

(5) The scholarship recipient should be acknowledged by the community and school in an appropriate fashion, such as high school graduation.

(6) The scholarship should be provided by private funding sources, and should be a minimum of \$500.

The following is one potential design of the program to assist organizations in understanding the scope and magnitude of the effort required in this project. In this scenario, individuals might be selected by local high schools or community organizations as National Service Scholars. They, in turn, might complete a brief application and submit them to either the State Education Agency, which now administers service learning programs, or to the State Commission on National and Community Service, as determined by the governor of the State. That organization, based on merit criteria and consistent with the local guidelines, could select a number of individuals who would have their scholarship matched by the Corporation; and award a number of larger scholarships to particularly noteworthy individuals. The application might also include reference to the connection between service and school studies. Each State agency would forward the applications of the statewide scholarship recipients to a panel of nationally renowned individuals who will select several larger scholarship recipients across the nation.

The scholarships provided by private organizations should be for the purpose of paying the cost of a student's higher education and will be granted under the terms and conditions set by those organizations. The matching amount provided by the Corporation, as well as the larger scholarships, would be paid directly to an institution of higher education.

#### Eligible Applicants

To be eligible, applicants must be a non-profit organization or educational institution. Pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, 26 U.S.C. 501(c)(4), which engages in lobbying activities is not eligible.

#### Required Activities of the Successful Applicant

The organization selected will (1) Complete a final program design and implementation plan for approval by the Corporation; (2) publicize the program to local school districts, State agencies, and other affected parties; (3) provide assistance to local nonprofits and seek input from national nonprofit

organization with relevant expertise and knowledge; (4) respond to inquiries from all parties in timely fashion; (5) organize the selection process for nationally-selected scholarships; and (6) provide administrative and technical support to the Corporation at all phases of the program.

#### Corporation Involvement

Substantial involvement is expected between the Corporation and the successful applicant when carrying out the program. The Corporation anticipates providing sufficient staff to support this effort and to oversee the provision of Corporation funds. The applicant must keep relevant Corporation staff informed of its activities; work with Corporation staff during development, delivery and assessment of services provided; and attend meetings/conferences at the Corporation's request.

#### Project Duration

The Corporation anticipates entering into a cooperative agreement covering a project period of approximately November, 1996 through approximately October, 1997, with the possibility of renewal based on performance, need, and the availability of funds at the discretion of the Corporation.

#### Overview of Application Requirements

The application should include a narrative section describing the organization's background and capacity to provide the technical and administrative support for this program, an implementation timeline, a staffing plan, and a certification that it will comply with all conditions attendant to the receipt of federal funding. The application may be no longer than 20 single-sided pages double-spaced in 12-point font.

Initially all applications will be reviewed to confirm that the applicant is an eligible recipient and to ensure that the application contains the information required. The Corporation will assess applications based on the criteria listed below (in descending order of importance):

- (1) *Quality*
- (2) *Organizational Capacity*
- (3) *Proposed Costs.*

The Corporation reserves the right to request additional written information from applicants subsequent to the submission of initial applications.

Dated: August 28, 1996.

Shirley Sagawa,

*Managing Director for Planning, Corporation for National Service.*

[FR Doc. 96-22450 Filed 9-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6050-28-P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

#### Pharmacoeconomic Center Notice Regarding Use of Drugs for Unlabeled Applications

**AGENCY:** Department of Defense Pharmacoeconomic Center.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Pharmacoeconomic Center (PEC) announces as a matter of policy that Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved drugs may be used, where appropriate, for unlabeled indications. It is the further intent of the Department of Defense (DoD) that such drugs may be included, where appropriate, in disease state analyses which may result in their selection to the Tri-Service Formulary and promotion for a given disease state.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Captain Charles S. Reeves, USN, DoD Pharmacoeconomic Center, Fort Sam Houston, Texas 78234, (210) 221-5596.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. 352(f) et seq., notice is given that pharmacies on DoD installations will, as a matter of policy, fill prescriptions in appropriate cases with drugs that are not necessarily approved by the FDA for the treatment of the underlying medical condition but have nonetheless been proven effective for treatment of the disease state in question.

