

- b. D.C. Public School Initiative
- c. Education Award Only Programs
- d. Forums
- 3. 1997 AmeriCorps Changes
- 4. Grant Renewal Update
- 5. Evaluation Update
- V. Report on Special Projects
  - A. First National Senior Service Corps Training Conference and National Leadership Forum on Senior Service
  - B. Presidents' Summit for Community Volunteering and National Service
  - C. Olympics and Paralympics—AmeriCorps Team for the Games
  - D. National Volunteer Week
- VI. Ethic of Service Discussion
- VII. Future Board Meetings
  - A. Locations
    - B. Dates (October 3 and 4, 1996)
- VIII. Public Comment
- Adjournment

**ACCOMMODATIONS:** Those needing interpreters or other accommodations should notify the Corporation by June 6, 1996.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** Rhonda Taylor, Associate Director of Special Projects and Initiatives, Corporation for National Service, 8th Floor, Room 8619, 1201 New York Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20525. Phone (202) 606-5000 ext. 282. Fax (202) 565-2794. TDD: (202) 565-2799.

Dated: May 31, 1996.

Terry Russell,  
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 96-14085 Filed 5-31-96; 2:46 pm]

BILLING CODE 6050-28-P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Navy

#### Record of Decision for the Disposal and Reuse of Naval Air Station Glenview, IL

The Department of the Navy (Navy), pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.*, and the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality that implement NEPA procedures, 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508, hereby announces its decision to dispose of Naval Air Station (NAS) Glenview, Illinois.

Navy intends to dispose of the property in a manner that is consistent with the Glenview Naval Air Station Consensus Reuse Plan submitted by the Village of Glenview, the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) for NAS Glenview, described in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) as the preferred alternative. The Consensus Reuse Plan proposed a mixed use approach of commercial,

residential, recreational, public service, and open space land uses.

In deciding to dispose of NAS Glenview in a manner consistent with the Consensus Reuse Plan, Navy has determined that mixed land use will meet the goals of local economic redevelopment and creation of new jobs, while also maintaining the Village of Glenview's character and fiscal integrity, minimizing adverse environmental impacts, and ensuring land uses that are compatible with surrounding properties. This Record Of Decision does not mandate a specific mix of land uses. Rather, it leaves selection of the particular means to achieve the mixed use redevelopment to the acquiring entity and the local zoning authority.

#### Background

The 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended closure of NAS Glenview. This recommendation was then approved by President Clinton and accepted by the One Hundred Third Congress in 1993. Operations at NAS Glenview ceased on September 9, 1995, and the property has been in caretaker status since that date.

NAS Glenview is located entirely within the Village of Glenview and consists of 1,121 acres of fee-owned land with 110 buildings that contain 1,332,138 square feet of office and storage space. Navy has reserved 78 acres containing military family housing and open space for use as family housing that will serve the Naval Training Center at Great Lakes, Illinois. The remaining property is surplus to the needs of the Federal Government and can be conveyed.

Navy published a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register on February 3, 1994, announcing that Navy would prepare an Environmental Impact Statement that would analyze the impacts of disposal and reuse of the land, buildings, and infrastructure at NAS Glenview. A 30-day public scoping period was established, and a scoping meeting was held on February 17, 1994, in the Village of Glenview.

On July 14, 1995, Navy distributed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to Federal, State, and local agencies, elected officials, special interest groups, and interested persons. Navy held a public hearing on August 17, 1995, in the Village of Glenview. Federal agencies, Illinois State agencies, local governments, and the general public commented on the DEIS. These comments and Navy's responses were incorporated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) which was distributed to the public on December 1,

1995, for a review that concluded on January 2, 1996. Navy did not receive any comments on the FEIS.

