more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Specifically, NGT proposes to install a 6-inch tap on its Line AC in Pike County and construct approximately 16.7 miles of 6-inch pipe (Line ACT–5) to deliver additional gas to an existing customer in Howard County. NGT states that it will install this tap, Line ACT–5, a 6-inch meter station and four 2-inch first-cut regulators to provide an incremental delivery of 3,000 Dth to James Hardie Gypsum, Inc. (Hardie Gypsum). NGT estimates the peak day and annual deliverability of gas through these facilities to be 8,000 Dth and 2.9 million Dth, respectively. The estimated cost of the facilities to be installed is approximately $2.2 million.

NGT states that in lieu of reimbursement to NGT, Hardie Gypsum has executed a transportation agreement with initial contract demand of 3,000 Dth per day and a primary term extending through December 31, 2010. NGT states that it currently delivers 5,000 Dth to Hardie Gypsum through Line AM–165, but will file to abandon and relocate that point to Line ACT–5 upon completion of Hardie Gypsum's plant expansion.

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 If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of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,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–20198 Filed 7–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98–601–001]

Northwest Pipeline Corporation; Notice of Amendment

July 23, 1998.

Take notice that on July 15, 1998, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84108, filed in Docket No. CP98–601–001 an amendment to the pending request filed on June 9, 1998, in Docket No. CP98–601–000, to reflect changes in the facilities originally proposed and other related aspects of the project, under Northwest's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–433–000 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.

Northwest proposed in its original request to construct and operate approximately 2.8 miles of 6-inch loop line on its Moscow Lateral in Whitman County, Washington and to upgrade its Moscow Meter Station in Latah County, Idaho to better accommodate existing firm service delivery obligations to the Washington Water Power Company (Water Power).

Northwest states that as originally proposed, the new 6-inch loop line on the Moscow Lateral would commence at a new 6-inch tap on the existing 12-inch Lewiston Lateral, adjacent to the existing 4-inch Moscow Lateral tap and terminate at milepost 2.8 on the Moscow Lateral with a tie-in valve installed at the terminus of the loop line.

Northwest states that because the landowner has expressed concern regarding its proposal to locate the site for the tie-in valve in the middle of a field he uses for agricultural purposes, Northwest has redesigned the loop line and with the approval of the landowner proposes to install the tie-in valve at a site near the edge of the landowner's property. Northwest states that the proposed loop line will now terminate at milepost 2.39 on the Moscow Lateral and will be approximately 2,221 feet shorter in length than the loop line as originally proposed.

Northwest states that as a result of the proposed change, the maximum design capacity of the Moscow Lateral and loop line will increase from approximately 8,300 Dth per day to approximately 9,500 Dth per day. Northwest states that even though the proposed maximum design capacity has decreased by approximately 300 Dth per day from its original proposal, Northwest believes that the Moscow Lateral and proposed loop line will still have sufficient capacity to meet Water Power's projected market growth downstream of the Moscow Meter Station through the year 2001.

Northwest states that it had originally proposed to use temporary work space at four locations along the 75-foot wide Moscow Lateral right-of-way, but will now only need temporary work space at three locations.

Northwest states the estimated cost of constructing the loop line and the Moscow Meter Station will decrease from approximately $1,634,617 to approximately $1,484,617.

Northwest states that all other pertinent information as stated in its original prior notice request filed in Docket No. CP98–601–000 remain accurate as previously filed.

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,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–20197 Filed 7–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. RP93–5–030 and RP93–96–010]

Northwest Pipeline Corporation; Notice of Refund Report

July 23, 1998.

Take notice that on July 17, 1998, Northwest Pipeline Corporation, (Northwest) tendered for filing a corrected refund report to replace in its entirety the refund report filed on June 29, 1998 in the above-referenced dockets.

Northwest states that the June 29 filing indicated that refunds totaling $29,030,148 were made to Northwest's customers on June 26, 1998. Northwest states that the corrected total amount is $29,138,955 (which includes the $108,278) correction plus $529 in additional interest on the $108,278). Northwest states that it is distributing the $108,807 to its customers.

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 July 29, 1998. 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.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–20203 Filed 7–28–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Before Commissioners: James J. Hoecker, Chairman; Vicky A. Bailey, William L. Massey, Linda Breathitt, and Curt Hébert, Jr.

[Docket No. TX96–7–001]

City of Palm Springs, California; Show Cause Order

Issued July 16, 1998.

The City of Palm Springs, California (Palm Springs), Enron Power Marketing, Inc. (Enron), and the Electricity Consumers Resource Council and the American Iron and Steel Institute (jointly ELCON) have requested rehearing of our order (July 31 order) [1] finding that Southern California Edison Company (SoCal Edison) was not obligated to provide certain transmission service to Palm Springs. In this order, we ask the parties to show cause why subsequent events in California have not rendered the requests for rehearing moot and subject to dismissal.

