

Signed at Washington, DC, this 6th day of August, 2002.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 02-21101 Filed 8-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

Development of a National Reporting System to Collect Performance and "Outcomes" Information on the Results of the Services Provided by LSC-funded Grantees to Eligible Clients

AGENCY: Legal Services Corporation.

ACTION: Request for Information on the Development of a National Reporting System to Collect Performance and "Outcomes" Information on the Results of the Services Provided by LSC-funded Grantees to Eligible Clients.

SUMMARY: This notice is a request for information for use by the Legal Services Corporation regarding the Development of a National Reporting System to Collect "Outcomes" Information on the Results of the Services Provided by LSC-funded grantees to Eligible Clients.

ADDRESSES: Two (2) copies of written submissions should be addressed to Wendy Burnette, Legal Services Corporation, 750 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20002-4250.

DATES: Information must be submitted by 5 p.m., September 28, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randi Youells or Michael Genz, Legal Services Corporation, 750 1st Street NE., Washington, DC 20002-4250.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Legal Services Corporation (LSC) is a private, nonprofit corporation established by the Congress of the United States to ensure equal access to justice under the law by providing legal assistance in civil matter to low-income individuals. LSC is headed by an 11-member board of directors, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

LSC does not itself provide legal services to low-income Americans. The Corporation is authorized by Congress to make grants and contracts to support the provision of civil legal assistance to clients who meet eligibility requirements. LSC develops and administers policy consistent with Congressional mandate, secures and receives federal appropriations and allocates these appropriations to not-for-profit legal services organizations throughout the county; assures that

grantees of LSC funds comply with federal law and regulations; and guarantees the delivery of high quality services to eligible low-income people in the United States and its territories. LSC makes grants to organizations that provide legal assistance to indigent persons throughout the United States, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and Micronesia. LSC grants federal dollars to independent local programs chosen through a system of competition.

As a delivery system, legal services programs provide a full range of services to eligible clients. While grantees provide many kinds of services to clients, all are reported to LSC as either cases (the CSR reporting system) or matters (the MSR reporting system). However, neither CSR nor MSR statistics give any information on the outcome of a particular case. In fact, the CSR system reveals very little about a case closed by and LSC-funded grantee other than the following:

- That the grantee accepted the case, that is, the case met the eligibility guidelines established by the program's board and by LSC;
- That the case was 'completed' or closed within the calendar year covered by the CSR submission;
- The manner in which the case was handled, such as 'advice'; and
- The general area of law in which the case falls (e.g., housing law, family law).

This is perceived as problematic for several reasons:

(1) By simply counting closed cases the CSR system reduces the provision of legal services to a number rather than helping us understand what changes grantees have made in the lives of our clients and their communities.

(2) Reducing to a single number (a 'closed case') the services that a grantee provides to a client makes the work of grantees seem easy and undemanding.

(3) Because the CSR data do not measure performance and outcomes, it does not allow LSC and its grantees to objectivity track whether we are expanding access and improving performance quality as required by LSC's five-year Strategic Plan.

(4) CSR data do not allow for comparisons of grantees in terms of the efficiency and effectiveness of grantees' work for clients. Although we are able to extrapolate 'cost-per-case' from the CSR data, the data do not enable us to identify which grantees are working ineffectively or do not otherwise meet the standards commonly expected of high quality legal services providers. Conversely, we cannot objectivity identify our strongest programs so that

we can understand what makes them 'best' in order to replicate them.

(5) The CSR/MSR data do not present information that allows the legal service community to draw reasonable conclusions about what happened to those clients who were given advice or brief service, or who received assistance through a service classified by LSC as a 'matter,' such as the receipt of community legal education materials.

Request for Information

LSC invites interested parties to submit written information relevant to the development of outcomes measures for legal services programs. Information provided through public submission will be considered by the Legal Services Corporation in developing a strategy to design a data system to supplant or supplement the current CSR and MSR systems.

