

segments of submerged geotextile breakwater (offshore Sunny Isles). All construction of the beach fill transition offshore of Golden Beach would occur on State of Florida lands, which are located below the mean high water line. The transition would taper from 120 feet wide at the Sunny Isles/Golden Beach city limit to zero feet, over a length of 1500 feet offshore of Golden Beach. The planned source of borrow for this action is a southerly extension of an offshore borrow site south of Government Cut. The forecast completion date for the proposed project modification would be by the end of 1998.

The 2nd Periodic Renourishment at Sunny Isles was addressed in a final Environmental Assessment dated May 1995. The proposed modification primarily differs from the 2nd Periodic Renourishment in that it uses a different borrow source, places additional material on the beach (an advance maintenance berm), and it also involves two project features not previously used at this location. These are a geotextile breakwater (offshore of Sunny Isles) and a transition fill (offshore of Golden Beach). The proposed action including the above was described in the feasibility study and final Environmental Impact Statement for the "Coast of Florida Erosion and Storm Effects Study, Region III" dated November 1996 but was not proposed for authorization in that document.

**Alternatives:** Alternatives considered include no action, non-structural measures, the construction of revetments, perched beaches, breakwaters, beach fills of varying widths, construction of submerged nearshore berms, beach fill transitions, and a beach fill/groin combination. Alternative sand sources in addition to the use of the proposed borrow area for nourishment, include the use of other local offshore sand sources, the use of other sand sources such as upland sources, Bahamian sand, other foreign sands, or other distant sources.

**Issues:** The EIS will consider impacts on coral reefs and other hardbottom communities, protected species, shore protection, health and safety, water quality, aesthetics and recreation, fish and wildlife resources, cultural resources, energy conservation, socio-economic resources, and other impacts identified through scoping, public involvement, and interagency coordination.

**Scoping:** A scoping letter was sent to interested parties on April 21, 1993. In addition, all parties are invited to participate in the scoping process by identifying any additional concerns on issues, studies needed, alternatives,

procedures, and other matters related to the scoping process. At this time there are no plans for a public scoping meeting.

**Public Involvement:** We invite the participation of affected Federal, state and local agencies, affected Indian tribes, and other interested private organizations and parties.

**Coordination:** The proposed action is being coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, with the FWS under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and with the State Historic Preservation Officer.

**Other Environmental Review and Consultation:** The proposed action would involve evaluation for compliance with guidelines pursuant to Section 404(b) of the Clean Water Act; application (to the State of Florida) for Water Quality Certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act; certification of state lands, easements, and rights of way; and determination of Coastal Zone Management Act consistency.

**Agency Role:** As cooperating agency, non-Federal sponsor, and leading local expert; DERM will provide extensive information and assistance on the resources to be impacted, mitigation measures, and alternatives.

**DEIS Preparation:** It is estimated that the DEIS will be available to the public on or about February 1, 1997.

Dated: December 31, 1996.

Hanley K. Smith,

Acting Chief, Planning Division.

[FR Doc. 97-1335 Filed 1-17-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-AJ-M

---

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Submission for OMB review; comment request.

**SUMMARY:** The Director, Information Resources Management Group, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before February 20, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Wendy Taylor, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th

Street, NW., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503. Requests for copies of the proposed information collection requests should be addressed to Patrick J. Sherrill, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202-4651.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Patrick J. Sherrill (202)708-8196.

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U. S. C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Director of the Information Resources Management Group publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g., new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment at the address specified above. Copies of the requests are available from Patrick J. Sherrill at the address specified above.

Dated: January 14, 1997.

Gloria Parker,

Director, Information Resources Management Group.

Office of the Under Secretary

*Type of Review:* NEW.

*Title:* Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance (LESCP).

*Frequency:* Annually.

*Affected Public:* State, local or Tribal Government, SEAs or LEAs.

*Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:*

*Responses:* 18,620 Burden Hours: 64,310.

*Abstract:* The LESCOP is being conducted in response to the legislative requirement in P.L. 103-382, Section 1501 to assess the implementation of Title I and related education reforms. The information will be used to examine changes—over a 3-year period—that are occurring in schools and classrooms. Teachers and teacher aides will complete a mail survey, and district Title I administrators, principals, school-based staff, and parents will be interviewed during on-site field work.

[FR Doc. 97-1307 Filed 1-17-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Record of decision for the Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

**AGENCY:** Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Record of Decision.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Energy (DOE) has decided to implement a program to provide for safe and secure storage of weapons-usable fissile materials (plutonium and highly enriched uranium [HEU]) and a strategy for the disposition of surplus weapons-usable plutonium, as specified in the Preferred Alternative in the Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (S&D Final PEIS, DOE/EIS-0229, December 1996). The fundamental purpose of the program is to maintain a high standard of security and accounting for these materials while in storage, and to ensure that plutonium produced for nuclear weapons and declared excess to national security needs (now, or in the future) is never again used for nuclear weapons.

DOE will consolidate the storage of weapons-usable plutonium by upgrading and expanding existing and planned facilities at the Pantex Plant in Texas and the Savannah River Site (SRS) in South Carolina, and continue the storage of weapons-usable HEU at DOE's Y-12 Plant at the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR) in Tennessee, in upgraded and, as HEU is dispositioned, consolidated facilities. After certain conditions are met, most plutonium now stored at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS) in Colorado will be moved to Pantex and SRS. Plutonium currently stored at the Hanford Site (Hanford), the Idaho

National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), and the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) will remain at those sites until disposition (or movement to lag storage at the disposition facilities).

DOE's strategy for disposition of surplus plutonium is to pursue an approach that allows immobilization of surplus plutonium in glass or ceramic material for disposal in a geologic repository pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and burning of some of the surplus plutonium as mixed oxide (MOX) fuel in existing, domestic, commercial reactors, with subsequent disposal of the spent fuel in a geologic repository pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. DOE may also burn MOX fuel in Canadian Deuterium Uranium [CANDU] reactors in the event of an appropriate agreement among Russia, Canada, and the United States, as discussed below. The timing and extent to which either or both of these disposition approaches (immobilization or MOX) are ultimately deployed will depend upon the results of future technology development and demonstrations, follow-on (tiered) site-specific environmental review, contract negotiations, and detailed cost reviews, as well as nonproliferation considerations, and agreements with Russia and other nations. DOE's program will be subject to the highest standards of safeguards and security throughout all aspects of storage, transportation, and processing, and will include appropriate International Atomic Energy Agency verification.

Due to technology, complexity, timing, cost, and other factors that would be involved in purifying certain plutonium materials to make them suitable for potential use in MOX fuel, approximately 30 percent of the total quantity of plutonium (that has or may be declared surplus to defense needs) would require extensive purification to use in MOX fuel, and therefore will likely be immobilized. DOE will immobilize at least 8 metric tons (MT) of currently declared surplus plutonium materials that DOE has already determined are not suitable for use in MOX fuel. DOE reserves the option of using the immobilization approach for all of the surplus plutonium.

The exact locations for disposition facilities will be determined pursuant to a follow-on, site-specific disposition environmental impact statement (EIS) as well as cost, technical and nonproliferation studies. However, DOE has decided to narrow the field of candidate disposition sites. DOE has decided that a vitrification or immobilization facility (collocated with a plutonium conversion facility) will be

located at either Hanford or SRS, that a potential MOX fuel fabrication facility will be located at Hanford, INEL, Pantex, or SRS (only one site), and that a "pit" disassembly and conversion facility will be located at Hanford, INEL, Pantex, or SRS (only one site). ("Pits" are weapons components containing plutonium.) The specific reactors, and their locations, that may be used to burn the MOX fuel will depend on contract negotiations, licensing, and environmental reviews. Because there are a number of technology variations that could be used for immobilization, DOE will also determine the specific immobilization technology based on the follow-on EIS, technology developments, cost information, and nonproliferation considerations. Based on current technological and cost information, DOE anticipates that the follow-on EIS will identify, as part of the proposed action, immobilizing a portion of the surplus plutonium using the "can-in-canister" technology at the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) at the Savannah River Site.

The use of MOX fuel in existing reactors would be undertaken in a manner that is consistent with the United States' policy objective on the irreversibility of the nuclear disarmament process and the United States' policy discouraging the civilian use of plutonium. To this end, implementing the MOX alternative would include government ownership and control of the MOX fuel fabrication facility at a DOE site, and use of the facility only for the surplus plutonium disposition program. There would be no reprocessing or subsequent reuse of spent MOX fuel. The MOX fuel would be used in a once-through fuel cycle in existing reactors, with appropriate arrangements, including contractual or licensing provisions, limiting use of MOX fuel to surplus plutonium disposition.

The Department of Energy also retains the option of using MOX fuel in Canadian Deuterium Uranium (CANDU) reactors in Canada in the event a multilateral agreement is negotiated among Russia, Canada, and the United States to use CANDU reactors for surplus United States' and Russian plutonium. DOE will engage in a test and demonstration program for CANDU MOX fuel as appropriate and consistent with future cooperative efforts with Russia and Canada.

These efforts will provide the basis and flexibility for the United States to initiate disposition efforts either multilaterally or bilaterally through negotiations with other nations, or unilaterally as an example to Russia and