DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP99–150–001]

NorAm Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Amendment of Request Under Blanket Authorization

February 4, 1999.

Take notice that on January 27, 1999, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NGT), 1111 Louisiana, Houston, Texas 77002–5231, filed in Docket No. C99–150–001 an amendment to the pending request filed on January 12, 1999, in Docket No. CP99–150–000, to reflect changes in the facilities originally proposed, 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 proposed in its original request to (1) abandon a 6-inch tap and relocate the existing skid mounted meter station located on Line LM–2 to a new location on Line BT–1; and (2) construct and operate a 2-inch tap on Line BT–1 and 380 feet of 4-inch diameter pipe (Line BT–20) to continue to provide reliable service to Reynolds Metals Company (Reynolds).

NGT states that subsequent to the original application that was noticed on January 19, 1999, Reynolds has requested that NGT construct a 4-inch tap on Line BT–1 and 380 feet of 6-inch diameter pipe (Line BT–20). NGT states the remainder of the application remains unchanged.

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 If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of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. 99–3210 Filed 2–9–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP96–200–036]

NorAm Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

February 4, 1999.

Take notice that on February 1, 1999, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NGT) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Fourth Revised Volume No. 1, the following revised tariff sheets to be effective February 1, 1999:

Sixth Revised Sheet No. 7E.2
Fifth Revised Sheet No. 7E.3

NGT states that the purpose of this filing is to reflect the implementation of a new negotiated rate transaction.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such 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. 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. 99–3215 Filed 2–9–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project Nos. 935, 2071, 2111, and 2213]

PacificCorp (Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County); Notice of Request To Use Alternative Procedures in Filing License Applications, Defer Action on a Future License Application, and Accelerate a License Expiration Date

February 4, 1999.

By letters dated January 21, 1999, PacifiCorp and Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County (licensees) have asked to use an alternative procedure in filing applications for new licenses for PacifiCorp's Merwin Project No. 935, Yale Project No. 2071, Swift No. 1 Project No. 2111, and Cowlitz PUD's Swift No. 2 Project No. 2213. The projects are located in sequence on the North Fork Lewis River in Cowlitz, Clark, and Skamania Counties, Washington. License applications are due to be filed on: April 30, 1999 for the Yale Project; April 30, 2004, for the Swift No. 1 and No. 2 Projects; and December 11, 2007, for the Merwin Project.

The licensees are proposing to consolidate the relicensing of these projects under a single process which would involve accelerating the license expiration for the Merwin Project to April 30, 2006, and delaying action on the Yale Project application. An applicant-prepared environmental assessment would be filed on all four projects by April 30, 2004, when the Swift No. 1 and No. 2 applications are due.

The licensees have demonstrated that they've made a reasonable effort to contact the resource agencies, Indian tribes, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and others who may be affected by their proposal, and have submitted a communication protocol governing how participants in the proposed process may communicate with each other. The licensees have also submitted several letters of support for their proposal, and it appears that the use of an alternative procedure may be appropriate in this case.

The purpose of this notice is to invite comments on the licensees' request to use alternative procedures, as required under the final rule for Regulations for the Licensing of Hydroelectric Projects.[1] We are also interested in comments on the proposal to delay action on the Yale license application, and accelerate the termination date for the Merwin Project license. Additional notices seeking comments on specific project proposals, interventions and protests, and recommended terms and conditions will be issued at a later date.

The alternative procedure being requested here would combine the prefiling consultation process with the environmental review process, allowing the applicants to file an applicant-prepared Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) in lieu of Exhibit E of the license applications. This differs from the traditional process, in which the applicant consults with agencies, Indian tribes, and NGOs during preparation of the application for the license and before filing it, but the Commission staff performs the environmental review after the application is filed. The alternative

[1] 81 FERC 61,103 (1997).

procedures are intended to reduce redundancies in the licensing process by combining the prefiling consultation and environmental review processes into a single process, to facilitate greater participation, and to improve communication and cooperation among the participants. The alternative procedures can be tailored to the particular project under consideration.

