#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98-290-000]

#### NorAm Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

March 23, 1998.

Take notice that on March 19, 1998, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NGT), 1111 Louisiana Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed a request with the Commission in Docket No. CP98-290-000, pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.211 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (NGA), for authorization to own and operate certain facilities in Arkansas to deliver gas to Arkla, a distribution of NorAm Energy Corporation authorized in blanket certificate issued in Docket Nos. CP82-384-000 and CP82-384-001. all as more fully set forth in the request on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

NGT proposes to install a 1-inch delivery tap and meter station on NGT's Line BT–14 in Conway County, Arkansas which would provide service to Arkla's rural distribution system. The estimated volumes to be delivered through the above facilities are 4,320 MMBtu annually and 11 MMBtu on a peak day. NGT's construction costs are estimated at \$6,523. NGT states that Arkla would reimburse NGT \$5,603 of actual construction costs.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after the Commission has issued this notice, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the allowed time, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the NGA.

#### David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.
[FR Doc. 98–8009 Filed 3–26–98; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98-282-000]

# Northwest Pipeline Corporation; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

March 23, 1998.

Take notice that on March 16, 1998, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84158–0900, filed in Docket No. CP98-282-000, a request, pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.211 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.211), for authorization to construct and operate a new Oremet Meter Station to provide direct deliveries to Oregon Metallurgical Corporation (Oremet) in Linn County, Oregon, under Northwest's blanket certificate authorization issued in Docket No. CP82-433-000, pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Northwest describes the new meter station as tap facilities, consisting of two 4-inch taps, one each on Northwest's 10-inch Camas-Eugene Lateral and 20-inch lateral loop line; and meter facilities consisting of a 3-inch turbine meter, 2-inch piping, filter-separator, valves and appurtenances.

Northwest reports that the proposed meter station will have a design delivery capacity of approximately 4,300 Dth per day, limited by the inlet piping, calculated at an assumed line pressure of 500 psig, with initial deliveries projected to be up to 2,000 Dth per day and up to 500,000 Dth annually.

Northwest states that Oremet is presently receiving natural gas transportation and sales services from Northwest Natural Gas Company (Northwest Natural), a local distribution company. Northwest says that Oremet requested Northwest to provide a new delivery point for direct natural gas deliveries to Oremet's titanium mill, when the Oregon Public Utility Commission declined to approve an anti-bypass competitive rate contract between Northwest Natural and Oremet.

Northwest provides services to Northwest Natural under Rate Schedule TF-1, TF-2 or TI-1 transportation agreements. Northwest indicates that to receive service from Northwest at the new Oremet Meter Station, Oremet intends to acquire released firm capacity on Northwest's system or arrange for deliveries by existing firm shippers. Northwest states that the total cost for construction of the meter station will be approximately \$189,000; \$30,000 for new tap facilities to be built and owned by Northwest and the remainder for the new meter facilities to be built and owned by Oremet. Northwest says its expenses will be totally reimbursed by Oremet. Northwest proposes to operate the meter station, including facilities to be owned by Oremet, as part of its openaccess transportation system.

Northwest asserts that any deliveries made to Oremet through the new Meter Station will be gas delivered either for Oremet or other shippers for whom Northwest is authorized to transport gas. Northwest states that any volumes delivered to the new Oremet delivery point will be within the authorized entitlement of such shippers. Northwest does not expect its system peak day deliveries or its annual throughput to increase since deliveries through the proposed facilities will replace existing services currently being provided by Northwest Natural, which is also served by Northwest.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE. Washington, D.C., 20426, pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214), a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefore, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

#### David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–8007 Filed 3–26–98; 11:25 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98-285-000]

# Northwest Pipeline Corporation; Notice of Application

March 23, 1998.

Take notice that on March 18, 1998, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84158, filed an application pursuant to Sections 7 (b) and (c) of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's Regulations for amendments to existing certificates of public convenience and necessity, permission and approval for abandonments and approval of various tariff waivers and modifications as necessary to implement changes in its use of storage for system balancing and its provision of storage from the Jackson Prairie Storage Project (Jackson Prairie), in which it is a one-third owner, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Northwest states that the proposed changes generally are related to and/or consistent with proposals by Puget Sound Energy, Inc. (Puget Sound), the Project Operator of Jackson Prairie, to implement an updated and amended Gas Storage Agreement (Update Project Agreement) and expand the storage

project.

