components.

Distillate Fuel Oil

• Add the following new categories for distillate fuel oil on Forms EIA–800, 801, 802, 810, 811, 812, 817, and 820:

—Distillate Fuel Oil—Total
1. 15 ppm sulfur and under
2. Greater than 15 ppm to 500 ppm sulfur, inclusive
3. Greater than 500 ppm sulfur.

• Collect imports (EIA–814) by specific sulfur level.

• For the weekly imports (EIA–804), collect the following categories:

—15 ppm sulfur and under
—Greater than 15 ppm to 500 ppm sulfur, inclusive
—Greater than 500 to 2000 ppm, inclusive
—Greater than 2000 ppm.

• Collect volumes of ultra-low sulfur distillate fuel oil (15 ppm and under) downgraded at bulk terminals and pipelines on Forms EIA–801, 802, 811, and 812.

There are no proposed changes to the Form EIA–803 (Weekly Crude Oil Stocks Report) or the Form EIA–813 (Monthly Crude Oil Report).

III. Request for Comments

Prospective respondents and other interested parties should comment on the actions discussed in item II. The following guidelines are provided to assist in the preparation of comments. Please indicate to which form(s) your comments apply.

General Issues

A. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency and does the information have practical utility? Practical utility is defined as the actual usefulness of information to or for an agency, taking into account its accuracy, adequacy, reliability, timeliness, and the agency's ability to process the information it collects.

B. What enhancements can be made to the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

As a Potential Respondent to the Request for Information

A. What actions could be taken to help ensure and maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of the information to be collected?

B. Are the instructions and definitions clear and sufficient? If not, which instructions need clarification?

C. Can the information be submitted by the due date?

D. Public reporting burdens for the forms are estimated to average:

Estimated Hours Per Response in 2004 With Changes (Current 2003 Hours Per Response)

EIA–800, ''Weekly Refinery and Fractionator Report,''—1.58 hours (1.12 hours)
EIA–801, ''Weekly Bulk Terminal Report,''—0.95 hours (0.72 hours)
EIA–802, ''Weekly Product Pipeline Report,''—0.95 hours (0.69 hours)
EIA–803, ''Weekly Crude Oil Stocks Report,''—0.50 hours (0.45 hours)
EIA–804, ''Weekly Imports Report,''—1.58 hours (1.22 hours)
EIA–805, ''Weekly Terminal Blenders Report,''—0.58 hours (new form)
EIA–810, ''Monthly Refinery Report,''—4.74 hours (3.31 hours)
EIA–811, ''Monthly Bulk Terminal Report,''—2.21 hours (1.70 hours)
EIA–812, ''Monthly Product Pipeline Report,''—2.85 hours (2.09 hours)
EIA–813, ''Monthly Crude Oil Report,''—1.50 hours (1.37 hours)
EIA–814, ''Monthly Imports Report,''—2.53 hours (1.93 hours)
EIA–815, ''Monthly Terminal Blenders Report,''—1.15 hours (new form)
EIA–816, ''Monthly Natural Gas Liquids Report,''—0.95 hours (0.78 hours)
EIA–817, ''Monthly Tanker and Barge Movement Report,''—2.21 hours (1.62 hours)
EIA–819, ''Monthly Oxygenate Telephone Report,''—0.63 hours (0.50 hours)
EIA–820, ''Annual Refinery Report''—2.30 hours (2.00 hours)

The estimated burdens include the total time necessary to provide the requested information. In your opinion, how accurate are the estimates?

The agency estimates that the only cost to a respondent is for the time it will take to complete the collection. Will a respondent incur any start-up costs for reporting, or any recurring annual costs for operation, maintenance, and purchase of services associated with the information collection?

E. What additional actions could be taken to minimize the burden of this collection of information? Such actions may involve the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

F. Does any other Federal, State, or local agency collect similar information? If so, specify the agency, the data element(s), and the methods of collection.

As a Potential User of the Information To Be Collected

A. What actions could be taken to help ensure and maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of the information disseminated?

B. Is the information useful at the levels of detail to be collected?

C. For what purpose(s) would the information be used? Be specific.

D. Are there alternate sources for the information and are they useful? If so, what are their weaknesses and/or strengths?

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of the form. They also will become a matter of public record.

Statutory Authority: Section 3507(h)(1) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Issued in Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.

Jay H. Casselberry,

Agency Clearance Officer, Statistics and Methods Group, Energy Information Administration.

[FR Doc. 03–12871 Filed 5–22–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP03–476–000]

Alliance Pipeline L.P.; Notice of Proposed Change in FERC Gas Tariff

May 19, 2003.

Take notice that on May 13, 2003, Alliance Pipeline L.P. (Alliance) tendered for filing, as part of Alliance's FERC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 1, First Revised Sheet No. 308; and First Revised Sheet No. 309, proposed to be effective June 1, 2003.

Alliance states that the listed tariff sheets make certain minor, ministerial changes in the form of Assignment and Novation Agreement set forth in Alliance's tariff.

Alliance states that copies of its filing have been mailed to all customers, state commissions, and other interested parties.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with sections 385.214 or 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed in accordance with section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. 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 proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. 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 to access the document. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov* or toll-free at (866) 208–3676, or TTY, contact (202) 502–8659. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings. *See* 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site under the ''e-Filing'' link.

