proposed action would restructure research and development (R&D) and testing facilities. These two proposed actions differ in their magnitude and timing. The alternatives for restructuring SNM facilities, which would take 10 years or more, are necessarily broad and address issues such as where to locate these facilities and whether to construct new facilities or renovate existing ones for these functions. As such, the Draft Complex Transformation SPEIS analysis is ''programmatic'' for the proposed action of restructuring SNM facilities. Tiered, project-specific NEPA documents would likely be needed to inform decisions unless existing site-wide EIS's or other NEPA documents were sufficient.

In comparison, NNSA proposes to pursue restructuring of R&D and testing facilities in the near-term, independent of decisions it may make as to restructuring of SNM facilities. The proposed action to restructure R&D and testing facilities would likely not require further NEPA documentation to implement decisions after NNSA issues the Final Complex Transformation SPEIS and Record of Decision.

The alternatives for restructuring SNM facilities are: (1) No Action; (2) Distributed Centers of Excellence; (3) Consolidated Centers of Excellence; and (4) Capability-Based. Common to each of these are alternatives to consolidate storage of certain SNM. The No Action Alternative represents continuation of the status quo including implementation of decisions already made on the basis of prior NEPA analyses. Under the No Action Alternative, NNSA would not make major changes to the missions assigned to NNSA sites.

The Distributed Centers of Excellence Alternative retains the three major SNM functions (plutonium, uranium, and weapon assembly/disassembly) involving Category I/II quantities of SNM at up to three sites. This alternative would create a consolidated plutonium center for R&D, storage, processing, and manufacture of plutonium parts for nuclear weapons. The following sites are evaluated for the consolidated plutonium center: Los Alamos, NTS, Pantex, SRS, and Y–12. Uranium storage and operations (including the storage and use of highly enriched uranium) would remain at Y–12. Weapons assembly, disassembly, and high explosive fabrication would remain at Pantex.

The Consolidated Centers of Excellence Alternative consolidates the three major SNM functions (plutonium, uranium, and weapon assembly/disassembly) involving Category I/II quantities of SNM at one or two sites. The single site option is referred to as the Consolidated Nuclear Production Center option and the two site option is referred to as the Consolidated Nuclear Center option. Three major facilities are involved in this alternative: a Consolidated Plutonium Center, a Consolidated Uranium Center, and an assembly/disassembly/high explosives facility, which would assemble and disassemble nuclear weapons, and fabricate high explosives. The following sites are evaluated for these facilities: Los Alamos, NTS, Pantex, SRS, and Y–12.

Under the Capability-Based Alternative, NNSA would maintain basic capabilities for manufacturing components for all stockpile weapons, as well as laboratory and experimental capabilities to support stockpile decisions, but would reduce production capabilities at existing or planned facilities. Under this alternative, pit production at LANL would not be expanded beyond a capability to provide 50 pits [3] per year. Production capacities at Pantex, Y–12, and SRS (tritium production) would be reduced to capability-based levels.

To consolidate Category I/II quantities of SNM, NNSA proposes to remove Category I/II SNM from LLNL by approximately 2012, and phase-out operations at LLNL involving Category I/II quantities of SNM.[4] NNSA is also proposing to transfer more than 10,000 pits currently stored at Pantex in Zone 4 to Zone 12, enabling all Category I/II quantities of SNM at Pantex to be consolidated into a central location, close to assembly, modification, and disassembly operations.

For the proposed action to restructure R&D and testing facilities, the alternatives focus on immediate options to consolidate, relocate, or eliminate duplicative facilities and programs and to improve operating efficiencies. The following five functional capabilities are evaluated for this proposed action: tritium R&D; high explosives R&D; hydrodynamic testing; major environmental testing; and flight test operations. The sites potentially affected by decisions regarding these alternatives are: LANL, LLNL, SNL, NTS, Pantex, TTR, SRS, Y–12, and the White Sands Missile Range (WSMR). The WSMR, located in south-central New Mexico, is the largest installation in the Department of Defense. WSMR is being considered as a location for NNSA's flight test operations that are now conducted at TTR. Alternatives to relocate the current non-nuclear component design and engineering work at SNL/California also are being evaluated in this proposed action.

While NNSA has proposed to modernize its facilities that produce non-nuclear components in Kansas City, Missouri, this proposal is evaluated in a separate NEPA analysis. The General Services Administration (GSA), as the lead agency, and NNSA, as a cooperating agency, announced the availability of a draft Environmental Assessment on December 10, 2007 (72 FR 69690) that evaluates the potential environmental impacts of a proposal for GSA to procure the construction of a new facility to house NNSA's procurement and manufacturing operations for non-nuclear components. A recent analysis demonstrates that transferring non-nuclear operations outside of the Kansas City area is not cost effective. Whether non-nuclear operations remain at the current Kansas City Plant or move to a new facility in the vicinity of Kansas City would not affect nor be affected by decisions NNSA makes regarding alternatives evaluated in the Draft Complex Transformation SPEIS.

Other Federal Agency Involvement. The Department of the Air Force and U.S. Army Garrison White Sands are cooperating agencies in the preparation of the Draft Complex Transformation SPEIS.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 7, 2008.

Thomas P. D'Agostino,

Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration.

[FR Doc. E8–365 Filed 1–10–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

[3] A pit is the central core of a nuclear weapon, typically containing plutonium-239, that undergoes fission when compressed by high explosives.