Errol L. Moran,

*Director, Pharmacoeconomic Center.*

[FR Doc. 96-22479 Filed 9-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

### Performance Review Boards

**AGENCY:** Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is given of the names of members of the Performance Review Boards for the Department of the Army.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 1, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Stokes, U.S. Army Senior Executive Service Office, Assistant Secretary of the Army, Manpower &

Reserve Affairs, 111 Army, Washington, DC 20310-0111.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 4314(c)(1) through (5) of Title 5, U.S.C., requires each agency to establish, in accordance with regulations, one or more Senior Executive Service performance review boards. The boards shall review and evaluate the initial appraisal of senior executives; performance by supervisors and make recommendations to the appointing authority or rating official relative to the performance of these executives.

The members of the Performance Review Board for the U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC) are:

1. Major General (MG) Michael S. Davison, Jr., Commander, U.S. Army Security Assistance Command
2. MG Robert D. Orton, Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization
3. Brigadier General (BG) Jerry L. Laws, Commander, U.S. Army White Sands Missile Range
4. BG David R. Gust, Program Executive Officer, Intelligence and Electronic Warfare, Army Acquisition Executive
5. BG James R. Snider, Comanche Program Manager, Program Executive Office, Aviation, Army Acquisition Executive
6. Mr. Dale G. Adams, Principal Deputy for Acquisition, U.S. Army Materiel Command
7. Mr. Edward Bair, Deputy PEO, Intelligence and Electronic Warfare, Army Acquisition Executive
8. Mr. Jerry L. Chapin, Director, Tank Automotive RD&E Center, U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command, AMC
9. Dr. Andrew Crowson, Director, Materiel Science Division, U.S. Army Research Office, AMC
10. Ms. L. Marlene Cruze, Director, Acquisition Center, U.S. Army Missile Command, AMC
11. Dr. Larry O. Daniel, Director, Systems Engineering and Production, U.S. Army Missile Command, AMC
12. Mr. Vito J. DeMonte, Director, Information Sciences and Technology, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, AMC
13. Mr. Edward G. Elgart, Director, CECOM Acquisition Center, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command, AMC
14. Mr. Eugene Famolari, Jr., Associate Technical Director, CECOM RD&E Center, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command, AMC
15. Mr. Alexander Farkas, Director for Development Business Group, U.S. Army Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command, AMC
16. Mr. Frank E. Fiorilli, Comptroller, U.S. Army Communications-Electronic Command, AMC
17. Mr. James L. Flinn III, Director, Integrated Materiel Management Center, U.S. Army Missile Command, AMC
18. Dr. John T. Fraiser, Associate Director for Science and Technology, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, AMC
19. Mr. John F. Gehbauer, Deputy Director, Close Combat Armaments Center, Armament RD&E Center, AMC
20. Ms. Linda J. Glasgow, Executive Director, Integrated Materiel Management Center, U.S. Army Aviation and Troop Command, AMC
21. Mr. Spencer S. Hirshman, Associate Technical Dir, Producibility and Process Technology, U.S. Army Armament RD&E Center, AMC
22. Ms. Kathryn T. Hoener, Chief Counsel, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command, AMC
23. Mr. Gary L. Holloway, Director for Test and Assessment, U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command, AMC
24. Mr. Thomas L. House, Executive Director, Aviation RD&E Center, U.S. Army Aviation and Troop Command, AMC
25. Dr. Paul L. Jacobs, Associate Director for Technology, U.S. Army Missile Command, AMC
26. Mr. Larry H. Johnson, Director, Redstone Technical Test Center, U.S. Test and Evaluation Command, AMC
27. Mr. Arthur R. Keltz, Principal Deputy for Logistics, U.S. Army Materiel Command
28. Ms. Barbara A. Leiby, Deputy Chief of Staff for Resource Management, U.S. Army Materiel Command
29. Mr. Harold L. Mabrey, Executive Director, Acquisition Center, U.S. Army Aviation and Troop Command, AMC
30. Dr. Ingo W. May, Acting Director, Weapons Technology Directorate, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, AMC
31. Mr. Douglas R. Newberry, Deputy to the Commander, U.S. Army Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command, AMC
32. Ms. Renata F. Price, Associate Technical Director, U.S. Army Armament RD&E Center, U.S. Army Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command, AMC
33. Dr. Bhakta Rath, Associate Director for Research, U.S. Naval Research Laboratory
34. Mr. Arend H. Reid, Retired SES Member
35. Mr. Daniel J. Rubery, Deputy to the Commander, U.S. Army Aviation and Troop Command, AMC
36. Mr. Carmine Spinelli, Technical Director, U.S. Army Armament RD&E Center, U.S. Army Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command, AMC
37. Dr. James J. Streilein, Chief, Reliability Analysis Division, U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity
38. Mr. Joseph J. Vervier, Acting Technical Director, Edgewood RD&E Center, U.S. Army Chemical and Biological Defense Command, AMC
39. Mr. Walter Wynbelt, Program Executive Officer, Tactical Wheeled Vehicles, Army Acquisition Executive

