of burden accurate, (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected, and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Dated: August 29, 1996.

Gloria Parker,

Director, Information Resources Group.

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Type of Review: New.
Title: Guidance on the Goals 2000 Amendments (Draft).
Frequency: One-time submission.
Affected Public: State, local or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.
Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:
Responses: 30
Burden Hours: 3,000
Abstract: The Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 amended portions of Titles II and III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Included within those amendments is a provision which offers states an alternative to submitting their Goals 2000 plans in order to receive funding.

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Type of Review: New.
Title: Guidance on the Goals 2000 Amendments (Draft).
Frequency: Annually.
Affected Public: State, local or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.
Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:
Responses: 56
Burden Hours: 5,600
Abstract: The Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 amended portions of Titles II and III of the Goals 2000: Educate American Act. The guidance document which was created to clarify these amendments addresses the reporting requirements of states participating in Goals 2000.

[FR Doc. 96–22585 Filed 9–4–96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Construction and Operation of an Accelerator for the Production of Tritium at the Savannah River Site

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) announces its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Construction and Operation of an Accelerator for the Production of Tritium at the Savannah River Site pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 USC 4321 et seq.). DOE intends to select various options and a location on the Savannah River Site (SRS) for the construction and operation of an accelerator to produce tritium to support the nuclear weapons stockpile, as announced in the Record of Decision for the Tritium Supply and Recycling Environmental Impact Statement.

DOE has also decided to prepare an EIS for the Construction and Operation of a Tritium Extraction Facility at the SRS. That EIS is the subject of a separate Notice of Intent (NOI), but will have scoping meetings concurrent with the Accelerator Production of Tritium (APT) EIS scoping meetings.

DATES: Comments from the public and others will be accepted during the scoping period, which will continue until November 1, 1996. Written comments submitted by mail should be postmarked by that date to ensure consideration. DOE will consider comments mailed after that date to the extent practicable. DOE will conduct public scoping meetings to assist in defining the appropriate scope of the EIS and identifying significant environmental issues to be addressed. Meetings for the APT EIS will be held concurrently with those of the Operation of the Tritium Extraction Facility EIS, with separate workshops possible depending on attendance levels. Notices of the dates, times, and locations of the scoping meetings will be announced in the local media at least 15 days before the meetings.

ADDRESSES: Please direct written comments or suggestions on the scope of the EIS, requests to speak at the public scoping meetings, and questions concerning the project to: Mr. Andrew R. Grainger, U.S. Department of Energy, Savannah River Operations Office, P.O. Box 5031, Aiken, SC 29804–5031; phone 1–800–242–8269; or E-mail: nepa@barms036.b-r.com. Mark envelopes: ''Accelerator Production of Tritium EIS Comments''

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information on the DOE NEPA process, please contact: Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance (EH–42), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585; telephone 202–586–4600; or to leave a message at 1–800- 472–2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: SRS is an 800 square kilometer (300 square mile) controlled access area located in southwestern South Carolina. The Site is approximately 25 miles southeast of Augusta, Georgia, and 20 miles south of Aiken, South Carolina. Since its establishment, the mission of SRS has been to produce nuclear materials that support the defense, research, and medical programs of the United States.

With the end of the Cold War and the reduction in the size of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile, there is no longer a requirement to produce new nuclear materials for defense purposes with the exception of tritium. As a result, activities at SRS have shifted from nuclear material production to cleanup and environmental restoration. All production reactors are permanently shut down. However, a new source of tritium is needed to support the nuclear weapons stockpile well into the twenty-first century. Tritium has a relatively short half life (12.3 years) and therefore must be periodically replenished in each weapon in the stockpile.

The Department evaluated the programmatic need for a new tritium source in a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for Tritium Supply and Recycling (DOE/EIS–0161, October 1995). Based on the findings in the PEIS and other technical, cost, and schedule evaluations, the Department issued a Record of Decision (ROD) on December 5, 1995 (60 FR 63877, December 12, 1995). In the ROD, the Department decided to pursue a dual-track approach on the two most promising tritium supply alternatives: (1) To initiate purchase of an existing commercial reactor (operating or partially complete) for conversion to a defense facility, or purchase of irradiation services with an option to purchase the reactor; and (2) to design, build, and test critical components of an accelerator system for tritium production. Within a three-year period, the Department would select one of these approaches to serve as the primary source of tritium. The other alternative, if feasible, would continue to be developed as a backup tritium source. SRS was selected as the location for an accelerator, should one be built. Under the ROD, the tritium recycling facilities at SRS would be upgraded and consolidated, and a tritium extraction facility would be constructed at SRS to support both of the dual-track options.

