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. 98–19448 Filed 7–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. GT98–83–000]

Northwest Pipeline Corporation; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff and Filing of Non-Conforming Service Agreements

July 16, 1998.

Take notice that on July 13, 1998, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest) tendered for filing and acceptance several non-conforming service agreements and, as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheets to become effective August 13, 1998:

Fifth Revised Sheet No. 363
Second Revised Sheet No. 364
Original Sheet No. 365
Sheets Nos. 366 through 374

Northwest states that each of the service agreements contains a contract-specific operational flow order provision and/or a provision imposing subordinate primary corridor rights with an exemption from reservation charge adjustments for nominations that are not scheduled as a result of the subordinate scheduling priority. The tariff sheets are submitted to add these agreements to the list of non-conforming service agreements contained in Northwest's tariff, and to remove three terminated service agreements from such list.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest this filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed as provided in Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–19449 Filed 7–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 184–057

Pacific Gas and Electric Company El Dorado Irrigation District; Notice Extending Deadline

July 16, 1998.

By application filed April 17, 1998, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and the El Dorado Irrigation District (El Dorado) asked to transfer the license for Project No. 184 from PG&E to El Dorado. The Commission issued a Notice of Transfer of License on April 29, 1998 (63 FR 24780, May 5, 1998), setting June 10, 1998, as the deadline for filing comments, protests, and motions to intervene. On June 10, 1998, Alpine County, California, *et al.* (movants),[1] filed a ''Motion to Intervene, Request for Extension of Comment Deadline, and Preliminary Comments,'' which includes a request for a 60-day extension of the June 10 comment deadline to August 9, 1998. PG&E and El Dorado filed replies in opposition to the extension request. Movants have shown good cause for granting an extension of time.[2] and notice is hereby given that the deadline for filing comments, protests, and motions to intervene in this proceeding is extended to August 7, 1998.[3]

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–19453 Filed 7–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[1] League to Save Sierra Lakes, El Dorado County Taxpayers for Quality Growth, Forty-Niner Council of the Boy Scouts of America, Plasse Homestead Homeowners' Association, Kit Carson Lodge, Caples Lake Resort, Kirkwood Meadows Public Utilities District, Northern Sierra Summer Homeowners' Association, East Silver Lake Improvement Association, South Silver Lake Homeowners' Association, Lake Kirkwood Association, Plasse's Resort, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, Environmental Planning and Information Council of Western El Dorado County, Inc., Friends Aware of Wildlife Needs, Safegrow, California Native Plant Society, Caples Lake Homeowners Association, Soreson's Resort, and Sierra Club.

[2] *See* 18 CFR 385.2008(a).

[3] August 9, 1998 falls on a Sunday.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 77–110]

Pacific Gas and Electric Company; Notice of Technical Workshop on Action Alternatives, Water Rights, and Water Balance Modeling

July 16, 1998.

On May 5, 1998, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) issued notice of a site visit and scoping meetings pursuant to the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in support of the Commission's decision on a proposed amendment to the license for the Potter Valley Project (PVP; FERC No. 77–110). The proposed amendment involves changes in the minimum flow requirements at the project, consisting of increased releases to the Eel River, which would result in overall decreased diversions to the Russian River. The PVP is licensed to Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and is located in Lake and Mendocino counties. California.

The purpose of this notice is to advise all parties of a technical workshop that will be held to obtain additional information on the proposed amendment, its relationship to existing water rights, and available modeling approaches to evaluate water balances between the two river basins. This technical workshop will be held at the Ukiah Valley Conference Center, 200 S. School Street, Ukiah, California, on August 11, 1998, from 9 am to 5 pm. All interested parties are invited to attend.

Three subjects will be covered at the workshop: (1) PG&E's recently completed Implementation Plan associated with the proposed license amendment; (2) existing water rights in the Eel and Russian rivers; and (3) comparison of three alternative water balance models that have been identified in filings for this proceeding. The first half of the workshop will consist of presentations by staff from PG&E, speaking on their Implementation Plan, and by staff from the California State Water Resources Control Board, speaking on water rights issues. The second half of the workshop will consist of presentations by the three parties offering different water balance models: PG&E, the Round Valley Tribes, and the Sonoma County Water Agency, followed by discussion of the models. The goals of these discussions are to understand the relative differences among the models and to attempt to achieve consensus on the best available

water balance model for application to the PVP EIS.

