

ST95-3138	COLUMBIA GULF TRANS-MISSION CO.	ASSOCIATED GAS SERVICES, INC.	07-31-95	G-S	150,000	N	I	07-01-95	INDEF.
ST95-3139	TRANS-CONTINENTAL GAS P/L CORP.	COMSTOCK RESOURCES, INC.	07-31-95	G-S	10,000	N	I	07-01-95	INDEF.
ST95-3140	TRANS-CONTINENTAL GAS P/L CORP.	BNG, INC .....	07-31-95	G-S	100,000	N	I	07-01-95	INDEF.
ST95-3141	TRANS-CONTINENTAL GAS P/L CORP.	CNG ENERGY SERVICES CORP.	07-31-95	G-S	750,000	N	I	07-01-95	INDEF.
ST95-3142	TRANS-CONTINENTAL GAS P/L CORP.	GM HYDRO-CARBONS, LTD.	07-31-95	G-S	135,000	N	I	07-01-95	INDEF.
ST95-3143	TRANS-CONTINENTAL GAS P/L CORP.	UNION CAMP CORP.	07-31-95	G-S	20,000	N	I	07-01-95	INDEF.
ST95-3144	TRANS-CONTINENTAL GAS P/L CORP.	ASSOCIATED NATURAL GAS, INC.	07-31-95	G-S	300,000	N	I	07-01-95	INDEF.
ST95-3145	MISSISSIPPI RIVER TRANS. CORP.	MRT ENERGY MARKETING CO.	07-31-95	G-S	75	A	F	07-01-95	INDEF.
ST95-3146	MISSISSIPPI RIVER TRANS. CORP.	MRT ENERGY MARKETING CO.	07-31-95	G-S	47	A	F	07-01-95	INDEF.
ST95-3147	MISSISSIPPI RIVER TRANS. CORP.	MRT ENERGY MARKETING CO.	07-31-95	G-S	13	A	F	07-01-95	INDEF.

\* NOTICE OF TRANSACTIONS DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A DETERMINATION THAT FILINGS COMPLY WITH COMMISSION REGULATIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ORDER NO. 436 (FINAL RULE AND NOTICE REQUESTING SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS, 50 FR 42,372, 10/10/85).

\*\* ESTIMATED MAXIMUM DAILY VOLUMES INCLUDES VOLUMES REPORTED BY THE FILING COMPANY IN MMBTU, MCF AND DT.

\*\*\* AFFILIATION OF REPORTING COMPANY TO ENTITIES INVOLVED IN THE TRANSACTION. A "Y" INDICATES AFFILIATION, AN "A" INDICATES MARKETING AFFILIATION, AND A "N" INDICATES NO AFFILIATION.

[FR Doc. 95-20458 Filed 8-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Docket No. CP95-639-000, et al.]

### Shell Offshore Inc., et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings

August 11, 1995.

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

#### 1. Shell Offshore Inc.

[Docket No. CP95-639-000]

Take notice that on July 24, 1995, Shell Offshore Inc. (SOI), P.O. Box 576, Houston, Texas 77079, filed in Docket No. CP95-639-000 a petition pursuant to Section 16 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Rule 207(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.207 (a)(2)), for a declaratory order disclaiming Commission jurisdiction over a certain facility and the services provided through it, all as more fully set forth in the petition which is on file with the

Commission and open to public inspection.<sup>1</sup>

SOI requests a declaratory order from the Commission finding that the acquisition, ownership and operation by SOI of a natural gas meter facility presently owned by Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company (Transco) and Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT) will not subject SOI, or any portion of its facilities or services to the Commission's jurisdiction under the Natural Gas Act (NGA) or the Commission's Regulations thereunder. Restated, SOI seeks an order finding that (1) the meter facility would be exempt from Commission jurisdiction pursuant to the "production and gathering exemption" in Section 1(b) of the NGA, and (2) SOI would not become a "natural gas company" pursuant to Section 2 of the NGA by virtue of the proposed acquisition, ownership and operation of the facility. SOI states that

<sup>1</sup> SOI indicates that a related application was being filed concurrently in Docket No. CP95-640-000 by Transco and FGT, requesting authorization to abandon the facilities by sale to SOI.

it is a wholly owned indirect subsidiary of Shell Oil Company, and is engaged primarily in the business of exploring for and producing oil and natural gas in the Gulf of Mexico.

SOI states that it has entered into an agreement with Transco and FGT whereby it would purchase the natural gas meter facility located at the tailgate of its Yellowhammer gas treatment plant near Coden in Mobile County, Alabama. SOI states that the meter facility is currently used to measure residue gas leaving the tailgate of the Yellowhammer plant for delivery into the Mobile Bay area jurisdictional transportation facilities of Transco and FGT (the Onshore Mobile Bay Pipeline).

