The pre-filing consultation process combines efforts to address NGA issues with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review process into a single pre-filing collaborative process that also includes the administrative processes associated with the Clean Water Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species Act and other relevant statutes. Combining the prefiling consultation and environmental review into a single pre-filing process simplifies and expedites the authorization of gas facilities and services.

The Commission uses the information to determine the appropriateness of the proposed facilities and their proposed location. The determination involves among other things, an examination of adequacy of design, cost, reliability, redundancy and environmental acceptability. The information is necessary for the Commission to make a determination that the facilities and location are consistent with the public interest. The Commission implements these filing requirements in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) under 18 CFR

5. Respondent Description: The respondent universe currently comprises 12 companies (on average) subject to the Commission's jurisdiction

6. Estimated Burden: 2,886 total hours, 12 respondents(average), 1 response per respondent, 241 hours per response (average).

7. Estimated Cost Burden to respondents: 2,886 hours / 2080 hours per years \times \$117,041 per year = \$162,394. The cost per respondent is equal to \$13,533.00.

Statutory Authority: Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. 717–717w.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-9522 Filed 4-16-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP03-84-000]

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation; Notice of Application

April 11, 2003.

Take notice that on April 2, 2003, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco), filed pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), an application, in abbreviated form, for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing

Transco's replacement of certain pipeline facilities in Mobile County, Alabama, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. This filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at http:// www.ferc.gov using the "FERRIS" link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or tollfree at (866) 208-3676, or for TTY,

contact (202) 502-8659.

Transco states that due to recent increases in the population density along its Mobile Bay Lateral, it must upgrade approximately 1.45 miles of pipeline in Mobile County, Alabama, in order to ensure compliance with USDOT regulations at 49 CFR 192.611 and maintain certificated service and the safety and reliability of the Mobile Bay Lateral. The replacement will take place in an area recently classified as meeting the DOT Class 3 Regulations, as defined at 49 CFR 192.5(b)(3)(i).

Transco requests an order granting the authorization requested by July 10, 2003. Transco states that this date is requested to enable commencement of the replacement activities on or about August 4, 2003, in order to restore service by September 15, 2003. Transco estimates the replacement costs to be \$4.0 million.

There are two ways to become involved in the Commission's review of this project. First, any person wishing to obtain legal status by becoming a party to the proceedings for this project should, on or before the comment date stated below, 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 NGA (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 in the proceeding, with the Commission and must mail a copy to the applicant and to every other party. 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 comments in support of or in opposition to this project. The Commission will consider these comments in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but the filing of a comment alone will not serve to make the filer a party to the proceeding. The Commission's rules require that persons filing comments in opposition to the project provide copies of their protests only to the party or parties directly involved in the protest.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project should submit an original and two copies of their comments to the Secretary of the Commission. Environmental commenters will be placed on the Commission's environmental mailing list, will receive copies of the environmental documents, and will be notified of meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Environmental commenters will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, the non-party commenters will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission (except for the mailing of environmental documents issued by the Commission) and will not have the right to seek court review of the Commission's final order.

The Commission may issue a preliminary determination on nonenvironmental issues prior to the completion of its review of the environmental aspects of the project. This preliminary determination typically considers such issues as the need for the project and its economic effect on existing customers of the applicant, on other pipelines in the area, and on landowners and communities. For example, the Commission considers the extent to which the applicant may need to exercise eminent domain to obtain rights-of-way for the proposed project and balances that against the non-environmental benefits to be provided by the project. Therefore, if a person has comments on community and landowner impacts from this proposal, it is important either to file comments or to intervene as early in the process as possible.

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. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings.

If the Commission decides to set the application for a formal hearing before an Administrative Law Judge, the Commission will issue another notice describing that process. At the end of the Commission's review process, a final Commission order approving or denying a certificate will be issued.

Any questions regarding the application should be directed to Steve Isenhower, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, P.O. Box 1396, Houston, Texas 77251, at (713) 215–2704.

