level'' documents and are the second level of the tier.

The second level document(s) would address specific siting issues, construction and operation decisions, and the impacts of transport between identified origins and destinations. As this PEIS supports the selection of a general strategy, the range of impact areas to be considered will focus on those appropriate to this level of decision. The impact analysis will consider, for each alternative, the physical, chemical, and radiological health and safety risks to workers and to the public of material storage, conversion, transportation, use, and disposal. Potential impacts to air quality and noise levels, water quality, waste disposal capacity, biotic resources, and socioeconomic factors associated with these activities will be assessed. Environmental justice issues will be considered as appropriate for this level of decision. Cumulative impacts of strategy-related actions and other actions at the three DOE sites will be assessed.

Related and Other DOE NEPA Documentation

Consistent with tiering, should the depleted UF_6 strategy selection result in site-specific actions, additional NEPA documents would be prepared to consider the specific impacts on the site and vicinity from any proposed action. Such analyses would address additional site-specific issues such as historic resources, threatened and endangered species, critical environmental resources, floodplain, and land use. The results of specific analyses conducted as part of other Departmental EISs will be incorporated as appropriate.

Invitation to Comment

DOE will conduct a full and open process to define the scope of the PEIS. DOE will hold public scoping meetings at the sites that may be affected by the proposed action in order to discuss issues and to receive oral and written comments on the scope of the impact statement. These meetings will provide the public with an opportunity to present comments, ask questions, and discuss concerns with DOE officials. The public will be encouraged to comment on the content of the proposed action, the proposed alternatives, and the range of impacts to be considered including cumulative effects. Oral and written comments will be considered equally in the preparation of the document.

The scoping meetings will allow opportunity for the public to provide comments on the alternative strategies being considered by DOE. These scoping meetings build upon six public information forums held during the request for recommendations comment period and the completion of the technology assessment phase. At those forums, the public provided recommendations for technologies to be considered and comments on the factors used to evaluate the recommendations.

The scoping meetings will consist of an explanation of the depleted UF_6 management program, as well as interactive workshops to examine the alternatives being considered for evaluation in the EIS. Background information and fact sheets will be made available to the public prior to the scoping meetings, upon request. (Requests should be sent to Mr. Charles E. Bradley, Jr., Office of Facilities, Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, U.S. Department of Energy, 19901 Germantown Road, Germantown, MD 20874–1290; (301) 903–4781.) These materials, along with posters, demonstrations, and technical experts, will be present at each of the scoping meetings to provide as much information as possible to the participants.

Information on the meeting dates and locations, as well as related materials, can be obtained through the address above. Information is also available through the information and resource centers located near the sites. Contact Mr. Charles E. Bradley at the address above for more information.

Issued in Washington, DC, this 22nd day of January 1996.

Peter N. Brush,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Environment, Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 96–1196 Filed 1–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board, Department of Energy/Los Alamos National Laboratory

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Open Meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92–463, 86 Stat. 770) notice is hereby given of the following Advisory Committee meeting: Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EMSSAB), Los Alamos National Laboratory.

DATES: Tuesday, February 13, 1996: 6:30 pm–9:30 pm; 7:00 pm to 8:00 pm (public comment session).

ADDRESSES: San Ildefonso Gym, Route 5, San Ildefonso, New Mexico 87501.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Lisa Roybal, EMSSAB, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Northern New Mexico Community College, 1002 Onate Street, Espanola, NM 87352, in New Mexico call (800)753–8970, or out-of-state call (505)753–8970.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose of the Board

The purpose of the Advisory Board is to make recommendations to DOE and its regulators in the areas of environmental restoration, waste management, and related activities.