Concurrently with the implementation of the Updated Project Agreement proposed by Puget Sound, which is anticipated to occur in the fall of 1998, Northwest proposes to:

(1) Abandon the certificated services provided under Rate Schedule SGS-1 and X-82 for the two-thirds of the Jackson Prairie capacity owned by Puget Sound and The Washington Water Power Company. (Each owner henceforth will have direct access to its one-third ownership share of storage rights in Jackson Prairie.)

(2) Abandon the certificated Rate Schedule SGS-1 services from Northwest's one-third ownership share of storage rights in Jackson Prairie. (Each SGS-1 customer has elected to convert to open-access service under Rate Schedule SGS-2F.) Northwest also requests waivers of the posting/billing provisions in Section 25 of the General Terms and Conditions in its FERC tariff to the extent necessary to effectuate

these conversions.

(3) Increase total firm deliverability by 2,200 Dth per day (Dth/d) and total firm working gas capacity by 60,400 Dth available for Northwest's storage services from its one-third ownership share in the storage project. (These increased storage quantities result from utilization of an updated thermal conversion factor for the existing volumetric capacities of the storage project.) Northwest specifically requests waivers of the available capacity posting provisions in Sections 17.4(c) and 26 of the General Terms and Conditions in its FERC tariff to allow these available storage quantities to be allocated pro

rata among Northwest's existing firm storage customers, as reflected in the new Rate Schedule SGS-2F service agreements replacing existing service agreements for both converting Rate Schedule SGS-1 customers and existing Rate Schedule SGS-2F customers.

(4) Utilize for system balancing all firm, best-efforts and interruptible rights to which Northwest is entitled under the Updated Project Agreement, to the extent such rights are not being used to provide firm service under Rate Schedule SGS-2F. (This clarification of existing certificate authority ensures that Northwest's existing balancing flexibility will be maintained.)

(5) Abandon its certificate for operation of the Jackson Prairie meter station. (Northwest henceforth will operate the meter station as agent for and under the certificate authority of Puget Sound, the project operator.)

(6) Implement the related tariff changes necessary to: cancel Rate Schedules X-82 and SGS-1; enhance the best-efforts withdrawal rights under Rate Schedule SGS-2F; clarify and revise the scheduling and curtailment priorities for Northwest's use of its storage service rights under the Updated Project Agreement; clarify and enhance availability of interruptible service under Rate Schedule SGS-2I; explicitly define injection capacity rights under Rate Schedule SGS-2F; and update and revise the provisions of Rate Schedule TF-2 for storage redelivery transportation service.

Upon completion of the Jackson Prairie expansion proposed by Puget Sound, which is anticipated to occur in the fall of 1999, Northwest proposes to:

- (1) Realign storage capacity authorized to be retained for system balancing by replacing 3.04 Bcf of its existing Clay Basin storage capacity and the associated 25.3 MMcf/d of firm deliverability with Northwest's share of the proposed Jackson Prairie expansion capacity, 1.067 Bcf of storage capacity and the associated 100 MMcf/d firm deliverability;
- (2) Abandon, by sale, Northwest's certificated share of the Jackson Prairie Zone 2 cushion gas (0.73 Bcf) and Zone 9 testing gas (0.33 Bcf) which will be converted to working gas as a result of Puget Sound's proposed expansion;
- (3) Implement the related tariff changes necessary to: revise the fuel gas reimbursement procedures applicable to Northwest's share of the Jackson Prairie storage fuel and lost and unaccountedfor-gas; allow the sale of the cushion gas and testing gas proposed to be abandoned; and reflect the storage project's proposed new withdrawal

deliverability formula in Rate Schedule SGS-2F.

Further, Northwest requests the Commission to make a determination in this proceeding that Northwest's onethird share (approximately \$10 million) of the Jackson Prairie expansion costs should be treated on a rolled-in basis in Northwest's next general rate case. Northwest proposes to use its share of the expanded storage capacity for system balancing, which will provide system-wide operational benefits. Northwest contends that its cost-ofservice attributable to the expansion will be more than offset by the associated reduction in Clay Basin storage expenses.

Northwest also requests blanket authority to make periodic, short-term (less than one year) adjustments in the quantity of Clay Basin storage capacity and associated injection and withdrawal rights which it retains for system balancing, as appropriate to accommodate by short-term changes in its operational balancing agreements.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said amendment should on or before April 13, 1998, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest 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 Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal **Energy Regulatory Commission by** Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and procedure, a hearing will be held with further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, or if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that permission and approval for the proposed certificate and abandonment are required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is

required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Northwest to appear or be represented at the hearing.

#### David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-8008 Filed 3-26-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. SA98-64-000]

#### R.J. Patrick Operating Company; Notice of Petition for Adjustment

March 23, 1998.