SOI advises that the meter facility is classified by Transco for jurisdictional ratemaking purposes as a gathering facility, and shippers moving gas through Transco's capacity in the meter facility must pay Transco's separately stated gathering charge under its transportation rate schedules. Further, SOI advises that FGT does not have a separately stated gathering charge for services rendered through the meter

facility. SOI states that, upon acquisition by SOI, the meter facility would become part of SOI's Yellowhammer gas treatment plant facilities. SOI advises that thereafter shippers on the Transco system would no longer be required to pay Transco's separately stated gathering charge for transportation service from the plant.

Comment date: September 1, 1995, in accordance with the first paragraph of Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

## 2. Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation and Florida Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP95-640-000]

Take notice that on July 25, 1995, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco), P.O. Box 1396, Houston, Texas 77251, and Florida Gas Transmission Company (Florida) (Transco and Florida are referred to jointly as Applicants), 1400 Smith Street, P.O. Box 1188, Houston, Texas 77251-1188, filed in Docket No. CP95-640-000 an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for permission and approval to abandon a jointly owned meter facility which was authorized in Docket No. CP88-570, *et al.*,<sup>2</sup> all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.<sup>3</sup>

Applicants propose to abandon by sale to Shell Offshore Inc. (SOI) the Yellowhammer Meter Station located just downstream (0.20 mile) of SOI's gas treatment facility, located near Coden in Mobile County, Alabama. It is indicated that the meter is used to measure natural gas treated by SOI and delivered into the Mobile Bay Lateral (also known as the Onshore Mobile Bay Pipeline). Applicants state that SOI has agreed to pay the net book value of the facility as of the closing of the purchase and sale. Applicants advise that the estimated net book value of the meter facility is \$318,612 as of August 31, 1995.

Applicants explain that the meter facility is currently classified for rate purposes on Transco's system as a gathering facility, and, therefore,

<sup>2</sup>The meter facility was constructed by Transco as part of the Mobile Bay Lateral pursuant to the certificate of public convenience and necessity granted by order issued June 4, 1991, in Docket Nos. CP88-570, *et al.*, 55 FERC ¶61,358 (1991). Florida acquired its 37.22% ownership interest in the Mobile Bay Lateral pursuant to the authorizations granted in Docket Nos. CP92-182, *et al.* See *Florida Gas Transmission Co., et al.*, 62 FERC ¶61,024 (1993); 63 FERC ¶61,093 (1993); and 66 FERC ¶61,160 (1994).

<sup>3</sup>It is indicated that SOI filed a related petition in Docket No. CP95-639-000 for an order from the Commission declaring the metering facilities non-jurisdictional upon their acquisition by SOI.

shippers moving gas through Transco's capacity in the meter facility must pay Transco's separately stated gathering charge under its transportation rate schedules. (Florida does not have a separately stated gathering charge for services rendered through the meter facility.) It is stated that, by transferring ownership of the meter facility to SOI, the meter facilities would be considered as part of SOI's gas treatment operations and, as a result, Transco's shippers no longer would incur Transco's separately stated gathering charge for transportation service from the plant.

Comment date: September 1, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

## 3. K N Interstate Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP95-671-000]

Take notice that on August 8, 1995, K N Interstate Gas Transmission Co. (K N Interstate), P.O. Box 281304, Lakewood, Colorado 80228-8304, filed in Docket No. CP95-671-000 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 install and operate a new delivery tap under K N Interstate's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-140-000, *et al.*, 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.

K N Interstate proposes to install and operate a new delivery tap in Dawes County, Nebraska. This tap will be added as a delivery point under an existing transportation agreement between K N Interstate and K N Energy Inc. (K N) and will be used by K N to facilitate the delivery of natural gas to a direct retail customer.

Comment date: September 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

## 4. Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company

[Docket No. CP95-672-000]

Take notice that on August 8, 1995, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Tennessee), P.O. Box 2511, Houston, Texas 77252, filed in Docket No. CP95-672-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.212) and under its blanket authority issued in Docket No. CP82-413-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, for authorization to upgrade an existing delivery point for its customer, the Hardeman-Fayette Utility District

(Hardeman-Fayette), all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Specifically, Tennessee proposes to upgrade the Hardeman-Fayette delivery point located at Tennessee's M.P. 70-4+10.17 in Hardeman County, Tennessee, by replacing an existing check valve and approximately 165 feet of 1-inch interconnecting pipe with 2-inch pipe, running from the 2-inch tap valve on Tennessee's 100-4 Line to the Hardeman-Fayette Meter. Additionally, Tennessee will replace the pipe within the meter station from 1-inch to 2-inch.

