only when it is in the best interest of the Government to do so. After receipt of the notice of termination, contractors are required to terminate subcontracts, advise the contracting officer of any special circumstances, submit any requests for an equitable adjustment, submit a settlement proposal, and take other action as directed. Records regarding the terminated contract must be maintained for 3 years.

The information submitted or retained in connection with contract termination is used to reach an equitable settlement with firms and to protect the interests of the Government and the terminated contractor.

### B. Annual Reporting Burden

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 3 hours per termination, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The annual reporting burden is estimated as follows: *Respondents,* 2,920; *responses per respondent,* 1; *total annual responses,* 2,920; *preparation hours per response,* 3; and *total response burden hours,* 8,760; and *total recordkeeping hours,* 2,920.

**OBTAINING COPIES OF PROPOSALS:** Requester may obtain a copy of the justification from the General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (MVRS), 1800 F Street, NW, Room 4035, Washington, DC 20405, telephone (202) 501–4755. Please cite OMB Control No. 9000–0028, Termination Requirements, in all correspondence.

Dated: August 24, 1998.

**Jeremy F. Olson,**

*Acting Director, Federal Acquisition Policy Division.*

[FR Doc. 98–23110 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–34–U

---

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Defense Intelligence Agency

### Science and Technology Advisory Board Closed Panel Meeting

**AGENCY:** Department of Defense, Defense Intelligence Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (d) of Section 10 of Public Law 92–463, as amended by Section 5 of Public Law 94–409, notice is hereby given that a closed meeting of the DIA Science and Technology Advisory Board has been scheduled as follows:

**DATES:** 10 September 1998 (800 am to 1600 pm).

**ADDRESSES:** The Defense Intelligence Agency, Bolling AFB, Washington, DC 20340–5100.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Maj Donald R. Culp, USAF, Executive Secretary, DIA Science and Technology Advisory Board, Washington, D.C. 20340–1328 (202) 231–4930.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The entire meeting is devoted to the discussion of classified information as defined in Section 552(b)(c)(l), Title 5 of the U.S. Code and therefore will be closed to the public. The Board will receive briefings on and discuss several current critical intelligence issues and advise the Director, DIA, on related scientific and technical matters.

Dated: August 24, 1998.

**Patricia L. Toppings,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 98–23102 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–M

---

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

### Intent to Grant Exclusive Patent License; Novavax Inc.

**AGENCY:** U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Army hereby gives notice of its intent to grant to Novavax Inc., a revocable, nonassignable, exclusive license in the United States to practice the Government owned invention described in U.S. Patent No. 5,453,271, entitled ''Vaccine against ricin toxin,'' issued September 26, 1995. Anyone wishing to object to the grant of this license has 60 days from the date of this notice to file written objections along with supporting evidence, if any. Written objections may be filed with the Office of the Command Judge Advocate, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, 504 Scott Street, Fort Detrick, Maryland, 21702–5012, ATTN: MCMR–JA.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Elizabeth Arwine, Attorney Advisor, (301) 619–2065 or fax (301) 619–5034.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** None.

**Gregory D. Showalter,**

*Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98–23200 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

---

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

### Availability of Exclusive Licensing of U.S. Patent Concerning Vaccine Against Ricin Toxin

**AGENCY:** U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with 37 CFR 404.6, announcement is made of the availability for licensing of U.S. Patent No. 5,453,271, entitled ''Vaccine against ricin toxin,'' issued September 26, 1995. This patent has been assigned to the United States of America as represented by the Secretary of the Army.

**ADDRESSES:** Office of the Command Judge Advocate, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, 504 Scott Street, Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702–5012, ATTN: MCMR-JA.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Elizabeth Arwine, Attorney Advisor, (301) 619–2065 or fax (301) 619–5034.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This invention is a method for immunizing susceptible mammals to the pathological effects of exposure to ricin toxin. This immunization occurs by administration of a composition of matter comprising an antigenic effective amount of ricin A chain and essentially free of ricin B chain in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

**Gregory D. Showalter,**

*Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98–23199 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–M

---

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

### Performance Review Boards; Membership

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is given of the names of members of the Performance Review Boards for the Department of the Army.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 1, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kate Barnett Mack, U.S. Army Senior Executive Service Office, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), 111 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310–0111.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 4314(c)(1) through (5) of Title 5, U.S.C., requires each agency to establish, in accordance with regulations, one or more Senior Executive Service

performance review boards. The boards shall review and evaluate the initial appraisal of senior executives' performance by supervisors and make recommendations to the appointing authority or rating official relative to the performance of these executives.

