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. This filing may be viewed on the web at http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm (call 202–208–2222 for assistance).

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–14552 Filed 6–8–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP99–539–000]

Earle and H. Smith, 81 Bunker Hill Ave., Stratham, NH 03885 v. Portland Natural Gas Transmission System; Complaint

June 3, 1999.

Take notice that on June 1, 1999, Earle H. Smith III and Julie A. Smith filed a complaint, in Docket No. CP99–539–000, against Portland Natural Gas Transmission System (PNGTS). This complaint requests that PNGTS pay $7,900 for unauthorized use of their property, easement violations, and improper restoration of stone wall.

Specifically the complaint states that PNGTS constructed a natural gas pipeline through their property committing numerous violations to its certificate. Violations are claimed in the areas of:

- Safety—numerous OSHA violations (e.g., lack of safe access, and excavators working in close proximity to power lines);
- Easement violation—trench spoil spilled outside of the construction right-of-way and PNGTS failed to restore the area to preconstruction conditions, and right-of-way limits were staked improperly;
- Unauthorized use of their property—PNGTS should control off-road vehicles access to the right-of-way and posting ''no repassing'' signs is not enough; and
- Improper restoration of stone wall.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to this complaint should, on or before June 11, 1999, 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 and Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 and 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 in any hearing therein must file motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules. Answers to the complaint shall be due on or before June 11, 1999, since the amount in controversy in less than $100,000.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–14564 Filed 6–8–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717––M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. TM99–1–8–000]

South Georgia Natural Gas Company; Proposed Changes to FERC Gas Tariff

June 3, 1999.

Take notice that on May 28, 1999, South Georgia Natural Gas Company (South Georgia) tendered for filing to become part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, the following revised tariff sheets to be effective July 1, 1999:

Thirteenth Revised Sheet No. 5
Twelfth Revised Sheet No. 6
1st Alternate Thirteenth Revised Sheet No. 5
1st Alternate Twelfth Revised Sheet No. 6

South Georgia states that the instant filing is submitted pursuant to Section 19.2 of the General Terms and Conditions of its Tariff to adjust its fuel retention percentage (FRP) for all transportation services on its system effective July 1, 1999. The derivation of the revised FRP is based on South Georgia's gas required for operations (GRO) for the twelve-month period ending April 30, 1999, adjusted for the balance accumulated in the Deferred GRO Account at the end of said period, divided by the transportation volumes received during the same twelve-month period. In the filing, South Georgia request a limited waiver of the formula used in Section 19.2 to determine the FRP. As set forth more fully in filing, such request is based on South Georgia's belief that certain GRO volumes recorded in 1998 were inaccurate. As a result, South Georgia proposes to base the FRP on those months in which reliable data is available, as annualized to cover the entire twelve-month period for the FRP. Based on this calculation, the revised FRP is 1.93% which is a decrease from the currently effective FRP of 2.24%.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NW, Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 or 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed in accordance with 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. 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 in the Public Reference Room. This filing may be viewed on the web at http://www.fer.fed.us/online/rims.htm (call 202–208–2222 for assistance).

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–14559 Filed 6–8–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 2017–011]

Southern California Edison Company; Technical Workshop on Water Management and Intent To Conduct a Site visit

June 3, 1999.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) received an application for a new license for the continued operation and maintenance of the existing Big Creek No. 4 Hydropower Project (BC#4) on February 26, 1997. BC#4 is located on the San Joaquin river, in Fresno, Madera, and Tulare Counties, California. The project is partially located on federal lands managed by the Forest Service. The project would have an installed capacity of 98.6 megawatts.

During scoping meetings held in December 1997, to solicit public comment on the relicensing of the BC#4, Southern California Edison Company (Edison) offered to conduct a technical workshop to explain the criteria that go into managing water for the operations of the hydropower projects in Edison's big Creek System (BCS) of which BC#4 is one part. Therefore, on January 11, 1999, the Commission requested that Edison provide a schedule and agenda