Comment Date: May 2, 2003.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–9521 Filed 4–16–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 12347-000]

Universal Electric Power Corporation; Notice of Extension of Deadline for Filing Comments and or Motions on Notice of Preliminary Permit Application

April 11, 2003.

On January 28, 2003, the Commission issued in the above-captioned docket a "Notice of Application Accepted for Filing and Soliciting Comments, Protests, and Motions to Intervene" for the Coffeeville L&D Hydroelectric Project. Take notice that the deadline for filing comments, protests, or motions to intervene is extended to April 30, 2003.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–9523 Filed 4–16–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 2782-006]

Parowan City, Utah; Notice of Ava

April 11, 2003.

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 47897), the Office of Energy Projects has reviewed the application for license for the Red Creek Hydroelectric Project located on Red Creek, in Iron County, Utah, and has prepared a final Environmental Assessment (EA) for the project. The project occupies 19.06 acres of United States lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

The final EA contains Commission staff's analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the project and concludes that licensing the project, with appropriate environmental protective measures, would not constitute a major federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

A copy of the final EA is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site at http://www.ferc.gov using the "FERRIS" link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance contact FERC Online Support at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or toll-free at (866) 208–3676, or for TTY, (202) 502–8659.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Steve Hocking at (202) 502–8753 or steve.hocking@ferc.gov.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–9524 Filed 4–16–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RM96-1-024]

Standards for Business Practices of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines; Notice Regarding Standard Numbers for Compliance With Order No. 587–R

April 11, 2003.

In Order No. 587–R,¹ the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) amended its regulations to adopt the most recent version, Version 1.6, of the consensus standards promulgated by the North American Energy Standards Board Wholesale Gas Quadrant (WGQ) and the WGQ standards governing partial day recalls. In addition, the Commission required pipelines to file tariff sheets to reflect the changed standards by May 1, 2003,

with an effective date of July 1, 2003. In response to several comments on the appropriate method for referencing the standards, the Commission found that the pipelines could incorporate these standards by reference by identifying the number of the standard (using "z" as a placeholder such as 3.3.z2) and identifying whether the standard was adopted in Recommendation R02002 or R02002–2, as appropriate.

Subsequent to the issuance of Order No. 587-R, the WGQ assigned standard numbers to the partial day recall standards to replace the temporary reference numbers for the standards using the "z" placeholders. The WGQ assigned standard numbers are listed in a posting on the WGQ's Web site entitled "Assignment of Standard Numbers for Final Actions for R02002 and R02002-2, Ratified October 31, 2002" at http://www.naesb.org/ Final.htm. Consequently, when incorporating partial day recall standards by reference, pipelines should use the WGQ assigned standard numbers as are listed in the Appendix to this Notice.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

APPENDIX.—ASSIGNED STANDARD NUMBERS FOR RECENT RATIFICATIONS R02002 AND R02002—2

Recommendation	Rec- ommenda- tion tem- porary ref- erence ID for standard	WGQ assigned standard number
R02002	5.3.z1	5.3.44
	5.3.z2	5.3.45
	5.3.z3	5.3.46
	5.3.z4	5.3.47
	5.3.z5	5.3.48
	5.3.z6	5.3.49
	5.3.z7	5.3.50
	5.3.z8	5.3.51
	5.3.z9	5.3.52
	5.3.z10	5.3.53
	5.3.z11	5.3.54
	5.1.z1	5.1.2
R02002-2	5.1.z2	5.1.3
	5.1.z3	5.1.4
	5.2.z1	5.2.3
	5.3.z12	5.3.55
	5.3.z13	5.3.56
	5.3.z14	5.3.57
	5.3.z15	5.3.58
	•	

[FR Doc. 03–9525 Filed 4–16–03; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

¹ Standards for Business Practices of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines, Order No. 587–R, 102 FERC ¶61,273 (March 12, 2003).