

caretaker status after closure; (2) the unencumbered disposal alternative, under which the Army would transfer the property without encumbrances, such as environmental restrictions and easements; and (3) the encumbered disposal alternative, under which the Army would transfer the property with various environmental restrictions and easements, limiting the future use of the property. The Supplemental Draft EIS also analyzes the potential environmental and socioeconomic consequences of a range of community reuse alternatives: (1) Low intensity reuse alternative; (2) low-medium intensity reuse alternative; (3) medium intensity reuse alternative; (4) medium-high intensity reuse alternative; (5) medium-high/high intensity reuse alternative; (6) high intensity reuse alternative; and (7) very-high intensity reuse alternative.

This Supplemental Draft EIS concludes the no action alternative is not reasonable because the BRAC law mandates closure of the OARB, and the Army has no requirement to retain the property. This Supplemental Draft EIS also concludes that the unencumbered disposal alternative is not feasible given environmental conditions and legal requirements.

The Army's preferred alternative course of action is the encumbered disposal of excess property. Possible encumbrances include: covenants and restrictions pertaining to asbestos-containing material; lead-based paint; biological resources; historic properties; future remedial activities after transfer; infrastructure easements; and rights-of-way.

This Supplemental Draft EIS analyzes community reuse of the OARB property as a secondary action resulting from closure and disposal by the Army. While the Army does not control the community's reuse of the property, under NEPA, the Army is required to analyze the reasonably foreseeable impacts of its disposal action. The local community has established the OBRA to develop and implement a reuse plan for the installation. Approval and implementation of the reuse plan are within the discretion of the OBRA.

In response to required local coordination of federal projects under the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) indicated that the Final Draft Reuse Plan inconsistently allocated non-maritime uses to "port priority use areas" as designated under the San Francisco Bay Plan and Seaport Plan, the key planning documents of the San Francisco Coastal Zone

Management Program (CZMP). To ensure proper compliance with the CZMP and CZMA, the Army temporarily suspended the NEPA process while OBRA, in consultation with the Port of Oakland, City of Oakland, Oakland Redevelopment Agency, and BCDC, worked to revise its Final Draft Reuse Plan and request an amendment to the Bay and Seaport Plans. In April 2001, the OBRA Governing Body approved an Amended Draft Final Reuse Plan. The BCDC also amended the Bay Plan and Seaport Plan to allow some areas originally designated "port priority use areas" to be used for non-maritime purposes. In May 2001, the BCDC agreed with the Army's determination that the proposed disposal and reuse of the OARB under the Amended Draft Final Reuse Plan is consistent with the amended Bay and Seaport Plans, and meets the requirements of the CZMP and CZMA. The detailed analysis of the incorporated Amended Final Draft Reuse Plan has been included as a new chapter in the Supplemental Draft EIS to accommodate public review and comment.

Comments on the Supplemental Draft EIS received during the 45-day public comment period will be considered in preparing the Army's Final EIS and Record of Decision. Copies of the Supplemental Draft EIS are available for review at the following libraries: (1) Oakland Public Library Main Branch, Science, Social Science and Documents Section, 125 Fourteenth Street, Oakland, California 94612; (2) West Oakland Branch Library, 1801 Adeline Street, Oakland, California 94607; and (3) Base Transition Office, 2475-D West 12th Street, Oakland, California 94607.

Dated: July 20, 2001.

**Raymond J. Fatz,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health) OASA (I&E).*

[FR Doc. 01-18730 Filed 7-26-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3710-08-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation

#### Proposed Subsequent Arrangement

**AGENCY:** Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Subsequent Arrangement.

**SUMMARY:** This notice is being issued under the authority of section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2160). The Department is providing notice of a proposed

"subsequent arrangement" under Article 10 paragraph 3 of the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy and the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Argentine Republic Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy.

This subsequent arrangement concerns the retransfer of 9.3 kilograms of atomized depleted uranium-molybdenum powder, 0.22 percent enrichment, from the Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute (KAERI) to the Comision Nacional de Energia (CNEA). The material, which is located at and was prepared by KAERI, will be used for the formability test of plate-type nuclear fuel as part of a Reduced Enrichment for Research and Test Reactors (RERTR) program. The material originally was transferred to KAERI by Comet Industrial Corp. pursuant to Export License Number XSOU8765.

In accordance with section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, we have determined that this subsequent arrangement will not be inimical to the common defense and security.

This subsequent arrangement will take effect no sooner than fifteen days after the publication of this notice.

Dated: July 23, 2001.

For the Department of Energy.

