exclusive, exclusive or partially exclusive manner to any party interested in manufacturing, using, and/or selling devices or processes covered by these patents.

Title: Microarc Chaff.
Inventor: Richard N. Johnson.
Patent Number: 5,619,205.
Issue Date: April 8, 1997.

Title: Buried Pipe Locator Utilizing a Change in Ground Capacitance.
Inventor: John E.B. Tuttle.
Patent Number: 5,617,031.
Issue Date: April 1, 1997.

Title: Apparatus for Dispersing a Jet From a Shaped Charge Liner via Non-Uniform Charge Confinement.
Inventor(s): William Walters and Richard Summers.
Patent Number: 5,616,885.
Issue Date: April 1, 1997.

Title: Process for Encapsulating a Shaped Body for Hot Isostatic Pressing by Sol-Gel Method.
Inventor: Kerry Richard.
Patent Number: 5,613,993.
Issue Date: March 25, 1997.

Title: High Range Resolution Ladar.
Inventor(s): Barry L. Stann, William C. Ruff and Zoltan G. Sztankay.
Patent Number: 5,608,514.
Issue Date: March 4, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Norma Vaught, Technology Transfer Office, AMSRL–CS–TT, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, Adelphi, MD 20783–1197; tel: (301) 394–2952; fax: (301) 394–5815; e-mail: nvaught@arl.mil

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: None.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 97–15685 Filed 6–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

Intent to Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Indian River Lagoon Restoration Feasibility Study

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Jacksonville District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) intends to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Indian River Lagoon Restoration Feasibility Study. The study is a cooperative effort between the Corps and the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) which is also a cooperating agency for this DEIS.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Traxler, 561–683–2178, or Elmar Kurzbach, 904–232–2325 Environmental Branch, Planning Division, P.O. Box 4970, Jacksonville, Florida 32232–0019.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: a. The Central and Southern Florida (C&SF) Project is a multi-purpose project which was first authorized in 1948 to provide flood control, water control, water supply, and other services to the area which stretches from around Orlando to Florida Bay (the southern part of the Florida peninsula). The project has performed its intended purposes well. However, the project has also contributed to the decline of the south Florida ecosystems. The purpose of the C&SF Project Comprehensive Review Study is to holistically re-examine the C&SF Project to determine the feasibility of providing water resources infrastructure that supports the sustainability of south Florida ecosystems. Specifically, the study will investigate structural and operational modifications to the C&SF Project to improve the quality of the environment; protect the aquifer; improve the integrity, capability, and conservation of urban and agricultural water supplies; and improve other water-related purposes. The C&SF Reconnaissance Report described a number of potential feasibility studies including the Indian River Lagoon Restoration.

b. The geographic area encompassed by the Indian River Lagoon Restoration Feasibility Study is generally described as hydrologically removed from the Everglades and Florida Bay ecosystems. The only existing hydraulic connection between those ecosystems is the project Canal (C–44 or St. Lucie Canal) which discharges water from Lake Okeechobee to the St. Lucie Estuary. The Comprehensive Review Study will evaluate alternative regulation schedules for Lake Okeechobee on a comprehensive system-wide basis with due consideration being given to the needs of St. Lucie Estuary and Indian River Lagoon. These two studies will be underway concurrently, the Lake Okeechobee regulation schedules evaluated in the Comprehensive Review Study will be incorporated into the specific benefits and impacts analysis performed for alternatives considered in this study. Similarly, system-wide benefits identified by plan alternatives evaluated in this study will be incorporated into the Comprehensive Review Study. A plan recommended in this study can be considered as a separable element to the overall comprehensive plan for restoration of South Florida.

c. The Indian River Lagoon Restoration Feasibility Study will incorporate components previously identified in the C&SF Project Comprehensive Review Study Reconnaissance Report. Known concepts that will be considered in this feasibility study are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Alternative Actions to be Considered in the Indian River Lagoon Feasibility Study

Alternatives to consider include no action, non-structural measures, and the structural components discussed below, as well as potential, as-yet-unidentified measures or combinations of features to be developed during the study.

Water Preserve Areas (Regional Attenuation Facilities)

a. The Water Preserve Area (WPA) concept, referred to in the Reconnaissance Report as Regional Attenuation Facilities (RAFs), would provide for the diversion of surplus rainfall runoff from the C–23, C–24, C–25, and C–44 drainage basins to storage areas where the water could be treated prior to discharge for environmental base flow for estuarine and other water supply purposes. RAF's would also attempt to reduce the damaging effects of uncontrolled basin runoff during storm events. The reconnaissance phase of the C&SF Project Comprehensive Review Study investigated concepts to capture and store excess surface waters by backpumping stormwater that is normally released directly to tide through the C&SF Project canal system into WPA's along the eastern edge of the Water Conservation Areas. Although the WPA concept for the upper east coast area has not been fully formulated or designed, the concept is analogous to the proposed Water Preserve Areas for the lower east coast which are very important components of the Comprehensive Review Study. These WPA's are expected to serve a number of objectives, including improved water supply for environmental base flow to the estuary, improved water supply for urban and agricultural use, increased short hydroperiod wetlands, reduced sediment loading to the estuary and improved flow control in the region.

