Issued at Washington, DC on April 22, 1998.

### Rachel Samuel,

Deputy Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98-11216 Filed 4-27-98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Secretary of Energy Advisory Board; Notice of Open Meeting

**SUMMARY:** Department of Energy. **SUMMARY:** Consistent with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 86 Stat. 770), notice is hereby given of the following advisory committee meeting:

Name: Secretary of Energy Advisory Board—Electric System Reliability Task Force

**DATES AND TIMES:** Tuesday, May 12, 1998, 8:30 AM-4:00 PM.

ADDRESSES: The Madison Hotel, Dolley Madison Ballroom, 15th and M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Richard C. Burrow, Secretary of Energy Advisory Board (AB–1), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585, (202) 586–1709 or (202) 586–6279 (fax).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### **Background**

The electric power industry is in the midst of a complex transition to competition, which will induce many far-reaching changes in the structure of the industry and the institutions which regulate it. This transition raises many reliability issues, as new entities emerge in the power markets and as generation becomes less integrated with transmission.

# **Purpose of the Task Force**

The purpose of the Electric System Reliability Task Force is to provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board regarding the critical institutional, technical, and policy issues that need to be addressed in order to maintain the reliability of the nation's bulk electric system in the context of a more competitive industry.

# **Tentative Agenda**

Tuesday, May 12, 1998

8:30–8:45 AM Opening Remarks & Objectives—Philip Sharp, ESR Task Force Chairman

8:45–10:00 AM Working Session: Discussion of Draft Position Paper on Technical Issues in Transmission Reliability— Facilitated by Philip Sharp 10:00–10:30 AM Working Session: Discussion of International Lessons

Discussion of International Lesson Learned—Facilitated by Matthew Holden

10:30-10:45 AM Break

10:45–11:45 AM Working Session: Discussion of a Draft Position Paper on State/Regional Reliability Issues—Facilitated by Ralph Cavanagh

11:45–12:00 PM Working Session: Planning for the Final Report— Facilitated by Philip Sharp 12:00–1:00 PM Lunch

1:00–2:15 PM Working Session: Discussion of a Draft Position Paper on Incentives for Transmission Enhancement—Facilitated by Susan Tierney

2:15–3:30 PM Working Session:
Discussion of Draft Position Paper
on Ancillary Services and BulkPower Reliability—Facilitated by
Philip Sharp

3:30–4:00 PM Public Comment Period 4:00 PM Adjourn

This tentative agenda is subject to change. The final agenda will be available at the meeting.

### **Public Participation**

The Chairman of the Task Force is empowered to conduct the meeting in a fashion that will, in the Chairman's judgment, facilitate the orderly conduct of business. During its meeting in Washington, D.C., the Task Force welcomes public comment. Members of the public will be heard in the order in which they sign up at the beginning of the meeting. The Task Force will make every effort to hear the views of all interested parties. Written comments may be submitted to Skila Harris, Executive Director, Secretary of Energy Advisory Board, AB-1, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585. This notice is being published less than 15 days before the date of the meeting due to programmatic issues that had to be resolved prior to publication.

### Minutes

Minutes and a transcript of the meeting will be available for public review and copying approximately 30 days following the meeting at the Freedom of Information Public Reading Room, 1E–190 Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C., between 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM, Monday through Friday except Federal holidays. Information on the Electric System Reliability Task Force and the Task Force's interim report may

be found at the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board's web site, located at http://www.hr.doe.gov/seab.

Issued at Washington, D.C., on April 23, 1998

### Rachel M. Samuel,

Deputy Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–11217 Filed 4–27–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98-353-000]

# Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

April 22, 1998.

Take notice that on April 15, 1998, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue S.E., Charleston, West Virginia 25314-1599, filed in Docket No. CP98-353-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.211 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.211) for authorization to construct and operate a new delivery point in Maryland, under Columbia's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-76-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Columbia proposes to construct and operate a new point of delivery to Washington Gas Light Company (WGL) on Columbia's pipeline number WG in Poolesville Township, Montgomery County, Maryland. The interconnecting facilities will consist of installing a 4inch tap, 3-inch meter, electronic measurement and approximately 250 feet of 4-inch pipeline. Transportation service will be firm service provided under Columbia's Rate Schedule Storage Service Transportation (SST). The estimated natural gas quantities to be delivered is 3,500 Dth/day and 1,277,500 Dth/annually. Columbia states that the point of delivery has been requested by WGL to serve both residential and commercial customers. WGL has not requested an increase in its firm entitlement in conjunction with this request. The estimated cost is \$176,074 which includes "gross up" for income tax purposes and WGL will reimburse Columbia 100% of the actual total cost of construction.

