

*E. Major Studies*

## 1. 2012 REP Settlement Agreement Study and Analysis

The 2012 REP Settlement Agreement Study and Analysis (REP Study) describes the terms of the 2012 REP Settlement and provides the analytical work BPA staff is performing to test the reasonableness of the 2012 REP Settlement. The REP Study is comprised of two major parts.

Part I of the REP Study reviews the history of the REP and the background underlying the current litigation. This portion of the REP Study also contains an overview of the section 7(b)(2) rate test and a description of how rate protection works in BPA ratemaking. Part I also describes the terms of the proposed 2012 REP Settlement and explains how BPA staff intends to implement the terms of the proposed settlement in BPA's rates.

Part II of the REP Study contains BPA staff's evaluation and analysis of the 2012 REP Settlement. This portion of the REP Study begins with an explanation of the criteria BPA staff is using to evaluate the 2012 REP Settlement. This section is followed by an overview of the models BPA staff developed to create a variety of near- and long-term forecasts of REP benefits under various scenarios. Part II of the REP Study also describes the various factors that will have an effect on REP benefits, such as the current and future issues in litigation and issues related to ASCs and the PF Exchange rate. At the end of Part II of the REP Study, BPA staff presents its scenario analysis. In this section, BPA staff presents near- and long-term REP benefits under different scenarios. These scenario REP benefits are compared to the REP benefits provided under the proposed 2012 REP Settlement to determine, from an analytical perspective, whether the 2012 REP Settlement affords rate protection to COUs and is otherwise reasonable.

## 2. FY 2012–2013 7(b)(2) Rate Test and Documentation

This Study will be used only if the 2012 REP Settlement is not adopted.

BPA has interpreted the Northwest Power Act and described how the section 7(b)(2) rate test will be performed in the *Section 7(b)(2) Legal Interpretation (Legal Interpretation)* and *Section 7(b)(2) Implementation Methodology (Implementation Methodology)* published in August, 2008. The Section 7(b)(2) Rate Test Study explains and documents the results of the rate test.

The 7(b)(2) rate test triggers in this proposal if no REP settlement is assumed, creating rate protection for preference customers and causing test period costs to be reallocated to others. The PF Public rate applied to the general requirements of COUs has been reduced by the rate protection amount and reallocated to other rates pursuant to section 7(b)(3). BPA's other rates, the PF Exchange rate and the NR and IP rates, have been increased by an allocation of the rate protection amount. An allocation of the rate protection amount has also been assigned to surplus power sales.

## 3. FY 2012–2013 Lookback Study

This Study will only be used if the 2012 REP Settlement is not adopted.

This Study explains and documents BPA's proposed modifications to the amounts to be recovered from the IOUs and applied to the Lookback Amounts determined in the final WP–07 Supplemental Proposal. The Study also sets forth the accounting of the Lookback Amounts expected to be recovered from IOUs and repaid to COUs during the FY 2012–2013 rate period. BPA also explains in this Study what amount of Lookback will be recovered from IOUs and returned to applicable COUs for the FY 2012–2013 rate period.

**Part VI—Proposed 2012 REP Settlement Agreement**

On December 17, 2010, a draft of the proposed 2012 REP Settlement will be available for viewing and downloading on BPA's Web site at <http://www.bpa.gov/corporate/ratecase/2012/rep-12.cfm>. Copies of the draft 2012 REP Settlement will also be available for viewing in BPA's Public Reference Room at the BPA Headquarters, 1st Floor, 905 NE. 11th Avenue, Portland, OR 97232.

Issued this 7th day of December 2010.

**Stephen J. Wright,**

*Administrator and Chief Executive Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2010–31622 Filed 12–15–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY****Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. IC10–542–001, FERC–542]

**Commission Information Collection Activities, Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Submitted for OMB Review**

December 9, 2010.

**AGENCY:** Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the requirements of section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3507, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or the Commission) has submitted the information collection described below to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and extension of this information collection requirement. Any interested person may file comments 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 August 2010 (75 FR 45609) and has notified OMB of this in its submission.

**DATES:** Further comments on this collection of information are due by January 18, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Address further comments on this collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Desk Officer. Comments to OMB should be filed electronically, c/o [oir\\_submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:oir_submission@omb.eop.gov) and include OMB Control Number 1902–0070 for reference. The Desk Officer may be reached by telephone at 202–395–4638.

