1. Personnel actions (appointments, promotions, assignments, reassignments, and salary actions) involving individual Federal Reserve System employees.

2. Any items carried forward from a previously announced meeting.

Contact Person for More Information: Mr. Joseph R. Coyne, Assistant to the Board; (202) 452–3204. You may call (202) 452–3207, beginning at approximately 5 p.m. two business days before this meeting, for a recorded announcement of bank and bank holding company applications scheduled for the meeting.

Dated: August 7, 1996.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 96–20436 Filed 8–7–96; 10:51 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

TIME AND DATE: 10:00 a.m. (EDT) August 19, 1996.

PLACE: 4th Floor, Conference Room, 1250 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Approval of the minutes of the July 15, 1996, Board meeting.
2. Thrift Savings Plan activity report by the Executive Director.
3. Review of investment policy.
4. Review of Arthur Andersen semiannual financial review.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Thomas J. Trabucco, Director, Office of External Affairs, (202) 942–1640.

DATE: August 6, 1996.

Roger W. Mehle,

Executive Director, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board.

[FR Doc. 96–20451 Filed 8–7–96; 11:53 am]

BILLING CODE 6760–01–M

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Record of Decision, U.S. Courthouse Annex, Savannah, Georgia

Action

This is the Record of Decision (ROD) for the construction of a Courthouse Annex (Annex) in Savannah, Georgia. The proposed Annex will contain between 165,000 and 180,000 occupiable square feet (osf) of space including office space, courtrooms, storage space, and special space. The project may also include 40 secured inside parking spaces. The proposed Annex is intended to meet 10-year requirements and the 30-year expansion needs of the U.S. Courts and related agencies in conjunction with the continued use of the existing Federal Building Courthouse (FB–CT).

Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR Part 1500–1508), General Services Administration (GSA) Order PBS R 1095.4B, GSA conducted an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for this proposed action. The purpose of the EIS was to identify the potential impacts resulting from this project. The EIS examined the alternatives to the proposed action and the impacts of the alternatives considered. The EIS also addressed mitigation of the adverse impacts. GSA has made every effort to identify and take into account all of the concerns expressed about undertaking this proposed action.

The Draft EIS was released for 45 days of public comment February 28. The Final EIS was released for 30 days of public comment ending on May 28. In addition, notice was provided in the Federal Register, the Savannah News Press, and through direct mail. Approximately 150 copies of the Draft and the Final EIS were distributed for comment using a mailing list of interested parties accumulated through the two years this project has been in the planning stage.

Public participation was accomplished through notices in the Savannah News Press, the Federal Register, direct mail, public meetings, and through regular meetings with stakeholders beginning in April 1994. GSA recognized early the potential for negative impacts from this project, and maintaining an ongoing dialogue with the local community to take their concerns into account.

In April 1994, GSA began the preparation of an EIS and a Cultural Resource Assessment (CRA). At the same time, as required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), GSA initiated consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) as well as local preservation interests.

GSA implemented the Section 106 Review process for the proposed Annex concurrently with the implementation of NEPA. In order to determine how this proposed action could affect historic properties, the CRA documented potentially impacted cultural resources. The CRA provided an in-depth evaluation of seven potential sites under initial consideration for the Annex. An architectural history survey was completed for each of the potential sites. A larger Area of Potential Effect (APE) surrounding each of the sites was also examined. An archeological assessment was accomplished through compilation and review of existing archaeological historic documentation and previously conducted fieldwork and reports on Savannah.

The CRA reviewed the documentation for each of the seven sites and identified preservation concerns. This document provided a comprehensive review of historic resources located on and around each site. This became the basis for analysis of impacts to historic resources in the EIS.

GSA solicited comments at five public meetings conducted from August 1994 through March 1996. In addition, eleven meetings were held with local organizations and stakeholders to solicit comments and address concerns. These participating organizations included the City of Savannah, Historic Savannah Foundation, the Savannah Development and Renewal Authority, the SHPO, the Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the ACHP.

The Delineated Area (DA) for the Annex was located within the Central Business Area (CBA) and defined as the area surrounded by Bay Street on the North, Liberty Street on the South, Martin Luther King Boulevard on the West, and East Broad on the East.

