CEESI states that the planned calibration facility will provide manufacturers and users of large volume flow meters in the United States access to a calibration facility in the United States, resulting in reduced expense and time required to test and transport such meters. In addition, CEESI avers that the facility will provide the opportunity to further develop the ultrasonic flowmeter technology and to develop United States standards for ultrasonic flowmeters.

CEESI further states that Northern Border will install about 900 feet of 30-inch pipe and a tie-over between Ventura to Harper, Iowa and the outlet of the CEESI facility all located in the Ventura Station yard to accommodate CEESI's calibration facility. The 30-inch pipe will connect the meter calibration facility and Northern Border's system. Northern Border will also construct two buildings for CEESI, one to house instrumentation and one for the testing of meters. CEESI will reimburse Northern Border for any operating or maintenance costs. CEESI will also pay Northern Border a fee related to the 30-inch pipe, the tie-over, buildings and appurtenances installed by Northern Border. CEESI will replace in kind any natural gas volume lost during the meter calibration process. The gas loss during the meter calibration process will be minimis. Operation of the CEESI facilities will not result in costs or charges to Northern Border's customers.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before June 17, 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. Any person wishing to become 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.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by Section 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein and if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate is 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 the CEESI to appear or be represented at the hearing.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–14481 Filed 6–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING COCE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. GP98–33–000]

Graham-Michaelis Corporation; Notice of Petition for Dispute Resolution

May 27, 1998.

Take notice that, on May 19, 1998, Graham-Michaelis Corporation (GMC) filed a petition requesting the Commission to resolve any dispute between GMC and Williams Gas Pipelines Central, Inc., formerly: Williams Natural Gas Company (Williams), regarding GMC's refund liability for Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursements that Amoco made to GMC and that GMC forwarded to certain third-party working interest owners. GMC asks the Commission to find that GMC has no such refund liability, to Williams, because GMC only served as the operator for those third-party working interest owners, and did not hold an interest in those leases and wells. GMC's petition is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

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. 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).

GMC states that it received a copy of a letter that Amoco Production Company (Amoco) sent to Williams (in response to the Statement of Refunds Due that Williams sent to Amoco) that detailed Amoco's analysis of its Kansas ad valorem tax refund liability. GMC notes that Amoco stated therein that it is not responsible for refunds attributable to third-party working interests, and listed ''Graham-Michaelis'' as having received these reimbursements during the applicable period (1983–1988). GMC states that, with interest computed through March 9, 1998, these refunds total $42,004.68.

While GMC agrees that Amoco has no refund liability for the third-party reimbursements, GMC contends that it also has no such refund liability, because GMC only operated the leases and the eight wells involved (Bowker 2, Lowe, Long Wood, Wheatley 2–33, Weber B, Weber A, Dennis, and Steen) on behalf of the working interest owners, and GMC did not retain the Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursements. GMC adds that: 1) the subject working interest owners sold the leases and wells a number of years ago; 2) many of the corresponding files and records were turned over to the purchaser; 3) it has been unable to determine whether, and to what extent these reimbursements exceeded the maximum lawful prices; and 4) it has been unable to determine the principal and interest owed by each working interest owner.

GMC states that it has not received a Statement of Refunds Due from Williams with respect to these refunds; thus, no refund claim has been leveled at GMC. GMC further states that it does not know, at this time, whether any dispute with Williams exists. Nevertheless, GMC asks the Commission to find that GMC has no refund liability to Williams, with regard to the Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursements that GMC passed through to the working interest owners. Meanwhile, GMC states that it will: 1) continue to assemble the information to determine what Kansas ad valorem tax reimbursement distributions it made to each working interest owner; 2) continue its efforts to determine whether those reimbursements exceeded the applicable maximum lawful prices; and 3) notify the working interest owners of their refund liability once GMC completes its determinations, and furnish its findings to Williams,

---

[1] See 80 FERC ¶ 61,264 (1997); order denying rehearing 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).

along with the names and addresses of the working interest owners. GMC states that it believes that these determinations will be completed and the notifications given within the next three weeks.

