consideration for preservation as a national historic site. Although KE and KW Reactors have had CERCLA documentation issued that identified ISS as the preferred alternative, the KE and KW reactors are not currently in ISS. However, they are the next reactors in the queue for completion of ISS.

II. Decision

DOE has decided to broaden the decommissioning approach for these eight surplus reactors. DOE is retaining the deferred one-piece removal option, as selected in the 1993 ROD, and, based on a recently prepared Supplement Analysis, is modifying the deferred dismantlement option, as expressed in the Final EIS, by selecting an option for immediate dismantlement.

Activities to implement this decision will be conducted as CERCLA non-time critical removal actions. Specific details on unit operations of dismantlement will be addressed in the CERCLA documentation. All practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm have been incorporated in this decision.

III. Basis for the Decision

In accordance with CEQ NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1502.9(c)) and DOE NEPA regulations (10 CFR 1021.314(c)), DOE prepared a Supplement Analysis to determine whether a supplemental EIS or a new EIS is required. The Supplement Analysis focused on the resource areas and considerations most likely to be affected by this amended ROD; specifically, worker radiological impacts (routine operations and accident conditions), land use, historical/cultural resources, ecological resources, and cumulative impacts.

Preliminary calculations (based on near-term dismantlement of the KE reactor core and extrapolated to all eight surplus production reactors) indicate that worker dose under a dismantlement scenario for all eight reactors (approximately 80 person-rem) would be expected to be substantially less than that projected in the Final EIS (532 person-rem) for deferred dismantlement, and slightly higher than that for deferred one-piece removal (51 person-rem in the safe storage/deferred one-piece removal scenario). The actual dose rates to which workers would be exposed would be controlled by such means as remote handling, use of robotics, and the use of shielding. Worker radiation exposure would be controlled to stay within administrative and regulatory limits. Regardless, less than one latent cancer fatality (LCF) would be expected under all of the alternatives. No new bounding accident scenarios associated with reactor decommissioning have been identified; less than one LCF would be expected as a result of any postulated bounding accident.

No new land use, historical/cultural resource, or ecological resources impacts were identified in the Supplement Analysis relevant to decommissioning activities under deferred one-piece removal or immediate dismantlement.

Also, as stated in the Supplement Analysis, no short-term or long-term cumulative impacts (based on the analyses presented in DOE/EIS–0391, *Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement*) were identified relevant to decommissioning activities under one-piece removal or dismantlement.

In evaluating the viability of supporting accelerated decommissioning of surplus reactor facilities in a safe and environmentally effective manner, DOE also considered technological advances and additional information since the Final EIS and the 1993 ROD were issued. New engineering controls (such as development and deployment of robotics in an array of field applications), data collection and validation, worker safety practices, and real-time lessons learned from reactor demolition activities at Brookhaven National Laboratory all could be applied to accelerated surplus reactor decommissioning at the Hanford Site. These controls and information would enable accelerated decommissioning activities to be conducted safely.

IV. Determination

DOE has decided to broaden the decommissioning approach for the surplus reactors, retaining the deferred one-piece removal option and adding an option for immediate dismantlement. Based on the Supplement Analysis, this is not a substantial change in the proposed action relevant to environmental concerns. Further, there are no significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed actions or their impacts described in the Surplus Production Reactors Final EIS. Therefore, DOE has determined that neither a new EIS, nor a supplement to the Surplus Production Reactors EIS, is required.

Issued in Washington, DC on July 16, 2010.

Inés R. Triay,

Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management.

[FR Doc. 2010–18079 Filed 7–22–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Notice of Solicitation of Nominations for Appointment as a Member of the Biomass Research and Development Technical Advisory Committee; Correction

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of solicitation of members; correction.

SUMMARY: On July 15, 2010, the Department of Energy published a notice of solicitation of members (75 FR 41166). This document corrects that notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laura McCann, Designated Federal Official for the Committee, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585; (202) 586–7766; e-mail: *laura.mccann@ee.doe.gov* or Christina Fagerholm at (202) 586–2933; e-mail: *christina.fagerholm@ee.doe.gov*.

In the **Federal Register** of July 15, 2010, in FR Doc. 2010–17285, on page 41167, please make the following correction:

Under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**, first column, the second to the last paragraph is corrected to read:

"Nominations are open to all individuals without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, mental or physical handicap, marital status, or sexual orientation. Please note, however, that registered lobbyists and individuals already serving on another Federal Advisory Committee are ineligible for nomination."

The deadline for Technical Advisory Committee member nominations is July 30, 2010.

Issued in Washington, DC on July 20, 2010.

Rachel Samuel,

Deputy Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 2010–18127 Filed 7–22–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Energy Information Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Agency information collection activities: Submission for OMB review; comment request.

SUMMARY: The EIA has submitted the Energy Information Administration's