

Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910 (301/713-2289).

Dated: February 7, 1996.

Ann D. Terbush,

Chief, Permits and Documentation Division,
Office of Protected Resources, National
Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 96-3828 Filed 2-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-F

Patent and Trademark Office

Trademark Processing

ACTION: Notice of proposed collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on the continuing information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), by the

Patent and Trademark Office (Office) in the performance of its statutory functions of examining, registering and maintaining trademarks, as required by the Trademark Act of 1946, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 1051, et seq.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before April 22, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington D.C. 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Requests for additional information should be directed to the attention of Lynne G. Beresford, Trademark Legal Administrator, at the Office of the Assistant Commissioner for Trademarks, 2900 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Va. 22202-3513 or by facsimile transmission to (703) 308-7220.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The Patent and Trademark Office (Office) administers the Trademark Act of 1946, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 1051 et

seq., which provides for the Federal registration of trademarks and service marks. Any individual or business owning a valid trademark or service mark that is both used in a type of commerce which can be controlled by Congress, and used in connection with goods or services, may apply to register its mark. A registration is valid for ten years and renewable for like periods. Federal registration is not necessary in order to use a mark, nor is registration required to obtain rights in a mark. Registration does provide certain procedural benefits, such as access to Federal court. Information collected by the Office is required by the statute or the rules and is used by the Office to determine the eligibility of trademarks or service marks for registration, to issue registrations, and to maintain the Register.

II. Method of Collection

Mail or facsimile transmission.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0651-0009.

| Title of form | Form No(s). | Estimated time for response | Est. annual burden hours | Est. annual responses |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Application for Trademark | 1478, 4.8 & 4.9 | 1 hour | 165,559 | 165,559 |
| Amendment to Allege Use | 1579 | 15 minutes | 1,222 | 4,882 |
| Statement of Use (SOU) | 1580 | 15 minutes | 4,626 | 18,505 |
| Extension of Time to File SOU | 1581 | 15 minutes | 8,438 | 33,750 |
| Opposition | 4.17 & 4.17(a) | 1 hour | 5,248 | 5,248 |
| Totals | | | 185,090 | 227,944 |

Type of Review: Regular.

Affected Public: The forms are used by trademark owners and trademark practitioners. However, use of the forms is not mandatory and many law firms and corporations develop their own forms. Information collected is a matter of public record, and is used by the public for a variety of private business purposes related to establishing and enforcing trademark rights. This information is important to the public, since both common law trademark owners and Federal trademark registrants must actively protect their own rights.

Estimated Total Annual Cost:

Estimated costs to the private sector are \$11,105,400.

Private sector costs were calculated using a composite rate of paralegal and attorney time. The paralegal hourly rate was calculated to be \$11 per hour. The professional rate was calculated to be \$108 per hour. In house costs were estimated to be \$142,853.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: February 14, 1996.

Linda Engelmeier,

Acting Departmental Forms Clearance
Officer, Office of Management and
Organization.

[FR Doc. 96-3823 Filed 2-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Army Science Board; Notice of Closed Meeting

In accordance with Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P.L. 92-463), announcement is made of the following Committee Meeting:

Name of Committee: Army Science Board (ASB).

Date of Meeting: 21-22 February 1996.

Time of Meeting: 0800-1700, 21 February 1996; 0800-1200, 22 February 1996.

Place: Pentagon—Washington, DC.

Agenda: The Army Science Board's (ASB) 1996 Summer Study on "Army Simulation Implementation and Use" will meet for briefings and discussions on the study subject. These meetings will be closed to the public in accordance with Section 552b(c) of Title 5, U.S.C., specifically paragraph (1) thereof, and Title 5, U.S.C., Appendix 2, subsection 10(d). The classified matters to be discussed are so inextricably intertwined so as to preclude opening any portion of these meetings. For further information, please contact Michelle Diaz at (703) 695-0781.

Michelle P. Diaz,

Acting Administrative Officer, Army Science Board.

[FR Doc. 96-3873 Filed 2-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

Army Science Board; Notice of Closed Meeting

In accordance with Section 10a(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P.L. 92-463), announcement is made of the following Committee Meeting:

Name of the Committee: Army Science Board (ASB), Special Study Panel on Reengineering the Acquisition and Modernization Processes of the Institutional Army.

Date of Meeting: 27 February 1996.

Time: 1000-1600 hours.

Place: Room 2D731 Pentagon, Washington, DC.

