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.

Motions to intervene, protests and comments 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: August 17, 2006.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6–12511 Filed 8–2–06; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. EL06-91-000, P-12252-023]

Fourth Branch Associates (Mechanicville), Complainant, v Hudson River-Black Regulating District, Respondent; Notice of Complaint

July 27, 2006.

On July 25, 2006, Fourth Branch Associates (Fourth Branch) filed a formal complaint against Hudson River-Black River Regulating District (District) pursuant to Rule 206 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.206 (2006), and section 306 of the Federal Power Act (FPA), 16 U.S.C. 825(e).

In 2002, the Commission issued an original license to the District for the continued operation of the Great Sacandaga Lake Project No. 12252.¹ The project is located on the Sacandaga River, a tributary of the Hudson River. Fourth Branch is the licensee for the Mechanicville Project No. 6032, located on the Hudson River downstream of the

Sacandaga River.²

Fourth Branch alleges that when the District became a licensee in 2002, its annual assessment of charges against Fourth Branch to cover a portion of the District's costs of operating and maintaining Great Sacandaga Lake came under the headwater benefits provisions of section 10(f) of the FPA, 16 U.S.C. 803(f) (2000), and sections 11.10 through 11.17 of the Commission's regulations, 18 CFR 11.10-11.17 (2006). Fourth Branch further alleges that since 2002, the District has continued to assess and collect these charges from Fourth Branch notwithstanding the absence of an agreement with Fourth Branch for those charges or Commission approval of the charges. Moreover, Fourth Branch contends, despite Commission orders in 2002 and 2004 requiring the District to submit both its headwater benefits charges agreement and actual charges to the Commission for approval, the District has failed to do so, and is therefore in violation of the FPA and the Commission's regulations.

Fourth Branch certifies that copies of the complaint were served on the District, as well as all Hudson River hydroelectric and municipal flood control recipients of annual assessment bills from the District.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest this filing 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). 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 notice of intervention or motion to intervene, as appropriate. The Respondent's answer and all interventions, or protests must be filed on or before the comment date. The Respondent's answer, motions to intervene, and protests must be served on the Complainants.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the "eFiling" link at http://www.ferc.gov. Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 14 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426.

This filing is accessible on-line at http://www.ferc.gov, using the "eLibrary" link and is 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 16, 2006.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6–12507 Filed 8–2–06; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings #1

July 28, 2006

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric corporate filings:

Docket Numbers: EC06–143–000. Applicants: Mesquite Investors, L.L.C.; Chaparral Investors, L.L.C.; Capital District Energy Center Cogeneration Associates; Hartford

 $^{^1}$ Hudson River-Black River Regulating District, 100 FERC ¶ 61,319 (2002); order on rehearing, 102 FERC ¶ 61,133 (2003).

 $^{^2\,\}rm There$ are a number of other licensed projects located downstream of the District's project.

 $^{^3}$ See 100 FERC \P 61,319 at P 47–49; and 102 FERC \P 61,133 at P 13–14.