

position on issues raised by the proposal. Notice of the proposal is published solely to seek the views of interested persons on the issues presented by the application and does not represent a determination by the Board that the proposal meets, or is likely to meet, the standards of the BHC Act.

Any comments or requests for hearing should be submitted in writing and received by William W. Wiles, Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, not later than January 24, 1995. Any request for a hearing on this application must, as required by § 262.3(e) of the Board's Rules of Procedure (12 CFR 262.3(e)), be accompanied by a statement of the reasons why a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute, summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing, and indicating how the party commenting would be aggrieved by approval of the proposal.

This application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, January 4, 1995.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95-526 Filed 1-9-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-F

United Valley Bancorp, Inc., et al.; Formations of; Acquisitions by; and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied for the Board's approval under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842) and § 225.14 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.14) to become a bank holding company or to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the applications are set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

Each application is available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the application has been accepted for processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Any comment on an application that requests a hearing must include a statement of why a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that

are in dispute and summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received not later than February 3, 1995.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia (Michael E. Collins, Senior Vice President) 100 North 6th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19105:

1. *United Valley Bancorp, Inc.*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; to become a bank holding company by acquiring 100 percent of the voting shares of United Valley Bank, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. UVB Interim Bank, will be formed to facilitate the transaction.

B. Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago (James A. Bluemle, Vice President) 230 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60690:

1. *First Mutual Bancorp, Inc.*, Decatur, Illinois; to become a bank holding company by acquiring 100 percent of the voting shares of First Mutual Bank, S.B., Decatur, Illinois.

C. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (James M. Lyon, Vice President) 250 Marquette Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480:

1. *Elgin Bancshares, Inc.*, Elgin, North Dakota; to become a bank holding company by acquiring 100 percent of the voting shares of Farmers State Bank, Elgin, North Dakota.

D. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco (Kenneth R. Binning, Director, Bank Holding Company) 101 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94105:

1. *Wells Fargo & Company*, San Francisco, California; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of Wells Fargo Bank (Arizona), National Association, Phoenix, Arizona, a *de novo* bank.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, January 4, 1995.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95-528 Filed 1-9-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-F

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Public Buildings Service; Record of Decision; New United States Courthouse-Federal Building in Santa Ana, California

The United States General Services Administration (GSA) announces its decision, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (40 CFR parts 1500-1508) and

the Regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality, November 29, 1978, to construct a new Federal Building-United States Courthouse (FB-CT) in Santa Ana, California. The site is bordered by 5th Street to the north, 4th Street to the south, Ross Street to the west, and Broadway to the east.

The purposes for the new FB-CT are to consolidate courts and court related agencies space in one location, to relieve substandard and overcrowded conditions at the existing federal court facilities in the City of Santa Ana, and to provide space for anticipated future growth. The proposed project is anticipated to be ready for occupancy in 1997.

The existing court activities are currently dispersed between three separate buildings. The three locations are the Federal Building at 34 Civic Center Drive, leased office space at 600 West Santa Ana Boulevard, and a leased modular structure in the Civic Center Plaza. The courts and related agencies need to be consolidated in one location for the efficiency of their operations.

In use since 1987, the modular building is a prefabricated temporary structure which is approaching the end of its useful life. Its conditions are substandard for high-volume Federal Court activities. Problems associated with the leased modular facility such as inadequate parking, lack of loading dock or delivery facilities, poor building circulation, and poor acoustics currently hinder courts day to day activities. Additionally, the modular building is located on a site leased by the Government from the County of Orange. The ground lease will expire in 1997 and is nonrenewable.

The existing Federal Building, as well as the modular building, do not meet guidelines for court facilities set forth in the "U.S. Courts Design Guide" (February 1993). Structural restrictions such as obstructing columns and inadequate ceiling heights are prevalent in these facilities.

