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 Secretary of the Commission. Environmental commenters will be placed on the Commission's environmental mailing list, will receive copies of the environmental documents, and will be notified of meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Environmental commenters will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, the nonparty commenters will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission (except for the mailing of environmental documents issued by the Commission) and will not have the right to seek court review of the Commission's final order.

The Commission may issue a preliminary determination on non-environmental issues prior to the completion of its review of the environmental aspects of the project. This preliminary determination typically considers such issues as the need for the project and its economic effect on existing customers of the applicant, on other pipelines in the area, and on landowners and communities. For example, the Commission considers the extent to which the applicant may need to exercise eminent domain to obtain rights-of-way for the proposed project and balances that against the non-environmental benefits to be provided by the project. Therefore, if a person has comments on community and landowner impacts from this proposal, it is important either to file comments or to intervene as early in the process as possible.

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.

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.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–5719 Filed 3–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 6032–041]

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation and Fourth Branch Associates (Mechanicville); New York; Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Assessment

March 4, 2002.

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 license for the Mechanicville Hydroelectric Project, located on the Hudson River in Saratoga and Rensselaer Counties, New York, and has prepared a Final Environmental Assessment (FEA) for the project. A Draft Environmental Assessment was issued on November 13, 2001. No federal lands or Indian reservations are occupied by project works or located within the project boundary.

The FEA contains the staff's analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the project and concludes that surrendering the license for the project, with appropriate environmental protective measures, would not constitute a major federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

A copy of the FEA is attached to the Commission Order Accepting License Surrender issued on February 28, 2002 and is available for public inspection. The FEA 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).

For further information, contact Ellen Armbruster (202) 208–1672.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–5697 Filed 3–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP01–361–000]

Northwest Pipeline Corp.; Notice of Availability of the Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Grays Harbor Pipeline Project

March 4, 2002.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) on the natural gas pipeline facilities proposed by Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest) in the above-referenced docket.

The EA was prepared to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. The staff concludes that approval of the proposed project, with appropriate mitigating measures, would not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

The EA assesses the potential environmental effects of the construction and operation of the proposed gas pipeline and aboveground facilities including:

- About 49.0 miles of a 20-inch-diameter pipeline in Thurston and Grays Harbor Counties, Washington, which would tie in with Northwest's existing mainline and mainline loop south of the Town of Ranier in Thurston County, Washington. The pipeline would extend from the interconnect with Northwest's existing system to the Satsop Combustion Turbine Project that is being constructed in the town of Satsop in Grays Harbor County, Washington.
- A meter station adjacent to the Satsop Project plant site at the end of the pipeline;
- Upgrades to the existing Tumwater Compressor Station in Thurston County, including the addition of a new compressor unit (rated 3,894 horsepower) and replacement of an existing backup generator with a 355 kilowatt backup generator; and
- Other aboveground facilities including two 20-inch-diameter