

temporary items). Extra copies of fire reports and related documentation as well as electronic copies of documents created using electronic mail and word processing. Recordkeeping copies of these files are proposed for permanent retention.

2. Department of Defense, National Imagery and Mapping Agency (N1-537-02-2, 2 items, 2 temporary items). Individual procurement appointment files relating to participants in purchase card programs. Also included are electronic copies of records created using word processing and electronic mail.

3. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation (N1-65-02-5, 1 item, 1 temporary item). Hard copy fingerprint cards generated in connection with background investigations of military enlistees.

4. Department of Justice, National Drug Intelligence Center (N1-523-02-1, 8 items, 6 temporary items). Staff meeting files, firearms training records, and training materials that do not pertain to law enforcement. Also included are electronic copies of records created using electronic mail and word processing. Proposed for permanent retention are recordkeeping copies of executive level meeting files and training materials for law enforcement training.

5. Department of Justice, National Drug Intelligence Center (N1-523-02-2, 6 items, 3 temporary items). Policy files that do not pertain to the agency's mission, including electronic copies of records created using electronic mail and word processing. Proposed for permanent retention are recordkeeping copies of mission-related policy files and records that pertain to agreements.

6. Department of the Navy, Agency-wide (N1-NU-02-03, 5 items, 4 temporary items). Records relating to international agreements accumulated by the International Programs Office. The records include Navy annexes to data exchange agreements, newsletters, and charts. Also included are electronic copies of records created using electronic mail and word processing. Recordkeeping copies of case files pertaining to agreements are proposed for permanent retention.

7. Department of the Navy, Agency-wide (N1-NU-02-04, 13 items, 13 temporary items). Records relating to security assistance policy accumulated by the International Programs Office. Included are budgetary documents, case files relating to such matters as foreign military sales and other assistance programs, and inter-service agreements for administrative services. Also included are electronic copies of records

created using electronic mail and word processing.

8. Department of State, Bureau of Human Resources (N1-59-00-8, 23 items, 21 temporary items). Records accumulated by the Office of the Executive Director relating to administrative oversight and support. Included are such records as subject files, the personnel action handbook master, performance files, and several databases containing personnel data for employees, including Foreign Service Nationals. Also included are electronic copies of documents created using electronic mail and word processing. Proposed for permanent retention is the master file of the main personnel system and microfilm copies of employee service record cards from 1940 to 1975.

9. Department of State, Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Research (N1-59-02-7, 2 items, 1 temporary item). Electronic copies of documents created using electronic mail and word processing that are associated with the office's subject files. Proposed for permanent retention are the recordkeeping copies of these files.

10. Department of State, Office of the Secretary of State (N1-59-02-8, 2 items, 1 temporary item). Electronic copies of documents created using electronic mail and word processing that pertain to memorandums of conversations. Recordkeeping copies of these files are proposed for permanent retention.

11. Department of State, Office of Information Technology Operations and Management for the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and the Coordinator of International Information Programs (N1-59-02-9, 26 items, 26 temporary items). Records relating to information technology operations and management, including such matters as the management of computer equipment and software, tape libraries, system backups, data security, and user support. Also included are electronic copies of records created using electronic mail and word processing.

12. Department of the Treasury, Financial Management Service (N1-425-02-2, 4 items, 4 temporary items). Electronic copies of documents created using electronic mail and word processing relating to foreign claim files and to closed court cases concerning forgery and alteration of government checks. This schedule also increases retention period for recordkeeping copies of these files, which were previously approved for disposal.

13. Court Service and Offender Supervision Agency, Community Supervision Services Division (N1-562-02-1, 3 items, 3 temporary items). Case files for offenders in the District of

Columbia Superior Court system who are under parole, supervised release, and/or probation supervision. Included are electronic copies of documents created using electronic mail and word processing.

14. Peace Corps, Management Division (N1-490-02-1, 1 item, 1 temporary item). Electronic records accumulated by the Office of Information Resources Management that are used for tracking staff access to and use of agency automated systems.

Dated: September 12, 2002.

Michael J. Kurtz,

Assistant Archivist for Record Services, Washington, DC.

[FR Doc. 02-24038 Filed 9-20-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

National Nuclear Security Administration

Notice of Intent to Prepare a Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Stockpile Stewardship and Management for a Modern Pit Facility

AGENCY: Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy's (DOE) National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) is responsible for the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile, including protection of production readiness to maintain that stockpile. Since 1989, the DOE has been without the capability to produce plutonium pits (the portion of a nuclear weapon which generates the fission energy to drive modern thermonuclear weapons). The NNSA, the Department of Defense (DOD), and Congress have highlighted the lack of long-term pit production capability as a national security issue requiring timely resolution. While an interim capability is currently being established at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), classified analyses indicate that this capability will not suffice to maintain, long-term, the nuclear deterrent that is a cornerstone of U.S. national security policy. Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), and the DOE Regulations Implementing NEPA (10 CFR Part 1021), the NNSA is announcing its intent to prepare a Supplemental to the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on Stockpile Stewardship and Management (SSM) for

a Modern Pit Facility (MPF) in order to decide: (1) whether to proceed with the MPF; and (2) if so, where to locate the MPF. This NOI also sets forth the dates, times, and locations for public scoping meetings on the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility.

