

support obligations, as well as issues expected to arise in connection with the final Hague Conference negotiations on a convention on protection of children (jurisdiction and recognition of custody decrees) and other matters concerning children. Finally, with a view to enhancing private law unification in the Americas, the process and resources committed by the OAS to the OAS-sponsored Specialized Conferences on Private International Law will be discussed, and recommendations sought for practical ways in which that process can be improved. Alternatives to the OAS process may also be considered.

Persons interested but unable to attend the meeting are welcome in writing to request documents and to submit comments or proposals to the office indicated below. Additional topics may be considered depending on time available. In order to facilitate planning for the meeting, members of the public are requested to propose in writing to the office below any topics on which they may wish to comment.

Members of the general public may attend up to the capacity of the meeting room and participate subject to the direction of the Chair. The meeting will be held in Conference Room 1107 at the Department of State; entry should be only via the Diplomatic entrance at 22d and "C" Streets, N.W. As access to the building is controlled, in order to expedite entry, the office indicated below should be notified by mail or fax not later than Monday, March 11 of the name, address, firm or affiliation if any, social security number and date of birth of persons wishing to attend.

Additional meeting—following the general Advisory Committee meeting, a meeting of the Committee's study Group on cross-border insolvency will meet on Saturday, March 16, from 10 a.m.–3 p.m. That meeting will take place at the International Law Institute, 1615 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. Persons wishing to attend should notify the office below in advance.

For information on the Department's program in this field or for copies of documents on particular topics, please contact by mail the Office of the Assistant Legal Adviser for Private International Law (L/PIL), attention Harold S. Burman, at 2430 "E" Street, N.W., Suite 355 South Building, Washington, D.C. 20037–2800, or notify Ms. Gonzales by fax at (202) 776–8482.

Dated: February 21, 1996.

Peter H. Pfund,

Assistant Legal Adviser for Private International Law, U.S. Department of State.
[FR Doc. 96–4470 Filed 2–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–08–M

[Public Notice No. 2348]

State Department Advisory Committee Study Group Meeting on UNCITRAL Project on Cross-Border Insolvency

The Study Group on Cross-Border Insolvency of the Secretary of State's of State's Advisory Committee on Private International Law (ACPIL) will hold its next meeting on Saturday, March 16 from 10 A.M. to 3 P.M. to review international efforts to harmonize rules on cross-border insolvency cases involving commercial entities.

The meeting will review the recent Report by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Working Group on Insolvency Law, which met in November 1995 to consider possible standards for procedural aspects of cross-border insolvency. No decision has been made as to the form any proposed rules should take, i.e. whether to prepare UN guidelines, consensual rules, a model or uniform law, or a multilateral treaty. The Advisory Committee Study Group meeting will facilitate preparation of possible United States positions for the next meeting of the UNCITRAL intergovernmental Working Group in April, 1996, and consider other United States initiatives as well.

UNCITRAL decided at its Plenary session in May, 1995 to work primarily on procedural, rather than substantive, rules. Based on the Report referenced above, this is likely to cover judicial cooperation, jurisdiction, access to proceedings for foreign trustees and other interests, the relationship between primary, ancillary and secondary proceedings, and related matters. Other procedure concerns may be taken up at this stage in the U.N. process, depending on the interests of participating countries. Future issues, such as substantive law involving priorities of claims and distribution could be considered, if at all, at a later stage.

The relationship of the UNCITRAL project generally to U.S. interests, and its impact on facilitation of international trade will be considered. Current projects by other organizations will be referred to where relevant, including the American Law Institute's project on harmonization of bankruptcy law between the NAFTA states, the International Bar Association's Concordat, the recent European Union proposed treaty on cross-border insolvency, as well as work by INSOL, the American Bankruptcy Institute, and others.

Background documents include the Report of the UNCITRAL Working Group, Dec. 1, 1995, UN Doc. A/CN.9/419; and a Report by INSOL (International Association of Insolvency Practitioners) on the Joint Project of UNCITRAL and INSOL, March 1, 1995. Copies of these documents, as well as the IBA and European Union documents referred to, are available from the Legal Adviser's Office at the address indicated below.

