during the specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

Paragraph 6005 Class E airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth.

\* \* \* \* \*

## AWP AZ E5 Douglas, AZ [Modified]

Bisbee Douglas International Airport, AZ (Lat. 31°28′08″ N., long. 109°36′14″ W.)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within 3.9 miles northeast and 8.3 miles southwest of the Bisbee Douglas International Airport 333° bearing extending from the airport to 16.1 miles northwest. That airspace extending upward from 1.200 feet above the surface within a 7.8-mile radius of Bisbee Douglas International Airport, and within a 20-mile radius of Bisbee Douglas International Airport extending clockwise from the 288° bearing to the 075° bearing of the airport, and within 4.3 miles east and 7.4 miles west of the Bisbee Douglas International Airport 347° bearing extending from the airport to 34.5 miles north.

Issued in Seattle, Washington, on February 13, 2012.

#### John Warner,

Manager, Operations Support Group, Western Service Center.

[FR Doc. 2012-4156 Filed 2-22-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

## **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

#### 18 CFR Part 381

[Docket No. RM12-5-000]

## **Annual Update of Filing Fees**

**AGENCY:** Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, DOE.

**ACTION:** Final rule; annual update of Commission filing fees.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with its regulations, the Commission issues this update of its filing fees. This notice provides the yearly update using data in the Commission's Management, Administrative, and Payroll System to calculate the new fees. The purpose of updating is to adjust the fees on the basis of the Commission's costs for Fiscal Year 2011.

 $\textbf{DATES:} \ \textit{Effective Date:} \ March\ 26,\ 2012.$ 

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Raymond D. Johnson Jr., Office of the Executive Director, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Room 42–66, Washington, DC 20426, 202–502–8402.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Document Availability: In addition to publishing the full text of this document in the Federal Register, the Commission provides all interested persons an opportunity to view and/or print the contents of this document via the Internet through FERC's Home Page (http://www.ferc.gov) and in FERC's Public Reference Room during normal business hours (8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. Eastern time) at 888 First Street NE., Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426.

From FERC's Web site on the Internet, this information is available in the

eLibrary (formerly FERRIS). The full text of this document is available on eLibrary in PDF and Microsoft Word format for viewing, printing, and/or downloading. To access this document in eLibrary, type the docket number excluding the last three digits of this document in the docket number field and follow other directions on the search page.

User assistance is available for eLibrary and other aspects of FERC's Web site during normal business hours. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support at

FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or toll free at (866) 208–3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502–8659.

# **Annual Update of Filing Fees**

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) is issuing this notice to update filing fees that the Commission assesses for specific services and benefits provided to identifiable beneficiaries. Pursuant to 18 CFR 381.104, the Commission is establishing updated fees on the basis of the Commission's Fiscal Year 2011 costs. The adjusted fees announced in this notice are effective March 26, 2012. The Commission has determined, with the concurrence of the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget, that this final rule is not a major rule within the meaning of section 251 of Subtitle E of Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act, 5 U.S.C. 804(2). The Commission is submitting this final rule to both houses of the United States Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States.

The new fee schedule is as follows:

Fees Applicable to the Natural Gas Policy Act		
1. Petitions for rate approval pursuant to 18 CFR 284.123(b)(2). (18 CFR 381.403)	\$12,370	
Fees Applicable to General Activities		
1. Petition for issuance of a declaratory order (except under Part I of the Federal Power Act). (18 CFR 381.302(a))	24,860	
Amount in controversy		
\$0–9,999. (18 CFR 381.303(b))	100	
\$10,000–29,999. (18 CFR 381.303(b))	600	
\$30,000 or more. (18 CFR 381.303(a))	36,290	
3. Review of a Department of Energy denial of adjustment:		
Amount in controversy		
\$0-9,999. (18 CFR 381.304(b))	100	
\$10,000–29,999. (18 CFR 381.304(b))	600	
\$30,000 or more. (18 CFR 381.304(a))	19,030	
4. Written legal interpretations by the Office of General Counsel. (18 CFR 381.305(a))	7,130	

Fees Applicable to Natural Gas Pipelines	
1. Pipeline certificate applications pursuant to 18 CFR 284.224. (18 CFR 381.207(b))	*1,000
Fees Applicable to Cogenerators and Small Power Producers	
1. Certification of qualifying status as a small power production facility. (18 CFR 381.505(a))	21,380 24,200

<sup>\*</sup> This fee has not been changed.

