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 at the address in item g above.

n. Scoping Process: Scoping is intended to advise all parties regarding the proposed scope of the EA and to seek additional information pertinent to this analysis. The Commission intends to prepare one Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Enterprise Mill Project and Sibley Mill Project in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act. The EA will consider both site-specific and cumulative environmental impacts and reasonable alternatives to the proposed action. Should substantive comments requiring reanalysis be received on the NEPA document, we would consider preparing a subsequent NEPA document.

At this time, the Commission staff does not anticipate holding formal public or agency scoping meetings near the project site. Instead, staff will conduct paper scoping.

A Scoping Document (SD) outlining the subject areas to be addressed in the EA were distributed to the parties on the Commission's mailing list. Copies of the SD may 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).

As part of scoping the staff will: (1) Summarize the environmental issues tentatively identified for analysis in the EA; (2) solicit from comments all available information, especially quantifiable data, on the resources at issue; (3) encourage comments from experts and the public on issues that should be analyzed in the EA, including viewpoints in opposition to, or in support of, the staff's preliminary views; (4) determine the resource issues to be addressed in the EA; and (5) identify those issues that require a detailed analysis, as well as those issues that do not require a detailed analysis.

Consequently, interested entities are requested to file with the Commission any data and information concerning environmental resources and land uses in the project area and the subject project's impacts to the aforementioned.

O. The preliminary schedule for preparing the subject EA is as follows:

Milestone	Target date		
Issue Scoping Docu- ment 1 (Paper Scoping).	July/August 2002.		
Additional Information (if needed).	October 2002.		
Issue Acceptance Letter.	October 2002.		
Issue Notice of Ready for Environmental Analysis.	December 2002.		
Deadline for Filing Agency Rec- ommendations.	February 2003.		
Issue Notice of avail- ability of EA.	April 2003.		
Public Comments on EA Du.	May 2003.		
Initiate 10(j) Process Ready for Commis- sion decision on the application.	June 2003. September 2003.		

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–19039 Filed 7–26–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

#### Western Area Power Administration

### Post-2004 Resource Pool-Salt Lake City Area Integrated Projects

**AGENCY:** Western Area Power Administration, DOE. **ACTION:** Notice of adjustment to final allocations.

**SUMMARY:** The Western Area Power Administration (Western), a Federal power marketing agency of the Department of Energy (DOE), announces an adjustment to its Salt Lake City Area Integrated Projects (SLCA/IP) Post-2004 **Resource Pool Final Allocation of Power** developed under the requirements of Subpart C—Power Marketing Initiative of the Energy Planning and Management Program (Program) Final Rule. Final allocations were published in the Federal Register on February 4, 2002. Information received since then has made it necessary to revise the allocations.

Adjusted final allocations are published to indicate Western's decisions prior to beginning the contractual phase of the allocation process. Firm electric service contracts, negotiated between Western and allottees, will permit delivery of power allocations from the October 2004 billing period through the September 2024 billing period.

**DATES:** The Adjusted Post-2004 Resource Pool Final Allocation of Power will become effective August 28, 2002, and will remain in effect through September 30, 2024.

**ADDRESSES:** All documents developed or retained by Western in developing the adjusted final allocations are available for inspection and copying at the CRSP Management Center, 150 East Social Hall Avenue, Suite 300, Salt Lake City, UT 84111.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Western published Final Post-2004 Resource Pool Allocation Procedures (Procedures) in the Federal Register (64 FR 48825, September 8, 1999) to implement Subpart C-Power Marketing Initiative of the Program's Final Rule (10 CFR part 905), published in the Federal Register (60 FR 54151, October 20, 1995). The Program, developed in part to implement Section 114 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, became effective on November 20, 1995. The goal of the Program is to require planning and efficient electric energy use by Western's long-term firm power customers and to extend Western's firm power resource commitments. One aspect of the Program is to establish project-specific power resource pools and allocate power from these pools to new preference customers.

The Procedures, in conjunction with the Post-1989 Marketing Plan (51 FR 4844, February 7, 1986), establish the framework for allocating power from the SLCA/IP Post-2004 Power Pool.

Proposed allocations were published in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 31910, June 13, 2001). Public information/ comment forums concerning the proposed allocations were held August 10, 15, 16, 21, and October 4, 2001. The public comment period closed October 11, 2001.

Final allocations were published in the **Federal Register** (67 FR 5113, February 4, 2002). Information received by Western since that date has indicated that misinterpretation of data by Western made it necessary to adjust these allocations.