The meeting will be held at the International Law Institute, 1615 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20009 and is open to the public up to the capacity of the meeting room and subject to the rulings of the Chair. Since space is limited, persons wishing to attend should advise Ms. Gonzales of the Office of Legal Adviser (L/PIL), Suite 355 South Building, 2430 "E" Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037–2800, fax (202) 776–8482. Persons who cannot attend the meeting are welcome to submit comments to the Legal Adviser's Office. For further information on this project or on UNCITRAL, please contact Harold S. Burman at the above address or at (202) 776–8420. For information on meeting arrangements, please contact Stuart Kerr of the International Law Institute at (202) 483–3036.

Dated: February 21, 1996.

Harold S. Burman,

Executive Director, Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on Private International Law.

[FR Doc. 96–4469 Filed 2–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–08–M

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Integrated Resource Plan

AGENCY: Tennessee Valley Authority.

ACTION: Issuance of Record of Decision.

SUMMARY: This notice is provided in accordance with TVA's procedures implementing the National Environmental Policy Act. TVA has decided to adopt the preferred alternative identified in its final programmatic environmental impact statement (EIS), "Energy Vision 2020, Integrated Resource Plan." The Final EIS was made available to the public on December 21, 1995. The TVA Board of Directors decided to adopt the preferred alternative at its February 21, 1996, public meeting. Under the preferred alternative, TVA has identified a portfolio of energy resource options that it can deploy to meet future energy demands on the TVA power system over the next 25 years. In addition, a short

term action plan identifies actions that TVA plans to take over the next three years.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lynn Maxwell, Manager, System Integration, Tennessee Valley Authority, 1101 Market Street, MR 3K, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402, (423) 751-2539.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: TVA is a corporate agency of the United States Government. It operates the Nation's largest public power system. This power system provides power to an 80,000 square mile area, in parts of Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Virginia. Through independent power distributors, TVA serves more than 7.5 million people. TVA also directly serves more than 60 large industrial and Federal installations. The power produced by TVA constitutes approximately 4 to 5 percent of all of the electricity generated in the Nation.

Under the 1992 National Energy Policy Act, TVA has been directed to employ a least-cost energy planning process for the addition of new energy resources to its power system. This Act also requires TVA to provide distributors of TVA power an opportunity to participate in the planning process. In response to this directive, TVA began an integrated resource planning (IRP) process in February 1994. Although TVA prepares project-specific environmental reviews for proposed energy resource decisions, TVA committed to employing a public IRP process and decided to use the EIS process to obtain public input on the IRP itself. Energy Vision 2020 is the result of this commitment and process.

An IRP is simply a plan which broadly identifies the actions which a utility anticipates taking to meet demands for electric service and to achieve its long-term goals and objectives. TVA announced at the outset that its long-term objective was to maintain and enhance its competitiveness. "Competitiveness" for purposes of Energy Vision 2020 was viewed as not only maintaining low electric rates and reliable service, but also fostering sustainable economic development and protecting environmental quality.

Future Demands on the TVA System

In order to determine future power needs on a utility system, both the utility's existing energy resources and forecasted future demands must be considered. TVA's existing energy resources have a total generating capacity of 25,600 megawatts. (This

does not include TVA's Browns Ferry Nuclear Unit 3 and Watts Bar Nuclear Unit 1. These units were only recently restarted and started, respectively (November 1995). Browns Ferry Unit 3 is already returned to commercial operation and Watts Bar Unit 1 is expected to begin commercial operation in Spring 1996. The combined capacity of these two units is 2,235 megawatts.) Under its medium load forecast, TVA expects to need an additional 6,250 megawatts of energy resources by Year 2005 and 16,500 megawatts by Year 2020. Peak loads on the system in Year 2020 are expected to be about 40,300 megawatts.

