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. 98–9316 Filed 4–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98–309–000]

Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership; Notice of Application

April 3, 1998.

Take notice that on March 27, 1998, Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership (Great Lakes), One Woodward Avenue, Suite 1600, Detroit, Michigan 48226, filed an application pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing Great Lakes to construct and operate 258.5 miles of 36-inch pipeline loop in 11 segments (including a crossing of the Straits of Mackinac, a navigable waterbody located at the northern tip of Michigan's lower peninsula), seven compressor units totaling 180,000 horsepower (hp) and miscellaneous ancillary facilities, at an estimated cost of $620,250,000, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Great Lakes states that the proposed facilities (the Great Lakes 300 Expansion), in conjunction with Great Lakes existing system, will enable Great Lakes to increase its system-wide deliverability at its downstream St. Clair, Michigan interconnect by 304,000 dekatherms per day (dtd). It is stated that this additional system capacity has been subscribed by firm transportation service between a point on the U.S.—Canada international boundary near St. Vincent, Minnesota and a point on the U.S.—Canada international boundary near St. Clair, Michigan under a precedent agreement executed by TransCanada PipeLines Limited. Great Lakes requests approval to charge a stand alone initial, levelized transportation rate, which is derived from the estimated additional costs to the system, over a fifteen-year (15) period, resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed facilities. Great Lakes avers that the additional transportation service is to commence and the proposed facilities are to be placed into service on November 1, 2000. Great Lakes states that meeting this date necessitates 1999–2000 winter construction of approximately 39.5 miles of pipeline looping in two segments. Accordingly, Great Lakes requests that an order making a preliminary determination that the proposed facilities are required by the public convenience and necessity be issued in September 1998, and that an order granting a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing construction and operation of the project be issued no later than September 1999.

Great Lakes further states that its proposed looping will be constructed in Marshall, Pennington, Red Lake, Itasca, Aitkin and St. Louis Counties, Minnesota; Douglas and Bayfield Counties, Wisconsin; and Gogebic, Delta, Schoolcraft, Clare, Isabella, Midland, Mackinac, Emmet, Genessee and Lapeer Counties, Michigan.

Great Lakes also proposes to install and operate a 31,000 hp compressor unit at its Thief River Falls Compressor Station in Marshall County, Minnesota and a similarly sized unit at each of its following compressor stations: Deer River in Itasca County, Minnesota; Wakefield in Gogebic County, Michigan; Rapid River in Delta County, Michigan; and Farwell in Clare County, Michigan. A 10,000 hp unit addition is proposed for installation at Great Lakes' St. Vincent Compressor Station in Kittson County, Minnesota and a 15,000 hp unit addition is proposed for installation at Great Lakes' Boyne Falls Compressor Station in Charlevoix County, Michigan.

Specifically, Great Lakes proposes to:

(i) Construct and operate ten (10) 36-inch outside diameter (O.D.) mainline loop segments totaling 253.7 miles;

(ii) Construct and operate a 36-inch O.D. looping of Great Lakes existing crossing of the Straits of Mackinac, totaling 4.8 miles;

(iii) Install and operate one (1) 10,000 hp, one (1) 15,000 hp, and five (5) 31,000 hp (ISO) class compressor units, to be located individually at seven (7) existing Great Lakes' compressor stations;

(iv) Change out seventeen (17) aerodynamic assemblies including modifying/replacing four (4) existing compressor cases, install gas aftercoolers at five (5) existing compressor stations, and modify yard and station piping at seven (7) compressor stations; and

(v) Construct and operate various above ground, ancillary facilities.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said amendment should on or before April 24, 1998, 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 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). 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. The Commission's rules require that protestors provide copies of their protests to the party or parties directly involved. 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.

A person obtaining intervenor status will be placed on the service list maintained by the Secretary of the Commission and will receive copies of all documents filed by the applicant and every one of the intervenors. An intervenor can file for rehearing of any Commission order and can petition for court review of any such order. However, an intervenor must submit copies of comments or any other filing it makes with the Commission to every other intervenor in the proceeding, as well as 14 copies with the Commission.

A person does not have to intervene, however, in order to have comments considered. A person, instead, may submit two copies of comments to the Secretary of the Commission. Commenters will be placed on the Commission's environmental mailing list, will receive copies of environmental documents and will be able to participate in meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Commenters will not be required to serve copies of filed documents on all other parties. However, commenters will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission and will not have the right to seek rehearing or appeal the Commission's final order to a federal court.