b. The Water Preserve Area Task Force jointly established by Martin and St. Lucie County Commissioners has completed a preliminary study of potential locations for WPAs to address the much needed upland retention of stormwater runoff to prevent further degradation of the Indian River Lagoon

and St. Lucie River. The WPA Task Force identified 20 potential sites totaling approximately 65,600 acres. Sites were classified according to basic environmental and engineering design characteristics. The WPA Task Force draft report was published on August 31, 1995 and updated on December 31, 1996. The Task Force recommendations will be investigated further during this feasibility study.

c. Alternative WPA sites will be studied to identify other potential sites that may be less costly, less impacting on wetlands or provide additional water uses. In addition, individual upland runoff storage could be divided among the sub-basins of the study area, interconnected by the existing canal networks, to allow water transfer between sub-basins. Various combinations of facilities and operation scenarios will be evaluated during this feasibility study.

Upper East Coast Flowway (C–131)

a. The concept presented in the reconnaissance report included a 10,500 acre water quality treatment facility (flowway) located at the western juncture of Martin and St. Lucie counties, and a feature that would allow excess treated water to be backpumped into Lake Okeechobee when other needs are being met.

b. The C–131 concept was first documented in the Survey-Review Report on Central and Southern Florida Project Martin County Florida, September 22, 1967. It was further discussed in the Corps' Central and Southern Florida Project, Part III, Supplement II, General Design Memorandum (GDM), Martin County (St. Lucie County Water Supply Element), dated June 1984. The basic plan in the GDM was the backpumping of stormwater from C–23, C–24, and C–25 through a flowway, or nutrient consuming marsh, before discharging the water into Lake Okeechobee through the proposed C–131 canal. This concept will be revisited during the feasibility study. The C–131 canal plan was deferred from further consideration until the completion of other water resource studies which would assure the availability of water for irrigation uses in the general area.

On-Site Detention/Retention

On-site detention/retention is similar to the water preserve area proposal except that the detention/retention facilities would generally be individually constructed on privately developed land as opposed to large publicly owned regional facilities. The analysis conducted by this study will assume that the on-site facilities will be designed according to the applicable regulatory criteria of the SFWMD. On a site by site basis, benefits similar to those provided by RAF's may be realized. Stormwater discharges would be reduced and water quality would be improved. On-site detention/retention could also be designed to provide water supply benefits. However, any water supply benefits would probably be limited to the owner of the land where the on-site facility was located. The present study will evaluate whether a sufficient number of on-site facilities could significantly reduce stormwater discharges and improve water quality enough to benefit St. Lucie Estuary and the Indian River Lagoon. This alternative would require regulatory action by SFWMD. It is included in this study to evaluate the cost effectiveness of on-site detention and will be compared to providing regionally based solutions.

St. Lucie Flowway

a. The St. Lucie Flowway proposed in the reconnaissance study would capture some excess runoff in the C–44 basin that is now diverted to tide and divert the flow to the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge (Water Conservation Area 1). The flowway would originate at C–44 near Indiantown and divert flows south through the Corbett Wildlife Management Area to the proposed Everglades Construction Project divide structure S–316 that is intended to divert flows south to WCA–1. Diverted water would then be available for use in the Everglades system via WCA–1. The reconnaissance study also concluded that alternative sites for the flowway should be investigated to minimize adverse effects on existing natural areas, such as the Corbett Wildlife Management Areas. An alternative proposed in the reconnaissance study was to divert excess C–44 basin runoff to the north to a proposed regional attenuation facility.

b. The St. Lucie Flowway can be expected to serve a number of objectives including water quality improvement, increased supply, restoration of short hydroperiod wetlands, reduced sediment loading to the estuary and improved flood control.

Removal of St. Lucie Organic Sediments

a. Fine, organic-rich sediments (ooze or muck) have accumulated in the St. Lucie Estuary. Organic sediments, which are carried to the estuary as suspended load through the C–44, C–23 and C–24 canals, settle out in the estuary as the result of the interaction between the fresh and estuarine water. The highly organic sediment depletes the dissolved oxygen in the water column through natural chemical processes. The fine particulate sediments, composed of organic matter and silt, can also be re-suspended in the water column by wind and current action, creating turbidity conditions which diminish light penetration needed to maintain seagrass communities.

b. In a 1994 report on a muck removal demonstration project, the South Florida Water Management District concluded that large-scale sediment removal may improve water quality by reducing re-suspension of fine sediments during periods of physical disturbance, and would reduce oxygen demands in the water column. Further, exposing a courser grained substrate along the littoral shelf may promote a more diverse and abundant benthic macroinvertebrate community which would increase feeding opportunities for bottom feeding fish. However, the report recommended that further studies be undertaken prior to proceeding with the demonstration project. This study will further investigate the feasibility of a muck removal project.