In addition to the substandard facilities, overcrowding hinders courts day to day activities. The Central District Court of California, of which Santa Ana is a division, is the largest district in the Ninth Circuit. Between 1986 and 1991, the entire Central District Court of California experienced an average increase in case load filings of approximately 9.6 percent per year. During 1991 and 1992, the Santa Ana Divisional Office experienced an approximately 24.6 percent increase in case load filings. The federal court system located in Santa Ana currently requires approximately 25,000 additional occupiable square feet for its

operations due to the existing number of appointed judges and substantial increases in caseloads.

Not only are the courts currently operating at a deficit of approximately 25,000 occupiable square feet, additional square footage will be required to satisfy the projected courts' expansion. This increased need is attributed to the appointment of additional judges and continued burgeoning case loads. The courts growth will also increase the need for administrative support spaces and space for court related agencies such as the U.S. Attorney, U.S. Trustee, and U.S. Marshal. The courts are expected to need approximately 185,000 additional occupiable square feet by 1997, and approximately 260,000 additional occupiable square feet by 2005.

I. Alternatives Considered

In accordance with the NEPA, GSA has considered a range of alternatives to the proposed action that could satisfy the basic objectives of the planned project. The three other alternatives: construction at another location, leasing, and no action have been analyzed within the EIS and are representative of a reasonable range of alternatives. Although the leasing alternative is environmentally preferable, other considerations, which will be discussed later in this document, have led to our selection of the proposed construction alternative.

A. Proposed Alternative

The proposed alternative site, which has been donated by the City of Santa Ana to the Government, encompasses approximately four acres. The site is bounded by 5th Street to the north, 4th Street to the south, Ross Street to the west and Broadway to the east, within the Central Business Area (CBA) and adjacent to the Civic Center of the city of Santa Ana. The site is large enough to provide the space required to meet both current and projected court facility needs through the year 2021.

The proposed site is also located within the boundaries of the Santa Ana's Downtown Redevelopment Area. This alternative is consistent with the City's redevelopment plans and will provide a catalyst for downtown revitalization. The site's proximity to the Orange County Transit terminal will promote use of transportation means that are environmentally superior to single occupancy vehicles. Its close proximity to the existing Federal Building and other County and City facilities in the Civic Center area accentuates the architectural expression of "civic" area as originally planned by

the City and presents the potential for operational efficiencies.

Proximity of the proposed location to the Civic Center serves two functions. First, its proximity to the City Library, Law Library, the City Hall, and other "civic" and business activities offers citizens convenient access to government services. Secondly, proximity of the courthouse to the Men's and Women's jail, County Courthouse, and Police Headquarters will result in more effective and safe prisoners' transportation. The site is also located close to retail and business amenities which add to the attraction of the proposed alternative.

Additionally, the selection of the proposed location complies with Executive Order 12072 which mandates that federal facilities and federal use of space in urban areas shall encourage the development and redevelopment of cities. Procedures for meeting space needs in urban areas shall give first consideration to the central business area. Consistent with Executive Order 12072, the location of the proposed project is compatible with local development and redevelopment objectives. It will have a positive impact on economic development and employment opportunities in the City. Adequate public transportation and parking make it accessible to the public.

B. The Lease Alternative

Under this alternative, the federal government would lease, on a long-term basis, approximately 333,000 square feet of occupiable building space within the City of Santa Ana's CBA. According to real estate and property management sources in the City, the amount of space required to fulfill the project need is currently unavailable within the CBA. However, the Main Street Concourse project, located at the northeast corner of Main Street and Owens Drive, which is currently under construction was chosen for specific analysis as the lease alternative because it would be completed prior to the expiration of the court's current lease on the modular facility in 1997. Although this alternative is the environmentally preferred alternative, it was found to be practically infeasible for several reasons.

