

action, the bases for the criteria used to define the range of reasonable alternatives to be examined, the rationale for eliminating alternatives from detailed discussion, mitigation of noise impacts, and the biological opinion prepared by USFWS concerning endangered species. An outline of the issues addressed in this SIR is set out below.

Introduction

A. Effect of BRAC Recommendations

1. The Relationship Between the Proposed Action and the Purpose of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act (BRAC) of 1990 (Public Law 101-510).

2. Intent of BRAC.

3. Recommendations of the 1993 BRAC Commission.

4. Recommendations of the 1995 BRAC Commission.

5. Implications of the Purpose of BRAC on the Reasonableness of Alternatives.

B. Screening Potential Sites

1. Reasonableness of Alternative Sites.

2. Selection and Screening of Reasonable Sites.

a. Requirements of BRAC Recommendations.

b. Criteria for Selection and Screening.

(1) Operational Requirements.

(2) Infrastructure.

(3) Personnel Requirements.

c. Military Air Installations Initially Considered.

d. Application of the Criteria.

(1) MCAS Camp Pendleton.

(2) NAF El Centro.

(3) NAS North Island.

(4) March Air Reserve Base (ARB).

(5) NAS Miramar.

e. Summary of Comparative Costs, NAS Miramar and March ARB.

(1) Comparison of the Costs of Construction of Infrastructure.

(2) Comparison of Yearly Operating Costs.

(3) Cost of Construction and Operating for 20 Years.

C. Operations, Noise, and Safety Considerations

1. Operations at NAS Miramar.

a. Navy Operations at NAS Miramar.

(1) A History of Changing Operations.

(2) Aircraft Loading at NAS Miramar.

(3) Operational Tempo.

b. USMC Units Being Relocated to Miramar.

(1) Fixed-Wing Squadrons.

(2) Rotary-Wing Squadrons.

c. Existing F/A-18 Operations at Miramar.

d. Projected Operational Tempo at MCAS Miramar.

e. Analysis of Projected Operations.

f. Effect on Navy Operations at Miramar.

2. Noise Issues.

a. Noise Measurement.

b. Average Busy Day Versus Average Annual Day.

c. Mitigation of Aircraft Noise.

d. Continuing Community Involvement.

3. Safety Issues.

a. Combined Fixed- and Rotary-Wing Operations.

b. Interface with Class B Aircraft Operations and Local Airfields.

c. Community Involvement in Airspace Usage.

d. Other Environmental Issues at Miramar.

1. Endangered Species and Biological Resources.

a. Information in Biological Opinion and Multi-Species Habitat Management Plan.

b. Formal Consultation on Endangered Species.

c. Information in the Biological Opinion.

d. No Jeopardy Opinion.

e. Biological Opinion and Incidental Take Statement.

f. Reasonable and Prudent Measures.

g. Enhanced Mitigation Measures.

h. Additional Study of Effects of Noise on Gnatcatchers.

2. Wildlife Management.

3. Air Quality.

a. Concerns about Emissions Budgets.

b. Classification of Air Quality Regions for Non-Attainment.

c. Accuracy of Estimates Used in State Implementation Plans.

d. Accuracy of Data Used for Conformity Determination and Air Quality Analysis.

e. Conformity Analysis for NAS Miramar.

f. Differences Between Historical Emission Rates and Calculated Rates.

4. Traffic Congestion.

5. Ordnance Training Facility.

Where to Comment or Obtain Further Information.

Dated: August 30, 1996.

D. E. Koenig, Jr.

LCDR, JAGC, USN, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-22639 Filed 9-4-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Proposed collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Director, Information Resources Group, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before November 4, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and requests for copies of the proposed information collection requests should be addressed to Patrick J. Sherrill, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202-4651.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Patrick J. Sherrill (202) 708-8196.

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Director of the Information Resources Group publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g., new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment at the address specified above. Copies of the requests are available from Patrick J. Sherrill at the address specified above.

The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department, (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner, (3) is the estimate

of burden accurate, (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected, and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Dated: August 29, 1996.

Gloria Parker,

Director, Information Resources Group.

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Type of Review: New.

Title: Guidance on the Goals 2000 Amendments (Draft).

Frequency: One-time submission.

Affected Public: State, local or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 30

Burden Hours: 3,000

Abstract: The Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 amended portions of Titles II and III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Included within those amendments is a provision which offers states an alternative to submitting their Goals 2000 plans in order to receive funding.