Tennessee states that the total quantities to be delivered to Hardeman-Fayette will not exceed the total quantities authorized. Finally, Tennessee asserts that the upgrade of this facility is not prohibited by its tariff, and that it has sufficient capacity to accomplish deliveries without detriment or disadvantage to any of Tennessee's other customers.

Tennessee states that the estimated cost for installation of the facilities is \$29,800.

Comment date: September 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

## 5. Northwest Pipeline Corporation

[Docket No. CP95-674-000]

Take notice that on August 8, 1995, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84158, filed in Docket No. CP95-647-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205, 157.216, and 157.211 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.216, and 157.211) for permission and approval to abandon certain facilities and authorization to construct and operate replacement facilities, under Northwest's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-433-000 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.

Specifically, Northwest proposes to modify the Redmond Meter Station in King County, Washington, to more efficiently accommodate existing firm maximum daily delivery obligations at this delivery point to Washington Natural Gas Company. Northwest states that the proposed facility replacement will increase the maximum design capacity of the meter station from 43,333 Dth per day to approximately 50,331 Dth per day. The total cost of the proposed facility modification at the Redmond Station is estimated to be approximately \$107,650.

*Comment date:* September 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

### 6. Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company

[Docket No. CP95-675-000]

Take notice that on August 8, 1995, Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company (Williston Basin), Suite 300, 200 North Third Street, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501, filed in Docket No. CP95-675-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.211 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.211) for authorization to install a meter and regulator at an existing tap site to effectuate natural gas transportation deliveries to Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. (Montana-Dakota), a local distribution company, under Williston Basin's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-1-000 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.

Williston Basin proposes to install a meter and regulator at an existing tap site located in Lawrence County, South Dakota to enable it to provide natural gas deliveries to Montana-Dakota for ultimate delivery to approximately twenty-six additional residential customers. Williston Basin states that it would provide up to 5 Mcf per day additional service to Montana-Dakota under its Rate Schedules FT-1 and/or IT-1 and that such volume is within the certificated entitlements of the customer. Williston Basin further states that the proposed service will have no significant effect on its peak day or annual requirements.

Williston Basin states that the total cost to install the meter and regulator is approximately \$2,250 and that the actual cost of the facilities is 100% reimbursable by Montana-Dakota.

*Comment date:* September 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

### 7. Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation

[Docket No. CP95-681-000]

Take notice that on August 10, 1995, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation (Texas Eastern), P.O. Box 1642, Houston, Texas 77251-1642, filed in Docket No. CP95-681-000 an application, pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act, for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for authorization to construct, install, own, operate and maintain an additional 700

horsepower of compression facilities at its existing Gas City Compressor Station on the Lebanon Lateral, and to revise, restate and reduce its currently effective Part 284 rates for Rate Schedules LLFT and LLIT services, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Texas Eastern proposes to upgrade by 700 horsepower its existing reciprocating compressor unit at Gas City, Grant County, Indiana from the current 2,700 horsepower up to a total of 3,400 horsepower to increase natural gas transportation capacity on the Lebanon Lateral by approximately 29,944 dt equivalent on natural gas per day. To accomplish this increase, Texas Eastern states that it would construct and install two additional power cylinders and modify the turbocharger at the existing 2,700 horsepower Gas City unit. After installation of the facilities proposed herein, Texas Eastern states that the maximum operational capacity of the Lebanon Lateral would be 359,220 dt equivalent per day. Texas Eastern states that the estimated total capital cost of the proposed facilities is approximately \$224,000, to be financed initially with funds on hand. Texas Eastern also states that the proposed facilities would be located entirely within the existing Gas City compressor station building.

Texas Eastern also requests authorization herein to file a limited rate proceeding under Section 4 of the Natural Gas Act after receipt of the certificate authorization requested herein and prior to the in-service date of the proposed facilities to revise and restate the rates applicable to Texas Eastern's Part 284, open-access Rate Schedules LLFT and LLIT.

Texas Eastern submits that the revised and restated rates for Rate Schedules LLFT and LLIT result in a 15 percent reduction of the maximum rates. It is indicated that Texas Eastern's *pro forma* tariff sheet for Rate Schedules LLFT and LLIT illustrates the revised and restated rates resulting in a Reservation Charge of \$4.552 per dt equivalent on natural gas per day. It is stated that on a 100 percent load factor basis, the revised and restated rate is equivalent to \$0.1504 per dt equivalent of natural gas. Texas Eastern also states that the revised and restated rates are based on the cost of service and allocation methodology filed and approved in Texas Eastern's compliance filing in Docket Nos. CP92-459, *et al.*, as adjusted to include the cost of service associated with the additional facilities proposed in this application. It is stated that the cost of service underlying Texas Eastern's

current Rate Schedules LLFT and LLIT rates and revised cost of service reflected in Exhibit P of the filing are based on Texas Eastern's cost of service factors approved in Docket Nos. RP90-119, *et al.*

