delegation (Department of Energy, Department of Commerce and Department of State) of the North American Energy Working Group (NAEWG) Electricity Regulatory Issues Group of Experts, and a request for comments.

DATES: The Department of Energy will host a public workshop to hear the views of U.S. stakeholders at the following date, time and location. Those planning to attend the workshop should register by calling 202 586–5125,

—February 13, 2002/9 a.m.—4 p.m./ Washington, DC.Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Ave., SW, Room 1E–245

Public Participation: The workshops are open to the public. Written comments can be submitted at the workshop or to the address below on or before February 13, 2002. E-mailed comments are preferable.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to: Debra.Smith@hq.doe.gov or Debra Smith, US DOE, Office of Policy and International Affairs, PI–32, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW Washington, DC 20585.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: President Bush and Mexican President Fox, during President Bush's visit to Mexico on February 16, 2001, and President Bush and Canadian Premier Chretien, during a subsequent visit to Washington, DC, agreed to the development of a North American Energy Initiative. The Initiative is being developed by the NAEWG. In March 2001, Secretary Abraham, Minister of Natural Resources Canada Goodale, and Mexican Secretary of Energy Martens, met in Mexico City and agreed to the overarching principles and approach that would govern the NAEWG. President Bush's National Energy Policy, released in May 2001, directed the Secretaries of Energy, State, Commerce, to engage in a dialogue with Canada and Mexico through the NAEWG.

The broad goals of the NAEWG are to foster communication and cooperation among the governments and energy sectors of the three countries; enhance North American energy trade, development and interconnections; and promote regional integration and increased energy security for the people of North America. The NAEWG agreed to three areas of work to be carried out by three Groups of Experts. One such group, the Electricity Regulatory Issues Group of Experts, was formed to examine key regulatory issues associated with North American electricity markets, such as reliability, regional transmission organizations, and transmission access. Canada led the Electricity Experts Group which drafted a discussion paper and made recommendations to the NAEWG as to further actions. One recommendation accepted by the NAEWG suggested soliciting stakeholder input regarding the Experts Group discussion paper and other issues identified in this Supplementary Information section.

The purpose of the workshop is to solicit public comments on the issues raised in the Draft Discussion Paper with a view to better enable the Group of Experts to further its work and, in particular, to solicit public comments on the following question, drafted by the Group of Experts, to facilitate discussion:

What issues present challenges to Regional Transmission Organizations with international members? Issues that should be explored by stakeholders include, but are not limited to, organization, governance, rates, reliability standards, enforcement, and dispute resolution and transmission access.

Issued in Washington, DC, on January 11, 2002.

Vicky Bailey,

Assistant Secretary, Office of Policy and International Affairs.

[FR Doc. 02–1226 Filed 1–16–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Information Collection Submitted for Review and Request for Comments (IC01–521–001 FERC–521)

January 11, 2002.

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of submission for review by 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 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 received no comments in response to an earlier **Federal Register** notice of October 9, 2001 (66 FR 51416). The Commission has noted this fact in its submission to OMB.

DATES: Comments regarding this collection of information are best assured of having their full effect if received on or before February 19, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Address comments to Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Desk Officer, 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 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, 888 First Street NE, Washington, D.C. 20426.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Miller may be reached by telephone at (202)208–1415, by fax at (202)208–2425, and by e-mail: *mike.miller@ferc.fed.us.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Description

The energy information collection submitted to OMB for review contains:

1. *Collection of Information:* FERC–521 ''Headwaters Benefits''

2. *Sponsor:* Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

3. *Control No.:* OMB No. 1902–0087. The Commission is now requesting that OMB approve a three-year extension of the current expiration date, with no changes to the existing collection. This is a mandatory information collection requirement.

4. *Necessity of Collection of Information:* Submission of the information is necessary to fulfill the requirements of Section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act (FPA). The reporting requirements associated with FERC–521 are codified at 18 CFR Part 11 of the Commission's regulations.

FERC–521 implements the Commission's regulations for the determination of headwater benefits derived by downstream parties. The regulations set forth a formula for determining an equitable apportionment of the annual charges for interest, maintenance, and depreciation for a storage reservoir or other headwater improvement owned by the United States, a licensee, or pre-1920 permittee. Headwater benefits are the additional energy production possible at a downstream hydropower project. Under Section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act, an owner of a hydropower project is required to reimburse upstream headwater project owners for an equitable part of the benefits it receives. This includes paying equitable portions of annual charges for interest, maintenance, and depreciation of the headwater project to the U.S. Treasury.

The Commissions regulations provide for apportionment of the costs between the headwater project and down-stream projects based on downstream energy gains and propose equitable apportionment methodology that can be applied to all river basins in which headwater improvements are built. In determining energy gains, the size and efficiency of the turbines and their generators, and the load to be served will remain constant, while streamflow, reservoir storage, and head will vary depending on the operating conditions of the upstream reservoirs. Because head and streamflow determine the amount of energy produced at the hydropower project, a relationship that the generation is a function of the head and streamflow can be developed. Commission experience has shown that the relationship between generation and streamflow is an adequate tool for estimating generation in calculating energy gains. The information submitted enables the Commission to carry out its responsibilities in implementing the statutory provisions of the FPA.

