7. Mr. Edgar B. Vandiver III, Director, U.S. Army Concepts Analysis Agency.
8. Mr. William M. Robinson, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Engineering (International Affairs), U.S. Army Europe and Seventh Army.

The members of the Performance Review Board for the Chief of Staff are:

1. BG Albert J. Madora, Deputy Director, Program Analysis & Evaluation Directorate, Vice Chief of Staff, Army.
2. Mr. Edgar B. Vandiver III, Director, U.S. Army Concepts Analysis Agency, Director of the Army Staff.
3. Dr. Jeffrey Clarke, Chief Historian, U.S. Army Center of Military History, Director of the Army Staff.
4. Ms. Jean M. Bennett, Director, Programs & Analysis Directorate, Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence.
5. Mr. Mark J. O'Konski, Director, Logistics Integration Agency, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics.
6. MG Julian A. Sullivan, Jr., Director of Supply and Maintenance, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics.
7. Mr. John A. Riente, Technical Advisor to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans.
8. BG(P) Benjamin S. Griffin, Director of Force Programs, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans.
9. BG James J. Lovelace, Jr., Director of Training, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans.
10. MG Thomas W. Garrett, Commander, U.S. Total Army Personnel Command, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.
11. BG Kathryn Carlson, Special Assistant to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.
12. Ms. Maureen Lishcke, Program Executive Officer, National Guard Bureau.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–23202 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–08–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Northeast Phoenix Drainage Area Feasibility Study; Maricopa County, AZ

AGENCY: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Los Angeles District, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The Los Angeles District intends to prepare an EIS to support the proposed study for flood control and drainage in the Northeast Phoenix area. The Northeast Phoenix Drainage feasibility study area is located in the Northeast of the City of Phoenix, and adjacent communities. The Study area is roughly bounded by Carefree Highway on the North, Cave Creek Road to the West, the Central Arizona Project canal to the South, and Scottsdale Road to the East. The study will analyze flooding ad drainage problems in the study area and primarily on Rawhide Wash and alluvial fan 5 and 6.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

For further information contact Mr. David Compas, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Attn.: CESPL–PD–RN, P.O. Box 532711, Los Angeles, California, 90053–2325; phone (213) 452–3850; E-mail dcompas@spl.usace.army.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: To prepare for the preparation of the EIS, the Corps will be conducting a public scoping meeting on September 8, 1998, at 7 P.M., at the Paradise Valley Community Center located at 17402 N. 40th St., Phoenix, Arizona. This scoping meeting will be held to solicit public input on significant environmental issues associated with the proposed project. The public, as well as Federal, State, and local agencies are encouraged to participate in the scoping process by attending the Scoping Meeting and/or submitting data, information, and comments identifying relevant environmental and socioeconomic issues to be addressed in the environmental analysis. Useful information includes other environmental studies, published and unpublished data, and alternatives that should be addressed in the analysis. Individuals and agencies may offer information or data relevant to the proposed study and provide comments suggestions by attending the public scoping meeting, or by mailing the information within thirty (30) days to Mr. David Compas. Requests to be placed on the mailing list for announcements and the Draft EIS also should be sent to Mr. David Compas.

Alternatives: A full array of alternatives to the proposed action will be developed for further analyses. The proposed plan, viable project alternatives, and the no action plan will be carried forward for detailed analysis in the National Environmental Policy Act document.

Dated: August 19, 1998.

Robert L. Davis,

Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer.

[FR Doc. 98–23201 Filed 8–27–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–KF–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Scrub Alloy Stored at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (DOE) announces the availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Scrub Alloy Stored at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (DOE/EIS–0277F, August 1998). The Final EIS analyzes reasonable alternatives for the management of certain plutonium residues and all of the scrub alloy at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (Rocky Flats) near Golden, Colorado. Plutonium residues and scrub alloy are materials that were generated while processing plutonium during the manufacture of components for nuclear weapons. The Final EIS analyzes processing technologies for various material categories of residues (e.g., ash, salts, fluorides) and the scrub alloy. Processing of these materials is needed to address health and safety issues associated with their continued storage and to prepare them for disposal or other disposition. DOE has prepared this Final EIS pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321, *et seq.*), in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508) and the DOE NEPA implementing regulations (10 CFR Part 1021).

DOE analyzed four alternatives, in addition to the Preferred Alternative, for each of the categories of Rocky Flats plutonium residues and scrub alloy. The Final EIS identifies the rationale for identifying the treatment technologies as preferred.

All of the alternatives analyzed in the Final EIS were either analyzed in the Draft EIS or are composed of elements of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS, with the exception of two new candidate processing technologies similar to technologies analyzed in the Draft EIS. Nevertheless, because certain