

determination have been corrected, and the SEA or LEA is, in all other respects, in compliance with the requirements of the applicable program;

(2) SEA has submitted to the Secretary a plan for the use of the funds to be awarded under the grantback arrangement that meets the requirements of the program, and to the extent possible, benefits the population that was affected by the failure to comply or by the misexpenditures that resulted in the audit exception; and

(3) Use of funds to be awarded under the grantback arrangement in accordance with the SEA's plan would serve to achieve the purposes of the program under which the funds were originally granted.

### C. Plan for Use of Funds Awarded Under a Grantback Arrangement

Pursuant to section 459(a)(2) of GEPA, the SEA has applied for a grantback of \$31,696—75 percent of the principal amount recovered by the Department—and has submitted a plan on behalf of the LEA for use of the grantback funds to meet the special educational needs of both educationally deprived children in programs administered under Chapter 1, ESEA (20 U.S.C. 2701 *et seq.*), as well as those of migratory children under the Chapter 1 MEP (20 U.S.C. 2781 *et seq.*).

According to the plan, the LEA will use the grantback funds under Chapter 1 to upgrade its existing Higher Order Thinking Skills program (H.O.T.S.). This computer-assisted instruction has been used successfully in the county for the past two years to improve the skills of educationally deprived children, and the use of the program promotes the purpose of the Chapter 1 program under which funds were allocated (see section 1001(b)).

The KCSD currently has five existing H.O.T.S. Mac Labs, which serve an average of 28 students, in grades 4 through 7. The requested grantback funds will be used to upgrade existing H.O.T.S. sites and allow for another Mac Lab site to be established at Keno Elementary School. Also, software would be purchased for the five existing Mac Labs, as well as for the new Mac Lab.

The grantback funds under the Chapter 1 MEP will be used to purchase computer hardware and software for language instruction to migratory children in four schools in the LEA.

### D. The Secretary's Determinations

The Secretary has carefully reviewed the plan submitted by the SEA. Based upon that review, the Secretary has determined that the conditions under section 459 of GEPA have been met.

These determinations are based upon the best information available to the Secretary at the present time. If this information is not accurate or complete, the Secretary may take appropriate administrative action. In finding that the conditions of section 459 of GEPA have been met, the Secretary makes no determination concerning any pending audit recommendations or final audit determinations.

### E. Notice of the Secretary's Intent to Enter Into a Grantback Arrangement

Section 459(d) of GEPA requires that, at least 30 days before entering into an arrangement to award funds under a grantback, the Secretary must publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of intent to do so, and the terms and conditions under which payment will be made.

In accordance with section 459(d) of GEPA, notice is hereby given that the Secretary intends to make funds available to the SEA under a grantback arrangement. The grantback award would be in the amount of \$31,696.

### F. Terms and Conditions Under Which Payments Under a Grantback Arrangement Would Be Made

The SEA and LEA agree to comply with the following terms and conditions under which payment under a grantback arrangement would be made:

(1) The funds awarded under the grantback must be spent in accordance with—

(a) All applicable statutory and regulatory requirements;

(b) The plan that the SEA submitted and any amendments to that plan that are approved in advance by the Secretary; and

(c) The budget that was submitted with the plan and any amendments to the budget that are approved in advance by the Secretary.

(2) All funds received under the grantback arrangement must be obligated by September 30, 1995, in accordance with section 459(c) of GEPA and the SEA's plan.

(3) The SEA, on behalf of the LEA, will, not later than December 31, 1995, submit a report to the Secretary that—

(a) Indicates that the funds awarded under the grantback have been spent in accordance with the proposed plan and approved budget; and

(b) Describes the results and effectiveness of the project for which the funds were spent.

(4) Separate accounting records must be maintained documenting the expenditures of funds awarded under the grantback arrangement.

Dated: February 8, 1995.

**Thomas W. Payzant,**

*Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education.*

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 84.010, Educationally Deprived Children—Local Educational Agencies; and Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 84.011, Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program)

[FR Doc. 95-4247 Filed 2-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Savannah River Operations Office; Record of Decision: Stabilization of Plutonium Solutions Stored in the F- Canyon Facility at the Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC

**AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Record of Decision, Stabilization of Plutonium Solutions Stored in the F-Canyon Facility at the Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has prepared and issued a Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (DOE/EIS-0219, December 30, 1994), to assess the potential environmental impacts of stabilizing approximately 80,000 gallons of plutonium solutions currently stored in tanks in the F-Canyon chemical separations facility at the Savannah River Site (SRS) near Aiken, South Carolina. As long as the plutonium remains in solution there is a risk of releases and subsequent radiation exposure to workers, the public, and the environment from accidental criticality incidents, leaks, and disruptions of engineered systems from earthquakes. The Department has evaluated the impacts of alternative methods that would achieve stabilization of the solutions. The analysis reveals that the potential environmental impacts of implementing alternatives that would eliminate the risk inherent in storing plutonium in liquid form are small. Further, the impacts differ little among the alternatives. DOE currently has available the capability to process the plutonium solutions to a metal form. Given this existing capability, the potential for environmental releases that exists as a result of storing the plutonium in liquid form, and the relative lack of environmental advantages to implementing other options, DOE has decided to process the plutonium solutions to metal form using the F-Canyon and FB-Line facilities at the SRS. DOE has committed that this