#### I. Reason for Adjustment

Following publication of the final allocations, Western received information indicating that because of errors made in evaluating the data used to calculate the final allocations, three tribes' allocations were incorrect. Western has stated in the criteria that it would be consistent in determining the allocations of all tribes. It is necessary to adjust the allocations to correct these errors. The first of these is the San Carlos Apache Tribe (San Carlos). The San Carlos Apache Reservation is served by three utilities. Only one of these utilities currently receives Federal power that is used to serve the reservation. In calculating the allocation for San Carlos, the percentage of Federal power received by this utility was applied to San Carlos's total load. The result of this calculation was that San Carlos received a smaller allocation than it should have.

The second adjustment made was to the allocation of the Yavapai Prescott Tribe. The non-residential load information submitted with the Applicant Profile Data by Yavapai Prescott was misinterpreted resulting in only two commercial accounts being identified as tribally-owned and thus eligible for an allocation. However, a number of other tribal businesses, administrative offices, and eligible loads should have been included. These loads have been identified, and an adjustment made to Yavapai Prescott's allocation.

The third allottee to identify a problem was the Tohono O'odham Utility Authority (TOUA). TOUA is a tribal utility which currently receives an allocation of Federal power. The information available to Western and used to determine the percentage of TOUA's load served by its present Federal allocation was shown to be incorrect. This resulted in TOUA receiving a lower level of service in 2004 than other tribes. TOUA's allocation was adjusted by using the correct percentage of current Federal power in the calculations.

To maintain consistency in its treatment of all tribes Western believes it is necessary to make these corrections. Since the entire resource pool has been allocated, any adjustment to an allocation results in all of the allocations being changed. The result of these adjustments is that other tribes' allocations are reduced slightly from the previously published amounts. With these adjustments, the tribes' SLCA/IP allocations, combined with existing and future Western hydropower benefits, were reduced slightly to approximately 55.2 percent of eligible load in the Summer season and 57.2 percent in the Winter season based on the adjusted seasonal energy data submitted by each tribe.

Another result of recalculating the allocations is that the Kiabab Paiute

Tribe (Kiabab) will not receive an allocation. The utility which serves Kiabab receives a greater portion of its power supply through its allocation than Western is able to provide to the Tribes.

## **II. Final Power Allocation**

Since the proposed allocations were published in June 2001 and subsequently in February 2002, tribes have had sufficient time to review the allocations and point out any inconsistencies with the criteria. The following final power allocations are made in accordance with the Procedures. All of the allocations are subject to the execution of a firm electric service contract in accordance with the Procedures. Western will proceed to offer firm electric service contracts to the tribes receiving allocations in the amounts shown helow

The adjusted final allocations for Indian tribes and organizations are shown in this table.

# SALT LAKE CITY AREA PROJECTS POST-2004 POWER POOL FINAL ALLOCATIONS

Tribe	Summer en- ergy (kWh)	Winter energy (kWh)	Summer CROD (kW)	Winter CROD (kW)
Alamo Navajo Chapter	399,824	453,518	184	196
Canoncito Navajo Chapter	292,937	335,242	135	145
Cocopah Indian Tribe	2,779,230	2,454,829	1,281	1,058
Colorado River Indian Tribes	12,969,838	8,747,829	5,978	3,772
Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation	84,952	144,200	39	62
Duckwater Shoshone Tribe	149,225	156,069	69	67
Ely Shoshone Tribe	168,395	299,306	78	129
Fort Mojave Indian Tribe	612,855	631,886	282	272
Ft. McDowell Mojave-Apache Indian Community	5,089,153	5,263,924	2,346	2,270
Gila River Indian Community	30,202,512	30,918,295	13,920	13,330
Havasupai Tribe	432,433	548,898	199	237
Hopi Tribe	5,892,469	6,517,369	2,716	2,810
Hualapai Tribe	1,357,114	1,411,736	625	609
Jicarilla Apache Tribe	1,257,753	1,703,852	580	735
Las Vegas Paiute Tribe	1,563,305	1,213,043	721	523
Mescalero Apache Tribe	2,116,562	2,295,175	976	990
Nambe Pueblo	126,990	151,509	59	65
Navajo Tribal Utility Authority	45,155,581	56,535,996	20,812	24,375
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah	343,334	357,388	158	154
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	2,864,577	2,393,821	1,320	1,032
Picuris Pueblo	164,296	51,199	76	22
Pueblo De Cochiti	401,422	520,585	185	224
Pueblo of Acoma	911,224	950,635	420	410
Pueblo of Isleta	2,381,563	2,572,647	1,098	1,109
Pueblo of Jemez	464,155	613,561	214	265
Pueblo of Laguna	1,610,018	1,745,884	742	753
Pueblo of Pojoaque	451,379	628,599	208	271
Pueblo of San Felipe	711,597	977,634	328	422
Pueblo of San Ildefonso	136,791	148,335	63	64
Pueblo of San Juan	647,460	702,893	298	303
Pueblo of Sandia	2,045,141	1,894,685	943	817
Pueblo of Santa Clara	463,973	613,363	214	264
Pueblo of Santo Domingo	980,004	1,016,679	452	438
Pueblo of Taos	480,420	787,815	221	340
Pueblo of Tesuque	1,361,547	1,387,845	628	598
Pueblo of Zia	148,471	196,276	68	85
Pueblo of Zuni	2,212,186	2,748,632	1,020	1,185
Quechan Indian Tribe	1,095,632	1,691,226	505	729

