application amendments reflect a proposed new route variation and certain revised pipeline materials and design in the vicinity of the 12-square mile Navy Restricted Area located offshore from Broward County, Florida, as well as a change in the ownership structure of Ocean Express.

The application amendments are on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. The filings may be viewed on the web at http://www.ferc.gov using the ''FERRIS'' link, selecting ''Docket #'' and following the instructions (please call (202) 208–2222 for assistance). Any questions regarding the applications or these amendments may be directed to Julie Romaniw, AES Ocean Express LLC, Two Alhambra Plaza, Suite 1104, Coral Gables, FL 33134; Phone No. (305) 444–4002.

Ocean Express explains that its proposed route variation reflects the measures contemplated by the ''agreement in principle'' reached between Ocean Express and the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division (Naval Group) to resolve the Naval Group's technical and operational concerns regarding construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed Ocean Express Pipeline offshore of Broward County, Florida. Specifically, Ocean Express states that its amendment involves a 7.5-mile offshore route variation, as well as the use of special stainless steel, 40-foot and 500-foot anode spacings, three-layer polypropylene coating and other design features for specific portions of the offshore pipeline. Ocean Express explains that in developing the 7.5-mile offshore route variation, it gave extensive consideration to the avoidance or minimization of potential impacts to sensitive marine resources, such as the three nearshore reef systems, the technical feasibility of constructing the offshore route variation, and other related factors.

The proposed route variation increases the estimated cost of the project to from $ 93.1 million to $ 111.6 million and increases the Monthly Reservation Rate from $ 1.3859 per Dth to $ 1.6085 per Dth. The design capacity of the project is unchanged and is 842,000 Dth per day. The total length of the United States part of the pipeline project is increased from 52.4 miles to 54.3 miles; the onshore route and 6.3 mile length remains unchanged, but the offshore length in increased from 46.1 miles to 48.0 miles.

Separately, Ocean Express explains that since the time it filed its original applications in these proceedings on February 21, 2002, VAC Ocean Cay LLC (VAC) has acquired a 25% interest in Ocean Express. Ocean Express states that it has included the information and documentation required by the Commission's regulations regarding the new ownership structure.

Ocean Express requests that the Commission issue a preliminary determination on non-environmental issues by February 1, 2003, and final certificate authorization by early in the third quarter of 2003.

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 November 14, 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 385.211 and 385.214) 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 currently in the proceeding. Only parties to the proceeding can ask for court review of Commission orders in the proceeding.

Motions to intervene, comments and protests may be filed electronically via the internet in lieu of paper. *See* 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the Commission's website at *http://www.ferc.gov*. . The Commission strongly encourages prospective intervenors, commenters or protesters to file electronically.

Parties who filed motions to intervene in the underlying pending applications in Docket Nos. CP02–90, *et al.* do not need to move to intervene again in response to this notice, but may file a supplement to their previous filing(s) if they have any comments or protests with regard to the changes in the project proposed by these amendments.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project, as amended, 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 environmental documents, and will be able to participate in meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Commenters will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, Commenters will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission, and will not have the right to seek rehearing or appeal the Commission's final order to a Federal court.

The Commission will consider all comments and concerns equally, whether filed by commenters or those requesting intervenor status.

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 ion 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 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–27924 Filed 11–1–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. EC03–5–000 and ER03–65–000]

Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC; Allegheny Trading Finance Company; Notice of Filing

October 24, 2002.

Take notice that, in Docket No. EC03–5–000, on October 21, 2002, Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC (''AE Supply''), and Allegheny Trading Finance Company (''ATF'') filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission an application pursuant to

Section 203 of the Federal Power Act for authorization to assign two contracts between AE Supply and the California Department of Water Resources from AE Supply to ATF. The Applicants have requested Commission action on an expedited basis.