Materials submitted should be confined to the specific topic of the study. In particular, the LSC is seeking written submissions on the following topics: outcomes and related performance measurement systems for legal services programs currently in use across the country; optimal ways to assess equity, quality, and efficiency within and across legal services agencies; the types of performance information that can and should be tracked in a viable performance measurement system; performance measurement in relation to other evaluation activities; the performance measurement development process; and optimal ways of assessing the accuracy and usefulness of performance measurement systems.

Information acquired through this Request for Information process is provided voluntarily, will not be compensated and will not obligate LSC to pursue any particular course of action or strategy.

Victor M. Fortuno,

General Counsel and Vice President for Legal Affairs.

[FR Doc. 02-21167 Filed 8-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7050-01-M

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 02-099]

National Environmental Policy Act; NASA Ames Development Plan

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of availability of the Final Programmatic Environmental

Impact Statement (FPEIS) for the NASA Ames Development Plan (NADP).

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), and NASA "Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)" (14 CFR part 1216 subpart 1216.3), NASA has prepared a FPEIS for the proposed NADP. The purpose of the FPEIS is to assess the environmental consequences associated with development under the proposed NADP, which is intended to bring new research and development (R&D) uses to the NASA Ames Research Center (ARC) in Santa Clara County, California. NASA is planning to develop a world-class, shared-used educational and R&D campus focused on astrobiology, life sciences, space sciences, nanotechnology, biotechnology, information technology and aeronautics. As part of the NADP, NASA officials plan to create partnerships with federal, state and local government agencies, universities, private industry and non-profit organizations in support of NASA's mission to conduct research and develop new technologies.

DATES: NASA will take no final action on the NADP before September 9, 2002, or 30 days from the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Notice of Availability of the NADP FPEIS, whichever is later.

ADDRESSES: The FPEIS can be reviewed at the following locations:

(a) Mountain View Public Library, Reference Section, 585 Franklin Street, Mountain View, CA (650–903–6887).

(b) Sunnyvale Public Library, Reference Section, 665 West Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale, CA (650–730–7300).

(c) NASA Headquarters, Library, Room 1J20, 300 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20546 (202–358–0167).

(d) Access electronically at <http://researchpark.arc.nasa.gov>.

In addition, the FPEIS may be examined at the following locations through the NASA Freedom of Information Act Offices as follows:

(a) NASA, Dryden Flight Research Center, P.O. Box 273, Edwards, CA 93523 (661–276–2704).

(b) NASA, Glenn Research Center at Lewis Field, 21000 Brookpark Road, Cleveland, OH 44135 (216–433–2755).

(c) NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt Road, Greenbelt, MD 20771 (301–286–0730).

(d) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Visitors Lobby, Building 249, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, CA 91109 (818–354–5179).

(e) NASA, Johnson Space Center, Houston, TX 77058 (281–483–8612).

(f) Spaceport U.S.A., Room 2001, John F. Kennedy Space Center, FL 32899. Please call Lisa Fowler at 321–867–2201 in advance.

(g) NASA, Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA 23681 (757–864–2497).

(h) NASA, Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, AL 35812 (256–544–2030).

(i) NASA, Stennis Space Center, MS 39529 (228–688–2164).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sandy Olliges, NASA, Ames Research Center, M.S. 218–1/Building 218, Moffett Field, CA 94035–1000; telephone 650–604–3355; electronic mail (solliges@mail.arc.nasa.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In 1991, the Federal Base Closure and Realignment Commission decided to close Moffett Field Naval Air Station. Subsequently, the U.S. Department of Defense transferred stewardship of the property to NASA. NASA took over administration of Moffett Field in 1994. The immediate issues were how to use the newly acquired land in a manner consistent with NASA's mission, and how to pay for the maintenance and operations of such a large site. These matters were originally addressed in the Moffett Field Comprehensive Use Plan (CUP) and its associated Environmental Assessment (EA), which resulted in a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in 1994. After the transfer of the property, local community leaders formed a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) and recommended uses for the newly acquired land. The uses proposed in the NADP are consistent with the CAC recommendations.

