

amount of electricity that can be generated from the feedstock. Because of its multiple production capabilities, the plant is referred to as a poly-generation (or polygen) plant. The project could generate urea, ammonia, and perhaps other nitrogenous compounds for sale. The project's urea production unit would use pastillation technology, which converts urea melt into high-quality urea pellets.

The polygen plant would be built on 453-acres of the 1,106-acre site in south-central California near the unincorporated community of Tupman, located approximately 17-miles west of the city of Bakersfield. The site and surrounding areas are currently used for agricultural purposes, including cultivation of cotton, alfalfa, and onions. HECA would design and construct the plant to capture approximately 90 percent of the CO₂, equivalent to approximately 3.4 million tons per year. During the demonstration phase of the plant's operations, the project would sequester about 2.6 million tons of CO₂ per year in EOR operations. The compressed CO₂ would be transported approximately 4-miles via a new 12-inch diameter pipeline to the existing Elk Hills oil field for use in EOR operations by a third-party buyer. The oil field is majority owned and operated by Occidental of Elk Hills which would be responsible for the EOR operation. Approximately 0.4 million tons per year of CO₂ would be utilized in fertilizer production. Following the demonstration phase, the polygen plant would continue commercial operation for 30 to 50 years and would continue to capture its CO₂ for EOR.

The PSA/DEIS evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed project, connected actions (EOR, utility, rail spur), and reasonable alternatives. The PSA/DEIS includes an assessment of impacts to wetlands in accordance with DOE regulations for Compliance with Floodplains and Wetlands Environmental Review Requirements (10 CFR Part 1022) and the Draft General Conformity Analysis required under the Clean Air Act.

DOE analyzed two alternatives in the draft PSA/DEIS: the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative. Under the Proposed Action, DOE would provide approximately \$408 million in cost-shared funding under the CCPI program to the proposed project. Under the No Action Alternative, DOE would not continue funding the proposed project. DOE assumes that the project would not proceed without DOE funding. This option would not contribute to the goal of the CCPI program, which is to accelerate

commercial deployment of advanced coal technologies that provide the United States with clean, reliable, and affordable energy. As required by NEPA, DOE analyzes this option as the No Action Alternative in order to have a meaningful comparison between the impacts of DOE providing financial assistance and withholding that assistance. DOE recognizes that it is possible for the project to proceed without DOE funding. However, for purposes of this draft PSA/DEIS, DOE assumes that the project would not be built under the No Action Alternative.

The PSA/DEIS considers the environmental consequences that may result from the proposed project and describes additional mitigation that might be used to reduce various impacts.

Availability of the PSA/DEIS: Copies of the PSA/DEIS have been distributed to Members of Congress; Native American tribal governments; federal, state, and local officials; and agencies, organizations, and individuals who previously requested a copy. The PSA/DEIS is available on the Internet at <http://www.energy.gov/nepa> or on the CEC electronic docket site at http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/hydrogen_energy/. Copies of the PSA/DEIS are available for public review at the following locations: Beale Memorial Library, 701 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, CA 93301; Holloway-Gonzales Branch Library, 506 E. Brundage Lane, Bakersfield, CA 93307; and Southwest Memorial Library, 8301 Ming Avenue, Bakersfield, CA 93301. Additional copies can also be requested (see **ADDRESSES**).

Public Hearing: DOE and CEC will hold a public hearing(s) during the public comment period. The date(s), time(s), and location(s) of these public hearings will be published in *The Bakersfield Californian* at least 14 days prior to the hearings. This information will also be posted on CEC's Web site at http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/hydrogen_energy/.

Dated: July 17, 2013.

Mark J. Matarrese,

Director, Office of Environment, Security, Safety & Health, Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 2013-17507 Filed 7-19-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. IC13-13-000]

Commission Information Collection Activities (FERC-580); Comment Request

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Comment request.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 3507(a)(1)(D), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission or FERC) is submitting the information collection, FERC Form No. 580 (Interrogatory on Fuel and Energy Purchase Practices), to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review of the information collection requirements. Any interested person may file comments directly with OMB and should address a copy of those comments to the Commission as explained below. The Commission issued a Notice in the **Federal Register** (78 FR 26766, 5/8/2013) requesting public comments. FERC received two comments on the FERC-580. FERC addresses these comments in this notice and in its submittal to OMB.

DATES: Comments on the collection of information are due by August 21, 2013.

ADDRESSES: Comments filed with OMB, identified by the OMB Control No. 1902-0137, should be sent via email to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs: oir_submission@omb.gov. Attention: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Desk Officer. The Desk Officer may also be reached via telephone at 202-395-4718.

