

adopted and currently uses the new SPE/WPC definitions and these definitions are fundamentally consistent with IRS usage. The SEC has had extensive dialogue starting in 1997 with the EIA, petroleum industry and investment community on the new SPE/WPC definitions. The SEC has yet to reach a decision to modify their definitions or to adopt the SEC definitions to be more consistent with the SPE/WPC definitions. The dialogue will continue. The EIA, SPE, WPC and the SEC all recognize that definitions of proved reserves are not static and will continue to evolve over time.

These new definitions contain at least two major changes from the previous SPE definitions adopted in 1987. First, *probabilistic* calculation techniques (i.e., a range of reserves estimates with uncertainties associated with each level of reserve estimates) were accepted as valid methods of estimating proved reserves along with the traditional *deterministic* techniques (i.e., a discrete reserve estimate with an associated level of certainty). Second, the use of an oil or gas price averaged over a longer historical period of time, typically one year, rather than the price listed on a single day was recommended in the SPE/WPC definitions to be consistent with the purpose of economic estimation of reserves.

The EIA believes that allowing and accepting probabilistic estimates of reserves is both state-of-the-art and a means for improving the understanding of proved reserves. The EIA expects that most filers will continue to utilize the deterministic methodology to determine reserves but will accept probabilistic estimates when appropriate. Reserves calculated using any type of evaluation methodology rely upon the skill, integrity and judgment of the evaluator and require an ample amount of reliable data.

The EIA also believes that using an average annual price for oil and gas rather than a so called "market price" on December 31 of the reporting year as the SEC currently requires, will lead to more reliable proved reserves estimates, as well as more meaningful estimates of those reserves' economic value. Estimating reserves requires consideration of both technical and economic components. In 1998, U.S. proved reserves of crude oil registered the largest percentage decline in 53 years. The annualized oil price decline from \$17.40 per barrel in 1997 to \$10.88 per barrel in 1998 had a significant impact on proved reserves. Moreover, using end of year prices [\$15.04 per barrel in December 1997 to \$8.03 in December 1998], further exacerbated the

reduction in proved reserves for most producers and for the nation. As the oil price falls, each additional dollar decline has a proportionally larger negative impact on the reported volume of proved reserves.

The adoption of these new definitions of proved reserves by the EIA will not require respondents to change the way they report information on Form EIA-23.

Respondents should use the same methods when estimating reserves for the EIA as they do for the SEC. If there is an apparent conflict in requirements and assumptions, give precedence to the methods used for the SEC.

Operators should note in the footnotes whether end of year or annual average prices were used and whether probabilistic or deterministic methods were utilized at the field level.

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

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

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

C. Public reporting burden for this collection is estimated to average 4 hours for small operators, 32 hours for intermediate operators, and 160 hours for large operators on Form EIA-23. In addition, proposed Form EIA-23 modifications are anticipated to reduce these reporting burden estimates for intermediate operators by 4 hours and for large operators by 16 hours. For operators reporting on Form EIA-23P, reporting burden is estimated at 15 minutes. For natural gas plant operators reporting on Form EIA-64A, the reporting burden is estimated at 6 hours.

The estimated burden includes the total time, effort or financial resources expended to generate, maintain, retain, disclose and provide the information. Please comment on the accuracy of the burden estimates.

D. The agency estimates that the only costs to the respondents are for the time it will take them to complete the collection. Please comment if respondents will incur 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

A. Is the information useful at the levels of detail indicated on the form?

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

C. 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. These comments will also become a matter of public record.

Statutory Authority: Section 3506 (c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. No. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Issued in Washington, DC, April 14, 2000.

Jay H. Casselberry,

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

[FR Doc. 00-9912 Filed 4-19-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER00-1816-001]

DTE-River Rouge No. 1, L.L.C.; Notice of Filing

April 14, 2000.

Take notice that on April 12, 2000, DTE-River Rouge No. 1, L.L.C. tendered for filing a response to Staff's deficiency

letter issued in this docket on April 7, 2000 and a revised FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 1.

Copies of the filing were served upon parties to the above-captioned proceeding and the Michigan Public Service Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest such filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). All such motions and protests should be filed on or before April 24, 2000. Protests will be considered by the Commission to determine 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. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection. This filing may also be viewed on the Internet at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> (call 202-208-2222 for assistance).

David P. Boergers,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-9913 Filed 4-19-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP00-245-000]

East Tennessee Natural Gas Company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

April 14, 2000.

Take notice that on April 12, 2000, East Tennessee Natural Gas Company (East Tennessee) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, the tariff sheets listed in Appendix A to the filing, to be effective May 1, 2000:

East Tennessee states that, on March 14, 2000, East Tennessee was acquired from El Paso Energy (El Paso) and became a wholly owned subsidiary of Duke Energy Corporation (Duke). East Tennessee states that, pursuant to the Stock Purchase Agreement, El Paso entered into a Transition Agreement to ensure the smooth operation of the East Tennessee pipeline system for a period of up to nine months from the closing date (transition period). Among other things, the Transition Agreement requires El Paso to perform certain

capacity management activities on behalf of East Tennessee for the daily operations of the system during the transition period.

East Tennessee states that, as part of El Paso's transition to interactive Internet communications in compliance with the Commission's Order No. 587-I, El Paso has undertaken a major rewrite of its pipelines' critical computer system functions (the "PASSKEY" system). El Paso has advised Duke that it intends to complete the move to the Internet by May 1, 2000. East Tennessee states that, because El Paso will be performing certain capacity management activities for East Tennessee utilizing the PASSKEY System during the transition period, East Tennessee is modifying its existing tariff and pro forma service agreements to reflect the system and tariff changes made by the El Paso pipelines.

East Tennessee states that the purpose of this filing is to obtain Commission approval for the tariff modifications in East Tennessee's tariff mirroring the El Paso pipelines' proposals in order to implement the PASSKEY System rewrite and the Service Upgrades by May 1, 2000 for the duration of the transition period and to update East Tennessee's mailing addresses and contact information as a result of the acquisition by Duke. At the end of the transition period, East Tennessee will file revised tariff sheets to reflect the end of the transition period and the implementation of the LINKr System for East Tennessee, and will make any additional changes necessary to conform the operations of the East Tennessee pipeline system with those of the other Duke pipelines.

East Tennessee states that copies of its filing have been mailed to all affected customers and interested state commissions.

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. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room. This filing may be viewed on the

web at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> (call 202-208-2222 for assistance).

David P. Boergers,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-9865 Filed 4-19-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. GT00-25-000]

TransColorado Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Tariff Filing

April 14, 2000.

Take notice that on April 12, 2000, TransColorado Gas Transmission Company (TransColorado) tendered for filing to become part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 1, the tariff sheets listed to Appendix A to the filing, to be effective May 15, 2000.

TransColorado states that due to a change in the TransColorado partnership, changes have been proposed to modify the reference to the person to whom communications should be addressed regarding TransColorado's tariff and references to a former partner, El Paso TransColorado Company, have been removed. In addition, miscellaneous tariff "clean-up" type revisions have also been made.

TransColorado states that a copy of this filing has been served upon TransColorado's customers, the Colorado Public Utilities Commission and New Mexico Public Regulatory Commission.

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. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room. This filing may be viewed on the web at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/>