# List of Subjects in 18 CFR Part 381

Electric power plants, Electric utilities, Natural gas, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: February 16, 2012.

## Charles H. Schneider,

Executive Director.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Commission amends Part 381, Chapter I, Title 18, Code of Federal Regulations, as set forth below.

#### PART 381—FEES

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 381 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 15 U.S.C. 717–717w; 16 U.S.C. 791–828c, 2601–2645; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 42 U.S.C. 7101–7352; 49 U.S.C. 60502; 49 App. U.S.C. 1–85.

## § 381.302 [Amended]

2. In § 381.302, paragraph (a) is amended by removing "\$23,540" and adding "\$24,860" in its place.

## § 381.303 [Amended]

3. In § 381.303, paragraph (a) is amended by removing "\$34,370" and adding "\$36,290" in its place.

## § 381.304 [Amended]

4. In § 381.304, paragraph (a) is amended by removing "\$18,020" and adding "\$19,030" in its place.

## § 381.305 [Amended]

5. In § 381.305, paragraph (a) is amended by removing "\$ 6,750" and adding "\$7,130" in its place.

## § 381.403 [Amended]

6. Section 381.403 is amended by removing "\$11,720" and adding "\$12,370" in its place.

## § 381.505 [Amended]

7. In § 381.505, paragraph (a) is amended by removing "\$20,240" and adding "\$21,380" in its place and by removing "\$22,920" and adding "\$24,200" in its place.

[FR Doc. 2012–4146 Filed 2–22–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

## **SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION**

#### 20 CFR Parts 404 and 416

[Docket No. SSA 2010-0044]

RIN 0960-AG89

## How We Collect and Consider Evidence of Disability

**AGENCY:** Social Security Administration (SSA).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** We are modifying the requirement to recontact your medical source(s) first when we need to resolve an inconsistency or insufficiency in the evidence he or she provided. Depending on the nature of the inconsistency or insufficiency, there may be other, more appropriate sources from whom we could obtain the information we need. By giving adjudicators more flexibility in determining how best to obtain this information, we will be able to make a determination or decision on disability claims more quickly and efficiently in certain situations. Eventually, our need to recontact your medical source(s) in many situations will be significantly reduced as a result of our efforts to improve the evidence collection process through the increased use of Health Information Technology (HIT).

**DATES:** These rules are effective March 26, 2012.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Brian Rudick, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, 6401 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, MD 21235–6401, (410) 965–7102. For information on eligibility or filing for benefits, call our national toll-free number, 1–800–772–1213 or TTY 1–800–325–0778, or visit our Internet site, Social Security Online, at http://www.socialsecurity.gov.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

We are making final the proposed changes to our rules regarding when we will recontact your medical source(s) to resolve an inconsistency or insufficiency in the evidence he or she provided. We proposed these changes in a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) we published in the **Federal Register** on April 12, 2011 (76 FR 20282). The preamble to the NPRM discussed the changes from the current rules and our reasons for proposing those changes. Because we are adopting the proposed rules as published, we are not repeating that information here.

#### **Public Comments on the NPRM**

In the NPRM, we provided the public a 60-day comment period, which ended on June 13, 2011. We received 59 public comments. The comments came from a member of the public, members of the disability advocacy community, and several national groups of Social Security claimants' representatives.

We provide below summaries of the significant comments that were relevant to this rulemaking and our responses to those comments. We have tried to present the commenters' concerns and suggestions accurately and completely.

*Comment:* All of the commenters recommended that we keep our current requirement to recontact a person's medical source(s) first when we need to resolve an inconsistency or insufficiency in the evidence he or she provided. Some of these commenters believed that the proposed modification of this requirement was inconsistent with sections 223(d)(5)(B) and 1614(a)(3)(H) of the Social Security Act (Act), which require us to make "every reasonable effort to obtain from the individual's treating physician (or other treating health care provider) all medical evidence, including diagnostic tests, necessary in order to properly make [a] determination, prior to evaluating medical evidence obtained from any other source on a consultative basis." Other commenters believed that any modification of the current requirement would make it less likely that adjudicators would obtain evidence from a person's medical source(s), and more likely that they would try and obtain evidence from a consultative examination (CE) instead. These commenters speculated that some adjudicators may even purchase CEs to undermine evidence provided by

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  The NPRM is available at: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2011-04-12/pdf/2011-8388.pdf.