505. Notwithstanding any other provision herein, with respect to the matters covered by this Consent Order, the DOE reserves the right to initiate an enforcement proceeding or to seek appropriate penalties for any newly discovered regulatory violations committed by Occidental, but only if Occidental has knowingly concealed material facts relating to such violations. The DOE also reserves the right to seek appropriate judicial remedies, other than full rescission of this Consent Order, for any knowing misrepresentation of fact material to this Consent Order made by Occidental during the course of the audit or the negotiations that preceded this Consent Order.

VI. Recordkeeping, Reporting and Confidentiality

601. Occidental shall maintain such records as are necessary to demonstrate compliance with the terms of this Consent Order. Except for such records, Occidental is relieved of its obligation to comply with the recordkeeping requirements of the federal petroleum price and allocation regulations relating to the matters settled by this Consent Order.

602. Occidental will not be subject to any audit requests, report orders, subpoenas, or other administrative discovery by DOE relating to Occidental's activities subject to such regulations relating to the matters settled by this Consent Order.

603. The DOE shall treat all information provided to it by Occidental pursuant to negotiations which were conducted with respect to this Consent Order as confidential. Nothing herein shall alter or modify in any way the parties' obligations regarding confidentiality set forth in that Mediation Agreement between the DOE, Occidental and other parties entered into by the DOE and Occidental on or about January 13, 1995. Nor shall anything herein be deemed to waive or prejudice any right Occidental may have independent of this Consent Order or such Mediation Agreement regarding the disclosure of confidential information.

VII. Contractual Undertaking

701. It is the understanding and express intention of Occidental and the DOE that this Consent Order constitutes a legally enforceable contractual undertaking that is binding on the parties and their successors and assigns. Notwithstanding any other provision herein, Occidental (and its successors and assigns) and the DOE agree that the sole and exclusive remedy for a breach of this Consent Order shall be the filing of a civil action in an appropriate United States district court, and the DOE also reserves the right to seek appropriate penalties and interest for any failure to comply with the terms of this Consent Order. The DOE will undertake the defense of the Consent Order, as made effective, in response to any litigation challenging the Consent Order's validity in which the DOE, the FERC or any of their officials or employees is named as a party. Occidental agrees to cooperate with the DOE in the defense of any such challenge. Nothing in this Consent Order shall be construed as preventing Occidental from also participating as a party in such defense.

VIII. Final Order

801. Upon becoming effective, this Consent Order shall be a final order of the DOE having the same force and effect as a remedial order issued pursuant to Section 503 of the DOE Act, 42 U.S.C. 7193, and 10 CFR 2O5.l99B. Occidental hereby waives its right to administrative or judicial review of this Order, but Occidental reserves the right to participate in any such review initiated by a third party.

IX. Effective Date

901. This Consent Order shall become effective as a final order of the DOE on the date that notice to that effect is published in the **Federal Register** (the ''Effective Date''). Prior to that date, the DOE will publish notice in the **Federal Register** that it proposes to make this Consent Order final and, in that notice, will provide not less than thirty (30) days for members of the public to submit written comments. The DOE will consider all written comments in deciding whether to adopt the Consent Order as a final order, to withdraw agreement to the Consent Order, or to attempt to renegotiate the terms of the Consent Order.

902. Until the Effective Date, the DOE reserves the right to withdraw consent to this Consent Order by written notice to Occidental, in which event this Consent Order shall be null and void. If this Consent Order is not made effective on or before the one hundred twentieth (120th) day following execution by Occidental, Occidental may, at any time thereafter until the Effective Date, withdraw its agreement to this Consent Order by written notice to the DOE, in which event this Consent Order shall be null and void.

I, the undersigned, a duly authorized representative of Occidental Petroleum Corporation and OXY USA Inc., hereby agree to and accept on behalf of Occidental Petroleum Corporation and OXY USA Inc. the foregoing Consent Order.

Dated: June 27, 1995.

Donald P. de Brier,

Executive Vice President and General Counsel, Occidental Petroleum Corporation.

I, the undersigned, a duly authorized representative of the United States Department of Energy, hereby agree to and accept on behalf of the Department of Energy the foregoing Consent Order.

Dated: June 27, 1995.

Eric J. Fygi,

Deputy General Counsel, U.S. Department of Energy.

