

performs the environmental review after the application is filed. The alternative procedures are intended to simplify and expedite the licensing process by combining the pre-filing consultation and environmental review processes into a single process, to facilitate greater participation, and to improve communication and cooperation among the participants.

Synergics has contacted federal and state resources agencies, NGOs, elected officials, environmental groups, and the public regarding the Lassen Lodge Project. Synergics intends to file 6-month progress reports during the alternative procedures process.

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-27196 Filed 10-29-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Application Accepted for Filing and Soliciting Comments, Motions To Intervene, and Protests

October 24, 2001.

Take notice that the following hydroelectric application has been filed with the Commission and is available for public inspection:

a. *Application Type:* Amendment of Preliminary Permit Application.

b. *Project No.:* 12060-000.

c. *Date filed:* July 2, 2001, amended October 15, 2001.

d. *Applicant:* Mark R. Frederick.

e. *Name of Project:* Rock Creek Hydroelectric Energy Project.

f. *Location:* Would utilize the existing Wise Canal and Rock Creek Lake of Pacific Gas & Electric Company's Drum-Spaulding Project No. 2310, in Placer County, California.

g. *Filed Pursuant to:* Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 791(a)-825(r).

h. *Applicant Contact:* Mr. Mark R. Frederick, 17825 Crother Hills Road, Meadow Vista, CA 95722, (530) 887-1984.

i. *FERC Contact:* James Hunter, (202) 219-2839.

j. *Deadline for filing comments and or motions:* 60 days from the issue date of this notice. Filings already made in this proceeding need not be refiled.

All documents (original and eight copies) should be filed with: David P. Boergers, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. Comments, protests and interventions may be filed electronically via the

Internet in lieu of paper. See, 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's web site under the "e-Filing" link.

Please include the project number (P-12060-000) on any comments or motions filed.

k. *Description of Project:* The Applicant has withdrawn his preliminary permit application for the Rock Creek Lake Outlet Project No. 12069 and combined that project with the one first proposed as the PG&E Wise Canal Project No. 12060. The proposed project, as amended, using PG&E's existing Wise Canal and Rock Creek Lake, would consist of: (1) A proposed remotely controlled gated intake structure at an existing diversion dam on the canal above the lake, (2) a proposed 4,000-foot-long, 6-foot-diameter penstock, (3) a proposed powerhouse containing a 1,400-kilowatt generating unit, (4) a proposed draft tube emptying into the canal below the lake, (5) a proposed connection to an overhead transmission line, and (6) appurtenant facilities. The project would have an annual generation of 11.3 gigawatthours that would be sold to PG&E or a power distributor.

l. *Locations of the Application:* A copy of the application is available for inspection and reproduction at the Commission's Public Reference Room, located at 888 First Street, NE, Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426, or by calling (202) 208-1371. This filing may also be viewed on the web at <http://www.ferc.gov> using the "RIMS" link, select "Docket#" and follow the instructions (call 202-208-2222 for assistance). A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction at the address in item (h) above.

m. *Preliminary Permit*—Anyone desiring to file a competing application for preliminary permit for a proposed project must submit the competing application itself, or a notice of intent to file such an application, to the Commission on or before the specified comment date for the particular application (see 18 CFR 4.36). Submission of a timely notice of intent allows an interested person to file the competing preliminary permit application no later than 30 days after the specified comment date for the particular application. A competing preliminary permit application must conform with 18 CFR 4.30(b) and 4.36.

n. *Preliminary Permit*—Any qualified development applicant desiring to file a competing development application must submit to the Commission, on or before a specified comment date for the particular application, either a competing development application or a

notice of intent to file such an application. Submission of a timely notice of intent to file a development application allows an interested person to file the competing application no later than 120 days after the specified comment date for the particular application. A competing license application must conform with 18 CFR 4.30(b) and 4.36.

o. *Notice of intent*—A notice of intent must specify the exact name, business address, and telephone number of the prospective applicant, and must include an unequivocal statement of intent to submit, if such an application may be filed, either a preliminary permit application or a development application (specify which type of application). A notice of intent must be served on the applicant(s) named in this public notice.

p. *Proposed Scope of Studies under Permit*—A preliminary permit, if issued, does not authorize construction. The term of the proposed preliminary permit would be 36 months. The work proposed under the preliminary engineering plans, and a study of environmental impacts. Based on the results of these studies, the Applicant would decide whether to proceed with the preparation of a development application to construct and operate the project.

q. *Individuals desiring to be included on the Commission's mailing list* should so indicate by writing to the Secretary of the Commission.

r. *Comments, Protests, or Motions to Intervene*—Anyone may submit comments, a protest, or a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.210, 385.211, 385.214. In determining the appropriate action to take, the Commission will consider all protests or other comments filed, but only those who file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules may become a party to the proceeding. Any comments, protests, or motions to intervene must be received on or before the specified comment date for the particular application.

s. *Filing and Service of Responsive Documents*—Any filings must bear in all capital letters the title "COMMENTS", "RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS", "PROTEST", or "MOTION TO INTERVENE", as applicable, and the Project Number of the particular application to which the filing refers. A copy of any motion to intervene must also be served upon each representative of the applicant specified in the particular application.

t. Agency Comments—Federal, state, and local agencies are invited to file comments on the described application. A copy of the application may be obtained by agencies directly from the Applicant. If an agency does not file comments within the time specified for filing comments, it will be presumed to have no comments. One copy of an agency's comments must also be sent to the Applicant's representatives.

