- Send two copies of your letter to: Lois Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First St., N.E., Room 1A, Washington, D.C., 20426;
- Label one of the comments for the attention of the Environmental Review and Compliance Branch, PR–11.2;
- Reference Docket No. CP97–563–000; and
- Mail your comments so that they will be received in Washington, D.C. on or before August 30, 1997.

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, you may want to become an official party to the proceeding or become an ''intervenor''. Among other things, intervenors have the right to receive copies of case-related Commission documents and filings by other intervenors. Likewise, each intervenor must provide copies of its filings to all other parties. If you want to become an intervenor you must file a motion to intervene according to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214) (see appendix 2).

The date for filing timely motions to intervene in this proceeding has passed. Therefore, parties not seeking to file late interventions must show good cause, as required by § 385.214(b)(3), why this time limitation should be waived. Environmental issues have been viewed as good cause for late intervention.

You do not need intervenor status to have your scoping comments considered.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–20527 Filed 8–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP97–92–001]

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Mobile Bay Project and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues

July 30, 1997.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental assessment (EA) that will discuss the environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the facilities, about 75.66 miles of 24- and 30-inch-diameter pipeline, 30,000 horsepower (hp) of compression, an offshore junction platform and connecting facilities at another (nonjurisdictional) platform, proposed in the Mobile Bay Project.[1] This EA will be used by the Commission in its decision-making process to determine whether the project is in the public convenience and necessity.

Summary of the Proposed Project

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco) wants to expand the capacity of its facilities in the Gulf of Mexico and Alabama to transport an additional 350 million cubic feet of natural gas per day (Mmcfd) to the interstate market from sources offshore in the Gulf of Mexico. Transco seeks authority to construct and operate:

- 15,000 horsepower (hp) of compression at new Compressor Station 83 in Mobile County, Alabama;
- 15,000 hp of additional compression at Compressor Station 82 in Mobile County, Alabama;
- 19.08 miles of 30-inch-diameter pipeline from existing Compressor Station 82 in Mobile County, Alabama to a new offshore junction platform in Mobile Block 822 (this segment involves approximately 4.00 miles of onshore pipeline);
- a new offshore junction platform in Mobile Block 822, including a 24-inch-sphere launcher and appurtenant facilities;
- 56.58 miles of 24-inch-diameter pipeline from the new offshore junction platform in Mobile Block 822 to a new platform (owned by SOCO Offshore, Inc. (SOCO)) in Main Pass Viosca Knoll Block 261; and
- a 24-inch-sphere launcher, measurement equipment, riser pipe and appurtenant facilities on SOCO's new platform in Main Pass Viosca Knoll Block 261.

The location of the project facilities is shown in appendix 1.[2] If you are interested in obtaining procedural information, please write to the Secretary of the Commission.

Land Requirements for Construction

Construction of the proposed onshore facilities would require about 56.4 acres of land. Following construction, about 15.7 acres would be maintained as new aboveground facility sites. The remaining 40.7 acres of land would be restored; 17.4 acres would be allowed to revert to its former use and 23.3 acres would be permanent pipeline right-of-way.

The EA Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. We call this ''scoping''. The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this Notice of Intent, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the EA. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EA. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

The EA will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation of the onshore portion of the proposed project under these general headings:[3]

- Geology and soils
- Land use
- Water resources, fisheries, and wetlands
- Cultural resources
- Vegetation and wildlife
- Air quality and noise
- Endangered and threatened species
- Public safety

We will also evaluate possible alternatives to the proposed project or portions of the project, and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

Our independent analysis of the issues will be in the EA. Depending on the comments received during the scoping process, the EA may be published and mailed to Federal, state, and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, affected landowners, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list for this proceeding. A comment period will

---

[1] Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation's application was filed with the Commission under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations.

[2] The appendices referenced in this notice are not being printed in the **Federal Register.** Copies are available from the Commission's Public Reference and Files Maintenance Branch, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, or call (202) 208–1371. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail.

[3] The Commission intends to adopt the environmental documents created by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service (MMS) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) for the offshore facilities.

be allotted for review if the EA is published. We will consider all comments on the EA before we make our recommendations to the Commission.

Currently Identified Environmental Issues

We have already identified several issues that we think deserve attention based on a preliminary review of the proposed facilities and the environmental information provided by Transco. This preliminary list of issues may be changed based on your comments and our analysis.

