

Department of the Army**Army Science Board; Opening Meeting**

In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Act (Pub. L. 92-463), announcement is made of the following Committee Meeting:

Name of the Committee: Army Science Board (ASB).

Dates of the Meeting: 16-17 May 1991.

Time: 0800-1600.

Place: Pentagon, Washington, DC.

Agenda: The Army Science Board (ASB)

1991 Summer Study on Army Simulation Strategy will meet for discussions focused on technical and programmatic subjects as regards simulation and modeling. This meeting will be open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the committee at the time and in the manner permitted by the committee. The ASB Administrative Officer, Sally Warner, may be contacted for further information at (202) 695-0781/0782.

Sally A. Warner,

Administrative Officer, Army Science Board.

[FR Doc. 91-10570 Filed 5-2-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-06-M

DOE's St. James marine terminal on the Mississippi River in St. James Parish and to the Clovelly salt dome pipeline terminal of the Louisiana Offshore Oil Port (LOOP) in Lafourche Parish.

The proposed Texas storage facility would be pipeline-connected to either the proposed Seaway pipeline terminal in Brazoria County or to common carrier pipeline and/or marine terminals of East Houston, the Houston Ship Channel or Texas City in Harris and Galveston Counties.

For each of the two salt dome groupings, the EIS will assess each candidate as an alternative to the other three candidate sites of the group. The assessment of each alternative site will include consideration of ancillary offsite facilities and alternative pipeline routes to crude oil transportation and distribution centers.

Preparation of the EIS will be in accordance with NEPA, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), and the DOE NEPA guidelines (52 FR 47662, December 15, 1987).

INVITATION TO COMMENT AND DATES: To ensure that the significant issues related to this proposal are adequately addressed, DOE invites public comment on the proposed scope and content of the EIS from all interested parties. Written comments or suggestions to assist DOE in indentifying significant environmental issues and the appropriate scope of the EIS will be considered in preparing the implementation plan and draft EIS, and should be postmarked by June 17, 1991. Written comments postmarked after that date will be considered to the degree practicable.

Oral comments and suggestions are invited by DOE at public scoping meetings to which agencies, organizations, and the general public are invited. The location, date, and time for the scoping meetings are provided in the section of this Notice entitled SCOPING MEETINGS. Written and oral comments will be given equal weight and will be considered in determining the scope of the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS availability will be announced in the Federal Register along with dates for public hearings soliciting comments on it. Comments on the Draft EIS will be considered in preparing the Final EIS.

ADDRESSES: Written comments or suggestions on the scope of the EIS, requests to speak at the scoping meetings, questions concerning the project, or requests to be put on the mailing list for the Draft EIS should be directed to: Mr. Hal Delaplane, Strategic Petroleum Reserve (FE-421), U.S.

Department of Energy 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585, Telephone: (202) 586-4730.

Envelopes should be labeled "Scoping for SPR EIS."

FURTHER INFORMATION: For further information on the DOE NEPA process, please contact Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Oversight (EH-25), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585, Telephone: (202) 586-4600.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background and Need for the Proposed Action**

The SPR is designed to provide the United States with sufficient petroleum reserves to reduce the impacts of any future oil supply interruption and to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Energy Program. The SPR currently consists of six underground oil storage facilities: four in Louisiana and two in Texas; a marine terminal on the Mississippi River at St. James, Louisiana; and an administrative facility in New Orleans. One facility, Weeks Island, was a conventional room-and-pillar salt mine in a salt dome before DOE converted it to use for oil storage. At the other five storage facilities (Bayou Choctaw, Big Hill, Bryan Mound, Sulphur Mines, and West Hackberry), crude oil is stored in caverns constructed by solution mining of salt domes. The six SPR facilities had a total crude inventory of approximately 580 million barrels as of March 1991. All major surface construction at the six SPR facilities is completed, and cavern development is in progress to achieve a storage capacity of 750 million barrels. Current plans provide for the decommissioning of Sulphur Mines, with replacement capacity to be developed by the on-going enlargement of the caverns at Bayou Choctaw and Big Hill.

Creation of the SPR was mandated by Congress in title I, part B, of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975. In this Act, Congress authorized the United States Government to provide for the storage of up to one billion barrels of crude oil and petroleum products. The policies for implementing the SPR program were expressed in the SPR Plan that was approved by Congress and became effective on April 8, 1977. In accordance with this plan, 500 million barrels of oil were to have been in storage by December 1982.

