implementing regulations (10 CFR part 1021), Western completed an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on its Energy Planning and Management Program. The Record of Decision was published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 53181, October 12, 1995). Western also completed the 2004 Power Marketing Program EIS (2004 EIS), and the Record of Decision was published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 22934, April 28, 1997). The Marketing Plan falls within the range of alternatives considered in the 2004 EIS. This NEPA review identified and analyzed environmental effects related to the Marketing Plan. This action falls within the Marketing Plan and, thus, is covered by the 2004 EIS.

Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*), Western has received approval from the Office of Management and Budget for the collection of customer information in this rule, under control number 1910–5136, which expires on September 30, 2011.

Determination Under Executive Order 12866

Western has an exemption from centralized regulatory review under Executive Order 12866; accordingly, no clearance of this **Federal Register** notice by the Office of Management and Budget is required.

Dated: May 15, 2009.

Timothy J. Meeks,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. E9–12919 Filed 6–2–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP09–610–000]

Shell Energy North America (US), L.P.: Complainant v. Rockies Express Pipeline Company and Sempra Rockies Marketing, LLC: Respondents; Notice of Complaint

May 27, 2009.

Take notice that on May 26, 2009, pursuant to section 206 of the Rules and Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.206 (2008) and section 5 of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. 717d, Shell Energy North America (US), L.P. (Complainant) filed a formal complaint against Rockies Express Pipeline Company (REX) and Sempra Rockies Marketing, LLC (SRM) disputing its contract rate for service from Opal, Wyoming to Zone 3 on the REX system.

The Complainant certifies that copies of the complaint have been served on the representatives for REX and SRM.

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, 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. The Respondent's answer and all interventions, or protests must be filed on or before the comment date. The Respondent's answer, motions to intervene, and protests must be served on the Complainants.

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.

Comment Date: 5 pm Eastern Time on June 15, 2009.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E9–12862 Filed 6–2–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. EG09–19–000; EG09–20–000; EG09–23–000; EG09–24–000; EG09–25–000; EG09–28–000; EG09–29–000; EG09–30–000; EG09–31–000; EG09–32–000; EG09–33–000]

Hay Canyon Wind LLC; PowerSmith Cogeneration Project, LP; TXC Green Power LLC; Evergreen Wind Power V, LLC; EcoGrove Wind, LLC; RPL Holdings, Inc.; Reliant Energy Florida, LLC; High Lonesome Mesa, LLC; Saranac Power Partners, L.P.; EC&R Panther Creek Wind Farm III, LLC; Windy Flats Partners, LLC; Notice of Effectiveness of Exempt Wholesale Generator Status

May 27, 2009.

Take notice that during the month of April 2009, the status of the above-captioned entities as Exempt Wholesale Generators Companies became effective by operation of the Commission's regulations 18 CFR 366.7(a), except for Docket Nos. EG09–19–000 and EG09–20–000, which became effective in February 2009; and Docket Nos. EG09–23–000, EG09–24–000, and EG09–25–000, which became effective in March 2009.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. E9–12864 Filed 6–2–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Representative Average Unit Costs of Energy

AGENCY: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this notice, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is forecasting the representative average unit costs of five residential energy sources for the year 2009 pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. The five sources are electricity, natural gas, No. 2 heating oil, propane, and kerosene.

DATES: The representative average unit costs of energy contained in this notice will become effective July 6, 2009 and will remain in effect until further notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mohammed Khan, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Forrestal Building, Mail Station EE–2J, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585–0121, (202) 586–7892, *Mohammed.Khan@ee.doe.gov.*

Francine Pinto, Esq., U.S. Department of Energy, Office of General Counsel, Forrestal Building, Mail Station GC–72, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585–0103, (202) 586–7432, *Francine.pinto@hq.doe.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 323 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (Act) requires that DOE prescribe test procedures for the measurement of the estimated annual operating costs or other measures of energy consumption for certain consumer products specified in the Act. (42 U.S.C. 6293(b)(3)) These test procedures are found in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 430, subpart B.

