste.

Following an analysis using this draft policy, an in consideration of comments received during the public hearing on the Draft EIS, DOE has concluded that it may be cost-effective to immobilize up to 280 kg (617 lb) of the plutonium-bearing materials at the PFP Facility, and transport it to Hanford Site solid waste management facilities for storage. The EIS is therefore being revised to include an evaluation of the environmental impacts associated with this alternative. The following information describes the proposed immobilization alternative and identifies the associated potential environmental impacts. It is organized as follows:

I. Process Description
II. Anticipated Environmental Impacts
  A. Health Effects
  B. Air Quality
  C. Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Capacity
  D. Transportation
III. Alternatives for Immobilization
IV. Availability of the Immobilization Alternative

I. Process Description

The current inventory of plutonium at the PFP Facility includes up to 280 kg (617 lb) of plutonium in concentrations less than 50 weight percent that DOE has identified as potentially being suitable for immobilization. This inventory includes oxides, process residues, and miscellaneous/other combustibles. The bulk of this material is stored in the PFP Facility vaults.

These plutonium-bearing materials would be immobilized within gloveboxes at the PFP Facility. A cement system was selected as a reasonable method to represent the potential immobilization options because: (1) the ingredients are inexpensive, safe, and readily available; (2) the equipment needs are simple; (3) the final waste form has proven stability and meets the waste acceptance criteria for the Hanford site solid waste management facilities; (4) it has been used extensively at the Hanford Site for immobilizing wastes; and (5) impacts from its use should be similar to those incurred for any other reasonable immobilization technique.

Equipment for the immobilization process would be identified and sized based on the follow special considerations: (1) waste and cement feeding equipment that would control feed rates; (2) cooling equipment to maintain a low temperature for the cement-waste-water mixture to minimize water vapor in the glovebox; and (3) reuse of containers when possible.

The plutonium-bearing material would be mixed with cement, and the mixture would be placed within nominal 3.4-liter (0.9 gallon) containers. The containers would remain in the glovebox and allowed to cure. Curing hardens the mixture and fixes the plutonium into the cemented matrix. After curing, a lid would be placed over the container. Once three containers were readied in this manner, they would be removed from the glovebox and packaged.

The containers would be packaged in accordance with the waste acceptance criteria for the Hanford Site solid waste management facilities. Packaging would include a 15.25-cm (6-in) diameter pipe container in 55-gallon drum configuration. The pipe container in drum configuration was selected as the preferred packaging technique compared to other packaging methods because it results in the fewest number of total drums and will, therefore, result in less exposure to workers. The pipe container in drum configuration would enable three steel encased, cemented waste containers to be placed in each drum. The maximum allowable limit for plutonium in each pipe container in drum configuration is 200 g (0.44 lb). Up to 1,600 drums of waste with a nominal plutonium content of 170 g (0.37 lb) per drum would be generated by this alternative.

Following packaging, the drums would be managed as transuranic or radioactive mixed waste. All waste drums would be transferred from the PFP Facility to Hanford site solid waste management facilities for continued onsite storage.

II. Anticipated Environmental Impacts

Impacts from the alternative for immobilizing plutonium-bearing materials were evaluated in terms of the following elements: health effects; air quality; waste treatment, storage, and disposal capacity; and transportation.

A. Health Effects

Health effects to PFP Facility workers, other Hanford Site workers, and members of the public from exposure to ionizing radiation would result from implementing the immobilization alternative. Both normal operations and accident conditions would contribute to radiation exposures. Conservative estimates of the possible consequences from the immobilization activities were quantified in terms of dose and latent cancer fatalities probabilities. Tables 1 and 2 tabulate these possible consequences.

TABLE 1.—ANTICIPATED HEALTH EFFECTS FROM ROUTINE RELEASES

Exposed individual or population	Dose received	Latent cancer fatality probability
PFP Facility Workers	80 person-rem	0.03
Hypothetical Maximally Exposed Individual (Hanford Site Worker)	1.2×10^{-4} rem	5.0×10^{-8}
Hanford Site Workers	6.2×10^{-4} person-rem	2.5×10^{-7}
Hypothetical Maximally Exposed Individual (Off-site Public)	2.3×10^{-5} rem	1.1×10^{-8}
General Public (352,500 people)	2.2 person-rem	1.1×10^{-3}

TABLE 2.—ANTICIPATED HEALTH EFFECTS FROM ACCIDENT RELEASES

Hypothetical maximally exposed individual	Dose received	Latent cancer fatality probability
PFP Facility Worker	210 rem	8.4×10^{-2}
Hanford Site Worker	1.6×10^{-4} rem	6.5×10^{-8}
Off-site Individual	5.7×10^{-5} rem	2.9×10^{-8}

