

users of Mississippi River water. Subsequent meetings were held to discuss this information. Representatives of Federal, state, and local agencies, industries, environmental groups, and other organizations and interested individuals who desire input to the scoping process should contact Dr. Beckert at the address furnished below.

b. Significant issues to be addressed in the draft supplemental EIS include the effects of disposal of dredged material in the Mississippi River and on adjacent land, marsh, and open water areas; the effects of the enlargement of navigation channels on saltwater intrusion in the Mississippi River; the effects of alterations of flows in Southwest and South Passes on the aquatic ecosystem; and the costs and economic benefits of the proposed action.

c. It will be necessary for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to perform a Habitat Evaluation Procedure of the proposed action for inclusion in the DEIS.

d. Coordination will be maintained with interested agencies and other interested entities to keep them apprised of progress.

4. *Scoping Meetings.* No formal scoping meetings will be held.

5. *Availability.* The draft supplemental EIS is scheduled to be available to the public in July 1980.

**ADDRESS:** Questions concerning the proposed action and draft supplemental EIS can be directed to Dr. Heino Bockert, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Quality Section (LMNPD-RE), P.O. Box 60287, New Orleans, Louisiana, 70160, telephone (504) 838-2519.

Charles E. DeWeese,

Lt. Colonel, CE

Deputy District Engineer.

January 28, 1980.

(FR Doc. 80-465 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am)

BILLING CODE 3710-84-M

#### Office of the Secretary

#### Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS); Meeting

Pursuant to Pub. L. 92-403, notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS) is scheduled to be held from 1:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., 17 March 1980, Rm. 3D318 and from 9:30 a.m. to approximately 1:00 p.m., 18 March 1980 in Room 1E801, The Pentagon. Meeting sessions will be open to the public.

The purpose of the meeting is to review responses to earlier recommendations made by the Committee, discuss current issues relevant to women in the Services, and plan the itinerary/program for the next semi-annual meeting scheduled for 21-25 April 1980 in Washington, D.C. Persons desiring to make oral presentations or submit written statements for consideration at the Executive Committee Meeting must contact Captain Mary J. Mayer, Executive Secretary, DACOWITS, OASD (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics), Rm. 3D322, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301, telephone 202-697-5055 no later than March 7, 1980.

H. E. Lofdahl,  
Director, Correspondence and Directives,  
Washington Headquarters Service,  
Department of Defense.

February 7, 1980.

(FR Doc. 80-465 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am)

BILLING CODE 3410-70-M

#### Defense Systems Management College, Board of Visitors Meeting

A meeting of the Defense Systems Management College (DSMC) Board of Visitors will be held in Building 202, Fort Belvoir, VA, on Wednesday, 26 March 1980, from 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. The agenda will include a review of accomplishments related to the system acquisition education, system acquisition research, and information collection and dissemination missions. It will also include a review of the DSMC plans, resources and operations. The meeting is open to the public; however, because of limitations on the space available, allocation of seating will be made on a first-come, first-served basis. Persons desiring to attend the meeting should call Lieutenant Commander Judy Ray (703-604-1175) to reserve a seat.

H. E. Lofdahl,

Director.

(FR Doc. 80-465 Filed 2-12-80; 8:45 am)

BILLING CODE 3410-70-M

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

#### Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy

#### Long-Term Management of Defense High-Level Radioactive Wastes (Research and Development Program for Immobilization), Savannah River Plant; Record of Decision?

#### Decision

The decision has been made to continue a large Federal research and development (RAD) program directed

toward the immobilization of the high-level radioactive wastes at the Savannah River Plant (SRP) and not to undertake an R&D program on direct disposal of the wastes in bedrock.

#### Background

The SRP near Aiken, South Carolina, is a major installation of the Department of Energy (DOE) for the production of nuclear materials for national defense. It began operations in the early 1950's and is currently the Nation's primary source of reactor-produced defense materials. The SRP operations also produce liquid high-level radioactive waste from the chemical processing of fuel and target materials after irradiation in the SRP nuclear reactors. The high-level waste has been and is continuing to be stored safely in underground tanks that are engineered to provide reliable storage of the waste isolated from the environment. DOE is developing methods for permanent disposal of these wastes.

DOE published the final environmental impact statement "Long-Term Management of Defense High-Level Radioactive Wastes (Research and Development Program for Immobilization), Savannah River Plant, Aiken, South Carolina," (DOE/EIS-0023) in November 1979. Notices of its availability were published in the Federal Register by DOE on December 3, 1979 (44 FR 66320) and by the Environmental Protection Agency on December 7, 1979 (44 FR 70583).

#### Description of Action

The multi-year R&D program being continued is aimed at developing the technology for removing the wastes from the tanks, concentrating them into a high activity fraction, and immobilizing the radioactive nuclides in a high integrity form for subsequent disposal. Since the method of disposal has not been chosen, the R&D program is sufficiently broad in its initial stages so that it can be modified in later stages as appropriate, to satisfy the immobilization requirements of a variety of disposal techniques. Moreover, the R&D program provides for the development of a variety of waste forms, to permit the ultimate waste form to be specifically tailored to the exigencies of the disposal method ultimately selected.

