

For further information, contact the HQ USAF Scientific Advisory Board Secretariat at (703) 697-8404.

Barbara A. Carmichael,

Alternate Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 98-5977 Filed 3-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3910-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Docket Nos. EA-175 and EA-176]

Applications To Export Electric Energy; Enova Energy, Inc. and Sempra Energy Trading Corp.

AGENCY: Office of Fossil Energy, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of applications.

SUMMARY: Enova Energy, Inc. and Sempra Energy Trading Corp. both power marketers, have submitted applications to export electric energy to Mexico.

DATES: Comments, protests or requests to intervene must be submitted on or before March 24, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments, protests or requests to intervene should be addressed as follows: Office of Coal & Power Im/Ex (FE-27), Office of Fossil Energy, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585-0350 (FAX 202-287-5736).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Russell (Program Office) 202-586-9624 or Michael Skinker (Program Attorney) 202-586-6667.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Exports of electricity from the United States to a foreign country are regulated and require authorization under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (FPA) (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)).

The Office of Fossil Energy (FE) of the Department of Energy (DOE) has received applications from the following companies for authorization to export electric energy to Mexico, pursuant to section 202(e) of the FPA:

Applicant	Application date	Docket No.
Enova Energy, Inc. (EEI)	2/27/98	EA-175
Sempra Energy Trading Corp. (SET)	2/27/98	EA-176

EEI, a wholly owned subsidiary of Enova Corporation which owns 100% of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), is a power marketer that does not own, operate or control any electric power generation, transmission or distribution facilities. In Docket EA-

175, EEI proposes to purchase electric energy from electric utilities and federal power marketing agencies and transmit the energy on its own behalf to Mexico. EEI would arrange for the exported energy to be transmitted to Mexico over the international transmission facilities owned by SDG&E.

In Docket EA-176, SET, a power marketer, also proposes to transmit to Mexico surplus electric energy purchased from utilities and federal power marketing agencies using the international transmission facilities owned by SDG&E. SET is a wholly owned subsidiary of Wine Acquisition Inc., which in turn, is owned 50% by Enova Corporation and 50% Pacific Enterprises (which owns 100% of Southern California Gas Company).

The SDG&E international transmission facilities, as more fully described in the applications, have previously been authorized by Presidential permits issued pursuant to Executive Order 10485, as amended.

Procedural Matters

Any persons desiring to become a party to these proceedings or to be heard by filing comments or protests to these applications should file a petition to intervene, comment or protest at the address provided above in accordance with §§ 385.211 or 385.214 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). Fifteen copies of such petitions and protests should be filed with the DOE on or before the date listed above.

The comment period in this proceeding has been abbreviated so that each applicant may make a timely response to a solicitation for 320 MW or more of energy and capacity proffered by Comision Federal de Electricidad (CFE), the national electric utility of Mexico. FE considers this action to not harm, or otherwise prejudice, any entity that may wish to become a party to this proceeding because both EEI and SET are corporately related to SDG&E, the owner of the transmission facilities each proposes to use.

Comments on EEI's request to export to Mexico should be clearly marked with Docket EA-175. Additional copies are to be filed directly with Dwain M. Boettcher, President, Enova Energy, Inc., P.O. Box 126211, San Diego, CA 92112-6211 AND Michael C. Tierney, Enova Corporation, P.O. Box 129400, San Diego, CA 92112-9400.

Comments on SET's request to export to Mexico should be clearly marked with Docket EA-176. Additional copies are to be filed directly with Michael A. Goldstein, Esq., Vice President &

General Counsel, Sempra Energy Trading Corp., One Greenwich Plaza, Greenwich, CT 06830 AND Michael C. Tierney, Enova Corporation, P.O. Box 129400, San Diego, CA 92112-9400.

A final decision will be made on these applications after the environmental impacts have been evaluated pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), and a determination is made by the DOE that the proposed actions will not adversely impact on the reliability of the U.S. electric power supply system.

Copies of these applications will be made available, upon request, for public inspection and copying at the address provided above.

Issued in Washington, DC on March 3, 1998.

Anthony J. Como,

Manager, Electric Power Regulation, Office of Coal and Power Im/Ex, Office of Coal and Power Systems, Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 98-5940 Filed 3-6-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. GP98-2-000]

Amoco Production Company; Notice of Offer of Settlement and Call for the Protection of Rights Pending Adjudication or Settlement

March 3, 1998.

Take notice that on February 20, 1998, Amoco Production Company (Amoco), alleging compliance with the Commission's January 23, 1998 Order Clarifying Procedures (82 FERC ¶ 61,059), filed an offer of settlement with the Commission, and called for the protection of its rights pending adjudication or settlement, with respect to Amoco's Kansas ad valorem tax refund obligation to K N Interstate Gas Transmission Company (KNI), identified in the Statement of Refunds Due filed by KNI in Docket No. RP98-53-000. Amoco's pleading is on file with the Commission and, except for Amoco's confidential offer of settlement, is open to public inspection.