A copy of the comments should also be sent to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and should refer to Docket No. IC10–542–001. Comments may be filed either electronically or in paper format. Those persons filing electronically do not need to make a paper filing. Documents filed electronically via the Internet must be prepared in an acceptable filing format and in compliance with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission submission guidelines. Complete filing instructions and acceptable filing formats are available at <http://www.ferc.gov/help/submission-guide.asp>. To file the document

electronically, access the Commission's Web site and click on Documents & Filing, E-Filing (<http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling.asp>), and then follow the instructions for each screen. First-time users will have to establish a user name and password. The Commission will send an automatic acknowledgement to the sender's e-mail address upon receipt of comments.

For paper filings, the comments should be submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Secretary of the Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, and should refer to Docket No. IC10-542-001.

Users interested in receiving automatic notification of activity in FERC Docket Number IC10-542 may do so through eSubscription at <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/esubscription.asp>. All comments may be viewed, printed or downloaded remotely via the Internet through

FERC's homepage using the "eLibrary" link. For user assistance, contact [ferconlinesupport@ferc.gov](mailto:ferconlinesupport@ferc.gov) or toll-free at (866) 208-3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502-8659.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Ellen Brown may be reached by e-mail at [DataClearance@FERC.gov](mailto:DataClearance@FERC.gov), by telephone at (202) 502-8663, and by fax at (202) 273-0873.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The information collected under the requirements of FERC-542 "Gas Pipeline Rates: Rate Tracking" (OMB No. 1902-0070) is used by the Commission to implement the statutory provisions of Title IV of the Natural Gas Policy Act (NGPA), 15 U.S.C. 3301-3432, and Sections 4, 5 and 16 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) (P.L. 75-688) (15 U.S.C. 717-717w). These statutes empower the Commission to collect natural gas transmission cost information from interstate natural gas transporters for the purpose of verifying

that these costs, which are passed on to pipeline customers, are just and reasonable.

Interstate natural gas pipeline companies are required by the Commission to track their transportation-associated costs to allow for the Commission's review and, where appropriate, approve the pass-through of these costs to pipeline customers. These FERC-542 tracking filings are accountings of the cost of (1) Research, development, and deployment expenditures; (2) annual charge adjustments; and (3) periodic rate adjustments.

**ACTION:** The Commission is requesting a three-year extension of the FERC-542 reporting requirements, with the burden and cost estimates published in its August 2010 Notice. There is no change to the reporting requirements.

*Burden Statement:* The public reporting burden for this collection is estimated as:

| FERC data collection | Annual number of respondents | Number of responses per respondent | Average burden hours per response | Total annual burden hours |
|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
|                      | (1)                          | (2)                                | (3)                               | (1) × (2) × (3)           |
| FERC-542 .....       | 95                           | 3.5                                | 40                                | 13,300                    |

The FERC's estimated cost burden to respondents is \$881,598 (13,300 hours/2080 hours<sup>1</sup> times \$137,874<sup>2</sup>). The cost per respondent is \$9,280.

The reporting burden includes the total time, effort, or financial resources expended to generate, maintain, retain, disclose, or provide the information including: (1) Reviewing instructions; (2) developing, acquiring, installing, and utilizing technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, verifying, processing, maintaining, disclosing and providing information; (3) adjusting the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; (4) training personnel to respond to a collection of information; (5) searching data sources; (6) completing and reviewing the collection of information; and (7) transmitting, or otherwise disclosing the information. The estimate of cost for respondents is based upon salaries for professional and clerical support, as well as direct and indirect overhead costs. Direct costs include all costs directly attributable to providing this information, such as administrative costs and the cost for information technology. Indirect or overhead costs

are costs incurred by an organization in support of its mission. These costs apply to activities which benefit the whole organization rather than any one particular function or activity.

Comments are invited on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

**Kimberly D. Bose,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2010-31564 Filed 12-15-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6717-01-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Project No. 2594-013-MT]

**Northern Lights, Inc.; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment**

December 9, 2010.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) regulations, 18 CFR Part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 FR 47879), the Office of Energy Projects has reviewed the application for a new license for the existing Lake Creek Hydroelectric Project, located on Lake Creek in Lincoln County, Montana, near the City of Troy and prepared a final environmental assessment (EA). The project does not occupy federal lands.

The Final EA contains the staff's analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the project and concludes that licensing the project would not constitute a major federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

A copy of the Final EA is on file with the Commission and is available for public inspection. The Final EA may

<sup>1</sup> Number of hours an employee works each year.

<sup>2</sup> Average annual salary per employee.