follows: 57 cubic feet per second (cfs) year round at Dundee; 40 cfs year round at Gambo; and 63 cfs year round at Mallison Falls.

(2) Develop a detailed shoreline management plan for licensee-owned lands abutting project waters within 500 feet of the high water elevation that are determined to be needed for project-related purposes, such as fish and wildlife habitat protection, providing public access for recreation, or protecting sensitive, unique, or scenic areas.

Representatives of the licensee and the State of Maine's fish and wildlife agencies are encouraged to participate in meeting discussions; due to the nature of the 10(j) process, representatives of concerned non-governmental organizations and other interested persons are invited to attend the meeting as observers.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–1829 Filed 1–24–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. RP01–245–000 and RP01–253–000]

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation; Notice of Informal Settlement Conference

January 18, 2002.

Take notice that an informal settlement conference will be convened in this proceeding commencing at 10 a.m. on Monday, February 4, 2002 at the offices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC, 20426, for the purpose of exploring the possible settlement of the above-referenced proceeding.

Any party, as defined by 18 CFR 385.102(c), or any participant as defined by 18 CFR 385.102(b), is invited to attend. Persons wishing to become a party must move to intervene and receive intervenor status pursuant to the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 385.214).

For additional information, please contact Bill Collins at (202) 208–0248 or Irene Szopo at (202) 208–1602.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–1832 Filed 1–24–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER02–93–002]

Virginia Electric and Power Company; Notice of Filing

January 18, 2002.

Take notice that on January 10, 2002, Virginia Electric and Power Company, doing business as Dominion Virginia Power, tendered for filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) an unexecuted Generator Interconnection and Operating Agreement (Interconnection Agreement) with GenPower Earleys, L.L.C. (GenPower) that complies with the Commission's December 11, 2001 Letter Order in Docket No. ER02–93–000.

Dominion Virginia Power respectfully requests that the Commission accept this filing to make the Interconnection Agreement effective as of December 11, 2001, the same date the Commission made the Interconnection Agreement effective in its December 11th Order. pies of the filing were served upon GenPower, the North Carolina Utilities Commission and the Virginia State Corporation Commission.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest this filing should file 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). 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. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date, and, to the extent applicable, must be served on the applicant and on any other person designated on the official service list. This filing is available for review at the Commission or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the ''RIMS'' link, select ''Docket #'' and follow the instructions (call 202–208–2222 for assistance). 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.

Comment Date: January 31, 2002.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–1827 Filed 1–24–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P]

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP02–63–000]

White Rock Pipeline, L.L.C.; Notice of Application

January 18, 2002.

Take notice that on January 11, 2002, White Rock Pipeline, L.L.C. (White Rock), 426 East Missouri Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota 57501, filed in Docket No. CP02–63–000, an application pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Part 157 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations (Commission), for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing White Rock to operate an existing single-use pipeline that is approximately 10.5 miles long and 4.5 inches in diameter, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. 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).

White Rock states that the proposed pipeline is to be used for the sole purpose of transporting natural gas from an interconnection with the Alliance Pipeline in North Dakota, to a end-use customer, the Tri-State Ethanol Company, L.L.C. (Tri-State), which is White Rock's affiliate. White Rock states that Tri-State is a farmer-owned company that is in the process of building a facility near Rosholt, South Dakota that will produce ethanol from locally-produced corn. It is stated that the plant will be operational by mid-February. According to White Rock, Tri-State will be the majority owner and will exercise ownership and operational control over the pipeline.

White Rock states that the proposed pipeline is located in a sparsely-populated agricultural area in the extreme southeast corner of North Dakota and the extreme northeast corner of South Dakota. According to White Rock, the pipeline passes through farms and under rural roads; it will not pass through any residential areas. The sole

purpose and use of the pipeline will be to transport natural gas to White Rock's affiliate, Tri-State.

White Rock states that the proposed pipeline has already been constructed. It was built in October and November 2001 because, at that time, it was conceived that there would be two companies that would own the pipeline—White Rock, which would own the portion of the pipeline in South Dakota, and another company, Fairmount Natural Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (Fairmount), which would own the pipeline running from the Alliance interconnection to the North Dakota-South Dakota border. White Rock and Fairmount believed this arrangement would not be subject to FERC jurisdiction because the White Rock pipeline (as then conceived) would be a non-jurisdictional, intra-state plant line located wholly within South Dakota, and the Fairmount pipeline would be an intrastate pipeline located wholly in North Dakota, only interconnecting with the White Rock pipeline at the state border.

As a result, according to White Rock, the pipeline running from Alliance to the Tri-State facility was constructed in the Fall of 2001. No landowners expressed concern with the construction, as all easements and rights-of-way already had been purchased from consenting landowners.

According to White Rock, in accordance with Alliance's suggestion expressed during negotiations of an interconnect development agreement, White Rock agreed to obtain either an NGA certificate of public convenience and necessity, or a FERC determination that the pipelines were not required to obtain an NGA certificate.

According to White Rock, as a result and because the owners of these pipelines wish to put the entire pipeline into service as promptly as possible, White Rock has filed the subject application to operate the pipeline. Furthermore, and to simplify this application and its intent, the entire pipeline running from the Alliance interconnection to the Tri-State facility has been consolidated and now is owned and will be operated as a single pipeline—i.e., the White Rock pipeline, and the Fairmount entity will be or has been dissolved. The entire 10.5 mile pipeline is now owned by White Rock.

White Rock states that in addition to approving its request for a certificate, White Rock requests that the Commission grant a waiver of any regulations and requirements that White Rock may not have complied with in constructing its pipeline as it did. White Rock further requests waiver of various otherwise-applicable FERC regulations and requirements.

Any questions regarding this application should be directed to James Robbennolt, Olinger, Lovald, Robbennolt, McCahren & Reimers, P.C., 117 E. Capitol, P. O. Box 66, Pierre, S.D. 57501, at (605) 224–8851.

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 25, 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.

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.

If the Commission decides to set the application for a formal hearing before an Administrative Law Judge, the Commission will issue another notice describing that process. At the end of the Commission's review process, a final Commission order approving or denying a certificate will be issued.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–1825 Filed 1–24–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 5376–062]

Horseshoe Bend Hydroelectric Company; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

January 18, 2002.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) regulations, the Division of Hydropower Administration and Compliance, Office of Energy Projects has reviewed an application to amend the license for the Horseshoe Bend Hydroelectric Project. The amendment application is for the modification of existing facilities and construction of new facilities in two phases to control sediment accumulation in the project's power canal. The proposed Phase I facilities include (a) widening of the entrance of the canal bottom width from 79 feet to 360 feet, (b) installing a 540-foot long elevated sill at the canal entrance, (c) constructing a diverging channel downstream of the sill and a sluice way on the river side of the sill, with trash racks over sluiceway boxes. Features of the Phase II include (a) a desanding/settling basin in the canal area, (b) desander sluice boxes end-to-end across the canal bed, and (c) access ramp for the maintenance of desander and other facilities. Phase II facilities will be constructed only if required after evaluating the effectiveness of Phase I facilities.

An Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared by staff for the proposed Phase I activities only, because the implementation of Phase II actions is uncertain and would depend upon the effectiveness of the facilities under Phase I. In the EA, staff does not identify any significant impacts that would result from the Commission's approval of the construction of Phase I facilities. Thus, staff concludes that approval of the proposed amendment of license would not cause a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

The EA has been attached and made part of an Order Amending the License