Alternative Procedures and the Lewis River Projects

The licensees intend on preparing a PDEA for the projects to: consolidate and streamline the licensing process; provide for the early identification of environmental impacts; take into account cumulative project impacts and evaluate alternatives for addressing those impacts; and promote early, comprehensive settlement discussions. The licensees propose a watershed approach to studies of potential cumulative project-related environmental effects in the Lewis River Basin. The watershed studies would serve as the scientific basis for the PDEA, including prefiling consultation, and would facilitate scoping of environmental issues under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The studies would also provide scientific data and information to support the licensees' applications for individual new licenses for the projects and to facilitate comprehensive settlement negotiations.

The licensees plan on submitting a PDEA in lieu of Exhibit E in the project license applications. Each application would include a common multi-project PDEA adapted, as necessary, to each individual application.

Yale License Application and Interim Measures

PacifiCorp intends on submitting a license application for the Yale Project when it is due on April 30, 1999. The pre-filing consultation process for the Yale Project is currently at the draft application stage. The draft application calls for the near-term implementation of several environmental measures that are also listed in PacifiCorp's request to use the alternative procedures (Attachment 1). PacifiCorp proposes to implement those measures, and to consider reasonable proposals for other resource enhancement measures (i.e., measures to be implemented during the current license period and any subsequent annual licenses before issuance of a new project license) that relate to the Yale relicensing and do not ''prejudge'' the results of the watershed studies or comprehensive settlement discussions.

Merwin License Term

PacifiCorp's request includes an application to amend the Merwin Project license to accelerate the license expiration date from December 11, 2009 to April 30, 2006 to coordinate the Merwin license expiration with the expiration of the Swift No. 1 and No. 2 Project licenses. Therefore, applications for new licenses on all three projects would be due on April 30, 2004. PacifiCorp's application to accelerate the Merwin license is predicated on: (1) the Commission approving the licensees' request to use the alternative procedures; (2) the Commission deferring action on the Yale application until the Merwin, Swift No. 1 and Swift No. 2 applications are filed; and (3) the effective date of all four new licenses being no sooner than May 1, 2006.

Comments

Interested parties have 30 days from the date of this notice to file with the Commission, any comments on the licensees' proposal to use the alternative procedures to file applications for the Yale, Swift No. 1, Swift No. 2, and Merwin Projects, including the request to delay action on the Yale application, and accelerate the termination date for the Merwin license. The licensees request may be viewed on the web at www.ferc.fed.us. Call 202–208–2222 for assistance.

Filing Requirements

Any comments must be filed by providing an original and 8 copies as required by the Commission's regulations to: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of the Secretary, Dockets—Room 1A, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426.

All comment filings must bear the heading ''Comments on the Alternative Procedure,'' and include the project names and numbers (Yale Hydroelectric Project, No. 2071, Swift No. 1 Hydroelectric Project, No. 2111, Swift No. 2 Hydroelectric Project, No. 2213, and the Merwin Hydroelectric Project, No. 935). For further information, please contact Vince Yearick at (202) 219–3073 or e-mail at vince.yearick@ferc.fed.us.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–3212 Filed 2–9–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP99–180–000]

Williams Gas Pipelines Central, Inc.; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

February 4, 1999.

Take notice that on January 28, 1999, Williams Gas Pipelines Central, Inc. (Williams), P.O. Box 3288, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101, filed in Docket No. CP99–180–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.216 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.216) for authorization to abandon by reclaim facilities used for the receipt of transportation gas from Williams Field Services (WFS) at the Gate interconnect, located in Beaver County, Oklahoma, under Williams' blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–479–000, 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.

Williams proposes to abandon a meter setting and appurtenant facilities used for the receipt of transportation gas from WFS at the Gate interconnect, located in Section 28, Township 5 North, Range 28 ECM, Beaver County, Oklahoma. The facilities were originally installed in 1995 to receive transportation gas from WFS.

Williams asserts that this setting has been blinded for some time and that WFS has agreed to the reclaim of facilities. Williams states that the cost to reclaim the meter setting and appurtenant facilities is $1,175.

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