The members of the Performance Review Board for the Office of the Chief of Staff, Army are:

1. Mr. Chester A. Kowalczyk, Assistant Director, Energy and Troop Support, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (DCSLOG)
2. Mr. A. David Mills, Assistant Director for Maintenance Management, DCSLOG
3. MG Charles S. Mahan, Acting Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, DCSLOG
4. BG Boyd E. King, Director, Transportation, Energy and Troop Support, DCSLOG
5. Mr. Mark W. Ewing, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence (DCSINT)
6. MG Claudia J. Kennedy, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, DCSINT
7. Dr. James R. Fisher, Director, Missile Defense and Space Technology Center, U.S. Army Space and Strategic Defense Command (SSDC)
8. Mr. Mark J. Lumer, Principal Assistant Responsible for Contracting, SSDC
9. MG F.E. Vollrath, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DCSPER)
10. BG Stephen Smith, Director of Enlisted Personnel Management Directorate, DCSPER
11. Dr. Jack H. Hiller, Director of MANPRINT, DCSPER

12. Dr. Zita M. Simutis, Deputy Director, Army Research Institute, DCSPER
13. Mr. John Riente, Technical Advisor to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans

The members of the Performance Review Board for the Consolidated Commands are:

1. Mr. William R. Lucas, Deputy to the Commander, Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC)
2. Mr. Thomas D. Collinsworth, Director, MTMC Transportation Engineering Agency
3. MG Robert H. Scales, Deputy Chief of Staff for Doctrine, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC)
4. Mr. Roy Reynolds, Director of Operations, White Sands Missile Range, TRADOC
5. Mr. Robert Seger, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Training (Plans and Policy), TRADOC
6. BG Timothy J. Maude, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, U.S. Army, Europe (USAREUR)
7. Mr. Leland A. Goeke, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (Civilian Personnel), USAREUR
8. Dr. Michael Gentry, Technical Director/Chief Engineer, U.S. Army Information Systems Command (ISC)
9. Mr. James A. Macinko, Deputy Chief of Staff for Resource Management, ISC
10. BG Joseph E. Oder, Director of Resource Management, Forces Command (FORSCOM)
11. Mr. Philip Sakowitz, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel and Installation Management, FORSCOM
12. Ms. Vickie Jefferies, Deputy Director of Resource Management, FORSCOM
13. Mr. William S. Rich, Jr., Deputy/Technical Director, National Ground Intelligence Center, U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command

The members of the Performance Review Board for the U.S. Army Acquisition Executive are:

1. Mr. Edward Bair, Program Executive Officer (PEO), Intelligence & Electronic Warfare
2. Mr. Paul Bogosian, PEO, Aviation
3. MG William Campbell, PEO, Command and Control Systems
4. Dr. Herbert K. Fallin, Jr., Director for Assessment & Evaluation, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development & Acquisition)

5. Mr. Bennett Hart, PEO, Command and Control Systems
6. MG John Michitsch, PEO, Field Artillery Systems
7. Mr. Walter Wynbelt, PEO, Tactical Wheeled Vehicles
8. Mr. Daryl White, Deputy Director, Army Digitization Office

The members of the Performance Review Board for the Office of the Secretary of the Army are:

1. Mr. Walter Hollis, Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (Operations Research) (DUSA{OR})
2. Mr. Vernon Bettencourt, Special Assistant for Forces and Program Evaluation, DUSA(OR)
3. Mr. John Zirschky, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) (ASA{CW})
4. Mr. Steven Dola, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Management & Budget & Budget), ASA(CW)
5. Mr. William K. Takakoshi, Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of the Army
6. Ms. Alma Moore, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Logistics & Environment) (ASA{ILE})
7. Mr. Eric Orsini, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Logistics), ASA(ILE)
8. Mr. Thomas Brown, Director, Acquisition and Force Management, Army Audit Agency
9. Mr. Francis Reardon, The Auditor General
10. Dr. Richard Chait, Director for Research, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition) (ASA {RDA})
11. BG Harry D. Gatanas, Assistant Deputy for Systems Management and International Cooperation, ASA(RDA)
12. Mr. David Borland, Vice Director to the Director for Information Systems for Command, Control, Communications, and Computers
13. Mr. Robert Young, Deputy for Cost Analysis, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller)
14. Mr. Archie Barrett, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower & Reserve Affairs), Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower & Reserve Affairs) (ASA{MRA})
15. Ms. Carol Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civilian Personnel Policy)/Director of Civilian Personnel, ASA(MRA)
16. Mr. Claude M. Kicklighter, Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (International Affairs)

17. Mr. Joel B. Hudson, Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army

The members of the Performance Review Board for the United States Army, Corps of Engineers (USACE) are:

1. MG Stanley Genega, Director of Civil Works, USACE
2. Mr. Lester Edelman, Chief Counsel, USACE
3. Dr. William Roper, Assistant to the Chief of Engineers for Research and Development (R&D) and Director, Directorate of R&D, USACE
4. Mr. Charles Schroer, Chief, Construction Division, Directorate of Military Programs, USACE
5. Mr. Charles Hess, Director of Engineering and Technical Services, Ohio River Division, USACE
6. Dr. William Marcuson, Director, Geotechnical Laboratory, Waterways Experiment Station, USACE
7. BG Robert Flowers, Commander, Lower Mississippi Division, USACE
8. Dr. G. Edward Dickey, Chief, Planning Division, Directorate of Civil Works, USACE
9. Mr. William Brown, Sr., Chief, Programs Management Division, Directorate of Military Programs, USACE
10. Mr. Frank Oliva, Director of Programs Management, North Atlantic Division, USACE
11. Mr. Earl Stockdale, Deputy General Counsel (Civil Works and Environment), Office of the General Counsel.

The members of the Performance Review Board for the United States Army, Office of The Surgeon General are:

1. BG John S. Parker, Assistant Surgeon General, Health Services, Operations, & Logistics, Office of The Surgeon General
2. BG Patrick D. Sculley, Assistant Surgeon, Personnel & Resources Management, and Commander, U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion & Preventive Medicine
3. Mr. John L. Maddy, Principal Director, Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary (Health Budgets and Programs), Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs)
4. Ms. Jean Storck, Principal Director, Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary (Health Services Financing), Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs)
5. Dr. John F. Mazzuchi, Deputy Assistant Secretary (Clinical Services), Office of the Assistant

Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs).

6. Dr. Edgar M. Johnson, Director, U.S. Army Institute for Behavioral Sciences, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

Gregory D. Showalter,  
Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.  
[FR Doc. 96-22477 Filed 9-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

## Corps of Engineers

### Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report for Proposed U.S. Food & Drug Administration Laboratory, Irvine, California

**AGENCY:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) plans to consolidate the functions of several of its California facilities as recommended by the April 15, 1994 document, "Proposal for Implementing and Managing the Restructuring of the Field Laboratories". As a consolidated facility, the laboratory would be multi-functional with respect to FDA activities, including administration functions, such as investigation and compliance activities, and laboratory testing and analytical services. The facility would have a Food Chemistry Branch, Drug Chemistry Section, Pesticide Branch, Microbiology Branch, and Biochemistry section for its testing and analytical services. In addition, the FDA, in cooperation with University of California, Irvine, may utilize portions or functions of the laboratory for educational purposes.

