Panhandle, TX phone (806) 537–3742. Hours of operation are from 9:00 am to 7:00 pm on Monday; 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, Tuesday through Friday; and closed Saturday and Sunday as well as Federal Holidays. Minutes will also be available by writing or calling Jerry S. Johnson at the address or telephone number listed above.

Issued at Washington, DC on August 10, 1998.

Althea T. Vanzego,

Acting Deputy Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–21742 Filed 8–12–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Docket No. FE C&E 98–05—Certification Notice—160]

Office of Fossil Energy; Tenaska Frontier Partners, Ltd. Notice of Filing of Coal Capability Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act

AGENCY: Office of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of filing.

SUMMARY: On July 20, 1998, Tenaska Frontier Partners, Ltd. submitted a coal capability self-certification pursuant to section 201 of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978, as amended.

ADDRESSES: Copies of self-certification filings are available for public inspection, upon request, in the Office of Coal & Power Im/Ex, Fossil Energy, Room 4G–039, FE–27, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Russell at (202) 586–9624.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title II of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 (FUA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 8301 *et seq.*), provides that no new baseload electric powerplant may be constructed or operated without the capability to use coal or another alternate fuel as a primary energy source. In order to meet the requirement of coal capability, the owner or operator of such facilities proposing to use natural gas or petroleum as its primary energy source shall certify, pursuant to FUA section 201(d), to the Secretary of Energy prior to construction, or prior to operation as a base load powerplant, that such powerplant has the capability to use coal or another alternate fuel. Such certification establishes compliance with section 201(a) as of the date filed with the Department of Energy. The Secretary is required to publish a notice in the **Federal Register** that a certification has been filed. The following owner/operator of the proposed new baseload powerplant has filed a self-certification in acccordance with section 201(d).

Owner: Tenaska Frontier Partners, Ltd.

Operator: Tenaska Frontier Partners, Ltd.

Location: Grimes County, Texas.

Plant Configuration: Combined-Cycle.

Capacity: 800 megawatts.

Fuel: Natural gas.

Purchasing Entities: PECO Energy.

In-Service Date: May, 2000.

Issued in Washington, D.C., July 31, 1998.

Anthony J. Como,

Director, Electric Power Regulation, Office of Coal & Power Im/Ex, Office of Coal & Power Systems, Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 98–21743 Filed 8–12–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98–704–000]

Florida Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

August 7, 1998.

Take notice that on July 31, 1998, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT), filed in Docket No. CP98–704–000 a request for authorization pursuant to sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.212) to construct, own, and operate a new delivery point, PGS-Worthington Springs, on its system to accommodate deliveries of natural gas to the State of Florida, Department of Corrections (The State), under FGT's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–553–000 pursuant to section 7(c) 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.

Specifically, FGT proposes to construct, own, and operate a new tap, electronic flow measurement (EFM) equipment and approximately 100 feet of 2-inch connecting pipeline in Union County, Florida to deliver natural gas for the State of Florida through a new meter station and 6.25 miles of 4-inch non-jurisdictional pipeline constructed, owned, and operated by TECO Peoples Gas Inc. (TECO). FGT asserts that the new delivery point will be added to the existing FTS–1 Service Agreement between FGT and The State to allow deliveries of natural gas to TECO's new meter station.

FGT states that this new delivery point will not increase the contractual gas quantities nor increase the current certificated level of service under the existing FTS–1 Service Agreements. FGT estimates the total cost of the proposed construction to be approximately $76,000, inclusive of tax gross-up. FGT indicates that TECO will reimburse FGT for all costs directly and indirectly incurred by FGT for the construction of the new delivery point.

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,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–21683 Filed 8–12–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 2680–039]

Consumers Energy Company and the Detroit Edison Company; Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Assessment

August 7, 1998.

A final environmental assessment (FEA) is available for public review. The FEA is for an application to construct Lake Michigan angler access facilities in Ottawa County, Michigan. The proposed action involves the construction of a 2,500-foot boardwalk and 31-car parking area, at the Port Sheldon site, near the Town of West Olive, Michigan. A draft environmental assessment (DEA) of this application and Notice of Availability of the DEA were issued by the Commission on September 22, 1997. The FEA, like the DEA, finds that approval of the proposed action would not constitute a major federal action significantly

affecting the quality of the human environment.

