

emergency issues not contained in this agenda may come before the BPT for discussion, those issues may not be the subject of formal action during these meetings. Plan Team action will be restricted to those issues specifically listed in this document and any issue arising after publication of this document that requires emergency action under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, provided the public has been notified of the Council's intent to take final action to address the emergency.

Special Accommodations

These meetings are physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Kitty M. Simonds, 808-522-8220 (voice) or 808-522-8226 (fax), at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Dated: March 25, 2002.

Matteo Milazzo,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.
[FR Doc. 02-7513 Filed 3-27-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207.

TIME AND DATE: Wednesday, April 3, 2002, 2:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Room 410, East West Towers, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, Maryland.

STATUS: Closed to the Public—Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(f)(1) and 16 CFR 1013.4(b) (3), (7), (9), and (10) and submitted to the **Federal Register** pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3).

MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED: Compliance Status Report. The staff will brief the Commission on the status of various compliance matters.

For a recorded message containing the latest agenda information, call (301) 504-0709.

CONTACT PERSON FOR ADDITIONAL

INFORMATION: Todd A. Stevenson, Office of the Secretary, 4330 East West Highway, Bethesda, MD 20207 (301) 504-0800.

Dated: March 25, 2002.

Todd A. Stevenson,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-7722 Filed 3-26-02; 3:08 pm]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by April 29, 2002.

Title, Form, and OMB Number: Commissary Evaluation and Utility Surveys—Generic; OMB Number 0704-0407.

Type of Request: Revision.

Number of Respondents: 50,000.

Responses Per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 50,000.

Average Burden Per Response: 6 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 5,000.

Needs and Uses: The Defense Commissary Agency will conduct a variety of surveys to include, but not limited to customer satisfaction, transaction based comment cards, transaction based telephone interviews, commissary sizing, and patron migration. The information collection will provide customer perceptions, demographics, and will identify agency operations that need quality improvement, provide early detection of process or system problems, and focus attention on areas where customer service and functional training, new construction/renovations, and changes in existing operations that will improve service delivery.

Affected Public: Individuals or Households; Business or Other For-Profit.

Frequency: On Occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: Ms. Jackie Zeiher.

Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Ms. Zeiher at the Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer for DoD, Room 10236, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

DOD Clearance Officer: Mr. Robert Cushing.

Written requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Mr. Cushing, WHS/DIOR, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302.

Dated: March 22, 2002.

Patricia L. Toppings,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 02-7391 Filed 3-27-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary; Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Airborne Laser Program

AGENCY: Missile Defense Agency (MDA), Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The Missile Defense Agency is preparing a Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Program Definition and Risk Reduction (PDRR) Phase of the Airborne Laser (ABL) Program (April 1997) and Record of Decision (September 1997). This Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) will analyze proposed ABL Program test activities at Kirtland Air Force Base (KAFB), Holloman Air Force Base (HAFB), and White Sands Missile Range (WSMR), New Mexico; and Edwards Air Force Base (EAFB), Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB), and the Adjacent Point Mugu Naval Air Warfare Center (PMNAWC) Sea Range, California. The SEIS will be prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321, *et seq.*), and the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500-1508). The ABL is a laser weapon system installed on a Boeing 747-400F aircraft capable of operating for extended periods of time. Up to two such aircraft would be developed. The ABL weapon system is proposed to include four lasers:

- Active Ranging System (ARS) Laser (a small carbon dioxide laser used to begin tracking a target),
- Track Illuminator Laser (TILL), (a solid state laser used to provide detailed tracking of a target),
- Beacon Illuminator Laser (BILL), (a solid state laser used to measure atmospheric distortion), and
- High-Energy Laser (HEL), (i.e., Chemical Oxygen-Iodine Laser (COIL)—a chemical laser used to destroy a target).

An additional laser, a surrogate for the High-Energy Laser (SHEL), will be used during testing in place of the HEL. The SHEL is a low-power solid-state laser that would be used in both ground- and flight-testing. The ABL also would

include an Infrared Search and Track sensor (IRST) (a passive infrared device used to identify heat sources). The 1997 PDRR ABL FEIS analyzed use of a COIL HEL on board an aircraft to destroy ballistic missiles in the boost phase. The Record of Decision (ROD) on the FEIS documented the Air Force's decision to proceed with PDRR phase ABL home base activities at EAFB, diagnostic test activities over WSMR, and expanded area test activities at VAFB and the PMNAWC Sea Range. Since completion of the FEIS, specific proposed test activities have been identified and additional information made available about the proposed testing that warrant preparation of an SEIS.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Pamela Bain, Director, External Affairs, Missile Defense Agency, 7100 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-7100.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The MDA is developing an ABL element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS). The BMDS being developed is intended to provide an effective defense for the United States, its deployed forces, and its friends and allies from limited missile attack, during all segments of an attacking missile's flight. The BMDS includes separate elements to provide a defense during each of the three segments of missile flight. These segments are boost, midcourse, and terminal. While multiple elements could be used to defend against an attack, if necessary, during each of the threat's flight segments, each BMDS

