

which the filing responds; (3) furnish the name, address, and telephone number of the person submitting the filing; and (4) otherwise comply with the requirements of 18 CFR 385.2001 through 385.2005. All comments, recommendations, terms and conditions or prescriptions must set forth their evidentiary basis and otherwise comply with the requirements of 18 CFR 4.34(b). Agencies may obtain copies of the application directly from the applicant. Each filing must be accompanied by proof of service on all persons listed on the service list prepared by the Commission in this proceeding, in accordance with 18 CFR 4.34(b), and 385.2010.

David P. Boerger,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-7975 Filed 3-30-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Application Ready for Environmental Analysis and Soliciting Comments, Recommendations, Terms and Conditions, and Prescriptions

March 27, 2001.

Take notice that the following hydroelectric application has been filed with the Commission and is available for public inspection.

a. *Type of Application:* Original Major License.

b. *Project No.:* 10461-002.

c. *Date filed:* May 31, 1990.

d. *Applicant:* Erie Boulevard Hydropower, L.P.

e. *Name of Project:* Parishville Project.

f. *Location:* On the West Branch of the St. Regis River, near the village of Parishville, St. Lawrence County, New York. The project would not use federal lands.

g. *Filed Pursuant to:* Federal Power Act 16 U.S.C. 791(a)-825(r).

h. *Applicant Contact:* Mr. Jerry L. Sabattis, Erie Boulevard Hydropower, L.P., Suite 201, 225 Greenfield Parkway, Liverpool, NY 13088-6656, (315) 413-2700.

i. *FERC Contact:* Peter Leitzke, (202) 219-2803.

j. *Deadline for filing comments, recommendations, terms and conditions, and prescriptions:* 60 days from the issuance of this notice.

All documents (original and eight copies) should be filed with: David P. Boerger, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426.

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 website at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/efi/doorbell.htm>.

The Commission's Rules of Practice require all intervenors filing documents with the Commission to serve a copy of that document on each person on the official service list for the project. Further, if an intervenor files comments or documents with the Commission relating to the merits of an issue that may affect the responsibilities of a particular resource agency, they must also serve a copy of the document on that resource agency.

k. This application has been accepted and is now ready for environmental analysis.

l. The Parishville Project consists of the following existing facilities: (1) A dam composed of an earthen dike and various concrete structures; (2) a 70-acre reservoir having a net storage capacity of 35-acre-feet at elevation 844.5 feet MSL (mean sea level); (3) an intake structure; (4) a penstock 2,561 feet long and six to 10 feet in diameter; (5) a powerhouse housing a 2,400-kilowatt (kW) hydropower unit; (6) a tailrace 400 feet long; (7) a 4.8-kilovolt (kV) transmission line; and (8) appurtenant facilities. The project generates an estimated average of 15 million kilowatthours annually.

m. A copy of the application is available for inspection and reproduction at the Commission's Public Reference Room, located at 888 First Street, NE, Room 2-A, Washington, DC 20426, or by calling (202) 208-1371. The application may be viewed on <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> (call (202) 208-2222 for assistance). A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction at the address in item above.

n. Public notice of the filing of the initial development application, which has already been given, established the due date for filing competing applications or notices of intent. Under the Commission's regulations, any competing development application must be filed in response to and in compliance with public notice of the initial development application. No competing applications or notices of intent may be filed in response to this notice.

o. The Commission directs, pursuant to Section 4.34(b) of the Regulations (see Order No. 533 issued May 8, 1991, 56 FR 23108, May 20, 1991) that all comments, recommendations, terms and conditions and prescriptions concerning the application be filed with the

Commission within 60 days from the issuance date of this notice. All reply comments must be filed with the Commission within 105 days from the date of this notice.

Anyone may obtain an extension of time for these deadlines from the Commission only upon a showing of good cause or extraordinary circumstances in accordance with 18 CFR 385.2008.

All filings must (1) bear in all capital letters the title "COMMENTS", "REPLY COMMENTS", "RECOMMENDATIONS," "TERMS AND CONDITIONS," or "PRESCRIPTIONS;" (2) set forth in the heading the name of the applicant and the project number of the application to which the filing responds; (3) furnish the name, address, and telephone number of the person submitting the filing; and (4) otherwise comply with the requirements of 18 CFR 385.2001 through 385.2005. All comments, recommendations, terms and conditions or prescriptions must set forth their evidentiary basis and otherwise comply with the requirements of 18 CFR 4.34(b). Agencies may obtain copies of the application directly from the applicant. Each filing must be accompanied by proof of service on all persons listed on the service list prepared by the Commission in this proceeding, in accordance with 18 CFR 4.34(b), and 385.2010.

