

Preapplication

A preapplication is strongly encouraged. The preapplication should contain a title, address, telephone, fax and e-mail address of the Principal Investigator, and consist of 500 words or less of narrative outlining the proposed research objectives and methods. Include a list of proposed principal investigators and their institutions at the end of the narrative. Responses to preapplications, encouraging or discouraging formal applications, will generally be communicated within 7 days of receipt. Notification of a successful preapplication is not an indication that an award will be made in response to the formal application.

Merit Review

Applications will be subjected to formal merit review (peer review) and will be evaluated against the following criteria which are listed in descending order of importance codified at 10 CFR 605.10(d):

1. Scientific and/or Technical Merit of the Project;
2. Appropriateness of the Proposed Method or Approach;
3. Competency of Applicant's Personnel and Adequacy of Proposed Resources; and
4. Reasonableness and Appropriateness of the Proposed Budget.

The evaluation will include program policy factors such as the relevance of the proposed research to the terms of the announcement and the agency's programmatic needs. Note, external peer reviewers are selected with regard to both their scientific expertise and the absence of conflict-of-interest issues. Non-federal reviewers may be used, and submission of an application constitutes agreement that this is acceptable to the investigator(s) and the submitting institution.

Submission Information

Information about the development and submission of applications, eligibility, limitations, evaluation, selection process, and other policies and procedures may be found in 10 CFR Part 605, and in the Application Guide for the Office of Science Financial Assistance Program. Electronic access to the Guide and required forms is made available via the World Wide Web at: <http://www.sc.doe.gov/production/grants/grants.html>. DOE is under no obligation to pay for any costs associated with the preparation or submission of applications if an award is not made.

In addition, for this notice, the research description should not exceed

20 pages, exclusive of attachments, must include detailed budgets, form DOE F 4620.1, for each year of support requested, and must contain a one-page abstract or summary of the proposed research. On the SC grant face page, form DOE F 4650.2, in block 15, also provide the PI's phone number, fax number and e-mail address.

Attachments should include curriculum vitae for all key personnel, a listing of all current and pending federal support, and letters of intent when collaborations are part of the proposed research. Curriculum vitae should be submitted in a form similar to that of NIH or NSF (two pages maximum), see for example: <http://www.nsf.gov:80/bfa/cpo/gpg/fkit.htm#forms-9>.

For researchers who do not have access to the World Wide Web, please contact Karen Carlson, Environmental Sciences Division, SC-74, U.S. Department of Energy, 19901 Germantown Road, Germantown, MD 20874-1290, phone: (301) 903-3338, fax: (301) 903-8519, e-mail: karen.carlson@science.doe.gov; for hard copies of background material mentioned in this solicitation.

(The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number for this program is 81.049, and the solicitation control number is ERFAP 10 CFR part 605.)

Issued in Washington, DC May 9, 2001.

John Rodney Clark,

Associate Director of Science for Resource Management.

[FR Doc. 01-12539 Filed 5-17-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[FE Docket No. PP-197, DOE/EIS-0307]

Notice of Reopening Scoping Period and Schedule for Public Scoping Meetings; Public Service Company of New Mexico

AGENCY: Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: DOE announces that it is reopening the scoping period and will hold additional public scoping meetings for the environmental impact statement (DOE/EIS-0307) that is being prepared in connection with an application for a Presidential permit field by Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM). PNM has applied for a Presidential permit to construct electric transmission lines across the U.S.-Mexico border. DOE is preparing an EIS, with the U.S. Forest Service as a cooperating agency, because together they have determined that the issuance

of a DOE Presidential permit and/or issuance of a Forest Service "Special Use Permit" would constitute major Federal actions that may have a significant impact upon the environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The purpose of this notice is to open a new scoping period to obtain comments on the five alternative corridors proposed to be analyzed in the EIS. These alternative corridors have been derived from the eight study corridors that were the subject of previous scoping periods.

DATES: DOE invites interested agencies, organizations, and members of the public to submit comments or suggestions to assist in identifying significant environmental issues not previously identified and in determining the appropriate scope of the EIS. This new scoping period starts with the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** and will continue until June 22, 2001. Written and oral comments will be given equal weight and DOE will consider all comments received or postmarked by June 22, 2001, in defining the scope of the EIS. Comments received or postmarked after that date will be considered to the extent possible.

Dates, times and locations for the public scoping meetings are:

1. June 12, 2001, 4 p.m. to 7 p.m., Rio Rico Resort, 1069 Camino Caralampi, Rio Rico, Arizona.

2. June 13, 2001, 4 p.m. to 7 p.m., Marana High School, Marana, Arizona.

Requests to speak at a public scoping meeting(s) should be received by the NEPA Document Manager, Mrs. Ellen Russell, at the address indicated below on or before June 7, 2001. Requests to speak may also be made at the time of the scoping meeting(s). However, persons who submitted advance requests to speak will be given priority if time should be limited during the meeting.