TVA uses state-of-the-art energy forecasting models to predict future demands on its system. Because of the substantial uncertainty in predicting future demands, TVA develops three load forecasts: a high, medium, and low. The high forecast has a 90 percent probability of not being exceeded. The medium forecast has a 50 percent probability of not being exceeded. The low forecast has a 10 percent probability of not being exceeded. The Year 2020 peak loads under the high and low forecasts are 56,400 megawatts and 24,400 megawatts, respectively. If future demands approach the high forecast, TVA would need up to 36,000 megawatts of additional energy resources to meet that demand. If demands are closer to the low forecast, TVA would need no additional resources.

Alternatives Considered

The energy resource alternatives formulated for Energy Vision 2020 were the result of an extensive public and analytical process. Several different mechanisms were used to obtain public input at the scoping stage, including surveys of local opinion leaders, extensive interaction with members of a stakeholders group for over a year, 12 public meetings, and a nine-month period in which to submit written comments. After release of the draft IRP and EIS, TVA provided more than 80 days for public review and comment. During this period, TVA held nine public meetings throughout the TVA region on the IRP and EIS.

The primary analytical method used for Energy Vision 2020 was the multi-attribute tradeoff method. This approach allowed TVA to quantitatively integrate the identified environmental impacts of proposed energy resource strategies and to formulate alternative strategies to mitigate adverse environmental impacts while retaining other beneficial characteristics of specific strategies.

Energy resource strategies are created from different combinations of energy resource options. Energy resource options are either supply-side options (e.g., new generating resources such as coal-fired or nuclear units, gas-fired combustion turbines, repowering of existing units, integrated gasification, or wind turbines), or customer service options (e.g., demand-side management actions, including energy efficiency improvements and energy conservation, or beneficial electrification). In TVA's Energy Vision 2020 process, these options were first screened for acceptable performance using multiple criteria, including environmental criteria. These criteria were developed from public input and TVA's objectives.

TVA developed 2,000 energy resource strategies from more than 100 supply-side and 60 customer service options. These strategies were then analyzed through the use of computer models to identify combinations of resource options that best met the evaluation criteria and that effectively dealt with various uncertainties (such as increased stringency of environmental regulations, changes in natural gas prices, or changes in forecasted demands).

The multi-attribute tradeoff method allowed potential environmental impacts of each strategy to be compared to all other evaluation criteria (such as debt, electric rates, and economic development) and to all other strategies on an objective basis. This process identified where real tradeoffs existed. One of the most important tradeoffs occurred between better environmental performance and electric rates because achieving better environmental performance typically produces higher costs and higher electric rates. However, the integrated resource planning process used by TVA allowed it to reformulate strategies repeatedly to produce strategies that performed better across all criteria, including environmental criteria. Potential tradeoffs among criteria were reduced or eliminated. This was done by replacing resource options with undesirable or less desirable effects with options which produced more desirable effects. Eventually, this integration process produced seven final alternative strategies that performed well across all of the criteria, including environmental criteria.

As a result of the multi-attribute integration process, the final seven strategies consisted of similar, although not identical, energy resource options and they tended to produce similar environmental impacts. All of the strategies performed reasonably well from an environmental impact

standpoint and all performed better environmentally than the "no action" alternative. (TVA defined "no action" as the actions that it would likely have taken to meet future demands in the absence of the proposed IRP. Those actions include adding more combustion turbines and coal fired units to the system.)

For almost every air and water quality impact category, the seven final strategies showed improvement. Although coal usage on the TVA system is projected to increase under all of the final alternative strategies, sulfur dioxide emissions are projected to decrease in Year 2020 from 1996 levels by 47 to 51 percent depending on the strategy. System nitrogen oxide emissions are projected to decline in Year 2000 from 1996 levels by 10 to 20 percent, then increase, but still remain 3 to 13 percent below 1996 levels. This indicates that TVA's contribution to ozone, visibility, and acid rain related impacts should be reduced regardless of the final strategy employed. In contrast, greenhouse gas emissions from the TVA system are projected to increase under all strategies by 25 to 38 percent. This increase is still less than that projected for the no-action alternative (it results in a 52 percent increase) and on a per unit of electric energy basis produced 10 to 15 percent less than that produced by the existing system. This means that the efficiency of the TVA system is improved under the final seven alternatives.