First, it does not have the capacity to accommodate long-term growth of the federal courts and related agencies beyond the projections for the year 2005. Any expansion would have to be housed in separate leased locations, which would only repeat the existing problems in the court's current locations. Second, the Main Street Concourse project includes a mix of commercial and residential land uses to

be developed in two or more phases. Court use and residential use are not compatible. The security requirements for the courts are very strict and unsuited for a relaxed residential setting. Noise generated by everyday massive public use of the Federal Courthouse would be disturbing to adjacent residences. The heavy vehicular and pedestrian traffic demand of a courthouse would be annoying to the residential neighborhood. Third, although located at the fringe of the CBA, the lease alternative does not have the same convenient access to the City's Civic Center, public transportation, federal, County, and City's facilities.

Finally, Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended (Pub. L. 100-678, 40 U.S.C. 601) discourages GSA from leasing space to accommodate permanent courtrooms, judicial chambers or administrative offices for any United States Court where the average rental cost exceeds \$1,500,000. Clearly, this Act reflects strong congressional interest to house the courts in permanent, rather than leased, space. The average annual rental for the lease alternative in Santa Ana exceeds greatly the \$1,500,000 threshold. Thus, GSA is prohibited from adopting this alternative.

C. The Alternative Site Location

The alternative site is currently owned by the federal government. It encompasses approximately 1.5 acres and is bound by Santa Ana Boulevard to the north, Parton Avenue to the east, 3rd Street to the south, and Flower Street to the west. Currently, this site is undeveloped and is used as a paved parking area for the Federal Building in Santa Ana. Because of the limited size of the site, the proposed structure on this site would require architecturally a single tower without adequate set backs necessary to mitigate the mass of such structure. The building of a courthouse structure would also eliminate the existing 164 at-grade parking spaces on the site necessary for the existing Federal Building.

Additional underground parking would be required to provide both for the existing Federal Building and the new courthouse. The substantial excavation necessary to accommodate the required underground parking would be quite costly. In addition the future growth of the courts would have to be accommodated at another location off-site. The project goal of consolidating the space requirements of the courts and their related agencies would not be satisfied.

D. No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, the title of the proposed site would return to the City of Santa Ana, and no federal courthouse building would be constructed there, or any other location. The U.S. Court for the Central District of California would either reduce its space needs in the Santa Ana area, or accommodate its future growth by some other means. The projected increase in the federal presence in Santa Ana is not contingent upon the construction of a Federal Building-Courthouse. The rate of growth in all categories of federal employees (including judicial and executive branch agencies) is projected to be the same, regardless of whether the proposed building is constructed.

II. Criteria for Evaluating EIS Alternatives

Selection of an alternative site involves the weighing and balancing of many complex, interrelated and often competing policy factors. An alternative superior to others in one environmental respect may be inferior in another. Several factors were key in evaluating each of the alternatives. These are identified below:

1. The first project criterion is to provide for the expansion of the federal courts and related agencies and consolidate their functions in one location in Santa Ana. Current facilities housed in the leased modular building and the Federal Building in Santa Ana are insufficient. Leasing additional space piecemeal to make up for the shortfall at these facilities would not be an efficient means of providing court space. Alternative project site and lease consolidation possibilities were therefore examined for their ability to meet existing court needs as well as their suitability for future expansion.

2. The second project criterion is to promote local government redevelopment goals, which can often be greatly assisted by the implementation of large projects such as the high-profile federal courthouse building.

3. The third project criterion is to minimize adverse environmental effects.

4. The fourth project criterion is to provide an appropriate location for the facilities which are readily accessible to the general public. Some sites are more suitable due to their proximity to public transportation and amenities, the City's Central Business District, retail areas, and existing Federal, State, and local facilities.

