well, located approximately 2.8 miles from the facility. The well would draw water from the deep basalt aquifer, which is isolated from the shallow well aquifer in the area. Process water from the facility would be discharged either for land application through nearby irrigation district systems, land applied on site for irrigation, or discharged to the Lost River during periods allowed by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

The COB Energy Facility would deliver electric power to the regional power grid through an interconnection to existing electric transmission lines that cross the facility site. The facility would tie into two or three of the existing electric transmission lines, owned by BPA, PacifiCorp, and Portland General Electric. A transmission planning study conducted by the three utilities will determine the optimal interconnection among the transmission lines. The study also will identify any upgrades to the existing lines or the Malin Substation that may be needed.

### **B. Process to Date**

BPA is the lead Federal agency for the project EIS. The State of Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council is currently evaluating the Notice of Intent to Apply for a Site Certificate for the COB Energy Facility. Oregon's site evaluation process, like NEPA, provides opportunity for public participation, and a public meeting will be held by representatives from the Oregon Office of Energy at the January 15 meeting in Bonanza.

# C. Alternatives Proposed for Consideration

Alternatives thus far identified for evaluation in the EIS are: (1) The proposed action and (2) no action. Other alternatives may be identified through the scoping process.

### D. Public Participation and Identification of Environmental Issues

BPA intends to prepare an EIS addressing both the COB Energy Facility and the associated electric power interconnection facilities. BPA has established a 45-day scoping period during which affected landowners, concerned citizens, special interest groups, local governments, and any other interested parties are invited to comment on the scope of the proposed EIS. Scoping will help BPA ensure that a full range of issues related to this proposal is addressed in the EIS and also will identify significant or potentially significant impacts that may result from the proposed project. When

completed, the Draft EIS will be circulated for review and comment, and BPA will hold a public comment meeting on the Draft EIS. BPA will consider and respond in the Final EIS to comments received on the Draft EIS.

BPA decided to prepare the EIS for the following reasons: (1) The COB Energy Facility would depend on an interconnect to existing electric transmission lines that may include a BPA line, (2) the interconnect could require upgrades to the existing BPA line, (3) the interconnection may include a new substation on the site, (4) the interconnection may require upgrades to the BPA Malin Substation, (5) the interconnect may result in other system impacts identified in the transmission study, and (6) no other Federal or State agency is currently preparing an EIS on the proposed project. Because no other EIS is being prepared, the scope of BPA's EIS will cover both the interconnection elements and the COB Energy Facility itself.

The principal issues identified thus far for consideration in the Draft EIS with respect to the COB Energy Facility are as follows: (1) Air and water quality impacts, (2) noise impacts from plant operation, (3) aesthetic impacts, (4) socioeconomic impacts created by an influx of construction workers into a sparsely populated area, (5) impacts on wildlife habitat, and (6) cultural resource impacts. The principal issues identified thus far for consideration in the Draft EIS with respect to the electric power transmission facilities are impacts of electrical interconnection on the grid system.

These issues, together with any additional significant issues identified through the scoping process, will be addressed in the EIS.

Issued in Portland, Oregon, on December 21, 2001.

#### Stephen J. Wright,

Acting Administrator and Chief Executive Officer.

[FR Doc. 02–210 Filed 1–3–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 271-062—Arkansas]

### Entergy Arkansas, Inc.; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

December 28, 2001.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and

the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) regulations, 18 CFR part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 FR 47897), the Office of Energy Projects has reviewed the application for new license for the Carpenter-Remmel Hydro Project, located on the Ouachita River in Garland and Hot Springs Counties, Arkansas, and has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA). In the EA, the Commission staff has analyzed the potential environmental effects of the project and has concluded that approval of the project, with appropriate environmental measures, would not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Copies of the EA are available for review in the Public Reference Branch, Room 2–A, of the Commission's offices at 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. The EA may also be viewed on the web at <a href="http://www.ferc.fed.gov">http://www.ferc.fed.gov</a> using the "RIMS" link, select "Docket#" and follow the instructions. Please call (202) 208–2222 for assistance.

Any comments should be filed within 45 days from the date of this notice and should be addressed to Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Room 1–A, Washington, DC 20426. Please affix "Carpenter-Remmel Hydroelectric Project No. 271–062" to all comments. For further information, contact Ed Lee at (202) 219–2809. Comments 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.

### Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.
[FR Doc. 02–175 Filed 1–3–02; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EL02-44-000]

### Indeck Maine Energy, L.L.C., Complainant, v. ISO New England, Inc., Respondent; Notice of Complaint

December 28, 2001.

