Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 01–16929 Filed 7–5–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Defense Science Board

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of Advisory Committee Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force Precision Targeting will meet in closed session July 30, 2001, at the Air Combat Command, Langley AFB, VA. The Task Force will examine the full range of the precision weapons targeting in tactical military operations, from target execution, location, and identification through mission execution and damage assessment. Target types will include fixed installations and both transportable and mobile military force elements.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology & Logistics on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. The Task Force will review: all planned precision weapons programs and procurements to determine the degree to which these weapons are compatible with targeting requirements for different target classes; the degree to which existing and planned reconnaissance and surveillance assets are used to effectively develop target sets, real time targeting data and perform battle damage assessment under varied degrees of cover, concealment and deception; our ability to identify and precisely locate targets while minimizing false alarms using automatic target recognition techniques and precision location technologies; and our ability to attack moving targets.

In accordance with Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. II), it has been determined that this Defense Science Board meetings concerns matters listed in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1) and that, accordingly, these meetings will be closed to the public.

Dated: June 26, 2001.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 01–16878 Filed 7–5–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Record of Decision for Outfall Replacement for Wastewater Treatment Plant at Fort Kamehameha, Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, HI

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of record of decision.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy, after weighing the operational, environmental, and cost implications of alternatives to the existing outfall for the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) at Fort Kamehameha, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, announces its decision to construct a deep ocean outfall replacement that will discharge effluent into the open coastal waters of Mamala Bay to the south of the island of Oahu.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Melvin Kaku, Pacific Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command (PLN23), 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860–3134, telephone (808) 471–9338, facsimile (808) 474–5909.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Record of Decision (ROD) in its entirety is provided as follows:

Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c), and the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality that implement NEPA procedures, 40 CFR Parts 1500–1508, the Department of the Navy (DON) announces its decision to replace a physically deteriorating effluent outfall that discharges wastewater into the entrance channel of the Pearl Harbor Estuary with a deep ocean outfall into the open coastal waters of Mamala Bay where the effluent loading is less likely to adversely impact the environment.

The existing outfall has been operating under an administrative extension to a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) monitoring permit that expired on February 28, 1993. The Navy was advised by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 9 on January 24, 1997, that a new NPDES permit will limit the discharge of nutrients and metals to levels below those presently permitted. Replacement of the existing outfall will reduce pollutant loadings and water quality deterioration in the Pearl Harbor Estuary, and enable DON to be in compliance. As described in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), the DON will construct and operate a new deep ocean outfall. The new outfall will provide an effluent disposal system that meets environmental and other regulatory constraints. All practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted.

Process

On September 11, 1996, the DON published in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 47898) a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). On September 23, 1996, an EIS Preparation Notice was published in The Environmental Notice, a semi-monthly bulletin of the Hawaii State Department of Health (DOH). DON held two public scoping meetings on October 1 and October 2, 1996, in Honolulu, HI at Washington Intermediate School and Makalapa Elementary School, respectively. The EPA published a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIS (DEIS) in the **Federal Register** on November 21, 1997 (62 FR 62303). An announcement was also placed in the December 8, 1997, issue of The Environmental Notice. DON held a public hearing to receive comments on the DEIS at Radford High School, Honolulu, HI, on December 17, 1997. In addition, DON distributed the DEIS to 124 government agencies, groups, and individuals. DON considered all oral and written comments in preparation of the FEIS. The EPA published a NOA for the FEIS in the Federal Register on May 4, 2001 (66 FR 22551). A NOA was also published in two local newspapers on May 4, May 5, and May 6, 2001. An announcement was also placed in the May 8, 2001, issue of The Environmental Notice.

Alternatives Considered

DON initially considered six alternative methods for reducing the discharge of pollutant loadings from the effluent discharge into the Pearl Harbor Estuary. DON developed conceptual designs for the six alternative methods and conducted a preliminary analysis based on the following: (1) Purpose and need of the project; (2) 30-year life-cycle costs; and (3) feasibility of implementation including construction, operation, and maintenance. DON determined that of the six alternative methods, only the deep ocean outfall and the underground injection alternatives were reasonable. These two