

0183, June 1995). In the subsequent Business Plan Record of Decision (Business Plan ROD), issued August 15, 1995, the BPA Administrator selected the Market-Driven alternative.

The Business Plan EIS was intended to support a number of business decisions, including transmission system development and operation. The Business Plan EIS and ROD also documented a NEPA strategy for tiering subsequent business decisions. Consistent with that strategy, BPA will review the EIS to determine whether the environmental impacts associated with participation in an RTO-like organization are adequately analyzed. After incorporating information received during the public process associated with RTO West, BPA intends to prepare a ROD tiered to the Business Plan ROD, explaining any decision to join the RTO. The RTO West ROD will provide a summary of potential environmental impacts with reference to the appropriate discussions in the Business Plan EIS.

The comment period and the two public meetings are an integral part of BPA's decisionmaking process for whether or not to join the RTO. The Spokane public meeting will also incorporate an RTO West briefing as part of the RTO's commitment to host regional workshops.

Issued in Portland, Oregon, on August 8, 2000.

J.A. Johansen,

Administrator and Chief Executive Officer.

[FR Doc. 00-20786 Filed 8-15-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. EC96-10-000 and ER96-1663-000]

California Power Exchange Corporation; Notice of Filing

August 10, 2000.

Take notice that on July 31, 2000, the California Power Exchange Corporation (CalPX) filed the annual report of its Compliance Unit pursuant to the Commission's October 30, 1997 order in this proceeding, 81 FERC ¶ 61,122 at 61,553, and its March 15, 2000 Notice of Extension of Time in this proceeding. CalPX has served copies on all parties on the official service list in Docket Nos. EC96-19-000 *et al.* and on the California Public Utilities Commission, the California Energy Commission, the California Electricity Oversight Board,

the Arizona Corporation Commission, the Nevada Public Service Commission and the Oregon Public Utility Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest such filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214). All such motions and protests should be filed on or before August 30, 2000. Protests will be considered by the Commission to determine 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 Commission and are available for public inspection. This filing may also be viewed on the Internet at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> (call 202-208-2222 for assistance).

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-20785 Filed 8-15-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP00-344-000]

Dominion Transmission, Inc.; Notice of Technical Conference

August 10, 2000.

On June 15, 2000, Dominion transmission, Inc. (formerly CNG Transmission Corporation) (Dominion) filed in compliance with Order No. 637. Several parties have protested various aspects of Dominion's filing. Take notice that the technical conference to discuss the various issues raised by Dominion's filing will be held on Thursday, September 7, 2000, at 10:00 am, in a room to be designated at the offices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20426. This technical conference may extend to Friday, September 8, 2000. Parties protesting aspects of Dominion's filing should be prepared to discuss alternatives.

All interested parties and Staff are permitted to attend.

David P. Boergers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-20758 Filed 8-15-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP00-40-001]

Florida Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Amendment

August 10, 2000.

Take notice that on August 1, 2000, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT), 1400 Smith Street, P.O. Box 1188, Houston, Texas 77251-1188, filed in Docket No. CP00-40-001 an amendment to its application in Docket No. CP00-40-000, pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Part 157 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Regulations, to reflect: (1) changes in Phase V shippers; (2) changes in proposed facilities requirements, including changes in compressor horsepower and pipeline requirements; and (3) pipeline route modifications (including modifications to facilities located in Mobile and Baldwin Counties, AL; and Citrus, Hernando, Bay and Washington Counties, FL) that were requested by landowners, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection. This filing may be viewed on the web at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/rims.htm> (call 202-208-2222 for assistance).

Any questions regarding the application should be directed to Mr. Stephen T. Veatch, Director of Certificates and Regulatory Reporting, Suite 3997, 1400 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002 or call (713) 853-6549.

FGT states that its pipeline and horsepower modifications are due to the requirement to deliver natural gas to the west coast of Florida for Tampa Electric Company, a new shipper, instead of the east coast markets which were to be served by Enron North America Corp. and Dynegy who both exercised rights to terminate their contracts. FGT continue to request that the Commission find that the costs of the proposed Phase V Expansion can be rolled-in to establish rates for service under its incrementally priced Rate Schedule FTS-2. FGT states that the maximum rates applicable to Rate Schedule FTS-2 are expected to be lower as a result of such rolling-in of costs and thus, will not require subsidies from existing shippers.

By this amendment FGT proposes significant changes to the pipeline facilities proposed in its original application. Some of the originally proposed pipeline facilities will be modified (located in Greene County,