From April through November 1994, GSA actively solicited alternate sites through a series of advertisements in the Savannah News Press, meetings with local stakeholders, and an ''open house'' to receive site offers on June 28, 1994. No sites were offered. GSA also conducted a windshield survey and identified additional sites for consideration that appeared feasible. At a public meeting on December 6, 1994, GSA identified a total of nine sites within the DA for initial consideration as potential locations for the Annex. Five of the sites were adjacent to the existing FB–CT and four were non-adjacent sites.

In developing a site selection criteria for ranking prospective sites, GSA developed technical and operational criteria. The courts expressed strong preference for an adjacent site for security and operational reasons, but this did not preclude the consideration of non-adjacent sites. This criteria was developed at the beginning of the site selection process in April 1994 and used throughout the process to rank and screen potential sites.

Utilizing this site selection criteria, two of the four non-adjacent sites were screened from consideration for technical reasons on October 25, 1994 and February 16, 1995, respectively.

On August 8, 1994, GSA announced in the Commerce Business Daily a solicitation for an architect-engineer to provide professional services to GSA in support of site selection for the proposed Annex. On March 1, 1995, GSA selected Robert Stern as the lead project architect. The team of design consultants included the project architect, a courts consultant, a cost consultant, the principal architect-engineer, and a local Savannah architect.

The initial scope of work tasked the design consultants to focus its analysis on the seven sites that had been identified by GSA: Five sites adjacent to the FB–CT and two non-adjacent sites. The consultants were also tasked to analyze the technical and operational feasibility of each site and provide recommendations to GSA to assist with site selection.

The Scope of Work was accomplished by the Design Consultants beginning in July and concluding November 8, 1995. The task consisted of four phases:

Phase 1 Data Collection: The Design Consultants collected and reviewed existing information, local guidelines, regulations, and standards. Information developed by GSA's EIS and CRA was provided along with transcripts from the public meetings and all correspondence received during the scoping process. A public meeting to solicit input was conducted on July 12, 1995 by the architect.

Phase 2: Program Verification and Site Analysis: This analyzed each remaining alternative site based on the 10-year needs and 30-year expansion requirements of the Courts. Tenant agencies were interviewed to verify requirements. Sites were analyzed based on the site selection criteria. Analysis of the feasibility of the reuse of the existing Juliette Gordon Low (JGL) Federal Buildings was completed.

Phase 3: Programmatic Master Planning: The Consultants tabulated the program elements and allocated functions between the FB–CT and the Annex. The program fit and space requirements were identified. Required adjacencies and duplications of functions were outlined for each potential site

Phase 4 Conceptual Pre-design Analysis: The pre-design analysis examined and development options for all of the remaining sites. Volumetric analysis was conducted for each site based on interior layouts and interior ceiling height requirements. Block and stack concepts were developed showing mass, scale and contextual fit. Three successive stages of analysis were performed and 29 initial concepts were screened to 13 and finally to six concepts. On November 8, 1996, the relative merits of each of the six concepts, along with final recommendations, were presented to GSA by the design consultants.

On November 20, 1995, based on analyses provided by the Design Consultants, GSA's site selection team ranked and screened the remaining concepts. Four concepts and three siting options were identified as most feasible options for further study. These four concepts became the alternatives considered for full analysis in the EIS.

Alternatives Considered

GSA received authorization to begin the site selection process on March 15, 1994. At that time the GSA preferred alternative site was the City block surrounded by Bull, Broughton, State and Whitaker Streets, also known as site 1A. GSA met with local representatives on April 5, 1994. Local concerns were expressed about the GSA preferred site because it would adversely impact historic buildings, the City plan designed by General James Oglethorpe in 1733, and Savannah's nomination as a World Heritage Site.

From the initial nine potential sites within the DA that were identified from April through December 1994, two were screened for technical reasons. The remaining seven sites were analyzed by the Design Consultants. After the siting feasibility study was completed, GSA screened the two non-adjacent sites for technical and operational reasons. This left three sites and four concept options remaining as the Alternatives considered in the EIS.

In addition to these, the No Action Alternative was also analyzed in the EIS.

