

26, 1986) to ONEOK Exploration, rather than the date that ONEOK Exploration paid the ad valorem tax to the State of Kansas. According to ONEOK Resources, the true interest on the \$6,642.24 principal is \$10,381.41. ONEOK Resources states that the revised total (\$17,023.65) has been remitted to Williams.

In its petition in Docket No. GP98-29-000, ONEOK Resources states that it has requested verification from KNI concerning the statement that KNI sent, requesting payment of \$46,491.46. ONEOK Resources states that such verification was not received until March 9, 1998, that it has not had time to review this information, and that it has placed the entire sum into escrow.

Any person desiring to comment on or make any protest with respect to any of the above-referenced petitions should, on or before April 22, 1998, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene or protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211). 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 the proceeding, or to participate as a party in any hearing therein, must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-9491 Filed 4-9-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. GP98-25-000]

Plains Petroleum Company and Plains Petroleum Operating Company; Notice of Petition for Procedural Adjustment and Dispute Resolution

April 6, 1998.

Take notice that on March 9, 1998, Plains Petroleum Company and Plains Petroleum Operating Company (Plains), filed a petition for procedural adjustment and dispute resolution with the Commission. Plains requests Commission authorization to place certain disputed Kansas ad valorem tax refund amounts and potential refund amounts attributable to royalty interest owners into an interest-bearing escrow

account, pending resolution of Plains dispute with K N Interstate Gas Transmission Company (KNI), over the amount of Kansas ad valorem tax refunds that Plains owes KNI. Plains further requests that the Commission resolve Plains' dispute with KNI as to whether Plains owes KNI Kansas ad valorem tax refunds when Plains was a wholly-owned subsidiary of KN Energy, Inc., (KNE). Plains now reiterates, in Docket No. GP98-25-000, its request for a summary ruling that KNE is responsible for these refunds. Plains' petition is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

In Part I of its petition in Docket No. GP98-25-000, Plains explains that KNI's original \$10,413,154.37 refund claim against Plains was too high, and that Plains has been able to demonstrate that, for much of the 1986 through mid-1988 time period covered by KNI's Statement of Refunds Due, in Docket No. RP98-53-000, the total contract price paid by KNE for Plains' gas, including the Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursements, was less than the applicable maximum lawful price for that gas. Plains further explains that KNI has since issued a revised invoice to Plains in the amount of \$2,705,260.92. Plains, however, continues to dispute portions of this total and requests that the Commission authorize Plains to escrow disputed amounts, that the Commission permit Plains to defer payment of refunds related to royalty interests while Plains determines whether such sums are uncollectible, and that the Commission, in the interim, allow Plains to escrow potential royalty refund amount. Specifically, Plains contends that the Commission should authorize it:

(1) To defer payment and escrow, for one year, the \$476,987.18 in principal and interest that Plains owes in refunds with respect to its working interests;

(2) To recalculate its own refund obligation to exclude the refunds attributable to other working interest owners, for which Plains is not responsible; and

(3) To place \$1,344,824.32, representing the remaining principal and interest amounts, into an escrow account, pending the outcome of proceedings before the Commission and the courts regarding whether Plains is liable for refunds associated with (a) the grossed-up tax, (b) interest on the grossed-up tax, (c) interest generally on the refund principal.

In Part II of its pleading in Docket No. GP98-25-000, Plains explains that KNE contends that Plains owes \$2,848,688.12 in principal and interest for Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursements that KNE

allegedly made to Plains in January and June of 1985, during the period that Plains was KNE's wholly-owned subsidiary. Plains disputes that it owes any part of this amount, and requests the Commission to summarily rule that KNE is responsible for refunding these sums or, in the alternative, to require KNE to prove that it did not retain the refund monies at issue and enjoy the use of those funds, since 1985. Plains previously requested a summary ruling from the Commission on this issue in Docket No. GP97-6-000, and incorporates by reference the claims, facts, and arguments contained in its pleadings in that docket.

In the GP97-6-000 pleading, Plains requested that the Commission summarily rule that KNE should be required to make any Kansas ad valorem tax refunds that Plains might otherwise be required to make for the period from October 1, 1984 through September 13, 1985. In support of its request, Plains explained:

(1) That Plains Petroleum Company was a wholly-owned subsidiary of KNE until September 30, 1985;

(2) That Plains Petroleum Company was the lessee with respect to certain leases within the State of Kansas, from October 1, 1984 through November 30, 1986;

(3) That the Kansas leases were transferred to Plains Petroleum Operating Company, effective December 1, 1986;

(4) That Plains either did not receive Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursements from KNE during the period from October 1, 1984 through September 13, 1985, or returned any Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursements it did receive to KNE by means of a \$1,051,000 dividend that was paid to KNE on June 30, 1985; and

(5) That, by means of the \$1,051,000 dividend, KNE withdrew virtually all cash from Plains Petroleum Company, leaving Plains Petroleum Company with only \$18,211 in cash as of June 30, 1985.