Take notice that on December 27, 2001, Indeck Maine Energy, L.L.C. (Indeck Maine) filed a Complaint and Request for Appointment of Settlement Judgement against the ISO New England, Inc. (ISO NE) requesting that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) find (i) ISO-NE's actions in soliciting and

contracting for Indeck Maine's electrical energy for October 16 and 17, 1999; and October 21, 23 and 26, 1999, to support system reliability were not barred by NEPOOL Market Rule and Procedure 5 (MRP); (ii) that ISO-NE's requests were outside the scope of the real time market and the day-ahead dispatch; (iii) that MRP 17 does not apply to Indeck Maine's October 16, 1999, operations under the facts of this case; and (iv) to the extent MRP 17 did apply to the facts of this case, under the facts of this case ISO-NE did not implement MRP 17 in the manner required by the rule.

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 January 16, 2002. 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 January 16, 2002. 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 instructions on the Commission's web site under the "e-Filing" link.

### Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary. [FR Doc. 02–174 Filed 1–3–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP02-52-000]

# Iroquois Gas Transmission System, L.P.; Notice of Application

December 28, 2001.

Take notice that on December 14, 2001, Iroquois Gas Transmission System, L.P. (Iroquois), One Corporate Drive, Suite 600, Shelton, Connecticut 06484, filed an application in the above-referenced docket number pursuant to

section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act and parts 157 of the Commission's rules and regulations, for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing Iroquois to construct and operate its Eastern Long Island Expansion Project (ELI Project) all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. This filing may be viewed on the web at <a href="http://www.ferc.gov">http://www.ferc.gov</a> using the "RIMS" link, select "Docket#" and follow the instructions (please call 202–208–2222 for assistance).

Specifically, Iroquois requests authorization to construct and operate the following facilities: (i) 29.1 miles of 20-inch pipeline from a point offshore of Milford, Connecticut to a point in Brookhaven, Suffolk County, New York; (ii) a new compressor unit, with 20,000 (nominal) horsepower, in Milford, Connecticut; (iii) cooling facilities at the Dover, New York compressor station; (iv) various ancillary facilities at the existing Brookfield, Connecticut meter station; (v) various ancillary facilities associated with a new interconnection with the facilities of KeySpan Energy Delivery Long Island in Brookhaven, New York; and (vi) other necessary facilities, such as a tap valve in Long Island Sound, three mainline valves, pig launchers/receivers and temporary facilities, including pipe yards, storage yards, access roads and staging areas.

Iroquois states that the facilities are designed to provide approximately 175,000 dekatherms per day of firm transportation service to the eastern end of Long Island, and will be made pursuant to its Part 284 subpart G blanket certificate. Iroquois has executed precedent agreements with the following shippers:

• Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc., 10,000 dekatherms per day;

- Engage Energy America, LLC, 50,000 dekatherms per day;
- Long Island Power Authority,
   160,000 dekatherms per day;
- Mirant Americas, Inc., 80,000 dekatherms per day; and
- New York Power Authority, 40,000 dekatherms per day.

Iroquois states that because the precedent agreements currently provide for firm transportation of 340,000 dekatherms per day which exceeds the capacity of the facilities, pro-ration of capacity among the shippers may be necessary; Iroquois expects to make a decision on any such pro-ration no later than March 1, 2003.

The total cost of the ELI Project is estimated to be about \$105 million. Iroquois proposes to charge shippers its firm transportation rate in effect under its RTS rate schedule, plus an incremental surcharge, which, in total, is designed to recover the costs of the proposed facilities.

In order to meet a service commencement date of November 1, 2004, Iroquois requests that the Commission issue a preliminary determination on non-environmental aspects of the ELI Project by July 1, 2002, with final authorization no later than July 1, 2003.

Any questions regarding the application be directed to Jeffrey A. Bruner, Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary for Iroquois, One Corporate Drive, Suite 600, Shelton, Connecticut 06484, at 203–925–7200, or Donald F. Sanata, Jr., Troutman Saunders, LLP, 401 Ninth Street, NW, Suite 1000, Washington, DC 20004, at 202–274–2815.

There are two ways to become involved in the Commission's review of this project. First, any person wishing to obtain legal status by becoming a party to the proceedings for this project should, on or before January 18, 2002, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.10). A person obtaining party status will be placed on the service list maintained by the Secretary of the Commission and will receive copies of all documents filed by the applicant and by all other parties. A party must submit 14 copies of filings made with the Commission and must mail a copy to the applicant and to every other party in the proceeding. Only parties to the proceeding can ask for court review of Commission orders in the proceeding.

However, a person does not have to intervene in order to have comments considered. The second way to participate is by filing with the Secretary of the Commission, as soon as possible, an original and two copies of comments in support of or in opposition to this project. The Commission will consider these comments in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but the filing of a comment alone will not serve to make the filer a party to the proceeding. The Commission's rules require that persons filing comments in opposition to the project provide copies of their protests only to the party or parties directly involved in the protest.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project should submit an original and two copies of their comments to the