relief from paying Kansas ad valorem tax refunds to Northern, under the Commission's September 10, 1997 order in Docket No. RP97–369–000, *et al.* [80 FERC ¶ 61,264 (1977); rehearing denied, 82 FERC ¶ 61,058 (1998)]. The September 10 order directed First Sellers under the NGPA to make Kansas ad valorem tax refunds, with interest, for the period from 1983 to 1988. Harken's petition is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Harken contends that KMI has no Kansas ad valorem refund liability to Northern for the period from 1983–1988, due to a 1990 Settlement between KMI and Northern, the provisions of which release KMI and Northern from any future claims against one another, including refund claims.

Should the Commission hold that the 1990 Settlement does not relieve KMI/Harken from making Kansas ad valorem tax refunds to Northern, Harken requests that the Commission grant refund relief to KMI/Harken on equity grounds, due to KMI and Harken's good faith reliance upon the provisions of the 1990 Settlement. Harken asserts that to deny such relief would cause KMI/Harken an undue hardship, inequity, and an unfair distribution of burdens.

Harken asserts that it would be inequitable and an unfair distribution of burdens to require KMI/Harken to make these refunds, when KMI/Harken negotiated the 1990 Settlement with Northern, in good faith, and because there was no exclusion in the provisions of the 1990 Settlement for Kansas ad valorem refunds. Harken further argues that it would be inequitable and an unfair distribution of burdens to leave Northern whole, while requiring KMI/Harken to make the subject refunds.

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, NE., Washington, DC 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 385.1106). 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–33144 Filed 12–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP99–95–000]

NorAm Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

December 9, 1998.

Take notice that on December 1, 1998, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NGT), 1111 Louisiana, Houston, Texas 77002–5231, filed in Docket No. CP99–95–000 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 facilities in Oklahoma under NGT's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–384–000 and CP82–384–001 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.

NGT proposes to construct and operate one 2-inch delivery tap and first-cut regulator to serve ARKLA, a division of NorAm Energy Corp. (ARKLA). ARKLA will construct, own and operate at its costs, a 1-inch domestic meter. NGT will own and operate the delivery tap and first-cut regulator. The 2-inch tap will be located on NGT's Line O in Section 17, Township 5 North, Range 19 East, Latimer County, Oklahoma. The estimated volumes to be delivered to this tap are approximately 400 Dth annually and 6 Dth on a peak day. The tap and first-cut regulator will be constructed at an estimated cost of $2,667 and ARKLA will reimburse NGT the construction costs.

NGT states that this proposal is not prohibited by its existing tariff, that there is sufficient capacity to accomplish deliveries without detriment or disadvantage to other customers, that its peak day and annual deliveries will not be effected and that the total volumes delivered will not exceed the 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–33150 Filed 12–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. SA99–9–000]

W.A.R. Gas Company; Notice of Petition For Adjustment

December 9, 1998.

Take notice that on November 20, 1998, W.A.R. Gas Company (WAR), filed a petition for adjustment, pursuant to section 502(c) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (NGPA), for relief from paying approximately $15,130.70 in Kansas ad valorem tax refunds to Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company, under the Commission's September 10, 1997 order in Docket No. RP97–369–000, *et al.* [80 FERC ¶ 61,264 (1997); rehearing denied, 82 FERC ¶ 61,058 (1998)]. The Commission's September 10 order directed First Sellers under the NGPA to make Kansas ad valorem tax refunds, with interest, for the period from 1983 to 1988. WAR's petition is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

WAR's attorney states that it is a corporation with no assets, such that any attempt to collect the subject refunds from WAR would be fruitless. WAR's attorney contends that refund relief should be granted to WAR on the following grounds: (1) that WAR would suffer a special hardship if required to make the subject refunds; and (2) that it would be inequitable to require WAR to make the subject refunds.

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 385.1106). 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–33147 Filed 12–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP99–93–000]

Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

December 9, 1998.

Take notice that on November 30, 1998, Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company (Williston Basin), 200 North Third Street, Suite 300, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501, filed in Docket No. CP99–93–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.216 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 157.205, 157.216) under the Natural Gas Act (NGA) for authorization to abandon two farm taps in Carbon County, Montana, under Williston Basin's blanket certificate issued in Docket Nos. CP82–487–000, *et al.*, pursuant to Section 7 of the NGA, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Williston Basin proposes to abandon by removal the facilities, located on its Lovell-Billings transmission line in Carbon County, because they are no loner being used. Williston Basin does not foresee any use for these taps in the future. It is stated that Williston Basin was authorized to acquire and operate the taps in 1985 for deliveries to Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. (Montana-Dakota), a local distribution company, which in turn served end-use customers. It is asserted that Montana-Dakota now serves the customers through its distribution system and consent to the proposed abandonment.

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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–33148 Filed 12–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project Nos. 2004–073 and 11607–000]

Holyoke Water Power Company, Holyoke Gas & Electric Department, Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant, and Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company; Notice Denying Extension of Time, in Part, to File Comments, Recommendations, Terms and Conditions, and Prescriptions Pursuant to Our Ready for Environmental Analysis Notice

December 9, 1998.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission issued its Notice of Application Ready for Environmental Analysis (REA) for both relicense applications in the Holyoke proceeding on November 3, 1998. The REA notices established a deadline of January 2, 1999, for filing comments, recommendations, terms and conditions, and prescriptions in the aforementioned proceeding.

On November 9, 1998, subsequent to issuing the REA notices, the staff issued a request to both competing applicants, seeking clarification of previously filed additional information. The Commission staff's letter established deadlines of November 30 and December 24, 1998, for responding to different elements of the request. On or about November 19, 1998, the competing applicants jointly requested extensions of these deadlines. The Commission staff denied the applicants' requests by letters dated November 25, 1998.

On December 4, November 30, and November 27, 1998, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Connecticut River Watershed Council, and the Town of South Hadley, respectively, filed requests for extension of the January 2, 1999, deadline for filing comments, recommendations, terms and conditions, and prescriptions. These parties assert that the current juxtaposition of the deadlines for responses by the competing applicants to the requests for clarification of information already filed (December 24, 1998), and the due date for comments, recommendations, terms and conditions, and prescriptions (January 2, 1999), does not allow for an adequate review of the material filed with the Commission and subsequent preparation and filing of comments, recommendations, terms and conditions, and prescriptions based on that material.

A substantial amount of information has been on file with the Commission (with copies to the parties of the proceeding) as far back as September 28, 1998. Our letter dated November 9, 1998, merely sought clarification of information that had been previously filed with the Commission, or for responses to comments made by resources agencies and non-governmental organizations on that information. We believe that federal and state agencies, non-governmental organizations, and other interested parties should be able to respond to the remaining material to be filed by the applicants within a short period of time.

Also, as far back as October 27, 1997, in our Notice Granting Extension of Time to File comments and Requests for Additional Studies, we established a very tight schedule so as to resolve these contested applications for relicensing prior to the expiration of the original license term. Again, in Scoping Documents I and II (issued January 8 and June 9, 1998, respectively), we reiterated our schedule to complete these proceedings in the Summer/Fall of 1999. We take this schedule very seriously, and will continue to make every effort to resolve this relicensing prior to September 1, 1999.

We can not justify granting an extension of time to the dates requested. However, in order to address the concerns iterated above, we will extend the deadline to provide final comments, recommendations, terms and conditions, and prescriptions to January 15, 1999, with the caveat that preliminary comments, recommendations, terms and conditions, and prescriptions must be