DATES: NNSA is inviting comments related to its intention to prepare a Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility. Comments should be submitted within November 22, 2002. Comments submitted during the 60-day comment period following publication of this NOI will assist the NNSA in developing the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility. Public scoping meetings to discuss issues and receive comments on the scope of the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility will be held in the vicinity of sites that may be affected by the proposed action, as well as in Washington, DC. The public scoping meetings will provide the public with an opportunity to present comments, ask questions, and discuss concerns with NNSA officials regarding the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility. The locations, dates, and times for these public scoping meetings are as follows: Pantex—October 8, 2002, 7 p.m.–10 p.m., College Union Building, Oak Room, Amarillo College, Washington Street Campus, 24th and Jackson Streets, Amarillo, TX 79178, (806) 371-5100

Carlsbad, NM—October 10, 2002, 7 p.m.–10 p.m., U.S. Department of Energy, Carlsbad Area Office, 4021 National Parks Highway, Carlsbad, NM 88220, (505) 234-7227

Washington, DC—October 15, 2002, 2 p.m.–5 p.m., U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Room 1E-245, Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586-0821

Nevada Test Site—October 17, 2002, 7 p.m.–10 p.m., U.S. Department of Energy, Nevada Operations Office, Auditorium, 232 Energy Way, Las Vegas, NV 89030, (702) 295-3521

Los Alamos National Laboratory—October 24, 2002, 7 p.m.–10 p.m., Duane W. Smith Auditorium, 1400 Diamond Drive, Los Alamos, NM 87544, (505) 663-2510

Savannah River Site—October 29, 2002, 7 p.m.–10 p.m., North Augusta Community Center, 495 Brookside Avenue, North Augusta, SC 29841, (803) 441-4290

The NNSA will publish additional notices on the dates, times, and locations of the scoping meetings in

local newspapers in advance of the scheduled meetings. Any necessary changes will be announced in the local media. Any agency, state, pueblo, tribe, or unit of local government that desires to be designated a cooperating agency should contact Mr. Jay Rose at the address listed below by October 15, 2002.

ADDRESSES: General questions concerning this Notice of Intent for the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility can be asked by calling 1-800-832-0885, ext. 65484, or by writing to: Mr. Jay Rose, Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility Document Manager, NA-53, Forrestal Building, U.S. Department of Energy/NNSA, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C. 20585. Comments can be submitted to Mr. Rose at the address above; or faxed to: 1-202-586-5324; or e-mailed to James.Rose@nnsa.doe.gov. Please mark envelopes, faxes, and E-mail: "Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility Comments."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information on the NNSA NEPA process, please contact: Mr. James J. Mangeno, NNSA NEPA Compliance Officer, NA-3.6, Forrestal Building, U.S. Department of Energy/NNSA, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D.C. 20585; or telephone 1-800-832-0885, ext. 6-8395. For general information on the DOE NEPA process, please contact: Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Compliance, EH-42, Forrestal Building, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585, telephone 202-586-4600, or leave a message at 1-800-472-2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Plutonium pits are essential components of nuclear weapons. Prior to the shutdown of its production activities in 1989, plutonium pits for the nuclear weapons stockpile were manufactured at the DOE Rocky Flats Plant in Colorado. No stockpile-certified pits have been produced by this country since that shutdown. During the mid-1990s, the DOE conducted a comprehensive analysis of the capability and capacity needs for the entire Nuclear Weapons Complex and evaluated alternatives for maintaining the Nation's nuclear stockpile in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Stockpile Stewardship and Management (SSM PEIS, DOE/EIS-0236). Issued in September 1996, the SSM PEIS looked extensively at pit manufacturing

capability and capacity needs, and evaluated reasonable alternatives for re-establishing interim pit production capability on a small scale. A large pit production capacity—in line with the capacity planned for other manufacturing functions—was not evaluated in the PEIS "because of the small current demand for the fabrication of replacement pits, and the significant, but currently undefined, time period before additional capacity may be needed." In the SSM PEIS Record of Decision (ROD) (61 FR 68014, December 26, 1996), the Secretary of Energy decided to re-establish an interim pit fabrication capability, with a small capacity, at LANL. That decision limited pit fabrication to a facility "sized to meet programmatic requirements over the next ten or more years." In the ROD, DOE committed to "performing development and demonstration work at its operating plutonium facilities over the next several years to study alternative facility concepts for larger capacity."