Site-specific EISs were prepared between 1976 and 1981 which supported the selection of the present crude oil

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Conduct Public Scoping Meetings for the Proposed Expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve**

AGENCY: U.S. Department of energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of intent (NOI) to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: DOE announces its intent to prepare an EIS pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, to evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) from 750 million barrels to one billion barrels. The SPR is designed to provide the United States with sufficient petroleum reserves to reduce the impacts of any future oil supply interruption and to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Energy Program. The proposed action is to develop a total of 250 million barrels of crude oil storage capacity at two separate salt domes on the Texas and Louisiana coast. A 150-million-barrel storage facility is proposed for one of four candidate salt domes in southeast Louisiana and a 100-million-barrel storage facility is proposed for one of four candidate salt domes in Texas.

The proposed Louisiana storage facility would be pipeline-connected to

storage facilities and pipelines. The development of the initial 248 million barrels of storage capacity resulted in the selection of five salt dome sites: West Hackberry, Bayou Choctaw, Weeks Island, and Sulphur Mines in Louisiana, and Bryan Mound in Texas.

Three site-specific EISs were published in 1978 to assess the impacts of increasing the crude oil storage capacity to 538 million barrels. Each EIS addressed a complex of sites which were grouped according to the major interstate common carrier pipeline to which they would connect as follows: (1) The Capline Group, located in eastern Louisiana; (2) the Texoma Group, located in western Louisiana and eastern Texas; and (3) the Seaway Group, located in Texas. The selected alternative was the expansion of three existing sites: West Hackberry, Bryan Mound, and Bayou Choctaw.

For the expansion of the SPR from 538 million barrels to 750 million barrels, an EIS was published in 1981 which focused on maximizing early oil fill, as directed by Congress. First consideration, therefore, was given to expanding the existing SPR sites; additional candidates were to be among those considered in the 1978 site-specific EISs. This resulted in the expansion of the West Hackberry and Bryan Mound sites in Louisiana and the development of the Big Hill site in Texas.

In addition, an Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) published in January 1990 evaluated the impacts of decommissioning the Sulphur Mines storage facility and increasing the storage capacity of the Big Hill facility.

During 1990, Congress enacted two bills requiring DOE to undertake planning activities associated with the expansion of the SPR to one billion barrels: The Energy Policy and Conservation Act Amendments and the Department of Interior and Related Agencies' Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1991. The Appropriations Act requested that DOE report to the Committees on Appropriations regarding recommended storage sites, the proposed methods of storage, a conceptual plan for storage and distribution facilities, and preliminary construction cost estimates. In March 1991, DOE published *Report to the Congress on Candidate Sites for Expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to One Billion Barrels*, which fulfilled this request. DOE's 1989 Report to the Congress entitled *Report to Congress on Expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to One Billion Barrels* provides background and a

point of departure for the more recent report.

The SPR expansion and distribution plans are based on forecasts of U.S. petroleum demand and supply in the year 2000. Projections for the next ten years include: (1) U.S. oil consumption will increase slowly; (2) domestic oil production will decline significantly; (3) petroleum imports, particularly crude oil, will increase greatly to meet the Nation's net petroleum supply requirements. The crude oil pipeline infrastructure from the Gulf Coast to the Midwest and Midcontinent is projected to increase capacity as inland demands for Gulf Coast imports increase. DOE expects that all increases in pipeline capacity to meet inland crude oil demands will originate in the Houston and Freeport areas of Texas which are currently served by the SPR's Seaway System. Within the Gulf Coast, the Capline and Seaway areas stand out as the largest centers of projected demand and distribution potential.

In the 1989 Report to Congress, DOE discussed the possibility of a 100-million-barrel site on the East Coast utilizing an inground concrete storage technology as an alternative to a second Gulf Coast location. Since then, several studies have been performed to further assess the East Coast storage concept. Although the development of such a facility was found to be technically feasible, the East Coast site development would be roughly double the cost of a Gulf Coast site, and, environmentally, the project would likely encounter significant problems. Therefore, DOE concluded that inground concrete tank storage is not a reasonable alternative at this time and East Coast siting was deleted from the SPR's candidate site list in the 1991 Report.

