

occurrence rates (accidents per million miles) and fatality rates (accident fatalities per million miles) were used for accident calculations for truck and rail shipments. Transportation of both Department of Transportation compliant and noncompliant cylinders was analyzed. The noncompliant cylinders were assumed to be transported in overpacks or have their contents transferred into compliant cylinders at ETPP before being transported off-site.

The potential receptors of exposure resulting from DUF₆ transport considered in the PEIS analyses included workers who load and unload the cylinders, transportation crews, and members of the general public who live along the transportation routes, as well as members of the public who share the roads or rest stops with the DUF₆ cylinder transport vehicles. The assessment also considered impacts to maximally exposed individuals for several very specific exposure scenarios, such as vehicle inspectors, persons in vehicles stopped next to a shipment, and a resident living along a site entrance or exit road. Both radiological and nonradiological, including chemical and vehicle related, impacts were estimated.

Similar to the assessment of DUF₆ cylinders at ETPP, the DOE also analyzed the potential impacts from transporting the approximately 53,000 DUF₆ cylinders under its management responsibility at its Portsmouth and Paducah sites to an unspecified location in the continental United States over similar distances.

The Supplement Analysis analyzes the health and environmental impacts of shipments of up to 1,700 DUF₆ cylinders from ETPP to the Portsmouth site in 2003 through 2005. The result of this analysis and a separate report on transportation of DUF₆ cylinders to Portsmouth and Paducah prepared by B. M. Biwer, *et al.*; *Transportation Impact for Shipment of Uranium Hexafluoride (UF₆) Cylinders From the East Tennessee Technology Park to the Portsmouth and Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plants ANL EAD/TM-112*, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL, October 2001 subsequent to the PEIS were then compared to the results in the DUF₆ PEIS. The Supplement Analysis concluded as follows:

The estimated collective population risks for the proposed shipment of up to 1,700 DUF₆ cylinders from ETPP to Portsmouth by truck are compared with the results from the Argonne report and the DUF₆ PEIS in Table 6. In general, the collective risks for the proposed campaign are less than the projected risks presented in the PEIS for the shipment of ETPP DUF₆ cylinders over 1,000

km and much less than the PEIS results for shipment over 5,000 km. The one exception is the risk estimate for vehicle emissions (*i.e.*, exhaust emissions and fugitive dust), which is somewhat greater for the proposed shipment campaign than the estimates in the PEIS because of the use of a revised method of estimating such risks. However, the total number of estimated fatalities from all causes for the campaign is much less than one and well within the bounds of the PEIS analysis.

With respect to potential exposures of individual members of the public, the estimated doses and risks to maximally exposed individuals for the proposed shipments would be the same as the per-event results presented in the PEIS. The probability of being exposed to multiple shipments during the proposed campaign would be less than would be estimated for the PEIS because of the fewer number of shipments considered.

The maximum estimated consequences for severe accidents for the proposed shipments would also be the same as those reported in the PEIS. Because the number of shipments and the cumulative shipment distances would be considerably less than those in the PEIS, the probability of such an accident's occurring also would be less. Thus, the overall risk posed by such a severe accident, which is defined as the product of the accident consequence and the estimated probability, for the proposed campaign would be less than for the shipments considered in the PEIS.

Potential impacts at ETPP from the preparation of the cylinders for shipment for the proposed campaign would also be less than those reported in the PEIS. The PEIS considered preparation of up to 2,342 compliant cylinders for shipment, compared with 1,700 cylinders being considered in this SA.

Decision

Based on the Supplement Analysis, the DOE has concluded that the estimated impacts for the proposed transport of up to 1,700 ETPP DUF₆ cylinders are less than or equal to those analyzed in the PEIS for shipment of the entire ETPP cylinder inventory. Therefore, no supplemental EIS is necessary, and no further NEPA documentation is required. The DOE hereby amends the ROD for the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Alternative Strategies for the Long-Term Management and Use of Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride issued in August 1999 (64 FR 43358; August 10, 1999). The DOE has now decided to transfer up to 1,700 of the approximately 4,700 cylinders containing DUF₆ from the East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP) in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, to its storage facilities at DOE's enrichment facility at Portsmouth, Ohio, between fiscal years 2003 and 2005. Portsmouth was selected based on the availability of storage capacity and the desire to balance

cylinder inventory. The DOE's site-specific NEPA review will continue as before.

Issued in Washington, DC, this 28th day of August, 2003.

Jessie Hill Roberson,

Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management.

[FR Doc. 03-23167 Filed 9-10-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

International Energy Agency Meeting

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Industry Advisory Board (IAB) to the International Energy Agency (IEA) will meet on September 18, 2003, at the Sony Center at Potsdamer Platz, Berlin, Germany; and on September 19, 2003, in connection with an IEA seminar on Oil Stocks and New Challenges in the Oil Market, hosted by the German Federal Ministry of Economy and Labor on the same date at Scharnhorststrasse 34-37, Berlin, Germany.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Samuel M. Bradley, Assistant General Counsel for International and National Security Programs, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585, 202-586-6738.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

In accordance with section 252(c)(1)(A)(i) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6272(c)(1)(A)(i)) (EPCA), the following notice of meeting is provided:

A meeting of the Industry Advisory Board (IAB) to the International Energy Agency (IEA) will be held at the Sony Center at Potsdamer Platz, Berlin, Germany, on September 18, 2003, from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. The agenda for the IAB meeting is as follows:

- I. Welcome, Review of Agenda, and Introductions
- II. Near-term Goals of the IEA
- III. Overview of Upcoming Work at IEA
- IV. Progress Report: International Energy Forum & IEA World Energy Outlook 2003
- V. Introduction of Draft Outline for Emergency Response Exercise 3 (ERE3)
- VI. Discussion of Design Questions for ERE3
- VII. Closing and Review of Upcoming IAB Meetings

A meeting of the IAB will be held on September 19, 2003, in connection with a Seminar on Oil Stocks and New

Challenges in the Oil Market, sponsored by the IEA and hosted by the German Federal Ministry of Economy and Labor at Schornhorststrasse 34–37, Berlin, Germany, commencing at 9:15 a.m. The purpose of this notice is to permit attendance by representatives of U.S. company members of the IAB at the IEA-sponsored Seminar, which is scheduled to be held at the same time and location.

The agenda for the Seminar is under the control of the IEA. It is expected that the IEA will adopt the following agenda:

Opening

I. Opening Speeches

Session 1: Dynamics of Global Oil Market and Challenges to Oil Security

- I. Recent Oil Market Events, Near-Term Risks and the Continuing Importance of Strategic Stocks
- II. Industry's Perspective on Recent Oil Market Events and the Role of the IEA and Strategic Stocks
- III. Discussion
- IV. The Post Iraq Oil Market and the Role of Strategic Stocks
- V. Global Investment Outlook to 2030: Key Trends and Uncertainties
- VI. Discussion

Session 2: Oil Security and Stockholding

- I. Overview of IEA Member Country Stockholding Regimes
- II. Discussion
- III. Stocks, Data and the Oil Market
- IV. Public Stocks, Mandatory Industry Stocks and Fair Competition in the Market
- V. Emergency Reserves and the Growing Use of Bilateral Stockholding Tickets
- VI. Discussion

Session 3: A Global Framework for Future Oil Security

- I. Recent Developments in Stockholding by Non-Member Countries
- II. The Role of Non-Member Consuming Countries in Global Oil Supply Security: Strategic Stocks
- III. How Will the Producer/Consumer Dialogue Promote Stability in Global Energy Markets?
- IV. Discussion

Concluding Discussion—Key Issues for the Future of Oil Security

- I. Summary of the Chairmen and Discussion
- II. Conclusion

As provided in section 252(c)(1)(A)(ii) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6272(c)(1)(A)(ii)), the meeting of the IAB on September 18 is open only to representatives of members of the IAB and their counsel;

representatives of members of the IEA's Standing Group on Emergency Questions (SEQ); representatives of the Departments of Energy, Justice, and State, the Federal Trade Commission, the General Accounting Office, Committees of Congress, the IEA, and the European Commission; and invitees of the IAB, the SEQ, or the IEA. The expected participants at the IEA-sponsored Seminar on September 19 include Government members of the SEQ, representatives of the German Federal Ministry of Economy and Labor, representatives of the IEA Secretariat, and representatives of members of the IAB.

Issued in Washington, DC, September 5, 2003.

Samuel M. Bradley,

Assistant General Counsel for International and National Security Programs.

[FR Doc. 03–23166 Filed 9–10–03; 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: 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 Petroleum Marketing Program Surveys to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and a three-year extension with revisions under section 3507(h)(1) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

DATES: Comments must be filed by October 14, 2003. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments but find it difficult to do so within that period, you should contact the OMB Desk Officer for DOE listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to OMB Desk Officer for DOE, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget. To ensure receipt of the comments by the due date, submission by FAX (202–395–7285) or e-mail (Ballen@omb.eop.gov) is recommended. The mailing address is 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, DC 20503. The OMB DOE Desk Officer may be telephoned at (202) 395–3087. (A copy of your comments should also be

provided to EIA's Statistics and Methods Group at the address below.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information should be directed to Herbert Miller. To ensure receipt of the comments by the due date, submission by FAX (202–287–1705) or e-mail (herbert.miller@eia.doe.gov) is recommended. The mailing address is Statistics and Methods Group (EI–70), Forrestal Building, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20585–0670. Mr. Miller may be contacted by telephone at (202) 287–1711.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This section contains the following information about the energy information collection submitted to OMB for review: (1) The collection numbers and title; (2) the sponsor (*i.e.*, the Department of Energy component); (3) the current OMB docket number (if applicable); (4) the type of request (*i.e.*, new, revision, extension, or reinstatement); (5) response obligation (*i.e.*, mandatory, voluntary, or required to obtain or retain benefits); (6) a description of the need for and proposed use of the information; (7) a categorical description of the likely respondents; and (8) an estimate of the total annual reporting burden (*i.e.*, the estimated number of likely respondents times the proposed frequency of response per year times the average hours per response).

1. Petroleum Marketing Program Surveys—EIA–14, “Refiners” Monthly Cost Report”; EIA–182, “Domestic Crude Oil First Purchase Report”; EIA–782A, “Refiners’/ Gas Plant Operators” Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report”; EIA–782B, “Resellers’/ Retailers” Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report”; EIA–782C, “Monthly Report of Petroleum Products Sold Into States for Consumption”; EIA–821, “Annual Fuel Oil and Kerosene Sales Report”; EIA–856, “Monthly Foreign Crude Oil Acquisition Report”; EIA–863, “Petroleum Product Sales Identification Survey”; EIA–877, “Winter Heating Fuels Telephone Survey”; EIA–878, “Motor Gasoline Price Survey”; and EIA–888, “On-Highway Diesel Fuel Price Survey.”

2. Energy Information Administration.
3. OMB Number 1905–0174.

4. Revision.
5. Mandatory.

6. The Petroleum Marketing Program Surveys collect information on costs, sales, prices, and distribution for crude oil and petroleum products. Data are published in petroleum publications and in multi-fuel reports. Respondents are refiners, first purchasers of domestic