Title 5, U.S.C., Appendix 2, subsection 10(d). The classified and unclassified matters to be discussed are so inextricably intertwined so as to preclude opening any portion of these meetings. For further information, please contact Michelle Diaz at (703) 695–0781.

Michelle P. Diaz,

Acting Administrative Officer, Army Science Board.

[FR Doc. 96–820 Filed 1–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

Army Science Board; Notice of Closed Meeting

In accordance with Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P.L. 92–463), announcement is made of the following Committee Meeting:

Name of Committee: Army Science Board (ASB).

Date of Meeting: 23 January 1996.

Time of Meeting: 0900–1700.

Place: U.S. Army Operational Test and Evaluation Command, 4501 Ford Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22302–1458.

Agenda: The Army Science Board (ASB) Independent Assessment Panel on ''Analysis, Test and Evaluation Processes and Methodology Used in Army Advanced Warfighting Experiments (AWE) with Near-term focus on Task Force XXI'' will meet for briefings and discussions on the study subject. This meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with Section 552b(c) of Title 5, U.S.C., specifically subparagraph (4) thereof, and Title 5, U.S.C., Appendix 2, subsection 10(d). The proprietary matters to be discussed are so inextricably intertwined so as to preclude opening any portion of this meeting. For further information, please contact Michelle Diaz at (703) 695–0781.

Michelle P. Diaz,

Acting Administrative Officer, Army Science Board.

[FR Doc. 96–818 Filed 1–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

Army Science Board; Notice of Open Meeting

In accordance with Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P.L. 92–463), announcement is made of the following Committee Meeting:

Name of Committee: Army Science Board (ASB).

Date of Meeting: 22 and 23 January 1996.

Time of Meeting: 1200–1700, 22 January 1996; 0800–1400, 23 January 1996.

Place: Pentagon—Washington, DC.

Agenda: The Army Science Board (ASB) Personnel and Medical Panel will meet for continuing discussions on the design and staffing required to support the medical research, development, test and evaluation (RDTE) programs of the proposed Army and Navy consolidated laboratory management organization currently proposed to be called the Armed Forces Medical Research and Development Agency (AFMRDA). These meetings will be open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the committee at the time and in the manner permitted by the committee. For further information, please contact Michelle Diaz at (703) 695–0781.

Michelle P. Diaz,

Acting Administrative Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–817 Filed 1–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

Department of the Navy

Public Hearing for Draft Environmental Impact Statement on Yuma Training Range Complex

Pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508) implementing procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Marine Corps has prepared and filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Yuma Training Range Complex.

Public hearings to inform the public of the DEIS findings and to solicit comments will be held on February 6, 1996, beginning at 6:30 pm, in the Central Union High School multipurpose room, located at 1001 Brighton Avenue, El Centro, California; on February 7, 1996, beginning at 6:30 pm, in the Woodard Junior High School cafeteria, located at 2250 8th Avenue, Yuma, Arizonia; and February 15, 1996, beginning at 6:30 pm, in the Armory Senior Center ballroom, located at 220 South 5th Avenue, Tuscon, Arizona.

Federal, state, and local agencies and interested parties are invited and urged to be present or represented at the hearings. Oral statements will be heard and transcribed by a stenographer; however, to assure accuracy of the record, all statements should be submitted in writing. All statements, both oral and written, will become part of the public record on this study. Equal weight will be given to both oral and written statements.

In the interest of available time, each speaker will be asked to limit their oral comments to five minutes. If longer statements are to be presented, they should be summarized at the public hearings and submitted in writing either at the hearings or mailed to the address listed at the end of this announcement. All written statements must be postmarked by March 29, 1996, to become part of the official record.

The DEIS has been distributed to various Federal, State, and local agencies, elected officials, and civic associations and groups. In addition, the DEIS has been placed in the following libraries:

Tuscon/Pima Library, 101 N. Stone Street, Tuscon, AZ
Mira Mesa Public Library, 8540 Mira Mesa Boulevard, San Diego, CA.
Yuma County Library, 350 South 3rd Street, Yuma, AZ
Mesa Public Library, 64 East 1st Street, Mesa, AZ
Avondale City Library, 328 West Western Avenue, Avondale, AZ
Catalina Community Library, 15560 North Oracle Road, Catalina, CA
La Mesa Public Library, 8055 University Avenue, La Mesa, CA
Desert Foothills Library, 38443 N. Schoolhouse Road, Cave Creek, AZ
Wellton Branch Library, 30101 East Highway 80, Wellton, AZ
Chula Vista Public Library, 665 F Street, Chula Vista, CA
Scottsdale Public Library, 3839 Civic Center Boulevard, Scottsdale, AZ
Chandler Public Library, 25 South Arizona Place, Chandler, AZ
El Centro Public Library, 539 State Street, El Centro, CA
Marana Community Library, 13370 North Lon Adams Road, Marana, AZ
Brawley Public Library, 400 Main Street, Brawley, CA
San Luis Branch Library, 23222 South lst Street, San Luis, AZ
Glendale Public Library, 5959 North Schoolhouse Road, Glendale, AZ
Casa Grande Public Library, 405 East 6th Street, Casa Grande, AZ
San Diego Public Library, 820 E Street, San Diego, CA
Phoenix Public Library, 1221 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, AZ
Tempe Public Library, 3500 South Rural Road, Tempe, AZ
Pala Verde Valley Library, 125 West Chanslorway, Blythe, CA
Gila Bend Library, Gila Bend, AZ
Green Valley Community Library, 601 North La Canada Drive, Green Valley, AZ

A limited number of single copies are available at the address listed at the end of this notice.