Water quality impacts vary little across the final alternatives. EIS analyses indicated that improving the efficiency of TVA's existing hydroelectric units would be environmentally beneficial compared to impacts associated with building new hydroelectric units or other supply-side resources. The only noticeable difference among the final alternatives is that those strategies which employ more repowering options produce less water quality impacts. A similar reduction in potential air quality impacts also occurs when more repowering options are used.

Most potential land-related impacts are site-specific and would result from implementation of specific resource options. These kinds of impacts will be examined in subsequent site specific reviews. Energy Vision 2020 did look at more generic land-related impacts that are associated with the potential "footprint" of resource options. The larger the footprint (the size of the site needed for an option) the more likely there will be adverse land-related environmental impacts. Energy Vision 2020 concluded that due to the

availability of appropriate sites in the TVA region, potential land impacts do not pose a constraint. It also concluded that wind turbines posed the greatest risk of adverse land impacts because of their footprint (2,000 megawatts of wind turbines would require up to 50,000 acres).

Preferred Alternative

Rather than select a discrete energy resource strategy from among the final seven strategies as its "preferred" alternative, TVA identified a "portfolio" of energy resource options as its preferred strategy. All of the energy resource options included in the final seven strategies have been included in this portfolio. In addition, the portfolio includes several other resource options that respond particularly well to certain uncertainties. It also includes other options and actions that the TVA Board directed be included to respond to public comments on the draft IRP and EIS that TVA needed to include more renewable energy resources and demand side management programs.

One of the important conclusions that TVA reached in Energy Vision 2020 was that future events (uncertainties) will likely require changes in any discrete energy strategy. The utility industry is entering an era of significant changes as it moves from a regulated to a less regulated environment. This substantially heightens the already large uncertainties associated with long-range utility planning. Consequently, flexibility in resource option selection and implementation is highly valued. Flexibility heightens a utility's ability to respond to events as they unfold.

The portfolio alternative provides more flexibility than any discrete strategy. Much like a portfolio of stocks is chosen to manage risk and accomplish specific objectives, TVA's preferred portfolio alternative better enables TVA to meet customer needs at an acceptable level of risk and still meet the objectives of balancing costs, rates, environmental impacts, debt, and economic development.

Portfolio options include: combustion turbines, the purchase of options for both base load and peaking power, improvements to the existing hydro system, purchases from independent power producers, combined cycle repowering of coal-fired plants, use of landfill and coalbed methane and refuse derived fuel, converting TVA's Bellefonte Nuclear Plant to an integrated combined cycle gasification plant with a chemical coproduct, one additional coal unit at TVA's Shawnee fossil plant, demand-side management programs, beneficial electrification programs,

compressed air energy storage, wind turbines, a coal refinery, a biomass energy facility, and cascaded humidified advanced turbines. As events unfold, TVA can decide which of the portfolio options to deploy. Prior to deploying a specific resource option, TVA would conduct an appropriate site- or project-specific environmental review that tiers off of Energy Vision 2020.

The impacts that result from TVA's portfolio alternative depend on the energy resource options eventually deployed. Although these impacts cannot be definitively assessed at this programmatic level, the impacts identified for the final seven strategies are likely to bound those of the portfolio. It is unlikely that implementation of portfolio options will achieve better or worse environmental performance than those identified for the final seven alternative strategies.

The TVA Board decided to adopt the portfolio alternative as TVA's long-range energy resource strategy for the reasons given above. The portfolio provides the TVA Board and future Boards with a flexible energy plan that will help guide the strategic actions necessary for TVA to serve its energy customers efficiently, and to compete and succeed in the electric utility marketplace in the future. Because the Energy Vision 2020 process integrated economic development and environmental goals with other financial goals, TVA's portfolio of energy resources will allow it to use innovative approaches to meet future demands at competitive prices while providing opportunities for economic growth and a quality environment rich in natural resources.

Because the multi-attribute tradeoff integrated process produced final strategies with very similar environmental impacts, there is not an alternative which is clearly environmentally preferable. However, TVA's preferred alternative, the Energy Vision 2020 portfolio, contains all of the resource options that perform best under the environmental criteria and from this perspective, the portfolio can be viewed as environmentally preferable.