Also take notice that, in Docket No. ER03–65–000, on October 21, 2002, ATF filed proposed Market Rate Tariff, and a request for such waivers and blanket authorizations as have been granted in previous orders. ATF requests an effective date of October 22, 2002.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest these filings 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 ''FERRIS'' link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number filed to access the document. For assistance, call (202) 502–8222 or TTY, (202) 502–8659. 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. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings.

Comment Date: November 4, 2002.

Issued October 24, 2002.

By direction of the Commission. Commissioner Massey dissenting with a separate statement attached.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

MASSEY, Commissioner, dissenting:

I am concerned that a substantial shortening of our normal 21-day intervention period for this type of filing may not allow potential intervenors sufficient time to review the application and to comment appropriately. Therefore, I dissent.

William L. Massey,

Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 02–27927 Filed 11–1–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RM01–12–000 et al.]

Remedying Undue Discrimination Through Open Access Transmission Service and Standard Electricity Market Design; Notice Announcing Process for Western Interconnection Market Design and Postponing Technical Conference

October 25, 2002.

Avista Corporation, Bonneville Power Administration, Idaho Power Company, Montana Power Company, Nevada Power Company, PacifiCorp, Portland General Electric Company, Puget Sound Energy, Inc., Sierra Pacific Power Company, British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority, Arizona Public Service Company, El Paso Electric Company, Public Service Company of New Mexico, Tucson Electric Power Company , WestConnect RTO, LLC [Docket No. EL02–9–000], California Independent System Operator Corporation, California Independent System Operator Corporation. [Docket No. RM01–12–000], [Docket No. RT01–35–000], [Docket No. RT02–1–000], [Docket No. ER02–1656–000], [Docket No. ER02–2576–000]

The Commission is announcing a process to develop compatible market designs in the Western Interconnect. The Commission wishes to build upon constructive ideas that emerged in technical meetings in Denver this week, comments from western commissioners at CREPC on October 1, and other outreach meetings around the West. In these meetings, participants learned about positive developments in RTO West, WestConnect, and the California ISO and flagged certain market design elements that may not be sufficiently compatible across the region. We note that the Seams Steering Group of the Western Interconnect (SSG-WI) and other regional organizations have been working to identify such elements in order to develop and support an evolving seamless western wholesale energy market that minimizes trade barriers and promotes common business practices for inter-RTO transmission services. We learned that SSG-WI is pursuing plans to formalize its role and to re-structure in a way that allows for open participation, and that there has been further clarification of the roles of SSG-WI, the WECC, and CREPC. Participants in these meetings asked FERC staff for an opportunity to resolve ''seams'' issues through these regional processes.

We are encouraged by these developments and offer FERC staff resources to support this effort. We believe that the seams resolution and market development process will be most successful if all market participants and representatives of public power and states fully participate, and if the process is driven by the market participants within the context of FERC's efforts. State participation is essential to this process, and states are encouraged to give their policy guidance through the appropriate regional organization. We request that SSG-WI develop a list of recommended market design elements appropriate for the western interconnect (*i.e.,* balancing market, transmission rights, planning process, etc.), which elements must be designed compatibly to avoid seams, and a plan and timeline for resolution of these issues that is coordinated with RTO development efforts. This plan would include specific tasks for each of the current SSG-WI working groups and any other working groups that may be necessary. We request that SSG-WI present that plan by mid-January, consistent with previously set SSG-WI deadlines.

To accommodate this process, we recognize that some flexibility in RTO timelines may be required. We envision a parallel track between this process and RTO development processes so that both can continue to move forward. We expect the SSG–WI process to clarify which remaining issues can be resolved in RTO proceedings and which should be coordinated through this collaborative process for the Western Interconnect.

We will defer the November 4, 2002, policy meeting scheduled in Portland, Oregon, to allow this alternative process a chance to succeed. We will schedule a public meeting, which Commissioners plan to attend, after a consensus plan has been presented. We expect further technical meetings between the parties during November and December to advance this process; our staff will participate.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–27944 Filed 11–1–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P