

laboratory all information needed to respond to questions concerning the system under his or her purview and to provide the technical support required by the defense nuclear complex with regard to that system. The significant responsibilities assigned to these individuals will require care in their selection. There should be an internal process in place that provides for training and mentoring to ensure that they fully understand their weapon system and can competently judge how and when to draw on appropriate laboratory resources for the support needed by the complex to ensure safety. DOE is not adequately addressing this issue.

The example highlighted in the Board's August 2002 letter also indicated the need for better coordination between points of contact. In the example, both internal laboratory and inter-site communications were necessary between personnel who had been developing a technical application for several weapon programs and those responsible for one of the weapon programs. Both lines of communication broke down. As part of its actions to establish adequate points of contact, DOE will need to address proper communications amongst groups working on cross-platform projects, and to ensure that the appropriate resources are prioritized to provide critical stockpile support.

In formulating its Recommendation 93-6, the Board recognized some of the difficulties DOE would face in its stockpile stewardship program. That recognition was implicit in the statement: "Although it may be relatively straightforward to maintain these capabilities in the near term, ensuring their availability 5 to 20 years in the future may be very difficult." The Board is concerned that, without attention to the near-term problems associated with supporting the stockpile, the gains achieved in addressing Recommendation 93-6 are in danger of being lost.

Further, since the size and scope of the nuclear weapons stockpile have been reduced, and research and development leading to new weapons has been restricted, it appears that there has been an increase in "work-for-others" programs. The focus of the nuclear weapons laboratories on the nuclear weapons complex as their number one priority has waned. The Board was encouraged by the Secretary's statement at DOE's October 2001 Quarterly Leadership Meeting that DOE's "overarching mission is national security." However, it appears that this message is still not being effectively

implemented within DOE and its weapons laboratories.

### Recommendation

To address the above issues, the Board makes the following recommendations to ensure safety in weapons programs:

1. That the Secretary of Energy update and reemphasize DOE policies and Orders (e.g., DOE Order 5600.1, Management of the DOE Weapon Program and Weapon Complex) as needed to ensure that the nuclear weapons program is assigned the top priority among all activities at the weapons laboratories.

2. That a process be developed to ensure the assignment of a senior individual, as the point of contact for each weapon system under the purview of each weapons laboratory. This process should include:

(a) Adequate selection criteria;

(b) Appropriate training and mentoring programs (as necessary) to ensure that each individual selected is fully knowledgeable about the weapon system assigned to him or her, as well as internal weapons laboratory programs and procedures;

(c) Formal planning for succession of individuals when they retire or are replaced; and

(d) Periodic dissemination of updated listings of points of contact to the defense nuclear complex.

3. That the internal organizational structure, programs, and procedures of the weapons laboratories be aligned to ensure that these senior, technically competent individuals are empowered (i.e., given the authority and the funding) to direct appropriate resources of their laboratories to provide the support needed to ensure the safety of operations in the nuclear complex related to the weapons under their purview.

4. That DOE establish a position at each DOE site office with responsibility for a nuclear weapons laboratory to ensure that requirements of the defense nuclear complex for support by that laboratory are tracked and met. These positions should be filled by personnel with the appropriate competence and experience who have the authority to resolve competing requirements for resources.

John T. Conway,  
Chairman.

### Appendix—Transmittal Letter to the Secretary of Energy

#### Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

October 3, 2002.

The Honorable Spencer Abraham,

Secretary of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585-1000.

Dear Secretary Abraham: The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (Board) has been following the Department of Energy's (DOE) efforts to provide appropriate technical support to its defense nuclear facilities, particularly the Pantex Plant. The complexity and uniqueness of the technical safety issues that arise in the nuclear weapons complex require the concerted effort of a cadre of highly competent individuals with expertise not generally available in industry or academia. Most of the personnel with this training and experience are employed at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and Sandia National Laboratories.

The Board is concerned that the number of nuclear weapons experts is declining and the focus of remaining experts is being diverted to other areas. Action is required to change this trend and to re-emphasize the primary role and obligation of the weapons laboratories to support DOE's nuclear weapon-related activities, including the formal training and development of new experts.