Amoco contends that the Commission has established a procedure to follow, under 18 CFR 385.602 of the Commission's regulations, when informal settlement or reconciliation efforts fail, and that it has complied with the requisites of that Section. Amoco suggests that a Settlement Judge be appointed, that Amoco's refund obligation to KNI be held in abeyance and that interest be tolled, on the basis

that Amoco has a constitution and statutory right to a hearing before it may be deprived of property, i.e., the 1983–1988 Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursement dollars that Amoco previously collected from KNI. Amoco further alleges that it made a settlement offer to KNI, and that KNI rejected that offer.

Amoco also requests a full and fair hearing, and claims that there are contested issues of material fact (measurable in dollars) on which KNI and Amoco disagree. Amoco further argues that these issues must be adjudicated. Amoco's alleged issues of material fact include:

(1) The amount of dollars of revenue Amoco collected for the sale of its gas in each relevant time period;

(2) How much (if any) of the dollars Amoco collected were in excess of the maximum lawful price (MLP) in each relevant time period;

(3) How much (if any) of the excess dollars collected by Amoco were actually paid by customers of interstate pipelines through the pipeline's PGA process, i.e., how much were the pipeline's customers overcharged; and

(4) Assuming that part of the refund amount is interest, then when did the interstate pipeline customers begin paying a fraction of the amounts determined to be in excess of the MLP, which Amoco contends will govern the amount of interest owned.

Amoco's pleading includes its claim that it has complied with the Commission's orders requiring a statement of its basic principles for rejecting KNI's refund claim, and Amoco's privileged and confidential offer of settlement to KNI (Amoco's Attachment A). Amoco also provides its own assessment as to how to compute the correct refund amount.

The procedural rules governing settlements are set forth in Section 385.602 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Under Section 385.602(f), any person wishing to make comments with respect to an offer of settlement must do so not later than 20 days after the date the settlement offer was filed. Reply comments must be filed not later than 30 days after the date the settlement offer was filed. Accordingly, any person desiring to file comments with respect to Amoco's offer of settlement should file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C.

20426, by March 12, 1998, in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure [18 CFR 385.602(f)].

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–5965 Filed 3–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. GP98–4–000]

Amoco Production Company; Notice of Offer of Settlement and Call for the Protection of Rights Pending Adjudication or Settlement

March 3, 1998.

Take notice that on February 20, 1998, Amoco Production Company (Amoco), alleging compliance with the Commission's January 28, 1998 Order Clarifying Procedures (82 FERC ¶ 61,059), filed an offer of settlement with the Commission, and called for the protection of its rights pending adjudication or settlement, with respect to Amoco's Kansas ad valorem tax refund obligation to Williams Gas Pipeline Central, Inc., formerly: Williams Natural Gas Company, (Williams), identified in the Statement of Refunds Due filed by Williams in Docket No. RP98–52–000. Amoco's pleading is on file with the Commission and, except for Amoco's confidential offer of settlement, is open to public inspection.

Amoco contends that the Commission has established a procedure to follow, under 18 CFR 385.602 of the Commission's regulations, when informal settlement or reconciliation efforts fail, and that it has complied with the requisites of that Section. Amoco suggests that a Settlement Judge be appointed, that Amoco's refund obligation to Williams to held in abeyance and that interest be tolled, on the basis that Amoco has a constitutional and statutory right to a hearing before it may be deprived of property, i.e., the 1983–1988 Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursement dollars that Amoco previously collected from Williams. Amoco further alleges that it made a settlement offer to Williams, and that Williams rejected that offer.

Amoco also requests a full and fair hearing, and claims that there are contested issues of material fact (measurable in dollars) on which Williams and Amoco disagree. Amoco further argues that these issues must be adjudicated. Amoco's alleged issues of material fact include:

(1) Amount of dollars of revenue Amoco collected for the sale of its gas in each relevant time period;

(2) How much (if any) of the dollars Amoco collected were in excess of the maximum lawful price (MLP) in each relevant time period;

(3) How much (if any) of the excess dollars collected by Amoco were actually paid by customers of interstate pipelines through the pipeline's PGA process, i.e., how much were the pipeline's customers overcharged; and

(4) Assuming that part of the refund amount is interest, then when did the interstate pipeline customers begin paying a fraction of the amounts determined to be in excess of the MLP, which Amoco contends will govern the amount of interest owned.

Amoco's pleading includes its claim that it has complied with the Commission's orders requiring a statement of its basic principles for rejecting Williams's refund claim, and Amoco's privileged and confidential offer of settlement to Williams (Amoco's Attachment A). Amoco also provides its own assessment as to how to compute the correct refund amount.

The procedural rules governing settlements are set forth in Section 385.602 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Under Section 385.602(f), any person wishing to make comments with respect to an offer of settlement must do so not later than 20 days after the date the settlement offer was filed. Reply comments must be filed not later than 30 days after the date the settlement offer was filed. Accordingly, any person desiring to file comments with respect to Amoco's offer of settlement should file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, by March 12, 1998, in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure [18 CFR 385.602(f)].

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–5967 Filed 3–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M