In addition to the activities described in the CUP, NASA now proposes to develop the NASA Research Park (NRP) and other areas by building on the full range of existing high-technology and aviation resources at Moffett Field and creating partnerships with Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, universities, private industry and non-profit organizations in support of NASA's mission to develop new scientific knowledge and technologies. With the help of these collaborative organizations and consistent with its mission, NASA proposes to develop a world-class, shared-use educational and R&D campus focused on the advancement of human knowledge about nanotechnology, information

technology, biotechnology, astrobiology, life sciences, space sciences and aeronautics. By integrating public and private R&D efforts at the NRP, NASA would create a hub for technology transfer, stay involved with cutting-edge technology advances, and facilitate the commercial applications of NASA's basic scientific research.

Alternatives for the development at the Center in the FPEIS include:

Alternative 1: The No Action Alternative. Under the No Action (a.k.a. No Project) Alternative, NASA would not propose new development for ARC at this time. However, NASA would implement several projects at ARC that are already approved pursuant to the NASA ARC CUP EA and FONSI, and the California Air National Guard Master Plan EA and FONSI.

Alternative 2: In Alternative 2, NASA proposes to develop approximately 360,000 square meters (3.9 million square feet) of new space in the NRP, Bay View, and Eastside/Airfield areas. Within the NRP area, there would be approximately 190,000 square meters (2 million square feet) of new educational, office, research and development, museum, conference center, housing and retail development. Approximately 52,000 square meters (560,000 square feet) of existing non-historic structures would be demolished, and approximately 46,000 square meters (500,000 square feet) of existing space would be renovated. In this alternative, NASA proposes approximately 121,000 square meters (1.3 million square feet) of new educational and housing development in the Bay View area, and approximately 51,000 square meters (550,000 square feet) of new low density research and development and light industrial space. Hangars 2 and 3 in the Eastside Airfield area would be renovated. Total build out under this alternative would be approximately 845,000 square meters (9.1 million square feet).

Alternative 3: Based on the ideas of Traditional Neighborhood Design, NASA, in Alternative 3, would create a new mixed-use development within the NRP. In this alternative, NASA proposes to: (1) Add approximately 280,000 square meters (3 million square feet) of new educational, office, research and development, museum, conference center, housing and retail development, (2) demolish approximately 52,000 square meters (560,000 square feet) of non-historic structures, and (3) renovate approximately 46,000 square meters (500,000 square feet) of existing space. NASA does not propose any new construction in the Bay View or Eastside/Airfield areas, although

Hangars 2 and 3 in the Eastside/Airfield area would be renovated for low-intensity research and development or light industrial uses. The total build out under Alternative 3 would be approximately 760,000 square meters (8.2 million square feet).

Alternative 4: In Alternative 4, NASA would concentrate more of the new development in the Bay View area than it would in the other alternatives, while creating less dense development in the NRP area. In Alternative 4, NASA proposes to: (1) Add approximately 145,000 square meters (1.6 million square feet) of new educational office, research and development, museum, conference center, housing and retail space in the NRP area, (2) demolish approximately 52,000 square meters (560,000 square feet) of non-historic structures and (3) renovate approximately 46,000 square meters (500,000 square feet) of existing space. In the Bay View area, NASA proposes approximately 251,000 square meters (2.7 million square feet) of new office, research and development, laboratory, educational, and student/faculty housing development. In the Eastside/Airfield area, NASA proposes to (1) create approximately 62,000 square meters (670,000 square feet) of new light industrial, research and development, office and educational facility development, and (2) renovate the historic hangars. The total build out under Alternative 4 would be approximately 940,000 square meters (10.1 million square feet).