Comment Date: May 27, 2003.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–12952 Filed 5–22–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EL03–123–000]

Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General of the State of Connecticut and The Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control v. NRG Power Marketing, Inc.; Order Requiring Compliance With Contract

Issued May 16, 2003.

Before Commissioners: Pat Wood, III, Chairman; William L. Massey, and Nora Mead Brownell.

1. This order addresses the Complaint and Emergency Request for Order Staying Contested Termination of Wholesale Power Contract filed by Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General for the State of Connecticut (CTAG) and the Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control (CDPUC). The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) directs the seller under this contract to continue to provide service to Connecticut Light and Power Company (CL&P) pursuant to the rates, terms and conditions under the contract until the Commission has an adequate opportunity to evaluate its proposed termination of the contract and the opposition to such action.

Background

2. Under Connecticut retail choice law and CDPUC rules, CL&P was required to divest its generation and competitively procure wholesale power supply to serve the Standard Offer Service [1] (SOS) load. On October 29, 1999, CL&P and NRG Power Marketing, Inc. (NRG–PMI) entered into a Standard Offer Service Wholesale Sales Agreement (SOS Agreement). The SOS Agreement requires NRG–PMI to provide power supply for a specified percentage of CL&P's SOS load during the term of the contract.[2] The SOS Agreement is for a four-year term that ends on December 31, 2003. The price set forth in the SOS Agreement is the same price that NRG–PMI voluntarily bid in the competitive procurement process. CL&P states that because NRG–PMI did not own generation assets, then-applicable Commission rules did not require NRG–PMI to make a section 205 filing for the SOS Agreement.[3] NRG–PMI was instead required to reflect its wholesale sales to CL&P in its quarterly marketing reports to the Commission.

3. CL&P asserts that NRG–PMI paid CL&P the congestion costs imposed by New England Power Pool for the first two months of the SOS Agreement but subsequently claimed that it was not responsible for such charges under the contract. CL&P filed a breach of contract complaint against NRG–PMI in Connecticut Superior Court seeking recovery for unpaid congestion charges from NRG–PMI as well as a declaration that NRG–PMI would be responsible for future congestion charges. The case was removed to and is pending before the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut, Civil Action No. 01–CV2373. In August 2002, CL&P, pursuant to Section 5.4 of the SOS Agreement, began to withhold the contested amounts until the dispute was resolved.

4. On August 13, 2002, NRG–PMI informed CL&P that its failure to pay constituted a default under the SOS Agreement. On May 1, 2003, the CDPUC issued an order stating that it believed that strong arguments existed that NRG–PMI and other SOS sellers were responsible for all congestion costs and losses under the Standard Market Design market rules.[4]

5. On May 14, 2003, NRG–PMI notified CL&P that it considered CL&P in default of the SOS Agreement because (1) CL&P continued to withhold payments due for congestion costs beginning in August 2002; and (2) CL&P decided to withhold congestion costs and losses after the implementation of Standard Market Design. NRG–PMI stated that, pursuant to section 5.5 of the SOS Agreement, it intended to terminate service at midnight five days after the receipt of the letter unless CL&P cured the defaults. On the same date, NRG–PMI filed for bankruptcy court protection under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code.

Instant Pleading

6. On May 15, 2003, CTAG and CDPUC submitted a filing asking the Commission to issue an order staying the termination of the contract entered into by CL&P and NRG–PMI. CL&P claims that NRG–PMI is obligated to provide the power supply for 45 percent of CL&P's retail electrical load at the fixed prices under the SOS Agreement. CL&P argues that NRG–PMI may not terminate the SOS Agreement before the end of the contract term absent the CL&P's consent without first filing a notice with the Commission, pursuant to 18 CFR § 35.15 (2003). CL&P also argues that NRG–PMI is responsible for the congestion costs and losses and that NRG–PMI has failed to comply with the dispute resolution provision under section 16 of the SOS Agreement. CL&P further argues the Commission should exercise its jurisdiction under FPA section 205 to protect the public from exorbitant wholesale power rates and from contracts and practices that are unjust and unreasonable. CL&P contends that the Commission has jurisdiction over this matter notwithstanding NRG–PMI's filing for bankruptcy protection.

7. CTAG and CDPUC ask the Commission to issue an order prior to May 20, 2003 taking jurisdiction over NRG–PMI's termination of service under the SOS Agreement. They request that the Commission state that NRG–PMI may not unilaterally terminate its wholesale contract before December 31, 2003 without prior Commission review. CTAG and CDPUC also ask the Commission to initiate a proceeding under FPA sections 205 and 206 to determine: (a) Whether NRG–PMI has the contractual right to terminate service in these circumstances, and (b) if it does, whether termination of service under the SOS Agreement is consistent with the public interest.

---

[1] According to Connecticut's electric industry restructuring law, Standard Offer Service refers to the electric service provided to retail customers who do not actively choose an alternate electric generation services supplier or are unable to choose one.

[2] *See* Section 3.5 of the SOS Agreement: 35% in 2000, 40% in 2001 and 2002, and 45% in 2003.

[3] Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. § 824d (2000).

[4] Interim Decision in Application of the Connecticut Light and Power Company Concerning Recovery of SMD-Related Costs for March 1, 2003 through December 31, 2003—Petition of the Attorney General for a Declaratory Ruling Regarding the Legality and Prudency of CL&P's Application, Docket No. 03–04–017 (May 1, 2003).