The Department's strategy for compliance with NEPA has been, first, to make decisions on programmatic alternatives as described and evaluated in the Tritium Supply and Recycling PEIS. This evaluation was intended to

be followed by site-specific analyses to implement the selected programmatic decisions. The decisions made in the December 5, 1995, ROD have resulted in the Department proposing to prepare the following NEPA documents:

1. An EIS for the Selection of One or More Commercial Light Water Reactors for Tritium Production

2. An EIS for the Construction and Operation of an Accelerator for the Production of Tritium at the Savannah River Site

3. An Environmental Assessment for the Tritium Facility Modnerzation and Consolidation at the Savannah River Site

4. An EIS for the Construction and Operation of a Tritium Extraction Facility at the Savannah River Site

The EIS that is the subject of this NOI is the second of the proposed NEPA documents listed above. The preparation of the EIS for Construction and Operation of the Accelerator for Production of Tritium supports the planning within the Department for a long-term supply of tritium. However, the Department has not yet decided to actually build the accelerator. As noted in the Record of Decision for the Tritium Supply and Recycling PEIS, about three years of feasibility demonstration research are needed before the Department will decide whether the accelerator would be the lead (or backup) technology for tritium production.

Accelerator Production of Tritium: Production of tritium in an accelerator would occur through the following process: Protons are produced in an injector by ionizing hydrogen atoms to form a proton beam. The proton beam is initially accelerated by a series of radio-frequency magnetic sectors to increase the proton beam to its final speed of approximately 90% the speed of light. In each of these sections, electrical energy is converted to microwave energy by klystrons (a vacuum tube that converts electrical power into high power microwaves). The proton beam is then expanded to distribute the protons evenly across the face of a tungsten target. The proton beam strikes the target, producing neutrons by a process called spallation. Additional neutrons are produced and then slowed in a blanket assembly composed of lead and water which surrounds the target. The blanket also contains pipes with either helium-3 gas or solid lithium-6 aluminum alloy targets that capture the neutrons to produce tritium. The tritium is extracted continuously from the helium-3 in a co-located tritium separation facility. The lithium-6 aluminum alloy targets must be periodically removed and shipped to a nearby Tritium Extraction Facility for batch removal of the tritium. The accelerator will be designed with the capacity to produce up to 3 kilograms of tritium per year.

The construction and operation impacts of the alternatives will be examined in this EIS. The alternatives to be considered are combinations of site location and technology options:

1. Site location options: An initial evaluation of the entire SRS was made using four categories of disqualifying conditions: ecology, human health, geology/hydrology, and engineering. This evaluation identified those parts of the site where an APT could not be sited. A footprint 2000 meters long and 500 meters wide (247 acres) was used to identify potential locations. This size was considered conservative and bounding. Once disqualified locations were identified, a second set of screening criteria was used on the remaining candidates to evaluate the suitability of each particular site, based on impact to twenty-one factors: (1) Terrestrial ecology; (2) Aquatic ecology; (3) Wetland ecology; (4) Distance to population centers; (5) Distance to SRS boundary; (6) Impact of incidents at existing facilities on APT; (7) Ability of groundwater to supply 6000 gpm (0.38 m^3 /sec); (8) Depth to groundwater; (9) Stability of subsurface conditions; (10) Thermal capacity of soil; (11) Distance to the tritium loading facility; (12) Distance to rail lines; (13) Archaeology; (14) Distance to acceptable road; (15) Terrain; (16) Foundation conditions; (17) Distance to NPDES discharge point; (18) Distance to site utilities; (19) Distance to Centralized Sewage Treatment Plant tie-in; (20) Disruption to site infrastructure; and (21) Presence of existing waste site. Based on this evaluation scores were calculated and the potential sites ranked, as described below:

Proposed Action: A site located 3 miles northeast of the Tritium Loading Facility (TLF), formerly known as the Replacement Tritium Facility (RTF) (Building 233–H in H-Area); ALTERNATIVE: a site located 2 miles northwest of the TLF. OTHER ALTERNATIVES, which were dismissed from detailed analysis, included eight potential locations; these were screened out in a siting study based on the 21 factors listed above.

