transmission line or transformer for all load conditions to maintain reliable service.

The proposed Nucor Steel mill would require an instantaneous peak load of 225 MW for its arc furnace. The expected annual load growth with the new mill is about 3 percent. The existing transmission system cannot serve the new plant and the expected load growth. Furthermore, the existing system is not capable of suppressing voltage changes induced by the arc furnace.

Alternatives Proposed for Consideration

BPA has been studying ways to reinforce the transmission system. Several options for adding new 230-kV transmission lines and series compensation were studied. These options cannot provide the system reliability requirements needed, and the costs for adding three 230-kV transmission lines and series compensation are comparable to a new 500-kV transmission line. A new 500-kV line is needed to eliminate flickers induced by the arc furnace.

Potential routes for a 500-kV transmission line have been developed in cooperation with PacifiCorp and Federal, state and local agencies. Three routes that parallel existing transmission lines are being studied. The first route would follow an existing BPA transmission line that begins at BPA's Alvey Substation near Goshen, Oregon, west to near Florence, Oregon, then would follow an existing BPA transmission line south through Reedsport to a proposed new substation site in the hills above Glasgow, Oregon. The second route would follow an existing BPA transmission line from BPA's Alvey Substation south to near Roseburg, Oregon, then west next to an existing BPA transmission line through Fairview, and then north to the proposed substation site. A third route would begin at PacifiCorp's Dixonville Substation and follow PacifiCorp's transmission line west to BPA's Reston Substation, then west following BPA's transmission line through Fairview, then north to the proposed substation site.

Two additional routes would parallel existing lines for part of the route, but would then require new right-of-way. The first route would follow an existing BPA transmission line from BPA's Alvey Substation southwest to near Drain, Oregon. From near Drain, new right-of-way would head southwest, cross the Umpqua River, then turn west and travel to the proposed substation site above Glasgow, Oregon. The second route also starts at BPA's Alvey Substation and again follows the existing BPA transmission line to just south of Creswell, Oregon, then turns southwest on new right-of-way. This corridor heads west to near Elkton, crosses the Umpqua River, and ends at the same substation site.

The routes cross land in Lane, Douglas, and Coos counties, Oregon. A new 500-kV transmission line would be about 120 kilometers (75 miles) long and would require approximately 46 meters (150 feet) of new right-of-way width. A new substation would need to be constructed and would require about 2 hectares (5 acres). At this time, BPA believes the routes using some new right-of-way may be the preferred routes to study. BPA is also considering taking no action.

BPA is mandated by the Northwest Power Act to recover its costs. Each alternative will be evaluated to determine if the revenues generated cover the costs of the alternative, and if the alternative is consistent with sound business principles.

Identification of Environmental Issues

Potential issues presently identified for this proposal include: (1) Effects on fish, wildlife, and vegetation, including threatened and endangered species; (2) effects of economic development and socioeconomic effects of building a line and substation; (3) effects of construction and placement of electrical facilities in floodplains and wetlands; (4) concern over visual effects, noise, and other interference produced by electrical facilities in rural and populated areas; (5) impacts on range, forest, and agricultural resources due to construction and placement of electrical facilities; (6) concern over human exposure to electric and magnetic fields created by electrical facilities; (7) impacts to cultural resources; (8) impacts to recreational resources; (9) conflicting land use; (10) impact to property values; and (11) potential impacts to soils (erosion) and water quality. Additional issues identified through the scoping process may also be examined in the draft EIS.

Issued in Portland, Oregon, on March 23, 1998.

Steven G. Hickok,

Acting Administrator and Chief Executive Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–8375 Filed 3–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98–292–000]

Florida Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

March 25, 1998.

Take notice that on March 20, 1998, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT), 1400 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP98–292–000, a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.216(b) for authorization to abandon approximately .9 of a mile of the 12-inch Ft. Lauderdale Lateral 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 which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

FGT states that it is required to remove or abandon the 12-inch Ft. Lauderdale Lateral due to the state road department's plan to widen Griffin Road into Ft. Lauderdale where the 12-inch Ft. Lauderdale Lateral is in the road right-of-way. It is further stated that FGT has determined that the 12-inch lateral is no longer needed to serve Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) since the construction of the new metering facilities currently being served through the 24-inch lateral and metering facilities constructed on the north side of the FPL power plant.

