Clairain, E.J., Jr. (ed). In prep.
Guidelines for Developing
Hydrogeomorphic Approach
Regional Guidebooks. Wetland
Research Program Technical Report
WRP-DE-\_\_. U.S. Army Waterways
Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.

#### Appendix A

#### **Definition of Terms**

Assessment Model: A simple model that defines the relationship between ecosystem and landscape scale attributes and processes and functional capacity of a wetland. The model is developed and calibrated using reference wetlands from a reference domain.

Assessment Objective: The reason why an assessment of wetland functions is being conducted. Assessment objectives normally fall into one of three categories. These include: documenting existing conditions, comparing different wetlands at the same point in time (e.g., alternatives analysis, and comparing the same wetland at different points in time (e.g., impact analysis or mitigation success).

Assessment Team (A-Team): An interdisciplinary group of regional and local scientists responsible for identifying regional wetland subclasses, identification of reference wetlands, construction of assessment models, definition of reference standards, and calibration of assessment models.

Functional Assessment: The process by which the capacity of a wetland to perform a function is measured or estimated. The Hydrogeomorphic Approach measures capacity using an assessment model to determine a functional capacity index.

Functional Capacity: The rate or magnitude at which a wetland ecosystem performs a function. Functional capacity is dictated by characteristics of the wetland ecosystem and the surrounding landscape, and interaction between the two.

Functional Capacity Index (FCI): An index of the capacity of a wetland to perform a function relative to other wetlands within a regional wetland subclass in a reference domain. Functional capacity indices are by definition scaled from 0.0 to 1.0. An index of 1.0 indicates the wetland performs a function at the highest sustainable functional capacity, the level equivalent to a wetland under reference standard conditions in a reference domain. An index of 0.0 indicates the wetland does not perform the function at a measurable level, and will not recover the capacity to perform the function through natural processes.

Highest Sustainable Functional Capacity: The level of functional capacity achieved across the suite of functions by a wetland under reference standard conditions in a reference domain. This approach assumes that the highest sustainable functional capacity is achieved when a wetland ecosystem and the surrounding landscape are undisturbed.

Hydrogeomorphic Wetland Class: The highest level in the hydrogeomorphic wetland classification. There are seven basic hydrogeomorphic wetland classes including depressional, fringe—lacustrine and coastal, slope, riverine, and flat—mineral and organic.

Project Target: The level of functioning identified for a restoration or creation project. Conditions specified for the functioning are used to judge whether a project reaches the target and is developing toward site capacity.

Project Standards: Performance criteria and/or specifications used to guide the restoration or creation activities toward the project target. Project standards should include and specify reasonable contingency measures if the project target is not being achieved.

Red Flag Features: Features of a wetland or the surrounding landscape to which special recognition or protection is assigned on the basis of objective criteria. The recognition or protection may occur at a federal, state, regional, or local level, and may be official or unofficial.

Reference: Standard for measuring, reckoning, or constructing.

Reference Domain: The geographic area from which reference wetlands are selected. A reference domain may or may not include the entire geographic area in which a regional wetland subclass occurs.

Reference Standard Wetlands: The sites within a reference wetland data set from which reference standards are developed. Among all reference wetlands, reference standard sites are judged by an interdisciplinary team to have the highest level of functioning.

Reference Standards: Conditions exhibited by a group of reference wetlands that correspond to the highest level of functioning (highest, sustainable level of functioning) across the suite of functions performed by the regional wetland subclass. The highest level of functional capacity is assigned an index score of 1.0 by definition.

Reference Wetlands: Wetland sites that encompass the variability of a regional wetland subclass in a reference domain. Reference wetlands are used to establish the range of conditions for construction and calibration of functional indices and establish reference standards.

Regional Wetland Subclass: Wetlands within a region that are similar based on hydrogeomorphic classification factors. There may be more than one regional wetland subclass identified within each hydrogeomorphic wetland class depending on the diversity of wetlands in a region, and assessment objectives.

Site Potential: The highest level of functioning possible, given local constraints of disturbance history, land use, or other factors. Site capacity may be equal to or less than levels of functioning established by reference standards for the reference domain, and it may be equal to or less than the functional capacity of a wetland ecosystem.

Wetland Functions: The normal activities or actions that occur in wetland ecosystems, or simply, the things that wetlands do. Wetland functions result directly from the characteristics of a wetland ecosystem and the surrounding landscape, and their interaction.

[FR Doc. 97–15959 Filed 6–19–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3710–92–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

[Docket No. EA-48-L]

# Issuance of Temporary Order; El Paso Electric Company

**AGENCY:** Office of Fossil Energy, DOE. **ACTION:** Notice of Issuance of Temporary Order and Request for Comments.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that of DOE has issued El Paso Electric Company (EPE) a Temporary Order in FE Docket EA–48-L that authorizes EPE to increase the level of electricity exports to Mexico from 200 MW to 210 MW for the summer months of 1997.