Tentative Agenda

Tuesday, February 13, 1996
6:30 PM Call to Order and Welcome
7:00 PM Input from the Public
8:00 PM DOE/LANL Environmental Restoration Briefing
8:30 PM Sub-Committee Reports
9:30 PM Adjourn

Public Participation

The meeting is open to the public. Written statements may be filed with the Committee either before or after the meeting. Individuals who wish to make oral statements pertaining to agenda items should contact Ms. Lisa Roybal, at the telephone number listed above. Requests must be received 5 days prior to the meeting and reasonable provision will be made to include the presentation in the agenda. The Designated Federal Official is empowered to conduct the meeting in a fashion that will facilitate the orderly conduct of business.

Minutes

The minutes of this meeting will be available for public review and copying at the Freedom of Information Public Reading Room, 1E–190, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585 between 9:00 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday–Friday, except Federal holidays. Minutes will also be available by writing to Herman Le-Doux, Department of Energy, Los Alamos Area Office, 528 35th Street, Los Alamos, NM 87185–5400.

Issued at Washington, DC on January 19, 1996.

Rachel M. Samuel,

Acting Deputy Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–1069 Filed 1–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Mixed Waste Focus Area

AGENCY: Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office.

ACTION: Expression of Interest.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office (DOE–ID) is seeking expressions of interests and capability from potential sources. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Mixed Waste Focus Area (MWFA) has identified thirty deficiencies related to the treatment of mixed hazardous and radioactive wastes within the DOE complex of facilities. These thirty deficiencies are listed below in order of priority.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contract Specialists; Dallas L. Hoffer, (208) 526–0014 or Linda A. Hallum, (208) 526–5545; U.S. Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office, 850 Energy Drive, Mail Stop 1221, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401–1563.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The thirty technology deficiency descriptions include:

1. *Mercury stabilization*—Mercury contaminated wastes require stabilization to control mercury solubility to meet Universal Treatment Standards.

2. *Mercury amalgamation*—Methods and equipment designs are required for amalgamating bulk non-recyclable mercury to meet Universal Treatment Standards.

3. *NDE/NDA-initial characterization*—Nondestructive examination (NDE) and nondestructive assay (NDA) techniques and equipment are required to determine the nature of a waste matrix in drums and boxes, to confirm the presence and concentration of RCRA-regulated materials and radionuclides, and to identify characteristics of concern for operational safety and process continuity.

4. *Mercury separation/removal*—New techniques must be developed to physically or chemically remove mercury from wastes as a pretreatment to other waste treatment processes.

5. *Material handling*—Methods and equipment designs are required that will provide for handling all types of DOE waste materials in all process steps without undue risk of exposure of operating personnel to radioactivity or hazardous materials.

6. *Sorting/segregation*—Efficient separation of waste types, as well as segregating nonradioactive, or radioactive only (no RCRA regulated constituents) from mixed wastes is needed for safe, reliable, efficient processing.

7. *Salt stabilization*—Stabilization processes are required for salt-containing wastes that increase waste loadings, improve durability, and/or reduce the volume increase typical of today's standard practices.

8. *Ash stabilization*—Stabilization processes are required for ash that increase waste loadings, improve durability and/or reduce the volume typical of today's standard practices.

9. *Mercury monitoring*—Although mercury monitors are commercially available, it would be advantageous to develop real-time monitors requiring minimal consumables and low maintenance, with operating ranges covering the emission limits typical of incinerators.

10. *Alpha monitoring*—Although alpha monitors are commercially available, it would be advantageous to develop real-time monitors requiring minimal consumables and low maintenance, with operating ranges covering the emission limits typical of alpha material processing facilities.

11. *VOC monitoring*—Process monitoring could be improved with real-time monitors requiring minimal consumables and low maintenance, which can identify and quantify specific VOC contaminants over operating ranges covering the emission limits typical of hazardous waste treatment facilities.

12. *Heavy metal monitoring*—Process monitoring could be improved with real-time monitors requiring minimal consumables and low maintenance, which can identify and quantify specific metals in operating ranges covering the emission limits typical of hazardous waste incinerators.

13. *Radionuclide distribution/partitioning*—More complete information on the fractional distribution of radionuclides between the off-gas, the final waste form, and any secondary waste streams in high temperature mixed waste treatment processes is needed to support equipment design and process permitting.