The Commission will consider all comments and concerns equally, whether filed by commenters or those requesting intervenor status.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held

with further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, or if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that permission and approval for the proposed certificate are required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Great Lakes to appear or be represented at the hearing.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–9299 Filed 4–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. GP98–22–000]

Kansas Natural Gas, Inc.; Notice of Report of Refunds and Petition for Dispute Resolution and Procedural Adjustment

April 3, 1998.

Take notice that, on March 9, 1998, Kansas Natural Gas, Inc. (KNG) filed:

(1) A report of (a) the refunds alleged to be owed to Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern), under Docket No. RP98–39–000, K N Interstate Gas Transmission Company (KNI) under Docket No. RP98–53–000, and Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG), under Docket No. RP98–54–000, (b) the refunds conditionally paid by KNG, and (c) the amounts set aside by KNG; and

(2) A petition requesting (a) the Commission to resolve KNG's dispute with Northern and CIG over KNG's Kansas ad valorem tax refund liability, and (b) an adjustment of the Commission's refund procedures.

The Commission, by order issued September 10, 1997, in Docket No. *RP97–369–000* et al,[1] on remand from the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals,[2] required first sellers to refund the Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursements to the pipelines, with interest, for the period from 1983 to 1988. KNG's petition is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

KNG states that, following receipt of the Statements of Refunds Due from the above-referenced pipelines, it contacted the subject pipelines and provided them with information regarding the refund amounts (principal and interest) attributable to each working interest owner. KNG adds that it also provided the pipelines with the last known mailing address of each working interest owner, that it requested (consistent with Commission precedent[3]) that Statements of Refunds Due be forwarded to the individual working interest owners, and that it requested a revised Statement of Refunds Due from each pipeline, limited to KNG's own individual working interest. KNG further states that KNI agreed and submitted a revised Statement of Refunds Due to KNG, on February 9, 1998, limited to KNG's working interest. KNG adds, however, that Northern and CIG held that KNG is responsible for the refunds attributable to the entire production.

In review of the above, KNG's pleading includes a petition for dispute resolution,[4] requesting the Commission to:

(1) Direct Northern and CIG to (a) provide a revised Statement of Refunds Due to the individual working interest owners, and (b) provide KNG with a revised Statement of Refunds Due, limited to KNG's own individual working interest;

(2) Find, based on the Commission's decision in *Williams Natural Gas Co.*, 70 FERC ¶ 61,380 at 62,119 (1995), that certain Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursements are not subject to refund, because the addition of those amounts to the price paid did not exceed the applicable maximum lawful price; and

(3) Expressly approve the conditional nature of payments that KNG has already made to each pipeline.

KNG's pleading also includes a petition for an adjustment of the Commission's refund procedures. Specifically, in lieu of placing disputed amounts escrow accounts, KNG requests permission to place such amounts into an interest-bearing fund over which it will maintain control. KNG states that it agrees, subject to the conditional nature of any payments made, to disburse funds in accordance with any subsequent order of the Commission in these proceedings. KNG argues that this approach:

(1) Will not harm or disadvantage any party;

(2) Will not affect the ultimate level of refunds provided; and

(3) Will relieve KNG of the burden and associated cost of establishing formal escrow accounts.

KNG also states that the Commission's orders in the Kansas ad valorem tax refund proceedings permit the affected parties (i.e., working interest owners) to establish the uncollectability of amounts attributable to royalty owners, on a case-by-case basis, and in accordance with the standards in *Wylee Petroleum Corporation*, 29 FERC ¶ 61,014 (1985). KNG informs the Commission that KNG intends to pursue this option, and that KNG has placed all amounts attributable to royalty owners in escrow.

Any person desiring to comment on or make any protest with respect to said petition should, on or before April 24, 1998, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene or protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211). 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 the 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. 98–9297 Filed 4–8–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. GP98–23–000]

La Jolla Properties, Inc.; Notice of Petition for Dispute Resolution

April 3, 1998.

Take notice that, on March 9, 1998, the certified public accounting firm of Gutschenritter & Johnson, L.L.C., filed a petition for dispute resolution on behalf of La Jolla Properties, Inc. (La Jolla), requesting the Commission to resolve La Jolla's dispute with Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG) over La Jolla's Kansas ad valorem tax refund liability to

[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).

[3] See *Robert F. White*, 71 ¶ 61,185 (1995).

[4] In its January 28, 1998 Order Clarifying Procedures, the Commission stated that producers (i.e., first sellers) could file dispute resolution requests with the Commission, asking the Commission to resolve the dispute with the pipeline over the amount of Kansas ad valorem tax refunds owed, see 82 FERC ¶ 61,059 (1998).