#### Alternatives

NEPA requires Navy to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives for disposal and reuse of this Federal property. In the NEPA process, Navy analyzed the environmental impacts of various proposed land uses that could result from disposal of the Air Station property. As the basis for this analysis, Navy relied upon the reuse and redevelopment alternatives identified by The Glenview Community Reuse Planning Group, an organization created by the Village of Glenview in its capacity as the LRA. The Community Reuse Planning Group analyzed various redevelopment scenarios and land uses and prepared the Glenview Naval Air Station Consensus Reuse Plan which was presented to the Department of the Navy on June 21, 1995.

The Community Reuse Planning Group initially considered ten preliminary scenarios for redevelopment that it described as: (1) General Aviation, which based reuse on continued use of the Air Station as a general aviation airport with compatible industrial, office, and warehouse uses; (2) Inherent Land Use Suitability, which based reuse on a variety of physical characteristics such as accessibility, area requirements, adjacent land use, site attractiveness, and environmental constraints; (3) Core Area Prominence, which based reuse on maximizing adaptive reuse of the core area buildings and related development of other areas; (4) Residential Neighborhood Focus, which based reuse on the establishment of new neighborhoods and the introduction of other uses compatible with the residential neighborhoods; (5) Open Space Focus, which dedicated half of the Air Station to open space and recreation; (6) Public Use Focus, which based reuse on recreational, cultural, educational, and public service facilities; (7) Major Institution Focus, which based reuse on the presence of a major institution such as a university campus, regional government center, or medical facility; (8) Commercial/Industrial Focus, which based reuse on revenue-generating activities that would create jobs, maximize revenue flow, and minimize government costs; (9) Sports/Leisure Complex Focus, which based reuse on the development of private and public sports and recreational facilities of regional interest; and (10) A Comprehensive Plan, which based reuse on the Village of Glenview's 1990 Comprehensive Plan that emphasized

residential development of the entire Naval Air Station property.

The Community Reuse Planning Group evaluated these ten redevelopment scenarios by considering the central theme of each scenario, the configuration of the scenario, its economic feasibility, its impact on the quality of life, and its potential for creating new jobs. Based upon these factors, the Community Reuse Planning Group selected four of the ten scenarios for further detailed analysis. These four scenarios were Inherent Land Use Suitability, Open Space Focus, Major Institution Focus, and Sports/Leisure Complex Focus. The Group then evaluated these four scenarios in light of twenty-two community redevelopment objectives.

The Community Reuse Planning Group's analysis examined the extent to which each of these four scenarios reflected community goals and objectives. The Group then adopted aspects of each scenario and combined them into one land use plan designated as the Glenview Naval Air Station Consensus Reuse Plan. Navy selected the Consensus Reuse Plan as the preferred alternative in the FEIS. Navy also considered a "No Action" alternative in the FEIS that proposed continued Navy ownership of the property in caretaker status with Navy maintaining the physical condition of the property, providing a security force, and making repairs essential to safety.

The Consensus Reuse Plan proposed mixed use of the Naval Air Station property to achieve local economic redevelopment. Light industrial, commercial, retail, and sports and leisure activities would occupy about 354 acres. Residential uses would occupy about 245 acres. Open space and public recreational uses would occupy about 342 acres, and the remaining 104 acres of the Air Station property would be occupied by public service uses such as public works facilities and a commuter rail station.

#### Environmental Impacts

Navy analyzed the potential impacts of the "No Action" alternative and the Consensus Reuse Plan alternative for their effects on earth resources, transportation, air quality, noise, water resources, hazardous materials and hazardous waste, historical and archaeological resources, biological resources, socioeconomic resources, and environmental justice. This Record of Decision focuses on the impacts that would likely result from implementing the Consensus Reuse Plan.

In order to implement the Consensus Reuse Plan, it would be necessary to

change the topography of some areas on the Naval Air Station property by grading, filling, and excavating land. It would also be necessary to change the elevation of some areas of the property to permit construction of facilities, roadways, and stormwater retention areas. None of these changes would result in significant environmental impacts.

