Service Commission, the Michigan Public Service commission, and all persons listed on the official service lists in Docket No. ER95–1528–000.

Comment date: March 7, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraph:

E. 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, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date. 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.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–4643 Filed 2–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[Docket No. CP96–183–000, et al.]

NorAm Gas Transmission Company, et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings

February 22, 1996.

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

1. NorAm Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP96–183–000]

Take notice that on February 12, 1996, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NGT), 1600 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP96–183–000 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 operate certain facilities in Arkansas under NGT's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–384–000, *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.

NGT proposes to operate an existing delivery tap on Line OM–1 to deliver gas to Arkla (Arkla), a distribution division of NorAm Energy Corp., who will deliver gas to a customer other than the right-of-way grantor for whom the tap was originally installed. The tap is located in Section 12, Township 15N, Range 31W, Washington County, Arkansas and will consist of a 2-inch delivery tap and first-cut regulator. NGT estimates the additional volumes to be delivered to this meter station will be approximately 85 MMBtu annually and 1 MMBtu peak day. NGT states there will be no new construction or costs associated with this application. NGT will transport gas to Arkla and provide service under its tariffs, that the volumes delivered are within Arkla's certificated entitlement and that NGT's tariff does not prohibit the addition of new delivery points. NGT also states that it has sufficient capacity to accomplish deliveries without detriment or disadvantage to its other customers.

Comment date: April 8, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

2. Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation

[Docket No. CP96–189–000]

Take notice that on February 15, 1996, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, SE., Charleston, West Virginia 25314–1599, filed in Docket No. CP96–189–000 an application pursuant to Section 7(c) and 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act requesting authority to construct and operate certain replacement natural gas facilities and permission to abandon the facilities being replaced, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Columbia proposes to replace approximately 7.3 miles of 12-inch pipeline and appurtenances designated as Columbia's Line VM–108, located in Prince George and Sussex Counties, Virginia with approximately 7.3 miles of 20-inch pipeline and appurtenances. Columbia states that it had originally anticipated replacing only 6.3 miles of the 12-inch pipeline as part of its overall age and condition activities on its pipeline system. Columbia asserts that Virginia Natural Gas Company (VNG) requested a reassignment of design day deliveries of up to 28,525 Dth/d from its Newport News No. 1 Gate Station to its Norfolk Gate Station due to increased growth in market requirements in the Norfolk, Virginia area. Columbia further states that it determined that it could accommodate the shift in deliveries by increasing the pipe size of the 6.3-mile replacement from 12-inch to 20-inch and extending the replacement from 6.3 miles to 7.3 miles.

Columbia indicates that the cost of the anticipated 6.3 mile, 12-inch replacement was estimated to be $4,928,889 while the estimated cost to replace the 6.3 miles with 20-inch pipe is $6,436,250 and the cost of the additional 1.0 mile replacement of 12-inch pipe with 20-inch pipe is $1,016,785 for a total cost estimated to be $7,453,035. Columbia states that VNG has agreed to reimburse Columbia for 50% of the replacement cost for the construction of the 6.3-mile 20-inch pipeline section and 100% for the additional mile of pipe required to accommodate VNG's shift.

Comment date: March 14, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

3. ANR Storage Company

[Docket No. CP96–190–000]

Take notice that on February 15, 1996, ANR Storage Company (ANR Storage), 500 Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan 48243, filed an application with the Commission in Docket No. CP96–190–000 pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) for permission and approval to abandon a storage service provided to Northern Indiana Public Service Company (NIPSCO), which was authorized in Docket No. CP78–432,[1] all as more fully set forth in the application which is open to the public for inspection.

ANR Storage proposes to abandon the storage service it provides to NIPSCO under ANR Storage's FERC Rate Schedule X–5. By letter dated June 30, 1994, NIPSCO informed ANR Storage of its intent to terminate the storage agreement as of March 31, 1996. ANR Storage requests approval to abandon Rate Schedule X–5 effective April 1, 1996. ANR Storage states that it would not abandon any facilities in this proposal.

Comment date: March 14, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

4. Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation

[Docket No. CP96–194–000]

Take notice that on February 15, 1996, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation (Texas Eastern), P.O. Box 1642, Houston, Texas 77251–1642, filed a petition for declaratory order in Docket No. CP96–194–000 requesting that the Commission confirm that deliveries of natural gas to Interstate Energy Company (IEC) from a proposed delivery point do not constitute a bypass of service, all as more fully set forth in the petition which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

---

[1] 8 FERC ¶ 61,059 (1979).