Based on an analysis of refinery demand and the related SPR distribution infrastructure, the 1991 report concludes that a 250-million-barrel expansion of the SPR would logically be concentrated in the Seaway and Capline complexes. Developing a larger proportion of storage at the Capline site would be more desirable for two reasons. First, the Capline Complex is projected to have a larger distribution potential than the Seaway Complex and is also expected to be the dominant import carrier to the Midwest due to its more direct route and lower tariffs. Secondly, because the Capline Complex was never developed to the level of storage capacity envisioned in the original SPR Plan, the SPR's storage in the Capline area is only 20 percent of the current Reserve and is insufficient to sustain a

150 to 180-day drawdown at design rates. Therefore, the most desirable expansion configuration for the one billion barrel program would be (1) a 150-million-barrel storage site in the Capline Complex connected to the LOOP Clovelly terminal for distribution; and (2) a 100-million-barrel storage site in the Seaway Complex connected to the Seaway Pipeline Terminal or Houston Pipeline terminals serving the Midcontinent and Midwest.

A prototype 150-million-barrel SPR facility in the Capline Complex in Louisiana would include fifteen 10-million-barrel caverns on a 300-acre site. The caverns would be created in rock salt from 2,000 to 5,000 feet below ground by solution-mining, or leaching, with fresh or salt water using from one to three wells per cavern. Leaching 150 million barrels of storage space would create between 1.0 and 1.2 billion barrels of concentrated brine that would require disposal either by pipeline and diffuser into the Gulf of Mexico or by an array of offsite underground injection wells.

To provide the water, a raw water intake structure would be constructed offsite in a source surface water body. The principal operating systems would be the raw water leaching/drawdown system, a brine setting and disposal system, a crude oil injection/distribution system, a fixed fire protection system, and a central control system. Major surface buildings and structures would include an electrical substation, a control center, an administration building, security operations buildings, communications, covered laydown, fire house, and a storage and maintenance warehouse. The water and brine systems would be sized for leaching caverns at a rate of one million barrels per day and the crude oil system would be designed for drawdown at 900,000 barrels per day.

The facility would be connected by crude oil pipelines to the distribution terminals at LOOP's Clovelly salt dome in Lafourche Parish and DOE's St. James Terminal in St. James Parish.

A prototype 100-million-barrel SPR facility in the Seaway Complex in Texas would consist of ten 10-million-barrel caverns on a 200-acre site with the similar systems and structures as described above for the Capline site. Water and brine systems would be sized for leaching caverns at a rate of approximately one million barrels per day; the crude oil system would be designed for drawdown at 800,000 barrels per day. The facility will be pipeline-connected to either the Houston/Texas City distribution centers

on the Seaway Pipeline terminus at the Jones Creek Tank Farm in Brazoria County.

In accordance with NEPA, DOE has completed a Supplement Analysis (SA) of the 1978 SPR Programmatic EIS and its 1979 Supplement. The Programmatic EIS considered the impacts of the overall program as well as several alternative storage facilities (e.g., existing solution—mined cavities in salt dome formations, existing conventional mines, development of new solution-mined cavities in salt dome formations, existing and new surface tankage, and surplus tanker ships) and recommended the development of new solution-mined cavities in salt formations along the Gulf Coast. After the SPR Plan was revised by Amendment 2 in June 1978 to increase the SPR to one billion barrels, DOE published a Supplement to the Programmatic EIS in 1979 that addressed this expansion at the programmatic level. Based on the detailed review of the Programmatic EIS and its Supplement in the SA, DOE determined that no supplement to the Programmatic EIS is required to support the proposed expansion. A Strategic Petroleum Reserve Plan Amendment will be submitted at the completion of the NEPA process which will provide final recommendations regarding the storage sites to be developed.

Proposed Action

The proposed action is to develop 250 million barrels of crude oil storage capacity at two salt domes on the Texas and Louisiana coast. A 150-million-barrel storage facility is proposed for one of four candidate salt domes in southeast Louisiana and a 100-million-barrel storage facility is proposed for one of four candidate salt domes in Texas.

Eight Gulf Coast salt domes have been identified as candidate sites in the March 1991 Report to Congress on Candidate Sites for Expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to One Billion Barrels: Chacahoula, Cote Blanche, Napoleonville, and Weeks Island in Louisiana are candidates for a 150-million-barrel storage facility in the Capline Complex; and Boling, Big Hill, Hawkinsville, and Stratton Ridge in Texas are candidates for a 100-million-barrel storage facility in the Seaway Complex. Together, these eight candidate sites represent the alternatives to be assessed under NEPA; however, the scoping process may identify additional alternatives for assessment in the EIS.

The proposed Louisiana storage facility would be pipeline-connected to DOE's St. James marine terminal on the

Mississippi River in St. James Parish and to the Clovelly salt dome pipeline terminal of the Louisiana Offshore Oil Port (LOOP) in Lafourche Parish.