No-Action: Under this alternative, agencies slated for relocation into the Annex would remain in their current locations and additional space requirements would be satisfied by leasing action. No construction would occur to address the Courts' expansion requirements. Additional courtrooms would be provided in nearby leased buildings and the judiciary would accomplish its expansion needs through a series of ad hoc lease acquisitions. The courts and related agencies would become fragmented and over time, and they would face serious problems with efficiency and security.

Alternative 1—Site 1E—Construction of One Building (GSA Preferred Alternative): Under this siting alternative, GSA would construct a single building of 165,000 osf, on the two trust lots currently occupied by the JGL Buildings A & B. The existing buildings would be demolished and the Annex footprint would cover both of the trust lots and President Street between Buildings A & B. The mass and scale of this Annex would be of similar proportions to the existing FB–CT, and a tunnel connection between the Annex and the FB–CT would be constructed under Whitaker Street. Forty secure parking spaces would be provided either in the basement, or in JGL Building C with a tunnel connection under York Street.

Alternative 2—Site 1E—Construction of Two Buildings: Under this option, two larger and less efficient buildings approximately of 180,000 osf would be constructed on the trust two lots. President Street would be retained for pedestrian traffic. Because of the required duplication and inefficiency of constructing two buildings, each building would be approximately 60 feet taller than the existing FB–CT. Secured parking would be provided either in the basement, or in JGL Building C with a tunnel connection under York Street.

Alternative 3—Site 1D—Construction of One Building: Under this option, GSA would construct a single building on the site of the JGL Building C currently housing the Corps of Engineers. This alternative would require the demolition of the existing JGL Building C with the exception of the underground parking, part of existing structural support, and the elevator core. This alternative would provide 173,000 osf on three floors reaching 58 feet high, or ten feet higher than the existing FB–CT.

Alternative 4—Site 1A—Construction of One Building: Under this alternative the Annex would be constructed on the City block surrounded by Broughton, Bull, State and Whitaker Streets. The building would have 166,000 osf above grade and connect with the existing FB–CT through a tunnel constructed under State Street with secure parking below grade. It would require the demolition of 14 buildings that contribute to the NHLD. The two historic buildings facing Bull Street would be retained. Broughton Lane would be closed retaining only that portion between the two historic buildings remaining on Bull Street. The building would be four stories tall facing Broughton Street and six stories tall facing State Street.

Issues of Concern: The concerns expressed about this project were the potential adverse effects to Savannah's

National Historic Landmark District (NHLD). Savannah's NHLD is currently listed as Endangered Priority 2 by the National Park Service. This Endangered status has been caused by the cumulative addition of incompatible buildings, the cumulative demolition of historic buildings, and cumulative alterations to the Oglethorpe Plan. Concerns were also expressed about the potential impact to Savannah's nomination as a World Heritage Site.

Specific requests were also expressed that GSA should: not demolish any historic or contributing buildings, should not alter the Oglethorpe Plan, and the Annex should be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood in terms of mass, scale, materials, context, fit, and design. Concerns were expressed that the Annex could create a ''dead zone'' around Telfair Square during non-business hours. Additional concerns were the project's negative impact on the current parking shortages downtown, the potential relocation of the U.S. Post Office outside downtown, the potential loss of Federal employees downtown displaced by this project, and potential negative impacts to the City's efforts to revitalize the Broughton Street retail corridor.

The NHLD is a critical designation for the City of Savannah and contributes to both the tourist economy of the City, and to the quality of life within the City itself. Concerns focused on the potential negative impact that this proposed action could have on the sensitive and fragile nature of the NHLD and neighborhoods if local concerns are not taken into account during the planning and design of the Annex.

Environmental Consequences and Mitigation

No Action Alternative: While the No Action alternative would have no impact on the natural environment, it would result in the continued inefficient housing of Federal Courts and would have long-term impacts as the Courts outgrow their current space. Security and efficiency would be compromised as the Courts 10-year requirements and 30-year expansion needs would not be met in a single facility. As the Courts requirements for space increases over time, housing the Court's functions in non-adjacent buildings would occur in the vicinity of the FB–CT. This leasing of space could ultimately impact other historic buildings as leasehold alterations are made to accommodate Court needs. The No Action Alternative could ultimately cause the U.S. Courts to look outside the CBA for their space needs. The loss of the Federal Courts downtown would have a negative impact to Savannah's NHLD.

