Paiute Indians of the Kaibab Indian Reservation.

This notice has been sent to officials of the Hopi Tribe and the Kaibab Band of the Paiute Indians of the Kaibab Indian Reservation. Representatives of any other Indian tribe which believes itself to be culturally affiliation with these human remains and associated funerary objects should contact Gary Stumpf, Bureau of Land Management, Arizona State Office, 3707 N. 7th Street, Phoenix, AZ 85014, telephone (602) 650–0509 before May 1, 1996. Repatriation of these human remains and associated funerary objects may begin after this date if no additional claimants come forward.

Dated: March 26, 1996

Francis P. McManamon

Departmental Consulting Archeologist

Chief, Archeology & Ethnography Program

[FR Doc. 96–7816 Filed 3–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–F

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Title II Development Activity Proposal and Previously Approved Activity Submissions; Final Draft Guidelines Availability

Pursuant to the Agricultural Trade and Development Act of 1990, notice is hereby given that the Final Draft Guidelines for Fiscal Year 1997 (FY 97) Public Law 480 Title II Development Activity Proposal (DAP) and Previously Approved Activity (PAA) Submissions are available to interested parties for the required thirty (30) day comment period. An earlier version of these guidelines was announced in the Federal Register on December 26, 1995. Due to the number of revisions to Section I, they have been resubmitted for the legislatively—mandated thirty (30) day comment period. It is anticipated that the guidelines will not undergo further changes.

Individuals who wish to review and comment on the final draft guidelines should contact: Office of Food for Peace, Room 323, SA–8, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. 20523. Contact person: Adrienne Benson of Mendez England and Associates , (703) 841–2700.

The thirty day comment period will begin on the date that this announcement is published in the Federal Register.

Dated: March 19, 1996.

H. Robert Kramer,

Director, Office of Food for Peace, Bureau for Humanitarian Response.

[FR Doc. 96–7790 Filed 3–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6116–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[DEA #147I]

Controlled Substances: 1996 Aggregate Production Quotas

AGENCY: Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Justice.

ACTION: Interim notice establishing 1996 aggregate production quotas and request for comments.

SUMMARY: This interim notice establishes revised 1996 aggregate production quotas for amobarbital and hydromorphone, Schedule II controlled substances, as required under the Controlled Substances Act of 1970.

DATES: The is effective on April 1, 1996. Comments must be submitted on or before May 1, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Send comments or objections to the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC 20537, Attn: DEA Federal Register Representative/CCR.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Howard McClain, Jr., Chief, Drug and Chemical Evaluation Section, Drug Enforcement Administration, Washington, DC 20537, (202) 307–7183.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 306 of the Controlled Substances Act, (21 U.S.C. 826), requires the Attorney General to establish aggregate production quotas for controlled substances in Schedules I and II each year. This responsibility has been delegated to the Administrator of the DEA pursuant to Section 0.100 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The Administrator, in turn, has redelegated this function to the Deputy Administrator of the DEA pursuant to § 0.14 of Tile 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

The DEA established initial 1996 aggregate production quotas for controlled substances in Schedules I and II, including amobarbital and hydromorphone, in a Federal Register notice published on November 21, 1995 (60 FR 57808). Since publication of the initial 1996 aggregate production quotas, DEA has received information which necessities an immediate increase in the initial 1996 aggregate production quotas for amobarbital and hydromorphone. The company which is currently the only bulk manufacturer of amobarbital, did not request a 1996 individual manufacturing quota for amobarbital. Since the company now needs to manufacture amobarbital to meet unexpected customer demands, the established initial 1996 aggregate production quota for amobarbital must be increased so that they may receive an individual manufacturing quota. The increase proposed for hydromorphone is necessary for a company to meet its customers' product development activities. For these reasons, an interim notice is being published.

