

foreign military sales (FMS) requirements to submit a separate progress payment request for each progress payment rate, and to submit a supporting schedule that clearly distinguishes the contract's FMS requirements from U.S. requirements. The Government uses this information to determine how much of each country's funds to disburse to the contractor.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit and not-for profit institutions.

Annual Burden Hours: 5,400 (includes 3,600 recordkeeping hours).

Number of Respondents: 150.

Responses per Respondent: 24.

Annual Responses: 3,600.

Average Burden per Response: .5 hours.

Frequency: On occasion.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Summary of Information Collection

The information collection includes requirements relating to DFARS Part 232, Contract Financing.

a. DFARS 232.502-4-70(a) prescribes use of the clause at DFARS 252.232-7002, Progress Payments for Foreign Military Sales Acquisitions, in any contract that provides for progress payments and contains foreign military sales requirements.

b. DFARS 252.232-7002 requires contractors whose contracts include foreign military sales requirements to submit a separate progress payment request for each progress payment rate, and to submit a supporting schedule that clearly distinguishes the contract's foreign military sales requirements from U.S. requirements.

Michele P. Peterson,
Executive Editor, Defense Acquisition Regulations Council.

[FR Doc. 96-27280 Filed 10-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

Office of the Secretary

Ballistic Missile Defense Advisory Committee

ACTION: Notice of advisory committee meeting.

SUMMARY: The Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) Advisory Committee will meet in closed session in Norfolk, Virginia, on November 7-8, 1996.

The mission of the BMD Advisory Committee is to advise the Secretary of Defense and Deputy Secretary of Defense, through the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology), on all matters relating to BMD acquisition, system development, and technology.

In accordance with Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, as amended by 5 U.S.C., Appendix II, it is hereby determined that this BMD Advisory Committee meeting concerns matters listed in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1), and that accordingly this meeting will be closed to the public.

Dated: October 21, 1996.

Linda M. Bynum,
*OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer,
Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 96-27318 Filed 10-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

Department of the Navy, DoD

Notice of Public Hearing for the Joint Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for Disposal and Proposed Reuse of the Naval Medical Center Oakland, Oakland, CA

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15170, the Department of the Navy, in coordination with the City of Oakland, California, has prepared and filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency a joint Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for disposal and proposed reuse of the former Naval Medical Center Oakland (NMCO) property and structures in Oakland, California. The Navy is the lead agency for NEPA documentation and the City of Oakland is the lead agency for CEQA documentation. The Draft EIS/EIR is being prepared in compliance with the 1993 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) directive from Congress to close NMCO. NMCO property will be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act (Pub. L. 101-510) of 1990 as amended, and applicable federal property disposal regulations. NMCO closed on September 30, 1996.

The Draft EIS/EIR assesses the potential impacts to the environment that may result from Navy disposal of the NMCO property and subsequent community reuse. The Oakland Base Reuse Authority (OBRA) has adopted a Final Reuse Plan for the NMCO property. The NMCO Reuse Plan was adopted in June 1996 and published for distribution in August 1996. The preferred reuse alternative described in the Draft EIS/EIR as the Maximum

Capacity alternative proposes development of an executive 9-hole golf course combined with residential development, mixed corporate, commercial and residential uses, open space, and active recreation.

In addition to the preferred alternative, the other alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS/EIR include: (1) A Mixed Use Village alternative that would include a mixed use zone, areas for a research and development facility, cultural/meeting facilities, neighborhood retail development, residential development, open space, and active recreation; (2) a Single Use Campus alternative that would include an educational campus, neighborhood retail development, open space, and active recreation; and (3) a Residential alternative that would include either low-density or high-density housing units, combined with neighborhood retail development, open space, and active recreation; and (4) a "No Action" alternative that would result in the NMCO property remaining in federal ownership in a caretaker status.

The Draft EIS/EIR is available for Review at the following public libraries in the vicinity of NMCO: (1) Oakland-Eastmont Mall Branch Library, 175 Eastmont Mall, 2nd Floor, Oakland, CA; (2) Oakland-Montclair Branch Library, 1687 Mountain Blvd., Oakland, CA; (3) Oakland Main Library, 125 14th Street, Oakland, CA; and (4) San Leandro Main Library, 300 Estudillo Ave., San Leandro, CA.

ADDRESSES: The Navy will conduct a public hearing on Wednesday, November 13, 1996, at 6:30 p.m., in the Hearing Room 2, City Hall, One City Hall Plaza, Oakland, California, to inform the public of the Draft EIS/EIR findings and to solicit comments. Federal, state and local agencies, and interested individuals are invited to be present or represented at the hearing. Oral comments will be heard and transcribed by a stenographer. To assure accuracy of the record, all comments should be submitted in writing. All comments, both oral and written, will become part of the public record in the study. In the interest of available time, each speaker will be asked to limit oral comments to five minutes. Longer comments should be summarized at the public hearing and submitted in writing either at the hearing or mailed to the address listed below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: All written comments must be submitted no later than November 27, 1996 to Mr. Gary J. Muneakawa (Code 185GM), Engineering Field Activity West, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, 900

Commodore Drive, San Bruno, California 94066-5006, telephone (415) 244-3022, fax (415) 244-3737. For information concerning the EIR, please contact Ms. Anu Raud, City of Oakland, Community and Economic Development Agency, telephone (415) 238-6346, or fax (510) 238-4730. For further information regarding the Oakland Base Reuse Planning Process, please contact Mr. Mel Blair, City of Oakland Base Reuse Authority, telephone (510) 238-6908, or fax (510) 238-2936.

