

using Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) technology. Although DOE funding would support only the Orlando Gasification Project (*i.e.*, coal gasifier, synthesis gas cleanup systems, and supporting infrastructure), the project would be integrated with a planned, privately funded, combined-cycle unit, which together would constitute the IGCC facilities. The facilities would convert coal into synthesis gas to drive a gas combustion turbine, and hot exhaust gas from the gas turbine would generate steam from water to drive a steam turbine. Combined, the two turbines would generate 285 MW (megawatts) of electricity. The EIS evaluates potential impacts of the proposed facilities on land use, aesthetics, air quality, geology, water resources, floodplains, wetlands, ecological resources, social and economic resources, waste management, human health and safety, and noise.

Construction of the proposed facilities would begin in late 2007 and continue until early 2010. An average of about 350 construction workers would be on the site during construction. Approximately 600 to 700 workers would be required during the peak construction period between fall 2008 and spring 2009. After mechanical checkout of the proposed facilities, demonstration (including data analysis and process evaluation) would be conducted over a 4.5-year period from mid 2010 until late 2014. If the demonstration is successful, commercial operation would follow immediately. The combined workforce (*i.e.*, including the proposed Orlando Gasification Project and the combined-cycle generating unit) would consist of approximately 72 employees added to the existing Stanton Energy Center staff of 204 employees. Of the 72 new employees, 19 workers would provide support only during the startup and demonstration phases of the project, while 53 employees would be needed over the lifetime of the facilities (*i.e.*, during startup, demonstration, and commercial operation), unless the gasifier and related equipment would no longer be required because the demonstration was unsuccessful.

Under this latter scenario, only 21 employees would be needed over the lifetime of the remaining combined-cycle unit using natural gas exclusively. The facilities would be designed for a lifetime of at least 20 years, including the 4.5-year demonstration period. The new coal gasifier would operate entirely on coal, consuming a total of approximately 1,020,000 tons per year to produce synthesis gas. Two to three trains per week would deliver low-

sulfur subbituminous coal from the Powder River Basin in Wyoming. The heating value of the coal would average about 8,760 Btu/lb and the sulfur content would average about 0.26%. Most air emissions would result from combustion of synthesis gas in the gas combustion turbine during normal operations. The exhaust gas would be released to the atmosphere via a 205 ft stack.

Sources of air emissions from the proposed facilities would include the HRSG stack, startup stack, multipoint flare, and 6-cell mechanical-draft cooling tower, of which the HRSG stack would generate the most emissions. Except during occasional startups, shutdowns, and upsets, the flare would normally have only minimal emissions associated with eight natural gas-fired pilot lights. Based on 100% load throughout the year (100% capacity factor) using the higher of estimated synthesis gas or natural gas emission rates, annual emissions of criteria pollutants would include 162 tons of SO₂, 1,006 tons of NO_x, 189 tons of particulate matter, 654 tons of carbon monoxide (CO), and 0.03 tons of lead (Pb). Annual NO_x emissions from the Stanton Energy Center overall would not be expected to increase because OUC has agreed, as part of the permitting process, to reduce NO_x emissions from other units at the Stanton Energy Center so that there would be a net decrease in NO_x emissions. Annual emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), a precursor of the criteria pollutant ozone, would be 129 tons.

Under the No Action Alternative, DOE would not provide cost-shared funding to demonstrate the Orlando Gasification Project. Without DOE participation, Southern Company and/or OUC could reasonably pursue at least one option. The combined-cycle facilities could be built at the Stanton Energy Center without the gasifier, synthesis gas cleanup systems, and supporting infrastructure. The combined-cycle facilities would operate using natural gas as fuel without the availability of synthesis gas. During operation of the natural gas-fired unit, emissions of air pollutants (*e.g.*, SO₂ and NO_x) would be less than those predicted for the proposed Orlando Gasification Project. The flare required for the proposed facilities would not be required. This scenario would not provide a low-cost fuel source for the combined-cycle facilities and would not contribute to the goal of the CCPI program, which is to accelerate commercial deployment of advanced coal technologies that provide the

United States with clean, reliable, and affordable energy.

Availability of the Draft EIS

Copies of this Draft EIS have been distributed to Members of Congress, Federal, State, and local officials, and agencies, organizations and individuals who may be interested or affected. This Draft EIS will be available on the Internet at: <http://www.eh.doe.gov/nepa/>. Additional copies can also be requested by telephone at: (412) 386-6065, or (888) 322-7436, x6065. Copies of the Draft EIS are also available for public review at the Alafaya Library, 1200 E. Colonial Dr., Orlando, Florida, 32803.

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 18, 2006.