**DATES:** Comments, protests or requests to intervene must be submitted on or before July 7, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments, protests or requests to intervene should be addressed as follows: Office of Coal & Power Im/Ex (FE–27), Office of Fossil Energy, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585–0350 (FAX 202–287–5736).

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ellen Russell (Program Office) 202–586–5883 or Michael Skinker (Program Attorney) 202–586–6667.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Exports of electricity from the United States to a foreign country are regulated and

require authorization under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (FPA) (16 U.S.C. § 824a(e)).

On June 9, 1997, EPE filed an application with the Office of Fossil Energy (FE) of the Department of Energy (DOE) to temporarily exceed the authorized transmission rate of 200 megawatts (MW) for electricity exports to Mexico over two international transmission lines owned and operated by EPE in the vicinity of El Paso, Texas. This request, to export up to 210 MW of electric power through August, 1997, is to accommodate hourly fluctuations in CFE's summer load requirement.

DOE has determined that the immediate nature of CFE's need for electric energy this summer justifies an abbreviated public comment period and the issuance of a temporary order prior to completion of the comment period. PROCEDURAL MATTERS: DOE is publishing this notice concurrent with issuance of the Order in Docket EA-48-L attached as Appendix A to this Notice. Any persons desiring to become a party to this proceeding or to be heard by filing comments or protests regarding this Order should file a petition to intervene, comment or protest at the address provided above in accordance with §§ 385.211 or 385.214 of the FERC's Rules of Practice and Procedures (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). Fifteen copies of such petitions and protests should be filed with the DOE on or before the date listed above. Additional copies are to be filed directly with: Pedro Serrano, Jr., Assistant Vice President, El Paso Electric Company. P.O. Box 982, El Paso, Texas 79960.

Copies of the EPE application and Order EA-48-L will be made available, upon request, for public inspection and copying at the address provided above.

Issued in Washington, D.C., June 13, 1997.

#### Anthony J. Como

Manager, Electric Power Regulation, Office of Coal & Power Im/Ex, Office of Coal & Power Systems, Office of Fossil Energy.

#### Appendix A

### El Paso Electric Company, Order No. EA-48-L

#### I. Background

Exports of electric energy from the United States to a foreign country are regulated and require authorization under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (FPA) (16 U.S.C. § 824a(e)).

On June 9, 1997, El Paso Electric Company (EPE) filed a letter application with the Office of Fossil Energy (FE) of the Department of Energy (DOE) requesting that EPE's electricity export authorization be amended to increase the allowable level of exports to Mexico from 200 megawatts (MW) to 210 MW through August 1997. EPE's request was occasioned by a recent request from the Comision Federal de Electricidad (CFE), the national electric utility of Mexico, for additional purchases of capacity to accommodate hourly fluctuations in the CFE load requirements during the summer. The increased exports would be delivered to CFE over EPE's two existing 115–kV international transmission lines previously authorized by Presidential Permits PP–48 and PP–92.

The EPE and CFE normally are operated asynchronously. During periods when EPE is either exporting electric energy to, or importing from CFE, synchronism between the two systems can only be maintained when either a portion of CFE's Ciudad Juarez system is not connected to CFE's national interconnected electrical system or El Paso's system is not interconnected with the rest of the Western System Coordinating Council (WSCC) system. When CFE receives electric energy from EPE, it must isolate a portion of its system from the remainder of the CFE system and rely on EPE to supply the full electrical requirements of that isolated portion. When supplying electrical service to that isolated portion of the CFE system, EPE must be able to accommodate the hourly fluctuation in load. EPE has estimated that these hourly fluctuations could require EPE to supply up to 210 MW of electric power to the isolated portion of the CFE system. Since EPE's existing export authorization (EA-48-I) limits exports to CFE to 200 MW, EPE has requested a 10-MW increase in the authorized level of exports for the summer months.

DOE is issuing this Order concurrent with the public notice in the **Federal Register**. DOE's intent in so doing is to accommodate an immediate need for power in Mexico that can only be satisfied by this accelerated process.

#### II. Discussion and Analysis

On October 29, 1996, the Secretary of Energy signed Delegation Order No. 0204-163, which delegated and assigned to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) authority to carry out such functions vested in the Secretary to regulate access to, and the rates, terms and conditions for, transmission services over EPE's international transmission facilities. This authority was delegated to FERC for the sole purpose of carrying out the Department's policy of comparable open-access, nondiscriminatory transmission service over international transmission lines

and, thus, authorized FERC to take any further actions that may be necessary to effectuate open access transmission over the United States portion of EPE's international lines. Notice and a copy of the Delegation Order were published in the **Federal Register** on November 1, 1996, at 61 FR 56525.

The Delegation Order did not preclude the Secretary from exercising or further delegating any of the authority therein delegated.

Accordingly, the instant application by EPE is being processed by DOE. In addition, because of the immediate nature of the CFE request, the limited notice provided to EPE of the added energy requirement, and the technical inability of CFE to obtain the required relief from other domestic or U.S. sources, DOE is expediting its normal process to provide CFE maximum relief.