B. Air Quality

Implementing the immobilization alternative would not result in appreciable impacts to air quality. High efficiency particulate air filters in use at the PFP Facility would minimize the amount of contaminants that would be discharged to the atmosphere. Although most expected air contaminants would be trapped by these filters, some fine particulates, referred to as PM_{10} (particulates less than 10 microns in size) would be emitted. The total estimated release of respirable particles from the immobilization alternative is 7.1 x 10^{-10} g/sec (1.6×10^{-12} lb/sec). The maximum downwind contaminant concentrations projected by an Environmental Protection Agency-approved computer model and the ambient air standards are provided in Table 3. The contaminant levels anticipated from the immobilization alternative are significantly lower than the regulatory ambient air standard.

TABLE 3.—PROJECTED MAXIMUM GROUND LEVEL CONCENTRATIONS OF PARTICULATE AIR CONTAMINANTS

Air contaminant	Maximum average concentration[a] (μg/m³)	Background concentration[b] (μg/m³)	Ambient air standard (μg/m³)
PM_{10} (24-hr)	1.9×10^{-9}	81	150

TABLE 3.—PROJECTED MAXIMUM GROUND LEVEL CONCENTRATIONS OF PARTICULATE AIR CONTAMINANTS—Continued

Air contaminant	Maximum average concentration[a] (μg/m³)	Background concentration[b] (μg/m³)	Ambient air standard (μg/m³)
PM_{10} (Annual)	3.9×10^{-10}	27	50

Notes: a. Modeled maximum ground-level concentrations occurred at 630 m from the stack.

b. Background concentrations for PM_{10} taken from 1987 data (Pacific Northwest Laboratories, 1991, Air Quality Impact Analysis, PNL–7681, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington)

C. Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Capacity

Implementing the immobilization alternative would also result in impacts to treatment, storage, and disposal capacity. Hanford site solid waste management facilities that would receive the 1,600 drums anticipated to be generated as a result of the immobilization alternate include the Low Level Burial Grounds, Transuranic Waste Storage and Assay Facility, Central Waste Complex, and the Waste Receiving and Processing Facility. The available capacity at these facilities for managing low-level radioactive and mixed waste is considered sufficient. The available capacity for managing transuranic and transuranic mixed waste is currently being evaluated. This information will be available in the Final EIS.

D. Transportation

Finally, implementing the immobilization alternative would result in transportation impacts. Over a 6 to 12 month period, up to 90 truck trips would result from the shipment of the immobilized materials from the PFP Facility to Hanford Site solid waste management facilities. This corresponds to an average of 7 to 15 trips per month. These trips would be short in distance (2 km [1.2 miles] or less) and would be made during off-peak hours. Compared with the current volume of vehicular traffic on nearby Hanford Site transport roadways, the additional truck trips would not be expected to adversely impact the existing or future Hanford Site transportation system.

III. Alternatives for Immobilization

Cementation using a pipe container in drum configuration was selected because of its ability to satisfy packaging and immobilization requirements based on worker safety and economic considerations. A cement system was selected because it would meet acceptance criteria for Hanford Site solid waste management facilities; the ingredients are inexpensive, safe, and readily available; equipment requirements can be very simple; the final form has proven stability; and the method has been used extensively at the Hanford Site for immobilizing transuranic materials.

In contrast, immobilizing of materials in a glass (i.e., vitrification) or a ceramic matrix was not considered desirable because of the cost, specialized equipment required, lack of such equipment on the Hanford Site, and lack of site experience. These factors would result in delays in implementing these alternatives. The lack of site experience and anticipated delays would result in additional health and safety risks.

Another alternative would be to mix the plutonium with uranium to produce a mixed oxide fuel suitable for energy production in a nuclear power reactor. Because of the relatively small quantity of plutonium material being considered, it was not considered reasonable to develop the technology at Hanford to support this alternative.

IV. Availability of the Immobilization Alternative

Copies of the proposed immobilization alternative may be reviewed at the following locations, or may be obtained by calling DOE at 1–888–946–3700:

U.S. Department of Energy, Headquarters, Freedom of Information Reading Room, Forrestall Building, 1000 Independence Ave. SW., Room 1E–0190, Washington, DC 20585, 202/586–3142

DOE Public Reading Room, Washington State University, Tri Cities Branch, 100 Sprout Road, Richland, WA 99352, 509/376–8583

University of Washington, Suzzallo Library, Government Publications, 15th Ave N.E. and Campus Parkway, Seattle, WA 98185, 206/543–1937

Gonzaga University, Foley Center, E. 502 Boone Avenue, Spokane, WA 99258, 509/324–5931

Portland State University, Branford Price Millar Library, SW Harrison and Park, Portland, OR 97207, 503/725–3690

Signed in Richland, Washington, this 25th day of April, 1996 for the United States Department of Energy.