[FR Doc. 95–16608 Filed 7–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Medical Isotope Production

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) announces its intent to hold scoping meetings and prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the proposed domestic production of molybdenum-99 (Mo-99) and related medical isotopes (iodine-125, iodine-131, and xenon-133). The EIS will describe the need for and purpose of the proposed action, the alternatives for satisfying the need (as well as a ''no action'' alternative), and analyze the impacts of producing Mo-99 and related medical isotopes using reasonable alternative facilities.

DATES: Written comments must be postmarked not later than August 7, 1995 to ensure consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable. The locations, dates and times of the public scoping meetings are included in the Supplementary Information section of this notice, and will also be announced by additional appropriate means. Oral and written comments will be considered equally in the preparation of the EIS.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the scope of the medical isotope production EIS, or other matters regarding this environmental review, should be addressed to: Mr. Wade Carroll, NEPA Document Manager, Office of Isotope Production and Distribution, NE–70, U.S. Department of Energy, 19901 Germantown Road, Germantown, Maryland, 20874, Attn: Medical Isotope Production EIS. Mr. Carroll may be contacted by telephone at (301) 903–7731, facsimile (301) 903–5434.

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, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Ave. SW, Washington, D.C. 20585. Ms. Borgstrom may be contacted by leaving a message at (800) 472–2756 or by calling (202) 586–4600. For general information on the DOE isotope production program, please contact: Mr. Owen W. Lowe, Associate Director, Office of Isotope Production and Distribution, NE–70, U.S. Department of Energy, 19901 Germantown Road, Germantown, MD 20874. Mr. Lowe may be contacted by calling (301) 903–5161.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

For more than forty years, DOE and its predecessor agencies have produced and distributed isotopes for medical and industrial applications through the Department's national laboratories. In 1990, the Congress established the Isotope Production and Distribution Program (IPDP), bringing together under one program all DOE isotope production activities.

Among other activities, the IPDP has been assigned responsibility for ensuring a stable supply of Mo-99 to the United States medical care community. Mo-99 is a short-lived radioactive isotope of molybdenum that results from the fission of uranium atoms. Technetium-99m (Tc-99^m), the most widely used medical radioisotope, is a decay product of Mo-99. Tc-99^m has broad nuclear medicine applications in the areas of diagnostic procedures and medical laboratory tests. The use of Tc-99^m for diagnosis enables definition of conditions in the body that are not currently achievable with any other means except invasive surgery. Also, Tc-99^m concentrates in the area of the body that is of interest, and its short life minimizes the radiation dose received by the patient. Because these isotopes are highly perishable with short lifetimes (the half-lives of Mo-99 and Tc-99^m are 66 hours and 6 hours, respectively), the need to ensure a stable, continuous supply for medical use is critical. The United States medical community accounts for about 60 percent of the worldwide demand for Mo-99/Tc-99^m, yet there is no current domestic source for these isotopes.

Prior to 1989, Mo-99 was produced in the United States by a single supplier, Cintichem, Inc. Cintichem produced Mo-99 by irradiating ''targets'' in a reactor, and later removing the Mo-99 from the targets. In 1989, Cintichem discontinued operation of its production reactor. Since then, the United States has relied on Canadian production reactors for its supply of Mo-99.

Prior to 1993, two Canadian reactors, operated by Atomic Energy of Canada, Limited (AECL) at the Chalk River site (located about 100 miles from Ottawa, Canada) were available to produce Mo-99 through the irradiation of targets. AECL extracted the raw Mo-99 from the targets and provided it to Nordion International, who purified the Mo-99 and shipped it to radiopharmaceutical manufacturers. In 1993, one of the two Canadian reactors was permanently shut down, leaving only the second reactor operating. Any shutdown or extended outage of this nearly 40-year-old reactor would jeopardize the U.S. supply of Mo-99, resulting in a drastic effect on this nation's medical patients who need nuclear medicine care. In April 1995, this reactor suffered an unplanned shutdown for four days. European sources were able to temporarily increase their production enough to cover the European demand normally supplied by Nordion, and Nordion had sufficient product in process to meet the United States demand during this period. However, it was expected that shortages would have begun in the United States if the Canadian reactor had remained out of service for one or two more days.

AECL is considering building two modern 10 megawatt reactors as replacements for the existing reactor. One new plant initially was planned to be put in service by 1998. However, the funding to complete construction of even one of these plants has not yet been identified and committed. In any case, there are apparently no plans to operate the existing reactor beyond the year 2000. Thus, there is a ''window of vulnerability'' for the United States medical community until a new or reliable backup source of Mo-99 can be put in place.