Based upon the redevelopment proposed by the Consensus Reuse Plan, vehicular traffic in the area would increase. The proposed redevelopment would generate 52,821 average daily trips in the vicinity of the Air Station by the year 2010. This increase in traffic would require roadway and intersection improvements. Additionally, this region is projected to grow in the future and this future growth would account for most of the increased traffic in the area. Thus, most of these improvements would be needed even if the Naval Air Station were not redeveloped. Roadway and intersection improvements that are currently planned and roadway and intersection improvements on the Naval Air Station property recommended by the LRA should adequately mitigate impacts caused by the increased traffic.

The long term impact on air quality that would arise from stationary emission sources, including heating units, will depend upon the nature and extent of the activities conducted on the property. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) will have jurisdiction over these emission sources, and it will be necessary for all such sources to comply with IEPA standards. Certain sources will require appropriate permits from IEPA. The elimination of aircraft operations and maintenance activities at the Air Station will reduce mobile sources of emission from the area. The projected increase in vehicular traffic would increase mobile source emissions of nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds. The extent of this increased would be mitigated by the proposed commuter rail station, bike paths, pedestrian paths, and shuttle buses.

The cessation of military aircraft activity will also result in a substantial decrease in noise. Construction and demolition activities arising out of redevelopment would cause a temporary increase in ambient noise levels. The long term noise that would be generated under the proposed reuse plan would be typical of that present in the community that now surrounds the Air Station.

Redevelopment of the Naval Air Station property would increase the surface areas that will not absorb rainwater, largely by the construction of

buildings, roadways, and parking lots on land that was previously undeveloped. In turn, this would increase stormwater runoff. To address this problem, the LRA proposed in its reuse plan to build a stormwater management system consisting of 25 to 60 acre lake and drainage swales. Together with existing drainage areas, these systems should adequately manage normal stormwater runoff. While a 25-acre lake would adequately manage stormwater runoff for the redeveloped Naval Air Station property, the proposed larger lake would also meet the stormwater drainage requirements of the surrounding area, resulting in a positive impact on the area's stormwater management and water quality.

Navy has identified several hazardous waste sites on the Air Station property and is developing methods for remediating the sites. Navy has already initiated cleanup at some of these sites. Navy, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency will continue to review and approve the risk assessments developed to ascertain the potential impacts of existing contamination on human health and the environment before Navy remediates the contaminated sites and conveys the property.

Aircraft Hanger One, known as the Curtiss-Reynolds Building, is the only building or site on the Air Station that is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Navy, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Illinois State Historic Preservation Officer entered into a Programmatic Agreement on May 13, 1996. Under this Agreement, Navy will encourage adaptive reuse of this historic structure and maintain and preserve the building until conveyance. Navy will include protective covenants in the deed for the parcel that contains this historic building.

While some wetlands may be drained or filled as a result of redevelopment, the net amount of wetlands would increase from construction of the stormwater retention lake and the drainage swales. Among the existing wetlands, the Naval Air Station also contains small areas of prairie. The proposed commercial and industrial redevelopment in the northern part of the Air Station may eliminate most of this remnant prairie. However, since the State of Illinois' Department of Natural Resources has classified this prairie as moderately heavily disturbed, its loss would not cause a significant impact on local biological resources.

There are no threatened or endangered species listed under the Federal Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1531 *et seq.*, that inhabit the Air Station property. There are two State-designated endangered and two State-designated threatened species that may be adversely affected by implementation of the Consensus Reuse Plan. The upland sandpiper and the golden sedge are endangered, and the mountain blue-eyed grass and early fen sedge are threatened. Thus, it will be necessary for future developers to coordinate with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources before conducting activities that may have an impact on these endangered and threatened species. Two of the species (the golden sedge and the early fen sedge) occur in wetlands and may be afforded additional protection under Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1252, *et seq.*, which establishes a permitting process that is administered by the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

Redevelopment of the Naval Air Station would result in the creation of new jobs and improved socioeconomic conditions. Although the redevelopment would generate a demand for additional infrastructure and community services, the Consensus Reuse Plan projects that public revenue generated by the redevelopment would be sufficient to fund the additional infrastructure, *i.e.*, roadway improvements and public utilities, and services, *i.e.*, schools and police and fire protection.

