

jurisdiction and order accepting rate schedule.

Comment date: July 25, 1995, 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, 825 North Capitol 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. 95-17449 Filed 7-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Docket No. CP94-109-002, et al.]

Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Corporation, et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings

July 10, 1995.

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

1. Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Corporation

[Docket No. CP94-109-002]

Take notice that on July 3, 1995, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation ("Transco"), Post Office Box 1396, Houston, Texas 77251, pursuant to and in accordance with Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act ("NGA") and Part 157 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") regulations, filed an application in Docket No. CP94-109-002 to amend the certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Commission on December 21, 1994 in Docket No. CP94-109-000 ("December 21 Order") authorizing Transco's 1995/1996 Southeast Expansion Project ("SE95/96"). Specifically, Transco requests authorization to (i) increase the certificated horsepower of the compressor additions authorized in the December 21 Order at Transco's Station Nos. 90, 100 and 150, (ii) increase,

commencing with SE95/96 Phase II service, the firm transportation capacity under the project from 165,000 Mcf/d to 170,000 Mcf/d as a result of such increased horsepower, and (iii) reduce the certificated initial rate for Phase II service to reflect such increased firm transportation capacity under the project.

Transco states that its SE95/96 certificate includes the authorization to construct and operate 12,600 horsepower compressor additions at Transco's Station Nos. 90 and 150. Transco states that it contemplated installing compressor units at those stations which equalled 12,600 horsepower because those units were commercially available at the time of its original application. However, Transco states that the units now available from the manufacturer in this size range are rated at 14,100 horsepower, and, therefore, the manufacturers have replaced the specified units with 14,100 horsepower units. Thus, Transco will install the 14,100 horsepower units at Station Nos. 90 and 150 instead of the 12,600 horsepower units. Transco states that until further certificate authority is received, it will operate the 14,100 horsepower units at the 12,600 horsepower level certificated by the Commission in the December 21 Order. Transco states that limiting the operation of those units to the 12,600 horsepower level, however, will not take advantage of their full operational capability. Therefore, Transco requests that it be permitted to operate the units up to the 14,100 horsepower level commencing with the placement into service of Phase II of the project.

Transco further states that at Station No. 100, Transco is currently authorized by the SE95/96 certificate to install and operate 6,500 horsepower of additional compression in Phase II of the project. Transco now proposes to increase that certificated addition by 2,000 horsepower, to 8,500 horsepower. Transco states that it will accomplish this 8,500 horsepower increase at Station No. 100 by (i) derating existing compressor units 3, 4, 5 and 9 at the station by an aggregate amount of 4,000 horsepower, and (ii) installing an additional 12,500 NEMA rated horsepower unit. Transco's determination to derate the existing units is based on actual operating data for the units and the removal of steam injection from unit 5 due to water shortages experienced at the station. The 12,500 horsepower unit is the size unit that was furnished by the manufacturer. Accordingly, Transco requests that it be permitted to make these Phase II modifications at Station

No. 100 and install and operate 8,500 horsepower of additional compression in lieu of the 6,500 horsepower addition certificated in the December 21 Order.

Transco states that the horsepower increases and compressor modifications proposed herein will be performed in compliance with the Commission's environmental requirements, including the environmental conditions set forth in Appendix B of the December 21 Order.

Transco also requests authorization to increase the firm transportation capacity under SE95/96 from 165,000 Mcf/d to 170,000 Mcf/d commencing with Phase II service. Transco states that this additional 5,000 Mcf/d of firm transportation capacity will be created as a result of the compressor modifications described above. The additional capacity will extend from the main line interconnect with the Mobile Bay Lateral to points upstream of Transco's Station No. 140. Pursuant to the terms of the Precedent Agreements executed with the SE95/96 shippers, Transco has executed letter agreements with 12 of the SE95/96 shippers for such additional firm transportation service. Those letter agreements require Transco and the shippers to execute, within 30 days after Transco's receipt and acceptance of the authorizations requested, a restated Rate Schedule FT Service Agreement for service under SE95/96 providing for the increased level of service.

