

percentage and corresponding dollar goals.

3. Participating contractors shall also enter separate in Item 14 the percentage and corresponding dollar goals for each of the two selected industry categories (see paragraph IV(A)(2)).

4. Participating contractors shall also enter separately in Item 14 on a semi-annual cumulative basis the percentage and corresponding dollar amount of subcontract awards made in each of the two selected industry categories.

5. Participating contractors shall be exempt from the completion of SF 294 "Subcontract Report For Individual Contracts" for DoD contracts during their participation in the Program.

[FR Doc. 96-19414 Filed 7-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

## Office of the Secretary

### Defense Science Board

**ACTION:** Notice of Advisory Committee Meetings.

**SUMMARY:** The Defense Science Board will meet in closed session on August 5-16, 1996 at the Beckman Center, Irvine, California.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Acquisition on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. At that time the Board will examine the substance, interrelationships, and the US national security implications of three critical areas identified and tasked to the Board by the Secretary of Defense, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology. The subject areas are: Achieving and Innovative Support Structure to Enhance Early 21st Century Military Operations; and Tactics and Technology for 21st Century Military Superiority. The period of study is anticipated to culminate in the formulation of specific recommendations to be submitted to the Secretary of Defense, via the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, for his consideration in determining resource policies, short- and long-range plans, and in shaping appropriate implementing actions as they may affect the U.S. national defense posture.

In accordance with Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, P.L. No. 92-463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. II, (1988)), it has been determined that this DSB meeting, concerns matters

listed in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1) (1988), and that accordingly this meeting will be closed to the public.

Dated: July 25, 1996.

L.M. Bynum,

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

[FR Doc. 96-19450 Filed 7-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

### Defense Science Board Task Force on Anti-Personnel Landmine Alternatives, Landmine Detection and Demining, and Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Clearance Operations

**ACTION:** Notice of Advisory Committee Meetings.

**SUMMARY:** The Defense Science Board Task Force on Anti-Personnel Landmine Alternatives, Landmine Detection and Demining, and Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Clearance Operations will meet in closed session on July 30-31, 1996 at Strategic Analysis, Inc., Arlington, Virginia. In order for the Task Force to obtain time sensitive classified briefings, critical to the understanding of the issues, this meeting is scheduled on short notice. The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense through the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. At this meeting the Task Force will examine US landmine, landmine detection and demining efforts, and alternatives to anti-personnel landmines. It will also examine UXO remediation, active range UXO clearance, and explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) efforts. It will include in this examination, the relationship between the UXO/EOD detection/characterization/clearance and neutralization issues and landmine detection/neutralization issues. In accordance with Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, P.L. No. 92-463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. II, (1994)), it has been determined that this DSB Task Force meeting concerns matters listed in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1) (1994), and that accordingly this meeting will be closed to the public.

Dated: July 25, 1996.

L.M. Bynum,

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

[FR Doc. 96-19449 Filed 7-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

## DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

### Resolution of Potential Conflict of Interest

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (Board) has identified and resolved potential conflicts of interest situations related to its proposed contractor, MPR Associates, Incorporated (MPR). This Notice, which is a summary of the facts related to this decision, satisfies the requirements of 10 CFR 1706.8(e) with respect to publication in the Federal Register. Under the Board's Organizational and Consultant Conflicts of Interest Regulation, 10 CFR Part 1706 (OCI Regulations), an organizational or consultant conflict of interest (OCI) means that because of other past, present or future planned activities or relationships, a contractor or consultant is unable, or potentially unable, to render impartial assistance or advice to the Board, or the objectivity of such offeror or contractor in performing work for the Board is or might be otherwise impaired, or such offeror or contractor has or would have an unfair competitive advantage. While the OCI Regulations provide that contracts shall generally not be awarded to an organization where the Board has determined that an actual or potential OCI exists and cannot be avoided, the Board may waive this requirement in certain circumstances.

