revetments to approximately the Coast Guard station (about 2,800 feet), is projected to require management of 350,000 cubic yards of dredged material over the next 20 years. This material would continue to be beneficially used for nourishment of eroding beaches in the harbor vicinity.

The inner harbor material, which is silty, is dewatered at an interim site (Whirpool site) and later trucked to various upland sites for final storage or beneficial use. Previously used upland sites are either full or no longer available. Maintenance dredging of the inner harbor is projected to require management of 300,000 cubic yards of dredged material over the next 20 years. Therefore, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit District, is evaluating the environmental impacts of new long-term dredged material management alternatives for dredged material from the inner harbor. The environmental evaluation will be coordinated with the development of a 20-year Dredged Material Management Plan for the harbor.

Two specific dredged material management alternatives have been identified: Placement at an upland site at the Southwest Michigan Regional Airport in Benton Harbor, Michigan, and placement at a previously used (1970s and early 1980s) open-water site. Beneficial use applications will also be explored. The no Federal action alternative will be considered and will serve as a baseline from which to measure the impacts of the action alternatives. The final 20-year management plan may consist of a combination of alternatives and beneficial use applications.

The upland site lies between the airport and the Paw Paw River, extending about 3,000 feet along an embankment at the western runway end. The site is located on the bottom of Lake Michigan, with a change in elevation of over 30 feet. The site includes trees, shrubs, and open grassy areas. The site is the marshy area that borders the Paw Paw River. Dredged material placement would avoid the marsh areas, if possible. Dredged material placement at the airport site may include beneficial use by providing fill to build-up the area beyond the end of the runway, which would accommodate the development of a runway safety area.

The open-water site is an area, approximately ½-mile by ½-mile, located on the bottom of Lake Michigan, about 1¾ miles due west from the north pier head. The site is a sufficient water depth (approximately 50 feet) to prevent significant disturbance of the dredged material by wind and storm induced wave action in the lake. Dredged material would be transported directly from the dredging operation to the open water site by floating plant (such as a barge or a bottom dumping dredge), hydraulic pipeline, or other similar methods. The suitability of the dredged material for open-water placement will be determined in accordance with the Great Lakes Dredged Material Testing and Evaluation Manual (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1994), which presents testing and evaluation guidance for proposed discharges of dredged material into the waters of the United States within the Great Lakes Basin.

Significant issues to be analyzed include potential impacts on wetlands, water quality, fish and wildlife habitat, and cultural resources. Social impacts, including impacts upon recreation, aesthetics, and the local economy, will also be considered.


The proposed dredged material management plan will be coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Michigan State Historic Preservation Office, and local and regional Indian tribes.

All Federal, State, and local agencies, Indian tribes, and other private organizations and parties are invited to participate in the proposed project review. Questions, concerns, and comments may be directed to the address given above. It is anticipated that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement would be made available in February 1998 for a 45-day public review period. During the public review period, the Corps of Engineers and the local project sponsor would hold a public meeting in the St. Joseph Harbor vicinity.

Dated: August 16, 1996.
Thomas C. Haid,
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army, District Engineer.

[FR Doc. 96–22079 Filed 8–28–96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3710–GA–M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Advisory Council on Education Statistics; Partially Closed Meeting

AGENCY: Advisory Council on Education Statistics, ED.

ACTION: Notice of Partially Closed Meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of a forthcoming meeting of the Advisory Council on Education Statistics (ACES). Notice of this meeting is required under Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. This document is intended to notify the general public of their opportunity to attend the open portions of the meeting.

DATES: September 11–13, 1996.

T I M E S : September 11—Full Council, 1:00 p.m.–5:30 p.m. (open); September 12—Management Committee, 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m. (closed from 1:00 p.m.–5:00 p.m.); Statistics Committee, 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m. (open); Strategy/Policy Committee, 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m. (open); September 13—Full Council, 8:30 a.m.–9:30 a.m. (closed) and 9:30 a.m.–1:00 p.m. (open). The Committee meetings will take place in the following locations: Management-Room 326a; Strategy/Policy-Room 326b; Statistics-Room 322. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barbara Marenus, National Center for Education Statistics-Room 326a; Strategy/Policy-Room 326b; Statistics-Room 322.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Advisory Council on Education Statistics (ACES) is established under Section 406(c)(1) of the Education Amendments of 1974, Pub. L. 93–380. The Council is established to review general policies for the operation of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement and is responsible for advising on standards to insure that statistics and analyses disseminated by NCES are of high
quality and are not subject to political influence. In addition, ACES is required to advise the Commissioner of NCES and the National Assessment Governing Board on technical and statistical matters related to the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP).