Section 323(b)(3) of the Act requires that the estimated annual operating costs of a covered product be calculated from measurements of energy use in a representative average use cycle or period of use and from representative average unit costs of the energy needed to operate such product during such cycle. (42 U.S.C. 6293(b)(3)) The section further requires that DOE provide information to manufacturers regarding the representative average unit costs of energy. (42 U.S.C. 6293(b)(4)) This cost information should be used by manufacturers to meet their obligations under section 323(c) of the Act. Most notably, these costs are used to comply with Federal Trade Commission (FTC) requirements for labeling. Manufacturers are required to use the revised DOE representative average unit costs when the FTC publishes new ranges of comparability for specific covered products, 16 CFR part 305. Interested parties can also find information covering the FTC labeling requirements at *http://www.ftc.gov/appliances.*

DOE last published representative average unit costs of residential energy in a **Federal Register** notice entitled, ''Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Representative Average Unit Costs of Energy'', dated March 3, 2008 (73 FR 11406). Effective July 6, 2009, the cost figures published on March 3, 2008, will be superseded by the cost figures set forth in this notice.

DOE's Energy Information Administration (EIA) has developed the 2009 representative average unit after-tax costs found in this notice. The representative average unit after-tax costs for electricity, natural gas, No. 2 heating oil, and propane are based on simulations used to produce the March 2009, EIA *Short-Term Energy Outlook.* (EIA releases the *Outlook* monthly.) The representative average unit after-tax cost for kerosene is derived from its price relative to that of heating oil, based on the 2003–2007 averages for these two fuels. The source for these price data is the February 2009 *Monthly Energy Review* DOE/EIA–0035(2009/02). The *Short-Term Energy Outlook* and the *Monthly Energy Review* are available on the EIA Web site at *http://www.eia.doe.gov.* For more information on the two sources, contact the National Energy Information Center, Forrestal Building, EI–30, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586–8800, e-mail: *infoctr@eia.doe.gov.*

The 2009 representative average unit costs under section 323(b)(4) of the Act are set forth in Table 1, and will become effective July 6, 2009. They will remain in effect until further notice.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 26, 2009.

Steven G. Chalk,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

TABLE 1—REPRESENTATIVE AVERAGE UNIT COSTS OF ENERGY FOR FIVE RESIDENTIAL ENERGY SOURCES

[2009]

Type of energy	Per million Btu[1]	In commonly used terms	As required by test procedure
Electricity	$33.41	11.40¢/kWh[2,3]	$.1140/kWh
Natural Gas	11.12	$1.112/therm[4] or $11.44/MCF[5,6]	.00001112/Btu
No. 2 Heating Oil	16.22	$2.25/gallon[7]	.00001622/Btu
Propane	21.02	$1.92/gallon[8]	.00002102/Btu
Kerosene	15.63	$2.11/gallon[9]	.00001563/Btu

Sources: U.S. Energy Information Administration, *Short-Term Energy Outlook* (March 2009) and *Monthly Energy Review* (February 2009).

[1] Btu stands for British thermal units.

[2] kWh stands for kilowatt hour.

[3] 1 kWh = 3,412 Btu.

[4] 1 therm = 100,000 Btu. Natural gas prices include taxes.

[5] MCF stands for 1,000 cubic feet.

[6] For the purposes of this table, one cubic foot of natural gas has an energy equivalence of 1,029 Btu.

[7] For the purposes of this table, one gallon of No. 2 heating oil has an energy equivalence of 138,690 Btu.

[8] For the purposes of this table, one gallon of liquid propane has an energy equivalence of 91,333 Btu.

[9] For the purposes of this table, one gallon of kerosene has an energy equivalence of 135,000 Btu.

[FR Doc. E9–12913 Filed 6–2–09; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. PF08–24–000]

Calais LNG Project Company, LLC; Supplemental Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Calais LNG Project and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues Related to the Potential Expansion of the Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline System

May 27, 2009.

As previously noticed on November 20, 2008, and supplemented herein, the staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) that will discuss environmental impacts that could result from construction and operation of the Calais Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Project planned by the Calais LNG Project Company, LLC (Calais LNG). The EIS will be used by the Commission in its decision making process to determine whether the project is in the public convenience and necessity.

The planned Calais LNG Project would consist of an onshore LNG import and storage terminal located just north of Ford Point on the St. Croix River, about 6 miles southeast of the Town of Calais in Washington County, Maine; and about 20 miles of natural gas sendout pipeline between the LNG terminal and an interconnection with the existing Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline L.L.C.'s (M&NE) pipeline system near the Town of Baileyville, Maine. The M&NE system currently does not have sufficient capacity to transport the natural gas that would be supplied by the LNG terminal. Therefore, if the Calais LNG Project is authorized and placed into service, the M&NE system would require expansion in Maine, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire.