Navy also analyzed the impacts on low income and minority populations pursuant to Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, and found that there would be no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low income populations. Any impact related to reuse of the Naval Air Station would be experienced equally by all groups within the regional population.

#### Mitigation

No mitigation measures are required to implement Navy's decision to dispose of the Naval Air Station property. Navy's FEIS identified and discussed the actions that would be necessary to mitigate the impacts associated with reuse and redevelopment. The acquiring entity, under the direction of Federal, State and local agencies with regulatory authority over protected resources, will be responsible for implementing necessary mitigation measures.

Absent statutory authority, Navy cannot impose restrictions on the future use of this surplus Federal property. Navy will, however, include appropriate notification in the deeds for any parcels that are inhabited by endangered or threatened species protected under State law and that contain wetlands or lie within floodplains that are protected under Federal and State laws.

#### Comments Received on the FEIS

Navy did not receive any comments on the FEIS.

#### Regulations Governing the Disposal Decision

Since the proposed action contemplates a disposal action under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (DBCRA), Public Law 101-510, 10 U.S.C. § 2687 note, selection of the Consensus Reuse Plan as the preferred alternative was based upon the environmental analysis in the FEIS and application of the standards set forth in DBCRA, the Federal Property Management Regulations (FPMR), 41 CFR Part 101-47, and the Department of Defense Rule on Revitalizing Base Closure Communities and Community Assistance (DOD Rule), 32 CFR Parts 90 and 91.

Section 101-47.303-1 of the FPMR requires that the disposal of Federal property benefit the Federal government and constitute the highest and best use of the property. Section 101-47.4909 of the FPMR defines the "highest and best use" as that use to which a property can be put that produces the highest monetary return from the property, promotes its maximum value, or serves a public or institutional purpose. The "highest and best use" determination must be based upon the property's economic potential, qualitative values inherent in the property, and utilization factors affecting land use such as zoning, physical characteristics, other private and public uses in the vicinity, neighboring improvements, utility services, access, roads, location, and environmental and historical considerations.

After Federal property has been conveyed to non-Federal entities, the property is subject to local land use regulations, including zoning and subdivision regulations and building codes. Unless expressly authorized by statute, the disposing Federal agency cannot restrict the future use of surplus Government property. As a result, the local community exercises substantial control over future use of the property. For this reason, local land use plans and zoning affect determination of the

highest and best use of surplus Government property.

The DBCRA directed the Administrator of the General Services Administration (GSA) to delegate to the Secretary of Defense authority to transfer and dispose of base closure property. Section 2905(b) of DBCRA directs the Secretary of Defense to exercise this authority in accordance with GSA's property disposal regulations, set forth at Sections 101-47.1 through 101-47.8 of the FPMR. By letter dated December 20, 1991, the Secretary of Defense delegated the authority to transfer and dispose of base closure property closed under DBCRA to the Secretaries of the Military Departments. Under this delegation of authority, the Secretary of the Navy must follow FPMR procedures for screening and disposing of real property when implementing base closures. Only where Congress has expressly provided additional authority for disposing of base closure property, *e.g.*, the economic development conveyance authority established in 1993 by Section 2905(b)(4) of DBCRA, may Navy apply disposal procedures other than the FPMR's prescriptions.

In Section 2901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, Public Law 103-160, Congress recognized the economic hardship occasioned by base closures, the Federal interest in facilitating economic recovery of base closure communities, and the need to identify and implement reuse and redevelopment of property at closing installations. In Section 2903(c) of Public Law 103-160, Congress directed the Military Departments to consider each base closure community's economic needs and priorities in the property disposal process. Under Section 2905(b)(2)(E) of DBCRA, Navy must consult with local communities before it disposes of base closure property and must consider local plans developed for reuse and redevelopment of the surplus Federal property.