The members of the Performance Review Board for the Office, Secretary of the Army are:

1. Sandra R. Riley, Deputy Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army Office, Secretary of the Army.
2. Levator Norsworthy, Jr., Deputy General Counsel (Acquisition), Office, General Counsel.
3. Thomas Taylor, Senior Deputy General Counsel, Office, General Counsel.
4. Mr. James W. Bohmbach, Director of Management and Control, ASA (FM&C).
5. MG Clair F. Gill, Deputy ASA for Army Budget, ASA (FM&C).
6. Mr. David Borland, Vice Director to the DISC4.
7. Ms. Miriam F. Browning, Director of Army Information, DISC4.
8. Mr. Jayson L. Spiegel, Deputy ASA (Force Management, Manpower and Resources), ASA (M&RA).
9. Mr. David L. Snyder, Director for Civilian Personnel Management and Operations, ASA (M&RA).
10. Mr. Michael L. Davis, Deputy ASA (Policy and Legislation), ASA (CW).
11. Mr. Raymond J. Fatz, DASA (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health), ASA (IL&E).
12. Dr. John B. Foulkes, Director, Test and Evaluation Management Agency, DUSA (OR).
13. BG Joseph L. Yakovac, Jr., Assistant Deputy, ASA (RDA).
14. Dr. A. Michael Andrews II, Director for Technology; ASA (RDA).
15. Mr. Francis E. Reardon, The Auditor General, Army Audit Agency.
16. Mr. Thomas Druzgal, Deputy Auditor General, Army Audit Agency.

The members of the Performance Review Board for the U.S. Army Materiel Command are:

1. Major General Norman E. Williams, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics and Operations, HQ, AMC.
2. Major General Steven Boutelli, Program Executive Officer, Command, Control and Communications Systems, Army Acquisition Executive.
3. Brigadier General John P. Geis, Commander, U.S. Army Simulation, Training and Instrumentation Command, AMC.
4. Ms. Vicky R. Armbruster, Deputy Program Executive Officer, Tactical Missiles, Army Acquisition Executive.
5. Mr. James L. Bacon, Deputy Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization Operations, Army Acquisition Executive.
6. Mr. James J. Barbarello, Director, Command, Control, and Systems Integration, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command, AMC.
7. Mr. Paul Bogosian, Deputy Program Executive Officer, Aviation, Army Acquisition Executive.
8. Ms. L. Marlene Cruze, Executive Director, Acquisition Center, U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command, AMC.
9. Dr. Larry O. Daniel, Acting Associate Director for Systems, Missile Research, Development, and Engineering Center, U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command, AMC.
10. Mr. James L. Flinn III, Director, Integrated Materiel Management Center, U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command, AMC.
11. Mr. Frank E. Fiorilli, Deputy for Business, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command, AMC.
12. Dr. James Gantt, Director, Information Science and Technology, U.S. Army Research Office, AMC.
13. Mr. Robert V. Kennedy, Director, Advanced Systems/Associate Director for Technology, U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command, AMC.
14. Mr. Anthony A. LaPlaca, Director, CECOM Logistics and Readiness Center, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command, AMC.
15. Mr. Victor Lindner, Associate Technical Director for Systems Development and Engineering, Armament RD&E Center, U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command.
16. Dr. Ingo W. May, Director, Weapons and Materials Research, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, AMC.
17. Mr. Daniel G. Mehney, Director, Acquisition Center, U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command.
18. Mr. A. Q. Oldacre, Deputy Program Executive officer, Air and Missile Defense, Army Acquisition Executive.
19. Mr. Raymond G. Pollard III, Civilian Deputy/Chief Engineer, U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command, AMC.
20. Ms. Renata F. Price, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for RD&A Science and Technology, U.S. Army Materiel Command.
21. Mr. Vemula P. Rao, Vice President for Customer Engineering, U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command.
22. Dr. Joseph J. Rocchio, Deputy Director, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, AMC.
23. Mr. Larry D. Scheuble, Director, Integrated Materiel Management Center, U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command.
24. Mr. Anthony B. Sconyers, Chief Counsel, U.S. Army Industrial Operations Command, IOC.
25. Mr. David J. Shaffer, Director, U.S. Army Materiel Systems Analysis Activity.
26. Ms. Kathryn Szymanski, Command Counsel, U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command, AMC.
27. Mr. Gary A. Tull, Principal Deputy for Acquisition, U.S. Army Materiel Command.

The members of the Performance Review Board for the Army Acquisition Executive are:

1. Mr. Paul Bogosian, Deputy Program Executive Officer, Aviation.
2. Mr. Edward T. Bair, Deputy Program Executive Officer, Intelligence and Electronic Warfare.
3. BG Joseph L. Yakovac, Assistant Deputy for Systems Management and Horizontal Technology Integration, Office of the Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition).

The members of the Performance Review Board for the U.S. Army Consolidated Commands are:

1. Ms. Vicky L. Jefferis, Acting Deputy Chief of Staff for Resources and Evaluation, U.S. Army Forces Command.
2. Mr. William S. Rich, Jr., Deputy and Technical Director, USA National Ground Intelligence Center, U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command.
3. Mr. Thomas D. Collinsworth, Director, MTMC Transportation Engineering Agency, Military Traffic Management Command.
4. Mr. Jess F. Granone, Director, Sensors Directorate, USA Space & Missile Defense Command.
5. Dr. Michael Lavan, Director, Advanced Technology Directorate, USA Space & Missile Defense Command.
6. Mr. Roy Reynolds, Director of Operations, TRADOC Analysis Center, White Sands Missile Range, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.