The DEIS addresses proposed training procedures, development, and airspace reconfiguration within the Yuma Training Range Complex, which consists of the Chocolate Mountains Aerial Gunnery Range in southeastern California, the western portion of the Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Range in southwestern Arizonia, and associated special use airspaces designated for military use. The proposed improvements are needed to ensure that Marine and other U.S. tactical air forces have the advanced and diversified training resources to ensure their combat readiness.

Additional information concerning this notice may be obtained by contacting Major Joe Cox or Mr. Ron Pearce, Range Management Department, Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, 85369–9160, telephone (602) 341–3318.

Dated: January 18, 1996.

Kim G. Weirick,

Acting Head, Land Use and Military Construction Branch, Facilities and Services Division /Installations and Logistics Department, By Direction of the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

[FR Doc. 96–860 Filed 1–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DOE Response to Recommendation 95–2 of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Regarding Safety Management

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Section 315 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2286d(b) requires the Department of Energy to publish its response to Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board recommendations for notice and public comment. The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board published Recommendation 95–2 concerning Safety Management in the Federal Register on October 19, 1995 (60 FR 54065). The Department of Energy published notice of a request for an additional 45 days to respond to Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendation 95–2 concerning Safety Management in the Federal Register on December 11, 1995 (60 FR 63514). The Department of Energy (DOE) hereby publishes its response to Recommendation 95–2 as allowed by the statute cited above.

DATES: Comments, data, views, or arguments concerning the Secretary's request are due on or before February 22, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Send comments, data, views, or arguments concerning the Secretary's response to: Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue NW., Suite 700. Washington, D.C. 20004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Peter N. Brush, Principal Deputy, Assistant Secretary for Environmental, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC. 20585.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on January 18, 1996.

Mark B. Whitaker,

Departmental Representative to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The Secretary of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

January 17, 1996

The Honorable John T. Conway,

Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mr. Chairman: On October 11, 1995, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board issued Recommendation 95–2, Safety Management, to the Department of Energy. The Department shares the concerns that prompted the Board to formulate its recommendation. Like you, we are committed to conducting our work efficiently and in a manner that ensures protection of workers, the public and the environment. Over the past three years, we have developed and implemented a number of systems that are designed to achieve an acceptable level of safety throughout Departmental operations. These systems are designed to achieve the following objectives:

—enhance our ability to plan and execute work, identify the hazards associated with specific operations and activities, and control or eliminate such hazards in an appropriate and cost-effective manner;

—clarify our expectations for the work to be accomplished and the level of environment, safety and health protection to be established and to do so in a manner that is not overly prescriptive but allows contractors to exercise the best means of meeting these expectations;

—establish clear roles and responsibilities for protection of environment, safety and health throughout the Department and our contractor corps;

—shift the focus of attention from ''paper requirements'' and documentation to a disciplined, analytical and collaborative focus on work planning, hazards analysis and hazards control; and

—establish analytical bases for setting risk-based management and project priorities.

Key among these policy initiatives and programs are directives reform, the Necessary and Sufficient Closure Process, including the companion process relating to Standards/Requirements Identification Documents, and contract reform, including performance-based contracting.

In developing and implementing these safety systems, we have recognized that the size and diversity of the Department's organization and operations do not permit a ''one-size-fits-all'' approach to management. Further, the need for the Department's Headquarters program managers to be responsible and accountable for establishing environment, safety and health policies and management systems must be balanced against the practical imperative to provide field operations and contractors sufficient flexibility to accomplish their missions effectively. Finally, in this period of severely constrained resources, it is critical that management systems ensure that we are attending to our most significant risks to environment, safety and health, that resources dedicated to environment, safety and health are both adequate and appropriate to the attendant level of risk throughout the complex, and that hazard control be achieved in a cost-effective manner.

The Department accepts Recommendation 95–2 as follows:

1. The first subpart of Recommendation 95–2 calls for the Department to institutionalize the process of incorporating into the planning and execution of every major defense nuclear activity involving hazardous materials those controls necessary to ensure that environment, safety and health objectives are achieved. We accept this Recommendation. While we believe that we have accomplished a great deal in this regard, we are committed to further improvements as evidenced by our ongoing safety management initiatives and recognize the need to further institutionalize the process of incorporating environment, safety and health considerations into the planning and execution of all activities at our facilities.

The task of institutionalizing the process includes incorporation in work planning of the ''Necessary and Sufficient Closure Process,'' along with other relevant processes, such as the process for Standards/Requirements Identification Documents.

2. Subpart 2 calls for the conduct of all operations and activities within the defense nuclear complex or the former defense nuclear complex that involve radioactive and other substantially hazardous materials to be subject to management plans that are graded according to the risk associated with the activity. We accept this portion of the Recommendation.

We cannot accept the portion of subpart 2 which calls for ''Safety Management Plans'' to be ''structured on the lines'' of certain Board Technical Documents. As stated above, we are committed to the development of effective safety plans which reflect the diversity of the Department's operations and the need for a flexible approach to these activities. We stand ready to work closely with the Board as we refine our approach to subpart 2, but the Department is not able to accept this part in all of its detail.

3. Subpart 3 calls for the Department to prioritize its facilities and activities according to their hazard and their importance to defense and cleanup programs. We accept this portion of the Recommendation because for both safety and budget formulation reasons, the Department always will need an effective understanding of its priorities.

The Department cannot accept the portion of subpart 3 that calls for the development of priorities ''following the process of Section I of DNFSB/TECH–6,'' relating to the revised Standards/Requirements Identification Document process, and Safety Management Plans. To be useful, any such new list of prioritized facilities and activities must reflect other current initiatives underway in the Department and should not be carried out exclusively for the purpose of focusing the transition from implementation programs related to Board Recommendations 90–2 and 92–5. Again, the Department stands ready to