Summary of Construction Alternatives: Considering the four alternatives that involve the construction of an Annex, all of the alternatives would have little or no long-term impact on the natural environment. There would be minimal or no impact to the following categories: Housing, Open Space and Recreation Facilities, Utilities and City Services, Subsurface and Geological Conditions, Vegetation and Wildlife, Natural Hazards, Ambient Air Quality, Ambient Noise, Natural or Depletable Resources, and Hazardous Substances or Contamination. All of the construction alternatives are in substantial compliance with City zoning requirements. Potential archaeological disturbance is not likely except for Site 1–A, and all appropriate regulations and procedures would be followed if archaeological resources are found during construction. Sites 1–C and 1–D have been previously disturbed.

All of the construction alternatives will produce temporary negative impacts during construction. These impacts would be short term and would include disruptions due to increased noise levels, increased dust and emissions, disruptions due to temporary street closures, construction related traffic, and temporary loss of utility services. These impacts would be minimized through proper construction mitigation techniques and with good advance planning. By working closely with the City, unavoidable disruptions during the two year construction phase could be minimized but not totally avoided.

Alternative 1—Site 1E—Construction of One Building (GSA Preferred Alternative): This alternative would involve the demolition of the JGL Buildings A & B and constructing an Annex of 165,000 osf on the entire site including President Street. This would remove that portion of President Street which is part of the Oglethorpe Plan. This loss would be unavoidable and only partially mitigated through design considerations. This alternative replaces two smaller buildings which are in proportion with surrounding buildings, with a larger Annex of similar mass to the current FB–CT. This additional mass and the loss of that section of President Street will cause some negative visual impacts. These cumulative impacts could affect the status of the NHLD. This alternative would demolish two 27,000 osf government-owned buildings that would have remaining economic life. This alternative would also require the relocation of 145 employees currently housed in buildings A and B.

Alternative 2—Site 1E—Construction of Two Buildings: Under this alternative an Annex of 180,000 osf would be constructed on two trust lots leaving President Street open to pedestrian traffic. These buildings would be substantially taller than the current FB–CT and would be out of context on that site in terms of the mass and scale. This alternative would demolish two government-owned buildings that have remaining economic life. This would have the same negative impacts as Alternative 1 and potentially affect the status of the NHLD. This alternative would also require the relocation of 145 employees currently housed in buildings A and B.

Alternative 3—Site 1D—Construction of One Building: Under this alternative, GSA would demolish all of the JGL Building C except the elevator core, the basement parking, and part of the structural support. No historic buildings would be demolished and no alterations to the Oglethorpe Plan would occur. This alternative would demolish a 145,000 osf government-owned building that has remaining economic life. This alternative may have positive impacts on the NHLD if the new Annex is more visually compatible with the surrounding neighborhood than the current JGL Building C.

This alternative would require the relocation of 714 Corps of Engineer employees. This action itself would cause additional impacts. If these employees were relocated within the NHLD, adverse impacts are likely depending on the location selected and whether leasing or new construction was the selected acquisition. If this action caused these employees to relocate outside Savannah's NHLD, or to relocate outside Savannah altogether, adverse economic impacts to the NHLD would occur due to the loss of employment within the City. These future potential impacts cannot be accurately measured until alternative courses of action are identified and considered.

Alternative 4—Site 1A—Construction of One Building: Under this alternative, a single building Annex would be constructed on Broughton Street. Broughton Lane would be permanently lost and 14 contributing buildings would be demolished. The Broughton Street Revitalization program would be severely impacted by removing a block of commercial buildings creating a retail ''dead zone''. Two historic buildings would be preserved on Bull Street between Broughton Street and State Street, and that portion of Broughton

Lane between the buildings would be retained. This alternative would cause adverse effects to Savannah's historic resources and could have negative impacts to the status of the NHLD.

Mitigation of Cultural and Historic Resources. In order to mitigate and minimize the impacts that have been identified, GSA will continue to consult with the local community, the SHPO, the ACHP, the NPS, as well as other preservation groups that have been identified. This consultation will lead to the development and ultimate signing of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between GSA and the consulted parties including the SHPO, the ACHP, the NPS, pursuant to 36 CFR 800.5(e) and 800.10, which are the implementing regulations of the National Historic Preservation Act. The stipulations of the MOA will identify elements of the mitigation plan which GSA will implement.