Paul F.X. Dunigan, Jr.,

NEPA Compliance Officer, Richland Operations Office.

[FR Doc. 96–11034 Filed 5–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Notice of Wetlands Involvement for Refurbishment of Uranium Hexafluoride Cylinder Storage Yards C–745–K, L, M, N, and P and Construction of a New Uranium Hexafluoride Cylinder Storage Yard (C–745–T) at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Near Paducah, KY

AGENCY: Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of wetlands involvement.

SUMMARY: DOE proposes to renovate existing storage yards and construct a new storage yard to accommodate restacking of approximately 19,000 steel cylinders containing uranium hexafluoride at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PGDP) in McCracken County, Kentucky. Construction of the new storage yard would result in the loss (filling) of less than one acre of wetlands. In accordance with 10 CFR Part 1022, DOE will prepare a wetlands assessment and will perform the proposed action in a manner so as to avoid or minimize potential harm to or within the affected wetlands.

DATES: Comments are due to the address below no later than May 20, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to: Mr. Jimmie C. Hodges, Paducah Site Manager, U. S. Department of Energy, 5600 Hobbs Road, Paducah, KY 42001. Phone (502) 441–6800.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Further information on the proposed action and wetlands assessment can be obtained from Mr. Jimmie C. Hodges, Paducah Site Manager (see **ADDRESSES** above). Information on general DOE wetlands environmental review requirements is available from: Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance (EH–25), U. S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585. Phone (202) 586–4600 or (800) 472–2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: PGDP is an operational uranium enrichment facility owned by DOE and operated by the United States Enrichment Corporation. A consequence of the uranium enrichment process is the accumulation of depleted uranium hexafluoride (UF_6). Depleted UF_6, a solid at ambient temperatures, is stored in large steel cylinders weighing up to 14 tons each. DOE is responsible for approximately 32,200 cylinders of UF_6 stored at PGDP. Storage conditions are suboptimal and have resulted in accelerated corrosion of cylinders and have increased the potential for a release of hazardous substances. Consequently, DOE has proposed refurbishment of certain existing yards and construction of a new storage yard (C–745–T).

The C–745–T yard would consist of a concrete pad occupying approximately 43,200 m^2 (450,000 ft^2). The initial construction activities in the storage yard would consist of clearing and grubbing the area and stripping the topsoil. After this excavation, a storm water drainage system would be installed. The excavated area would be filled with soil and gravel to achieve the desired design elevation. A concrete pad would be constructed on top of the fill.

The proposed site for the C–745–T cylinder storage yard is immediately south of existing cylinder yards at the southern end of the plant. Of available sites, DOE considers the proposed site to best meet siting criteria. A different site was initially proposed but was discovered to encompass approximately 1.8 hectares (4.5 acres) of wetlands. In order to minimize impacts to wetlands in accordance with Executive Order 11990, ''Protection of Wetlands,'' and 10 CFR Part 1022, DOE's ''Compliance With Floodplain/Wetlands Environmental Review Requirements,'' DOE selected the current proposed site.

Six small, isolated wetlands are present at the proposed C–745–T yard site. These wetlands are classified as palustrine emergent, palustrine scrub/shrub, and palustrine forested, according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service wetland classification system. Palustrine wetlands in the vicinity of PGDP are those less than 8 hectares (20 acres) in surface area with a water depth less than 2 m (6.6 ft) during low water. Emergent vegetation is erect, rooted, non-woody; scrub/shrub vegetation is woody not exceeding 6 m (20 ft) in height; and forested vegetation is woody, exceeding 6 m (20 ft) in height.

The total area of wetlands directly impacted by the proposed action would be 0.32 hectare (0.8 acre). Under the worst case scenario, an additional 0.12 hectare (0.3 acre) of wetlands could be impacted by (1) construction equipment accessing the area or materials and equipment staged in wetland areas, if proper precautions (best management practices) are not followed, or (2) diversion of flow away from a man-made drainage ditch which contains wetlands.

In accordance with 10 CFR Part 1022, DOE will prepare a wetlands assessment for the proposed action. The wetlands assessment will be included in the environmental assessment (EA) being prepared for the proposed action in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act.

Issued in Oak Ridge, Tennessee on April 1, 1996.

James L. Elmore,

Alternate NEPA Compliance Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–11033 Filed 5–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Morgantown Energy Technology Center; Research Opportunity Announcement (ROA) Applied Research and Development

AGENCY: U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Morgantown Energy Technology Center.