DOE calls EPE's attention to the repetitive nature of summer emergency and short term requests to export at increased power levels to Mexico. Because of these historic trends in the operation of the EPE/CFE interconnection, DOE encourages EPE to prepare, prior to the 1998 peak load season, studies to support an application to permanently increase the authorized rate of transmission to CFE above the current 200 MW limit to handle future emergency needs of CFE during the summer months.

#### **III. Finding and Decision**

The circumstances described in the letter application in FE Docket EA-48-L to amend Order EA-48-I by temporarily increasing the authorized rate of transmission to 210 MW for the summer months of 1997 are similar to other temporary emergency authorizations issued EPE in the past. DOE has determined that the electric reliability review prepared on March 19, 1992, in FE Docket FE-48-I, and its review of EPE's June 9, 1997 Study of System Impacts that modeled the proposed increase in transmission to CFE, fulfills the statutory requirements of the FPA. Specifically, this review determined that operating these facilities in compliance with the system criteria of EPE and WSCC, combined with the EPE/CFE interconnection agreement that permits EPE to reduce or terminate exports to CFE (even emergency sales) during any system operating conditions on the EPE system which would create a potential reliability problem, would not adversely impact on the reliability of the U.S. electric power supply system.

Similarly, DOE finds that it has adequately satisfied its responsibility under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 through adoption of the Finding of No Significant Impact dated April 15, 1992, and contained in FE Docket EA–48–I.

#### IV. Order

Based on the above discussion and findings, paragraph (A) of Order EA–48–I is amended by adding the following sentence: From the date of this Order until August 31, 1997, EPE is authorized to export electric energy to Mexico at a maximum allowable rate of transmission of 210 MW.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on June 13, 1997.

#### Anthony J. Como,

Manager, Electric Power Regulation, Office of Coal & Power Im/Ex, Office of Coal & Power Systems, Office of Fossil Energy. [FR Doc. 97–16187 Filed 6–19–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

## Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP97-568-000]

# ANR Pipeline Company; Notice of Request under Blanket Authorization

June 16, 1997

Take notice that on June 10, 1997, ANR Pipeline Company (ANR), 500 Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan 48243, filed in Docket No. CP97–568–000, a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.211 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.211) for authorization to operate under the provisions of Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) existing facilities that have been constructed pursuant to Section 311 of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (NGPA).

ANR states that it constructed an interconnection between ANR and Arkla, a division of NorAm Energy Corporation, (Arkla) in Woodward County, Oklahoma, under Section 311 of the NGPA. ANR states that this interconnection was placed in service on April 12, 1997. ANR indicates that the facilities consist of a two-inch positive displacement meter, an electronic measurement system, an insulating flange, and approximately 400 feet of four-inch pipeline. ANR further indicates that the total cost of the facilities was approximately \$73,500, for which ANR are fully reimbursed by Arkla. By this application, ANR seeks authorization, under Section 157.211 of the Commission's prior notice regulations, to operate its intercommection with

Arkla under the provisions of Section 7(c) of the NGA.

Any person or the Commission Staff may, within 45 days of the issuance if the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214), a motion to intervene and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205), a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, the proposed activities 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 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 the Natural Gas Act.

#### Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–16141 Filed 6–19–97; 8:45 am]

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

#### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP97-570-000]

# Northern Natural Gas Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

June 16, 1997.

Take notice that on June 11, 1997, Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern), 1111 South 103rd Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68124-1000, filed in Docket No. CP97-570-000 a request pursuant to sections 157.205, 157.216 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.216, 157.212) for authorization to upgrade the Rosemount #1 TBS, an existing delivery point located in Dakota County, Minnesota, to accommodate increased natural gas deliveries to Koch Hydrocarbon Company (Koch) under Northern's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-401-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public

Northern proposes to replace the meter module on the existing 8-inch meter and install an additional 8-inch meter at the existing station. Northern states that Koch has requested the proposed upgrade of the Rosemount #1 TBS to accommodate increased deliveries for use at their plant. The increased deliveries would be from

35,000 MMBtu/day to 100,000 MMBtu/day, peak day and from 11,400,000 MMBtu to 25,500,000 MMBtu, annual under Northern's currently effective service agreements. Northern estimates the cost to upgrade this delivery point to be \$117,000.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, 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 Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, 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 the Natural Gas Act.

#### Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–16140 Filed 6–19–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

#### **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

## Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP97-559-000]

## Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company; Notice of Application

June 16, 1997.

Take notice that on June 3, 1997, Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company (Williston Basin), 200 North Third Street, Suite 300, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501, filed in Docket No. CP97–559–000 an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for permission and approval to abandon 7.5 miles of Warren-Elk Basin natural gas transmission pipeline, 6.9 miles in Carbon County, Montana and .6 miles in Park County, Wyoming, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Williston Basin states that the 7.5 miles of 6-inch pipeline is old and deteriorated and has not been used in several years. Williston Basin states further that there would be no effect on existing customers, as service would continue through an existing 12-inch loop line.

Any person desiring to be heard or any person desiring to make any protest