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Type of Review: New.

Title: Guidance on the Goals 2000 Amendments (Draft).

Frequency: Annually.

Affected Public: State, local or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 56

Burden Hours: 5,600

Abstract: The Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 amended portions of Titles II and III of the Goals 2000: Educate American Act. The guidance document which was created to clarify these amendments addresses the reporting requirements of states participating in Goals 2000.

[FR Doc. 96-22585 Filed 9-4-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Construction and Operation of an Accelerator for the Production of Tritium at the Savannah River Site

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) announces its intent to prepare

an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Construction and Operation of an Accelerator for the Production of Tritium at the Savannah River Site pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 USC 4321 et seq.). DOE intends to select various options and a location on the Savannah River Site (SRS) for the construction and operation of an accelerator to produce tritium to support the nuclear weapons stockpile, as announced in the Record of Decision for the Tritium Supply and Recycling Environmental Impact Statement.

DOE has also decided to prepare an EIS for the Construction and Operation of a Tritium Extraction Facility at the SRS. That EIS is the subject of a separate Notice of Intent (NOI), but will have scoping meetings concurrent with the Accelerator Production of Tritium (APT) EIS scoping meetings.

DATES: Comments from the public and others will be accepted during the scoping period, which will continue until November 1, 1996. Written comments submitted by mail should be postmarked by that date to ensure consideration. DOE will consider comments mailed after that date to the extent practicable. DOE will conduct public scoping meetings to assist in defining the appropriate scope of the EIS and identifying significant environmental issues to be addressed. Meetings for the APT EIS will be held concurrently with those of the Operation of the Tritium Extraction Facility EIS, with separate workshops possible depending on attendance levels. Notices of the dates, times, and locations of the scoping meetings will be announced in the local media at least 15 days before the meetings.

ADDRESSES: Please direct written comments or suggestions on the scope of the EIS, requests to speak at the public scoping meetings, and questions concerning the project to: Mr. Andrew R. Grainger, U.S. Department of Energy, Savannah River Operations Office, P.O. Box 5031, Aiken, SC 29804-5031; phone 1-800-242-8269; or E-mail: nepa@barms036.b-r.com. Mark envelopes: "Accelerator Production of Tritium EIS Comments"

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information on the DOE NEPA process, please contact: Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance (EH-42), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585; telephone 202-586-4600; or to leave a message at 1-800-472-2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: SRS is an 800 square kilometer (300 square mile) controlled access area located in southwestern South Carolina. The Site is approximately 25 miles southeast of Augusta, Georgia, and 20 miles south of Aiken, South Carolina. Since its establishment, the mission of SRS has been to produce nuclear materials that support the defense, research, and medical programs of the United States.

With the end of the Cold War and the reduction in the size of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile, there is no longer a requirement to produce new nuclear materials for defense purposes with the exception of tritium. As a result, activities at SRS have shifted from nuclear material production to cleanup and environmental restoration. All production reactors are permanently shut down. However, a new source of tritium is needed to support the nuclear weapons stockpile well into the twenty-first century. Tritium has a relatively short half life (12.3 years) and therefore must be periodically replenished in each weapon in the stockpile.

The Department evaluated the programmatic need for a new tritium source in a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for Tritium Supply and Recycling (DOE/EIS-0161, October 1995). Based on the findings in the PEIS and other technical, cost, and schedule evaluations, the Department issued a Record of Decision (ROD) on December 5, 1995 (60 FR 63877, December 12, 1995). In the ROD, the Department decided to pursue a dual-track approach on the two most promising tritium supply alternatives: (1) To initiate purchase of an existing commercial reactor (operating or partially complete) for conversion to a defense facility, or purchase of irradiation services with an option to purchase the reactor; and (2) to design, build, and test critical components of an accelerator system for tritium production. Within a three-year period, the Department would select one of these approaches to serve as the primary source of tritium. The other alternative, if feasible, would continue to be developed as a backup tritium source. SRS was selected as the location for an accelerator, should one be built. Under the ROD, the tritium recycling facilities at SRS would be upgraded and consolidated, and a tritium extraction facility would be constructed at SRS to support both of the dual-track options.

The Department's strategy for compliance with NEPA has been, first, to make decisions on programmatic alternatives as described and evaluated in the Tritium Supply and Recycling PEIS. This evaluation was intended to