14. *Waste form performance*—An objective, technically defensible evaluation of the long-term performance of advanced waste forms must be conducted to allow flexibility in siting and operating low-level waste (LLW) disposal facilities in a manner to best exploit the more durable, higher waste-loading forms.

15. *HEPA filter improvements*—A stronger, high-temperature, longer lived HEPA filter, that can survive a greater pressure drop, and that requires less frequent replacement, or that can be cleaned and reused, is needed.

16. *Mercury filter*—A potential enhancement to traditional off-gas treatment design would be a selective mercury removal step, which removes essentially all of the mercury from the offgas stream for separate treatment.

17. *Molten product decanting*—Operating techniques and equipment design are required to facilitate decanting or transfer of molten materials from furnaces in an effective, reliable, and safe manner applicable to a radioactive environment.

18. *Comparative analysis/aqueous*—A comparative analysis on the efficacy, reliability, applicability, and maintainability of the many processes now being developed for destruction of organic contamination in wastewaters containing radionuclides will assist in identifying processes for further consideration and development.

19. *Aqueous organic nonthermal destruction*—Destruction/removal of most regulated organic constituents expected to be found in wastewaters from mixed waste treatment should be demonstrated to reliably attain regulatory limits in a manner applicable to a radioactive environment.

20. *Refractory performance*—Improved refractories, or operating techniques better suited to the DOE-specific waste processing conditions, are required to increase long-term refractory reliability.

21. *Nitrate removal*—Methods are needed to destroy or remove residual nitrates in sludges and wastewaters.

22. *Fission product removal*—Methods are needed for removal or significant reduction of the concentrations of fission products from mixed waste, especially process residues and sludges.

23. *Internal drum pressure measurement*—Methods are needed to measure internal drum pressure without penetrating the drums.

24. *Container integrity measurement*—Methods are needed to test the integrity of stored containers to identify any containers that may require particularly careful handling or overpack in preparation for management or processing of the contents.

25. *Cyanide destruction*—Methods are required to treat cyanide in the presence of interfering dissolved, suspended, and matrix materials.

26. *Thermal desorption*—Methods are required to minimize pretreatment to adequately prepare wastes for thermal desorption so the contaminants can escape, and to verify cleanup levels can be attained while maintaining radionuclide containment.

27. *Evaporator design*—Better designs are needed for evaporators for DOE waste-specific treatment plant streams.

28. *Sludge washing*—Sludge washing technologies should demonstrate reliable feed preparation and washing of

contaminated process residues, sludges, and particulates to satisfy RCRA requirements.

29. *Trace metal removal*—Techniques are needed to meet wastewater discharge permit requirements (e.g. 0.001mg/L cadmium, 0.003 mg/L lead, and 0.004 mg/L silver) while minimizing secondary waste generation.

30. *Supercritical CO_2*—Techniques are needed to minimize pretreatment to adequately prepare the wastes for supercritical CO_2 extraction so that the organics can be removed, and the wastes can be fed and removed from the supercritical environment while maintaining radionuclide containment.

The MWFA desires a list of interested parties who have technology available to address one or more of the technology deficiency areas. This includes technology that may need to be demonstrated in a radioactive environment on DOE mixed waste to verify its applicability. The MWFA also desires a list of parties interested in participating in cooperative research and development leading to demonstration of technologies. A document with more detailed descriptions of the deficiencies can be obtained by accessing the Mixed Waste Focus Area home page on the internet at ''http://wastenot.inel.gov/mwfa,'' or by calling the Mixed Waste Focus Area, 208–526–7575. From the MWFA home page, simply push the button for ''News and Events.'' Interested parties are asked to submit a contact name and address plus a brief description of existing technology or of capabilities for conducting research and development (R&D) to Jihad Aljayoushi, U.S. Department of Energy, 850 Energy Drive, MS 1118, Idaho Falls, ID 83401–1563. Written expressions of interest should not include detailed proposals or proprietary data, but should include the name, address, telephone number, and facsimile (fax) number of the primary contact person. Submittals should be as brief as practical (e.g., should not exceed five pages). To assist in the ''Organizational Conflicts of Interest'' determinations, all submittals are required to disclose business affiliations, partners for proposed teaming arrangements, sister organizations, etc. To assist in the SBA determinations all submittals are required to disclose business size and type. Written expressions of interest should be received on or before February 20, 1996. This announcement is for expressions of interest only, and is not associated with any specific funding opportunity, solicitation, procurement, assistance award, etc.

