Secretariat at the Commission's headquarters in accordance with 17 CFR 145.7 and 145.8.

Any person interested in submitting written data, views, or arguments on the proposed terms and conditions, or with respect to other materials submitted by the CSCE, should send such comments to Jean A. Webb, Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 2033 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20581 by the specified date.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 19, 1995.

Blake Imel,

Acting Director.

[FR Doc. 95–12991 Filed 5–25–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board, Hanford Site

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92–463, 86 Stat. 770) notice is hereby given of the following Advisory Committee meeting: Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB), Hanford Site.

DATES: Thursday, June 1: 9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.; Friday, June 2: 8:30 a.m.–4:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: Red Lion Columbia River, 1401 N. Hayden Island Drive, Portland, Oregon.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jon Yerxa, Public Participation Coordinator, Department of Energy Richland Operations Office, P.O. Box 550, Richland, WA, 99352.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Purpose of the Board: The purpose of the Board is to make recommendations to DOE and its regulators in the areas of environmental restoration, waste management, and related activities.

Tentative Agenda

June Meeting Topics

The Hanford Advisory Board will receive information on and discuss issues related to: Privatization, Risk Assessment, St. Louis Plan Implementation, the '97 Budget, the M&O Contract Rebid Process, and the USDOE–HQ Risk Report for Congress. The Committee will also receive updates from various Subcommittees, including reports on: the Board Progress Report, and the Board Schedule and Operating Plan for FY '96.

Public Participation: The meeting is open to the public. Written statements may be filed with the Committee either before or after the meeting. Individuals who wish to make oral statements pertaining to agenda items should contact Jon Yerxa's office at the address or telephone number listed above. Requests must be received 5 days prior to the meeting and reasonable provision will be made to include the presentation in the agenda. The Designated Federal Official is empowered to conduct the meeting in a fashion that will facilitate the orderly conduct of business. Each individual wishing to make public comment will be provided a maximum of 5 minutes to present their comments. Due to programmatic issues that had to be resolved, the **Federal Register** notice is being published less than fifteen days before the date of the meeting.

Minutes: The minutes of this meeting will be available for public review and copying at the Freedom of Information Public Reading Room, 1E–190, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585 between 9:00 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday–Friday, except Federal holidays. Minutes will also be available by writing to Jon Yerxa, Department of Energy Richland Operations Office, P.O. Box 550, Richland, WA 99352, or by calling him at (509)–376–9628.

Issued at Washington, DC on May 23, 1995.

Rachel M. Samuel,

Acting Deputy Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–13008 Filed 5–25–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. MG92–3–002]

Pacific Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Filing

May 22, 1995

Take notice that on May 12, 1995, Pacific Gas Transmission Company (PGT) submitted revised standards of conduct to incorporate the changes required by Order Nos. 566 *et seq.*[1] and the Commission's Order issued April 19, 1995 in Docket No. MG92–3–001.

PGT states that all parties of record in the above-referenced docket have been served with copies of this filing, as well as all jurisdictional customers and interested state regulatory agencies.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC, 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 or 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 or 385.214 (1991)). All such motion to intervene or protest should be filed on or before June 6, 1995. 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 proceeding. 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–12923 Filed 5–25–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. CP95–503–000]

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

May 22, 1995.

Take notice that on May 18, 1995, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Tennessee), P.O. Box 2511, Houston, Texas 77252, filed in Docket No. CP95–503–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.212) for authorization to construct and operate delivery point facilities in Humphreys County, Mississippi, in order to deliver gas to Producer Feed Company (PFC) under Tennessee's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–413–000 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 inspection.

Tennessee proposes to construct a delivery point to enable PFC to receive gas under various transportation arrangements. Tennessee states that the estimated cost of the proposed facilities will be $105,220, which will be reimbursed to Tennessee by PFC.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission,

[1] Standards of Conduct and Reporting Requirements for Transportation and Affiliate Transactions, Order No. 566, 59 FR 32885 (June 27, 1994), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶30,997 (June 17, 1994); Order No. 566–A, *Order on rehearing*, 59 FR 52896 (October 20, 1994), 69 FERC ¶61,044 (October 14, 1994); Order No. 566–B, *order on rehearing*, 59 FR 65707, (December 21, 1994); 69 FERC ¶61,334 (December 14, 1994): *appeal docketed sub nom. Conoco, Inc.* v. *FERC*, D.C. Cir No. 94–1745 (December 13, 1994).

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 § 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 therefore, 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–12922 Filed 5–25–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. PL94–3–000]

City of Hamilton, Ohio; Order on Request for Designation of Market Center

Issued May 22, 1995.

On May 23, 1994, the City of Hamilton, Ohio (Hamilton) filed a Request to Designate Lebanon, Ohio a Market Center and to require Tariff Changes. The City of Hamilton,[1] a municipal gas system located in Butler County, Ohio, serves approximately 23,000 residential, commercial, and industrial customers. Hamilton is located approximately 16 miles from Lebanon, Ohio. Within a 20-mile radius of Lebanon, five interstate pipelines interconnect.[2]

Hamilton requests that the Commission issue a policy statement designating Lebanon, Ohio as a market center and requiring changes to the tariffs of the interstate pipelines which connect in the Lebanon Market Center. Hamilton asserts that certain tariff provisions currently impede the development of an efficient market center at Lebanon. Hamilton contends that use of a policy statement in this case is consistent with continued implementation of the Commission's mandate in Order No. 636[3] for pipelines to remove impediments to the development of market centers.

