

a franchised electric service territory, include a related code of conduct, reflect a name change, and incorporate the requirements of Order No. 614, 90 FERC ¶ 61,352 (2000).

Comment date: August 2, 2000, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraph

E. Any person desiring to be heard or to protest such filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., 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 should be filed on or before the comment date. 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. Copies of these filings are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection. This filing may also be viewed on the Internet at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> (call 202-208-2222 for assistance).

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-18501 Filed 7-20-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

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

July 18, 2000.

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

a. *Type of Application:* Preliminary Permit.

b. *Project No.:* 11841-000.

c. *Date filed:* May 8, 2000.

d. *Applicant:* Ketchikan Public Utilities.

e. *Name of Project:* Whitman Lake Project.

f. *Location:* On Whitman Lake and Whitman Creek, in Ketchikan Gateway Borough, Alaska, partially within the Tongass National Forest.

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

h. *Applicant Contact:* Karl R. Amylon, Ketchikan Public Utilities, 2930 Tongass

Avenue, Ketchikan, Alaska 99901, 907-225-3111.

i. *FERC Contact:* Robert Bell, 202-219-2806.

j. *Deadline for filing motions to intervene, protests and comments:* 60 days from the issuance date of this notice.

All documents (original and eight copies) should be filed with: David P. Boergers, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20426.

The Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure require all interveners filing documents with the Commission to serve a copy of that document on each person in the official service list for the project. Further, if an intervener files comments or documents with the Commission relating to the merits of an issue that may affect the responsibilities of a particular resource agency, they must also serve a copy of the document on that resource agency.

k. *Description of Project:* The proposed project would consist of: (1) The existing 45-foot-high and 220-foot-long concrete arch Whitman Lake Dam ½-mile upstream from the entrance of Whitman Creek into Herring Bay; (2) Whitman Lake with a surface area of 148 acres, a proposed usable storage capacity of 6,500 acre-feet, and normal maximum water surface elevation of 380 feet above mean sea level; (3) an intake structure; (4) a 2,200-foot-long, 3-foot-diameter steel and steel-lined tunnel penstock; (6) a powerhouse containing two generating units having a total installed capacity of 4,600 kW; (7) a 34.5-kV, 1,500-foot-long transmission line; and other appurtenant facilities.

The project would have an annual generation of 19.6 GWh that would be sold to the applicant's customers.

l. 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, D.C. 20426, or by calling (202) 208-1371. The application may be viewed on <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> (call (202) 208-2222 for assistance). A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction at the address in item h above.

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.

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.

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.

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 permit would include economic analysis, preparation of 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.

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, .211, .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.

Filing and Service of Responsive Documents—Any filings must bear in all capital letters the title

“COMMENTS”, “NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE COMPETING APPLICATION”, “COMPETING APPLICATION”, “PROTEST”, “MOTION TO INTERVENE”, as applicable, and the Project Number of the particular application to which the filing refers. Any of the above-named documents must be filed by providing the original and the number of copies provided by the Commission’s regulations to: The Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. An additional copy must be sent to Director, Division of Hydropower Administration and Compliance, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, at the above-mentioned address. A copy of any notice of intent, competing application or motion to intervene must also be served upon each representative of the Applicant specified in the particular application.

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. 00–18502 Filed 7–20–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6609–4]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of FEDERAL ACTIVITIES AT (202) 564–7167.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 14, 2000 (65 FR 20157).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–A65168–00 Rating EC2, Forest Service Roadless Area Conservation, Implementation, Proposal to Protect Roadless Areas.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the proposed alternative, citing potential adverse impacts to water quality and aquatic habitat. EPA also commented that the draft EIS does not adequately justify excluding the Tongass National Forest from the proposed rulemaking.

ERP No. D–AFS–J61103–MT Rating EC2, Discovery Ski Area Expansion, Implementation, Special-Use-Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest, Pintler Ranger District, Rumsey Mountain, Granite County, MT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the lack of information to support expansion of the ski area; inadequate analysis and disclosure of indirect effects of induced development; and effects of additional snowmaking and increased wastewater pollutant loadings to area ground water. EPA requested additional information in the final document to assess and mitigate potential environmental impacts of the management actions.

ERP No. D–AFS–K65227–CA Rating EC2, 64-Acre Tract Intermodal Transit Center, Construction and Operation, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Tahoe City, Placer County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding water quality impacts and cumulative impacts associated with the proposal. EPA also had concerns because there is no provision for solid waste recycling nor integration of pollution prevention mechanisms in the project.

ERP No. D–NPS–K61149–CA Rating EC2, Yosemite Valley Plan, A Comprehensive Look of at Four Areas of Concern: Resource Preservation and Restoration, Visitor Enjoyment, Transportation, and Employee Housing, from Happy Isles to El Portal Road/Big Oak Flat Road, Merced River, several counties, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed concerns regarding the vehicle emission impacts from the proposed shuttle bus systems. EPA requested more information on the standards and criteria that will be used to select the fuel(s) technology used in the shuttle bus fleets.

ERP No. D–USN–K39059–HI Rating EC2, North Pacific Acoustic Laboratory Project, Reuse of Low Frequency Sound Source and Cable for Use in Acoustic Thermometry of Ocean Climate (ATOC) Research, Kauai, HI.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to marine fish species, turtles, seabirds and marine mammals. EPA

recommended an implementing program lasting 24 to 36 months rather than the proposed 60 months, because of uncertainties regarding potential impacts to marine species. EPA also recommended Federal agency coordination to determine if marine mammal monitoring should be expanded to monitor populations of turtles and marine fish.

ERP No. DS–AFS–L65289–00 Rating EC2, Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Projects, Updated and New Information on three Management Alternatives, Implementation, WA, OR, ID and MT.

Summary: EPA continues to have concern that there is no discussion on how the FS and BLM will address competing objectives and the implications of implementing the preferred alternative with insufficient funding. In addition, there is no oversight process to ensure proper implementation and monitoring of the project. EPA requested that a multi-agency oversight organization be chartered.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–AFS–L65275–00 Targhee National Forest Plan Oil and Gas Leasing Analysis, Implementation, Bonneville, Butte, Clark, Fremont and Madison Counties, ID and Teton County, WY.

Summary: No formal comment letter was sent to the preparing agency.

ERP No. F–BLM–J02038–WY Pinedale Anticline Oil and Gas Exploration and Development Natural Gas Wells Project, Implementation, Sublette County, WY.

Summary: ERP No. F–BLM–K67049–CA Soledad Canyon Sand and Gravel Mining Project, Proposal to Mine, Produce and Sell, “Split Estate” Private Owned and Federally Owned Lands, Transit Mixed Concrete, Los Angeles County, CA.

Summary: EPA concurred with BLM’s conformity determination and is satisfied that air quality standards will be protected. EPA expressed continuing concerns that a jurisdictional analysis has not yet been conducted for waters of the U.S., and potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures remain uncertain.

ERP No. F–IBR–K64018–CA Lower Mokelumne River Restoration Program, Implementation, Resource Management Plan, San Joaquin County, CA.

Summary: EPA has no objection to the action as proposed since EPA’s comments on the Draft were adequately addressed. EPA did recommend that the Record of Decision clearly state the