element is designed to work separately to provide a militarily significant defense, even if no other BMDS element exists. The ABL element of BMDS is being developed to provide an effective defense to limited ballistic missile threats during the boost segment of an attacking missile's flight. The Air Force began development of the ABL program aircraft in November 1996. In October 2001, ABL was transferred from the Air Force to the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, which was renamed in January 2002 as the Missile Defense Agency.

Alternatives

Test activities and proposed alternative test locations to be addressed in the SEIS include:

- Ground tests of the ARS, TILL, BILL, and SHEL at KAFB, WSMR/ Holloman AFB.
- Flight tests of the ARS, TILL, BILL, SHEL and HEL (i.e., COIL) at WSMR;
- Flight tests of the ARS, TILL, BILL, and HEL at VAFB and the PMNAWC Sea Range; and
- Ground and flight tests of the ARS, TILL, BILL, SHEL, and HEL at EAFB.

As proposed, the ABL aircraft would be housed in an existing hanger at EAFB. EAFB is also where the laser device would be integrated into the aircraft, where ground and flight tests would occur, and where initial flight tests of the aircraft would be performed. The ABL aircraft also would be flown to KAFB to conduct ground testing and would use existing runways at both

bases. Additional flight tests would take place at WSMR. Both ground and flight tests would take place at VAFB and the PMNAWC Sea Range. Flight tests that include ABL destruction of a missile are proposed at WSMR and/or VAFB and the PMNAWC Sea Range.

PDRR ABL ground tests¹ are proposed to include tests of individual components, integration of the components on the ABL, and ground test of the integrated ABL. Flight tests are proposed to test each stage of the target acquisition and destruction process. Early flight tests will test the ARS, TILL, and BILL ability to provide accurate tracking and targeting. The flight tests will progress to use of SHEL, and will culminate with tests of the entire ABL element's ability to destroy a representative threat missile using the COIL HEL. Targets for flight tests are proposed to include target boards attached to balloons (MARTI²) and to piloted aircraft (Proteus³), sounding rockets, Lance, Black Brant, Aries missiles, and a limited number of representative threat missiles.

Although the FEIS (1997) analyzed both ground and flight tests involving the COIL HEL, the majority of these tests have not yet been performed. All tests proposed for the ABL PDRR phase are summarized in the following table. The table includes the tests analyzed in the FEIS which have not yet been performed, as well as additional ground and flight tests required for testing the ARS, TILL, BILL, SHEL, and HEL.

Proposed test location	Type of test	Type of flight engagement for each aircraft		
		MARTI Drop	Proteus aircraft	Missile launch
VAFB	Flight Tests	0	0	25
WSMR/Holloman	Ground/Flight Tests	50	50	35
EAFB	Ground/Flight Tests	50	50	0
KAFB	Ground Tests	0	0	0

Scoping Process

This SEIS will assess environmental issues associated with the proposed action; reasonable alternatives including the no-action alternative; and foreseeable future actions and cumulative effects. Under the No Action

alternative, there would be no change to ABL test activities from those documented in the PDRR ABL ROD signed in September 1997. Scoping will be conducted to identify environmental, safety and occupational health issues to be addressed in the SEIS. Public scoping meetings will be held as part of the SEIS

preparation process, as described below. Public comments will be solicited to assist in scoping related environmental issues for analysis in the SEIS. Alternatives to the proposed actions may be identified verbally and in writing during the public scoping process.

Location	Date	Place	Time (p.m.)
Lancaster, CA	4/1/02	Antelope Valley Inn 44055 North Sierra Highway	7:00

¹ Ground tests include rotplane, billboard, and range simulator targets. The billboard target is a piece of material such as Plexiglas or stainless steel that contains sensors. A rotplane target is a

spinning ground target designed to simulate a missile in flight.

² Missile Alternative Range Target Instrument (MARTI) Drop is a balloon with a target board attached used during flight tests.

³ Proteus Aircraft is a manned aircraft with a target board attached that is used during flight tests.

Location	Date	Place	Time (p.m.)
Lompoc, CA	4/3/02	Lompoc City Council Chambers 100 Civic Center Plaza	7:00
Albuquerque, NM	4/15/02	Albuquerque Marriott 2101 Louisiana Boulevard, NE	7:00
Las Cruces, NM	4/17/02	Holiday Inn de Las Cruces 201 E. University Avenue	7:00

Dated: March 25, 2002.

Patricia L. Toppings,

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison
Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 02-7628 Filed 3-26-02; 1:49 pm]

BILLING CODE 5001-08-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary; Preparation of the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense Extended Test Range Environmental Impact Statement

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: In order to meet the requirement to increase the realism of GMD integrated flight testing, MDA proposes to enhance the current test capability that includes the missile launch sites and array of sensors and other test equipment associated with the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Test Site (RTS) at Kwajalein Atoll, the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) in Hawaii and Vandenberg Air Force Base (AFB) in California. The Department of Defense is publishing this notice to announce the initiation and preparation of the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) Extended Test Range (ETR) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) per Council of Environmental Quality regulations.

Background

The Ground-Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) Joint Program Office of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has been directed to conduct more operationally realistic testing of the GMD element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS). The BMDS being developed is intended to provide an effective defense to the United States, its deployed forces, and its friends and allies from limited missile attack, during all segments of an attacking missile's flight. The GMD element of BMDS is being developed to protect the entire United States against limited ballistic missile threats during the midcourse segment of an attacking missile's flight. The extension of the GMD test range would increase the realism of GMD testing by using multiple engagement scenarios, trajectories, geometry, distances, speeds of targets and interceptors that closely resemble those in which an operational system would be required to provide an

effective defense. The extension of the GMD test range is a separate effort, independent of the test bed that MDA proposes to develop in order to validate the operational concept of GMD. Both the validation of the GMD operational concept test bed and the extension of the GMD test range are intended to be interoperable parts of the multi-parted BMDS test bed, if MDA proceeds with both efforts.

Alternatives

Potential alternatives to be analyzed in the EIS, that may meet some of the enhanced test objectives, may include launching target and/or interceptor missiles from Kodiak Launch Complex (KLC) on Kodiak Island, Alaska, adding interceptor launches from Vandenberg AFB and launching target missiles from aircraft over the broad ocean area. Enhanced GMD testing may also include use of existing ship-borne radars, new land-based radars in southern Alaska and an early-warning radar at Beale AFB. The early-warning radar at Beale AFB may already have been upgraded to support the separate, validation of the GMD operational concept part of the BMDS test bed. If the early-warning radar at Beale AFB has not already been upgraded, new software and hardware will be installed that will enhance the radar's detection and discrimination capabilities as part of the extension of the GMD integrated flight test range. The target and interceptors may be launched in sets of two under some testing scenarios from either KLC or VAFB. Existing launch sites and test resources would continue to be used in enhanced test scenarios. Other reasonable alternatives identified during the scoping process would also be evaluated in the EIS. In addition, the EIS will analyze the No-Action Alternative, which would be a MDA decision not to enhance the capabilities of the existing test range but to continue testing within the existing range constraints to develop and improve the GMD system.

As with current testing, all missile intercepts from test activities would occur over the broad ocean area. The environmental impacts associated with these intercepts have been analyzed in previous NEPA documents. To the extent that enhanced testing would involve similar effects over the broad

ocean area, those analyses will be incorporated by reference in the EIS.

The action alternatives could include construction of two interceptor launchers, one additional target launch pad and construction/alteration of launch support facilities at the KLC, construction of In-Flight Interceptor Communication System (IFICS) Data Terminals (IDT), military and commercial satellite communications (MIL/COMSATCOM) in the mid-Pacific and at KLC or VAFB, added range instrumentation (tracking and range safety radars) in the vicinity of sites, and use of either existing Battle Management Command and Control (BMC2) Facilities at RTS, or new BMC2 Facilities that may be developed at Fort Greely, AK and/or Shriever AFB or Cheyenne Mountain Complex, CO in the validation of the GMD operational concept part of the BMDS test bed.

The MDA will analyze the environmental issues associated with licenses or permits required to implement the proposed action at each of the potential extended test range sites. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Office of Commercial Space Transportation (AST) will be a cooperating agency in this Environmental Impact Analysis Process because of their regulatory authority in licensing the Kodiak Launch Complex. The term of the current Launch Operator License (LOL) held by the Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation will expire in September 2003. Renewal or modification of the KLC LOL is considered a major federal action and will require environmental review of the proposed activities. The range of alternatives that the FAA may consider in its licensing decision may include but are not limited to (1) renewing the license in current status; (2) licensing with the addition of MDA's proposed activities in whole or part and (3) the No Action Alternative, not renewing the license. As a Cooperating Agency, the FAA may use the analysis contained in the Extended Test Range (ETR) EIS to support its licensing decision.

Scoping Process

This EIS will assess environmental issues associated with the proposed action; reasonable alternatives including the no-action alternative; foreseeable future actions; and cumulative effects.