ADDRESSES: Written comments or suggestions on the scope of the EIS and requests to speak at the scoping meeting(s) should be addressed to: Mrs. Ellen Russell, NEPA Document Manager, Office of Fossil Energy (FE-27), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington DC 20585-0350; phone 202-586-9624, facsimile: 202-287-5736, or by electronic mail at Ellen.Russell@hq.doe.gov. Comments that relate exclusively to activities on or impacts to lands under the control of the U.S. Forest Service may also be transmitted directly to Jerry Conner, Coronado National Forest, 300 W.

Congress Street, Tucson, Arizona 85701; phone 520-670-4527 or via electronic mail at jconner@fs.fed.us.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information on the proposed project or to receive a copy of the Draft EIS when it is issued, contact Mrs. Russell at the address listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice.

For general information on the DOE NEPA review process, contact: Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Compliance (EH-42), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585-0119; Phone: 202-586-4600 or leave a message at 800-472-2756; Facsimile: 202-586-7031.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background and Need for Agency Action

Executive Order 10485, as amended by Executive Order 12038, requires that a Presidential permit be issued by DOE before electric transmission facilities may be constructed, maintained, operated or connected at the U.S. international border. The Executive Order provides that a Presidential permit may be issued after a finding that the proposed project is consistent with the public interest. In determining consistency with the public interest, DOE considers the impacts of the project on the reliability of the U.S. electric power system and on the environment. The regulations implementing the Executive Order have been codified at 10 205.320-205.329. Issuance of a Presidential permit does not mandate that the project be completed; in fact, prior to construction, the recipient must obtain approval from all other Federal, state and local authorities with jurisdiction over the project.

On December 28, 1998, PNM filed an application for a Presidential permit with the Office of Fossil Energy of DOE. PNM proposed to construct up to two transmission lines on a single right-of-way extending approximately 210 to 250 miles from the electric switchyard near the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station (PVNGS), located approximately 30 miles west of Phoenix, Arizona, to the U.S.-Mexico border. South of the border, PNM would extend the line(s) approximately 60 miles to the Santa Ana Substation, located in the City of Santa Ana, Sonora, Mexico, and owned by the Commission Federal de Electricidad (CFE), the national electric utility of Mexico.

In its December 28, 1998, Presidential permit application, PNM identified

three alternative corridors for construction of the two cross-border transmission lines. These corridors were the subject of public scoping meetings conducted in Nogales, Tucson, Patagonia, Sells, Ajo, Gila Bend, and Casa Grande, Arizona, in March 1999. The initial scoping period extended from February 12 to March 15, 1999 (64 FR 7173, February 12, 1999), and was later extended to April 14, 1999 (64 FR 13553, March 19, 1999). Later, three additional alternative corridors were developed and were the subject of public scoping meetings conducted in Green Valley, Tubac, Sasabe, Three Points (Robles Junction), and Tucson in June 1999, during a second scoping period that extended from June 10 to July 14, 1999 (64 FR 31204, June 10, 1999). A third scoping period was opened on July 20, 2000 (65 FR 45042, July 20, 2000), and, by an August 20, 2000, information letter to the public, continued until October 2, 2000, to receive public comment on two additional alternative corridors, one identified as the PNM "Preferred Alternative." Public scoping meetings on these two additional alternative corridors were scheduled for Rio Rico and Tucson during August but were later canceled when DOE became aware from comments by the public that the quality of maps distributed and posted on the project web site was not adequate. Also, the public pointed out to DOE that during the month of August many residents of southern Arizona vacation outside of the State and either would not be available for the meeting or would not have received information on the proceeding.

When the third scoping period was opened on July 20, 2000, PNM had identified a total of eight corridors, modified the path of several from what had originally been presented to the public by DOE, and eliminated the proposal to use direct current (DC) technology. Since the close of the third scoping period, PNM has continued to identify, eliminate and/or modify its proposed alternative corridors. For example, initially, for each of its proposal corridors, PNM had assumed a two-mile-wide study corridor. As its proposal has evolved, PNM has more narrowly defined each alternative study corridor, reducing the width of most to approximately one mile. PNM also has continued to define corridor alternatives and consider multiple options to many segments of these corridors.

Earlier this year DOE informed PNM that this proceeding and the number of variations to proposed corridors had become too cumbersome for DOE to adequately describe and analyze or for

the public to decipher. DOE requested PNM to identify the set of alternatives that DOE would propose to analyze in the EIS. DOE then mapped PNM's set of alternatives to provide the public with information to identify potential impacts to their property and to their community during this scoping period. In addition, DOE decided that it would not consider corridors PNM had earlier proposed through the Tohono O'odham Nation in light of the Nation's sovereignty and in response to its request that DOE terminate the NEPA and Presidential permit processes as they pertain to the Nation.

