

Diagnosis Related Group 481, ICD 9 Code 41.03, must be evaluated by WHMC before receiving an allogeneic bone marrow transplant under direct military care of CHAMPUS cost sharing, except for those beneficiaries participating in DoD's demonstration project involving Phase II or Phase III clinical trials sponsored by the National Cancer Institute, as described in Federal Register Notice 61 FR 1899, January 24, 1996. Evaluation in person is preferred. Travel and lodging costs for the patient and, if medically indicated, one nonmedical attendant, will be reimbursed for the evaluation. It is possible to conduct the evaluation telephonically if the patient is unable to travel to WHMC. If the allogeneic bone marrow transplant cannot be performed at WHMC, WHMC will provide a medical necessity review in order to support its issuance of a Nonavailability Statement.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 15, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Major Lewis, Bone Marrow Transplantation Service, WHMC, at (210) 670-7391, or Captain Orcutt, OSD (Health Affairs), at (703) 695-6800.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In FR DOC 93-27050, appearing in the Federal Register on November 5, 1993 (Vol. 58, 58955-58964), the final rule on the STS Program was published. Included in the final rule was a provision that notices of all military and civilian STS facilities be published in the Federal Register annually. This notice is issued under the authority of 10 U.S.C. 1105 and 32 CFR 199.4(a)(10).

Dated: February 11, 1997.

L.M. Bynum,

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

[FR Doc. 97-3787 Filed 2-13-97; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5000-04-M**

### **Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, Scientific Advisory Board; Meeting**

**ACTION:** Notice.

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

**DATES:** April 22-23, 1997 from 0800 to approximately 1735 and April 24, 1997 from 0800 to approximately 1240.

**PLACE:** Crown Plaza Hotel, 15 West Sixth Street, Cincinnati, OH.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:** Research and Development proposals and continuing projects requesting Strategic

Environmental Research and Development Program funds in excess of \$1M will be reviewed.

This meeting is open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the Scientific Advisory Board at the time and in the manner permitted by the Board.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Kimberly Kay, 8000 Westpark Drive, Suite 400, McLean, VA 22102, or telephone 703 506-1400 extension 552.

Dated: February 10, 1997.

L.M. Bynum,

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

[FR Doc. 97-3678 Filed 2-13-97; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 5000-04-M**

### **Department of the Army**

#### **Supplemental Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the Realignment of Depot Maintenance Workload (Except Bradley Fighting Vehicle Series and Multiple Launch Rocket Systems) From Red River Army Depot, Texarkana, Texas; the Associated Combat Vehicle Support Mission From Defense Distribution Depot Red River, Texarkana, TX; and the Relocation of the AGT 1500 Engine Recuperator Manufacturing Process From Stratford Army Engine Plant, Stratford, CT, to Anniston Army Depot, Anniston, AL**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with Public Law 101-510 (as amended), the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended the realignment of Red River Army Depot (RRAD) and the closure of the Stratford Army Engine Plant (SAEP).

The RRAD realignment recommendation included the movement of all maintenance missions, except for that related to the Bradley Fighting Vehicle Series (BFVS), to other depot maintenance activities, including the private sector. The Secretary of the Army made the decision that all maintenance missions, except BFVS and Multiple Launch Rocket Systems (MLRS), would be relocated to Anniston Army Depot (ANAD), Anniston, AL. The Army also proposed the relocation of the associated non-BFVS/MLRS maintenance mission support from Defense Distribution Depot Red River, Texas (DDRT), to Defense Distribution Depot Anniston, Alabama (DDAA).

The relocation of the AGT 1500 engine recuperator manufacturing process from SAEP to ANAD was not directed by the Commission, but a decision by the Department of the Army to retain the capability to rebuild and repair tank engines to meet projected operation and mobilization requirements.

This Environmental Assessment (EA) supplements one completed for Anniston in June 1996 pursuant to a Commission directed maintenance mission transfer from Letterkenny Army Depot, Letterkenny, Pennsylvania to ANAD. The three relocations addressed in this Supplemental EA resulted from discretionary decisions, based on Commission recommendations, made after the completion of the June 1996 EA.

The relocations from RRAD and DDRT does not involve the transfer of any military or civilian personnel. The relocation of the AGT 1500 engine recuperator manufacturing process from Stratford, CT, involves transfer of 7 civilian contractor jobs with an anticipated growth of 33 more civilian contractor positions from the Anniston area. Adequate facilities and outdoor space for parking of combat vehicles exist at ANAD to accommodate the relocations from RRAD and DDRT. However, the AGT 1500 engine recuperator workload requires renovation of 30,000 square feet of Building 134, an underutilized warehouse facility.

Potential effects on the physical, natural, and cultural environment from the proposed relocations and renovation of Building 134 would be temporary and not significant and would be mitigated through the use of best management practices.

Based on the analysis of the environmental effects of the proposed relocations found in the EA, it has been determined that the implementation of these relocations to ANAD and DDAA would have no significant impacts on the quality of the natural or human environment. Because no significant environmental impacts would result from implementation of the proposed action, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. Implementation of the proposed action will result in a Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI).

**DATES:** Inquiries will be accepted on or before March 17, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the Supplemental EA and FNSI can be obtained by contacting Dr. Neil Robison at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, ATTN: CESAM-PD-E, P.O. Box

2288, Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001 or by telephone at (334) 690-3018.