Mark J. Matarrese,

Director, Office of Environment, Security, Safety and Health, Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 06-7093 Filed 8-23-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; Carbon Nanotubes for On-Board Hydrogen Storage Go/No-Go Decision

AGENCY: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy (DOE).

ACTION: Notice of request for technical input to go/no-go decision.

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (the Department or DOE), Hydrogen, Fuel Cells and Infrastructure Technologies Program, is requesting position papers or other technical documentation regarding carbon nanotubes for on-board hydrogen storage systems by September 15, 2006. This information will be used as part of DOE's go/no-go process in determining the future of applied research and development of carbon nanotubes for on-board hydrogen storage.

DATES: Written position papers or other technical documentation for consideration by the Department regarding this decision are welcome. Documents may be submitted via e-mail or as hard copies but must be received by September 15, 2006.

ADDRESSES: For hard copies, please submit 2 copies of all documents to: U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Mail Station EE-2H, Attn: Dr. Sunita Satyapal, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585-0121. For e-mail submissions, send documents to

brinda.thomas@ee.doe.gov and
laura.verduzco@ee.doe.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Sunita Satyapal, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Mail Station EE-2H, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585-0121, Phone: (202) 586-2336, e-mail: *sunita.satyapal@ee.doe.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The mission of the Department of Energy's Hydrogen, Fuel Cells and Infrastructure Technologies Program is to research, develop and validate fuel cell and hydrogen production, delivery, and storage technologies, such that hydrogen from diverse domestic resources will be used in a clean, safe, reliable and affordable manner in fuel cell vehicles, central station electric power production, distributed thermal electric, and combined heat and power applications. The President's Hydrogen Fuel Initiative, launched in 2003, accelerates research, development and demonstration of hydrogen production, delivery and storage technologies to enable technology readiness. A critical requirement for achieving technology readiness is the development of on-board hydrogen storage systems with enough storage capacity to meet driving range expectations (more than 300 miles in the United States), while meeting a number of requirements such as weight, volume and cost. Detailed technical targets developed by DOE, with input through the FreedomCAR and Fuel Partnership, are available at: <http://www1.eere.energy.gov/hydrogenandfuelcells/mypp/pdfs/storage.pdf>.

The DOE Hydrogen Program initiated research to develop single wall carbon nanotubes as a storage medium for hydrogen in the early 1990s. At that time, the overall Program had limited resources and storage research and development (R&D) was limited to just a few material classes. Initial hydrogen capacity measurements on nanotubes had appeared promising, but some of these results were subsequently found not to be reproducible. Uncertainty in the performance of carbon nanotubes as a storage material grew as other research groups initiated their own efforts on this material and published hydrogen capacity results ranging from 0 to well over 6 wt.%. Importantly, the differences in hydrogen capacity could not be correlated with specific carbon nanotube synthesis methods or with various properties of the carbon nanotube structure. Although the number of publications and the worldwide level of effort on carbon

nanotube R&D have continued to grow and important progress has been achieved, uncertainties remain concerning hydrogen storage capacity.

Subsequent to the DOE's no-go decision for on-board fuel processing of gasoline in 2004 (see: http://www1.eere.energy.gov/hydrogenandfuelcells/pdfs/committee_report.pdf), the strategy for fueling fuel cell vehicles shifted from an on-board reformer-based fuel system to the development of technologies and infrastructure to produce, store, and distribute hydrogen for on-board storage and use in direct-hydrogen fuel cell vehicles. Development of viable on-board hydrogen storage systems became a critical element within the Program. Consequently, the hydrogen storage Program has greatly expanded and restructured into a "National Hydrogen Storage Project" including three Centers of Excellence and independent projects covering a diverse portfolio of hydrogen storage R&D. Each Center of Excellence is focusing on a class of storage materials—metal (reversible) hydrides, chemical hydrides (non-reversible) and carbon (and other hydrogen adsorbent) materials—and each has university, industry and national lab partners pursuing and leveraging their specific expertise in different areas. The Program has also expanded basic science efforts and coordination between DOE's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and Office of Science (see www.hydrogen.energy.gov).

Within the current storage sub-Program portfolio, there are a number of promising storage materials being studied which have the potential for hydrogen storage capacities comparable to, or greater than initially envisioned for carbon nanotubes. For example, modeling studies of metal-modified carbon fullerene structures suggest that they hold promise for achieving high hydrogen capacities. Non-carbon structures, such as metal-oxide frameworks, are also being pursued in the Center of Excellence for carbon-based materials. On-board hydrogen storage systems must be developed which are safe, low cost and have high volumetric and gravimetric energy capacities. Periodic assessments and decision points on specific material technologies are included within the hydrogen storage sub-Program to meet the required performance targets within the Program timeframe.

The DOE will make a decision regarding the future of pure carbon nanotubes for on-board hydrogen storage activities within the Hydrogen, Fuel Cells and Infrastructure Technologies Program in October 2006.

DOE will review the current state of carbon nanotube activities against technical criteria and base its pure carbon single-wall nanotube go/no-go decision on an analysis of:

(1) The technical progress to date on the demonstrated capacity for hydrogen storage in pure, undoped carbon single-walled nanotubes (SWNTs) and whether SWNTs have met the criterion of 6 weight percent hydrogen storage (on a materials basis) at room temperature, and

(2) Whether a technically viable pathway exists to meet the original criterion of 6 weight percent at room temperature using either pure, undoped SWNTs or a "hybrid" approach (e.g., metal doped nanotubes).

DOE will consider whether its 2007 or 2010 system targets can be met using available pure nanotube technology as demonstrated on the laboratory scale. A single system that meets all criteria simultaneously is desired; however, if integration with other technologies is needed to simultaneously meet all targets, the technologies must be compatible.

DOE will also take into consideration input on the following:

(1) Whether hydrogen adsorption in carbon nanotubes at low temperature (77 K) should be considered at this early stage of the DOE R&D Program (although the original criterion of 6 weight percent was at room temperature), and

(2) Whether SWNTs may be used as model materials for fundamental research, theoretical simulation and an improved understanding of nanoscale hydrogen storage mechanisms and the interplay between factors such as charge/discharge efficiency, thermodynamics/kinetics considerations, and volumetric/gravimetric capacities.

Position papers or other technical documents relevant to the go/no-go decision will be accepted by DOE for consideration in this decision. Position papers are limited to 10 pages maximum, and should contain a cover page with a point of contact, company name, address and e-mail address. The cover page will not be counted in the 10 page limitation. Technical documents, such as published journal articles or preprints, are not restricted to the page limit. Position papers and other technical documents will be made available to the public and should not contain any proprietary information.

For more information about the Hydrogen, Fuel Cells and Infrastructure Technologies Program and related on-board hydrogen storage activities visit the Program's Web site at

www.eere.energy.gov/hydrogenandfuelcells.

Issued in Golden, CO on August 10, 2006.

Matthew A. Barron,

Acting Procurement Director, Golden Field Office.

[FR Doc. E6-14047 Filed 8-23-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER00-3614-004]

BP Energy Company, BP West Coast Products LLC; Notice of Filing

August 18, 2006.

On August 10, 2006, BP Energy Company (BP Energy) and BP West Coast Products LLC filed a supplemental informational filing relating to BP Energy's June 17, 2002 triennial market-power update and June 17, 2005 triennial market power update filed by BP Energy on behalf of itself and its affiliates in the above-captioned dockets.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and § 385.214) on or before 5 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. It is not necessary to separately intervene again in a subdocket related to a compliance filing if you have previously intervened in the same docket. 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. Anyone filing a motion to intervene or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant. In reference to filings initiating a new proceeding, interventions or protests submitted on or before the comment deadline need not be served on persons other than the Applicant.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper, using the FERC Online links at <http://www.ferc.gov>. To facilitate electronic service, persons with Internet access who will eFile a document and/or be listed as a contact for an intervenor must create and validate an eRegistration account using the eRegistration link. Select the eFiling link to log on and submit the intervention or protests.

Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 14 copies

of the intervention or protest to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First St. NE., Washington, DC 20426.

The filings in the above proceedings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the appropriate link in the above list. They are also available for review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an eSubscription link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive e-mail notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please e-mail FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or call (866) 208-3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502-8659.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. Eastern Time on August 31, 2006.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6-14013 Filed 8-23-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP06-430-000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Application

August 17, 2006.

Take notice that on August 15, 2006, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, SE., Charleston, West Virginia, filed in Docket No. CP06-430-000 an application pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), as amended, for authorization to permit Columbia to increase the maximum volume of gas in storage in certain storage fields in Bedford and Washington Counties, Pennsylvania; Kanawha, Randolph, Pocahontas, Putnam, and Preston Counties, West Virginia; and Hocking and Lorain Counties, Ohio, on a temporary basis from August 2006 to April 2007, to a level above the amount currently certificated by the Commission, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. This filing may also be viewed on the Commission's Web site at <http://www.ferc.gov> using the "eLibrary" link. Enter the docket number, excluding the last three digits, in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, call (202) 502-8659 or TTY, (202) 208-3676.

Any questions regarding this application should be directed to Fredric J. George, Lead Counsel, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation, P.O. Box 1273, Charleston West Virginia 25325-1273; telephone (304) 357-2359, fax (304) 357-3206.

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 the comment date stated below, 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 commentors 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 commentors will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, the non-party commentors will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the