

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Mission critical CMR capabilities at LANL support NNSA's stockpile stewardship and management strategic objectives. The CMR Building's analytical chemistry, materials characterization, and actinide research and development capabilities are necessary to support the current and future directed stockpile work and campaign activities conducted at LANL. The CMR Building is over 50 years old and approaching end of design life. Studies conducted in the late 1990s identified a seismic fault trace located beneath the CMR Building, which greatly enhances the level of structural upgrades needed for the building to meet current structural seismic code requirements for a Hazard Category 2 nuclear facility. The CMR Building has been upgraded such that operations can continue, on a restricted basis, in support of national security missions. The CMR Upgrades project was designed to extend the life of the CMR Building through approximately 2010. It would be cost prohibitive to perform the needed repairs, upgrades, and systems retrofitting for a long-term (beyond 2010), unrestricted use of the CMR Building.

NNSA cannot continue to perform the assigned LANL mission critical CMR capabilities in the existing CMR Building at an acceptable level of risk to public and worker health and safety without operational restrictions. These operational restrictions would preclude the full implementation of the level of operation DOE decided upon through its Record of Decision for the 1999 LANL Site-wide Environmental Impact Statement for the Continued Operation of Los Alamos National Laboratory (DOE/EIS-0238). CMR capabilities are necessary to support the current and directed stockpile work and campaign activities at LANL. By 2010, operations will have been conducted in the existing CMR Building for 60 years; this is the estimated operational life span for nuclear operations at the existing CMR Building. Given that the CMR Building is near the end of its useful life, action is now required by NNSA to assess alternatives for continuing these activities for the succeeding 50 years.

The Final CMRR EIS evaluates the environmental impacts associated with relocating the CMR capabilities at LANL to new buildings sited at the following alternative locations: (1) Next to the Plutonium Facility at TA-55 at LANL (the Proposed Action), and (2) a "greenfield" site within TA-6. The NNSA also evaluated performing minimal necessary structural and systems upgrades and repairs to portions of the existing CMR Building

and continuing the use of these upgraded portions of the structure for administrative offices and support function purposes, as well as evaluating the potential decontamination and demolition of the existing CMR Building as disposition options coupled with the alternatives for construction and operation of new nuclear laboratory facilities at the two previously identified locations. The Final CMRR EIS considers the performance of minimal necessary structural and systems upgrades and repairs to the existing CMR Building as a no-action alternative with continued maintenance of limited mission critical CMR capabilities at the CMR Building.

In the Final CMRR EIS, the Administrator of the NNSA designated Alternative 1, the Proposed Action of constructing and operating a new CMRR Facility at TA-55, as its preferred alternative. Additionally, the designated preferred construction option is the construction of a single consolidated SNM-capable Hazard Category laboratory above ground with a separate administrative offices support functions building (Option 3); NNSA's preferred option for the disposition of the CMR Building is to decontaminate, decommission, and demolish that entire structure (Option 3).

Signed in Washington, DC, this 21 day of October, 2003.

Everet H. Beckner,

*Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs,
National Nuclear Security Administration.*

[FR Doc. 03-28508 Filed 11-13-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-6645-5]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under section 309 of the Clean Air Act and section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at (202) 564-7167. An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in the **Federal Register** dated April 4, 2003 (68 FR 16511).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-AFS-G65090-NM Rating LO, Magdalena Ridge Observatory

Project, Construct and Operate an Observatory in the Magdalena Mountains, Cibola National Forest, Magdalena Ranger District, Socorro County, NM.

Summary: EPA had no objection to the preferred alternative.

ERP No. D-DOE-L09817-WA Rating EC2, BP Cherry Point Cogeneration Project, To Build a 720-megawatt Gas-Fired Combined Cycle Cogeneration Facility, Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC), Whatcom County, WA.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns that proposed mitigation would not adequately offset project-related impacts to wetlands. EPA recommended that the additional wetland mitigation be developed along with a demonstration that the applicant-proposed project represents the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative. EPA also recommended that the Bonneville Power Administration and the Corps of Engineers consult with the governments of affected tribes, pursuant to Executive Order 13175.

ERP No. D-NOA-L91019-00 Rating EC2, Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment 16-2, Rebuilding Plans for: Darkblotched Rockfish, Pacific Ocean Perch, Canary Rockfish, and Lingcod, Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, WA, OR, CA and Boundary of U.S. EEZ.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns on bycatch information, impacts on habitat, and enforcement of depth-based management restrictions.

ERP No. D-USA-G11042-LA Rating EC2, 2nd Armored Cavalry Regiment Transformation and Installation Mission Support, Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC) Stryker Brigade Combat Team, Long-Term Military Training Use of Kisatchie National Forest Lands, Fort Polk, LA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns and requested additional information on mitigation measure to reduce sediment loadings, mapping wetlands, and forest restoration.

ERP No. D-USA-L10005-AK Rating EC2, Programmatic EIS—Army Transformation of the 172nd Infantry Brigade (Separate) to a Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT), Propose Location Forts Wainwright and Richardson, AK.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns regarding impacts on natural resources from increased in live-fire training and maneuver training. EPA requested that the FEIS clarify impacts and include compensation information for natural resources.