The Board is tasked with the responsibility of overseeing the safe operation of the Department of Energy's (DOE's) defense nuclear facilities in order to ensure that the health and safety of the workers and the general public are adequately protected. One such facility is the Savannah River Site, which operates an In-Tank Precipitation (ITP) facility that provides highly radioactive material to the Defense Waste Processing Facility for conversion into vitrified logs for long-term storage.

The Board has become aware of a potential health and safety matter at the Savannah River Site involving the ITP facility. Specifically, the ITP chemical process results in the generation of benzene in solution in an unpredictable manner. Furthermore, the benzene, a flammable substance, is released from the solution at an anomalous rate. These unpredictable phenomena could be due to catalysts, radioactive hydrolysis, turbulence, or other factors. Of overriding concern to the Board is that the result of these phenomena, in combination with oxygen intrusion, creates the potential for a deflagration or explosion of the vapor within the tank

and the subsequent release of highly radioactive material to the environment.

In order to prevent the potential for a deflagration or explosion, certain aspects of the ITP chemical process must be established and fully understood. The first issue involves determining what caused an unexpected chemical excursion to occur in Tank 48H of the ITP facility where excess sodium tetraphenylborate rapidly decomposed to benzene. The second issue that requires assessment occurred during the excursion and revealed the fact that the benzene, by some yet to be understood mechanism, was not immediately released into the tank vapor space. As the fortuitous retention of the benzene was not due to a safety system design feature, determining what caused the benzene to be retained must be comprehended as its release could have compromised the safety system and resulted in a serious threat to the safety of the workers and the general public. Lastly, the adequacy of the safety system design must be addressed based on the chemical excursion and benzene retention determinations. It is therefore imperative that a comprehensive understanding of the causes for the unresolved benzene issues be acquired and appropriate safety measures be put into effect.

Consequently, the Board informed DOE that no additional tank waste or sodium tetraphenylborate should be added to Tank 48H until the tetraphenylborate decomposition and benzene release mechanism are well understood and adequate safety measures are instituted.

The Board does not have the breadth of required expertise readily available to conduct an in-depth safety evaluation of the ITP chemical process. The Board determined that outside technical experts possessing the prerequisite combination of chemical engineering expertise and nuclear safety experience were essential to the expeditious and proficient evaluation of the Board's concerns. To accomplish this, the Board identified MPR Associates, Incorporated (MPR) as an organization which could immediately provide the necessary expert technical assistance needed to assess the safety implication of this situation. The scope of this assistance includes such areas as identification of benzene generation and release mechanisms, potential hazard prevention and mitigation, and establishment of safety class systems and controls. MPR's technical expertise is precisely the kind of support that is critical to the successful performance of the Board's requirement. Specifically, MPR will provide the expert services of

Mr. Julian Nichols, a chemical engineer with extensive background knowledge and experience gained from his long-term efforts on similar problems within the commercial nuclear industry and through performance of safety-related activities at the Savannah River Site under previous contract to the Board.

However, MPR brought potential conflict of interest situations to the Board's attention based on their current contractual relationships with DOE through six subcontracts. A brief description of each scope of work follows:

1. Westinghouse Savannah River. Under this subcontract arrangement, MPR is performing an assessment of the Savannah River Site's integrated High-Level Waste System against commercial nuclear safety standards.

2. Westinghouse Hanford Company. This subcontract agreement requires MPR to provide direct support to the Spent Nuclear Fuel Project by participating in the K Basin Independent Technical Assessment and providing management and technical assistance in other projects of this nature.

3. Sandia National Laboratories. MPR is conducting an annealing demonstration of a U.S. reactor pressure vessel to determine if annealing is an economically viable option that can adequately address technical, engineering, and institutional issues.

4. Sandia National Laboratories. The scope of the contract is to provide on-going engineering support to the Sandia Fissile Materials Disposition Technical Integration Team in specific planning and technical management tasks related to DOE's decision making process in the technology areas of nuclear power and materials management.

5. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. Under this agreement, MPR is providing technical support in the analysis and development of federal facility compliance requirements, health and ecological risk assessments, and review of various policy guidance documents related to "deactivation end states."

6. Energetics. This subcontract requires MPR to provide technical assistance in the evaluation of a proposal submitted for a full-scale demonstration of fossil-fuel-fired vitrification technology for the vitrification of radionuclide and hazardous-material contaminated soils.

While MPR's anticipated contractual work for the Board and each DOE-related project would not necessarily create an actual overlap of work at this time, and hence no direct OCI, potential OCI's do exist due to MPR's concurrent

relationships on behalf of DOE and the Board, as the Savannah River Site, for instance, is a defense nuclear facility under the Board's jurisdiction. Consequently, as a result of its relationships with DOE, the ability of MPR to provide objective to the Board could be questioned.

The Board reviewed each potential conflict of interest situation and concluded that it is nonetheless in the best interests of the Government to have MPR perform the ITP chemical process safety evaluation due to their extensive experience with similar technical issues gained primarily in the commercial nuclear area coupled with their ability to respond immediately to this need. The determination was made that even if there were conflicts of interest as a result of the DOE-related work, it was outweighed by the need for an immediate in-depth safety evaluation of the ITP chemical process by a known expert in order to contend with the health risk that could result from deflagration or explosion of the vapor within Tank 48H.

In accordance with the OCI Regulations, the Board also considered the value of MPR's subcontracts with DOE, which MPR disclosed represented a small fraction of its total revenues. In the Board's view, the revenues from the DOE-related projects do not make MPR financially dependent on DOE.

The Board also considered whether a source other than MPR existed which has the caliber of qualified staff capable of responding to the Board's needs without having potential OCI situations. Three other potential contractors were considered but they did not possess the necessary combination of expertise and experience to satisfy the requirements of the Board's urgent needs. The Board is not aware of any other firm with the level of background knowledge and experience essential to the successful undertaking of the Board's requirement. In the Board's opinion, MPR, a nationally-recognized, well-respected expert firm in the nuclear industry, is the only source known to the Board that can satisfactorily perform the evaluation required by the Board. The Board's view is supported by MPR's previous involvement with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission when the need for immediate expert advice arose in the wake of the Three-Mile Island nuclear accident, and the Board's own experience with MPR, including the expert technical assistance MPR rendered in connection with the Board's investigation of leaks in the heat exchangers at the K-Reactor, and the evaluation of an F-Canyon tank

corrosion issue at the Savannah River Site.

Finally, the Board is required under the OCI Regulations to initiate measures which attempt to mitigate an OCI where reasonably possible. The efforts of MPR will be overseen by experienced technical staff members of the Board to ensure that all resultant work products are impartial and reflect full support for any findings and recommendations contained therein.

Accordingly, on the basis of the determination described above and pursuant to the applicable provisions of 10 CFR 1706, the Chairman of the Board granted a Waiver of any conflicts of interests (and the pertinent provisions of the OCI Regulations) with the effort to be performed by MPR under contract to the Board that might arise out of the contractual relationships with DOE.

Dated: July 25, 1996.

Kenneth M. Pusateri,  
General Manager.

[FR Doc. 96-19451 Filed 7-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3670-01-M

## DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

### Notice of Commission Meeting and Public Hearing

Notice is hereby given that the Delaware River Basin Commission will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, August 7, 1996. The hearing will be part of the Commission's regular business meeting which is open to the public and scheduled to begin at 11:00 a.m. in the Goddard Conference Room of the Commission's offices at 25 State Police Drive, West Trenton, New Jersey.

An informal conference among the Commissioners and staff will be held at 9:30 a.m. at the same location and will include discussion of proposed revisions to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure and status reports on Blue Marsh Reservoir/Tulpehocken Creek water quality and the Commission's 35th anniversary.