The uncertainties and liabilities of constructing and operating a nuclear reactor have prevented and will likely continue to prevent private companies in the United States from developing a domestic source of Mo-99 to replace the Cintichem reactor. Congress has acknowledged the danger of United States dependence upon a single foreign source for its supply of Mo-99, and has supported DOE's efforts to ensure that a backup capability will be available to produce Mo-99 to meet the needs of the United States medical care community should the Canadian source fail. In Senate Report No. 103–291 accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1995, the Committee on Appropriations stated that ''[t]he the United States is fully dependent for 100 percent of the supply of molybdenum-99 and technetium-99^m, both important to nuclear medicine, on sources in Canada which produces (sic) these isotopes in aging facilities. Of particular concern is the lack, since 1990, of a domestic source of molybdenum-99, an isotope used to produce technetium-99^m which is used in approximately 36,000 medical diagnoses per day. The Committee notes that the Department is taking steps to . . . produce molybdenum-99 and related medical isotopes to ensure that there are no inadequacies of supply for domestic use. The committee supports this effort and wishes to be kept informed as the Department progresses.'' Congress provided $7.6 million for this effort for Fiscal Year (FY) 1995, and the President requested $12 million for FY 1996.

Production Processes

Mo-99 can be produced by a number of processes. However, only two processes have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration for Mo-99 sold in the United States: the proprietary process used by Nordion, and the Cintichem process. Both processes produce Mo-99 in a reactor. The Nordion process results in substantial quantities of liquid radioactive waste, while the Cintichem process produces largely solid waste, which is much easier to manage and dispose.

In November, 1991, DOE purchased the Cintichem technology and equipment for $750,000 plus an agreement to pay Cintichem a 4 percent royalty on the first 5 years of sales of Mo-99 and other isotopes produced in the Cintichem process. In addition, DOE agreed to accept the spent nuclear fuel from the Cintichem reactor. Subsequently, the reactor was decommissioned.

Environmental Assessment

A draft environmental assessment (EA), dated February 7, 1995, was prepared and issued for public comment on the proposed action to produce medical isotopes using the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory, in Los Alamos, New Mexico (for target fabrication), and the Annular Core Research Reactor (ACRR) (a small, open pool research reactor of 2 megawatts) and its associated hot cell facilities at the Sandia National Laboratories/New Mexico (for target irradiation and isotope extraction). The public review and comment period for the draft EA ended on May 1, 1995. Based on the

draft EA and comments received, the Department decided that it would be appropriate to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

Within DOE, the ACRR at SNL/NM and its associated hot cell facilities are managed by the Office of Defense Programs because the principal use of these facilities has been to support defense research needs. There is a defense-related experiment in progress in the ACRR that is scheduled to be completed in mid-August 1995. Beyond that, the Office of Defense Programs has not currently identified any follow-on work; however, the ACRR must be available to support DP missions in time of emergency for national security reasons. DOE has not yet decided on any specific other uses for the ACRR, although a range of activities are possible for a reactor of this type. These activities could involve other DOE program areas besides the production of Mo-99 and related medical isotopes, as well as work performed for other agencies or organizations, such as the past work performed for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. In the interim, DOE will physically maintain the reactor, hot cells and associated facilities, and will continue to train the operating staff to maintain their proficiency to meet safe operating standards. DOE will also complete installation of a new control system designed to meet today's standards. In addition, SNL/NM will clean out ''legacy'' waste materials that remain, principally in the hot cells and storage areas adjacent to the reactor.

Proposed Action

The proposed action is for DOE to establish within two years a medical radioisotope production program that would ensure the domestic capability to produce a continual supply of Mo-99 and related medical isotopes (iodine-125, iodine-131, and xenon-133) for United States medical community use. The near-term goal of DOE is to provide a backup capability to supply a baseline production level of 10 to 30 percent of current United States demand for Mo-99 and 100 percent of the United States demand should the Canadian source be unavailable. The baseline production level would serve to maintain the capabilities of the facilities and staff to respond on short notice to supply the entire United States demand on an as-needed basis. The longer term objective is to transfer the process to private industry.

The United States demand is presently about 3,000 6-day curies per week; a 6-day curie is defined as the amount of product, measured in curies, remaining 6 days after the product arrives on the radiopharmaceutical manufacturer's dock. The pharmaceutical manufacturers also require that the specific activity of the product must be at least 10,000 curies of activity per gram of molybdenum when it arrives at the manufacturer's dock.

Proposed Process

DOE proposes to use the Cintichem process as the most expeditious way to satisfy the goals of the proposed action. A brief description of the steps in the process follows.

As the initial step in the proposed Mo-99 production program, targets containing highly enriched uranium would be fabricated, tested and shipped to the reactor facility for irradiation. Target elements would be manufactured by electroplating highly enriched uranium oxide on the inner wall of stainless steel tubes, and then sealing the ends with custom fittings.

At the reactor facility, the targets would be irradiated for several days depending on the power level. Upon removal from the reactor, the irradiated targets would be transferred in a shielded cask to an appropriate hot cell facility, preferably located immediately adjacent to or near the reactor facility because of the short half-life of Mo-99. Within the hot cells, the isotopes of interest would be extracted from the fission product inventory by chemical dissolution and precipitation procedures. The isotopes would be further refined and would undergo strict quality control procedures to meet FDA standards.

Because Mo-99 decays at the rate of about 1 percent per hour, all steps after irradiation of the target and shipment of the product must be expedited. The isotopes would be packaged in Department of Transportation-approved packaging for shipment by air freight on a daily basis to any of the three currently known potential customers: DuPont-Merck in Boston, Massachusetts; Amersham Mediphysics in Chicago, Illinois; and Mallinckrodt in St. Louis, Missouri. Air express class shipments would be used.

The radioactive waste would be both low-level waste (LLW) and spent nuclear fuel. Both types of waste would be managed, stored and eventually disposed of in accordance with applicable requirements and regulations.

Although no mixed waste (waste that is both radioactive and chemically hazardous) would be generated in the isotope extraction process, small amounts of mixed waste would be produced during target fabrication. These mixed waste streams would be managed, stored and disposed of in accordance with applicable requirements and regulations.

During the preparation of the EIS, the Department will conduct laboratory-scale process validation tests to help ensure that the Cintichem process can be accurately reproduced. The results of these tests would be applicable to any site for Mo-99 production using the Cintichem process.

Alternatives

DOE has identified a number of alternatives for the production of Mo-99. Others may be identified during the scoping process. All alternatives will be evaluated against the purpose and need for the proposed action, and those that meet the goals of the proposal will be addressed in detail in the EIS. At this time, DOE's preferred alternative is to use the Cintichem process with Mo-99 target fabrication in the CMR at LANL and target irradiation and isotope separation in the ACRR and associated hot-cell facilities at SNL .

No Action

The Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA require that an agency analyze the impacts of not taking the proposed action (the ''No Action Alternative''). In this case, the No Action Alternative would mean that DOE would not establish a backup production capability for Mo-99. The United States medical community would continue to rely on the current Canadian source, or other foreign sources, of radioisotopes.

Alternatives to Accomplish the Proposed Action

There are several existing federally-owned facilities that could be configured to produce Mo-99 and other medical isotopes. Previous studies which narrowed the possible alternatives to a single reactor facility, the ACRR, will be revisited and re-evaluated. Possible additional DOE facilities include:

(1) Omega West Reactor at LANL
(2) Advanced Test Reactor at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL)
(3) High Flux Isotope Reactor at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL)

The possibility of using non-DOE federally-owned facilities will also be examined.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

There may be ways to accomplish the goal of the proposed action (i.e., establish a source for the domestic

production of Mo-99) that would use private rather than federally-owned facilities. However, some or all of these alternatives would not be able to meet this goal within the time desired. The alternatives identified below, as well as others which may be identified in the scoping process, will be considered.

(1) *University Reactors:* Several United States universities currently operate research reactors, which are typically small and relatively simple. They also typically do not have hot cell facilities or radio-chemical process facilities. However, in some cases, university reactors have already produced other radioisotopes, and they will be re-evaluated. Universities which have reactor facilities that are of particular interest are listed below:

- The University of Missouri.
- Rhode Island Nuclear Science Center.
- Georgia Institute of Technology.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

(2) New Concepts: New concepts which have been proposed for the production of Mo-99 will be considered. Examples of these new concepts include:

- Medical Isotope Production Reactor (MIPR): The Babcock and Wilcox Corporation (B&W) has submitted an unsolicited proposal to DOE to design, construct and operate a new and unproven reactor concept that uses an aqueous solution of uranyl nitrate contained in an aluminum or stainless steel vessel immersed in a large pool of water to provide both shielding and heat exchange. The reactor could be operated with low-enriched fuel. The Mo-99 would be obtained by on-line extraction of a portion of the uranyl nitrate and passing it through an ion exchange column, where the Mo-99 would be deposited. The uranyl nitrate would then be returned to the reactor. Wastes could be substantially reduced with this concept. B&W believes that a MIPR Mo-99 facility could be run as a profitable business. However, to date, the perceived risks have prevented them from making a corporate commitment to fund such an enterprise without substantial government support.
- Isotopes U.S.A.: Personnel from DOE's Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL) and the University of Idaho have developed a concept, referred to as Isotopes U.S.A. Under this concept, a not-for-profit corporation would be established dedicated to education, research and other scientific purposes relevant to the production and use of stable and radioactive isotopes. The concept includes isotope production and distribution, isotope research, education and training, administration and for-profit isotope ventures. This concept, should it be implemented, could privatize most, if not all, of the current IPDP functions, including the production of Mo-99.