Therefore, under the authority vested in the Attorney General by Section 306 of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 826), delegated to the Administrator of the DEA by § 0.100 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, and redelegated to the Deputy Administrator, pursuant to § 0.104 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the Deputy Administrator hereby establishes the following revised 1996 aggregate production quotas for the listed controlled substances, expressed in grams of anhydrous base or acid:

Basic class	Established revised 1996 quota
Amobarbital	301,000
Hydromorphone	718,000

All interested persons are invited to submit their comments in writing regarding this interim notice.

The Office of Management and Budget has determined that notices of aggregate production quotas are not subject to centralized review under Executive Order 12866. This action has been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612, and it has been determined that this matter does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

The Deputy Administrator hereby certifies that this action will have no significant impact upon small entities whose interest must be considered under the Regulary Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.* The establishment of annual aggregate production quotas for Schedules I and II controlled substances is mandated by law and by international treaty obligations. While aggregate production quotas are of primary importance to large manufacturers, their impact upon small entities is neither negative nor beneficial. Accordingly, the Deputy Administrator has determined

that this action does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

Dated: March 22, 1996.

Stephen H. Green,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96–7797 Filed 3–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 96–035]

NASA Advisory Council, Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications Advisory Committee; Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. 92–463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a meeting of the NASA Advisory Council, Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications Advisory Committee.

DATES: April 18, 1996, 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.; and April 19, 1996, 8:30 a.m. to Noon.

ADDRESSES: NASA Headquarters, Room MIC 7A, 300 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Arnauld Nicogossian, Code U, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546, 202/358–0215.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will be closed to the public on Thursday, April 18, 1996, from 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 522b(c)(6), to allow for discussion on qualifications of individuals being considered for membership to the Committee. The remainder of the meeting will be open to the public up to the seating capacity of the room. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

—Review of the Office of Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications Status
—Committee Discussion on Strategy and Metrics
—International Space Station Status, Phase 1
—Advisory Committee Structure
—Subcommittee Reports
—Discussion of Committee Findings and Recommendations

It is imperative that the meeting be held on these dates to accommodate the scheduling priorities of the key participants. Visitors will be required to sign a visitor's register.

Dated: March 26, 1996.

Leslie M. Nolan,

Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–7820 Filed 3–29–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–397]

Washington Public Power Supply System; WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to the technical specifications (TSs) for Facility Operating License No. NPF–21, issued to Washington Public Power Supply System (the Supply System, or the licensee) for operation of the WPPSS Nuclear Project No. 2, located in Benton County, Washington.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed change would modify the TSs to reflect replacement of the existing reactor recirculation (RRC) flow control system with an adjustable speed drive (ASD) system. The current system relies on operation of the RRC pumps at two discrete speeds, using flow control valves to vary the flow in the RRC system. Following the design change, the flow control valves and the existing pump controllers would be deactivated in place. The existing analog-hydraulic flow control system will be replaced with dual channel, variable frequency ASDs and a digital recirculation flow control system that would vary RRC flow by varying RRC pump speed. The proposed TS changes would reflect the new RRC flow control system.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The licensee proposed the action to improve the reliability of flow control in the RRC system, and to provide increased operational flexibility during plant startup to avoid RRC pump cavitation and core instability restriction zones.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action. The proposed change would not affect the probability of loss of the RRC pumps. Blocking open the RRC flow control valves would remove the potential failure of these valves from affecting operation of the RRC system, thereby reducing the probability of loss of RRC flow from this failure. The proposed change would allow removal of the hydraulic components for the RRC flow control valves and allow the licensee to cap eight containment penetrations. This in turn would allow removal of the 16 associated containment isolation valves. This reduces the number of potential leakage paths from the containment, and removes these potential leakage paths from affecting the consequences of postulated accidents. The proposed change also does not affect the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The proposed action does not affect systems that generate or process non-radiological plant effluents, and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded that there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greated impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the Commission considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

The proposed action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environnmental Statement for WNP–2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on February 27, 1996, the Commission consulted with the Washington State official, Mr. R.R. Cowley of the Department of Health, State of