

Commission's Regulations. Transco asserts that the addition of the delivery point will have no significant impact on Transco's peak day or annual deliveries, and is not prohibited by Transco's FERC Gas Tariff.

Transco states that the estimated cost of the proposed facilities is approximately \$888,200. Transco indicates that Sweetheart will reimburse Transco for all costs associated with such facilities.

Any questions regarding the prior notice request should be directed to Paul Gredell, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, P.O. Box 1396, Houston, Texas 77251-1396, at (713) 215-2197.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to section 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205), a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to section 7 of the Natural Gas Act. Comments and protests 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-2094 Filed 1-28-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP96-359-007]

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation; Notice of Negotiated Rate Contracts

January 23, 2002.

Take notice that on January 15, 2002 Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco) tendered for filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) copies of executed service agreements that contain a negotiated rate under Rate Schedule FT applicable to Public

Service Electric & Gas Company (PSE&G) and Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company (WEM&T) of the MarketLink Expansion Project Phase I customers. These service agreements are the result of the permanent capacity release of a previously filed and reviewed Phase I MarketLink service agreement containing a negotiated rate. The effective date of the permanent capacity release and therefore these negotiated rate transactions is December 19, 2001.

Transco states that the purpose of the instant filing is to reflect one of the MarketLink Expansion Project customers, WEM&T, permanently released, effective December 19, 2001, 50,000 dt per day of its 100,000 dt per day of firm Phase 1 MarketLink capacity to PSE&G at the same negotiated rate and primary term. The permanent release of firm MarketLink capacity was effectuated pursuant to Section 42.12 of the General Terms and Conditions of Transco's FERC Gas Tariff. Accordingly, Transco hereby files with the Commission the negotiated rate agreements under Rate Schedule FT applicable to WEM&T and PSE&G to reflect this permanent capacity release.

Transco states that copies of the filing are being mailed to its affected customers and interested State Commissions. In accordance with the provisions of Sections 154.2(d) of the Commission's Regulations, copies of this filing are available for public inspection, during regular business hours in a convenient form and place at Transco's main offices at 2800 Post Oak Boulevard in Houston, Texas.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be filed in accordance with section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. 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 proceedings. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection. This filing may also be viewed on the Web at <http://www.ferc.gov> using the "RIMS" link, select "Docket#" and follow the instructions (call 202-208-2222 for assistance). 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 under the "e-Filing" link.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-2104 Filed 1-28-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. OR02-3-000]

Ultramar Inc. Complainant, v. Calnev Pipe Line, L.L.C. Respondent; Notice of Complaint

January 23, 2002.

Take notice that on January 18, 2002, pursuant to Rule 206 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.206) and the Procedural Rules Applicable to Oil Pipeline Procedures (18 CFR 343, *et seq.*), Ultramar Inc. (Ultramar) filed a Complaint and Motion for Consolidation in the above captioned proceeding. Ultramar alleges that Calnev Pipe Line, L.L.C. (Calnev) has violated the Interstate Commerce Act, 49 U.S.C. App. § 1, *et seq.*, by charging unjust and unreasonable rates for Calnev's jurisdictional interstate services associated with its lines originating at Colton in San Bernardino County, California, to stations at two interstate destinations in Clark County, Nevada, one at McCarran Field and the other at North Las Vegas as more fully set forth in the Complaint. To the extent that any of Calnev's rates may be deemed just and reasonable under § 1803 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, Public Law 102-486, 106 Stat. 2776 (1992), Ultramar alleges that there has been a substantial change in the economic circumstances on which the rates are based.

Ultramar requests that the Commission: (1) Examine the challenged rates and charges collected by Calnev for its jurisdictional interstate services; (2) order reparations to Ultramar, including appropriate interest thereon, for the applicable reparation periods to the extent the Commission finds that such rates or charges were unlawful; (3) determine just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory rates for Calnev's jurisdictional interstate service; (4) award Ultramar reasonable attorneys' and experts' fees and costs; and (5) order such other relief as may be appropriate.

Ultramar states that it has served the Complaint on Calnev pursuant to Rule 206 of the Commission's Rules of