In view of the above, Plains asserted in Docket No. GP97-6-000 that KNE was the entity enriched by the reimbursement of Kansas ad valorem taxes, that KNE (not Plains) retained the use of those funds. Therefore, Plains requested that the Commission summarily rule that any Kansas ad valorem tax refunds that Plains might otherwise be required to make, for the period from October 1, 1984 through September 13, 1985, should be made by KNE or, in the alternative, that the Commission require KNE to show that KNE did not receive value from Plains (in the form of dividends, or otherwise) for any Kansas ad valorem tax

reimbursement payments that KNE made to Plains and, therefore, that KNE should not be required to bear the burden of any refunds to its customers.

Plains' pleading in Docket No. GP98-25-000 is a continuation of Plains' claims and arguments in Docket No. GP97-6-000. In Docket No. GP98-25-000, Plains states that the aforementioned \$1,051,000 dividend that went to KNE is considerably greater than the principal and interest of \$987,399.45 that KNE's invoice shows that Plains owed as of July 1985.

Any person desiring to comment on or make any protest with respect to said petition should, on or before April 22, 1998, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene or protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211). 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 the proceeding, or to participate as a party in any hearing therein, must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-9490 Filed 4-9-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. GP98-24-000]

Bill C. Romig; Notice of Petition

April 6, 1998.

Take notice that, on March 9, 1998, the Commission received a March 4, 1998 letter from Bill C. Romig (Romig), in which Romig asserts that the Commission's September 10, 1997 order, in Docket No. RP97-369-000 *et al.*,¹ on remand from the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals,² has no jurisdiction over him, because he is a royalty owner and the September 10 order pertains to first sellers who are required by that order to refund Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursements, with interest, for the

period from 1983 to 1988. Romig does not believe that he has any refund liability under the September 10 order, and seeks clarification as to whether such refund liability exists. Romig attaches a letter from Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern) to Romig, dated January 21, 1998, indicating that Northern served Romig with a Statement of Refunds Due, because it paid Romig directly, rather than the unnamed first seller. Northern's January 21 letter further states that it expects Romig to refund the amounts in question. Romig's petition is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Any person desiring to comment on or make any protest with respect to said petition should, on or before April 22, 1998, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene or protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211). 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 the proceeding, or to participate as a party in any hearing therein, must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-9489 Filed 4-9-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EC98-34-000, et al.]

Florida Power Corporation, et al.; Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

April 3, 1998.

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

1. Florida Power Corporation

[Docket No. EC98-34-000]

Take notice that on March 27, 1998, Florida Power Corporation (Florida Power), filed an Application under Section 203 of the Federal Power Act for authorization to sell jurisdictional substation facilities to the City of Mount Dora, Florida.

Florida Power explains that it has agreed to sell the Mount Dora

Distribution Substation in its entirety including all land, substation facilities and other equipment associated with the Substation and that the sale will allow the City of Mount Dora to purchase power from a number of bulk power providers which will result in savings to customers.

Comment date: April 27, 1998, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

2. Origen Power Corp. and OGE Energy Corp.

[Docket No. EC98-33-000]

Take notice that on March 25, 1998, Origen Power Corp. (OPC) and OGE Energy Corp. (Energy Corp.), (together, the Applicants) submitted for filing, pursuant to Section 203 of the Federal Power Act, and Part 35 of the Commission's Regulations, an Application in connection with the acquisition of jurisdictional assets through the purchase by Energy Corp., of 100% of the ownership interests in Oklahoma Loan Acquisition Corp. (OLAC) and the change of the name of OLAC to Origen Power Corp.

Comment date: April 27, 1998, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

3. New England Power Company and USGen New England, Inc.

[Docket No. EC98-35-000]

Take notice that on March 26, 1998, New England Power Company and USGen New England, Inc. submitted for filing, pursuant to Section 203 of the Federal Power Act and Part 33 of the Commission's Regulations, an application seeking authorization for the transfer of rights to transmission capacity under certain contracts associated with the Hydro-Quebec Phase I and Phase II interconnections.

Copies of the filing have been served on regulatory agencies in the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island and New Hampshire.

Comment date: April 27, 1998, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

4. Southern California Edison Company

[Docket No. EL98-34-000]

Take notice that on March 18, 1998, Southern California Edison Company (Edison), tendered for filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission a Petition for Declaratory Order. The petition asks the Commission to declare that Sacramento Municipal Utility District may not unilaterally abrogate or refuse to perform its obligations under its 1990 and 1994 system power sale agreements with Edison on the basis of

¹ See 80 FERC ¶ 61,264 (1997); order denying reh'g issued January 28, 1998, 82 FERC ¶ 61,058 (1998).

² *Public Service Company of Colorado v. FERC*, 91 F.3d 1478 (D.C. 1996), cert. denied, Nos. 96-954 and 96-1230 (65 U.S.L.W. 3751 and 3754, May 12, 1997).