Take notice that on March 10, 1998, R.J. Patrick Operating Company (Patrick Operating Company), filed a petition for adjustment under Section 502(c) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (NGPA),1 requesting to be relieved of its obligation to pay Kansas ad valorem tax refunds, as required by the Commission's September 10, 1997, order in Docket Nos. GP97-3-000, GP97-4-000, GP97-5-000 and RP97-369-000,2 and as set forth in the Statement of Refunds Due (SRD) received from Northern Natural Gas Company. Patrick Operating Company's petition is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

The Commission's September 10 order on remand from the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals <sup>3</sup> directed first sellers under the NGPA to make Kansas ad valorem tax refunds, with interest, for the period from 1983 to 1988. The Commission's September 10, order also provided that first sellers could, with the Commission's prior approval, amortize their Kansas ad valorem tax refunds over a 5-year period, although interest would continue to accrue on any outstanding balance.

Patrick Operating Company states that the SRD, as subsequently revised, seeks refund in the amount of \$323,669.97, including interest, for 8 Western Kansas wells, namely, the Lemert #2, R. Baker #1, Wimmer 1, 3, and 4, Ora Baker #2, and the Ora Baker #1 and #3. Patrick Operating Company also states that the Ora Baker #1, determined to be a

Section 102 well, was deregulated January 1, 1985. Patrick Operating Company further states that during the period involved from 1983 through June 1987, these were very low-volume wells.

Patrick Operating Company states that since the wells were producing 12 Mcf per day or less, all of the wells, except the Lemert, were sold February 1, 1995. Patrick Operating Company further states that the Lemert #2 was then sold in February 1992, at which time it was also producing about 12 Mcf per day.

It is stated that the R.J. Operating Company presently operates 20 wells, of which Mr. and Mrs. R.J. Patrick own 5 of the wells. It is stated that these wells are owned by a number of people, many of whom do not have great financial resources. It is stated that it would take considerable time to recover the reimbursement amount even from other production. The Patrick Operating Company states that although each working interest owner is liable for his own share of any refund; Patrick Operating Company is requesting that since the 8 wells were only marginally economical to produce, that Mr. Patrick and all other working interest owners be relieved of any refund obligation because of the great financial hardship that would occur.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said petition should on or before 15 days after the date of publication in the Federal Register of this notice, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214, 385.211, 385.1105, and 285.1106). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

#### David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–8012 Filed 3–26–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EC98-32-000, et al.]

#### PG&E Generating Company, et al. Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

March 19, 1998.

Take notice that the following filings have been made with the Commission:

#### 1. PG&E Generating Company, U.S. Generating Company, LLC, USGen Power Group, LLC, USGen Energy Group, LLC

[Docket No. EC98-32-000]

Take notice that on March 17, 1998, PG&E Generating Company, U.S. Generating Company, LLC, USGen Power Group, LLC, and USGen Energy Group, LLC tendered for filing an application for approval pursuant to Section 203 of the Federal Power Act for an intra-corporate restructuring, or for disclaimer of jurisdiction over such restructuring.

Comment date: April 16, 1998, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

## 2. West Texas Wind Energy Partners, LLC

[Docket No. EG98-58-000]

On March 11, 1998, West Texas Wind Energy Partners, LLC (WTWEP) filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission an application for determination of exempt wholesale generator status pursuant to part 365 of the Commission's regulations.

WTWEP is developing a wind-powered eligible facility with a capacity of 74.6 megawatts (gross), powered by 113 Vestas V–47 660kW wind turbines, which will be located approximately four miles southeast of the town of McCamey, Texas, in the area known as the Southwest Mesa, Upton and Crockett Counties, Texas.

Comment date: April 8, 1998, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice. The Commission will limit its consideration of comments to those that concern the adequacy or accuracy of the application.

# 3. Morgan Stanley Capital Group v. Illinois Power Company

[Docket No. EL98-29-000]

Take notice that on March 6, 1998, Morgan Stanley Capital Group tendered for filing a Complaint and Request for Expeditious Action against Illinois Power Company (IP) regarding (1) IP's failure to accurately post available firm

<sup>1 15</sup> U.S.C. 3142(c) (1982).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See 80 FERC ¶ 61,264 (1997); order denying reh'g issued January 28, 1998, 82 FERC ¶ 61,058 (1998).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Public Service Company of Colorado v. FERC, 91 F.3d 1478 (D.C. 1986), cert. denied, Nos. 96–954 and 96–1230 (65 U.S.L.W. 3751 and 3754, May 12, 1997) (Public Service).