Transco further states that the initial monthly reservation rate of \$9.86 per Mcf certificated by the Commission for Phase II service was based in part on billing determinants of 165,000 Mcf/d times 12. As a result of the 5,000 Mcf/d of increased firm transportation service that Transco will be able to render under SE95/96 beginning with Phase II, the billing determinants for Phase II service will be increased to 170,000 Mcf/d times 12. Based on these revised billing determinants and the estimated costs, rate design and cost of service factors approved by the Commission in the December 21 Order, Transco requests approval of a revised initial monthly reservation rate of \$9.57 per Mcf for Phase II service.

Comment date: July 31, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

2. Pacific Interstate Offshore Company

[Docket No. CP95-588-000]

Take notice that on June 29, 1995, Pacific Interstate Offshore Company (PIOC), located at 633 West Fifth Street, Suite 5200, Los Angeles, CA 90071-2006, filed in Docket No. CP95-588-000, an application pursuant to Section

3 of the Natural Gas Act and Sections 153.10–153.12 of the Commission's Regulations for Section 3 authorization and a Presidential Permit pursuant to Executive Order 10485, as amended by Executive Order 12038, to construct, connect, operate, and maintain certain pipeline and metering facilities (the Border Crossing Facilities) in El Paso County, Texas, in the vicinity of the International Boundary between the United States and the Republic of Mexico.

PIOC states that the Border Crossing Facilities will be used to provide natural gas transportation service from upstream pipeline facilities to downstream facilities to be built in Mexico to serve the Samalayuca II gas-fired electric generating plant which is to be located approximately 30 miles south of the Cities of Juarez, Mexico, and El Paso, Texas. PIOC further states that it will operate the Border Crossing Facilities as "open access" facilities to be interconnected with upstream facilities which are not yet constructed. If PIOC is successful in negotiating a gas transportation agreement with the Comision Federal de Electricidad, it will file an application under Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act seeking authority to construct the upstream pipeline facilities which will interconnect with existing facilities of El Paso Natural Gas Company.

The facilities will have a capacity of 175 Mmcf/d. PIOC estimates the cost of the proposed facilities to be approximately \$792,000.

Comment date: July 31, 1995, in accordance with the first paragraph of Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

3. Northwest Pipeline Corporation

[Docket No. CP95–589–000]

Take notice that on June 29, 1995, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84158, filed in Docket No. CP95–589–000 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 construct and operate upgraded metering facilities at a new location for the Duvall/Cottage Lake Meter Station in King County, Washington, 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.

Northwest proposes to construct and operate upgraded metering facilities at a new location for the Duvall/Cottage

Lake Meter Station in King County, Washington, which will have a design capacity of 32,450 Dth/d at 400 psig. It is stated that these facilities, which would cost \$597,900, would be used to provide firm deliveries to Washington Natural Gas Company under existing agreements.

Comment date: August 24, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

4. Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Columbia Gulf Transmission Company; Koch Gateway Pipeline Company

[Docket No. CP95–600–000]

Take notice that on July 3, 1995, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, S.E., Charleston, West Virginia 25314–1599, Columbia Gulf Transmission Company (Columbia Gulf), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, S.E., Charleston, West Virginia 25314–1599, and Koch Gateway Pipeline Company (Koch Gateway), formerly United Gas Pipe Line Company, 600 Travis Street, Houston, Texas 77002, jointly as the Companies, filed in Docket No. CP95–600–000, an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for an order granting permission and approval to abandon a certain exchange service which was once required for exchange of gas among the Companies. The Companies received authority for the exchange service on February 23, 1981. The rate schedules for which the Companies are seeking abandonment authority are as follows:

Docket No.	Volume (Mcf/d)	Company	Rate Schedule
CP80–543.	10,000	Columbia	X–100
CP80–543.	10,000	Columbia Gulf	X–75
CP80–543.	10,000	Koch	X–137
		Gateway .	

