the Commission's prior approval, amortize their Kansas ad valorem tax refunds over a 5-year period, although interest would continue to accrue on any outstanding balance.

[Docket No. SA98–3–000]

In this petition, White asserts that requiring him to make the refunds sought by Williams Gas Pipeline Central, Inc. [formerly: Williams Natural Gas Company] (Williams) would constitute the taking of property without due process.

White's SA98–3–000 petition pertains to one well in Morton County, Kansas. White became the operator of the well and bought a single lease in the gas unit, which gave White approximately a 10 percent interest in the well. White asserts that leases in this gas unit should have the same 6-year statute of limitations for the retention of records as Federal leases do under U.S. Code 30 Section 1713. Noting that Kansas law imposes a 5-year statute of limitations on any contract in writing, White also suggests that there should be a statute of limitations on the refunds sought by Williams, and that the time period should have run out by now. White further asserts that the doctrine of ''Laches'' should apply, i.e., that ''after an unreasonable period of time elapses, no action can be brought.'' White also claims that there is no way he can collect a refund from certain deceases prior owners, or their heirs.

[Docket No. SA98–4–000]

In this petition, White asserts that requiring him to make the refunds sought by Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG) would constitute the taking of property without due process.

White's SA98–4–000 petition pertains to six wells in Morton County, Kansas. White became the operator of these wells, and states that he bought-out one of the other three original owners, which gave White a 66 percent interest in these six wells. White adds that, although he initially made distributions to an unspecified number of royalty owners, the mineral rights reverted to the United States Government in 1987. White states that since that time, he has been making royalty payments to the Minerals Management Service, in Denver, Colorado, and that he has lost all contact with the former owners. White claims that there is no way he can collect a refund from prior owners, that he has nothing to withhold from, and that he does not know the whereabouts of the prior owners. White also asserts that the 6-year statute of limitations for retaining records under U.S. Code 30 Section 1713 should apply to these wells, since all of the leasehold have been entirely Federal since 1987. Noting the aforementioned 5-year, Kansas statute of limitations on written contracts, White asserts that there should be a statute of limitations on the refunds sought by CIG, and that the doctrine of Laches should apply to these refunds.

[Docket No. SA98–5–000]

In this petition, White asserts that requiring him to make the refunds sought by Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company (Panhandle) would constitute the taking of property without due process.

White's SA98–5–000 petition pertains to four wells in Morton County, Kansas. White became the operator of these wells, and states that he holds a 50 percent interest in the four wells. White asserts that these leases should have the same 6-year statute of limitations on the retention of records as Federal leases do under U.S. Code 30 Section 1713. White adds that the royalty ownership of the Schweizer No. 3 well reverted to the United States Government in 1987, that he has been making payments to the Minerals Management Service, in Denver, Colorado, since that time, and that he has had no contact with the prior minerals owners since May of 1987. White asserts that there is no way he can collect a refund from the prior owners. White also claims that there is no way he can collect a refund from certain deceased prior owners, or their heirs. Noting the aforementioned 5-year, Kansas statute of limitations on written contracts, White asserts that there should be a statute of limitations on the refunds sought by Panhandle, and that the doctrine of Laches should apply to these refunds.

In view of the above, White requests to be relieved of: (1) His obligation to make Kansas ad valorem tax refunds to Williams, CIG and Panhandle, with respect to this interest the subject wells; and (2) the obligation, as operator, to make such refunds for the other interest owners, on the basis that paying the refunds would cause him a special hardship, that requiring him to make all of the refunds is inequitable, and that requiring him to make all of the refunds unfairly distributes the refund burden. In the alternative, if the Commission will not grant the relief requested, White requests that he be authorized to amortize the refund obligations.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to any of these petitions 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, 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 384.214, 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 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.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–5029 Filed 2–26–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER98–1828–000]

FirstEnergy Corp. and Pennsylvania Power Company; Notice of Filing

February 23, 1998.

Take notice that on February 11, 1998, FirstEnergy Corp., tendered for filing on behalf of itself and Pennsylvania Power Company, a Service Agreement for Network Integration Service under the Pennsylvania Retail Pilot with Energis Resources pursuant to the FirstEnergy System Open Access Tariff. This Service Agreement will enable the party to obtain Network Integration Service under the Pennsylvania Retail Pilot in accordance with the terms of the Tariff.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before March 6, 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 proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–5010 Filed 2–26–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M