This Supplemental Notice of Intent (NOI) discloses the potential facilities that are anticipated to expand M&NE's system, based on information provided to Calais LNG by M&NE. Although M&NE is not proposing to construct these facilities and does not have an application before the FERC, these expanded M&NE facilities are likely a necessary part of the project. An analysis of the impacts of these facilities will be included in the EIS being prepared for the Calais LNG facility. This Supplemental NOI is being issued to notify the public about the anticipated M&NE system expansion and to request comments regarding the possible environmental impact of those facilities. Your input will help determine what issues need to be evaluated in the EIS regarding the M&NE system expansion. Please note that the scoping period for this supplemental NOI will close on June 29, 2009.

This notice is being sent to the Commission's current environmental mailing list for this project, which includes federal, state, and local government representatives and agencies; elected officials; environmental and public interest groups; Native American tribes; other interested parties; and local libraries and newspapers. State and local government representatives are asked to notify their constituents of this planned project and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

Summary of the Anticipated M&NE Expansion

The following facilities have been identified by M&NE as necessary to accommodate the gas volumes to be delivered by Calais LNG. A summary of the Calais LNG Project was included in the NOI issued on November 20, 2008, and the scoping period closed on December 22, 2008. This NOI may also be accessed via the FERC eLibrary. Instructions about using eLibrary are included in the Additional Information section on page 7.

Pipeline Looping

Approximately 233.4 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline looping [1] is anticipated in or adjacent to the existing M&NE right-of-way (ROW) or other nearby utility or road ROWs, as follows:

- *Eliot Loop*—21.1 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline adjacent to the existing 30-inch-diameter Joint Mainline (milepost [MP] 31.1 in Rockingham County, New Hampshire to MP 51.2 in York County, Maine);
- *Westbrook Loop*—41.1 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline adjacent to the existing 30-inch-diameter Joint Mainline (MP 60.3 to MP 101.4 in Cumberland County, Maine);
- *Richmond Loop*—35.4 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline adjacent to the existing 24-inch-diameter Phase II Mainline (MP 107.9 in Cumberland County, Maine to MP 143.4 in Sagadahoc County, Maine);
- *Searsmont Loop*—35.5 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline adjacent to the existing 24-inch-diameter Phase II Mainline (MP 152.0 in Kennebec County, Maine to MP 185.5 in Waldo County, Maine);
- *Brewer Loop*—34.2 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline adjacent to the existing 24-inch-diameter Phase II Mainline (MP 191.6 in Waldo County, Maine to MP 225.8 in Penobscot County, Maine);
- *WC Ridge Loop*—35.2 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline adjacent to the existing 24-inch-diameter Phase II Mainline (MP 230.8 in Penobscot County, Maine to MP 266.0 in Hancock County, Maine); and
- *Baileyville Loop*—30.9 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline adjacent to the existing 24-inch-diameter Phase II Mainline (MP 271.3 in Washington County, Maine to MP 302.2 in Washington County, Maine).

Nearly all 233.4 miles of the required looping are in or adjacent to the existing Joint Mainline or Phase II Mainline ROW or other utility or road ROWs. M&NE's primary goal would be to align, as much as possible, the new looping parallel to the existing Phase II Mainline and Joint Mainline with a 25-foot offset. The side that the loops would be located on would vary due to residential impacts, screening, land use, environmental or construction issues where known to exist.

Compressor Station Facilities [2]

A new meter station would be required at the tie-in of the Calais LNG sendout pipeline with the M&NE's system in Baileyville, Maine. Modifications to the existing meter station in Dracut, Massachusetts would be necessary, as well as uprating the maximum allowable operating pressure of the existing Joint Pipeline Facilities from Westbrook, Maine to Dracut, Massachusetts from 1,440 to 1,600 pounds per square inch gauge. Compression requirements for the pipeline expansion would likely include adding a total of 63,000 horsepower of compression to six existing compressor stations. These compressor stations include the Eliot Compressor Station (MP 51.2), Westbrook Compressor Station (MP 101.4), Richmond Compressor Station (MP 147.3), Searsmont Compressor

[1] A pipeline loop is a segment of pipe that is installed adjacent to or in the vicinity of an existing pipeline and connected to the existing pipeline at both ends. A loop increases the volume of gas that can be transported through that portion of the system.

[2] Construction of the Westbrook, Searsmont, Brewer and Woodchopping Ridge Compressor Stations was recently completed as part of Maritimes' Phase IV Project, as described in Docket No. CP06–335–000. These compressor stations were placed into service in January 2009.