Dated: February 11, 1997.

Raymond J. Fatz,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army  
(Environment, Safety and Occupational  
Health) OASA (I, L&E).*

[FR Doc. 97-3773 Filed 2-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

## Department of the Navy

### Notice of Record of Decision for the Disposal of U.S. Navy Shipboard Solid Waste from Surface Ships

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA procedures (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), and Executive Order 12114 "Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions," the Department of the Navy announces its decision to implement its preferred alternative for the management of non-hazardous biodegradable solid wastes, (paper, cardboard and food), and non-hazardous non-biodegradable solid wastes (metal and glass) from U.S. Navy surface ships. This decision makes a significant change to present waste disposal practices in the fleet. The Navy will equip surface ships the size of a frigate and larger (approximately 200 ships) with equipment to pulp paper, cardboard and food waste, and shred and bag all metal and glass prior to discharge overboard. The equipment, once installed, will be used to prepare material for discharge throughout the oceans and seas of the globe, including those special areas in effect pursuant to Regulation 5 of Annex V of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL). Pulped material will be discharged only outside of 3 nautical miles from land and shredded material will only be discharged outside of 12 nautical miles from land. This record of decision and the EIS on which it is based, do not apply to submarines. A separate solid waste management plan will be prepared for submarines at a future date.

#### Background

The National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994 required the Secretary of the Navy to submit to Congress, no later than November 30, 1996, a plan for Navy compliance with Regulation 5 of Annex V of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), which pertains to disposal

of shipboard solid waste in "special areas." The MARPOL Convention, formulated in 1973 and amended in 1978, contains five annexes. Solid waste is addressed in Annex V, "Regulations for the Prevention of Pollution by Garbage from Ships." MARPOL prohibits some discharges altogether, restricts some discharges to set distances from land, and establishes "special areas" within which additional discharge limitations apply, based on the oceanographic characteristics and ecological significance of those areas.

Eight "special areas" have been designated by Annex V: the Baltic Sea, portions of the North Sea, the Antarctic Ocean, the Red Sea, the Black Sea, the Gulf area (including the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Aden), the wider Caribbean (including the Gulf of Mexico), and the Mediterranean Sea. To date, only the first three are in effect. Areas come into effect following a positive assessment of the waste management capabilities of each area's littoral countries.

The MARPOL Convention limitations on ocean discharges do not expressly apply to warships or naval auxiliaries. The Convention requires, however, that party states ensure their warships and auxiliaries operate consistent with the Convention so far as is "reasonable and practicable."

The United States became a party to MARPOL Annex V in 1997 with the enactment of the Marine Plastic Pollution Research and Control Act (MPPRCA), which amended the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (APPS). In MPPRCA, Congress did not adopt the Convention's "reasonable and practicable" requirement for U.S. public vessels, but instead affirmatively required full compliance by U.S. public vessels, including Navy vessels, with all Annex V requirements by 1994. In 1993, the National Defense Authorization Act of 1994 (DDA 94) amended APPS and, with respect to Navy ships, extended the 1994 deadline to the end of 1994 for the plastic discharge prohibition, and to the year 2000 for the special area requirements. Both MPPRCA and the DAA 94 allowed the Navy to petition Congress for relief from the legislatively imposed requirements of Annex V, if the Navy demonstrated that full compliance for U.S. Navy warships and auxiliaries was not technologically feasible while maintaining the necessary level of operational capability.

The DAA 94 also provided that if the plan demonstrated that compliance by certain ships under certain conditions was not technologically feasible, Congress could modify the applicability

of the special area requirements for Navy warships and auxiliaries.

The DAA 94 required that the Navy submit a plan for special areas to Congress by November 30, 1996. If the Navy determined that compliance with the requirements of Regulation 5 of Annex V was not technologically feasible for certain ships under certain conditions, the Navy must document:

- The ships for which full compliance was not technologically feasible;
- The technical and operational impediments for achieving such compliance as rapidly as technologically feasible;
- A proposed alternative schedule for achieving compliance as rapidly as technologically possible; and
- Such other information as the Secretary of the Navy considers relevant and appropriate.

The development of a management plan for the disposal of shipboard solid waste necessarily addressed the design and management of warships. Navy warships have a substantially different mission from merchant marine vessels and cruise ships, which is reflected in warship design.

Critical factors used to develop the Navy shipboard solid waste management plan include the composition, operation, and deployment of the U.S. Navy fleet, waste generation rates and characteristics, available processing technologies and current Navy solid waste management practices. Using this basic information, the Navy identified, in addition to source reduction, three potential categories of alternatives for managing shipboard solid waste:

- Store and retrograde (store and return to shore for landbased processing and/or disposal);
- Process and discharge at sea; and
- Destroy on board.

In each of these alternatives food waste would be comminuted (ground up) and discharged, and plastic waste would be processed using Navy developed plastic waste processors (currently being installed on most Navy ships). The treated plastic will be stored and returned to shore.

The potential environmental effects of the Navy's solid waste management plan were analyzed in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Publication of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on October 12, 1995. The NOI broadly described the range of alternatives to be considered and analyses to be conducted for the EIS and also announced the time and place for two public scoping meetings. These