Columbia states that the new point of delivery will have no effect on its peak

day and annual deliveries, that its existing tariff does not prohibit the addition of new delivery points, and that deliveries will be accomplished without detriment or disadvantage to its other customers and that the total volumes delivered will not exceed total volumes authorized prior to this request.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, 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 Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, 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. 98–11175 Filed 4–27–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

# **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98-357-000]

# El Paso Natural Gas Company; Notice of Application

April 22, 1998.

Take notice that on April 16, 1998, El Paso Natural Gas Company (El Paso), P.O. Box 1492, El Paso, Texas 79978, filed in Docket No. CP98-357-000, an application pursuant to Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, Subpart B of Part 153 of the Commission's Regulations, and Executive Order Nos. 10485 and 12038. El Paso seeks a Presidential Permit and Section 3 authority to site, construct, operate, maintain, and connect the proposed pipeline facilities and the place of exit for exporting natural gas at the International Boundary between the United States and Mexico in Cochise County, Arizona. On April 6, 1998, in FE Docket No. 98-26-NG, Mexcobre filed with the Department of Energy its application for blanket authorization to export natural gas to Mexico, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

El Paso states that Mexicano de Cobre, S.A. de C.V. (Mexcobre) is a corporation organized under the laws of Mexico that currently operates a copper mine in Nacozari, Sonora, Mexico, located approximately 65 miles south of the town of Douglas, Cochise County, Arizona, and the International Boundary between the United States and Mexico. Mexcobre has been using high sulfur residual oil as fuel for its mining of copper. Mexcobre now desires to use clean burning natural gas as a fuel for its mining process.

El Paso further states that in support of Mexcobre's decision to use natural gas as fuel for its mining operations, Mexcobre has requested that El Paso provide transportation service for Mexcobre. In order for El Paso to provide the requested transportation service to Mexcobre, it will be necessary that certain additional facilities be constructed for the delivery of natural gas. El Paso and Mexcobre have entered into a Transportation Service Agreement dated March 17, 1998.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before May 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 and 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 Section 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application, if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its 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 El Paso to appear or be represented at the hearing.

### Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–11176 Filed 4–27–98; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

## **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

# Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. SA98-71-001 and SA98-71-002]

# Graham-Michaelis Corporation; Notice of Amendment To Petition for Adjustment and Request for Extension of Time

April 22, 1998.

Take notice that on March 26, 1998, Graham-Michaelis Corporation (GMC), filed a second supplement amending its March 10, 1998, petition for adjustment, pursuant to Section 502(c) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (NGPA), regarding its Kansas ad valorem refund liability and the refund liability of the working interest owners for whom GMC operated.1 On September 10, 1997, the Commission issued an order in Docket No. RP97-369-000, et al.,2 order on remand from the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals,<sup>3</sup> directing first sellers to make Kansas ad valorem tax refunds, with interest, for the period from 1983 to 1988. GMC's March 10 petition, as amended, is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

The March 10 petition pertains to Kansas ad valorem tax refund claims submitted to GMC by Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG), for GMC and the working interest owners for whom GMC operated. GMC's March 10 petition requested that the Commission grant a 90-day extension of the Commission's March 9, 1998, refund deadline, to allow GMC, its working

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> As set forth in the March 10, petition, GMC's working interest owners included: W.A. Michaelis, Jr. Revocable Trust; John L. James Revocable Trust; Ross Beach; Dail C. West; Graham Enterprises; William L. Graham Revocable Trust; Betty Harrison Graham Revocable Trust; GrahamCo.; Paul Ward Trust "B"; Margaret L. Roberts; David M. Dayvault Revocable Trust; Jack L. Yinger Revocable Trust; K & B Producers, Inc.; William Graham, Inc.; William Graham, Jr.; Chas. A. Neal & Company; March Oil Company; Minatome Corporation; Lake Forest Academy; and Melissa S. Elliott Trust.

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Public Service Company of Colorado v. FERC, 91 F.3d 1478 (D.C. Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 65 U.S.L.W. 3751 and 3754 (May 12, 1997) (Nos. 96– 954 and 96–1230).