**Trisha Dedik,**

*Director, Office of Nonproliferation Policy for Nonproliferation and International Security, Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.*

[FR Doc. 01-18771 Filed 7-26-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

**[FE Docket No. PP-229]**

### Notice Extending the Public Scoping Period; Tucson Electric Power Company

**AGENCY:** Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Energy (DOE) announces the extension of the scoping period for the environmental impact statement (EIS) that DOE is preparing in connection with an application for a Presidential permit filed by the Tucson Electric Power Company.

**DATES:** The scoping period on the EIS is extended until August 31, 2001.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be submitted to: Dr. Jerry Pell, NEPA Document Manager, Office of Fossil Energy (FE-27), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20585-0350; telephone 301-903-2617; facsimile: 202-318-7761; or electronic mail at Jerry.Pell@hq.doe.gov.

For general information on the DOE's NEPA process, contact: Carol Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Compliance (EH-42), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20585; telephone: 202-586-4600; or leave a message at 800-472-2756.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On August 17, 2000, TEP filed an application with the Office of Fossil Energy (FE) of DOE for a Presidential permit to construct a double-circuit, 345,000-volt electric transmission line across the U.S.-Mexican border. Both circuits would be constructed on a single set of support structures. DOE has determined that the issuance of a Presidential permit for this project would constitute a major Federal action that may have a significant impact upon the environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). For this reason, DOE will prepare an EIS to address reasonably foreseeable impacts from the proposed action and the range of reasonable alternatives.

On July 10, 2001, DOE published in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 35950) a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS and to conduct public scoping meetings in the vicinity of the proposed line. The public scoping period was to continue until August 9, 2001. However, to ensure that the public has ample opportunity to provide comments, DOE is extending until August 31, 2001, the period during which it will receive comments for consideration in establishing the scope and content of the EIS. Comments received after August 31, 2001, will be considered to the extent practicable. Further information on this proceeding is contained in the previously published NOI.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 24, 2001.

**Anthony J. Como,**

*Deputy Director, Electric Power Regulation, Office of Coal & Power Import/Export, Office of Coal & Power Systems, Office of Fossil Energy.*

[FR Doc. 01-18810 Filed 7-26-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 184-065]

#### El Dorado Irrigation District, California; Notice of Public Meeting

July 23, 2001.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) is reviewing the application for a new license for the El Dorado Project (FERC No.184), which was filed on February 22, 2000. The El Dorado Project, licensed to the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID), is located on the South Fork American River, in El Dorado, Alpine, and Amador Counties, California. The project occupies lands of the Eldorado National Forest.

The EID, several state and Federal agencies, and several non-governmental agencies have agreed to ask the Commission for time to work collaboratively with a facilitator to resolve certain issues relevant to this proceeding. The purpose of this two-day meeting is to prepare a request to the Commission for time to conduct collaborative discussions and to develop protocols by which the collaborative group would operate. We invite the participation of all interested governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations, and the general public in this meeting.

The meeting will be held on Monday, August 6 and Tuesday, August 7, 2001, from 9 am until 4 pm in the Marriott Sacramento, located at 11211 Point East Drive, Rancho Cordova, California.

For further information, please contact Elizabeth Molloy at (202) 208-0771 or John Mudre at (202) 219-1208.

**David P. Boergers,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 01-18775 Filed 7-26-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6717-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EL01-105-000]

#### The New Power Company, Complainant v. PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Respondent; Notice of Complaint

July 20, 2001.

Take notice that on July 19, 2001, The New Power Company (New Power) filed a complaint requesting that the Commission find that (1) the rules for

ensuring reliable electric service in the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland (PJM) control area have resulted in prices for capacity in the PJM auction and bilateral markets that are unjust and unreasonable, and (2) the continued imposition of the existing capacity requirement and deficiency charge on load serving entities (LSEs) under the current changed circumstances resulting from restructuring, is unjust and unreasonable, and unduly discriminatory and preferential. New Power further requests that the Commission order PJM to eliminate immediately the recently imposed seasonal deficiency penalty and set the Capacity Deficiency Rate (CDR) on a daily basis at the higher of the marginal cost of the least efficient capacity resource required to make up the deficiency on that day or the Alternate Value, i.e., the difference between the energy prices on that day at the Cinergy Hub and PJM's Western Hub.

New Power requests that the Commission set a refund effective date of 60 days from the date of filing of its complaint.

Copies of New Power's filing were served on PJM, all parties to PJM's Reliability Assurance Agreement and each state electric utility regulatory commission in the PJM control area.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest this filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). All such motions or protests must be filed on or before August 3, 2001. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Answers to the complaint shall also be due on or before August 3, 2001. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection. 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). 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