

validate system design and operational effectiveness.

The Final EIS addresses the potential environmental impacts that would result from test site modifications, launch preparation requirements, missile flights along the proposed flight paths, and intercepts of targets over existing ranges or open sea areas. It also identifies mitigation measures that would lessen the impacts.

Environmental resource topics evaluated include: health and safety, air quality, airspace, noise, geology and soils, water resources, socioeconomic, hazardous materials and waste, land use, infrastructure and transportation, and biological and cultural resource stewardship.

EIS LEAD AGENCY: U.S. Army Space and Strategic Defense Command.

COOPERATING AGENCIES: Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, United States Air Force, United States Navy, and Federal Aviation Administration.

PROPOSED ACTION: The action is to conduct defensive missile tests and associated sensor tests at one or more of four extended test ranges. The tests involve target missile launches and defensive missile launches from existing test ranges and from off-range locations. Potential off-range launch locations included land areas and sea-based platforms. Missile-to-missile intercepts will occur over existing test range areas or over open sea areas. Up to approximately 100 flight tests could occur during the period 1995 to 2000, from more than one off-range location, and potentially from more than one test range area. These test may continue well beyond 2000.

Alternatives for conducting these missile flight tests and intercepts, evaluated in the TMD Extended Test Range EIS, are:

1. White Sands Missile Range (WSMR), NM. This alternative includes defensive missile launches and associated sensor testing at WSMR and Fort Bliss, TX, with off-range target missile launches from Fort Wingate Depot Activity, NM, and the Green River Launch Complex, UT.

2. Eglin Air Force Base (AFB), FL. This alternative includes defensive missile launches and associated sensor testing at Eglin AFB on Santa Rosa Island and at Cape San Blas, with off-range target missile launches from a sea-based platform in the Gulf of Mexico.

3. The Western Range, CA. This alternative includes defensive missile launches and associated sensor testing at Vandenberg AFB, San Nicholas Island, and San Clemente Island, with

off-range target missile launches from a sea-based platform in the Pacific Ocean.

4. Kwajalein Missile Range (KMR), U.S. Army Kwajalein Atoll, Republic of the Marshall Islands. This alternative includes defensive missile launches and associated sensor testing at KMR and Wake Island with off-range target missile launches from a sea-based platform in the Pacific Ocean.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Major Thomas LaRock, OATSD/PA, Washington, DC 20301-1400, (703) 697-5131.

Dated: January 9, 1995.

Patricia L. Toppings,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 95-842 Filed 1-11-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

Department of the Army

Corps of Engineers

Availability of Guidance on Design-Build for Military Construction

AGENCY: Army Corps of Engineers, DOD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Interested individuals may obtain copies of the Design-Build Instructions (DBI) For Military Construction, dated 29 October 1994. The purpose of the DBI is to serve as a practical guide for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers offices to consistently and efficiently plan, develop, and execute design-build contracts.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the DBI may be obtained from two sources; printed copies (as quantities last) from the Huntsville Division Engineer Office (CEHND-ED-ES), P.O. Box 1600, Huntsville, AL 35807-4301; or automated copies on the compact disk (CD-ROM), January 1995 issue of the Construction Criteria Base (CCB), from the National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS), 1201 L Street, N.W. Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20005-4024, (202) 289-7800, FAX (202) 289-1092. Written suggestions for improving the DBI may be submitted before 30 June 1995 to HQUSACE, ATTN: CEMP-EA, 20 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20314-1000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Daniel W. Duncan, Architectural and Planning Branch, Directorate of Military Programs, (202) 272-0437.

Kenneth L. Denton,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-772 Filed 1-11-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-92-M

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Resolution of Potential Conflict of Interest

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (Board) has identified and resolved a potential conflict of interest situation related to its contractor, Dr. Sol Pearlstein. This Notice satisfies the requirements of 10 CFR Part 1706.8(e) with respect to publication in the **Federal Register**. Under the Board's Organizational and Consultant Conflicts of Interests Regulations, 10 CFR Part 1706 (OCI Regulations), an organizational or consultant conflict of interest (OCI) means that because of other past, present, or future planned activities or relationships, a contractor or consultant is unable, or potentially unable, to render impartial assistance or advice to the Board, or the objectivity of such offeror or contractor in performing work for the Board is or might be otherwise impaired, or such offeror or contractor has or would have an unfair competitive advantage. While the OCI Regulations provide that contracts shall generally not be awarded to an organization where the Board has determined that an actual or potential OCI exists and cannot be avoided, the Board may waive this requirement in certain circumstances.

The Board's mission is to provide advice and recommendations to the Department of Energy (DOE) regarding public health and safety matters related to DOE's defense nuclear facilities. This includes the review and evacuation of the content and implementation of health and safety standards including DOE orders, rules, and other safety requirements, relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of DOE defense nuclear facilities.

In the Fall of 1992, the Board recognized an urgent need for technical expertise in evaluating nuclear physics data, particularly in the area of nuclear applications. While the Board had been engaged in extensive recruiting efforts, it had been unsuccessful in identifying an individual with the required expertise, experience, and knowledge to satisfy this need. Consequently, the Board offered Dr. Sol Pearlstein, an employee of Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) a full-time two year appointment as Physicist on its staff. Following BNL's agreement to grant Dr. Pearlstein a twenty-four month unpaid leave of absence, he accepted the Board's offer and began work on October 1, 1992. Additionally, recognizing that a potential conflict of