Dated: October 21, 1996.

M.A. Waters,
LCDR, JAGC, USN, Alternate Federal Register
Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 96-27277 Filed 10-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the "Government in the Sunshine Act" (5 U.S.C. § 552b), notice is hereby given of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board's (Board) meeting to inform the public on the status of the Board's oversight of the Department of Energy's (DOE) initiatives to simplify existing safety orders and to promulgate new rules.

TIME AND DATE: November 7, 1996, 9:00 a.m.

PLACE: The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Public Hearing Room, 625 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20004.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: 42 U.S.C. § 2286a requires that the Board review and evaluate the content and implementation of standards relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of defense nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy. Those standards include rules, DOE safety orders, and other requirements. Since 1990, the Board, acting pursuant to its enabling statute, has issued a series of recommendations designed to foster the development and implementation of an effective standards-based nuclear safety program within DOE.

The Secretary of Energy has accepted each of these recommendations. In the meantime, DOE has engaged in a number of initiatives designed to simplify existing safety orders and the promulgation of new safety rules. The streamlining of safety orders affecting defense nuclear facilities and the promulgation of new rules has required the Board to commit substantial

resources to assure that DOE did not eliminate sound engineering practices codified in existing safety orders that are necessary to adequately protect the public health and safety. During the past two years, the Board's staff has conducted reviews of all DOE revisions to safety orders and rules.

DOE's efforts continue, as does the Board's oversight to ensure full development and implementation of safety standards tailored to each DOE defense nuclear facility's hazards. The Board believes that the public interest will be served by holding a public meeting to assess DOE's progress in streamlining the safety orders and promulgating new safety rules pertaining to its defense nuclear facilities, and to assure that DOE's activities in streamlining DOE's nuclear safety order system and converting to its new regulatory system do not eliminate the sound engineering practices now codified in its safety orders that are necessary to adequately protect public health and safety.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Robert M. Andersen, General Counsel, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20004, (800) 788-4016. This is a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Board has a responsibility for oversight of DOE's development and implementation of nuclear health and safety requirements as a transition is being made from the use of safety orders to rules. The Board understands DOE's desire to streamline its system of directives. Nevertheless, the Board continues to be concerned that the conversion process not compromise the requirements-based safety program not embodied in the DOE's safety orders and existing regulations.

During the past two years, the Board has held three Board meetings, open to the public, regarding its review of DOE efforts to revise and improve nuclear safety requirements. This will be the fourth in that series. On May 31, 1995, the Board met to lay the groundwork for a full assessment of how Standards/Requirements Identification Documents, rules, orders, and other safety requirements are integrated into an overall safety management program for defense nuclear facilities. This meeting was continued on July 18, 1995. The Board's staff reported on their comprehensive review of existing orders and rules, their adequacy, and the status of DOE revisions to safety orders and rules. Individual Board members presented their views. Then, in a joint meeting with DOE officials on

September 20, 1996, DOE's representatives reported on the status of DOE's review and revision of nuclear safety orders and rules, and the Board identified safety issues requiring resolution, including inappropriate application of "sunset provisions" to safety orders, the need for "crosswalks" showing the disposition of requirements in superseded safety orders, the need to preserve sound engineering practice embodied in guidance documents. The Board reserved its right to further comment after it completed its integrated review of how rules, orders, and other safety requirements are being revised and integrated into an overall safety management program for defense nuclear facilities. The Board reiterated its concern that DOE's streamlining and conversion process not compromise the requirements-based safety program currently embodied in contracts which incorporate applicable DOE safety orders.

In accordance with the statute establishing the Board, a public meeting will be conducted to assess DOE's activities in streamlining DOE's nuclear safety order system and converting to a regulatory program and to determine if DOE is taking sufficient steps to assure that this effort not eliminate the engineering practices now codified in its safety orders that are necessary to adequately protect public health and safety. To assist the Board and inform the public, individual Board members will present their views, and the Board's staff will brief the Board on several related topics, including, but not limited to:

1. A comprehensive report on the status of staff reviews conducted over the past two years of DOE's revision of safety orders, rules, and "crosswalks" which track the original set of fifty-two orders of interest to the Board through the revision process and/or conversion to rules.

2. Identification and discussion of the superseding streamlined order system.

3. DOE's new rules affecting health and safety at defense nuclear facilities.

4. Actions taken to address the Board's concerns that the safety envelope currently in place to ensure adequate protection of the public health and safety is not inadvertently compromised by DOE's effort to streamline its directive.

5. Lessons learned regarding the managerial tools needed to assure that DOE's activities in streamlining its nuclear safety order system and converting to a regulatory program not eliminate the engineering practices now codified in its safety orders that are necessary to adequately protect public