The proposed Texas storage facility would be pipeline-connected to either the proposed Seaway pipeline terminal in Brazoria County or to common carrier pipeline and/or marine terminals of East Houston, the Houston Ship Channel or Texas City in Harris and Galveston Counties.

Alternatives

The Department's preferred alternative is to develop a 150-million-barrel storage facility in the Capline Complex and a 100-million-barrel storage facility in the Seaway Complex. Alternatives to be evaluated include (1) no action; (2) the selection of a different distribution system and/or location of storage facilities for each of the Capline and Seaway Complexes. For each of the two salt dome groupings, the EIS will assess each candidate salt dome as an alternative to the other three candidates in the group. The assessment of each alternative site will include consideration of ancillary offsite facilities and alternative pipeline routes to crude oil transportation and distribution centers.

Identification of Environmental Issues

The following issues associated with the proposed expansion of the SPR will be considered by DOE during its evaluation of candidate storage locations. This list is neither intended to be all inclusive, nor is it a predetermination of potential impacts. Additions to or deletions from this list may occur as a result of the scoping process.

(1) **Air Quality Impacts:** The effects of construction and operation of SPR facilities at the candidate sites on air quality within the surrounding region.

(2) **Water Resources and Water Quality Impacts:** The qualitative and quantitative effects on water quality of potential oil, brine, or other types of spills, waste disposal (including brine disposal), and water usage during site development and operations.

(3) **Involvement of Sensitive Environments and Ecological Impacts:** The potential environmental impacts of construction and operation of SPR facilities on local ecology and wetlands, as well as the potential disturbance or destruction of threatened or endangered flora and fauna.

(4) **Land Use Impacts:** Potential effects of allocating land resources in the area to storage capacity development rather than other uses (e.g., agricultural, commercial, recreational) and potential aesthetic or visual impacts.

(5) **Geological Impacts:** Potential impacts on the geology in the vicinity of the sites, including halokinesis or cavern "creep".

subsidence, increased potential for flooding, and soil impacts.

(6) **Socioeconomic Impacts:** Potential impacts of (1) economic dislocations on co-located industries and their employees and the local tax base, and (2) increased development on communities located near the candidate sites, including increased traffic, effects on labor patterns, and increased demand for services such as police, fire, and medical services.

(7) **Impacts on Cultural Resources:** Potential effects on historical, archaeological, scientific, or culturally important sites.

Issues will be discussed in sufficient detail to clarify and distinguish among alternatives.

Mitigation Measures

The projected environmental impacts from the expansion of the SPR at the candidate sites will depend on the level of SPR operations and the mitigation measures that are recommended for each potential impact. Mitigation measures will be discussed in the EIS and will relate specifically to the potential impacts identified.

NEPA and the Scoping Process

DOE will comply with the NEPA process as outlined in the Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR parts 1500-1508) and DOE's Guidelines for Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (52 FR 47662, December 15, 1987).

Scoping, an integral part of the NEPA process, solicits public input to the EIS process to ensure that: (1) Issues are identified early and properly studied; (2) the Draft EIS is thorough and balanced; and (3) delays occasioned by an inadequate Draft EIS are avoided. The scoping process will involve all interested agencies (Federal, State, and local), organizations, and members of the public.

Issues to be addressed in the Draft EIS, in addition to those already listed, will be determined from comments submitted by mail, or presented orally or in writing at the public scoping meetings. All comments will be given equal weight by DOE. The preliminary identification of reasonable alternatives and environmental issues is not meant to be exhaustive or final. Alternatives other than those outlined above may warrant examination, and new issues may be identified for evaluation. The results of scoping will be incorporated into a document called an Implementation Plan (IP) which provides guidance for the preparation of an EIS. The IP will be available for public distribution at the conclusion of scoping.

Scoping Meetings

Public scoping meetings, held at the locations on the date and at the time indicated below, will be informal. A presiding officer designated by DOE will establish procedures governing the conduct of the meetings. The meetings will not be conducted as evidentiary hearings, and those who choose to make statements may not be cross-examined by other speakers. To request time to speak at the public scoping meetings, persons should submit a written request to Hal Delaplane using the address listed in the **ADDRESSES AND FURTHER INFORMATION** section of this notice. The meetings are scheduled as follows:

Date: Tuesday, June 4, 1991

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Place: Center for Arts and Sciences, 400 College Drive, Lake Jackson, Texas

Date: Thursday, June 6, 1991

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Place: Goaux Hall, Madewood Drive, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, Louisiana

To ensure that everyone who wishes to speak has a chance to do so, five minutes will be allotted to each speaker who signs up before the meeting begins. Depending on the number of persons requesting to be heard, DOE may allow longer times for representatives of organizations. Persons wishing to speak on behalf of an organization should identify that organization when they sign up to speak. Persons who have not submitted a written request to speak in advance may register to speak at the scoping meetings. They will be called upon to present their comments as time permits.

