Please specify the complete title of the information collection when making your request. Comments regarding burden and/or the collection activity requirements should be directed to Kathy Axt at her internet address *Kathy.Axt@ed.gov.* Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339.

[FR Doc. 01–14434 Filed 6–7–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. IC01–542–001, FERC–542]

Information Collection Submitted for Review and Request for Comments

June 4, 2001.

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of submission for review of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) has submitted the energy information collection listed in this notice to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review under the provisions of section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13). Any interested person may file comments on the collection of information directly with OMB and should address a copy of those comments to the Commission as explained below. The Commission did not receive comments in response to an earlier **Federal Register** notice of January 24, 2001 (66 FR 7634) and has made a notation in this submission.

DATES: Comments regarding this collection are best assured of having their full effect if received on or before July 9, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Address comments to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Desk Officer, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington DC 20503. A copy of the comments should also be sent to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Attention: Mr. Michael Miller, CI–1, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426. Mr. Miller may be reached by telephone at (202) 208–1415, by fax at (202) 208–2425, and by e-mail at *mike.miller@ferc.fed.us.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Description

The energy information submitted to OMB for review contains:

1. *Collection of Information:* FERC–542 ''Gas Pipeline Rates: Rate Tracking''

2. *Sponsor:* Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

3. *Control No:* 1902–0070. The Commission is requesting reinstatement, without change, of the previously approved data collection for which approval expired December 31, 2000, and a three-year approval of the collection of data. This is a mandatory information collection requirement.

4. *Necessity of Collection of Information:* Submission of the information is necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its responsibilities in implementing provisions of Sections 4, 5, and 16 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Title IV of the Natural Gas Policy Act (NGPA), 15 U.S.C. 3301–3432. These statutes empower the Commission to collect natural gas transmission cost information from interstate natural gas transporters for the purposes of verifying that these costs, which are passed on to pipeline companies, are just and reasonable. The Commission implements these requirements in 18 CFR 154.4; 154.7; 154.101; 154.107; 154.201; 154.207–.209 and 154.401–.403. Interstate natural gas pipelines are required by the Commission to track their transportation associated costs to allow for the Commission's review and where appropriate, approval of the through of these costs to pipeline customers. Most of the FERC–542 tracking filings are scheduled accountings of the cost of fuel or electric power necessary to operate compressor stations. Other track the costs of Gas Research Institute fees, the Commission's annul charge adjustment assessments, and various cost reimbursements.

Tracking filings may be submitted to any time or on a regularly scheduled basis in accordance with the pipeline company's tariff. Filings may be either: (1) Accepted; (2) suspended and set for hearing; (3) suspended, but not set for hearing; or (4) suspended for further review, such as technical conference or some other type of Commission action.

5. *Respondent Description:* The respondent universe currently comprises approximately 55 natural gas pipeline companies.

6. *Estimated Burden:* 23,100 total burden hours, 55 respondents, 165 responses annually, 140 hours per response.

Authority: Sections 4, 5 and 16 of the NGA (15 U.S.C. 717–717w) and Title IV of the Natural Gas Policy Act (NGPA), 15 U.S.C. 3301–3432.

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–14435 Filed 6–7–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP01–376–000]

Intermountain Municipal Gas Agency and Questar Gas Company; Notice of Petition for Declaratory Order

June 4, 2001.

On May 25, 2001, the Intermountain Municipal Gas Agency (IMGA) [1] and Questar Gas Company (Questar Gas), formerly Mountain Fuel Supply Company, filed a joint petition for a declaratory order by the Commission addressing jurisdictional issues raised by an agreement under which Questar Gas is to undertake natural gas transportation services for municipalities in Utah and Arizona for operation of their retain natural gas utilities.[2]

Questar Gas has agreed to provide transportation service to municipalities in Utah pursuant to a settlement agreement approved by the Public Service Commission of Utah (Utah PSC). The petitioners' joint filing may be viewed on the web at *http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm* (call 202–208–2222 for assistance).

Questar Gas' northern Utah distribution system, which is a designated service area pursuant to section 7(f) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA),[3] includes Questar Gas' southern Idaho and northern Utah distribution facilities. Questar Gas' southern distribution system operates as an exempt Hinshaw system pursuant to NGA section 1(c). Questar Gas' northern

[1] IMGA is a group of Utah municipalities organized pursuant to the Interlocal Cooperation Act, Title 11 Chapter 13 of the Utah Code, which allows Utah municipalities to organize a cooperative legal entity having the same powers as a municipality including those given by the statute.

[2] Although the municipalities presently have requested only transportation service, Questar Gas believes the same issues will arise if it is requested in the future to make sales of natural gas for resale by the municipalities.

[3] 82 FERC ¶16,057 (1998).

and southern distribution systems are not interconnected.