The Department of Defense's goal, as set forth in Section 90.4 of the DOD Rule, is to help base closure communities achieve rapid economic recovery through expeditious reuse and redevelopment of the assets at closing bases, taking into consideration local market conditions and locally developed reuse plans. Thus, the Department has adopted a consultative approach with each community to ensure that property disposal decisions consider the Local Redevelopment Authority's reuse plan and encourage job creation. As a part of this cooperative approach, the base closure

community's interests, e.g., reflected in its zoning for the area, play a significant role in determining the range of alternatives considered in the environmental analysis for property disposal. Furthermore, Section 91.7(d)(3) of the DOD Rule provides that the Local Redevelopment Authority's plan generally will be used as the basis for the proposed disposal action.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 40 U.S.C. § 484, as implemented by the FPMR, identifies several mechanisms for disposing of surplus base closure property; by public benefit conveyance (FPMR Sec. 101-47.303-2); by negotiated sale (FPMR Sec. 101-47.304-8); and by competitive sale (FPMR Sec. 101-47.304-7). Additionally, in section 2905(b)(4), the DBCRA established economic development conveyances as a means of disposing of surplus base closure property. The selection of any particular method of conveyance merely implements the Federal agency's decision to dispose of the property. Decisions concerning whether to undertake a public benefit conveyance or an economic development conveyance, or to sell property by negotiation or by competitive bid are committed by law to agency discretion. Selecting a method of disposal implicates a broad range of factors and rests solely within the Secretary of the Navy's discretion.

#### Conclusion

The Consensus Reuse Plan proposed by the Village of Glenview presents the highest and best use of the NAS Glenview property. The Village of Glenview, as the LRA, has determined in its Consensus Reuse Plan that the property should be used for several purposes, including commercial, light industrial, retail, residential, recreational, public service, and open space uses. The property's physical characteristics and the current uses of adjacent lands make it appropriate for this mixed use redevelopment.

The Consensus Reuse Plan responds to local economic conditions, promotes rapid economic recovery from the impact of the Naval Air Station's closure, and is consistent with President Clinton's Five-Part Plan for revitalizing base closure communities, which emphasizes local economic redevelopment of the closing military facility and creation of new jobs as the means to revitalize these communities. 32 CFR Parts 90 and 91, 59 Fed. Reg. 16,123 (1994). The resultant environmental impacts can be mitigated by the acquiring entity under the

direction of Federal, State and local regulatory authorities.

Although the "No Action" alternative has less potential for causing adverse environmental impacts, this alternative would not constitute the highest and best use of the Naval Air Station property. It would not take advantage of the property's physical characteristics and the current uses of adjacent property. It is not compatible with the LRA's Consensus Reuse Plan. It would not foster local economic redevelopment of the Air Station and would not create new jobs.

Accordingly, Navy will dispose of Naval Air Station Glenview in a manner that is consistent with the Village of Glenview's Consensus Reuse Plan for the property.

Dated: May 28, 1996.  
William J. Cassidy, Jr.,  
*Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy*  
(*Conversion and Redevelopment*).  
[FR Doc. 96-13807 Filed 6-3-96; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 3810-FF-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Proposed collection; comment request.

**SUMMARY:** The Director, Information Resources Group, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before August 5, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments and requests for copies of the proposed information collection request should be addressed to Patrick J. Sherrill, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202-4651.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Patrick J. Sherrill (202) 708-8196. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information

collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Director of the Information Resources Group publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g., new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment at the address specified above. Copies of the requests are available from Patrick J. Sherrill at the address specified above.

The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department, (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner, (3) is the estimate of burden accurate, (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected, and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Dated: May 30, 1996.  
Gloria Parker,  
*Director, Information Resources Group.*

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

*Type of Review:* Extension.

*Title:* State Plan Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

*Frequency:* Triennially.

*Affected Public:* State, local or Tribal Gov't, SEAs and LEA.

*Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden: Responses: 1; Burden Hours: 551.*

*Abstract:* State Educational agencies are required to submit a State Plan to the U.S. Department of Education in order to receive funds under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

[FR Doc. 96-13900 Filed 6-3-96; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4000-01-P**