No long-term adverse ecological or environmental health effects are expected due to the land acquisition for, and the construction and operation of the proposed U.S. Food and Drug Administration Laboratory. No significant impacts are expected to occur.

The Draft EIS/EIR was released for a 45 day public comment period on June 14, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For a copy of the FEIS/EIR or for further information, please contact Mr. Dale Bulick, (213) 452-4010, or by writing to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District (Attn: CESPL-PM-C), P.O. Box 2711, Los Angeles, CA 90053-2325. Written comments on the Final EIS/EIR can be sent to Mr. Dale Bulick, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, at the above address, or Faxed to him at (213) 452-4213.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Scoping:*

A Public Hearing was held in Irvine, California on July 10, 1996. Public notices requesting comments from the public concerning the environmental impact statement were issued in the regional area surrounding University of Irvine Campus. Separate notification of the hearing was sent to all parties on the project mailing list.

The Final EIS/EIR has been prepared as an addendum to the Draft, and includes all comments received on the Draft document, responses to the comments, and changes made to the text of the document.

Copies of the FEIS/R, including the Draft EIS/EIR, are available for review at the following locations:

UCI Main Library, Government Publications, P.O. Box 19557, Irvine, California 92623-9557  
Heritage Park Regional Library, 14361 Yale Avenue, Irvine, California 92714  
Newport Beach Public Library, Central Library, 1000 Avocado Avenue, Newport Beach, California 92660  
University Park Library, 4512 Sandburg Way, Irvine, CA 92715  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, Environmental Resources Branch, 911 Wilshire Boulevard, 14th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dated: August 22, 1996.

Michal R. Robinson,  
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer.  
[FR Doc. 96-22478 Filed 9-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-KF-M

## Corps of Engineers

### Intent to Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Environmental Restoration, Jackson Hole, Wyoming

**AGENCY:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of Intent.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Walla Walla District, intends to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The EIS will evaluate the environmental effects of providing environmental restoration to riverine, wetland, and riparian habitat for four sites within the active Snake River channel between Grand Teton National Park and the South Park Elk Feed Grounds in Jackson Hole, Wyoming. Teton County and the Teton County Natural Resources District are cost sharing sponsors and participating partners in the project and in developing the EIS.

The objective of this study is to provide site-specific restoration measures. Formulation of the restoration activities focuses on examining the condition of the existing ecosystem and determining the feasibility of restoring degraded ecosystem structure, function, and dynamic processes to a less degraded and more natural condition. Ecosystem restoration provides a more comprehensive approach than focusing only on fish and wildlife habitat for addressing problems associated with disturbed and degraded ecological resources.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Please contact Mr. Bill MacDonald, Study Manager, Walla Walla District, Corps of Engineers, CENPW-PL-PF, 201 North Third Avenue, Walla Walla, WA 99362, phone (509) 527-7253 or Ms. Anneli Aston, NEPA Coordinator, Walla Walla District, Corps of Engineers, CENPW-PL-ER, 201 North Third Avenue, Walla Walla, WA 99362, phone (509) 527-7263.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** By focusing on the Upper Snake River ecosystem structure, the Corps' interdisciplinary planning team will identify parameters that are altering water quantity or quality and adversely impacting the ecosystem, or parts thereof, within the watershed. Consideration must be given, during plan formulation, to those activities and conditions in the watershed that may influence the success and resilience of the restoration proposal, even though they may exist outside of the study area. Hydrology and sediment transport are two key functions that must be investigated in order for this restoration effort to be successful.

**Alternatives:** Along a 25-mile reach of the Snake and Gros Ventre rivers, twelve locations which showed the best potential for restoration were selected for evaluation. In an effort to reduce the scope and cost of the study, the number of sites was reduced to four. Alternatives that could be implemented at the four sites include:

- Channel restoration to rehabilitate fisheries.
- Island protection measures to preserve riparian island values.
- Island restoration measures to restore riparian island values.
- Fish habitat creation through stream structure alteration.
- Headgate opportunities to provide for future water diversions to restore spring creeks, wetlands, and riparian habitats.
- No action.

**Scoping Process:** The Corps invites affected Federal, state and local