For additional information on this workshop. please contact the FERC Project Manager, Dr. John M. Mudre at (202) 219–1208.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–19454 Filed 7–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project Nos. 10942–001 and 10416–003]

Skykomish River Hydro, Washington Hydro Develop. Corp.; Notice of Meetings

July 16, 1998.

A meeting will be convened by staff of the Office of Hydropower Licensing on Tuesday, August 11, 1998, at 10:00 a.m. at the Lynwood City Hall, 19100 44th Avenue West, Lynwood, Washington. The purpose of this meeting is to learn the status of the applicant's response to the Commission's March 19, 1998, additional information request on the proposed Martin Creek Project (P–10942–001). In particular, the meeting will focus on the project's consistency with the President's Forest Plan.

Following the first meeting, the Commission will attend a meeting at the same location on the proposed licensing of the Anderson Creek Project (P–10416–003). The meeting will involve the Forest Service and the applicant, Washington Hydro Development Corporation, who will discuss the possibility of redesigning the project to minimize environmental impacts.

If you have any questions concerning these matters, please contact Mr. Carl Keller at (202) 219–2831 or e-mail at carl.keller@ferc.fed.us, or Mr. Alan Mitchnick at (202) 219–2826 or e-mail at alan.mitchnick@ferc.fed.us.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–19452 Filed 7–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98–659–000]

Texas Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

July 16, 1998.

Take notice that on July 8, 1998, Texas Gas Transmission Corporation (Applicant), 3800 Frederica Street, Owensboro, Kentucky, 42304, filed in docket No. CP98–659–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.216(b) of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.216) for approval to abandon a receipt meter located in Hopkins County, Kentucky, under Applicant's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–407–000, pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Applicant proposes to abandon by removal the Reynolds-Narge Creek receipt meter station, which was constructed in 1992. Applicant asserts that it is requesting such authorization because the producer has discontinued deliveries of natural gas at this meter. Applicant further asserts that the producer, Wiser Oil Company (Wiser), which had been delivering natural gas to this meter, has been acquired by Orbit Gas Company (Orbit), and the natural gas from Wiser's wells in this area is now being delivered to Orbit. It is also asserted that Wiser has cut and capped its line to the meter station.

Any person or the Commission's Staff may, within 45 days of the issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214), a motion to intervene 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 activities 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 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. 98–19447 Filed 7–21–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. GP98–38–000]

Vastar Gas Marketing, Inc. and Atlantic Richfield Company; Notice of Petition for Dispute Resolution

July 16, 1998.

Take notice that, on July 7, 1998, Vastar Gas Marketing, Inc. (VGM) and Atlantic Richfield Company (ARCO) filed a petition requesting the Commission to resolve VGM and ARCO's dispute with El Paso Natural Gas Company (El Paso) over El Paso's revised $3,619,181.55 Kansas ad valorem tax refund claim in Docket No. RP98–44–000. VGM and ARCO seek rulings: 1) That VGM has no Kansas ad valorem tax refund liability to El Paso; 2) that El Paso has failed to substantiate its refund claim against ARCO and, therefore, that ARCO has no Kansas ad valorem tax refund obligation to El Paso; and 3) that El Paso waived any refund claim attributable to Kansas ad valorem tax overcharges in a March 1, 1988 settlement with ARCO Oil & Gas Company. In the alternative, if the Commission finds that ARCO does owe Kansas ad valorem tax refunds to El Paso, VGM and ARCO request a ruling that such refund liability is limited to ARCO's own working interest and the attributable royalties. VGM and ARCO's petition is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

The Commission, by order issued September 10, 1997, in Docket No. RP97–369–000 *et al*,[1] on remand from the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals,[2] required First Sellers to refund Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursements to pipelines, with interest, for the period from 1983 to 1988. In its January 28, 1998 Order Clarifying Procedures [82 FERC ¶ 61,059 (1998)], the Commission stated that producers (i.e., First Sellers) could file dispute resolution requests with the Commission, asking the Commission to resolve the dispute with

[1] See 80 FERC ¶ 61,264 (1997); order denying rehearing 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).