Any person desiring to comment on or make any protest with respect to the above-referenced petition should, on or before June 17, 1998, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 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. 98–14480 Filed 6–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98–553–000]

Midcoast Interstate Transmission, Inc.; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

May 27, 1998.

Take notice that on May 14, 1998, as supplemented on May 22, 1998, Midcoast Interstate Transmission, Inc. (MIT), 3230 Second Street, Muscle Shoals, Alabama 35661, filed a prior notice request with the Commission in Docket No. CP98–553–000 pursuant to section 157.205 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (NGA) for authorization to install and operate a new delivery point and appurtenant facilities in Morgan County, Alabama, under MIT's blanket certificates issued in Docket No. CP85–359–000 pursuant to Section 7 of the NGA, all as more fully set forth in the request which is open to the public for inspection.

MIT proposes to install and operate a new delivery point under a transportation agreement with Bailey-PVS Oxides (Decatur), L.L.C. (Bailey). MIT states that it would install two hot taps on its mainline transmission system in Morgan County approximately 250 feet of 2-inch diameter pipe from the hot taps to the delivery point, a sales meter, and a regulator station. MIT states that it would construct the proposed delivery point facilities at a cost of $93,063 in order to deliver approximately 1,000 dekatherm equivalents of natural gas per day to Bailey pursuant to Rate Schedule IT of MIT's FERC Gas Tariff. MIT also states that Bailey has contracted for firm transportation service with MIT via the proposed delivery point once the looping facilities that MIT has requested approval for in Docket No. CP98–247–000 are authorized and operational. MIT further states that the addition of the proposed delivery point is not prohibited by its FERC Gas Tariff and that addition of the delivery point would not have any adverse impact on a daily or annual basis upon MIT's existing customers.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after the Commission has issued this notice, 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 NGA (18CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the allowed time, 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–14485 Filed 6–1–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. CP98–563–000 and CP98–564–000]

Western Gas Resources, Inc.; Notice of Application

May 27, 1998.

Take notice that on May 20, 1998, Western Gas Resources, Inc. (Western), 12200 N. Pecos Street, Denver, Colorado 80234, filed in Docket Nos. CP98–563–000 and CP98–564–000 an application pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Part 157 of the Commission's Regulations for a limited jurisdiction certificate of public convenience and necessity to operate a processing plant residue line and to engage in certain routine activities, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

It is stated that the subject application is made in compliance with the January 29, 1998, order issued in Docket No. CP97–636–000, wherein the Commission determined that if Western decided to commence operation of a currently idle 9 mile, 10-inch residue line extending from the tailgate of the Chaney Dell processing plant to Williams Gas Pipelines Central, Inc.'s (Williams) Canadian-Blackwell pipeline, Western must apply for a Section 7 certificate under the NGA. Western states that it is requesting a limited jurisdiction certificate for the sole purpose of authorizing Western's use of its Chaney Dell plant residue line to deliver Western's gas to Williams in order to satisfy the 4 Bcf delivery obligation arising from Western's purchase of the Yellowstone Line in Docket No. CP97–636–000.

Western also requests a blanket certificate of public convenience and necessity under Part 157 of the Commission's Regulations authorizing the various activities stated in Subpart F of Part 157 of the Commission's Regulations. In this regard, Western requests waiver of the requirements of Section 157.204(a) of the Commission's Regulations which otherwise limits issuance of such blanket certificates only to applicants which have been issued certificates other than limited jurisdiction authorizations, and which have had rates accepted by the Commission.

Western requests waiver of all Commission rate and tariff filing requirements, such as FERC annual reports, tariffs or rate schedules, or any requirement that would subject Western to any strictures prohibiting bundled sales of gas which might otherwise affect Western's ability to gather and sell gas like all other non-jurisdictional gathering and processing plant operators with which Western competes. Western also requests waiver of any requirement that would result in being assessed or having to pay annual charges to the Commission pursuant to Part 382 of the Commission's Regulations.

Western requests that any certificate authorized by the Commission confirm that the Commission's jurisdiction under the NGA arising both granting such certificate and from Western's acceptance thereof will be limited solely and exclusively to Western's operation of the Chaney Dell residue line for deliveries to Williams.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before June 17,