[4] The LLNL Site-wide EIS (DOE/EIS–0348 and DOE/EIS–0236–S3, March 2005) assesses the environmental impacts of transporting SNM to and from LLNL and other sites as part of the proposed action, which NNSA decided to implement (70 FR 71491, November 29, 2005). That analysis includes consideration of transportation actions involving greater quantities of SNM and more shipments than are identified in this draft SPEIS.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6694–9]

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 FR dated April 6, 2007 (72 FR 17156).

Draft EISs

EIS No. 20070303, ERP No. D–FRA–K53012–CA, Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train (HST) Project, Provide a Reliable High-Speed Electrified Train System to Link Bay Area Cities to the Central Valley, Sacramento, and South California.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to aquatic resources, growth-related impacts, and cumulative impacts. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070399, ERP No. D–FTA–E40816–FL, Tier 1 Programmatic—Jacksonville Rapid Transit System (RTS), Improvement to Transportation in Four Primary Transit Corridors Radiating from Downtown Jacksonville, Duval County, FL.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to air quality, floodplains, wetlands, and low-income/minority communities, and requested additional information and mitigation measures. Rating EC1.

EIS No. 20070426, ERP No. D–FHW–K40265–CA, CA–76 Corridor Project, Transportation Improvements from Melrose to South Mission Highway, San Diego County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about indirect and cumulative impacts to biological and aquatic resources as well as the relationship of the proposed project to future expansion of State Route 76 to the east. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070454, ERP No. D–BIA–J65498–WY, Riverton Dome Coal Bed Natural Gas (CBNG) and Conventional Gas Development Project, Construction of Well Pads, Roads, Pipelines, and Production Facilities, Wind River Indian Reservation (WRIR), Fremont County, WY.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to air quality from particulate matter and recommended the analysis incorporate more recent particulate matter background concentration data. EPA also expressed concerns about environmental justice, cultural resources, soil resources and water quality. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070463, ERP No. D–CGD–E03017–FL, Calypso Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Deepwater Port License Application, Proposes to Own, Construct and Operate a Deepwater Port, Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) in the OCS NG 17–06 (Bahamas) Lease Area, 8 to 10 miles off the East Coast of Florida to the Northeast of Port Everglades, FL.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the air impacts from the proposed LNG regasification port, and the potential impact to marine bottom communities from construction of the pipelines, and requested additional information about the analysis of air impacts and the planned construction methods for pipelines, and consideration of mitigation for both impacts. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070482, ERP No. D–FHW–J40180–UT, UT–108 Transportation Improvement Project, To Improve Local and Regional Mobility from UT–108 between UT–127 (Antelope Drive) to UT–126 (1900 West) Located in Syracuse, West Point and Clinton in Dave County, and Roy and West Haven in Weber County, UT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about potential air impacts to sensitive receptors. In addition, EPA suggests the FEIS evaluate the indirect effects of the increased rate of growth caused by new highway construction. Rating EC2.

EIS No. 20070483, ERP No. DS–FHW–E40716–TN, Kirby Parkway Project, Construction from Macon Road to Walnut Grove Road, U.S. Army COE section 401 and 404 Permits, Shelby County, TN.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about potential impacts to water quality and aquatic habitat due to construction and future operation of the project. Rating EC1.

Final EISs

EIS No. 20070405, ERP No. F–AFS–J61111–00, Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks and the John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Memorial Parkway, Winter Use Plan, To Provide a Framework for Managing Winter Use Activities, Implementation, Fremont County, ID, Gallatin and Park Counties, MT Park and Teton Counties, WY.

Summary: EPA acknowledges the improvements gained in the Parks' winter environment compared to historic conditions. However, EPA continues to have environmental concerns about adverse impacts from snowmobile use on air quality and visitor experiences.

EIS No. 20070442, ERP No. F–FHW–K40260–CA, Interstate 5/Cosumnes River Boulevard Interchange Project, Extension of Cosumnes River Boulevard from Franklin Boulevard to Freeport Boulevard with an Interchange at Interstate 5, South of the Pocket/Meadowview Road Interchange and North of the Laguna Boulevard Interchange, City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, CA.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed project.

EIS No. 20070477, ERP No. F–MMS–A09833–00, PROGRAMMATIC—Alternative Energy Development and Production and Alternate Use of Facilities on the Outer Continental Shelf, Implementation, Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, Pacific and Alaska.

Summary: EPA's previous concerns have been resolved; therefore, EPA does not object to the proposed action.

EIS No. 20070505, ERP No. F–WPA–K08032–CA, Trinity Public Utilities District Direct Interconnection Project, Construct and Operate a 16-mile Long 60–Kilovolt Power Transmission Facilities (DOE/EIS–0389), Trinity County, CA.

Summary: No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

EIS No. 20070506, ERP No. F–AFS–K65303–CA, Phoenix Project, Proposes to Use a Combination of Contract and Forest Service Crew to Treat Poor Forest Health and High Fire Hazard Conditions, Develop a Network Defensible Fuel Profile Zones (DFPZs), Sierraville Ranger District, Tahoe National Forest, Sierra and Nevada Counties, CA.

Summary: EPA does not object to the proposed action.

EIS No. 20070509, ERP No. F–FHW–E40807–SC, Interstate 73 Southern Project, Construction from I–95 to the Myrtle Beach Region, Funding, NPDES Permit, U.S. Coast Guard Permit, U.S. Army COE section 404 Permit, Dillon, Horry and Marion Counties, SC.

Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns about wetland impacts.

Dated: January 8, 2008.

Robert W. Hargrove,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. E8–357 Filed 1–10–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P