

Docket Numbers: ER06–1562–000.
Applicants: American Electric Power Service Corporation.

Description: Indiana Michigan Power Co submits a third revision to its Interconnection and Local Delivery Service Agreement 1262 between Wabash Valley Power Association and AEP.

Filed Date: 9/29/2006.

Accession Number: 20061003–0154.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. Eastern Time on Friday, October 20, 2006.

Docket Numbers: ER06–1563–000.
Applicants: American Electric Power Company.

Description: American Electric Power submits a revision to its Repair and Maintenance Agreement between Indiana Michigan Power Co and Wabash Valley Power Association.

Filed Date: 9/29/2006.

Accession Number: 20061003–0155.

Comment Date: 5 p.m. Eastern Time on Friday, October 20, 2006.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest in any of the above proceedings 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) on or before 5 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. It is not necessary to separately intervene again in a subdocket related to a compliance filing if you have previously intervened in the same docket. 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. Anyone filing a motion to intervene or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant. In reference to filings initiating a new proceeding, interventions or protests submitted on or before the comment deadline need not be served on persons other than the Applicant.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper, using the FERC Online links at <http://www.ferc.gov>. To facilitate electronic service, persons with Internet access who will eFile a document and/or be listed as a contact for an intervenor must create and validate an eRegistration account using the eRegistration link. Select the eFiling link to log on and submit the intervention or protests.

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

The filings in the above proceedings are accessible in the Commission's

eLibrary system by clicking on the appropriate link in the above list. They are also 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. E6–16803 Filed 10–10–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. AD07–1–000]

Billing Procedures for Annual Charges for the Costs for Administering Part I of the Federal Power Act; Notice Reporting Increase in Municipal Costs for FY 2005 Actual and FY 2006 Estimated Hydropower Administrative Annual Charges

October 3, 2006.

1. Municipal licensees have expressed concerns regarding the substantial increases they have observed in their Statement of Annual Charges issued on August 4, 2006. Specifically, licensees are concerned with the amounts assessed for the current year's *Administrative Charge* and the prior year's *Adjustment of FERC Administrative Charge*. The increase in these charges is primarily attributable to a substantial increase in the proportion of direct labor hours staff charged to municipal projects in FY 2005. The purpose of this notice is to provide licensees with information regarding the Commission's process for assessing these charges and how this increase in direct labor applicable to municipal projects resulted in the increases observed on the August 4, 2004 billing statements.

Components of Administrative Annual Charges

2. The Federal Power Act requires the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to assess annual charges against licensees to reimburse the United States for the costs of administration of the Commission's hydropower regulatory

program.¹ The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986 provided FERC with the authority to “assess and collect fees and annual charges in any fiscal year in amounts equal to all of the costs incurred by the Commission in that fiscal year.”² Each fiscal year the Commission estimates the total costs of its operations for the current year. These estimates are the basis for the current year's *Administrative Charge* which is reflected on the annual billing statements as such. In addition, the Commission determines the actual operating costs for the prior fiscal year, and the prior year's *Administrative Charge* is adjusted either upward or downward for the difference between the prior year's actual costs and the prior year's estimates. These adjustments to the prior year's costs are then reflected as the *Adjustment to FERC Administrative Charge* on the annual billing statements.

Allocation Methodology for Hydropower Projects

3. The total costs for the hydropower regulatory program consist of both direct and indirect costs. Once the Commission calculates estimated and actual program costs, it allocates these costs based on direct time charged by Commission staff to designated time and labor codes for municipal and non-municipal projects.³ Annually the Commission allocates current year estimated costs and prior year actual costs based on the direct labor proportions of staff time recorded against municipal and non-municipal projects in the prior fiscal year. Applying this methodology allows the Commission to utilize credible historical information for the allocation of current year estimated costs and provides the relevant data needed to appropriately affect the prior year downward or upward adjustment when allocating the prior year's actual costs.

4. With regard to the August 4, 2006 statements, the Commission allocated the cost bases for the current year's *Administrative Charge* and the prior year's *Adjustment to FERC*

¹ 16 U.S.C 794–823b.

² Pub. L. 99–509 § 3401, 100 Stat. 1874, 1890–91 (1986) (codified at 42 U.S.C. 7178).

³ The Commission has implemented within its time and attendance system designated codes which segregate staff hours spent on municipal projects from staff hours spent on non-municipal projects. In calculating direct labor proportions, the Commission aggregates the hours recorded against municipal and non-municipal time codes. The number of hours charged to municipal codes is divided by this aggregate total to derive the municipal proportion used to allocate hydropower program costs. The number of hours charged to non-municipal projects is treated similarly to derive the non-municipal proportion.