Partial Alternatives

Some alternatives to meet individual portions of the proposed action will be considered in combination with other appropriate processing and irradiation facilities.

Examples are: (1) Alternative Target Fabrication Sites: Alternate target fabrication sites include DOE facilities at LANL, SNL/NM, or ORNL or commercial facilities such as Babcock and Wilcox in Lynchburg, Virginia; Nuclear Fuel Services in Erwin, Tennessee; and General Atomics in San Diego, California. Any alternate fabrication site would manufacture the same target using the selected process.

(2) Alternate Target Processing Sites: Some hot cell facilities may be more effective for post-irradiation processing than the hot cells that are near a candidate reactor, although such arrangements would have to consider the short half-life of Mo-99. Also, if the targets were fabricated at the same facility where the post-irradiation processing is done, there would be the potential that unfissioned uranium from the targets could be recycled back into new targets.

Preliminary Identification of Environmental Issues

The issues listed below have been tentatively identified for analysis in the Medical Isotope Production EIS. This list is presented to facilitate public comment on the scope of the EIS. It is not intended to be all-inclusive or to predetermine the potential impacts of any of the alternatives. DOE seeks public comment on the adequacy and inclusiveness of these issues:

(1) Potential impacts on natural ecosystems, including air quality, surface and ground water quality, and plants and animals;

(2) Potential health and safety impacts to on-site workers and to the public resulting from operations, including reasonable postulated accidents;

(3) Potential health and safety, environmental and other impacts related to the transport of targets and radioisotopes;

(4) Waste management considerations related to the generation, storage and disposal of hazardous waste, LLW, mixed waste and spent nuclear fuel;

(5) Potential cumulative impacts of Mo-99 production operations, including relevant impacts from other past present and reasonably foreseeable activities at the production site;

(6) Potential impacts on cultural resources;

(7) Potential socioeconomic impacts, including any disproportionate impacts on minority and low income populations; and

(8) Potential economic impacts, including those from producing radioisotopes for commercial sector use.

Related NEPA Documentation

NEPA documents that have been or are being prepared for activities related to the proposed action include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) The LANL Site Wide EIS (a Notice of Intent was published at 60 FR 25697, May 12, 1995) will analyze the cumulative impacts of operations and planned activities foreseen at LANL within the next 5 to 10 years.

(2) An Environmental Assessment for SNL/NM Offsite Transportation of Low-Level Radioactive Waste is currently being prepared which will evaluate the shipment of both existing inventories of LLW accumulated at SNL/NM since 1988 and LLW projected to be newly generated at SNL/NM in the foreseeable future.

(3) The Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Waste Management will address waste management alternatives for existing and proposed actions and DOE complex-wide issues associated with long-term waste management policies and practices. An Implementation Plan for this Programmatic EIS was issued in January 1994.

(4) The Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Spent Nuclear Fuel Management and Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Environmental Restoration and Waste Management addresses the management of DOE-owned spent nuclear fuel. A Record of Decision for the Programmatic EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on June 1, 1995.

Public Involvement Opportunities

DOE will develop a public (''stakeholder'') involvement plan for this EIS process. To assist with developing the stakeholder involvement plan, the DOE requests suggestions by the public on how this EIS process should be conducted, including suggestions regarding the type, format, and conduct of public involvement opportunities.

Through this notice, the DOE formally invites States, tribes, other government agencies, and the public to comment on the scope of this EIS. The locations,

dates and times for these public meetings are:

Idaho National Engineering Laboratory—July 24, 1995, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., Shilo Inn, 780 Lindsay Blvd., Idaho Falls, ID 83402, Ph. (208) 536–0805

Oak Ridge National Laboratory—July 26, 1995, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., Pollard Auditorium, 210 Badger Avenue, Oak Ridge, TN 37830, Ph. (615) 576–0885

Sandia National Laboratories/Albuquerque—July 31, 1995, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., Albuquerque Convention Center, Cochiti/Taos Rooms, 401 2nd Street, N.W., Albuquerque, NM 87102, Ph. (505) 845–6094

Los Alamos National Laboratory—August 1, 1995, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., Hilltop House, 400 Trinity Drive, Los Alamos, NM 87544, Ph. (505) 665–4400

A second formal opportunity for comment will be provided after DOE issues the Draft EIS. Public hearings will be held in conjunction with the comment period for the Draft EIS.