2. Cooling water system options: PROPOSED ACTION: Mechanical draft cooling towers with river water makeup. ALTERNATIVES: once-through cooling using river water; mechanical draft cooling towers with groundwater makeup; and use of the K-Reactor cooling tower with river water makeup.

A study performed at SRS evaluated these four choices for cooling. In some cases, parts of the existing River Water System would be used. As described in the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for Shutdown of the River Water System (61 FR 29744), some portions of the River Water System could be placed in a higher state of readiness than in ''layup'' condition, and could be restarted in a relatively short period of time. The use of river water makeup to mechanical draft cooling towers was used as the base case for comparison and is the proposed cooling mechanism. Under this alternative, major portions of the existing River Water System would be upgraded or replaced with modern components. Approximately 6000 gpm (0.38 m^3/sec) of makeup water would be supplied to the cooling water system to make up for losses due to blowdown and evaporation. Blowdown would be directed to Par Pond.

With the second alternative, once-through cooling, approximately 125,000 gpm (7.88 m^3/sec) of river water would flow through heat exchangers and discharge to Par Pond. The third cooling water alternative would use 6000 gpm (0.38 m^3/sec) of groundwater makeup to the cooling water system to make up for losses due to blowdown and evaporation. This alternative would also use mechanical draft cooling towers. Blowdown would be directed to Par Pond. The fourth cooling water alternative would involve the existing K- Reactor natural draft cooling tower. Approximately 125,000 gpm (7.88 m^3/sec) of cooling water would circulate from heat exchangers at the APT to the cooling tower. This alternative would need 6000 gpm (0.38 m^3/sec) of river water makeup. Blowdown would be directed to Pen Branch, which flows into the Savannah River.

Two cooling water alternatives were eliminated in the study. The first was to use Par Pond as a source of once-through cooling water for the APT. This alternative was eliminated based on cost and technical uncertainty, due to the conditions of the components in the Par Pond pump house. The second alternative dismissed was to construct a new cooling pond to dissipate heat. Preliminary estimates of the size of pond necessary to dissipate the heat indicated the need for a very large pond, which would present permitting and environmental issues greater than those under other alternatives.

3. Accelerator technology: PROPOSED ACTION: room temperature. ALTERNATIVE: superconducting.

A room temperature accelerator has a higher demand for electricity when compared to a superconducting accelerator. In an accelerator, large currents are set up inside metal cavities, which in turn create the electric fields that accelerate the proton beam. Energy losses occur as a result of the internal resistance of the cavity material. In a room temperature accelerator, these energy losses are significant. In a superconducting accelerator, the cavities are cooled to the point that resistance is negligible, thus minimizing the energy loss. A room temperature accelerator by definition requires no special temperature for operation, but a superconducting APT would require the construction and operation of a cryogenic plant in the APT complex.

4. Target physics: PROPOSED ACTION: Blanket type: Helium-3. ALTERNATIVE: Lithium-6 Aluminum alloy blanket.

The proposed blanket utilizes helium-3. Through neutron capture, the helium-3 is converted to tritium, which can be extracted continuously in the co-located tritium separations facility. The lithium-6 aluminum alloy blanket through neutron capture converts lithium to tritium and helium-4. The lithium-6 aluminum alloy is a metal, which must be removed and the tritium extracted in a batch process. This extraction would take place in the Tritium Extraction Facility (TEF). The impacts of extraction will be discussed in the separate EIS being prepared for the TEF.

5. Accelerator Power Source: **PROPOSED ACTION:** Radio frequency (RF) power tube (klystron). **ALTERNATIVE:** Inductive-Output Tube (IOT).

A klystron is an evacuated electron-beam tube that is used as an oscillator/amplifier in ultrahigh frequency circuits like television transmitters and radar equipment. In the APT, klystrons are used as RF power amplifiers to convert electric power to amplified RF (microwave) power which in turn accelerates the protons. An IOT is an RF amplifier currently under development. Its different design results in an improved efficiency and lower electrical power requirements.