Discussion

We agree with the City of Hamilton that market centers should be encouraged to develop and allowed to operate so that both the industry and consumers of natural gas will benefit. The Commission has made clear its intent that market centers should develop and that rate structures not inhibit market centers. Consistent with the basic operational characteristics of the market, Order no. 636 states the Commission's belief that market centers should develop naturally and that the Commission should not designate market centers.[4] Market centers have developed since Order No. 636 without the Commission designating locations as market centers.

Hamilton specifies some of its concerns regarding the efficiency of the running of a market center at Lebanon and expresses concerns about the consideration of other issues in individual proceedings. There is more to be considered here than economy of administrative effort, however. The Commission's policy that market centers should evolve naturally does not compromise Hamilton's interests. Hamilton has raised and may raise tariff and rate issues in particular pipelines' individual rate cases.[5] Discussion among the pipelines to better coordinate their operations is also encouraged.

For these reasons, the Commission sees no reason to change its policy now. The market is better able than the Commission to determine where market centers should be located. As we have already stated, unless a market center proposal or specific rate and tariff terms violate the Commission's rules and regulations, the Commission is unlikely to intrude on the natural process of development of a market center. Accordingly, the Commission will not designate Lebanon a market center and Hamilton's request that the Commission generally review pipeline operations and tariffs is denied.

The Commission orders

The request for designation of Lebanon, Ohio as a market center and for a general review of pipeline tariffs and operations is denied.

By the Commission.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–12989 Filed 5–25–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. EG95–51–000, et al.]

CNG Power Services Corporation, et al., Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

May 19, 1995.

Take notice that the following filings have been made with the Commission:

1. CNG Power Services Corporation

[Docket No. EG95–51–000]

On May 15, 1995, CNG Power Services Corporation (''CNGPS''), One Park Ridge Center, Box 15746, Pittsburgh, PA 15222, filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (''Commission'') an application for a new determination of exempt wholesale generator status, due to changed circumstances resulting from certain

---

[1] Hamilton states that it is directly connected to two interstate pipeline systems, Texas Gas Transmission Corporation (Texas Gas) and Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation (Texas Eastern), and has contracted for substantial storage capacity on ANR Pipeline Company (ANR); these three pipelines interconnect in the area of Lebanon, Ohio.

[2] Hamilton states that: (1) these pipelines are ANR, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation, CNG Transmission Corporation, Texas Eastern, and Texas Gas; (2) Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company also delivers gas to Lebanon through facilities owned by Texas Eastern and ANR (''the Lebanon Lateral''); (3) all major producing areas, including Canada, are accessible through at least one of these pipelines; (4) several storage areas are accessible to the Lebanon area.

[3] Pipeline Service Obligations and Revisions to Regulations Governing Self-Implementing Transportation; and Regulation of Natural Gas Pipelines After Partial Wellhead Decontrol, 57 Fed. Reg. 13,267 (April 16, 1992), III FERC Stats. & Regs. Preambles ¶ 30,939 (April 8, 1992); *order on reh'g,* Order No. 636–A, 57 Fed. Reg. 36,128 (August 12, 1992, III Stats. & Regs. Preambles ¶ 30,950 (August 3, 1992); *order on reh'g,* Order No. 636–B, 57 Fed. Reg. 57,911 (December 8, 1992), 61 FERC ¶ 61,272 (November 27, 1992) *appeal redocketed sub nom.,* Atlanta Gas Light Company and Chattanooga Gas Company, *et al.* v. *FERC,* No. 94–1171 (D.C. Cir. (May 27, 1994).

[4] The Commission stated that it was adopting Order No. 636

> in order to facilitate the meeting of gas purchasers and gas sellers in a national gas market. Market centers may, in certain areas, create additional meeting places for gas purchasers and gas sellers. These inter-pipeline market centers would allow gas from production areas attached to different pipelines to meet where the pipelines intersect to create a market for gas purchasers from different market areas. The Commission believes that market centers should develop naturally and, therefore, will not mandate market centers. However, as stated above, the Commission is requiring in new Sections 284.8(b)(5) and 284.9(b)(5) that there must be nothing in a pipeline's tariff that inhibits the development of market centers. (Order No. 636, ¶ 30,939 at 30,427–28. *Emphasis added*; footnote omitted.)

The Commission provided specific examples of rate structures that may inhibit market centers. In various restructuring proceedings, the Commission provided examples of those rate structures which may impede the development of market centers. *See* Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, 63 FERC ¶ 61,194 at 62,501 (1993), and Arkla Energy Resources Company, 62 FERC ¶ 61,076 at 61,461 (1993).

[5] In Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation's (Texas Eastern) one year restructuring report, Hamilton State that Texas Eastern's backhaul service was merely a transfer of gas within a market center and that a rate reduction was appropriate. Citing the Commission's earlier order on restructuring, the Commission said that:

> The Commission continues to believe, as it previously advised Hamilton, that the appropriate place to discuss the maximum rate for backhaul services is in Texas Eastern's next rate case proceeding. 69 FERC ¶ 61,362, 62,370 (1994).