Texas Eastern states that the additional facilities would enable it to make additional firm and interruptible transportation on the Lebanon Lateral. Texas Eastern also states that this service would benefit natural gas transportation customers who desire to access additional Gulf Coast gas supplies by transporting such gas quantities through Trunkline Gas Company and other interstate pipelines to interconnections with Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company for further downstream transportation on Texas Eastern and other interstate pipelines to Mid-Atlantic and Northeast markets. In addition, it is indicated that, after Texas Eastern's revised and restated rates are placed into effect, all Rate Schedule LLFT and LLIT customers would enjoy maximum rates for such services that would be 15 percent lower than current maximum rates.

It is also indicated that Texas Eastern had previously received authorization to construct and operate the 700 horsepower of compression but, because of postponements of the Liberty Pipeline Project, Texas Eastern allowed the authorization to lapse.

*Comment date:* August 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

### Standard Paragraphs:

F. Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before the comment date, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 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 a 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 Sections 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, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate and/or permission and approval for the proposed abandonment are 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 applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

G. 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.

**Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,**

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-20487 Filed 8-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Docket No. CP95-676-000]

### **Richfield Gas Storage System; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization**

August 14, 1995.

Take notice that on August 8, 1995, Richfield Gas Storage System (Richfield), 2 Warren Place, 6120 S. Yale, Suite 1200, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74136, filed in Docket No. CP95-676-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, and 157.212) for approval to operate an existing tap and side valve as a new delivery point located in Stevens County, Kansas for delivery of natural gas to Associated Gas Services, Inc.

(AGS)<sup>1</sup> to interconnect to facilities to be constructed by Utilicorp United (Utilicorp), a local distribution company, for ultimate consumption by Utilicorp's end-user customers, under the blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP93-679-000, pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Richfield indicates that the quantity of natural gas it will deliver through the proposed delivery point is 1,000 Mcf on a peak day, and 150,000 Mcf annually, respectively. Richfield further indicates that the new delivery point will also serve as an interconnect between the Richfield system and a lateral, no greater than four inches, to be constructed by Utilicorp, through which AGS will delivery gas to Utilicorp for ultimate consumption by Utilicorp's end-user customers. Richfield states that it is not proposing to construct any facilities.

Richfield states that its tariff does not prohibit the addition of new delivery points. It is indicated that Richfield will provide service to AGS pursuant to the terms and conditions of its FERC Gas Tariff, Rate Schedule FSS-1 and Rate Schedule ISS-1. Richfield further states that the operation of the subject delivery point will not result in an increase in the total daily or annual quantities Richfield is presently authorized to store for AGS. Richfield indicates that it has capacity to operate the proposed delivery point without adversely impacting its other storage customers.

Any person or the Commission's Staff may, within 45 days of the issuance of 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.

**Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,**

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-20488 Filed 8-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

<sup>1</sup> AGS is the successor-in-interest to Grant Valley Gas Company.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[ER-FRL-4725-8]

#### **Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments**

Availability of EPA comments prepared July 03, 1995 Through July 07, 1995 pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at (202) 260-5076.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 14, 1995 (60 FR 19047).

#### **Draft EISs**

ERP No. D-AFS-J65236-MT Rating EC2, North Fork Decision Area Fire Recovery Project, Timber Salvage, Implementation, Kootenai National Forest, Rexford Ranger District, Lincoln County, MT.

*Summary:* EPA expressed environmental concerns about the potential impacts of the proposed action on the watershed of the North Fork of Big Creek where the majority of activities are proposed. Peak stream flow thresholds are already being exceeded here and EPA suggested additional information be supplied to fully assess and mitigate all potential environmental impacts.

ERP No. D-AFS-K65170-AZ Rating EO2, Pocket/Baker Ecosystem and Land Management Plan, Implementation, Mogollen Rim, Coconino National Forest, Coconino County, AZ.

*Summary:* EPA expressed environmental objections to the components of the preferred alternative which exceed management activity thresholds in the draft Mexican Spotted Owl (MOS) Recovery Plan and dispersal habitat guidelines. The draft EIS does not adequately evaluate potential impacts to water quality and air quality.

ERP No. D-AFS-L65244-ID Rating EC2, Fall Creek Post-Fire Project, Harvesting Fire-Killed and Damage Trees, Implementation, McCall Ranger District, Payette National Forest, Valley County, ID.

*Summary:* EPA expressed environmental concerns based on potential effects on water quality from timber salvage and road construction. Additional information is needed on watershed effects, water supply, water quality/fish habitat effectiveness