Alternative 5: Under Alternative 5, NASA would allow some new construction in each of the four development areas, but would concentrate most of this construction in the NRP area. In this alternative, NASA proposes to: (1) Add approximately 192,000 square meters (2.1 million square feet) of new educational, office, research and development, museum, conference center, housing and retail space in the NRP Area, (2) demolish approximately 52,000 square meters (560,000 square feet) of non-historic structures, and (3) renovate approximately 56,000 square meters (600,000 square feet) of existing space. In the Bay View area, NASA proposes to add approximately 93,000 square meters (1 million square feet) of new development, primarily for housing. In the Eastside/Airfield area, NASA proposes to construct approximately 1,115 square meters (12,000 square feet) of new space in a new control tower to replace the existing control tower that would be demolished in the NRP area. Finally, in the Ames Campus area, NASA proposes to demolish

approximately 37,000 square meters (400,000 square feet) of existing buildings to make way for 46,000 square meters (500,000 square feet) of high density office and research and development space. Total build out under Alternative 5 would be approximately 780,000 square meters (8.4 million square feet).

Mitigated Alternative 5: The Preferred Alternative Under Mitigated Alternative 5, development would be the same as in Alternative 5, with several exceptions. In the NRP area, the land area of parcel 1, which is proposed to accommodate the Lab Project proposed under the baseline, would be decreased. The development potential of this parcel would be kept the same through an increase in the parcel's allowed Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The land area of NRP Parcel 6, which is proposed for housing, would be increased, with a corresponding increase in its development potential. As well, a portion of building 19 and all of building 20 would be redesigned for use as dormitory housing. This would be in keeping with the historic use of these buildings, which were originally built as enlisted personnel and officer's housing respectively.

To accommodate additional housing, the land area of Bay View Parcel 1, which is designated for housing would be increased, as would the parcel's allowable FAR. However, the area of other parcels proposed for development was decreased, so the total land area proposed for development in the Bay View would remain the same. In the Bay View area, 1,120 townhomes and apartment units would be provided, as compared to 750 under Alternative 5 without mitigation.

The residential development in the Bay View area would occur in the 100-year floodplain. This site is the only on-site location suitable for the additional housing, which is required to help mitigate the significant environmental impacts on the jobs/housing imbalance and traffic. Fill would be added to approximately 23 acres to bring the finished grade above the 100-year floodplain elevation. No adverse impacts to human health or the environment are expected to result.

NASA has selected Mitigated Alternative Five as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative has been identified as the option that best meets NASA's purpose and need, and has the fewest significant environmental impacts. However, even with the proposed mitigation measures, there would be significant impacts to air quality, traffic, and the jobs/housing imbalance.

The FPEIS also includes the General Conformity Determination for Carbon Monoxide, which is provided in Appendix D of the FPEIS. Although more than 100 tons per year of carbon monoxide would be generated by the preferred alternative, no violation of National Ambient Air Quality Standards is expected.

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, NASA has conducted informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and has prepared a Biological Assessment to describe the effects of the proposed action on the federally listed species at the site. No adverse effect is expected from implementation of the preferred alternative. The Biological Assessment is provided as Appendix E to the FPEIS.

Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), NASA has prepared a Historic Resources Protection Plan (HRPP) for the Shenandoah Plaza Historic District in the proposed NRP, and a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the California State Historic Preservation Officer, to adopt and implement the HRPP. Under the proposed action, most noncontributing structures in the Historic District would be demolished, along with the non-historic buildings in the NRP that are outside the Historic District. Historic District infill and new construction in the area of potential effect would comply with the NHPA. No adverse effect is expected from implementation of the preferred alternative. The HRPP and PA are in appendix G of the FPEIS.

NASA has prepared a consistency determination for the entire NADP project relative to the Coastal Zone Management Act administered by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). This consistency determination was submitted to BCDC on April 12, 2002, with additional information submitted on May 29 and July 9, 2002. This consistency determination concluded that the proposed NADP would be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the Bay Plan, McAtteer-Petris Act, and the Coastal Zone Management Act. BCDC concurred with NASA's consistency determination on July 18, 2002.

Future projects implemented pursuant to the NADP will be evaluated for NEPA compliance by the NASA ARC Environmental Services Office to determine if the project's environmental impacts were adequately described in the FPEIS. Any applicable mitigation measures will also be identified. If the project is not adequately covered by the

FPEIS, then NASA will determine what level of additional NEPA analysis may be required. In addition to the NEPA review, NASA will review its partners' proposed projects for compliance with the NADP Design Guide, the Transportation Demand Management Program, the Historic Resources Protection Plan, and the Environmental Issues Management Plan, which are described in the FPEIS, as well as with Federal, State, and local environmental, health, and safety laws, regulations, and ordinances; Executive Orders; NASA ARC policies; and other applicable codes and standards.

Dated: August 14, 2002.

Jeffrey E. Sutton,

Assistant Administrator for Management Systems.

[FR Doc. 02-21201 Filed 8-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 02-100]

NASA Advisory Council, Revolutionize Aviation Subcommittee; Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a forthcoming meeting of the NASA Advisory Council, Aerospace Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC), Revolutionize Aviation Subcommittee (RAS).

DATES: Wednesday, September 18, 2002, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Room 3H46, 300 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20546.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Bernice E. Lynch, Office of Aerospace Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546-0001, 202/358-4594.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will be open to the public up to the seating capacity of the room. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

- Revolutionize Aviation Subcommittee (RAS) Overview
- Overview of Aeronautics Programs
- NASA Aeronautics Performance Report
- NASA Aeronautics Strategy & Planning

It is imperative that the meeting be held on these dates to accommodate the

scheduling priorities of the key participants.

Dated: August 14, 2002.

Sylvia K. Kraemer,

Acting Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. 02-21202 Filed 8-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

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

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: NARA is giving public notice that the agency has submitted to OMB for approval the information collections described in this notice. The public is invited to comment on the proposed information collections pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to OMB at the address below on or before September 19, 2002, to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Attn: Ms. Brooke Dickson, Desk Officer for NARA, Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the proposed information collections and supporting statements should be directed to Tamee Fechhelm at telephone number 301-837-1694 or fax number 301-837-3213.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13), NARA invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed information collections. NARA published a notice of proposed collection for these information collections on June 7, 2002 (67 FR 39442 and 39443). No comments were received. NARA has submitted the described information collections to OMB for approval.

In response to this notice, comments and suggestions should address one or more of the following points: (a) Whether the proposed information collections are necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NARA; (b) the accuracy of NARA's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collections; (c) ways to enhance the

quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of information technology. In this notice, NARA is soliciting comments concerning the following information collections:

1. *Title:* Application for attendance at the Institute for the Editing of Historical Documents.

OMB number: 3095-0012.

Agency form number: None.

Type of review: Regular.

Affected public: Individuals, often already working on documentary editing projects, who wish to apply to attend the annual one-week Institute for the Editing of Historical Documents, an intensive seminar in all aspects of modern documentary editing techniques taught by visiting editors and specialists.

Estimated number of respondents: 25.

Estimated time per response: 1.5 hours.

Frequency of response: On occasion, no more than annually (when respondent wishes to apply for attendance at the Institute).

Estimated total annual burden hours: 37.5 hours.

Abstract: The application is used by the NHPRC staff to establish the applicants qualifications and to permit selection of those individuals best qualified to attend the Institute jointly sponsored by the NHPRC, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and the University of Wisconsin. Selected applicants forms are forwarded to the resident advisors of the Institute, who use them to determine what areas of instruction would be most useful to the applicants.

2. *Title:* National Historical Publications and Records Commission Grant Program.

OMB number: 3095-0013.

Agency form number: None.

Type of review: Regular.

Affected public: Nonprofit organizations and institutions, state and local government agencies, Federally acknowledged or state-recognized Native American tribes or groups, and individuals who apply for NHPRC grants for support of historical documentary editions, archival preservation and planning projects, and other records projects.

Estimated number of respondents: 134 per year submit applications; approximately 100 grantees among the applicant respondents also submit semiannual narrative performance reports.