Each of the five corridors that DOE proposed to analyze in the EIS has been named after distinguishing characteristics in the southern part of the corridor within the United States: the East Valley Corridor, the Sasabe Corridor, the Pipeline Corridor, the Cross-Over Corridor (designated the PNM preferred corridor), and the Tucson Corridor. The first four of these corridors have an optional routing in the area near Picacho and Marana. A map and description of each of the alternatives (and options) is being mailed to stakeholders who have previously expressed an interest in this proposal. In addition, maps are available on the project web site maintained for DOE by Battelle Memorial Institute at <http://projects.battelle.org/pnmeis/> or may be received by mail by leaving a message at 1-888-806-3421. In addition, from this web site interested persons can download other project-related information.

The EIS is being prepared to satisfy the environmental review requirements of any Federal agency having jurisdiction over the proposed project or any segment of it. The U.S. Forest Service (Coronado National Forest) has notified DOE that it will participate as a cooperating agency in the preparation of this EIS; several of the PNM-proposed corridors cross land under control of the Coronado National Forest. PNM must obtain a "Special Use Permit" from the U.S. Forest Service before a transmission line can be constructed on these lands.

Scoping Process

Interested parties are invited to participate in the scoping process. Public scoping meetings will be held at the locations, dates, and times indicated above under **DATES** and **ADDRESSES** sections. These scoping meetings will be informal but a transcript will be taken and made available on the project web site. The DOE presiding officer will establish only those procedures needed

to ensure that everyone who wishes to speak has a chance to do so and that DOE understands all issues and comments. At this time DOE expects to provide speakers with approximately 5 minutes for their oral statements. Allotted time may change based on the number of speakers who register. Persons who have not submitted a request to speak in advance may register to speak at each scoping meeting, but advance requests are encouraged. Should any speaker desire to provide for the record further information that cannot be presented within the designated time, such additional information may be submitted in writing by the date listed in the **DATES** section. Both oral and written comments will be considered and given equal weight by DOE. Oral and written comments previously submitted in this proceeding have been entered in the official record of this proceeding and need not be resubmitted.

Issued in Washington, DC on May 15, 2001.

Anthony J. Como,

Deputy Director, Electric Power Regulation, Office of Coal & Power Im/Ex, Office of Coal & Power System, Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 01-12538 Filed 5-17-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EL01-61-001]

PacifiCorp; Notice of Filing

May 14, 2001.

Take notice that on May 4, 2001, PacifiCorp tendered for filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) in accordance with 18 CFR Part 35 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, a Long-Term Firm Transmission Service Agreement with Idaho Power Company (Idaho) under PacifiCorp's FERC Electric Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 11 (Tariff). Copies of this filing were supplied to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission and the Public Utility Commission of Oregon.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest such filing should file a motion to intervene or protest 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). All such motions and protests should be filed on or before May 25, 2001. Protests will be considered by the

Commission to determine the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection. This filing may also be viewed on the Internet at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> (call 202-208-2222 for assistance). Comments, protests and interventions may be filed electronically via the internet in lieu of paper. See, 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(m)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's web site at <http://www.ferc.us/efi/doorbell.htm>.

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-12504 Filed 5-17-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP01-360-000]

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company; Notice of Application

May 14, 2001.

Take notice that on May 7, 2001, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Tennessee), 1001 Louisiana, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP01-360-000, an application pursuant to sections 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), and the Regulations of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's requesting authorization for its proposed Dracut Expansion Project. In the proposal for the Dracut Expansion Project, Tennessee seeks to abandon approximately 11.92 miles of 16-inch pipeline, and requests a certificate of public convenience and necessity to construct, install and operate approximately 11.50 miles of 24-inch diameter replacement pipeline and 0.42 miles of 16-inch diameter replacement pipeline, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. This filing may be viewed on the web at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> [call (202) 208-2222 for assistance].

Tennessee states that the Project will increase Tennessee's capacity and flexibility on its system in the New England region, so that it can help meet the significant growth in the demand for natural gas services projected in this area of the country. Tennessee's current capacity from Dracut is 200 MMcf on

a firm year-round basis. Tennessee states that the proposed replacement and upgrade of facilities will increase its capacity from Dracut to 500 MMcf on a firm year-round basis, with minimal environmental disruption and relatively modest facility construction.

The estimated cost for installations and removal of the Dracut Project facilities is approximately \$36.4 million. Tennessee proposes to place the Dracut Expansion facilities in service by November 1, 2002. Tennessee requests that the Commission grant the requested authority by December 31, 2001.

Tennessee states that it will charge transportation rates as currently set forth in its tariff for any service which utilizes the proposed facilities; that no new or rate schedules are being proposed; and that capacity created by the Dracut Expansion Project will be awarded in accordance with Tennessee's existing Gas Tariff.

Any questions regarding this application should be directed to Susan T. Halbach, Senior Counsel, P.O. Box 2511, Houston, Texas 77252 (713) 420-5751.

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 May 4, 2001, 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 385.214 and 385.211) 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 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