Acting at the direction of member municipalities, including Hildale, Utah, Colorado City, Arizona, Kanab, Utah, and Fredonia, Arizona, IMGA has requested that Questar Gas deliver interstate gas supplies from its interconnections with interstate pipelines to the interconnection between Questar Gas' southern system feeder line and Hildale's municipal pipeline at the City of Hurricane, Utah. From that point, the gas supplies would then be transported by IMGA through Hildale's 22-mile municipal pipeline to Hildale, Utah. Some of the gas would then be delivered to a planned municipal pipeline that would cross the Utah border into northern Arizona and then back into Utah, terminating at Kanab, Utah, to service only the residents of Kanab, Utah. In the alternative, a new municipal pipeline could be jointly built to serve not only Kanab, Utah, but also Colorado City, Arizona, and Fredonia, Arizona. The Kaibab Paiute Indian tribe in Arizona may also participate.[4] Each city would connect to the pipeline and distribute and sell the gas through a municipal utility to their respective residential, commercial and industrial end-users.

In a recent proceeding before the Utah PSC, Hildale and IMGA requested that the Utah PSC order Questar Gas to provide wholesale transportation service for Hildale and similarly situated Utah municipalities. Under the terms of a stipulation resulting in an approved settlement in that proceeding, Questar Gas has agreed to provide such wholesale transportation service, provided it does not jeopardize Questar Gas' NGA section 1(c) Hinshaw exemption.

Accordingly, the petition seeks a declaratory order addressing Questar Gas' concerns regarding the jurisdictional consequences of providing transportation service directly to Kanab, Utah, where the pipeline serving Kanab crosses into Arizona before reentering Utah, and to municipalities, like Colorado City and Fredonia, Arizona, located outside of Utah. Questar Gas requests that the Commission address the jurisdictional implications of such transportation services on Questar's existing NGA section 1(c) Hinshaw exemption for its southern distribution system and Questar Gas' ability to seek in the future a service area determination for this system under NGA section 7(f).

The petition seeks clarification regarding whether Questar Gas would need NGA certificate authority, such as a blanket transportation certificate issued pursuant to section 284.224 of the Commission's regulations (18 CFR 284.224), to render wholesale transportation service or to construct facilities for transportation of gas to municipal utilities located within Questar Gas' existing designated NGA section 7(f) service area or any such service area designated for Questar Gas in the future. In addition, the petition raises the issue of whether Questar Gas would lose its Hinshaw exemption by providing wholesale transportation service, constructing facilities for such service, or connecting its northern section 7(f) system to its southern Hinshaw system so that gas could flow from one to the other.

IMGA requests clarification of the rate implications for Utah municipalities presently receiving wholesale transportation from Questar Gas, as a Hinshaw pipeline, if Questar Gas accepts a section 284.224 blanket transportation certificate to authorize Questar Gas' transportation of gas that ultimately would be distributed by municipal utilities in non-Utah cities.

The petition also raises the issue of whether Questar Gas may elect, pursuant to the Commission's regulations governing service under a section 284.224 blanket certificate, to charge the Utah PSC's currently approved rate for Questar Gas' existing Hinshaw transportation services for municipal utilities in Utah as Questar Gas' rate for transportation service for Arizona municipalities.

There are two ways to become involved in the Commission's review of this petition. First, any person wishing to obtain legal status by becoming a party to the proceeding should, on or before June 25, 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 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (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 applicants 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 the comments in support of or in opposition to matters raised in the petition. The Commission will consider these comments in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but the filing of a comment will not serve to make the filer a party to the proceeding. The Commission's rules require that persons filing comments in opposition provide copies of their protests only to the party or parties directly involved in the protest.

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 at *http://www/ferc/fed/us/efi/doorbell/htm.*

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01–14437 Filed 6–7–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[4] The petition notes that Indian tribes are identified as entities that can participate in intergovernmental agreements with municipalities under Arizona law A.R.S. 11–951 (1998).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EL01–84–000]

Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District v. California Independent System Operator Corporation; Notice of Complaint

June 4, 2001.

Take notice that on June 1, 2001, Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District (SRP) submitted a Complaint against the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO) pursuant to Section 206 of the Federal Power Act (FPA) 16 U.S.C. 824e. SRP alleges that the CAISO over collected neutrality adjustment charges from SRP, for the time period January 2000 through December 31, 2000, in violation of the FPA, the rate cap contained in CAISO's tariff and orders of the Commission. SRP also alleges that the CAISO off-set these erroneous charges against payments owed by the CAISO to SRP for power supplies and that the CAISO's tariff violations are discouraging suppliers from providing wholesale power to the CAISO, contrary to the Commission's policy goals. SRP seeks refunds of the alleged over charges, plus