6. Electric power supply: **PROPOSED ACTION:** Existing sources. **ALTERNATIVE:** a new power plant.

Because of the APT's power requirements (up to approximately 550 megawatts), the options for availability and reliability of the electric power supply to the accelerator will be analyzed. The purchase of power from South Carolina Electric and Gas (SCE&G) is the proposed option. This option includes system upgrades, capacitor bank or an additional 230 KV transmission line and a storage device, and use of an open access strategy. A second option is the generation of 550 megawatts from a generic new fossil fuel generating plant at an unknown location. This option would require a subsequent environmental analysis to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, if it is selected.

Proposed Action

DOE proposes to design a room temperature APT which is cooled using mechanical draft cooling towers with river water to make up for losses. Klystrons would supply the RF power, and helium-3 would capture neutrons. The APT would be located at the proposed site (see above) and would use existing sources of electricity.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

One alternative to the proposed action is not to select a technology or site. This is the No Action alternative required by the Council on Environmental Quality regulations. Under this alternative, the stockpile demands for tritium would have to be met through other means, such as the existing commercial reactor discussed above.

Other alternatives to the proposed action consist of any combination of the above APT technologies and two sites. Because of the large number of combinations, DOE will not explicitly describe the impacts of each possible combination. However, the EIS will describe the individual impacts of each option, and allow the reader to combine effects from any desired combination. In addition, DOE will identify the combination that has the most impact on the environment, thus providing a bounding case for comparison.

Identification of Environmental and Other Issues

The Department has identified the following issues for analysis for proposed and alternative actions in the EIS. Additional issues may be identified as a result of the scoping process.

1. Public and Worker Safety, Health Risk Assessment: Radiological and nonradiological impacts including projected effects on workers and the public from construction, operation and accident conditions.

2. Impacts from releases to air, water, and soil.

3. Impacts to plants, animals, and habitat, including impacts to wetlands, and threatened or endangered species and their habitat.

4. The consumption of natural resources and energy including water and natural gas.

5. Socioeconomic impacts to affected communities from construction and operation on labor forces and project purchases in the SRS area.

6. Environmental justice: Disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations.

7. Impacts to cultural resources such as historic, archaeological, scientific, or culturally important sites.

8. Compliance with all applicable Federal, state, and local statutes and regulations; required Federal and state environmental consultations and notifications; and DOE Orders on waste management, waste minimization initiatives, and environmental protection.

9. Cumulative impacts from the proposed action and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions at the SRS.

10. Potential irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources.

11. Pollution prevention and waste management practices, including waste characterization, storage, treatment and disposal.

Public Scoping Process: DOE will conduct public scoping meetings to assist in defining the appropriate scope of the EIS and to identify significant environmental issues to be addressed. Because another EIS for a separate tritium-related activity at SRS is commencing simultaneously (the TEF; see the notice in today's Federal Register), the public scoping meetings for the APT will be held concurrently with the public scoping meetings for the TEF EIS. DOE will begin each scoping meeting with an overview of tritium activities at SRS. Following the initial presentation, DOE will hold workshops on the APT and the TEF. These will either be separate workshops or a combined workshop depending on attendance levels. There will be two sessions at each meeting location. Copies of handouts from the meetings will be available to those unable to attend by writing Mr. Grainger at the address above, or by calling 1–800–242–8269.

Public notices on the dates, times, and locations of the scoping meetings will be announced in the local media at least 15 days before the meetings. DOE is committed to providing opportunities for the involvement of interested individuals and groups in this and other DOE planning activities.

The public, organizations, and agencies are invited to present oral and

written comments concerning (1) the scope of the EIS, (2) the issues the EIS should address, and (3) the alternatives the EIS should analyze. Please address written comments to Mr. Grainger at the address indicated above. These comments should be postmarked by November 1, 1996 to ensure full consideration.

Organizations and individuals wishing to participate in the public meeting can call 1–800–242–8269 between 8:30 AM and 5:00 PM Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, or submit their requests to Mr. Grainger at the address indicated above. DOE requests that anyone who wishes to speak at the scoping meeting preregister by contacting Mr. Grainger, either by phone or in writing. Preregistration should occur at least two days before the designated meeting. Persons who have not preregistered to speak may register at the meeting and will be called on to speak as time permits.

Related Documentation: Completed and ongoing environmental reviews both may affect the scope of this EIS. Background information is listed below on past, present, and future activities at the Savannah River Site.

Final Interim Management of Nuclear Materials Environmental Impact Statement, DOE/EIS–0220, 1995. This EIS contains information on DOE waste management activities which could be affected by APT waste streams.

