

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.gov/us/efi/doorbell.htm>.

David P. Boergers,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-14437 Filed 6-7-01; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

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

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).

interest calculated in accordance with the Commission's regulations.

Copies of the filing were served upon the California Independent System Operator Corporation, the California Public Utilities Commission and all parties to Cities of Anaheim, Azusa, Banning, Colton and Riverside, California v. California Independent System Operator Corporation, Docket No. EL00-111-000, where similar issues concerning the CAISO's neutrality adjustment charges were raised.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest this filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). All such motions or protests must be filed on or before June 21, 2001. 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 motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room. This filing may also be viewed on the Internet at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> (call 202-208-2222) for assistance. Answers to the complaint shall also be due on or before June 21, 2001. 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. 01-14436 Filed 6-7-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 2232-413 South Carolina]

Duke Energy Corporation; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

June 4, 2001.

An environmental assessment (EA) is available for public review. The EA analyzes the environmental impacts of Duke Energy Corporation's (Duke) application to grant a non-project use of project land to City of York (York) to install a pipeline and intake, for raw

water withdrawal, in Lake Wylie, a reservoir for the Catawba-Wateree Hydroelectric Project. Duke's proposed grant would also allow York to withdrawal up to 6 million gallons of water per day from Lake Wylie. The Catawba-Wateree Project is on the Catawba River in Lancaster, York, and Fairfield Counties, South Carolina, and Gaston, Lincoln, and Burke Counties, North Carolina.

The EA was written by staff in the Office of Energy Projects, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. In the EA, Commission staff conclude that approving Duke's application to grant the use would not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Copies of the EA can be viewed on the web at www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm. Call (202) 208-2222 for assistance. Copies are also available for inspection and reproduction at the Commission's Public Reference Room, located at 888 First Street, NE., Room 2A, Washington DC 20426, or by calling (202) 208-1371.

David P. Boergers,
Secretary.
[FR Doc. 01-14438 Filed 6-7-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 2114-091 Washington]

Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County Washington; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

June 4, 2001.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) regulations, 18 CFR part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 FR 47910), the Office of Energy Projects has reviewed Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County's application for an amendment to temporarily waive for the current year the spill flow requirements applicable to its Priest Rapids Project, located on the Columbia River in Grant, Yakima, Kittitas, Douglas, Benton and Chelan Counties, Washington and has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA). The project occupies 3,051.92 acres of federal lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management Department of Energy, Department of Army, Bureau of Reclamation, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The EA contains the staff's analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed amendment and alternatives developed by staff and concludes that approval of the staff recommended alternative would not constitute a major federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

The EA is attached to a Commission order issued on June 1, 2001 for the above application. Copies of the EA are available for review at the Commission's Public Reference Room, located at 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, or by calling (202) 208-1371. The EA may be viewed on the web at www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm (call (202) 208-2222 for assistance).

For further information, contact Charles Hall at (202) 219-2853.

David P. Boergers,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-14466 Filed 6-7-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Application Accepted for Filing and Soliciting Comments, Motions To Intervene, and Protests

May 31, 2001.

Take notice that the following hydroelectric application has been filed with the Commission and is available for public inspection:

- a. *Type of Application:* Preliminary Permit.
- b. *Project No:* 11986-000.
- c. *Date Filed:* May 4, 2001.
- d. *Applicant:* Symbiotics, LLC.
- e. *Name of Project:* Seven Oaks Dam Hydroelectric Project.
- f. *Location:* The proposed project would be located on an existing dam owned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, on the Santa Ana River in San Bernardino County, California. Part of the project would be on lands administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- g. *Filed Pursuant to:* Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. 791(a)-825(r).
- h. *Applicant Contact:* Mr. Brent L. Smith, President, Northwest Power Services, Inc., P.O. Box 535, Rigby, ID 83442, (208) 745-8630, (fax) (208) 745-7909, or e-mail address: npsihydro@aol.com.
- i. *FERC Contact:* Any questions on this notice should be addressed to Mr. Lynn R. Miles, Sr. at (202) 219-2671, or e-mail address: lynn.miles@ferc.fed.us.