Columbia's Rate Schedule X–100, Columbia Gulf's Rate Schedule X–75, and Koch Gateway's Rate Schedule X–137 provided for the exchange of up to 10,000 Mcf per day of natural gas among the companies. Koch Gateway received up to 10,000 Mcf per day for Columbia's account at the producer's platform in Eugene Island Block 43 and at an existing meter in the Lake Hatch Field, and redelivered equivalent volumes to Columbia at the outlet side of Sea Robin's meter near Erath, Louisiana. Columbia Gulf received up to 10,000 Mcf per day for Koch Gateway's account at a subsea tap in Vermilion Area Block 245 and transported the gas through the

Bluewater Project for delivery to Koch Gateway or for Koch Gateway's account at the outlet side of Sea Robin's meter near Erath. Imbalances in deliveries were corrected on a monthly basis. The benefits derived from the exchange of volumes were substantially equal and mutually beneficial, so there was no transportation charge involved. There has been no gas transported under the exchange agreement since July 1991 and there are no imbalances. Columbia Gulf is currently providing Koch Gateway alternative Part 284 interruptible transportation services under ITS–1 and ITS–2 rate schedules filed under Docket Nos. ST94–5135 and ST92–1926, respectively.

Comment date: July 31, 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.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-17450 Filed 7-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Docket No. CP93-564-003]

ANR Pipeline Co.; Notice of Amendment

July 11, 1995.

Take notice that on July 7, 1995, ANR Pipeline Company (ANR), 500 Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan 48243, filed, pursuant to 18 CFR 385.215, to further amend its application filed under Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) for authorization to construct and operate pipeline facilities and related facilities at the United States-Canada International Boundary proximate to St. Clair, Michigan, all as more fully set forth in the amendment which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

ANR is amending its application to supply recently executed precedent agreements and to make revisions in volumes to be transported as reflected in the terms of the precedent agreements. ANR states that the two shippers it has executed precedent agreements with, Michigan Consolidated Gas Company (MichCon) and The Consumers' Gas Company Limited (Consumers'), will now transport up to 90,000 Dth per day. (Previously, the maximum volume to be transported for both shippers was 75,000 Dth per day.) Specifically, MichCon has executed a 15-year precedent agreement for 75,000 Dth per day. Consumers' has executed an 11-year precedent agreement for 10,000 Dth per day the first year, 15,000 Dth per day in years two through ten, and 5,000

Dth in the final year. In addition, ANR proposes a new in-service date of November 1, 1996, due to the time it has taken to negotiate the precedent agreements.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said amendment should on or before August 1, 1995, 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. All persons who have heretofore filed need not file again.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-17390 Filed 7-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP93-566-002]

ANR Pipeline Co.; Notice of Amendment

July 11, 1995.

Take notice that on July 7, 1995, ANR Pipeline Company (ANR), 500 Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan 48243, filed, pursuant to 18 CFR 385.215, to further amend its application filed for authorization under Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and a Presidential Permit to site, construct, operate and maintain pipeline facilities at the United States-Canada International Boundary proximate to St. Clair, Michigan, all as more fully set forth in the amendment which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

ANR states that the purpose of this amendment is to reflect the restructuring of its project as set forth in ANR's companion application in Docket No. CP93-564-003, filed July 7, 1995. ANR states the project has been reconfigured with regard to: the inclusion of executed precedent agreements, the terms of such precedent agreements, and a change in the proposed in-service date to November 1, 1995.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said

amendment should on or before August 1, 1995, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 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 385.214 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. All persons who have heretofore filed need not file again.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-17389 Filed 7-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP95-601-000]

Mississippi River Transmission Corp.; Request Under Blanket Authorization

July 11, 1995.

Take notice that on July 5, 1995, Mississippi River Transmission Corporation (MRT), 9900 Clayton Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63124, filed a prior notice request with the Commission in Docket No. CP95-601-000 pursuant to Section 147.205 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (NGA) for authorization to construct and operate a delivery point in Ste. Genevieve County, Missouri, to provide service for Laclede Gas Company (Laclede) under MRT's blanket certificates issued in Docket Nos. CP82-489-000 and CP89-1121-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the NGA, all as more fully set forth in the request which is open to the public for inspection.

MRT proposes to construct and operate a 4-inch tap and appurtenant facilities as a delivery point to serve Laclede, who would provide natural gas service to Chemical Lime Company's lime kiln facilities. MRT states that it would deliver up to 6,000 MMBtu equivalent of natural gas to Laclede at the proposed delivery point on a peak day and 50,000 MMBtu on an annual basis. MRT states that Laclede would reimburse MRT for the estimated \$161,700 construction cost of the proposed delivery point. MRT also states that its existing FERC tariff does not prohibit additional delivery points, nor would the natural gas volumes it proposes to deliver to Laclede via the