Docket No.	Transporter/seller	Recipient	Date filed	Part 284 subpart	Est. max. daily quantity	Aff. Y/A/N	Rate Sch.	Date com-menced	Projected termi-nation date
ST95–2602	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2603	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2604	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2605	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2606	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2607	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2608	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2609	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2610	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2611	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2612	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2613	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2614	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2615	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2616	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2617	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2618	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2619	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2620	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97
ST95–2621	Williston Basin Int. P/L Co.	Koch Gas Services Co.	05–31–95	G–S	30,000	A	I	05–01–95	04–30–97

*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. 95–15798 Filed 6–27–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[Docket No. RP95–349–000]

The Brooklyn Union Gas Company v. CNG Transmission Corporation; Notice of Complaint

June 22, 1995.

Take notice that on June 20, 1995, pursuant to Rule 212 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures, The Brooklyn Union Gas Company (Brooklyn Union) filed a motion seeking an order from the Commission directing CNG Transmission Corporation (CNG) to refrain from requiring Brooklyn Union to comply with an operational flow order (OFO) that has required and will require Brooklyn Union to deliver gas transported by Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco) to CNG at Leidy, Pennsylvania for simultaneous redelivery by CNG back to Transco at Leidy for transportation and redelivery to Brooklyn Union.

Brooklyn Union states that during the 1994–1995 winter, CNG issued an OFO (Leidy OFO) which required Brooklyn Union to utilize up to its full X–56 capacity on Transco to deliver gas to Leidy if, and to the extent that, Brooklyn Union nominated FTNN service from CNG. Brooklyn Union states that the gas was then simultaneously ''redelivered'' to Transco at Leidy to be transported to Brooklyn Union's city gate.

Brooklyn Union states that the issuance of the Leidy OFO by CNG during the 1994–1994 winter imposed unjustified additional costs and administrative burdens on Brooklyn Union. Brooklyn Union was required to pay fuel charges to CNG and within-Zone-6 usage and fuel charges to Transco to reflect the fact that gas was being transported to CNG at Leidy and from CNG to Leidy to Brooklyn Union's city gate. Brooklyn Union submits that the application of the OFO to Brooklyn Union is not reasonably needed by CNG to permit it to maintain system reliability or provide firm service to its other customers.

Brooklyn Union requests the Commission to issue an order directing CNG to cease and desist from requiring Brooklyn Union to comply with the Leidy OFO to the extent that it requires Brooklyn Union to deliver gas at Leidy

where that gas will be simultaneously redelivered to Brooklyn Union at Leidy.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said complaint should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 214 and 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure 18 CFR 385.214, 385.211. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before July 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. Answers to this complaint shall be due on or before July 6, 1995.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–15799 Filed 6–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. RP93–186–005]

Carnegie Interstate Pipeline Company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

June 22, 1995.

Take notice that on June 20, 1995, Carnegie Interstate Pipeline Company (CIPCO) made a compliance filing in response to the order in the above-captioned proceeding issued by the Commission on June 8, 1995.[1] CIPCO states that Ordering Paragraph (C) of that order required CIPCO to file a revised Section 32.2(e) of its tariff to provide for the refunding of overrecovered amounts remaining in its surcharge accounts following the last amortization period, with interest pursuant to Section 154.67 of the Commission's Regulations. Carnegie states that this requirement was satisfied when Carnegie made its January 6, 1995 compliance filing in this proceeding.

On December 2, 1994, the Commission issued in this proceeding an order accepting tariff sheets subject to a number of modifications, including the requirement of refunding with interest overrecovered amounts remaining in Carnegie's surcharge accounts following the last amortization period. On January 3, 1995, Carnegie filed a request for rehearing and clarification of some of the requirements of the December 2 order. On January 6, 1995, Carnegie filed in compliance with other requirements of the order. Carnegie did not seek rehearing of the refund with interest requirement; instead it filed in compliance with that requirement.

Thus, as part of its January 6, 1995 compliance filing, Carnegie submitted Second Revised Sheet No. 144, which included the revisions to Section 32.2(e) of the tariff in accordance with the Commission's order. That sheet, and a red-lined version of the sheet, are attached to the subject June 20, 1995 compliance filing, just as they were attached to the January 6 filing. The Commission accepted Second Revised Sheet No. 144 in a letter order dated May 1, 1995.

CIPCO states that Substitute Original Sheet No. 144, filed on June 20, 1995 is identical to Carnegie's Second Revised Sheet No. 144, except for the changes required by the corporate reorganization. A copy of CIPCO's Substitute Original Sheet No. 144 is also attached. Accordingly, CIPCO believes that it is currently in compliance with the Commission's June 8 order.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capital Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rule 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR Section 385.211). All such protests should be filed on or before June 29, 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. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–15800 Filed 6–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. GT95–24–001]

Colorado Interstate Gas Company; Notice of Filing of Refund Report

June 22, 1995.

Take notice that on June 13, 1995, Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG) filed a second refund report in Docket Nos. GP83–11, RI83–9, et al. CIG states that the filing and refunds were made to comply with the Commission's orders of December 1, 1993 and May 19, 1994.

CIG states that initial refunds were paid by CIG on December 14, 1994 and the second refund was made on April 12, 1995.

CIG notes that the refund report summarizes the Kansas ad valorem tax refund amounts related to tax bills rendered for production on or after June 28, 1988 pursuant to the Commission's December 1, 1993 and May 19, 1994 Orders. Lump-sum cash refunds were made by CIG to its former jurisdictional sales customers within 30 days of receipt from the producers. As provided for in the Orders, no additional interest was required to be paid.

CIG states that copies of CIG's filing have been served on CIG's former jurisdictional sales customers, interested states commissions, and all parties to the proceedings.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rule 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR Section 385.211). All such protests should be filed on or before June 29, 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. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–15801 Filed 6–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. PR95–11–000]

Egan Hub Partners, L.P.; Notice of Petition for Rate Approval

June 22, 1995.

Take notice that on May 11, 1995, Egan Hub Partners, L.P. (Egan) filed pursuant to Section 284.123(b)(2) of the Commission's Regulations, a petition for rate approval requesting that the Commission approve as fair and equitable market-based rates for firm and interruptible storage and transportation services, including hub services, performed under Section 311(a)(2) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (NGPA).

Egan states that it is an intrastate pipeline that is subject to regulation by the Louisiana Office of Conservation. Egan proposes an effective date of September 1, 1995.

Pursuant to Section 284.123(b)(2)(ii), if the Commission does not act within 150 days of the filing date, the proposed rates will be deemed to be fair and equitable and not in excess of an amount which interstate pipelines would be permitted to charge for similar transportation service. The Commission may, prior to the expiration of the 150-

[1] 71 FERC ¶ 61,310 (1995).