III. Environmental Impact

Implementation of the proposed action or alternatives would result in a

variety of short-term and long-term impacts. During the construction period, surrounding land use would be temporarily impacted by dust, construction equipment emissions and noise, and adverse visual impact. Short-term erosion may occur until project landscaping is established. These impacts are considered temporary and would be mitigated to less than significant levels through measures recommended in Section 4.1 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement, dated June 1994 (FEIS). The long-term effect of the proposed action or alternatives would be the introduction of an urban structure, associated parking areas, and other amenities to a currently undeveloped sites. Construction of the project would constitute a change in land use for any of the development sites, and, in general, would serve as appropriate in fill. The characteristics of the physical, aesthetic and human environment would be impacted, as with any form of land use intensification. Consequences of this urbanization would include increased traffic volumes, incremental degradation of local and regional air quality, additional noise, alteration of the visual character of the sites, and incremental increases in demand for public services and utilities. Nonetheless, the proposed project would benefit the local community and federal government by providing much needed additional courtroom facilities. Implementation of mitigation measures, as proposed in the FEIS, would reduce impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

IV. Mitigation Measures

All practicable means to avoid or minimize impacts to the area are being considered in the development of the project. GSA received a number of comments and mitigation suggestions from concerned citizens, and interested and responsible local, State, and Federal agencies. Mitigation measures were set forth in the FEIS and those that can be implemented were adopted by GSA.

A. Geology and Landform

Due to its location within a seismically active region of Southern California, the proposed project site would be subject to potential long-term geologic hazards associated with seismic activity. Mitigation measures are adopted as specified in Section 4.1.1.2 of the FEIS to reduce those impacts to less than significant.

B. Natural Hazards

The proposed project site is not located within the 100-year or 500-year flood plain. Project implementation at

the proposed site would not result in any significant impacts associated with flooding hazards.

The proposed project site does not receive drainage from the surrounding areas. Project implementation would result in changes to existing flow paths and would increase storm runoff volumes, peak flows and velocities due to placement of structures and the increase of impervious surface areas. Surface runoff would be controlled by drainage facilities incorporated into project design. Mitigation measures are adopted as specified in Section 4.1.3.2 of the FEIS to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

C. Air Quality

Air quality impacts would occur from site preparation and building erection activities associated with construction of the project. The emissions of construction equipment and vehicles would be short-term and consist of fugitive dust and exhaust emissions. Those impacts are mitigated to a less than significant level by GSA adopting all mitigation measures as identified in the FEIS section 4.1.4.2 except for:

- Restriction of construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours from 7 p.m. to 6 a.m. and 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. This cannot be adopted because it is not economically feasible for construction of a project this size. The hours of construction operation will be limited to 6:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. Weekend construction activities will occur only under special circumstances if required.

- Trucks shall not idle for more than 2 minutes. This measure will not be adopted in full because it is not practical to measure and oversee. However, trucks arriving at the jobsite, and not being utilized will be shut down until required. GSA's general contractor will monitor to ensure that they do idle for an excessive period of time.

- Excavation and grading shall be suspended when the wind speed (as instantaneous gusts) exceeds 25 miles per hour. This measure will not be adopted because occurrence of wind at 25 miles per hour speed is often encountered in the area. If adopted, this measure would impede severely construction activities. Instead, the excavation contractor will be responsible for determining if the wind conditions are acceptable for construction activities. If the winds create conditions which are deemed to be unsafe for the construction or adjacent buildings and neighbors, then all work will be suspended. Also, the Government representatives on site have the authority to stop construction work

if they feel that the work is preceding unsafely.

Long-term emissions from the proposed action would exceed the South coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) operation thresholds for Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), Carbon Monoxide (CO), and Nitrogen Oxide (Nox). Therefore, these emissions are considered a significant impact to regional air quality.

The long-term impacts will be alleviated by mitigation measures as indicated in the FEIS section 4.1.4.2 except for:

- Providing carpool matching services and mailing mass transit information and schedules with each juror's information packet. These measures should be established by building tenants, court and related agencies, and they are not under GSA control.
- Preferential parking spaces for carpool vehicles will not be assigned because all parking spaces are being provided for official government vehicles and building tenants.
- Bus turnouts and passenger benches on or adjacent to the project site are not required because the site is located across the street from Orange County Transit Center.

In compliance with section 176 of the Clean Air Act, GSA has conducted a conformity analysis based on the Environmental Protection Agency's Final Rule entitled Determining Conformity of General Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans, 58 FR 63214 (1993) (to be codified at 40 CFR parts 6, 51 and 93). The result of the analysis indicates that total project emissions (direct and indirect) are less than the de minimis thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project is exempt from the final conformity rule, and a conformity determination need not be prepared.