The proposed agenda includes the following:
- Discussion of NCES’s next steps in implementing the redesign of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).
- An update and discussion on the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS).
- Individual meetings of the three ACES committees which will focus on specific topics. The agenda for the Management Committee includes a report on the preliminary findings from NCES’s customer survey and related customer service activities. In addition, there will be discussions of a design feasibility grant competition to solicit ideas on a redesigned NAEP. If these portions of the meeting were held in open session, the possible disclosure of the Department’s position might affect decisions by third parties outside the Government. These discussions would be likely to significantly frustrate implementation of a proposed agency action if conducted in open session.

These portions of the meeting will be closed under the authority of Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463; 5 U.S.C. Appendix 2) and under exemption (9)(B) of Section 522b(c) of Title 5 U.S.C.

The agenda for the Statistics Committee includes issues surrounding background variables in NAEP, and the potential for linking data from the TIMSS and NAEP. The agenda for the Strategy/Policy Committee includes review of a draft strategic plan for NAEP and the use of criteria for decisionmaking on the NCES budget. A summary of the activities of the closed sessions and related matters which are informative to the public consistent with the policy of Title 5 U.S.C. 551b(c) will be available within 14 days of the meeting. Records are kept of all Council proceedings and are available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Director, Advisory Council on Education Statistics, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW., Room 400; Washington, DC 20208–7575.

Sharon P. Robinson,
Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement.

[FR Doc. 96–21993 Filed 8–28–96; 8:45 am]
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. TM96–14–23–001]
Eastern Shore Natural Gas Company; Notice of Proposed Changes In FERC Gas Tariff
August 23, 1996.

Take notice that Eastern Shore Natural Gas Company (ESNG) tendered for filing on August 20, 1996 certain revised tariff sheets in the above captioned docket as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, First Revised Volume No. 1, with proposed effective dates of April 1, 1996 and August 1, 1996, respectively.

ESNG states the purpose of the instant filing is to supplement ESNG’s August 5, 1996 storage tracker filing in Docket No. TM96–14–23–000 (August 5, 1996 filing) in order to reflect demand and capacity rates charged by Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco) under its LSS Rate Schedule, the costs of which are included in ESNG’s Rate Schedule LSS. More specifically, its filing (a) makes a correction on 2nd Sub 1st Rev Sub 78th Rev Sheet No. 6 due to a typographical error under its CFSS Rate Schedule Demand Charge, and (b) tracks changes from Transco in its supplemental filing in its Docket No. TM96–15–29–000, et. al., dated August 8, 1996. ESNG further states its tracking filing is being filed pursuant to Section 24 of the General Terms and Conditions of ESNG’s FERC Gas Tariff to reflect changes in ESNG’s jurisdictional rates.

ESNG states that copies of the filing have been served upon its jurisdictional customers and interested State Commissions.

Eastern Shore states that copies of the filing have been served upon its jurisdictional customers and interested State Commissions. Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.211 of the Commission’s Rules and Regulations. All such protests should be filed on or before August 27, 1996. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding.

Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–22018 Filed 8–28–96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Project No. 2375; Project No. 8277 Maine]
International Paper Company; Otis Hydroelectric Company; Notice of Proposed Restricted Service List for a Programmatic Agreement for Managing Properties Included in or Eligible for Inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places
August 23, 1996.

Rule 2010 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure provides that, to eliminate unnecessary expense or improve administrative efficiency, the Secretary may establish a restricted service list for a particular phase or issue in a proceeding. The restricted service list should contain the names of persons on the service list who, in the judgment of the decisional authority establishing the list, are active participants with respect to the phase or issue in the proceeding for which the list is established.

The Commission is consulting with the Maine State Historic Preservation Officer (hereinafter, SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (hereinafter, Council) pursuant to the Council’s regulations, 36 CFR Part 800, Implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, (16 U.S.C. Section 470f), to prepare a programmatic agreement for managing properties included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places at Project No. 2375 and Project No. 8277.

The programmatic agreement, when executed by the Commission, the SHPO, and the Council, would satisfy the Commission’s Section 106 responsibilities for all individual undertakings carried out in accordance with the licenses until the licenses expire or are terminated (36 CFR 800.13(e)). The Commission’s responsibilities pursuant to Section 106 for the above projects would be fulfilled through one programmatic agreement which the Commission proposes to draft in consultation with certain parties listed below. The executive programmatic agreement would be incorporated into any orders issuing licenses.

1 18 CFR Section 385.2010.