A copy of the comments should also be sent to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, identified by the Docket No. IC13-13-000, by either of the following methods:

- **eFiling at Commission's Web site:** <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling.asp>.

- **Mail/Hand Delivery/Courier:** Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Secretary of the Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

Instructions: All submissions must be formatted and filed in accordance with submission guidelines at: <http://www.ferc.gov/help/submission-guide.asp>. For user assistance contact FERC Online Support by email at ferconlinesupport@ferc.gov, or by phone at: (866) 208-3676 (toll-free), or (202) 502-8659 for TTY.

Docket: Users interested in receiving automatic notification of activity in this docket or in viewing/downloading comments and issuances in this docket may do so at <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/docs-filing.asp>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Ellen Brown may be reached by email at DataClearance@FERC.gov, by telephone at (202) 502–8663, and by fax at (202) 273–0873.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Title: Interrogatory on Fuel and Energy Purchase Practices (FERC Form No. 580),

OMB Control No.: 1902–0137.¹
Type of Request: Three-year approval of the FERC Form No. 580.

Abstract: FERC Form No. 580 is collected in even numbered years. The Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA)² amended the Federal Power Act (FPA) and directed the Commission to make comprehensive biennial reviews of certain matters related to automatic adjustment clauses (AACs) in wholesale rate schedules used by public utilities subject to the Commission’s jurisdiction. Specifically, the Commission is required to examine

whether the clauses effectively provide the incentives for efficient use of resources and whether the clauses reflect only those costs that are either “subject to periodic fluctuations” or “not susceptible to precise determinations” in rate cases prior to the time the costs are incurred.

The Commission is also required to review the practices of each public utility under AACs “to insure efficient use of resources under such clauses.”³ In response to the PURPA directive, the Commission (Docket Number IN79–6–000) established an investigation. Beginning in 1982, the Commission collected “Interrogatory on Fuel and Energy Purchase Practices” data every other year.

In 2010, the Commission redesigned the form to collect the information electronically through use of a standard form. Based on filer comments in response to the new electronic form used in the 2010 and 2012 collections, FERC recommends the following changes to the form:

Question 1
—Repair the email field to eliminate error messages.

Question 2
—Add a column labeled “Is this AAC a fuel adjustment clause?”
—Add a column labeled “Tariff volume number containing”. This information will aid staff in locating AACs.
—Remove the column and, thus, the request for information titled:
○ “Type/s of AAC”
○ “Type of costs that were passed through the AAC—if fuel, state fuel type”

There has been an increasing number of AAC-related cost types. This field makes it difficult for Commission staff to repopulate the dropdowns for this column without additional OMB approval. The information otherwise gained from respondents supplying the information collected in these columns will not be lost. Staff will locate and recover the information from Commission rate filings by using the AAC identification information given by respondents in the first three columns of Question 2.

—Rename Question 2 columns as follows to correct typographical errors:

From	To
Identify service agreement within rate schedule containing AAC	Identify service schedule, if any, where the AAC is located within the rate schedule.
If rate schedule superseded or abandoned during 2012–2013	Was rate schedule superseded or abandoned during 2012–2013?

Additional changes to Question 2 table:
—Add a check box to enable the utility to indicate that it had no non-transmission related AACs during the reporting years, if the situation applies. This box, when checked,

clearly indicates that there were no AACs to report.
—Add a “Copy Row” button to facilitate data entry.
We are further reducing the amount of information required for AACs that are not fuel adjustment clauses. Utilities

with no fuel adjustment clauses only need to respond to questions 1 and 2. Utilities with a FAC will continue to complete the entire form.
Question 3
—Reword the question from:

From	To
If during the 2010 and 2011 period, the Utility had any contracts or agreements for the purchase of either energy or capacity under which all or any portion of the purchase costs were passed through the AAC, for each purchase provide the information requested in the table below. Provide the information separately for each reporting year 2010 and 2011. Do not report purchased power where none of the costs were recovered through an AAC.	If during the 2012–2013 period, the Utility had any contracts or agreements for the purchase of either energy or capacity under which all or any portion of the purchase costs were passed through a fuel adjustment clause (FAC), for each purchase from a PURPA Qualifying Facility (QF) or Independent Power Producer (IPP) provide the information requested in the non-shaded columns of the table below. Provide the information separately for each reporting year 2012 and 2013. Do not report purchased power where none of the costs were recovered through an FAC. For each purchase where costs were flowed through an FAC, fill-in the non-shaded columns and either “Only energy charges” or “The total cost of the purchase of economic power” columns, whichever apply.

The Commission is only interested in QF and IPP information here and not every power purchase contracts/

agreement. The language will be similar to what was used in Form No. 580 interrogatories prior to 2010.