#### Description of Alternatives

The alternatives to carrying out the immobilization R&D program considered by DOE in reaching this decision are:

1. terminate the immobilization R&D program and continue tank storage of the wastes indefinitely with transfer to

new tanks about every 50 years (no action alternative).

2. fund an R&D program for direct disposal of the waste in bedrock under the Savannah River Plant.

#### Basic for Decision

Orientation of the Savannah River technology development program toward conversion of the waste to a high-integrity form for subsequent disposal has been influenced by public opinion and perception of risks, as expressed through governmental bodies and special interest groups. For example, comment letters on DOE/EIS-0023D were received from the Governor of the State of Georgia indicating opposition to bedrock disposal of waste under the SRP site, and from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency categorizing any bedrock disposal option at SRP as Environmentally Unsatisfactory.

The decision to continue the R&D program is consistent with the recommendation of the Interagency Review Group on Nuclear Waste Management (IRG) that:

"DOE accelerate its R&D activities oriented toward improving immobilization and waste forms and review its current immobilization programs in the light of the latest views of the scientific and technical community. Since final processing of defense waste has been deferred for three decades the IRG also recommends that remedial action, including immobilization of the waste, should begin as soon as practicable."

A great deal of uncertainty is associated with the prediction of the environmental impacts which could result over very long periods of time from the disposal of radioactive wastes. Accordingly, DOE has selected the conservative approach of proceeding with the immobilization R&D program. Although the environmental impacts which are predicted to result from implementing any of the alternatives are small, proceeding with the immobilization R&D program is the most conservative approach to provide an option to help assure that the waste will not enter the biosphere and will pose no significant threat to public health and safety.

The most significant quantifiable differences between the alternatives are the differences in budgetary costs. The estimated capital and operating cost of the alternatives in constant 1980 dollars are: perpetual tank storage, \$510 million; bedrock disposal, \$755 million; and immobilization for disposal, \$3800 to \$3780 million. Although implementation of the immobilization R&D program is

the costliest alternative, retaining SRP waste disposal method flexibility and responding to the expressed public concern to minimize the risk of exposure to the general population from radioactive waste disposal justify continuation of the immobilization R&D program.

#### Discussion of Environmentally Preferred Alternatives

There are no substantial environmental impacts arising from nuclear radiation for any of the alternatives. The offsite population exposure risk from the alternative with the highest risk (liquid waste stored in SRP bedrock cavern) is more than one-thousand fold lower than natural radiation exposure to the same population. Nonnuclear fatalities to be expected from construction and operating activities related to each alternative are greater than those that would be expected for radiation effects, but are no larger than the risks voluntarily accepted by industrial workers. Off-site radiation risks, occupational exposures, nonnuclear risks, and other environmental effects are small in absolute magnitude for all options analyzed.

On a relative basis, some differences in environmental impact among the alternatives are evident. The no action alternative would result in lower occupational exposures but higher offsite population dose risk and more nonnuclear accidental fatalities than would implementation of the immobilization R&D program. Alternative 2 (bedrock disposal) is estimated to result in the lowest occupational radiation exposure and the lowest estimated fatality rate from nonnuclear accidents but the highest offsite population dose risk. Based on the judgment that offsite population radiation dose risk over time is a more important consideration than either occupational dose risk or fatalities from nonnuclear accidents, the analysts in DOE/EIS-0023 indicate that the immobilization R&D program with the lowest potential offsite population dose risk is the environmentally preferable alternative. This is primarily due to the degree of isolation afforded by rendering the wastes less mobile in the environment.

Occupational related risks such as occupational radiation exposure and nonnuclear accidents generally are voluntary in nature; conversely, offsite radiation exposures are involuntary in nature and involve a greater number of people. Accordingly, the offsite population dose was the controlling consideration in selecting continuation

of the immobilization R&D program as the environmentally-preferred alternative.

#### Considerations In Implementation of the Decision

The continuation of the DOE R&D program to immobilize the SRP liquid high-level radioactive waste will not pose any significant adverse environmental impact prior to a proposal for a specific facility which would be addressed in a separate NEPA review. No mitigation activities are anticipated.

For the United States Department of Energy

Dated, February 1, 1980

George W. Cunningham,

Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy

DOE HEADQUARTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20545

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

#### Office of Special Counsel for Compliance

#### Consent Order With Union Oil Co. of California Made Final

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of action taken on consent order.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to 10 CFR 205.199, the Office of Special Counsel (OSC) of the Department of Energy hereby gives notice that the Proposed Consent Order executed between OSC and Union Oil Company of California (Union) and noticed in the Federal Register on October 18, 1979, is final effective upon publication of this Notice.

The Consent Order addresses Union's computation of increased product and non-product costs for natural gas liquids and natural gas liquid products for the period August 1973 through December 1978 and therefore concerns only discrete components of maximum lawful selling prices and not a determination of possible overcharges. However, the Consent Order contains a reservation of the right of the OSC to take further remedial action if warranted by the continuing examination of Union.

On October 18, 1979, notice was published in the Federal Register at 44 FR 60143, that the proposed Consent Order had been signed. The notice set out the background of the Consent Order, summarized its terms and conditions and provided 30 days for the receipt of comments before determining whether to make the Consent Order final.

OSC has considered a comment received subsequent to the period specified for submission of comments in