The mitigation plan will identify the elements that GSA will implement to mitigate impacts to historic resources. It will address the stages of design review and will identify elements of new construction that are compatible with the historic and architectural qualities of the NHLD. It will address the issues of scale, massing, and materials, and will be responsive to the Secretary of Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.* GSA recognizes that concerns have been expressed by the NPS and others about the mass and scale of the proposed Annex. GSA is committed to reduce the mass above grade of the Annex to the greatest extent practical.

The City of Savannah has established a committee to work closely with GSA to identify issues and maintain a climate of cooperation throughout this project. GSA has committed to work with this committee and to participate in regular meetings to address issues and to keep the lines of communication open.

The City has identified three additional issues of concern about this project: exacerbation of parking shortages, the potential loss of the U.S. Post Office downtown, and the potential loss of federal employment downtown due to relocation caused by this proposed Annex.

As mitigation, GSA has committed to cooperate with the City's effort to development of a perimeter parking and shuttle system. GSA committed to assist the City in their efforts to find a suitable downtown location for the U.S. Post Office. GSA has committed to keep federal agencies that are relocated as a result of this project within the CBA of Savannah.

Rationale for Decision

The proposed project will meet the 10-year requirements and 30-year expansion needs of the U.S Courts in Savannah, Georgia. The proposed construction will result in a one-time consumption of non-renewable resources including land, energy and materials. Certain negative environmental impacts will occur regardless of the alternative selected.

The technically and operationally preferred alternative, which is also the GSA preferred alternative, is the construction of a single building on site 1–E. This technically preferred alternative best meets the projects objectives and criteria as recommended by the design consultants.

The alternative with the greatest adverse impact to the NHLD is Alternative 5, site 1–A, because it would demolish 14 historic buildings and permanently close Broughton Lane. It would also impact the City's efforts to revitalize the Broughton Street retail corridor. The alternative with the least environmental impact would be Alternative 4; a single building on site 1–D. This alternative would require no loss of historic resources, however it would cause a major agency relocation within the NHLD as 714 U.S. Army Corps of Engineer employees would be displaced. Additionally, JGL Building C, with 145,000 osf of government-owned space, would be mostly demolished with useful economic life remaining.

Therefore, giving consideration to all of the factors discovered during the two year environmental process, it is the decision to proceed with the GSA preferred alternative, which is the demolition of JGL Buildings A & B, and the construction of a single Courthouse Annex of 165,000 osf on site 1–E, adjacent to the FB–CT in Savannah, Georgia.

Approved: July 16, 1996.

Carole Dortch,

Regional Administrator (4A).

Dated: July 24, 1996.

Phil Youngberg,

Regional Environmental Officer (4PT).

[FR Doc. 96–20176 Filed 8–8–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–23–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

[INFO–96–21]

Proposed Data Collections Submitted for Public Comment and Recommendations

In compliance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 for opportunity for public comment on proposed data collection projects, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) will publish periodic summaries of proposed projects. To request more information on the proposed projects or to obtain a copy of the data collection plans and instruments, call the CDC Reports Clearance Officer on (404) 639–7090.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques for other forms of information technology. Send comments to Wilma Johnson, CDC Reports Clearance Officer, 1600 Clifton Road, MS-D24, Atlanta, GA 30333. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Proposed Projects

1. Studies of Immunotoxicity in Occupational Groups—(0920–0333)—Extension—A number of chemicals to which U.S. workers are potentially exposed, including metals such as lead and beryllium and solvents such as carbon tetrachloride, have been found to be immunotoxic in experimental animals. There is little data on immunosuppression, hypersensitivity or autoimmune disease in workers exposed to chemicals that are immunotoxic in experimental animals. NIOSH has undertaken a coordinated series of studies to focus on immune-system effects related to specific chemical exposures in the workplace. In the previous three years, NIOSH conducted studies of lead and egg protein exposed workers.

In this extension of the program, it is anticipated that up to five additional research studies will be conducted