—Remove the request for information and thus the columns titled:
○ Was an after-the-fact comparison

¹ In the 60-day public notice the Commission indicated that the control number was 1902–0131.

² Enacted November 8, 1978

³ The review requirement is set forth in two paragraphs of Section 208 of PURPA, 49 Stat. 851; 16 U.S.C. 824d

made of actual avoided costs against the purchase costs?

- Were purchases made on an hourly economic dispatch basis?

From the information provided in the 2010 and 2012 filings the Commission has found that it can fully evaluate

regulatory compliance without this information.

Question 6

Change the question as follows:

From	To
For each fuel supply contract, where costs were subject to 18 CFR 35.14, (including informal agreements with <i>associated companies</i>), in force at any time during 2012 and/or 2013, of longer than one year in duration, provide the requested information. Report the data individually, for each contract, for each calendar year. [No response to any part of Question 6 for fuel oil no. 2 is necessary.] Report all fuels consumed for electric power generation and thermal energy associated with the production of electricity. Information for only coal, natural gas, and oil should be reported. Information for all fuels e.g. fossil fuels, wood chips), except Uranium, should be reported.	For each fuel supply contract, of longer than one year in duration, in force at any time during 2012 and/or 2013, where costs were subject to 18 CFR 35.14, (including informal agreements with <i>associated companies</i>), provide the requested information. Report the data individually for each contract for each calendar year. No response to any part of Question 6 for fuel oil no. 2 is necessary. Report all fuels consumed for electric power generation and thermal energy associated with the production of electricity. Information for only coal, natural gas, and oil should be reported.

—As with the request for transportation information that was eliminated in 2010, the Commission has found alternative information sources and analytical approaches sufficient to eliminate the request for fuels other than coal, natural gas and oil.
—Add a “Copy Contract” button.

Question 6a

—Add a column labeled “Is contract evergreen?”.
—Add a column labeled “Pipeline quality? (Y/N)”.

Question 6b

—Add a new column to the fuel quantity section labeled: “Coal (x10³

tons) not delivered by end of contract year.”

—Add a column labeled “Pipeline quality? (Y/N)”.

Questions 7 and 8. There are no proposed changes.

Glossary: Define Evergreen contracts as follows: Evergreen contract: a contract that is renewed automatically or by notice from year to year until canceled by either party.

Access to the Revised Materials: A copy of the form, desk reference, and glossary are attached to this docket as part of the 60-day **Federal Register** notice issued by the Commission on May 2, 2013 but they are not included in the **Federal Register**.⁴ Interested

parties can see the form electronically as part of this notice in FERC’s eLibrary (<http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/elibrary.asp>) by searching Docket No. IC13–13–000 and accessing the “FILE LIST” for the May 2 notice.

Interested parties may also request paper or electronic copies of the form and desk reference by contacting Ellen Brown, by telephone at (202) 502–8663, by fax at (202) 273–0873, or by email at DataClearance@ferc.gov.

Type of Respondents: Large FERC-jurisdictional electric public utilities.

*Estimate of Annual Burden:*⁵ The Commission estimates the total Public Reporting Burden for this information collection as:

FERC FORM NO. 580 (IC13–13–000): INTERROGATORY ON FUEL AND ENERGY PURCHASE PRACTICES

	Number of respondents	Number of responses per respondent	Total number of responses	Average burden hours per response	Estimated total annual burden ⁶
	(A)	(B)	(A) × (B) = (C)	(D)	(C) × (D)
Respondents with FACs	37	0.5	18.5	103	1,905.5
Respondents with AACs, but no FACs	10	0.5	5	20	100
Respondents with no AACs nor FACs	35	0.5	17.5	2	35
Total	2,040.5

Despite the changes to the Form 580, burden estimates per response for each entity will not change from previously approved amounts. The burden estimate may vary by utility depending on whether the utility has or does not have an automatic adjustment clause and depending on whether or not those utilities with adjustment clauses allow automatic adjustment of fuel cost.

The total estimated annual cost burden to respondents is \$142,835. [2040.5 hours * \$70/hour⁷ = \$142,835]

The estimated annual cost of filing the FERC Form 580 per response is \$1,742. [\$142,835 ÷ 82 responses = \$1,742/response]

Public Comments and FERC Responses: Comments filed by the public in response to the FERC Form

No. 580 **Federal Register** Notice of Information Collection and Request for Comments and FERC’s response to those comments is provided below. For more detailed information regarding this collection of information, please see the Commission’s submission at <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain>, scroll to “Currently under Review”, key in “Federal Energy Regulatory

⁴ The form attached to the 60-day notice is for illustrative purposes only and does not include all the interactive features of the actual form. For a copy of the actual form, please contact Ellen Brown as indicated in this notice.