David P. Boerger,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-7976 Filed 3-30-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Fourth Interstate Natural Gas Facility-Planning Seminar

March 27, 2001.

The Office of Energy Projects will hold the fourth in a series of public meetings around the country for the purposes of exploring and enhancing strategies for constructive public participation in the earliest stages of natural gas facility planning. This seminar will be held in Seattle, Washington on Thursday, April 26, 2001. We are inviting interstate natural gas companies; Federal, state and local agencies; landowners and non-governmental organizations with an interest in developing new ways of doing business to join us in this effort. We will discuss:

- The pre-filing facility planning process;
- The potential benefits of pipeline facilities;

- Any other ways of improving the environmental review process for interstate natural gas pipeline projects.

The staff of the Commission's Office of Energy Projects will give a briefing on the results of our first three seminars in Albany, New York, Chicago, Illinois, and Tampa, Florida. We'll discuss problems that were identified and potential solutions that were offered in the seminars.

Join us as we continue to explore new strategies being employed by the natural gas industry, agencies, and citizens to learn about each others' concerns and to engage the public and agencies in participatory project design. Interactive discussions will be held with panelists from various Federal and state agencies, representatives from natural gas companies, and private landowners or citizen representatives who have had relevant experiences. There will be substantial opportunity for the sharing of experiences and knowledge during both the panel discussions and in the interactive "brainstorming" session. So, bring your ideas with you and prepare to share them.

The objectives of the seminar are:

- Exchange ideas with other stakeholders and explore the best avenues for involving people and agencies, pre-filing, toward fostering settlements through creative issue resolution.
- Explore steps taken to identify the parties directly involved with and affected by natural gas facility siting and/or permitting, so they can work together and resolve issues.
- Build upon the discussions from the first three seminars.
- To encourage the submission of filings with no or few contested issues in order to reduce the Commission's processing time.
- Discuss the potential benefits of an interstate natural gas pipeline project.
- Explore other ideas for improving the FERC's environmental review process.

We are building on what was learned at our prior meetings and continuing to work toward developing a toolbox of the best available techniques for increasing public involvement and developing

solutions to issues during the pre-filing planning process. This will help to plan projects with less opposition that can achieve faster action from the Commission with less controversy and fewer conditions.

The meeting in Seattle, Washington will be held at the Washington Athletic Club, 1325 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101. The meeting is scheduled to start at 9 a.m. and finish at 2:30 p.m. A preliminary agenda (attachment 1) and directions to the Washington Athletic Club (attachment 2) are enclosed. Also, see attachment 3 regarding the selection of locations of future meetings.

If you plan to attend, please e-mail our team at: gasoutreach@ferc.fed.us by April 20, 2001. Or, you can respond via facsimile to Pennie Lewis-Partee at 202-208-0353. Please include in the response the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of all attendees from your organization. We will send an acknowledgment of your request.

To help us enhance our panel discussions, please consider issues and/or questions you would like to have addressed at the meetings and e-mail them to us. If you have any questions, you may contact any of the staff listed below:

Richard Hoffmann 202/208-0066
 Lauren O'Donnell 202/208-0325
 Jeff Shenot 202/219-2178
 Howard Wheeler 202/208-2299

J. Mark Robinson,

Director, Division of Environmental & Engineering Review, Office of Energy Projects.

Attachment 1

Agenda

4th Interstate Natural Gas Facility Planning Seminar, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington Athletic Club, Seattle, Washington

April 26, 2001

9:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.

9:00 a.m.—Introductions

Welcome: Mark Robinson, Director, Division of Environmental & Engineering Review, Office of Energy Projects, FERC

Rich Hoffman, Office of Energy Projects (OEP), FERC

9:15—The Pipeline Planning/Approval Process—Lauren O'Donnell, OEP, What's the role of FERC

9:30—Summary of Contents from the Albany, Chicago, and Tampa Meetings—Rich Hoffman

9:45—Panel 1. Perspectives on Project Announcement, Route Planning, and How to Work Together—Howard Wheeler, OEP, Moderator

(Discussion of factors re: announcement of the project, planning of the route, types of surveys needed; extent of disturbance, and who to tell. What are the needs of the various stakeholders?)

John Cassidy, Pacific Gas and Electric Citizen/NGO Representative
 Gary Sprague, Washington

Department of Fish and Wildlife
 (10-minute discussion by each panelist with interactive Brainstorming/Q&A session with panelists and audience for remainder of Panel)

11:00—Break

11:15—Panel 2. What are the Benefits (real and potential) of a natural gas project and right-of-way?—Lauren O'Donnell, Moderator

(Discussion of the various types of benefits of a pipeline project to the company, the individual, local area, region and/or state. How to identify them, how to advertise them.)