As a result, the Board on October 3, 2002, unanimously approved Recommendation 2002-2, Weapons Laboratory Support of the Defense Nuclear Complex, which is enclosed for your consideration. After your receipt of this recommendation and as required by 42 U.S.C. 2286d(a), the Board will promptly make it available to the public. The Board believes that the recommendation contains no information that is classified or otherwise restricted. To the extent this recommendation does not include information restricted by DOE under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, 42 U.S.C. 2161-68, as amended, please see that it is promptly placed on file in your regional public reading rooms. The Board will also publish this recommendation in the **Federal Register**.

Sincerely,  
John T. Conway,  
Chairman.

[FR Doc. 02-25846 Filed 10-9-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3670-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Leader, Regulatory Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before December 9, 2002.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of

1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Leader, Regulatory Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment.

The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

Dated: October 4, 2002.

**John D. Tressler,**

*Leader, Regulatory Management Group,  
Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

#### **Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services**

*Type of Review:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* Quarterly Cumulative Caseload Report (SC).

*Frequency:* Quarterly.

*Affected Public:* State, Local, or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs (primary).

*Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:*

Responses: 320.

Burden Hours: 320.

*Abstract:* State VR agencies who administer vocational programs provide key caseload indicator data on this form, including numbers of persons who are

applicants, determined eligible/ineligible, waiting for services, and also their program outcomes. This data is used for program, planning, management, budgeting and general statistical purposes.

Requests for copies of the proposed information collection request may be accessed from <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, by selecting the Browse Pending Collections link and by clicking on link number 2161. When you access the information collection, click on "Download Attachments" to view. Written requests for information should be addressed to Vivian Reese, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 4050, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202-4651 or to the e-mail address [Vivian.Reese@ed.gov](mailto:Vivian.Reese@ed.gov). Requests may also be electronically mailed to the e-mail address [OCIO\\_RIMG@ed.gov](mailto:OCIO_RIMG@ed.gov) or faxed to 202-708-9346. Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request.

Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be directed to Sheila Carey at her e-mail address [Sheila.Carey@ed.gov](mailto:Sheila.Carey@ed.gov). Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

[FR Doc. 02-25729 Filed 10-9-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[FRL-7389-6]

#### **Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Eliciting Risk Tradeoffs for Valuing Fatal Cancer Risks**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that the following Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval:

*Title:* Eliciting Risk Tradeoffs for Valuing Fatal Cancer Risks, EPA ICR No. 2057.01. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected burden and cost; where appropriate, it includes the actual data collection instrument.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before November 12, 2002.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments, referencing EPA ICR No. 2057.01 to the following addresses: Susan Auby, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Collection Strategies Division (Mail Code 2822T), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20460-0001; and to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Attention: Desk Officer for EPA, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For a copy of the ICR contact Susan Auby at EPA by phone at (202) 566-1672, by e-mail at [auby.susan@epamail.epa.gov](mailto:auby.susan@epamail.epa.gov) or download off the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/icr> and refer to EPA ICR No. 2057.01. For technical questions about the ICR contact Dr. Melonie Williams at (202) 566-2279.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Title:* Eliciting Risk Tradeoffs for Valuing Cancer Risks, EPA ICR Number 2057.01. This is a request for a new collection.

*Abstract:* The purpose of the survey is to provide data that will improve valuation estimates of the benefits of fatal cancer risk reductions. The existing literature on mortality risk values has focused almost exclusively on accidental and immediate deaths; however, it is unclear how applicable these values are for assessing the benefits of fatal cancer risks, which can involve extended periods between exposure on disease onset (latency) and between onset and death (morbidity). The proposed survey will present respondents with choice scenarios involving tradeoffs between different levels and types of risks. It will specifically explore how individuals' tradeoffs between risks are affected by (1) the type of cancer involved and (2) differences in the length of the latency and morbidity periods from cancer. The results will provide empirically-based ratios, which can be used to adjust existing mortality risk value estimates according to these factors. We are requesting OMB permission to conduct a pretest (350 respondents) and full-scale survey (2000 respondents), using an established panel of respondents and a webTV mode of administration. Each survey will take approximately 25 minutes, and data will be collected and stored electronically.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control