David P. Boergers,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-27197 Filed 10-29-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7094-9]

EPA Science Advisory Board Environmental Health Committee Review of the Trichloroethylene (TCE) Health Risk Assessment Synthesis and Characterization Draft Document; Request for Nominations

ACTION: Request for nominations to the Environmental Health Committee (EHC) of the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Science Advisory Board (SAB) for its review of the Agency's draft Trichloroethylene (TCE) Health Risk Assessment.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Science Advisory Board (SAB) is announcing the formation of a Panel to review the Agency's draft Trichloroethylene (TCE) Health Risk Assessment. The SAB is soliciting nominations to augment the existing EHC to form this Panel. The EPA Science Advisory Board was established to provide independent scientific and technical advice, consultation, and recommendations to the EPA Administrator on the technical bases for EPA regulations. In this sense, the Board functions as a technical peer review panel.

Any interested person or organization may nominate qualified individuals for membership on the panel. Individuals should have expertise in one or more of the following areas: risk assessment and the application of the Agency's risk assessment guidelines; toxicology including carcinogenicity, with a focus on mechanisms of action and pharmacokinetic models; and molecular genetics. Nominees should be identified by name, occupation, position, address and telephone number. To be considered, all nominations must include a current resume providing the

nominee's background, experience and qualifications.

Background

EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD) has completed an external review draft assessing the health risks of trichloroethylene. TCE is a major contaminant of concern in EPA's air, water, and waste programs. This draft was published for public comment on September 19, 2001 at 66 FR 48257-48258. EPA's regulatory program and regional offices have identified TCE as among the highest priorities for a new assessment.

This assessment was also shaped by several new developments in risk assessment. The practice of risk assessment is evolving from a focus on one toxic effect of one pollutant in one environmental medium toward integrated assessments covering multiple effects and multiple media and incorporating information about mode of action, uncertainty, human variation, and cumulative effects of multiple pollutants in different media. This evolution responds to recommendations of the National Research Council, which have been embraced in EPA's proposed cancer guidelines.

This draft assessment takes on the new directions in risk assessment that EPA and others have advocated. The assessment discusses the possibility that children, infants, and the developing fetus may differ from adults with respect to susceptibility to TCE's toxic effects. The assessment addresses cumulative risks by discussing the implications of other chlorinated solvents and agents that have metabolic pathways, potential modes of action, and toxic effects similar to TCE. The assessment implements principles of the proposed cancer guidelines by emphasizing characterization discussions, using mode-of-action information, and identifying susceptible populations.

The issues surrounding TCE are quite complex, with extensive information in some areas and relatively little information in others. The ORD initiated development of 16 peer-reviewed state-of-the-science papers that were published in Environmental Health Perspectives (vol. 108, suppl. 2, May 2000). These papers, which provide the primary scientific support for the assessment, were written by well-recognized scientists carrying out research on TCE or its metabolites.

To accomplish this review, the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will convene a Panel to address the following draft Charge:

(a) Does the assessment adequately discuss the likelihood that trichloroethylene (TCE) acts through multiple metabolites and multiple modes of action?

(b) Is the cancer weight-of-evidence characterization adequately supported?

(c) A new feature of the cancer database is molecular information on the von Hippel-Lindau tumor suppressor gene. Is this information adequately discussed and are the conclusions appropriate?

(d) Does the assessment adequately discuss the use of multiple critical effects in developing an oral reference dose (RfD) and inhalation reference concentration (RfC) for effects other than cancer? Are the uncertainty factors well discussed and well supported?

(e) Does the assessment adequately discuss the derivation of a range of estimates for the cancer risk? Are there any studies that should/should not have been included?

(f) Please comment on the use of calibrated models and uncertainty analysis to address the question of pharmacokinetic model uncertainty.

(g) Is it appropriate to consider background exposures and other characteristics of an exposed population as modulating the risk of TCE exposure in that population?

(h) Do the data support identifying risk factors that may be associated with increased risks from TCE exposure? Are there any risk factors that should/should not have been included?

(i) Do the data support the possibility that TCE can affect children and adults differently? Should this be reflected in the quantitative assessment?

The criteria for selecting Panel members are that these persons be recognized experts in their fields; that they be as impartial and objective as possible; that they represent an array of backgrounds and perspectives (within their disciplines); and that they be available to participate fully in the review, which will be conducted over a relatively short time frame (*i.e.*, within approximately four months). Panel members will be asked to attend at least one public meeting followed by at least one public telephone conference meeting over the course of four months; they will be asked to participate in the discussion of key issues and assumptions at these meetings, and they will be asked to review and to help finalize the products and outputs of the panel. The panel will make recommendations to the Executive Committee (EC) of the SAB for approval of the Board's report and transmittal to the Administrator.