FGT proposes to abandon and remove four short sections totaling 45 feet, of the 12-inch Ft. Lauderdale pipeline, and filling the remaining portions with water or nitrogen. FGT states that the proposed abandonment would not result in the abandonment of any existing service to FGT's customers, nor would it disadvantage FGT's existing customers.

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. 98–8323 Filed 3–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP96–366–009]

Florida Gas Transmission Company, Notice of Report of Refunds

March 25, 1998.

Take notice that on March 20, 1998, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT) tendered for filing with a supplemental refund report reflecting amounts refunded to its transportation customers on February 20, 1998.

FGT states that on December 15, 1997 FGT refunded amounts to its customers in compliance with Article XI of the rate case settlement in Docket No. RP96–366–005. Subsequently it came to FGT's attention that FGT inadvertently failed to calculate refunds related to: (1) The transportation component of the cash-out price applicable to net delivery point overage imbalances pursuant to the cash-out mechanism of Section 14 of the General Terms and Conditions (GTC) of FGT's Tariff, and (2) reservation charge credits resulting from a one-time shortening of the gas day of April 5, 1997 due to FGT's implementation of Gas Industry Standards Board (GISB) Standard 1.3.1. On January 27, 1998 FGT filed a letter with the Commission stating that FGT would make additional refunds related to both of the above, inclusive of interest, and would file a supplemental refund report within 30 days of the date additional refunds were made.

FGT states that the supplemental refunds, totaling $285,656 inclusive of interest, were mailed to customers on February 20, 1998. FGT is filing the attached supplemental refund report as stated in the January 27 letter.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be filed on or before April 1, 1998. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–8324 Filed 3–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. SA98–74–000]

George Grenyo; Notice of Petition for Adjustment

March 25, 1998.

Take notice that on March 16, 1998, George Grenyo (Grenyo) filed a petition for adjustment, pursuant to section 502(c) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 [15 U.S.C. 3142(c) (1982)], requesting to be relieved of his obligation to pay Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company (Panhandle) the Kansas ad valorem tax refunds for the royalty interests attributable to Grenyo's working interest in the Ormiston Lease, otherwise required by 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] Grenyo's petition indicates that he has already paid Panhandle $126.25, and that this sum includes unspecified amounts attributable to royalty interests in the Ormiston Lease. Grenyo's petition is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

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. 98–8330 Filed 3–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[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) (Public Service).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project Nos. 2004–073 and 11607–000]

Holyoke Water Power Company, City of Holyoke, Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant, and Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company; Notice Granting Extension of Time to File Better Adapted Statements for the Holyoke Project

March 26, 1998.

On October 9, 1997, the Commission issued its Notice Establishing Subsequent Licensing Procedural Schedule and a Deadline for Submission of Final Amendments in the above-captioned proceedings. Among other things, the Notice's schedule established a March 31, 1998 deadline for the competing applicants to file a detailed and complete statement of how its plans are as well, or better, adapted than the plans of each of the other license applications to develop, conserve, and utilize in the public interest, the water resources of the region, per Section 4.36(d)(2)(iii) of the Commission's regulations.

On March 24, 1998, the Holyoke Water Power Company (NWP) filed a motion requesting an extension of time to file its ''better adapted'' statement for the Holyoke Project. As described below, HWP requested an extension of the March 31 deadline, for a period not to exceed 90 days, or until June 30, 1998. In its motion, HWP cites the deficiencies in the competing applicant's application (herein referred to as the City of Holyoke), as the reason for extending the deadline to file the ''better adapted'' statements. Most notably, HWP references the City of Holyoke's proposal to install additional capacity at the project.

HWP contends that the City of Holyoke's proposal to install additional capacity is an integral part of the City of Holyoke's application. In light of this, HWP argues that until the aforementioned deficiencies are corrected, it will be unclear as to what the City of Holyoke is proposing in its application with respect to the installation of additional capacity. Moreover, HWP argues that such an emission on the part of the City of