The subjects of the hearing will be as follows:

Applications for Approval of the Following Projects Pursuant to Article 10.3, Article 11 and/or Section 3.8 of the Compact

1. *Fallsburg Consolidated Water District D-90-105 CP Renewal*. An application for the renewal of a ground water withdrawal project to supply up to 90 million gallons (mg)/30 days of water to the applicant's distribution system from Well Nos. Fallsburg 1-7,

Woodbourne 1 and 2, Sheldrake 1, Hurleyville 1 and 2, and Brae 1. Commission approval on May 22, 1991 was limited to five years. The applicant requests that the total withdrawal from all wells remain limited to 90 mg/30 days. The project is located in the Town of Fallsburg, Sullivan County, New York.

2. *Warner Company D-91-26 RENEWAL*. An application for the renewal of a ground water withdrawal project to supply up to 6.23 mg/30 days of water to the applicant's quarrying operation from Well Nos. CH-4115 and CH-251. Commission approval on September 25, 1991 was limited to five years and will expire unless renewed. The applicant requests that the total withdrawal from all wells remain limited to 6.23 mg/30 days. The project is located in East Whiteland Township, Chester County, in the Southeastern Pennsylvania Ground Water Protected Area.

3. *United Water Delaware D-91-72 CP*. A resolution to extend the time limit for compliance with Conditions "p." and "q." of DRBC Docket No. D-91-72 CP to June 1, 1997. The project is located in New Castle County, Delaware.

4. *Westwood Golf Club D-96-3*. An application for approval of a ground water and surface water withdrawal project to supply up to 6 mg/30 days of water to the applicant's irrigation system from Well No. 2, existing Well No. 1, and a new intake on Matthews Branch; and to increase the existing withdrawal limit from all sources to 6 mg/30 days. The project is located in West Deptford Township, Gloucester County, New Jersey.

5. *Matrix Realty, Inc. (Commonwealth National Country Club) D-96-27*. An application to replace the withdrawal of water from Well No. 1 that has been sold as part of a property transfer. The applicant requests that the withdrawal from replacement Well No. 2 be limited to 5.0 mg/30 days and that the total withdrawal from all sources remain limited to 5.0 mg/30 days. The project is located in Horsham Township, Montgomery County, in the Southeastern Pennsylvania Ground Water Protected Area.

Documents relating to these items may be examined at the Commission's offices. Preliminary dockets are available in single copies upon request. Please contact George C. Elias concerning docket-related questions. Persons wishing to testify at this hearing are requested to register with the Secretary prior to the hearing.

Dated: July 23, 1996.

Susan M. Weisman,  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-19394 Filed 7-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6360-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board, Nevada Test Site

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of open 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 following Advisory Committee meeting: Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB), Nevada Test Site.

**DATES:** Wednesday, August 7, 1996: 5:30 p.m.-9:15 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** Community College of Southern Nevada, Cheyenne Avenue Campus, High Desert Conference and Training Center, Las Vegas, Nevada 89030, 702-651-4294.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kevin Rohrer, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Environmental Management, P.O. Box 98518, Las Vegas, Nevada 89193-8513, phone: 702-295-0197.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose of the Board

The purpose of the Advisory Board is to make recommendations to DOE and its regulators in the areas of environmental restoration, waste management, and related activities.

#### August Agenda

5:30 pm	Call to Order
5:40 pm	Presentations
7:00 pm	Public Comment/Questions
7:30 pm	Break
7:45 pm	Review Action Items
8:00 pm	Approve Meeting Minutes
8:10 pm	Committee Reports
8:45 pm	Public Comment
9:00 pm	Adjourn

#### Public Participation

The meeting is open to the public. Written statements may be filed with the Committee either before or after the meeting. Individuals who wish to make oral statements pertaining to agenda items should contact Kevin Rohrer, at the telephone number listed above. Requests must be received 5 days prior to the meeting and reasonable provision will be made to include the presentation in the agenda. The Designated Federal Official is empowered to conduct the