Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 14 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426.

This filing is accessible on-line at http://www.ferc.gov, using the "eLibrary" link and is available for review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an "eSubscription" link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive e-mail notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please e-mail FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov, or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E5-7319 Filed 12-13-05; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP06-135-000]

National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

December 8, 2005.

Take notice that on December 1, 2005, National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation (National Fuel) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Fourth Revised Volume No. 1, Sixth Revised Sheet No. 12 and Eighth Revised Sheet No. 478, to be effective January 1, 2006.

National Fuel states that copies of this filing were served upon its customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest this filing must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). 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 notice of intervention or motion to intervene, as appropriate. Such notices, motions, or protests must be filed in accordance with the provisions of section 154.210 of the Commission's regulations (18 CFR 154.210). Anyone filing an intervention or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant. Anyone filing an intervention or protest on or before the intervention or protest date

need not serve motions to intervene or protests on persons other than the Applicant.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the "eFiling" link at http://www.ferc.gov. Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 14 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426

This filing is accessible on-line at http://www.ferc.gov, using the "eLibrary" link and is available for review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an "eSubscription" link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive e-mail notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please e-mail FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov, or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E5–7316 Filed 12–13–05; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. EC03-131-003; EC03-131-004]

Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company; Notice of Request for Comments

December 8, 2005.

On July 2, 2004, the Commission approved Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company's (OG&E) Offer of Settlement in this proceeding subject to certain modifications. In the Offer of Settlement, OG&E offered a number of permanent and interim mitigation measures. Among these mitigation measures was a commitment to construct a 600 MW Bridge between InterGen's Redbud Energy Project and OG&E's control area that would create an additional 600 MWs of available transmission capacity. See Oklahoma Gas and Electric and NRG McClain LLC, 105 FERC ¶61,297 (2003), order approving settlement, 108 FERC ¶61,004 (2004). On May 31, 2005, OG&E filed a letter informing the Commission that, as of May 19, 2005, all of the facilities that OG&E committed to construct under the Offer of Settlement were placed into commercial operation.

A technical conference in this proceeding was held on December 1, 2005 at the Commission's Headquarters, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. The technical conference participants discussed whether the upgrades completed by OG&E resulted in an additional 600 MWs of available transmission capacity, as required in the July 2004 Order. At the conclusion of the conference, the parties agreed to answer the following questions:

1. Is an additional 600 MWs of Available Transfer Capability, achieved by upgrading the transmission system, created when: (a) The McClain generating units are not running; (b) the McClain generating units are running to serve OG&E load; or (c) the McClain generating units are running under operating conditions other than those described in (a) and (b)? In other words, should the base case be McClain running with no transmission upgrades or McClain not running with no transmission upgrades. Provide complete explanatory rationale and support for how the 600 MWs of Available Transfer Capability is created.

2. Explain if there are discrepancies in Available Transfer Capability, as calculated by OG&E and as calculated by SPP, including whether the difference (if any) is the result of the use of different models (planning models vs. operational models) containing different generation dispatch pattern, different transmission system configuration, different firm reservations, and different generation and transmission outages.

3. Were there any firm reservations, posted on the SPP OASIS after the July 2004 Order and prior to Redbud's transmission request in June 2005, by Redbud or any other party that would have reduced the Available Transfer Capability from Redbud to OG&E's transmission system?

4. In addition to the previously disclosed non-firm reservation that was not removed from the SPP study in response to Redbud's June 2005 request, were there any other non-firm reservations which were not removed from the ATC studies performed by OG&E and SPP.

5. Assuming the transmission upgrades created an additional 600 MWs of Available Transfer Capability, explain what happened to the Available Transfer Capability from the time OG&E placed it into service and when SPP made it available for transmission use.

Comments in response to these questions are due on or before December 16, 2005, and reply comments are due on or before January 20, 2006.

Comments must refer to Docket Nos.

EC03–131–003 and EC03–131–004, and