Electric Power Company, ISO New England Inc., Midwest Independent System Operator, Alliance Companies, NSTAR Services Company, New York Independent System Operator, Inc., Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, New York State Electric & Gas Corporation, Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc., Rochester Gas & Electric Corporation, PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Regional Transmission Organizations, Regional Transmission Organizations, International Transmission Company, DTE Energy Company, Arizona Public Service Company, El Paso Electric Company, Public Service Company of New Mexico, Tucson Electric Power Company, WestConnect RTO, LLC, Alliant Energy Corporate Services, Inc., MidAmerican Energy Company, Xcel Energy Services, Inc., TRANSLink Transmission Company, LLC, National Grid USA

Notice of Technical Conference Organization

As announced in the Notice of Technical Conference issued on February 5, 2002, Commission staff will hold a technical conference on February 19, 2002, to discuss the allocation of regional transmission organization (RTO) characteristics and functions between separate organizations within an RTO region.[1] Participants also may address the allocation of responsibility for performing other wholesale market functions. This notice provides further organizational details and the conference agenda.

The conference will start at approximately 9 a.m. and will adjourn at about 4:45 p.m. It is scheduled to take place at the Commission's offices, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426, in the Commission Meeting Room on the second floor. The agenda is appended to this notice as Attachment A.

The conference is open for the public to attend, and registration is not required. Members of the Commission may attend the conference and participate in the discussions. We ask participants to focus on the following four questions:

(1) If the functions and characteristics specified in Order No. 2000 are shared or coordinated among separate organizations within an RTO, how would you suggest that these functions be apportioned? Please use the matrix appended to this notice as Attachment B as a guide.

(2) From the perspective of either engineering or economic efficiency, is it more appropriate to have certain functions administered over as large a region as possible? Conversely, are there certain functions which can be effectively administered at a sub-regional level?

(3) As we try to evaluate how functions might be apportioned, is it useful to distinguish between functions that relate solely to operating and administrating the transmission grid and functions that relate more to operation and oversight of markets for trading wholesale power and energy?

(4) Is the business model or incentive structure proposed for an organization relevant to the question of which functions it should undertake?

Any interested party may file comments in Docket No. RM01–12–000 that address the issues above or follow up on the conference discussions. It is not necessary to re-file comments or file summaries of comments already filed with the Commission. Commenters are asked to specifically identify the region or regions, if any, that their comments address, and to cross-file their comments in any appropriate RT dockets. Comments must be filed no later than March 12, 2002.

The Capitol Connection offers all open and special Commission meetings held at the Commission's headquarters live over the Internet, as well as via telephone and satellite. For a fee, you can receive these meetings in your office, at home, or anywhere in the world. To find out more about the Capitol Connection's live Internet, phone bridge, or satellite coverage, contact David Reininger or Julia Morelli at (703) 993–3100, or visit www.capitolconnection.gmu.edu. The Capitol Connection also offers FERC open meetings through its Washington, D.C.—area television service.

Additionally, live and archived audio of FERC public meetings are available for a fee via National Narrowcast Network's Hearings.com (sm) and Hearing-On-The-Line (r) services. Interested parties may listen to the conference live by phone or web. Hearings.com audio will be archived immediately for listening on demand after the event is completed. Call (202) 966–2211 for further details.

Those interested in obtaining transcripts of the conference need to contact Ace Federal Reporters at (202) 347–3700 or (800) 336–6646. Anyone interested in purchasing videotapes of the meeting should call VISCOM at (703) 715–7999.

Other questions about the conference program should be directed to: Diane Bernier, Office of Markets, Tariffs and Rates, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, (202) 219–2886, diane.bernier@ferc.gov.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–4252 Filed 2–21–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[1] The RTO characteristics are: (1) Independence; (2) scope and regional configuration; (3) operational authority; and (4) short-term reliability. RTO functions include: (1) Tariff administration and design; (2) congestion management; (3) parallel path flow; (4) ancillary services; (5) OASIS, total transmission capacity and available transmission capacity; (6) market monitoring; (7) planning and expansion; and (8) interregional coordination. *See* Regional Transmission Organizations, Order No. 2000, FERC Stats. and Regs. 31,089 (1999), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 2000–A, FERC Stats. And Regs. 31,092 (2000), *aff'd*, Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County, Washington v. FERC, 272 F.3d 607 (D.C. Cir. 2001). *See also* Order Providing Guidance on Continued Processing of RTO Filings, 97 FERC ¶ 61,146 at 61,633 (2001).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RM98–1–000]

Regulations Governing Off-the-Record Communications; Public Notice

February 15, 2002.

This constitutes notice, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.2201(h), of the receipt of exempt and prohibited off-the-record communications.

Order No. 607 (64 FR 51222, September 22, 1999) requires Commission decisional employees, who make or receive an exempt or a prohibited off-the-record communication relevant to the merits of a contested on-the-record proceeding, to deliver a copy of the communication, if written, or a summary of the substance of any oral communication, to the Secretary.

