

Dated: May 12, 2000.

**J. L. Roth,**

*Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate  
General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register  
Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00-12998 Filed 5-23-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP99-355-002]

#### Baltimore Gas and Electric Company; Notice of Filing

May 18, 2000.

Take notice that on May 1, 2000, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (BGE), and Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) separately filed reports to comply with a Commission order issued July 29, 1999, in Docket No. RP99-355-000. The filings report on the parties' efforts to develop an unbundling program with BGE that does not require waiver of the Commission's shipper must have title policy.

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 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. 00-13011 Filed 5-23-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EF00-2011-000]

#### United States Department of Energy— Bonneville Power Administration; Order Approving Rates on an Interim Basis and Providing Opportunity for Additional Comments

Issued May 19, 2000.

In this order, we approve the Bonneville Power Administration's (Bonneville) proposed rates on an interim basis, pending our full review for final approval. We also provide for an additional period of time for the parties to file comments.

#### Background

On March 21, 2000, the Bonneville Power Administration (Bonneville) filed a request for interim and final approval of an adjustment of its Firm Power Products and Services rate schedule (FPS-96R) in accordance with the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (Northwest Power Act)<sup>1</sup> and Subpart B of Part 300 of the Commission's regulations.<sup>2</sup> FPS-96R was previously approved by the Commission for a ten-year period through September 30, 2006.<sup>3</sup> The filing incorporates into FPS-96R seasonally and diurnally adjusted rates for the capacity without energy product; the rates were inadvertently omitted when the rate schedule was originally adopted. Bonneville contends that the purpose of this filing is to allow Bonneville to recover the costs that are incurred by Bonneville offering this product, as the inadvertent omission could distort the revenue requirements already adopted by the Commission. Bonneville states that no other aspect of FPS-96R is being adjusted, and it otherwise continues in full force and effect through September 30, 2006.

In accordance with the statutory procedure,<sup>4</sup> Bonneville seeks interim approval of its rates, effective May 1, 2000, pending Commission consideration of whether to approve the rates on a final basis. Bonneville requests approval of the modification of the FPS-96R rate for the period

beginning May 1, 2000, through September 30, 2006.

#### Notice of Filing and Interventions

Notice of Bonneville's filing was published in the Federal Register, 65 Fed. Reg. 19,370 (2000), with comments, protests, or motions to intervene due on or before April 20, 2000.

Goldendale Aluminum Company, Northwest Aluminum Company, Reynolds Metals Company, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corporation, and Elf Atochem, North America (the Aluminum Companies) jointly filed a timely motion to intervene, raising no substantive issues.

Southern California Edison Company (SoCal Edison) filed a timely motion to intervene and protest. SoCal Edison requests that Bonneville's filing be rejected and that interim approval of the rate be denied. SoCal Edison argues that there is no evidence supporting the filing and that Bonneville has failed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Northwest Power Act. SoCal Edison further opposes Bonneville's request for waiver of the filing requirements and the 60-day prior notice requirement of the Commission's regulations. In the alternative, SoCal Edison requests that the Commission deny Bonneville interim approval of the proposed rate, suspend the proposed rate and set this matter for an evidentiary hearing.

SoCal Edison disputes both the procedure by which Bonneville developed the rate and the procedures it has followed in this processing. SoCal Edison states that the methodology used by Bonneville in developing the proposed rate is inconsistent with Bonneville's general obligations to set rates having regard to the recovery of the cost of generation and transmission, to encourage the most widespread use of Bonneville power, and to set rates at the lowest possible rates to consumers. SoCal Edison asserts that the proposed rate is not based upon the actual costs of generation and transmission incurred by Bonneville. Instead, SoCal Edison asserts, Bonneville has proposed a rate supposedly based upon the market even though, by the testimony of its own witness, no market exists.<sup>5</sup> SoCal Edison argues that Bonneville's methodology used in developing this market rate is not supported by credible data or analyses and is inconsistent with the methodology used in developing either market-based rates or cost-based rates in both the 1996 general rate proceeding and the general rate proceeding that

<sup>1</sup> Sections 7(a)(2) and 7(i)(6) of the Northwest Power Act, 16 USC §§ 839e(a)(2) and 839e(i)(6) (1994).

<sup>2</sup> 18 C.F.R. Part 300 (1999).

<sup>3</sup> See United States Department of Energy—Bonneville Power Administration, 80 FERC ¶ 61,118 (1997).

<sup>4</sup> Sections 7(a)(2) and 7 (i)(6), 16 U.S.C. §§ 839e(a)(2) and 839e(i)(6) (1994).

<sup>5</sup> SoCal Edison cites to the Cross-Examination Testimony of Gary Bolden, Tr. at 146, lines 6-11.