It is stated that IEC has requested that Texas Eastern install one 12-inch valve and 12-inch check valve each and electronic gas measurement equipment (EGM) on Texas Eastern's 30-inch Line No. 19 and 24-inch Line No. 12 in Bucks County, Pennsylvania so that Texas Eastern may initiate interruptible service of up to 250,000 dt equivalent of natural gas per day to IEC under its Rate Schedule IT–1. It is also indicated that IEC would install or cause to be installed dual 12-inch meter runs, related equipment and approximately 50 feet of 12-inch pipe which would extend from IEC's 18-inch line to Texas Eastern's Line Nos. 19 and 12 at the site of the proposed taps.

It is also indicated that IEC has requested that Texas Eastern construct and install the facilities proposed herein so that IEC can receive natural gas from Texas Eastern so that IEC may ultimately deliver natural gas to Pennsylvania Power and Light Co.'s (PP&L) Martins Creek Steam Electric Station (Martins Creek) located in the Lower Mount Bethel Township, Northampton County, Pennsylvania. Texas Eastern mentions that IEC is a wholly-owned subsidiary of PP&L. It is also stated that PP&L intends to modify its oil-fired Martins Creek Units 3 and 4 to co-fire these units with natural gas. Texas Eastern states that IEC currently holds authority from the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PaPUC) to operate a pipeline for the transportation of crude oil and petroleum products to PP&L at Martins Creek, and has received authorization from the PaPUC to convert 35 miles of its oil pipeline to dual natural gas and petroleum operations.

It has also been indicated that Martins Creek is not currently, nor has it ever been, served by UGI Utilities, Inc., (UGI), the local distribution company authorized by the PaPUC to serve customers in Lower Mount Bethel Township. Texas Eastern submits that the proposed delivery point does not constitute a bypass of UGI and requests that the Commission confirm that initiating this service will not trigger a contract reduction option for UGI.

On the same date, Texas Eastern also filed in Docket No. CP96–193–000 for authorization under its Subpart F blanket certificate to construct and operate the facilities to implement the proposed delivery point.

Comment date: March 14, 1996, in accordance with the first paragraph of Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraphs

F. Any person desiring to be heard or make any protest with reference to said filing should on or before the comment date file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) 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 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 filing 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 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 applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

G. Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after the 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 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.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–4644 Filed 2–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[Docket No. RM96–7–000]

Regulation of Negotiated Transportation Services of Natural Gas Pipelines; Order Granting Clarification

Issued February 23, 1996.

United Distribution Companies (UDC) and Associated Gas Distributors (AGD) request clarification of the scope of the comments solicited in the Commission's January 31, 1996 Policy Statement and Request for Comments (Policy Statement).[1] Among other things, the Policy Statement announced that the Commission is willing to accept, on a shipper-by-shipper basis, filings to charge negotiated rates if shippers retain the ability to choose a cost-of-service based tariff rate. In the Policy Statement, the Commission also established this separate proceeding and requested that interested parties file comments within 60 days on the appropriateness of negotiated terms and conditions of service.

UDC and AGD assert that the stated purpose of the proceeding established in Docket No. RM96–7–000 was to consider ''the ramifications of negotiated terms of service.''[2] UDC and AGD contend that this language limits public comment to questions solely relating to negotiated terms and conditions of service, excluding any comments that may also raise rate issues. UDC and AGD also cite language in the Policy Statement that permits parties to comment on ''any other issue that should be considered before permitting pipelines to negotiate terms of service with individual shippers.''[3] They assert that the concerns raised by the Commission with respect to the implementation of negotiated rates, and even aspects of the Statement of Policy on Market-Based Rates and changes to the Commission's Policy on Incentive Rates, ''could qualify as issues that should be considered before permitting pipelines to negotiate terms of service with individual shippers.''[4] Thus, UDC and AGD request that the Commission clarify the scope of Docket No. RM96–7–000 such that public comments are solicited on rate issues as well as on issues concerning terms and conditions of service.

UDC and AGD state they recognize the January 31 Policy Statement as setting forth the Commission's final decision to permit negotiated rates and that the Commission is not soliciting further comment on its statutory

[1] 74 FERC ¶ 61,076 (1996), 61 FR 4633 (February 7, 1996).

[2] Policy Statement, slip op. at 61.

[3] Policy Statement, slip op. at 62.

[4] Request for Clarification at 3–4.