Subsequent to the SSM PEIS ROD, a number of citizen groups filed suit challenging the adequacy of the SSM PEIS. In August 1998, the SSM PEIS litigation was resolved. As a result of that litigation, DOE agreed to entry of a court order that required, "[p]rior to taking any action that would commit DOE resources to detailed engineering design, testing, procurement, or installment of pit production capability for a capacity in excess of the level that has been analyzed in the SSM PEIS [50 pits per year under routine conditions, 80 pits per year under multiple-shift operations], DOE shall prepare and circulate a Supplemental PEIS, in accordance with DOE NEPA Regulation 10 CFR 1021.314, analyzing the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts of and alternatives to operating such an enhanced capacity, and shall issue a Record of Decision based thereon." This Supplement to the SSM PEIS is being prepared in part to satisfy that obligation.

Following the SSM PEIS, in January 1999, the Department prepared the LANL Site-Wide EIS (SWEIS) (DOE/EIS-0238), which evaluated site-specific alternatives for implementing pit production at LANL. Consistent with the SSM PEIS ROD, the LANL SWEIS evaluated alternatives that would implement pit production with a capacity up to 50 pits per year under single-shift operations and 80 pits per year using multiple shifts. In the ROD for the LANL SWEIS (64 FR 50797, September 20, 1999), DOE decided to produce up to 20 pits per year at LANL,

and deferred any decision to expand pit manufacturing beyond that level.

Consistent with the 1996 SSM PEIS ROD and the 1999 LANL SWEIS ROD, NNSA has been re-establishing a small pit manufacturing capability at LANL. The establishment of the interim pit production capacity is expected to be completed in 2007. However, classified analyses indicate that the capability being established at LANL will not support either the projected capacity requirements (number of pits to be produced over a period of time), or the agility (ability to rapidly change from production of one pit type to another, ability to simultaneously produce multiple pit types, or the flexibility to produce pits of a new design in a timely manner) necessary for long-term support of the stockpile. In particular, any systemic problems that might be identified in an existing pit type or class of pits (particularly any aging phenomenon) could not be adequately addressed today, nor could it be with the capability being established at LANL. Although no such problems have been identified, the potential for such problems increases as pits age. NNSA's inability to respond to such issues is a matter of national security concern. NNSA is responsible for ensuring that appropriate pit production capacity and agility are available when needed, and this Supplement to the SSM PEIS is being undertaken to assist NNSA in discharging this responsibility.

NEPA Strategy and EIS Alternatives

Currently, the NNSA envisions the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility as a "programmatic document" that will support two decisions: (1) Whether to proceed with the MPF; and (2) if so, where to locate the MPF. A tiered, project-specific EIS is expected to be prepared after the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility if the Secretary decides to proceed with such a facility. That tiered EIS, which would utilize detailed design information to evaluate site-specific alternatives at any site selected as a potential location for a MPF, would ultimately support a decision for construction and operation of the MPF. As described below, the NNSA has developed preliminary alternatives for the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility.

Alternatives: The NNSA has prepared, and will continue to prepare mission, requirements, and planning documents required to support an NNSA decision on whether to proceed with the MPF, and has conducted a site screening analysis to assure that potential sites

meet program requirements. Initially, all existing, major DOE sites were considered to serve as potential host location for the MPF. The site screening analysis considered the following criteria: population encroachment, mission compatibility, margin for safety/security, synergy with existing/future plutonium operations, minimizing transportation of plutonium, NNSA presence at the site, and infrastructure. The first two criteria were deemed to be "exclusionary" criteria; that is, a site either passed or failed on each of these two criteria. The sites that passed the exclusionary criteria were then scored against all criteria. Based upon results from the site screening analysis, the following sites were determined to be reasonable alternatives for the MPF: (1) Los Alamos National Laboratory at Los Alamos, New Mexico; (2) Nevada Test Site near Las Vegas, Nevada; (3) Pantex Plant at Amarillo, Texas; (4) Savannah River Site at Aiken, South Carolina; and (5) the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant at Carlsbad, NM. The Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility will also evaluate the no-action alternative of maintaining the current plutonium pit capabilities at LANL, and the reasonableness of upgrading the existing facilities at LANL to increase pit production capacity. Additionally, the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility will evaluate a range of pit production capacities consistent with national security requirements.

Identification of Environmental and Other Issues

The environmental impacts of constructing and operating the MPF, including the impacts that might occur at each potential site, will be addressed in the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility. These impacts will be presented along with environmental baseline information to enable the reader to discern the differences between alternatives. The NNSA has identified the following issues for analysis in the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility. Additional issues may be identified as a result of the scoping process.

