Removal of the dam and hydroelectric facilities would be done by the Corps as an Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project under Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1966. On October 26, 2000, the Corps held a public meeting in Falmouth, Maine to discuss the project. The Corps released its draft EA on November 2, 2000, with a public comment period ending on November 30, 2000. The Corps addressed comments in its final EA issued in January 2001. The final EA included the Corps' Finding of No Significant Impact dated January 22, 2001.

The EA evaluated three alternatives: partial dam removal, complete dam removal, and rehabilitation of the existing hydraulic fish lift at the dam. The EA recommended complete removal of the Smelt Hill Dam, with primary disposal of debris in upland areas on-site. Under this plan, anadromous and other fish would be able to migrate unimpeded past Presumpscot Falls. Seven miles of former reservoir would be restored to riffle and pool complexes, with habitat suitable for cold water fish spawning, and warm water fish populations would be reduced.

The FERC staff carefully reviewed the Corps' EA and conducted an independent assessment of MDMR's proposal to surrender its exemption and remove the Smelt Hill Dam. Based on this review and assessment, the FERC staff concludes that the EA adequately assesses the environmental impacts of the proposed action and can be adopted. The FERC staff further concludes that the information in the record is adequate, and no supplemental or additional environmental review is required to evaluate the application.

In its regulations implementing NEPA, the CEQ encourages agencies to reduce paperwork and duplication of efforts. One means of accomplishing these goals is adopting environmental documents prepared by other agencies, pursuant to 40 CFR 1500.4(n). Because the actions analyzed by the Corps are substantially the same as those being proposed by MDMR, the FERC may adopt the Corps EA without recirculating it, pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.3(b). The FERC staff agrees with the EA's findings that removing the dam would facilitate upstream migration of anadromous fish and improve riverine habitat. The FERC also agrees with the EA's finding that removal of the dam is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, and finds that no supplemental or additional environmental data or analyses are necessary to complete the staff's review of MDMR's proposal.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–15173 Filed 6–14–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Intent To File for New License

June 11, 2002.

a. *Type of Filing*: Notice of Intent to File an Application for New License.

b. *Project No.*: 9184–000.

c. *Date Filed*: April 3, 2002.

d. *Submitted By*: Flambeau Hydro, LLC—current licensee.

e. *Name of Project*: Danbury Dam Hydroelectric Project.

f. *Location*: On the Yellow River near the City of Danbury, in Burnett County, Wisconsin. The project does not occupy federal lands.

g. *Filed Pursuant to*: Section 15 of the Federal Power Act.

h. *Licensee Contact*: Loyal Gake, North American Hydro Inc., 116 State Street, P.O. Box 167, Neshkoro, WI 54960 (920) 293–4628.

i. *FERC Contact*: Tom Dean, *thomas.dean@ferc.gov*, (202) 219–2778.

j. *Effective date of current license*: June 10, 1957.

k. *Expiration date of current license*: June 9, 2007.

l. *Description of the Project*: The project consists of the following existing facilities: (1) A 30-foot-high, 54-foot-long concrete spillway dam with stoplog gates; (2) a 300-foot-long earthen dike; (3) a reservoir with a maximum pool elevation of 929.7 feet NGVD; (4) a gated intake structure; (5) two 25-foot-long, 69-inch diameter penstocks; (6) a powerhouse (Plant 1) containing two generating units with a total installed capacity of 476-kW; (7) an ungated canal headworks; (8) a 2,150-foot-long in-situ power canal; (9) a gated penstock intake structure; (10) a 95-foot-long, 96-inch diameter penstock, (11) a powerhouse (Plant 2) containing a single generating unit with an installed capacity of 600-kW; (12) a 200-foot-long tailrace; (13) a 2.4-kV, 2,325-foot-long transmission line from Plant 1; (14) a 2.4-kV, 200-foot-long transmission line from Plant 2; and (15) appurtenant facilities.

m. Each application for a license and any competing license applications must be filed with the Commission at least 24 months prior to the expiration of the existing license. All applications for license for this project must be filed by June 9, 2005.

n. 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). A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction by contacting the applicant identified in item h above.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–15174 Filed 6–14–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP97–431–000]

Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America; Notice of Motion To Defer Review Meeting

June 11, 2002.

Take notice that on June 5, 2002, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America (Natural) filed a motion to defer the meeting to be held in June 2002 to review Natural's procedures for posting and allocating capacity in its system. Natural proposes that the meeting be deferred for one year, with the deferred review meeting to be held prior to the end of June 2003.

On October 26, 2000, the Commission issued an order [1] accepting with modifications a Stipulation and Agreement (Settlement) filed by Natural that adopted procedures to govern the posting and awarding of firm capacity on Natural's system. Article IV of that Settlement provides that a meeting is to held between 17 and 19 months after the effective date of the tariff sheets implementing the Settlement to review how the capacity award procedures are working. That provision would require that the meeting be held before the end of June 2002.

In its motion to defer the meeting, Natural states that no significant issue regarding the operation of its capacity award procedures has arisen over the 18 months that the procedures have been in effect, and that Natural does not believe that there is any need for the review meeting at this time. Natural states that pursuant to the Commission's order approving the Settlement, Natural

[1] 93 FERC ¶ 61,075 (2000), *reh'g denied,* 94 FERC ¶ 61,310 (2001).