

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.