1. Public and Worker Safety, Health Risk Assessment: Radiological and non-radiological impacts, including projected effects on workers and the public from construction, normal operations and accident conditions, and decommissioning and decontamination activities associated with constructing and operating the MPF.

2. Impacts from releases to air, water, and soil associated with constructing and operating the MPF.

3. Impacts to plants, animals, and habitats, including threatened or endangered species and their habitats, associated with constructing and operating the MPF.

4. The consumption of natural resources and energy associated with constructing and operating the MPF.

5. Socioeconomic impacts to affected communities from construction and operation of the MPF.

6. Environmental justice: Disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations associated with constructing and operating the MPF.

7. Impacts to cultural resources such as historic, archaeological, scientific, or culturally important sites associated with constructing and operating the MPF.

8. Impacts associated with transportation and storage of nuclear materials.

9. Status of compliance with all applicable Federal, state, and local statutes and regulations; required Federal, state, and tribe environmental consultations and notifications; and DOE Orders on waste management, waste minimization, and environmental protection.

10. Cumulative impacts from the proposed action and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions at the alternative sites.

11. Potential irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources associated with constructing and operating the MPF.

12. Pollution prevention and waste management practices, including characterization, storage, treatment and disposal of wastes associated with constructing and operating the MPF. NNSA anticipates that certain classified information will be utilized in preparing the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility and considered by the NNSA in deciding whether to construct and operate MPF, and if so, where the facility would be located. Accordingly, the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility will likely contain a classified appendix. To the extent allowable, the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility will summarize this information in an unclassified manner.

Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility Schedule

The proposed Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility schedule is as follows:

Notice of Intent: September 2002.

Public Scoping Meetings: October 2002.

Publish Draft EIS: May 2003.

Draft EIS Public Hearings: June–July 2003.

Publish Final EIS: March 2004.

Record of Decision: April 2004.

Public Scoping Process

To assist in defining the appropriate scope of the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility and to identify significant environmental issues to be addressed, NNSA representatives will conduct public scoping meetings at the dates, times, and locations described above under **DATES**. At these meetings, the NNSA will present a short summary of the project, indicate the alternatives to be considered, and present the proposed scope of the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility. Following the initial presentation at each site, NNSA representatives will answer questions and accept comments, and the public will have a chance to offer their comments on the proposal, alternatives to be studied and the scope of the Supplement to the Programmatic EIS on SSM for a Modern Pit Facility. Copies of handouts from the meetings will be available to those unable to attend, by contacting the NNSA as described above under **ADDRESSES**.

Issued in Washington, DC, this 16th day of September 2002.

Spencer Abraham,

Secretary of Energy.

[FR Doc. 02–24076 Filed 9–20–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–237, 50–249, 50–254, and 50–265]

Exelon Generation Company, LLC; Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–19

and DPR–25, issued to Exelon Generation Company, LLC (the licensee), for operation of the Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, located in Grundy County, Illinois, and for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–29 and DPR–30, issued to the licensee, for operation of the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Rock Island County, Illinois. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC is issuing this environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant a schedular extension for Dresden Nuclear Power Station (Dresden), Units 2 and 3, and for Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station (Quad Cities), Units 1 and 2, for submittal of revised Updated Final Safety Analysis Reports (UFSARs) from the regularly scheduled dates. 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) requires that subsequent revisions to the UFSAR be submitted periodically to the NRC provided that the interval between successive updates does not exceed 24 months. The Dresden and Quad Cities UFSAR revisions are currently submitted on a 24-month cycle. The next scheduled date for submittal of the revised UFSAR for Dresden is June 30, 2003, and for Quad Cities is October 20, 2003. However, the licensee plans to submit revised UFSARs along with Operating License Renewal Applications (LRAs) for Dresden and Quad Cities in January 2003. The licensee plans to resume the established schedule for submittal of the UFSAR revisions in 2005 for both stations. The licensee requests a one-time exemption to postpone submittal of the revised Dresden and Quad Cities UFSARs until 2005.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated August 9, 2002.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The licensee proposes to submit revised UFSARs with LRAs in January 2003, and to resume the established schedule for submittal of UFSAR revisions for Dresden on June 30, 2005, and for Quad Cities on October 20, 2005. An exemption is required because 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) requires that subsequent revisions to the UFSAR be submitted periodically to the NRC provided that the interval between successive updates does not exceed 24 months.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there are no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (*i.e.*, the “no-action” alternative). 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 action does not involve the use of any different resource than those previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, dated November 1973, and for the Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, dated September 1972.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

On August 22, 2002, the staff consulted with the Illinois State official, Mr. F. Niziolek of the Department of Nuclear Safety, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the