- Two federally listed endangered or threatened species may occur in the onshore portions of the proposed project area.
- A total of 16.3 acres of agricultural land would be affected.
- There is the potential for noise impact due to the new compression at the new and existing stations.
- A nonjurisdictional processing plant will be constructed in conjunction with the interstate pipeline facilities.

We expect to adopt the environmental reviews done by the COE and the MMS covering wetland and offshore issues. The COE will also be addressing the crossing of Dauphin Island by directional drilling.

Nonjurisdictional Facilities

Williams Field Services Company (WFS) will construct and operate a 600 MMcfd nonjurisdictional processing plant (including a 350 MMcfd separation facility) immediately upstream of Compressor Station 82. The plant will be designed to remove liquids and liquefiables from the offshore pipeline and deliver interstate pipeline quality natural gas to the suction side of Transco's Compressor Station 82.

SOCO will construct a new production/gathering platform in Main Pass Viosca Knoll Block 261. We will not be addressing this facility in our EA because we will adopt the analysis done by the MMS.

Public Participation

You can make a difference by sending a letter addressing your specific comments or concerns about the project. You should focus on the potential environmental effects of the proposal, alternatives to the proposal (including alternative locations or routes), and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. Please carefully follow these instructions to ensure that your comments are received in time and properly recorded:

- Send two copies of your letter to: Lois Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First St., NE., Room 1A, Washington, DC 20426;
- Label one copy of the comments for the attention of the Environmental Review and Compliance Branch, PR–11.2;
- Reference Docket No. CP97–92–001; and
- Mail your comments so that they will be received in Washington, D.C. on or before August 29, 1997.

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, you may want to become an official party to the proceeding or become an ''intervenor''. Among other things, intervenors have the right to receive copies of case-related Commission documents and filings by other intervenors. Likewise, each intervenor must provide copies of its filings to all other parties. If you want to become an intervenor you must file a motion to intervene according to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214) (see appendix 2).

The date for filing timely motions to intervene in this proceeding has passed. Therefore, parties now seeking to file late interventions must show good cause, as required by § 385.214(b)(3), why this time limitation should be waived. Environmental issues have been viewed as good cause for late intervention.

You do not need intervenor status to have your comments considered.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–20526 Filed 8–4–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Application Filed With the Commission

July 30, 1997.

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

a. *Type of Application:* Settlement Agreement.

b. *Project No:* 2916–004.

c. *Date Filed:* June 26, 1997.

d. *Applicant:* East Bay Municipal Utility District.

e. *Name of Project:* Lower Mokelumne River.

f. *Location:* Mokelumne River, Amador, Calaveras, and San Joaquin Counties, California.

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

h. *Applicant Contact:* Mr. Jon A. Myers, Manager, Water Resources Planning, East Bay Municipal Utility District, 375 Eleventh Street, Oakland, CA 94607–4240, (510) 278–1121.

i. *FERC Contact:* John Schnagl, (202) 219–2661.

j. *Comment Date:* September 10, 1997.

k. *Description of Application:* On March 10, 1981, the Commission issued a license for the Lower Mokelumne River Project to the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). On July 1, 1991, pursuant to reserved authority in the license, Commission staff initiated a license reopener proceeding to determine if modifications to project facilities or operations were necessary for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources in the Mokelumne River. In November 1993, the Commission released a final environmental impact statement (FEIS), recommending modifications to the license. Recommended modifications included among other items, new minimum flow and minimum pool elevation requirements, ramping rates, studies on pulse flows, instream habitat enhancements, and further studies and monitoring to define mitigation needs for salmon and trout in the lower river.

In 1994, EBMUD participated in settlement discussions with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and other parties to resolve issues of dispute in the proceeding. In 1995, 1996, and 1997 EBMUD, the FWS, and the CBFG continued negotiations. These parties have filed a Settlement Agreement (SA) with the Commission. The SA is under consideration in the proceeding before the Commission as an alternative to the actions recommended in the FEIS issued in 1993.

The SA includes changes in instream flows, development of a Lower Mokelumne River Partnership to develop and implement measures to protect and enhance anadromous fish, development of a Lower Mokelumne River Stakeholders Group to recommend ecosystem protection and improvement, EBMUD establishing a $2 million Partnership Fund, EBMUD providing $12.5 million to expand and upgrade the Mokelumne River Fish Hatchery, coordination by the parties of fishery and habitat studies and monitoring programs, and development of a process to measure the success of flow requirements, non-flow measures and other actions contained in the SA.