## SALT LAKE CITY AREA PROJECTS POST-2004 POWER POOL FINAL ALLOCATIONS—Continued

Tribe	Summer en- ergy (kWh)	Winter energy (kWh)	Summer CROD (kW)	Winter CROD (kW)
Ramah Navajo Chapter	650,681	954,717	300	412
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	35,026,125	31,034,316	16,144	13,380
San Carlos Apache Tribe	9,008,264	8,766,824	4,152	3,780
Santa Ana Pueblo	997,747	950,995	460	410
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	33,098	34,336	15	15
Southern Ute Indian Tribe	2,435,344	2,723,333	1,122	1,174
Tohono O'Odham Utility Authority	2,270,947	7,060,054	1,047	3,044
Tonto Apache Tribe	829,541	810,134	382	349
Ute Indian Tribe	991,484	1,596,382	457	688
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe	1,034,236	1,177,682	477	508
White Mountain Apache Tribe	12,632,129	13,914,290	5,822	5,999
Wind River Reservation	1,050,627	1,138,890	484	491
Yavapai Apache Nation	4,106,724	3,399,015	1,893	1,465
Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe	1,589,784	1,867,486	733	805
Yomba Shoshone Tribe	68,129	70,678	31	30
Total	203,251,178	217,281,509	93,679	93,680

## IV. Review Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601–621, requires Federal agencies to perform a regulatory flexibility analysis if a final rule is likely to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities and there is a legal requirement to issue a general notice of proposed rulemaking. Western has determined that this action does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis since it is a rulemaking of particular applicability involving rates or services applicable to public property.

#### V. Environmental Compliance

Western has completed an environmental impact statement on the Program, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The Record of Decision was published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 53181, October 12, 1995). Western's NEPA review assured all environmental effects related to these procedures have been analyzed.

#### VI. Determination 12866

DOE has determined that this is not a significant regulatory action because it does not meet the criteria of Executive Order 12866, 58 FR 51735. Western has an exemption from centralized regulatory review under Executive Order 12866; accordingly, this notice requires no clearance by the Office of Management and Budget.

### VII. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

Western has determined that this rule is exempt from congressional notification requirements under 5 U.S.C. 801 because the action is a rulemaking of particular applicability relating to rates or services and involves matters of procedure.

Dated: July 5, 2002. **Michael S. Hacskaylo,**  *Administrator.* [FR Doc. 02–19070 Filed 7–26–02; 8:45 am] **BILLING CODE 6450–01–P** 

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-7251-3]

## Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request; National Waste Minimization Partnership Program; Correction

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; correction.

**SUMMARY:** The EPA published a document in the **Federal Register** of June 21, 2002, concerning a proposed information collection request for the National Waste Minimization Partnership Program.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Newman Smith, 703–308–8757.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The EPA published a document in the Federal Register of June 21, 2002, (67 FR 42251), in FR Doc. 02–15725. This document corrects the docket number in the ADDRESSES section in the second and third column of page 42251 to read "RCRA–2002–0022"; and also corrects the docket address in the second column to read: RCRA Docket Information Center, Office of Solid Waste (5305G) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20460.

Dated: July 19, 2002.

#### Elizabeth Cotsworth,

Director, Office of Solid Waste. [FR Doc. 02–19106 Filed 7–26–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[Petition IV-2001-2; FRL-7252-1]

### Clean Air Act Operating Permit Program; Petition for Objection to State Operating Permit for Dougherty County Landfill, Flemming/Gaissert Road Facility; Albany (Dougherty County), GA

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of final order on petition to object to a state operating permit.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Clean Air Act section 505(b)(2) and 40 CFR 70.8(d), the EPA Administrator signed an order, dated July 3, 2002, denying a petition to object to a state operating permit issued by the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) to Dougherty County Landfill, Flemming/Gaissert Road Facility (Dougherty) located in Albany, Dougherty County, Georgia. This order constitutes final action on the petition submitted by the Georgia Center for Law in the Public Interest (GCLPI or Petitioner) on behalf of the Sierra Club. Pursuant to section 505(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act (the Act) any person may seek judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days of this document under section 307 of the Act.