Discussion

On March 1, 1996, Palm Springs filed an application requesting that the Commission order SoCal Edison to provide Palm Springs with firm network transmission service under sections 211 and 212 of the Federal Power Act.[2] In short, Palm Springs stated that it wished to provide service to retail electricity consumers within the city limits of Palm Springs by installing only the meters and related equipment necessary to measure and deliver its electric power and energy. In our July 31 order, we denied Palm Springs' application because Palm Springs did not meet the requirements of section 212(h),[3] and because ordering SoCal Edison to provide the requested service would be contrary to the public interest in violation of section 211(a).[4] As noted above, Palm Springs, Enron, and ELCON have sought rehearing of our findings in the July 31 order. In an order issued on September 19, 1996, the Commission granted rehearing for the limited purpose of further consideration to give itself additional time for consideration of the matters raised.

We believe that these requests for rehearing may now be moot given the enactment of comprehensive electricity restructuring legislation in California,[5] its implementation by the California Commission, and the actual operation of the California Independent System Operator (ISO) and the California Power Exchange (PX) as of March 31, 1998. Specifically, in implementing AB 1890, the California Commission rejected a phase-in of retail competition in favor of an approach that generally allows all California electricity consumers (regardless of customer class or size of load) direct access to alternate suppliers at the same time.[6] Additionally, this Commission gave necessary approvals for the start-up of the ISO and PX,[7] which, as noted above, began operation on March 31, 1998. In light of these fundamental changes since the time the requests for rehearing were filed, the service requested by Palm Springs in its application under sections 211 and 212 appears to be unnecessary. Under the restructured California market, access to alternate suppliers is now permitted for each and every electricity consumer in the state, including all consumers residing in Palm Springs. Accordingly, there appears to be no reason for Palm Springs to continue to pursue its plan to install its own meters and seek a section 211 transmission order to gain access to alternate suppliers on behalf of electricity consumers in Palm Springs, as these electricity consumers already enjoy access to alternate suppliers through another process.[8] Thus, we are considering dismissing the requests for rehearing in Docket No. TX96–7–001 as moot.

Before taking this action, we will afford the parties who filed requests for rehearing in Docket No. TX96–7–001 an opportunity to show cause why the Commission should not dismiss their rehearing requests and why there is still a need for the Commission to address the merits of the pending rehearing requests. Accordingly, these parties may file written responses within 30 days of issuance of this order addressing this issue. An original and 14 copies of any such responses should be sent to the Office of the Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, and should reference Docket No. TX96–7–001.

The Commission Orders

Within 30 days of the date of issuance of this order, the parties to the requests for rehearing in Docket No. TX96–7–001 may file responses explaining why the Commission should or should not

[1] City of Palm Springs, California, 76 FERC ¶61,127 (1996).

[2] 16 U.S.C. 824j–k (1994).

[3] We found, among other things, that Palm Springs' plan to install only meters and related equipment would not meet the statutory requirement in section 212(h)(2)(B) that it ''utilize transmission or distribution facilities that it owns or controls to deliver all such electric energy to such electric consumer.'' 76 FERC at 61,701–3.

[4] This was because granting the application would allow Palm Springs to evade the then-current plans of the California Public Utilities Commission (California Commission) to phase-in retail competition over several years and to impose a competition transition charge, and because it might encourage forum shopping. *id.* at 61,703–4.

[5] This legislation (Assembly Bill No. 1890 or AB 1890) was approved by the California Assembly on August 30, 1996 and the California Senate on August 31, 1996, and was signed into law by the Governor of the State of California on September 23, 1996.

[6] *See* Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Proposed Policies Governing Restructuring California's Electric Services Industry and Reforming Regulation; Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission Proposed Policies Governing Restructuring California's Electric Services Industry and Reforming Regulation, Decision 97–05–040 (May 6, 1997), 177 PUR4th 1 at 12–29 (1997), *modified*, Decision 97–12–131 (December 30, 1997), _____ PUR4th _____ (1997), 1997 Cal. PUC LEXIS 1227 (orders providing for direct access for all consumers once the ISO and PX are operational, as there are no operational or other technological considerations requiring the phase-in of direct access).

[7] *See* Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company, 81 FERC ¶ 61,122 (1997), *order denying clarification*, 83 FERC ¶ 61,033 (1998).

[8] We note that Palm Springs is free, under California law, to seek to aggregate the loads of electricity consumers in Palm Springs in order to facilitate the sale and purchase of electricity services. *See, e.g.*, Cal. Pub. Util. Code §§ 331(a) & 366 (West Supp. 1998) (as added by section 10 of AB 1890) (provisions allowing, among other things, for cities to become aggregators of load); 177 PUR4th at 24–25.