

because FGT has been able to achieve other cost savings.

FGT requests that this amendment be approved by February 14, 2003, so construction can commence around March 1, 2003. Any questions concerning this application may be directed to Mr. Stephen T. Veatch, Director of Certificates and Regulatory Reporting, Suite 3997, 1400 Smith Street, Houston, TX 77002 or call (713) 853-6549.

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 October 4, 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 385.214 or 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 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 non-party 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.

The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings of comments, protests, and interventions 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.

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.

Magalie R. Salas,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-23861 Filed 9-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP02-430-000]

Saltville Gas Storage Company L.L.C.; Notice of Application for a Limited Blanket Certificate for Gas Storage and Related Transportation

September 13, 2002.

Take notice that on August 23, 2002, Saltville Gas Storage Company L.L.C.

(Saltville), a limited liability company with its principal place of business at 1096 Old Berry Drive, Abingdon, Virginia 24210, filed in Docket No. CP02-430-000 an application pursuant to section 7c of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, and Section 284.224 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations thereunder, for a limited jurisdiction blanket certificate authorizing it to engage in gas storage and related transportation activities.

Saltville states it is a Hinshaw company that is exempt from the Commission's general jurisdiction under section 1(c) of the Natural Gas Act. Saltville explains that it plans to develop natural gas storage caverns in underground salt formations in Smyth and Washington Counties, Virginia, and build seven miles of 24-inch diameter pipeline, pursuant to orders issued by the Commonwealth of Virginia State Corporation Commission (VSCC). The project will consist of four storage caverns with a total working gas capacity of 6.216 Bcf. Saltville requests a limited jurisdictional blanket certificate pursuant to Section 284.224 of the Commission's regulations authorizing it to provide certain non-exempt interstate services. Saltville proposes to charge VSCC approved rates for FERC jurisdictional service.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before October 4, 2002, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules 210, 211 or 214) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to the proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission Rules. 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). 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.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to

the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission on this application if no petition to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that the certificate is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a petition for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that an oral hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at hearing.

Magalie R. Salas,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-23862 Filed 9-19-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EG02-183-000, et al.]

Spring Canyon Energy, L.L.C., et al.; Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

September 13, 2002.

The following filings have been made with the Commission. The filings are listed in ascending order within each docket classification.

1. Spring Canyon Energy, L.L.C.

[Docket No. EG02-183-000]

On September 10, 2002, Spring Canyon Energy, L.L.C. (the Applicant) whose address is 10440 N. Central Expressway, No. 1400, Dallas, Texas 75231, filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission an application for determination of exempt wholesale generator status pursuant to part 365 of the Commission's regulations.

The Applicant states that it will be engaged directly or indirectly and exclusively in the business of owning and/or operating a 430 MW (up to 540 MW with duct burners) electric generating facility located near Mona, Utah and selling electric energy at wholesale. The Applicant requests a determination that the Applicant is an exempt wholesale generator under Section 32(a)(1) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

Comment Date: October 4, 2002.

2. City of Corona v. Southern California Edison Company

[Docket No. EL02-126-000]

Take notice that on September 11, 2002, the City of Corona, California (Corona) tendered for filing a Complaint and Request for Fast Track Processing, pursuant to section 206 of the Rules and Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, against Southern California Edison (SCE) alleging violations of Sections 202, 210, and 212 of the Federal Power Act and the Commission's regulations implementing such sections.

Corona requests an order directing SCE to promptly process Corona's Wholesale Distribution Access Tariff application and interconnect Corona as requested in the application filed with SCE on December 20, 2001, as well as an order to show cause directed against SCE as to why it should not be found in violation of the Federal Power Act, SCE's own tariffs, and the Commission's regulations for the actions described in the Complaint. A copy of the filing was served upon the Parties.

Comment Date: October 3, 2002.

3. Avista Energy, Inc.

[Docket No. ER96-2408-018]

Take notice that on September 9, 2002, Avista Energy, Inc. filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission its three-year updated market analysis. Avista Energy, Inc., an indirect, wholly-owned subsidiary of Avista Corporation, is an electricity and natural gas trading and marketing company headquartered in Spokane, Washington.

Copies of this filing have been served upon parties on the Commission's official service list for this docket.

Comment Date: September 30, 2002.

4. Foote Creek II and Foote Creek III

[Docket Nos. ER99-3450-002 and ER99-2769-003]

Take notice that on September 9, 2002, Foote Creek II and Foote Creek III, filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) their three-year updated market analysis. Foote Creek II and III has had no changes in ownership, generation capacity, transmission or market-based rates for this project.

Foote Creek III has changed the name of the utility purchasing the power the project produces from Public Service Company of Colorado to ExCel Energy.

Comment Date: September 30, 2002.

5. New York Independent System Operator, Inc.

[Docket Nos. ER00-3591-012, ER00-1969-014, ER00-3038-007, EL00-70-008, ER02-2081-001]

Take notice that on September 9, 2002, the New York Independent System Operator, Inc. (NYISO) tendered for filing a compliance filing in accordance with the Commission's August 9, 2002 order in the above-captioned proceedings.

A copy of this filing was served upon all signatories to the OATT and Services Tariff and upon all persons designated on the official service lists compiled by the Secretary in the above-captioned proceedings.

Comment Date: September 30, 2002.

6. California Power Exchange Corporation

[Docket No. ER02-2234-003]

Take notice that on September 9, 2002, the California Power Exchange Corporation made a filing to comply with the Commission's August 8, 2002 order in this proceeding (100 FERC ¶ 61,178).

Comment Date: September 30, 2002.

7. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

[Docket No. ER02-2419-000]

Take notice that on September 4, 2002, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL) submitted as a supplement to its initial filing in the captioned proceeding a one-line diagram of the interconnection facilities governed by the generator interconnection agreement between PPL and Bloomsburg Hospital.

Comment Date: September 25, 2002.

8. California Independent System Operator Corporation

[Docket No. ER02-2487-001]

Take notice that on September 10, 2002, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (ISO) tendered for filing Errata to the First Revised Service Agreement No. 381 Under ISO Rate Schedule No. 1, which is a Participating Generator Agreement (PGA) between the ISO and Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). The Errata corrects the requested effective date of the First Revised Service Agreement No. 381. The ISO filed First Revised Service Agreement No. 381 on August 22, 2002 to update Schedule 1 of the PGA. The ISO requests that the revised PGA be made effective as of August 22, 2002.

The ISO states that this filing has been served on all entities that are on the official service list for Docket No. ER02-2487-000.

Comment Date: October 1, 2002.