In addition to formal opportunities for comment, anyone may submit comments at any time during the NEPA process; however, to ensure that comments are considered at specific points in the NEPA review process, and to best assist DOE, the public is encouraged to comment during the formally established comment periods.

Copies of design and other background documents, written comments, records of public meetings, and other materials related to the development of the EIS have been and are being placed in DOE Reading Rooms at the following locations:

DOE Headquarters, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 1E–190, Washington, D.C., 20585, phone (202) 586–3142;

National Atomic Museum, Building 20358, Wyoming Blvd., Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico 87185, phone (505) 845–4378;

Los Alamos National Laboratory Community Reading Room, 1450 Central Avenue, Suite 101, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544, phone (505) 665–2127;

Idaho Operations Office, Idaho Public Reading Room, 1776 Science Center Drive, Idaho Falls, Idaho, 83402, phone (208) 526–0271; and

Oak Ridge Operations Office, Public Reading Room, 55 Jefferson Circle, Room 112, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 37831, (615) 241–4780.

Issued in Washington, D.C., this 30th day of June 1995, for the United States Department of Energy.

Peter N. Brush,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Environment, Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 95–16609 Filed 7–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Metal Casting Industrial Advisory Board

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 86 Stat. 770) notice is hereby given of the Metal Casting Industrial Advisory Board meeting.

DATES: August 1, 1995, 8:30 AM–5:30 PM and August 2, 1995, 9:00 AM–11:15 AM.

ADDRESSES: Milwaukee River Hilton, 4700 North Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53212.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Douglas E. Kaempf, Program Manager, Department of Energy, Office of Industrial Technologies (EE–23), 1000 Independence Ave. S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585, (202) 586–5264, Fax: (202) 586–3180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose of the Committee

The Metal Casting Industrial Advisory Board serves to provide guidance and oversight of research programs provided under the Metal Casting Competitiveness Research Program and to recommend to the Secretary of Energy new or revised program activities and Metal Casting Research Priorities.

Tentative Agenda

August 1, 1995

8:30—Sign-In
9:00–9:30—Opening Remarks; Douglas Kaempf
9:30–10:30—Presentations of FY95 funded projects and management plans (30 minutes each)
Case Western Reserve University; John Wallace
University of Alabama—Tuscaloosa/Florida A&M; Thomas Piwonka
10:30–10:45—Break
10:45–11:45—Continue presentations of FY95 funded projects and management plans (30 minutes each)
University of Alabama—Birmingham (Lost Foam Technology); Charles Bates
University of Alabama—Birmingham (Clean Casting); Charles Bates
11:45–1:00—Lunch (On your own)
1:00–2:00—Continue presentations of FY95 funded projects and management plans (30 minutes each)
Ohio State University (Deflection of Die Casting Dies); E. Allen Miller
Ohio State University (Visualization Tools for Die Casting); E. Allen Miller
2:00–3:00—Open discussion regarding project presentations; Board Members
3:00–3:15—Break
3:15–5:00—Development of Research Priorities; Board Members

August 2, 1995

9:00–10:00—Development of Board Subcommittees; Board Members
10:00–10:15—Break
10:15–11:15—Public Comment; Public
11:15—Meeting Adjournment; Derek Cocks, Co-Chairman, Dean Peters, Co-Chairman

Public Participation

The meeting is open to the public. The Chairperson of the Board is empowered to conduct the meeting to facilitate the orderly conduct of business. Any member of the public who wishes to make oral statements pertaining to the agenda items should contact Douglas E. Kaempf at the address or telephone number listed above. Requests must be received at least 5 days prior to the meeting and reasonable provisions will be made to include the presentation on the agenda. Written statements may be filed with the Committee either before or after the meeting.

Transcript

Detailed meeting minutes will be available for public review and copying at the Freedom of Information Public Reading Room, Room 1E–190, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. between 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Issued at Washington, D.C. on June 30, 1995.

Rachel Murphy Samuel,

Acting Deputy Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–16610 Filed 7–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board, Sandia Site (Kirtland Area Office)

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act