Agenda: The Army Science Board Special Study Panel on Reengineering the Acquisition And Modernization Processes of the Institutional Army will meet to discuss the current status of Army Modernization and to discuss plans to reengineer the Acquisition and Modernization processes. Discussion will include the current shortfalls in modernization and the attendant vulnerabilities to the U.S. Army. This meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with Section 552b(c) of Title 5, U.S.C., specifically subparagraph (1) thereof, and Title 5, U.S.C., Appendix 2, subsection 10(d). The classified and unclassified information to be discussed is so inextricably intertwined so as to preclude opening any portion of the meeting. The ASB Administrative Officer, Ms. Michelle Diaz, may be contacted for further information at (703) 695-0781.

Michelle P. Diaz,

Acting Administrative Officer, Army Science Board.

[FR Doc. 96-3872 Filed 2-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Savannah River Operations Office; Interim Management of Nuclear Materials at the Savannah River Site

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Supplemental Record of Decision.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) prepared a final environmental impact statement (EIS), "Interim Management of Nuclear Materials" (DOE/EIS-0220, October 20, 1995), to assess the potential environmental impacts of actions necessary to manage nuclear materials at the Savannah River Site (SRS), Aiken, South Carolina, until decisions on their ultimate disposition are made and implemented.

On December 12, 1995 (60 FR 65300), DOE issued a Record of Decision (ROD) and Notice of Preferred Alternatives on the interim management of several categories of nuclear materials at the SRS. DOE is now issuing its decisions on actions that will stabilize two additional categories of materials at the SRS, which present environment, safety and health vulnerabilities in their current storage condition or may present vulnerabilities within the next 10 years. The decisions on the stabilization of two additional categories of nuclear materials, neptunium-237 solution and targets, and H-Canyon plutonium-239 solutions, are not being made at this time.

Mark-16 and Mark-22 Fuels

DOE has decided to stabilize the Mark-16 and Mark-22 fuels by processing them in the SRS canyon facilities and blending down the resulting highly enriched uranium (HEU) to low enriched uranium (LEU). The LEU solution will be stored or converted to an oxide in the FA-Line. Neptunium-237 separated during the stabilization processing of the Mark-16 and Mark-22 fuels will be stabilized with the other SRS neptunium. The Department is still considering which of the management options for neptunium to implement.

Other Aluminum-Clad Targets

DOE has decided to stabilize the "other aluminum-clad targets" by dissolving them in the SRS canyon facilities and transferring the resulting nuclear material solution to the high level waste tanks for future vitrification in the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information on the interim management of nuclear materials at the SRS or to receive a copy of the Final EIS, the Facility Utilization Strategy study, the initial ROD and Notice, or this supplemental ROD contact: Andrew R. Grainger, NEPA Compliance Officer, U.S. Department of Energy, Savannah River Operations Office, P.O. Box 5031, Aiken, South Carolina 29804-5031,

(800) 242-8259, Internet: drew.grainger@srs.gov.

For further information on the DOE National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, contact: Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance, EH-42, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586-4600, or leave a message at (800) 472-2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) prepared the final environmental impact statement (EIS), "Interim Management of Nuclear Materials", (DOE/EIS-0220, October 20, 1995), to assess the potential environmental impacts of actions necessary to manage nuclear materials at the Savannah River Site (SRS), Aiken, South Carolina, until decisions on their ultimate disposition are made and implemented.

The Final EIS identified continued storage (i.e., No Action) as the preferred alternative for the Mark-16 and Mark-22 fuels and the "other aluminum-clad targets" until DOE could complete additional reviews of costs, schedules, and technical uncertainties associated with dry storage techniques for failed fuel.

On December 12, 1995 (60 FR 65300), DOE issued a Record of Decision (ROD) and Notice of Preferred Alternatives on the interim management of several categories of nuclear materials at the SRS. At that time, DOE announced new preferred alternatives for the management of the Mark-16 and Mark-22 fuels (processing and blending down to LEU) and the "other aluminum-clad targets" (processing and storage for vitrification in the DWPF). In addition, DOE indicated that neptunium-237 solution and targets would be stabilized through either processing to oxide or vitrification, and that plutonium-239 solutions in H-Canyon would be stabilized through processing to metal, processing to oxide, or vitrification. For each of these material categories, only one stabilization method will be implemented. The stabilization alternative chosen is dependent upon whether the materials would be stabilized in the SRS's F- or H-Canyon, as discussed in a DOE staff study, Facility Utilization Strategy for the Savannah River Site Chemical Separation Facilities (December 1995). DOE is still considering the facility utilization strategy study and other related information.