D. Noise

Implementation of the proposed action would expose surrounding land uses to short-term construction noise levels in excess of City threshold levels. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable. Mitigation measures will be implemented as specified in the FEIS section 4.1.5.2 except that:

- Restriction of construction activities due to noise problems cannot be adopted because it is not economically feasible for construction of a project this size. The hours of construction operation will be limited to 6:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. Weekend construction activities will occur only under special circumstances if required.

- Construction activities will not stop during the noon-hour period because with the number of contractors working on multi-shift basis on the job site, it is not practical to stop completely construction activities every day during the noon hour.

No significant long-term noise impact have been identified with this project.

E. Archaeological and Historic Resources

The implementation of the proposed alternative will have an impact on archaeological and historic resources. The proposed alternative site is located within the Santa Ana's Downtown Historic District which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The scale of the proposed courthouse will not be compatible with the surrounding historically significant structures. This is considered a significant unavoidable impact. GSA has consulted with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to seek ways to avoid or reduce the effect on historic properties. Mitigation measures were developed in consultation with the SHPO in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the GSA and the SHPO, with concurrence of the City of Santa Ana. According to the MOA, GSA shall develop and implement a Data Recovery Plan, consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Documentation (48 FR 44734-37), for the recovery of data from the project site, in consultation with the SHPO.

During construction excavation, archaeological monitoring will be performed under the supervision of an Archaeologist. If, during construction excavation, a "major archaeological discovery" (as defined in the MOA) has been made, the data will be recovered immediately. All materials and records resulting from data recovery will be curated in accordance with 36 CFR part 79 at the San Bernardino County Museum.

Recognizing that the proposed project will have an adverse effect on the Downtown Santa Ana Historic District, the GSA, nevertheless, will ensure that the project design, to the extent feasible, is compatible with historic and architectural qualities of the Downtown Santa Ana Historic District in terms of scale, massing, color, and materials, and is responsive to the recommended approaches for new construction set forth in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

F. Transportation and parking

Development of the proposed project would significantly impact the

intersection of Main Street/Civic Center Drive, Main Street/First Street, Flower Street/First Street, and Broadway/Civic Center Drive. The impact analysis assumed minimal use of public transit. Given that the site is well-situated vis a vis the Orange County Transit Center, it is likely that employees would use transit at a similar rate as the existing employees in the downtown area. However, this would not reduce intersection impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures as identified in section 4.6.1 of the FEIS will not be adopted by GSA. Transit improvements, bicycle facility improvements and increased carpooling and vanpooling are not with GSA's authority and control.

The General Services Administration believes that there are no outstanding issues to be resolved with respect to the proposed project. Questions associated with the environmental impacts of the new Federal Building-U.S. Courthouse may be directed to Ms. Mitra K. Nejad, Planning Staff (9PL), U.S. General Services Administration, 525 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, (415) 744-5252.

Dated: December 30, 1994.

Kenn N. Kojima,

Regional Administrator (9A).

[FR Doc. 95-480 Filed 1-9-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-23-M

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

[Public Law 103-40]

Public Meeting for Federal, State, and Local Government Agencies, and Others Interested in the Implementation of The GPO Electronic Information Enhancement Act of 1993

The Superintendent of Documents will hold a public meeting for Federal, State, and local government agencies and others interested in the implementation of the Government Printing Office (GPO) Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993 (Pub. L. 103-40). The meeting will be held on Monday, February 6, 1995, from 10 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., in the First Floor Conference Room at Van Pelt-Dietrich Library Center, 3420 Walnut Street, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Walk-in: Blanche P. Levy Park, north side).

Under Pub. L. 103-40, the Superintendent of Documents is required to provide a system of online access to the Congressional Record, the **Federal Register**, and other appropriate information. The purpose of this meeting is to demonstrate the online