7. Mr. Edgar B. Vandiver III, Director, U.S. Army Concepts Analysis Agency.
8. Mr. William M. Robinson, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Engineering (International Affairs), U.S. Army Europe and Seventh Army.

The members of the Performance Review Board for the Chief of Staff are:

1. BG Albert J. Madora, Deputy Director, Program Analysis & Evaluation Directorate, Vice Chief of Staff, Army.
2. Mr. Edgar B. Vandiver III, Director, U.S. Army Concepts Analysis Agency, Director of the Army Staff.
3. Dr. Jeffrey Clarke, Chief Historian, U.S. Army Center of Military History, Director of the Army Staff.
4. Ms. Jean M. Bennett, Director, Programs & Analysis Directorate, Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence.
5. Mr. Mark J. O'Konski, Director, Logistics Integration Agency, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics.
6. MG Julian A. Sullivan, Jr., Director of Supply and Maintenance, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics.
7. Mr. John A. Riente, Technical Advisor to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans.
8. BG(P) Benjamin S. Griffin, Director of Force Programs, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans.
9. BG James J. Lovelace, Jr., Director of Training, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans.
10. MG Thomas W. Garrett, Commander, U.S. Total Army Personnel Command, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.
11. BG Kathryn Carlson, Special Assistant to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.
12. Ms. Maureen Lishcke, Program Executive Officer, National Guard Bureau.

**Gregory D. Showalter,**

*Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 98–23202 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–P

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

### Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Northeast Phoenix Drainage Area Feasibility Study; Maricopa County, AZ

**AGENCY:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Los Angeles District, DOD.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The Los Angeles District intends to prepare an EIS to support the proposed study for flood control and drainage in the Northeast Phoenix area. The Northeast Phoenix Drainage feasibility study area is located in the Northeast of the City of Phoenix, and adjacent communities. The Study area is roughly bounded by Carefree Highway on the North, Cave Creek Road to the West, the Central Arizona Project canal to the South, and Scottsdale Road to the East. The study will analyze flooding ad drainage problems in the study area and primarily on Rawhide Wash and alluvial fan 5 and 6.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

For further information contact Mr. David Compas, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Attn.: CESPL–PD–RN, P.O. Box 532711, Los Angeles, California, 90053–2325; phone (213) 452–3850; E-mail dcompas@spl.usace.army.mil.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** To prepare for the preparation of the EIS, the Corps will be conducting a public scoping meeting on September 8, 1998, at 7 P.M., at the Paradise Valley Community Center located at 17402 N. 40th St., Phoenix, Arizona. This scoping meeting will be held to solicit public input on significant environmental issues associated with the proposed project. The public, as well as Federal, State, and local agencies are encouraged to participate in the scoping process by attending the Scoping Meeting and/or submitting data, information, and comments identifying relevant environmental and socioeconomic issues to be addressed in the environmental analysis. Useful information includes other environmental studies, published and unpublished data, and alternatives that should be addressed in the analysis. Individuals and agencies may offer information or data relevant to the proposed study and provide comments suggestions by attending the public scoping meeting, or by mailing the information within thirty (30) days to Mr. David Compas. Requests to be placed on the mailing list for announcements and the Draft EIS also should be sent to Mr. David Compas.

*Alternatives:* A full array of alternatives to the proposed action will be developed for further analyses. The proposed plan, viable project alternatives, and the no action plan will be carried forward for detailed analysis in the National Environmental Policy Act document.

Dated: August 19, 1998.

**Robert L. Davis,**

*Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer.*

[FR Doc. 98–23201 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–KF–M

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Scrub Alloy Stored at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

**AGENCY:** Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Energy (DOE) announces the availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Scrub Alloy Stored at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (DOE/EIS–0277F, August 1998). The Final EIS analyzes reasonable alternatives for the management of certain plutonium residues and all of the scrub alloy at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (Rocky Flats) near Golden, Colorado. Plutonium residues and scrub alloy are materials that were generated while processing plutonium during the manufacture of components for nuclear weapons. The Final EIS analyzes processing technologies for various material categories of residues (e.g., ash, salts, fluorides) and the scrub alloy. Processing of these materials is needed to address health and safety issues associated with their continued storage and to prepare them for disposal or other disposition. DOE has prepared this Final EIS pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321, *et seq.*), in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508) and the DOE NEPA implementing regulations (10 CFR Part 1021).

DOE analyzed four alternatives, in addition to the Preferred Alternative, for each of the categories of Rocky Flats plutonium residues and scrub alloy. The Final EIS identifies the rationale for identifying the treatment technologies as preferred.

All of the alternatives analyzed in the Final EIS were either analyzed in the Draft EIS or are composed of elements of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS, with the exception of two new candidate processing technologies similar to technologies analyzed in the Draft EIS. Nevertheless, because certain