⁵ Burden is defined as the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. For further explanation of what is included in the information collection burden, reference 5 CFR 1320.3.

⁶ The Form itself is only collected biennially but the data on the form is annual data. Therefore we maintain the convention of showing burden on an annual basis.

⁷ FY2013 Estimated Average Hourly Cost per FERC FTE, including salary + benefits.

Commission” and scroll to 1902–0137, “Interrogatory on Fuel and Energy Purchase Practices”.

Question 6b Additional Data Requested

Southern Company Services, Inc. (SCS) requests clarification addressing why the Commission proposes to add a new column in Question 6b titled “Coal ($\times 10^3$ tons) not delivered by end of contract year.” SCS states that proper contextualization of annual variances between actual deliveries and contract quantities could impact confidential negotiations, and that it is commercially sensitive business information. Further, SCS states that the efficiencies gained by the other revisions proposed by the Commission are outweighed by the addition of this new column. SCS states that if the Commission deems that such inquiry is appropriate for Form 580, that the Commission provide more context around its intent in proposing such an addition.

FERC Response: The proposal to add the new column to Question 6b originated with the Form 580 filers. Their issue is that it is not possible in the current form, to report coal delivered in, for example, 2012 under a 2011 contract. Without the new column, the Commission would have no way of knowing that a delivered coal quantity less than its contract quantity was coal truly not delivered, and that it wasn’t merely a typographical error in the form. Likewise, the Commission would assume all coal reported as delivered, was delivered during the contract year when it may not have been but was reported as delivered because there was no means provided in the form to report that it was not delivered. Not having the information that the column would provide, potentially results in assumptions leading to skewed data calculations. Further, coal contract amounts, delivery amounts, and shortage amounts have been determined by OMB for decades to be public information. In addition, the data requested in the new column are data routinely calculated by the utility and are readily available to enter into the form. Lastly, given the information that the Commission proposes to eliminate from the Form 580 for the 2014 reporting cycle, the reporting burden will not increase by adding this one column.

De Minimis Benchmarks

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) requests *de minimis* benchmarks from the Commission so that filers will know whether they are required or not to answer a question in the form without filing for a waiver.

FERC response: In some cases, the Commission has found it unnecessarily burdensome for utilities to answer a particular question based on the information gained from doing so. Not surprisingly, the *de minimis* determination requires a case-specific analysis using a utility-by-utility approach. Any utility that believes that its burden is not worth the information that the Commission would gain is welcome to request a waiver and in doing so provide detailed case-specific information supporting its claim. This has been the procedure used in prior years by the Commission and is approved by OMB.

“Type of Request”

PG&E also requests clarification of the term “Type of Request” stated at page 2 of FERC’s Notice.

FERC response: OMB requires approval/renewal of approvals of all collections of information every three years. The three year period does not refer to the collection frequency, but the period of time beyond which OMB’s approval of a collection of information would expire if not renewed.

Dated: July 15, 2013.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013–17414 Filed 7–19–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP13–514–000]

Texas Eastern Transmission, LP; Notice of Application

On July 2, 2013, Texas Eastern Transmission, LP (Texas Eastern) filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) an application under section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157, Subpart A of Commission regulations for authorization to abandon certain natural gas facilities no longer in service. As described more fully in the Application, Texas Eastern states that it lacks the documentation to confirm the dates these facilities were removed from service or that abandonment authorization was received. Texas Eastern lists more than 750 of such facilities, 550 meter stations and 200 small pipe sections in an appendix to the filing. Texas Eastern requests this abandonment authorization to clarify the regulatory status of these facilities and to ensure that Texas Eastern’s

records include documentation supporting their abandonment. Texas Eastern states that the proposed abandonment will not adversely impact existing Texas Eastern service provided and will not affect existing rates or tariff provisions.

Questions regarding this application may be directed to Lisa A. Connolly, General Manager, Rates & Certificates, Texas Eastern Transmission, LP, P.O. Box 1642, Houston, Texas, 77251–1642, or by calling (713) 627–4102; by fax 713–627–5947 or by email to laconnolly@spectraenergy.com.

Pursuant to section 157.9 of the Commission’s rules, 18 CFR 157.9, within 90 days of this Notice the Commission staff will either: complete its environmental assessment (EA) and place it into the Commission’s public record (eLibrary) for this proceeding; or issue a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review. If a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review is issued, it will indicate, among other milestones, the anticipated date for the Commission staff’s issuance of the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) or EA for this proposal. The filing of the EA in the Commission’s public record for this proceeding or the issuance of a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review will serve to notify federal and state agencies of the timing for the completion of all necessary reviews, and the subsequent need to complete all federal authorizations within 90 days of the date of issuance of the Commission staff’s FEIS or EA.

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 seven 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