Respondent Description: The respondent universe currently comprises on average, five entities subject to the Commission's jurisdiction.

6. *Estimated Burden:* 200 total burden hours, five respondents, one response annually, 40 hours per response (average).

7. *Estimated Cost Burden to Respondents:* 200 hours ÷ 2,080 hours per year × $117,041 per year = $11,254, average cost per respondent = $2,250.

Statutory Authority: Section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803).

C.B. Spencer,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–1229 Filed 1–16–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–U

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP02–143–000]

Kansas Gas Service, A Division of ONEOK, Inc., Complainant, v. Enbridge Pipelines (KPC), Respondent; Notice of Complaint

January 11, 2002.

Take notice that, on January 10, 2002, pursuant to Rule 206 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.206 (2001), Kansas Gas Service, a Division of ONEOK, Inc. (Kansas Gas Service) tendered for filing a Complaint against Enbridge Pipelines (KPC).

Kansas Gas Service alleges that: (1) KPC is violating the terms of certain service agreements with Kansas Gas Service, which are part of KPC's approved FERC Gas tariff, by failing to charge lower rates under those service agreements, and (2) KPC's obligation to charge the lower rates was triggered by a separate written agreement, a July 9, 1997 Settlement Agreement, in which KPC, in consideration for Kansas Gas Service's payment of: (1) $7.5 million in August 1997, and (2) rates based on an annual cost of service of $31 million from August 1997 through July 2001, agreed to charge Kansas Gas Service, under the service agreements, a lower Zone 3 rate, effective August 1, 1998, and lower rates based on Williams Gas Pipelines Central's rates for comparable service, effective August 1, 2001.

Kansas Gas Service requests that the Commission determine that: (1) KPC's actions and inaction described in the Complaint constitute unjust and unreasonable rates and rate practices in violation of its FERC Gas tariff and Section 4 of the Natural Gas Act; and (2) KPC should take steps necessary to implement the Settlement Agreement rates as discounted or negotiated rates (and bill Kansas Gas Service accordingly) in order to comply with its tariff and give full effect to the ''motion rates,'' which KPC urged the Commission to approve in February 1998. Kansas Gas Service further requests that the Commission affirm that: (1) The Commission, in its April 2, 1999 Order in Docket No. CP96–152, 87 FERC ¶ 61,020, did not intend to interpret its various provisions, nor did it intend to void, or otherwise disturb the Agreement, or adjudicate the issue of whether the Settlement Agreement amended the then existing contracts between KPC and Kansas Gas Service; (2) Kansas Gas Service's claims for common law relief based on KPC's breach of contract, repudiation, fraud and breach of the duty of good faith and fair dealing, as pleaded in Kansas Gas Service's Petition in Kansas state court, belong properly in state court in accordance with Commission and court precedent; and (3) if the relief sought by Kansas Gas Service in its state court Petition were granted, such relief would neither violate the filed rate doctrine nor impinge upon the Commission's jurisdiction under the NGA.

Kansas Gas Service requests that the Commission complete action on the Complaint within 110 days, in accordance with the time standards established in Order No. 602 for a decision on the pleadings, III FERC Stats. and Regs. ¶ 31,071, on reh'g and clarification, 88 FERC ¶ 61,114 (1999).

In accordance with subsection (f) of Rule 206, answers, interventions and comments must be filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, on or before January 30, 2002. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection. This filing may also be viewed on the Commission's Web site at *http://www.ferc.gov* using the ''RIMS'' link, select ''Docket #'' and follow the instructions ((202)208–2222 for assistance).

C.B. Spencer,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–1232 Filed 1–16–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP01–141–000]

PG&E Gas Transmission, Northwest Corporation; Notice of Technical Conference

January 11, 2002.

On August 6, 2001, the Commission issued an order granting PG&E Gas Transmission, Northwest Corporation (PG&E Transmission) a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing a proposed pipeline expansion project. 96 FERC ¶ 61,194 (2001). The PG&E Transmission certificate was conditioned upon PG&E Transmission developing a fuel surcharge mechanism to ensure that expansion shippers, rather than existing shippers, be responsible for all fuel costs above those attributable to fuel absent the proposed expansion's additional 97,500 horsepower of compression. On October 26, 2001, on rehearing, the Commission reiterated its rationale for and affirmed the imposition of this fuel surcharge. 97 FERC ¶ 61,101 (2001).

On November 26, 2001, PG&E Transmission filed a motion requesting the Commission reconsider the fuel surcharge for expansion shippers. Alternatively, PG&E Transmission requests the Commission initiate a technical conference to discuss aspects of the fuel charge. PG&E Transmission states that without further guidance it is unable to develop an incremental