Mitigation and Monitoring Measures

As TVA deploys specific energy resource options, it will appropriately mitigate site-specific environmental impacts. However, the most important mitigative measure associated with Energy Vision 2020 is the multi-attribute tradeoff method used to develop and evaluate energy resource strategies. This method allowed TVA to reformulate strategies in order to reduce potential environmental impacts.

Dated: February 22, 1996.
 William J. Museler,
Senior Vice President, Transmission/Power Supply Group.
 [FR Doc. 96-4497 Filed 2-27-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 8120-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement, Essex County, New York

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT).

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for a proposed highway project in the town of Jay, Essex County, New York.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Harold J. Brown, Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, New York Division, Leo W. O'Brien Federal Building, 9th Floor, Clinton Avenue and North Pearl Street, Albany, New York 12207, Telephone: (518) 431-4127, or Richard A. Maitano, Regional Director, New York State Department of Transportation, Region 1, 84 Holland Avenue, Albany, New York 12208, Telephone: (518) 474-6178.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the NYSDOT, will be preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposal to replace the County Route (CR) 22 bridge over the east branch of the Ausable River. The proposed improvement will involve the replacement of the existing bridge, and reconstruction of the route for a length sufficient to accommodate the new bridge location.

The bridge replacement would improve Glen Road (CR 22) as a transportation link over the east branch of the Ausable River.

Alternatives under consideration include: (1) No action; (2) rehabilitation of the existing structure; and (3) replacement with a new structure. Variations to horizontal and vertical alignment will also be studied with the various build alternatives.

Based on studies done to date, issues that need to be analyzed in depth include the visual resources, historic and cultural resources, land use, adjacent right-of-way, recreational rivers, and floodplains. The project's effect on features such as the National Register eligible Jay Covered Bridge, the east branch of the Ausable River, and the Adirondack Park will be addressed.

Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate federal, State and local agencies, public officials, various organizations and citizens who have previously expressed interest in this proposal. No formal scoping meeting is planned at this time. A public information meeting will be held after additional study. After the Draft EIS is prepared, it will be made available for agency and public review and comment. This will be followed by a public hearing for which a public notice will be given of the time and place of the hearing.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to the proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA or NYSDOT at the addresses provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on

federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: February 20, 1996.
 Harold J. Brown,
Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Albany, New York.
 [FR Doc. 96-4538 Filed 2-27-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Submission to OMB for Review; Comment Request

February 8, 1996.

The Department of Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Public Law 96-511. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, Room 2110, 1425 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

Internal Revenue Service (IRS)

OMB Number: 1545-1076.
Form Number: IRS Form 8807.
Type of Review: Revision.
Title: Certain Manufacturers and Retailers Excise Taxes.

Description: Form 8807 is used to compute the excise tax on fishing equipment, bows and arrows, trucks and trailer chassis and bodies and tractors and the luxury tax on passenger vehicles. (IRC sections 4051, 4161, and 4001).

Respondents: Business or other for-profit, Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents/Recordkeepers: 46,746.

Estimated Burden Hours Per Respondent/Respondent:

	8807 Part I	8807 Part II	Worksheet I
Recordkeeping	3 hr., 21 min.	4 hr., 18 min.	1 hr., 26 min.
Learning about the law or the form	12 min.	0 min.	0 min.
Preparing and sending the form to the IRS	16 min.	4 min.	1 min.

Frequency of Response: Quarterly.
Estimated Total Reporting/Reporting Burden: 148,618.
Clearance Officer: Garrick Shear (202) 622-3869, Internal Revenue Service, Room 5571, 1111 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20224.
OMB Reviewer: Milo Sunderhauf (202) 395-7340, Office of Management

and Budget, Room 10226, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.
 Lois K. Holland,
Departmental Reports Management Officer.
 [FR Doc. 96-4532 Filed 2-27-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4830-01-P

Submission to OMB for Review; Comment Request

February 6, 1996.

The Department of Treasury has submitted the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980,