Agency Representative
 Representative of Northwest Pipeline Corporation

Joanne Longwoods, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe

(10-minute discussion by each panelist with interactive Brainstorming/Q&A session with panelists and audience for remainder of Panel)

12:30—Lunch

1:00—Brainstorming Session * * * OEP Staff will lead an all-participants discussion of issues regarding other potential ways of improving and speeding up the environmental review of interstate natural gas pipeline projects.

—Explore Environmental Impact Statement timelines;

—Explore starting the NEPA process pre-filing; and

—Discuss the role of state and local agencies.

2:15—Summary of the day

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

Attachment 3**Future Meetings?**

Between now and September of 2001, we will conduct additional seminars at locations around the country. Locations for the meetings will be selected based on the history of past, present and especially future pipeline projects where interstate natural gas markets are developing or expanding.

Yes, for those who have been following our progress, we've gone west for our fourth meeting. But, we will hold a meeting in the northeast!

Areas we are considering for meetings include:

Boston, Massachusetts/Portland, Maine area—May/June, 2001?
Reno, Nevada or Salt Lake City, Utah—July/August, 2001?

If you care to voice your opinion about these or other areas, please follow the instructions for contacting us in the notice.

[FR Doc. 01-7889 Filed 3-30-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission, Comments Requested

March 23, 2001.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated

collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before June 1, 2001. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments to Les Smith, Federal Communications Commissions, 445 12th Street, SW., Room 1-A804, Washington, DC 20554 or via the Internet to lesmith@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collections contact Les Smith at (202) 418-0217 or via the Internet at lesmith@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060-0331.

Title: Section 76.615B Notification Requirements.

From Number: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities.

Number of Respondents: 1200.

Estimated Time Per Response: 0.5 hours.

Total Annual Costs: \$120,000.00.

Needs and Uses: The notifications are used by the Commission to locate and eliminate harmful interference as it occurs, to help assure safe operation of aeronautical and marine radio services and to minimize the possibility of interference to these safety-of-life services.

OMB Control Number: 3060-0594.

Title: FCC Form 1220 Cost of Service Filing for Regulated Cable Services.

Form Number: FCC Form 1220.

Type of Review: Extension of currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities, State, Local or Tribal Government.

Number of Respondents: 30.

Estimated Time Per Response: 40 hours.

Total Annual Costs: \$480,000.00.

Needs and Uses: The FCC Form 1220 is filed with the Commission by cable operators to demonstrate their costs of providing cable service in order to justify rates above levels determined under the Commission's benchmark methodology. The Commission uses the Form 1220 to determine whether cable rates for basic service, cable programming service and associated equipment are reasonable under the Commission's rules.

OMB Control Number: 3060-0601.

Title: FCC Form 1200 Setting Maximum Permitted Rates for Regulated Cable Services.

Form Number: FCC Form 1200.

Type of Review: Extension of currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities, State, Local or Tribal Government.

Number of Respondents: 100.

Estimated Time Per Response: 10 hours.

Total Annual Costs: \$200,000.00.

Needs and Uses: The FCC Form 1200 is filed with the Commission by cable operators and local franchise authorities to justify the reasonableness of rates in effect on or after May 15, 1994. The data are used by the Commission to evaluate cable rates the first time they are reviewed on or after May 15, 1994, so that maximum permitted rates for regulated cable service can be determined.

OMB Control Number: 3060-0685.

Title: Annual Updating of Maximum Permitted Rates for Regulated Cable Services.

Form Number: FCC Form 1240.

Type of Review: Extension of currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities, State, Local or Tribal Government.

Number of Respondents: 4500.

Estimated Time Per Response: 1.0 hour.

Total Annual Costs: \$900,000.00.

Needs and Uses: The FCC Form 1240 is filed with the Commission by cable operators seeking to adjust maximum permitted rates to reflect changes in external costs. The Commission uses the Form 1240 to adjudicate permitted rates for regulated cable rates, services and equipment and for the addition of new programming tiers, the addition and/or deletion of channels, and for allowance for pass through of external costs due to inflation.

OMB Approval Number: 3060-0004.

Title: Guidelines for Evaluating the Environmental Effects of Radiofrequency (Second Memorandum Opinion and Order, ET Docket No. 93-2).

Form No.: None.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Not for profit institutions; businesses or other for profit; small businesses and organizations.

Number of Respondents: 126,108.

Estimated Time Per Response: 2 hours per response (avg.). This time will vary with the number of transmitters considered; e.g., a site with a single