A complete transcript of the public scoping meetings will be retained by DOE and made available for inspection during business hours, Monday through Friday, at the Department of Energy Freedom of Information Reading Room, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585, and at the Department of Energy SPR Project Management Office (c/o Mike Farley), 900 Commerce Road East, New Orleans, LA 70123, telephone (504) 734-4374. Additional copies of the public scoping meetings transcripts also will be made available during normal business hours at the following locations:

Brazoria County Library, 401 East Cedar, Angleton, Texas 77515,
Contact: Steve Brown, (409) 849-5711 ext. 1505

Beaumont Public Library, 801 Pearl Street, Beaumont, Texas 77701,
Contact: Naomi Paul, (409) 838-8606

Allen J. Ellender Memorial Library, Leighton Drive, Nicholls State

University, Thibodaux, Louisiana
70310 Contact: Peter Kaatrud, (504) 448-4652

Dupre Library, 302 East St. Mary Blvd., U. of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana 70504, Contact: Sandy Himel or Barbara Flynn, (318) 231-8030.

In addition, copies of the public scoping meeting transcripts will be made available for purchase. Those interested parties who do not wish to submit comments or suggestions at this time, but who would like to receive a copy of the Implementation Plan and/or the Draft EIS, should notify Hal Delaplane at the address given in the **ADDRESSES AND FURTHER INFORMATION** section of this Notice.

Related Documentation

The following documents related to the proposed action are available from Mr. Hal Delaplane, Office of Strategic Petroleum Reserve (FE-421), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585, telephone (202) 586-4730:

"Strategic Petroleum Reserve Phase III Expansion; Record of Decision".
Federal Register, 47 FR 9730, March 5, 1982.

Report to the Congress on Candidate Sites for Expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to One Billion Barrels. U.S. Department of Energy, March 1991. DOE/FE-0221P.

Supplement Analysis for the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Strategic Petroleum Reserve, March 1991.

The following documents are available in microfiche form from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161. To obtain copies, contact the NTIS Sales Desk at (703) 487-4650. The Sales Desk representative will also provide information on document prices and the availability of the document as a printed, bound copy.

Report to the Congress on Expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to One Billion Barrels. U.S. Department of Energy, April 1989. DOE/FE-0128.

Strategic Petroleum Reserve Phase III Expansion: Texoma and Seaway Group Salt Domes (West Hackberry and Bryan Mound Expansion, Big Hill Development, Final Environmental Impact Statement. U.S. Department of Energy, October 1981. DOE/EIS-0075 (NTIS No. DE 84017132).

Strategic Petroleum Reserve, Expansion of the Reserve, Final Environmental Impact Statement. U.S. Department of Energy, January 1979. DOE/EIS-0034.
Strategic Petroleum Reserve Final Environmental Impact Statement. Federal Energy Administration, December 1976. 2 vols. FEA/S-76/487 and FEA/S-76/488 (NTIS Nos. PB261799 and PB 261800).

Signed in Washington, DC, this 26th day of April 1991, for the United States Department of Energy.

Paul L. Ziemer,

Assistant Secretary, Environment, Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 91-10510 Filed 5-2-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Energy Information Administration**Forms EIA-23, 23P and 64A, "Oil and Gas Reserves Surveys"**

AGENCY: Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Extension of the forms EIA-23, "Annual Survey of Domestic Oil and Gas Reserves," EIA-23P, "Oil and Gas Well Operator List Update Report," and EIA-64A, "Annual Report of the Origin of Natural Gas Liquids Production," and solicitation of comments.

SUMMARY: The Energy Information Administration (EIA) as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden (required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Public Law No. 96-511, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), conducts a presurvey consultation program to provide the general public and other Federal agencies with the opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing reporting forms. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden is minimized, reporting forms are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently, EIA is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension of the forms EIA-23, "Annual Survey of Domestic Oil and Gas Reserves," EIA-23P, "Oil and Gas Well Operator List Update Report," and EIA-64A, "Annual Report of the Origin of Natural Gas Liquids Production." Under the EIA budget proposal for FY 1992, the Oil and Gas Reserves program will remain a major part of EIA's effort with annual estimates of oil and gas reserves published every other year.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted, on or before June 3, 1991. If