Water Supply Alternatives

The exiting C&SF Project was designed to provide regional water supply for the study area. Consequently, alternatives developed for this feasibility study will identify urban and agricultural water supply demands and will include water supply features to help meet identified regional needs, including environmental needs and the potential conflicts that this may create with other water users. All of the alternatives described above have features related to the C&SF Project that are consistent with water supply and will be further evaluated as part of the plan formulation process during this feasibility study. These alternatives could be further developed for water supply by adding features such as aquifer storage and recovery.

Issues

The DEIS will consider impacts on protected species, wetlands health and safety, water quality, aesthetics and recreation, fish and wildlife resources, cultural resources, energy conservation, land use, socioeconomic resources, and other impacts identified through scoping, public involvement, and interagency coordination.

Scoping

A scoping letter was sent to interested parties on December 2, 1996. In addition, all parties are invited to

participate in the scoping process by identifying any additional concerns on issues, studies needed, alternatives, procedures, and other matters related to the scoping process. At this time, there are no plans for a public scoping meeting.

Public Involvement

We invite the participation of affected Federal, state and local agencies, affected Indian tribes, and other interested private organizations and parties.

Coordination

The proposed action is being coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, with the FWS under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and with the State Historic Preservation Officer under the Natural Historic Preservation Act. On a working level, the proposed action is being conducted by an interdisciplinary/interagency team combining local, state, and federal organizations.

Other Environmental Review and Consultation

The proposed action would involve evaluation for compliance with guidelines pursuant to Section 404(b) of the Clean Water Act; application (to the State of Florida) for Environmental Resource Permits pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act; certification of state lands, easements, and rights of way; and determination of Coastal Zone Management Act consistency.

Agency Role

As cooperating agency, non-Federal sponsor, and leading local expert; SFWD will provide extensive information and assistance on the resources to be impacted and alternatives.

DEIS Preparation

It is estimated that the DEIS will be available to the public in September, 1999.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 97–15683 Filed 6–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–AS–M

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Privacy Act; Systems of Records

AGENCY: Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

ACTION: New system of records.

SUMMARY: Each Federal agency is required by the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a, to publish a description of the systems of records it maintains containing personal information. In this notice the Board announces a new system of records.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard A. Azzaro, Acting General Counsel, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20004–2901, (202) 208–6387.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The new system of records, designated NDFSB–6, is described below.

DNFSB–6

SYSTEM NAME:

DNFSB Staff Resume Book.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:

Unclassified materials.

SYSTEM LOCATION:

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004–2901.

CATEGORIES OF INDIVIDUALS COVERED BY THE SYSTEM:

Members of the Board's technical and legal staff.

CATEGORIES OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:

A summary of each employee's educational background and work experience, with emphasis on areas relevant to the individual's work at the Board.

AUTHORITY FOR MAINTENANCE OF THE SYSTEM.

National Defense Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1989 (amended the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. § 2011 et seq.) by adding new Chapter 21—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board).

ROUTINE USES OF RECORDS MAINTAINED IN THE SYSTEM, INCLUDING CATEGORIES OF USERS AND THE PURPOSE OF SUCH USES:

The Resume Book may be distributed to representatives of the press, Congressional staff, representatives of State and local governments, and to any member of the public or any organization having a legitimate interest in understanding the technical and legal qualifications of the Board's staff.

POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR STORING, RETRIEVING, ACCESSING, RETAINING, AND DISPOSING OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:

STORAGE:

Paper records and computer files.

RETRIEVABILITY:

By employee name.

SAFEGUARDS:

Copies of the Resume Book will be sequentially numbered and all copies will be stored under the control of a Board employee. A record will be kept of each disclosure of the book by name of the receiving party and purpose for which the information is provided. The Resume Book will not be available via Internet nor will it be placed in the Board's Public Reading Room.

RETENTION AND DISPOSAL:

The Resume Book will be periodically updated, and out-of-date copies will be destroyed when updated copies are printed.

SYSTEM MANAGER AND ADDRESS:

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20004–2901. Attention: Andrew Thibadeau.

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE:

Board employees covered by the Resume Book may examine it at any time. They may also examine the list of disclosures maintained by the System Manager.

RECORD ACCESS PROCEDURE:

Same as Notification Procedure.

CONTESTING RECORD PROCEDURE:

Any Board employee covered by the Resume Book may request that corrections be made in his/here resume at any time.

RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

Subject individuals.

SYSTEM EXEMPTED FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE ACT:

None.

Dated: June 11, 1997.

John T. Conway,

Chairman.

[FR Doc. 97–15722 Filed 6–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3670–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Bonneville Power Administration

Transmission System Vegetation Management Program

AGENCY: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: This notice announces BPA's intention to prepare an EIS on