Prohibited communications will be included in a public, non-decisional file associated with, but not part of, the decisional record of the proceeding. Unless the Commission determines that the prohibited communication and any responses thereto should become part of the decisional record, the prohibited off-the-record communication will not be considered by the Commission in reaching its decision. Parties to a proceeding may seek the opportunity to respond to any facts or contentions made in a prohibited off-the-record communication, and may request that the Commission place the prohibited communication and responses thereto in the decisional record. The Commission will grant such requests

only when it determines that fairness so requires. Any person identified below as having made a prohibited off-the-record communication should serve the document on all parties listed on the official service list for the applicable proceeding in accordance with Rule 2010, 18 CFR 385.2010.

Exempt off-the-record communications will be included in the decisional record of the proceeding, unless the communication was with a cooperating agency as described by 40 CFR 1501.6, made under 18 CFR 385.2201(e)(1)(v).

The following is a list of exempt and prohibited off-the-record communications received in the Office of the Secretary within the preceding 14 days. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection. The documents may 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).

Take note that this notice will now be issued by the Commission on a weekly rather than bi-weekly basis.

Docket No.	Date filed	Presenter
Exempt:		
1. CP01–361–000	02–11–02	Susan Smillie.
2. CP01–384–000	02–11–02	Paul Campagnola.
3. Project No. 2016–044	02–13–02	Brian J. Brown.
4. CP01–361–000	02–13–02	Susan Smillie.
5. CP01–361–000	02–13–02	Alynda Foreman.
6. CP01–384–000	02–13–02	Sen. Melodie Peters (Conn.).
7. CP01–384–000	02–14–02	U.S. Rep. Felix J. Grucci (N.Y.).

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–4246 Filed 2–21–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–6626–8]

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 May 18, 2001 (66 FR 27647).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D–AFS–J65357–MT Rating EC2, White Pine Creek Project, Timber Harvest, Prescribe Fire Burning, Watershed Restoration and Associated Activities, Implementation, Kootenai National Forest, Cabinet Ranger District, Sanders County, MT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about increased peak flow from proposed timber harvest and impacts to the threatened bull trout. A biological assessment for the bull trout should have been included in the DEIS. EPA believes additional information is needed to fully assess and mitigate all potential impacts of the management actions.

ERP No. D–FRC–B05192–ME Rating EC2, Presumpscot River Projects, Relicensing of Five Hydroelectric Projects for Construction and Operation, Dundee Project (FERC No. 2942); Gambo Project (FERC No. 2931); Little Falls Project (FERC No. 2932); Mallison Falls Project (FERC No. 2941) and Saccarappa Project (FERC No. 2897), Cumberland County, ME.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about the absence of fish passage measures for anadromous fish for portions of the project, and that the EIS understated the effect of dam removal in combination with adequate fish passage on restoration of aquatic resources/water quality of the river. EPA also believes that FERC recommended bypass flows are too low and should be raised year round to increase habitat for fish, aquatic invertebrates and resident fish so water quality standards are met.

ERP No. DS–AFS–J65295–MT Rating EC2, Clancy-Unionville Vegetation Manipulation and Travel Management Project, Updated and New Information concerning Cumulative Effects and Introduction of Alternative F, Clancy-Unionville Implementation Area, Helena National Forest, Helena Ranger District, Lewis and Clark and Jefferson Counties, MT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding the levels of road rehabilitation. EPA recommended that additional information should be presented regarding increased road rehabilitation and consistency of proposed actions with State TMDL development.

ERP No. DS–AFS–L65376–OR Rating EC2, Silvies Canyon Watershed Restoration Project, Additional Information concerning Ecosystem Health Improvements in the Watershed, Grant and Harney Counties, OR.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with impacts to air quality and concerns about insufficient disclosure of tribal consultation and coordination.

Final EISs

ERP No. F–FRC–B03012–00, Phase III/Hubline Project, Construction and Operation a Natural Gas Pipeline, Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline (Docket No. CP01–4–000), Algonquin Gas Transmission (Docket No. CP01–5–000) and Texas Eastern Transmission (Docket No. CP01–8–000), MA and CT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about impacts to water supply sources and about mitigation associated with the project. EPA also expressed concerns about NEPA process related issues.

ERP No. F–FTA–B59001–CT, New Britain—Hartford Busway Project, Proposal to Build an Exclusive Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Facility, Located in the Towns/Cities of New Britain, Newington, West Hartford and Hartford CT.

Summary: EPA expressed a lack of environmental objections to the project and applauded the FTA/CTDOT decision to construct a multi-use path as part of the project and continues to suggest that the vehicles on the busway should use alternative fuel or be cleaner diesel vehicles that use particulate filters. EPA also encouraged FTA/CTDOT to commit resources to support transit oriented development in the vicinity of the busway stations.

ERP No. F–USN–B11024–MA, South Weymouth Naval Air Station, Disposal and Reuse, Norfolk and Plymouth Counties, MA.