The FEA was written by staff in the Office of Hydropower Licensing, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Copies of the FEA can be obtained by calling the Commission's Public Reference room at (202) 208–1371.

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–21682 Filed 8–12–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 4316–027 Colorado]

Galloway, Inc.; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

August 7, 1998.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) regulations, 18 CFR part 380 (Order 486, 52 F.R. 47897), the Commission's Office of Hydropower Licensing has reviewed the license surrender application for the Blue Valley Ranch Project, No. 4316–027. The Blue Valley Ranch Project is located on the Blue River in Grand County, Colorado. The license is being surrendered because the licensee has determined that it is not feasible to rehabilitate the project. An Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared, and the EA finds that surrendering the license would not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Copies of the EA are available for review in the Commission's Reference and Information Center, Room 2A, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. For further information, please contact Ms. Hillary Berlin, at (202) 219–0038.

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–21681 Filed 8–12–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice of Meeting on Midwest Electric Pricing Issues

August 7, 1998.

Take notice that members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) will meet with Midwest state utility commission members and officials of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners to discuss pricing issues arising from circumstances that existed in electric power markets in the Midwest during the last week of June, 1998.

The meeting will be open to the public. State and federal commissioners and their representatives will participate in the discussion. In addition, the Commission expects to hear presentations from representatives of the Edison Electric Institute, the American Public Power Association, the Electric Power Supply Association, the Electricity Consumers Resource Council, and the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association. A transcript will be made of the proceedings.

The meeting will be held from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon (CDT) on August 14, 1998. The location of the meeting will be the Rosemont Convention Center, 5555 North River Road, Rosemont, Illinois 60018 (Phone: (847) 692–2220).

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–21684 Filed 8–12–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–6144–1]

Science Advisory Board, Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meetings

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notification is hereby given that two committees of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on the dates and times described below. All times noted are Eastern Time. All meetings are open to the public, however, due to limited space, seating at meetings will be on a first-come basis. For further information concerning specific meetings, please contact the individuals listed below. Documents that are the subject of SAB reviews are normally available from the originating EPA office and are *not* available from the SAB Office.

1. Integrated Human Exposure Committee (IHEC)

The Integrated Human Exposure Committee (IHEC) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on Thursday, September 3 and Friday September 4, 1998, beginning no earlier than 9 am and ending no later than 5 pm on each day. The meeting will be held at the Sheraton City Centre Hotel at 1143 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20037. The hotel is Metro accessible. For directions, please call the hotel at 202–775–0800.

Purpose—The purpose of the meeting is to review the methodologies for the Basic Relative Burden Analysis Methodology (BRBA), the Enhanced Relative Burden Analysis Methodology (ERBA), and the Cumulative Outdoor Toxics Concentration and Exposure Methodology (COATCEM) for scientific merit.

Charge—The IHEC has been asked to respond to the following Charge questions presented in the document, Questions for the Science Advisory Board on the Title VI Relative Burden Analyses and the Cumulative Outdoor Air Toxics Concentration and Exposure Methodology, referred hereafter as ''the review document.'' The following charge questions are from the review document which provides the necessary context for each question. Instructions for obtaining copies of the review document are provided below.

I. Regarding the Relative Burden Analyses

Charge Question #1: The Risk Screening Environmental Indicators (RSEI) toxicity weights that Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT) developed have been reviewed and commented upon by the SAB within the past year (EPA-SAB-EEC-98–007). OPPT has addressed the major concerns of the SAB as to having the weights ordered on a continuous scale directly related to their toxicity values rather than in order of magnitude ''bins'' and avoiding truncation of the value range. The use of these weights for the specific purpose of doing relative burden analyses in the way outlined in the review document has not been commented upon by the SAB. What are the strengths and weaknesses of this approach, which applies the toxicity weights to a number of chemicals released into the air, for the purpose of developing a burden measure?

Charge Question #2: The Basic Relative Burden Analysis (BRBA) method is relatively simple and may not consider important parameters such as relative proximity, weather, stack height. Please provide comment on the strengths, weaknesses, and utility of the ''basic'' method in estimating the distribution of burden to areas proximate to facilities with air emissions.