Procurement Request Number: Not Applicable.

Dated: January 17, 1996.

R. Jeffrey Hoyles,

Director, Procurement Services Division.

[FR Doc. 96–1199 Filed 1–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Advisory Committee on External Regulation of Department of Energy Nuclear Safety

AGENCY: Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of release of Committee's final report.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 86 Stat. 770), notice is hereby given of the release of the Final Report of the Advisory Committee on External Regulation of Department of Energy Nuclear Safety entitled Improving the Regulation of Safety at DOE Nuclear Facilities, which was submitted to the Secretary of Energy, and to the White House Office of Management and Budget and the Council on Environmental Quality on January 19, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Copies of the Report are available from the following sources:

- Calling (toll free) 1–800–736–3282 through January 31, 1996
- Environment, Safety, and Health Information Center, EH–72, CXXI–20030, USDOE, 19901 Germantown Road, Germantown MD 20874–1290 (1–800–473–4375) after February 1, 1996.
- The Internet World Wide Web at: http://www.em.doe.gov/acd/index.html
- The National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161 (prices and information available from 703–487–4650)
- DOE and DOE contractors from the Office of Scientific and Technical Information, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge TN 37831 (prices and information available from 615–576–8401).
- All Department of Energy Freedom of Information Act Reading Rooms.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Committee's Final Report presents a number of recommendations to strengthen both the regulation and the assurance of safety at DOE nuclear facilities. Three recommendations are fundamental: (1) Essentially all aspects of safety at DOE's nuclear facilities and sites should be externally regulated; (2) existing agencies rather than a new one should be responsible for external regulation; and (3) under any regulatory scheme, DOE must maintain a strong internal safety management system. Along with recommendations for external regulation, the Report contains a summary of the current state of the DOE complex and its missions, recommendations on issues that must be addressed for any successful regulatory scheme, and recommended actions to achieve an effective internal system and a well-managed transition. Additional information is available in the Appendices and References volumes of the Final Report.

The Committee's charter was to provide advice, information, and recommendations on whether and how new and existing Department of Energy (DOE) nuclear facilities and operations, except those operations covered under Executive Order 12344 (Naval Propulsion Program), should be externally regulated to ensure safety. The Department currently self-regulates many aspects of nuclear safety, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. The Committee consisted of 24 members drawn from a cross section of public, Federal, State, Tribal, industrial, and academic sectors, representing a diversity of expertise. The Committee was co-chaired by John F. Ahearne, Lecturer in Public Policy, Duke University and Executive Director of Sigma Xi, The Scientific Research Society, and Gerard F. Scannell, President of the National Safety Council.

Issued at Washington, DC on January 19, 1996.

Thomas H. Isaacs,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 96–1204 Filed 1–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

[FE Docket No. PP–89]

Record of Decision for Issuance of Presidential Permit; Bangor Hydro-Electric Company

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Record of decision: Presidential Permit PP–89, Bangor Hydro-Electric Company; construction of an international electrical interconnection.

SUMMARY: Bangor Hydro applied to the DOE for a Presidential permit to construct a new electric transmission facility at the U.S. border with Canada. That action was determined to be ''a major federal action, significantly affecting the quality of the human environment'' within the meaning of NEPA. An EIS was issued on August 18, 1995, that considered the environmental impacts associated with granting or denying the Presidential permit. This