Final Savannah River Site Waste Management, DOE/EIS–0217, 1995. This EIS contains information on SRS waste management activities which could be affected by APT waste streams.

Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Tritium Supply and Recycling, DOE/DOE–0161, 1995. This PEIS presents a programmatic environmental analysis of various ways to produce tritium, including commercial light water reactors, and the APT technology, including the location of an accelerator at SRS, if DOE decides to proceed with the APT.

Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Stockpile Stewardship and Management, DOE/EIS–0236, February, 1996. The cumulative analysis of the PEIS includes the impacts at the Savannah River Site from the Tritium Supply and Recycling Programmatic EIS for the construction of an accelerator, an upgraded tritium recycling facility, and an extraction facility.

Environmental Assessment for the Natural Fluctuation of Water Level In Par Pond and Reduced Water Flow In Steel Creek Below L Lake at the Savannah River Site, DOE/EA–1070, 1995. This EA contains information on PAR Pond, which could receive cooling water blowdown from some of the cooling options examined for the APT.

Environmental Impact Statement for Shutdown of the River Water System, DOE/EIS–0268 (in preparation; see 61 FR 29744).

Environmental Impact Statement for the Construction and Operation of a Tritium Extraction Facility at the Savannah River Site, (see notice in today's Federal Register).

Environmental Assessment for the Tritium Facility Modernization and Consolidation, (anticipated). The environmental assessment is to include the impacts of modernizing and consolidating the existing tritium recycling facilities at the Savannah River Site.

This information is available in the following two DOE public reading rooms: DOE Freedom of Information Reading Room, Room 1E–190, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585, phone 202–586–6020; and DOE Public Document Room, University of South Carolina, Aiken Campus, University Library, 2nd Floor, 171 University Parkway, Aiken, SC 29801, phone 803–648–6851.

Issued in Washington, D.C., this 29th day of August, 1996.

Peter N. Brush,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Environment, Safety, and Health.

[FR Doc. 96–22607 Filed 9–4–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for Construction and Operation of a Tritium Extraction Facility at the Savannah River Site

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) announces its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for construction and operation of a Tritium Extraction Facility (TEF) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 USC 4321 et seq.). In the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Tritium Supply and Recycling Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement issued December 5, 1995, and published in the Federal Register on December 12, 1995 (60 FR 63878), DOE decided to construct and operate a Tritium Extraction Facility (TEF) at the Savannah River Site (SRS) as part of a dual track strategy to ensure a supply of tritium to support the continuing nuclear weapons stockpile of the United States. One of the strategy tracks is the Commercial Light Water Reactor (CLWR) alternative, and the other is an accelerator system for tritium production. The primary tritium source will be selected within three years of the ROD issuance. The TEF would be built at SRS, and would be capable of extracting tritium both from CLWR targets and from an alternate design for accelerator targets. (The primary accelerator design would use a different technology to extract tritium.) This site-specific EIS would analyze the environmental impacts of construction and operation of the proposed TEF.

DOE has also decided to prepare an EIS for Accelerator Production of Tritium (APT) at the SRS. That EIS will be the subject of a separate Notice of Intent (NOI), but will have scoping meetings concurrent with the TEF process.

DATES: The public scoping period will be open until November 1, 1996. Written comments submitted by mail should be postmarked by that date to ensure consideration. DOE will consider comments mailed after that date to the extent practicable. DOE will conduct public scoping meetings to assist in defining the appropriate scope of the EIS and identifying significant environmental issues to be addressed. Meetings for the TEF EIS and the APT EIS will be held concurrently, with separate workshops possible depending upon attendance levels. Notices of the dates, times, and locations of the scoping meetings will be announced in the local media at least 15 days before the meetings.

ADDRESSES: Please direct written comments or suggestions on the scope of the EIS, requests to speak at the public scoping meetings, and questions concerning the project to: Mr. Andrew R. Grainger, U.S. Department of Energy, Savannah River Operations Office, P.O. Box 5031, Aiken, S.C. 29804–5031, 1–800–242–8269, E-mail: nepa@barms036.b-r.com. Mark the envelopes: ''Tritium Extraction Facility EIS Comments''

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information on the DOE NEPA process, please contact: Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance (EH–42), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585–0119, telephone 202–586–4600 or leave a message at 1–800–472–2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The SRS is an 800 square kilometer (300 square mile) controlled access area located in