Administrative Charge using FY 2005 direct labor proportions. In FY 2005, Commission staff spent 25% of the total hours charged to licensing of hydropower projects on municipal projects. Conversely, 75% of the total hours charged to project licensing were attributable to work on non-municipal projects.

Impact of FY 2005 Direct Labor Allocation

5. The significant increase in municipal project costs for the FY 2006 *Administrative Charge* and the FY 2005 *Adjustment to FERC Administrative Charge* was the result of more direct time charged to hydropower municipal time and labor codes in FY 2005 than in FY 2004. Since the Commission used the FY 2005 municipal allocation of 25% to allocate its FY 2006 Administrative Annual Charges, licensees will likely notice an increase to their current year *Administrative Charge* when compared to previous years. Additionally, since the Commission used the FY 2004 municipal allocation of 11% to allocate its FY 2005 *Administrative Charge*, the FY 2005 *Adjustment to FERC Administrative Charge* reflects both a significant adjustment resulting from a 14% increase in the proportion of direct labor allocated and a minor upward adjustment related to the difference in actual and estimated costs previously assessed in FY 2005.

Review of Hydropower Program Costs

6. After calculating the annual charges, the Commission reviewed the total FY 2005 and FY 2006 hydropower costs and the applicable time and labor categories for the hydropower program which clearly differentiates between municipal and non-municipal activities. Overall, total costs for the hydropower program were found to have only small increases between the fiscal years. There were no new programs added in the hydropower area in FY 2005 or FY 2006 that would have contributed to this increase, thus the small increase in total hydropower program costs. However, since there was more direct time charged to municipal time and labor codes in FY 2005 than in FY 2004, municipal licensees received a larger proportion of the total hydropower program costs.

7. The Commission's hydropower program workload depends on how many hydropower applications or inspections are pending before the Commission in any given year. The Commission can not predict with exact certainty which licensees will file each year. In addition, the complexity of the

projects under review and the length of time it takes to process a hydropower application could impact the workload proportions. Hydropower program workload is cyclical, so in some years there may be more municipal projects pending versus non-municipal projects. While this increase does represent a large swing between municipal and non-municipal direct-labor hours, our review did show a history of cyclical fluctuations in this split.

8. For questions concerning this notice or any other annual charges issues, please direct inquiries via e-mail to annualcharges@ferc.gov or call Troy Cole at (202) 502-6161.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E6-16785 Filed 10-10-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP06-442-000]

UGI LNG, Inc.; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Temple LNG Plant and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues

October 4, 2006.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental assessment (EA) that will discuss the environmental impacts of the operation of facilities for the Temple LNG Plant involving operation of facilities by UGI LNG, Inc (UGI LNG) in Berks County, Pennsylvania.¹ This EA will be used by the Commission in its decision-making process to determine whether the project is in the public convenience and necessity.

A fact sheet prepared by the FERC entitled "An Interstate Natural Gas Facility On My Land? What Do I Need To Know?" was attached to the project notice UGI LNG provided to landowners. This fact sheet addresses a number of typically asked questions, including how to participate in the Commission's proceedings. It is available for viewing on the FERC Internet Web site (<http://www.ferc.gov>).

Summary of the Proposed Project

UGI LNG seeks authorization to acquire and operate in interstate commerce an existing liquefied natural

¹ UGI LNG's application was filed with the Commission under section 7 of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations.

gas (LNG) peak-shaving facility in Berks County, Pennsylvania, and certain appurtenant pipeline facilities interconnecting with the interstate facilities of Texas Eastern Transmission L.P. The Temple LNG Plant is presently owned by UGI Energy Services, Inc. (UGIES). The existing Temple LNG Plant consists of:

- 250,000 Mcf (73,000 Bbl) storage tank,
- A vaporization system designed to deliver up to 50,000 Dth/d and a liquefier designed to deliver 4,000 Dth/d, and
- Approximately 5,000 feet of 8-inch-diameter pipeline.

No additional land is required since UGI LNG does not propose any new facilities or any modifications to existing facilities. The general location of the project facilities is shown in Appendix 1.²

Land Requirements for Construction

The existing Temple LNG Plant consists of about 71.59 acres of land. No new facilities would be constructed as part of UGI LNG's application.

The EA Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. This process is referred to as "scoping". The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this Notice of Intent, the Commission staff requests public comments on the scope of the issues to address in the EA. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EA. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

Because the Temple LNG Plant is an existing facility and no new additions or modifications are proposed, the EA will focus on the operation of the proposed project, the cryogenic design aspects of the plant, and public safety.

² The appendices referenced in this notice are not being printed in the **Federal Register**. Copies of all appendices, other than Appendix 1 (maps), are available on the Commission's Web site at the "eLibrary" link or from the Commission's Public Reference Room, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, or call (202) 502-8371. For instructions on connecting to eLibrary refer to the last page of this notice. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail.