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. 95–23201 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[Docket No. CP85–221–051]

Frontier Gas Storage Co.; Notice of Sale Pursuant to Settlement Agreement

September 13, 1995.

Take notice that on September 7, 1995, Frontier Gas Storage Company (Frontier), c/o Reid & Priest, Market Square, 701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20004, in compliance with the provisions of the Commission's February 13, 1985, Order in Docket No. CP82–487–000, *et al.*, submitted an executed Service Agreement under Rate Schedule LVS–1 providing for the possible sale of up to a daily quantity of 50,000 MMBtu, not to exceed 5 Bcf for the term of the Agreement, of Frontier's gas storage inventory on an ''as metered'' basis to Western Gas Resources, Inc.

Under Subpart (b) of Ordering Paragraph (F) of the Commission's February 13, 1985, Order, Frontier is ''authorized to commence the sale of its inventory under such an executed service agreement fourteen days after filing the agreement with the Commission, and may continue making such sale unless the Commission issues an order either requiring Frontier to stop selling and setting the matter for hearing or permitting the sale to continue and establishing other procedures for resolving the matter.''

Any person desiring to be heard or to make a protest with reference to said filing should within 10 days of the publication of such notice in the Federal Register, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (825 North Capitol Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20426) a motion to intervene or protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures, 18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211. 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.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–23138 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. MG88–47–007]

Texas Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Filing

September 13, 1995.

Take notice that on September 7, 1995, Texas Gas Transmission Corporation (Texas Gas) submitted revised standards of conduct under Order Nos. 497 *et seq.*[1] and Order Nos. 566 *et seq.*[2] Texas Gas states that it is revising its standards of conduct to incorporate the changes required by Order Nos. 566 and 566–A. The modifications also reflect changes to Texas Gas's list of marketing affiliates and changes to its list of shared Directors.

Texas Gas states that copies of this filing have been mailed to all parties on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.

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). All such motions to intervene or protest should be filed on or before September 28, 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.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–23139 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

---

[1] Order No. 497, 53 FR 22139 (June 14, 1988) FERC Stats. & Regs. 1986–1990 ¶30,820 (1988); Order No. 497–A, *order on rehearing,* 54 FR 52781 (December 22, 1989), FERC Stats. & Regs. 1986–1990 ¶30,868 (1989); Order No. 497–B, *order extending sunset date,* 55 FR 53291 (December 28, 1990), FERC Stats. & Regs. 19861990 ¶30,908 (1990); Order No. 497–C, *order extending sunset date, 57 FR 9 (January 2, 1992), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶30,934 (1991), rehearing denied, 57 FR 5815 (February 18, 1992), 58 FERC ¶61,139 (1992); Tenneco Gas v. FERC (affirmed in part and remanded in part), 969 F.2d 1187 (D.C. Cir. 1992); Order No. 497–D, order on remand and extending sunset date,* III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶30,958 (December 4, 1992), 57 FR 58978 (December 14, 1992); Order No. 497–E, *order on rehearing and extending sunset date,* 59 FR 243 (January 4, 1994), 65 FERC ¶61,381 (December 23, 1993); Order No. 497–F, *order denying rehearing and granting clarification,* 59 FR 15336 (April 1, 1994), 66 FERC ¶61,347 (March 24, 1994); and Order No. 497–G, *order extending sunset date,* 59 FR 32884 (June 27, 1994), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶30,996 (June 17, 1994).

[2] 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 14, 1994).

Office of Hearings and Appeals

Proposed Implementation of Special Refund Procedures

AGENCY: Office of Hearings and Appeals, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of proposed implementation of special refund procedures.

SUMMARY: The Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) of the Department of Energy announces the proposed procedures for disbursement of $4,567,399.72 (plus accrued interest) in alleged or adjudicated crude oil overcharges obtained by the DOE from Malcolm Turner (Case No. VEF–0013), Revere Petroleum Corporation (Case No. VEF–0014), Granite Petroleum Corporation (Case No. VEF–0015), and Dalco Petroleum Corporation (Case No. VEF–0016). The OHA has tentatively determined that the funds obtained from these firms, plus accrued interest, be distributed in accordance with the DOE's Modified Statement of Restitutionary Policy in Crude Oil Cases, 51 Fed. Reg. 27899 (August 4, 1986).

DATE AND ADDRESSES: Comments must be filed in duplicate on or before October 19, 1995, and should be addressed to the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20585. All comments should conspicuously display a reference to Case Nos. VEF–0013, *et al.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard W. Dugan, Associate Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, 1000 Independence Avenue SW.,

Washington, D.C. 20585, (202) 586–2860.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 10 C.F.R. 205.282(b), notice is hereby given of the issuance of the Proposed Decision and Order set forth below. The Proposed Decision and Order sets forth the procedures that the DOE has tentatively formulated to distribute a total of $4,567,399.72, plus accrued interest, remitted to the DOE by Malcolm Turner, Revere Petroleum Corporation, Granite Petroleum Corporation and Dalco Petroleum Corporation. The DOE is currently holding these funds in interest bearing escrow accounts pending distribution.

The OHA proposes to distribute these funds in accordance with the DOE's Modified Statement of Restitutionary Policy in Crude Oil Cases, 51 FR 27899 (August 4, 1986) (the MSRP). Under the MSRP, crude oil overcharge monies are divided among the federal government, the states, and injured purchasers of refined petroleum products. Refunds to the states will be distributed in proportion to each state's consumption of petroleum products during the price control period. Refunds to eligible purchasers will be based on the volume of petroleum products that they purchased and the extent to which they can demonstrate injury.

Because the June 30, 1995, deadline for crude oil refund applications has passed, we propose not to accept any new applications from purchasers of refined petroleum products for these funds. As we state in the Proposed Decision, any party who has previously submitted a refund application in the crude oil refund proceeding should not file another Application for Refund. The previously filed crude oil application will be deemed filed in all crude oil proceedings as the proceedings are finalized.

Any member of the public may submit written comments regarding the proposed refund procedures. Commenting parties are requested to submit two copies of their comments. Comments should be submitted within 30 days of publication of this notice in the Federal Register, and should be sent to the address set forth at the beginning of this notice. All comments received in these proceedings will be available for public inspection between the hours of 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays, in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, located in Room 1E–234, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20585.

Dated: September 13, 1995.

George B. Breznay,

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Proposed Decision and Order of the Department of Energy

Implementation of Special Refund Procedures

Names of Firms:
Malcolm M. Turner
Revere Petroleum Corporation *et al.*
Granite Petroleum Corporation
Dalco Petroleum Corporation
Dates of Filing:
April 10, 1995
April 10, 1995
April 10, 1995
May 2, 1995
Case Numbers:
VEF–0013
VEF–0014
VEF–0015
VEF–0016
September 13, 1995.

In accordance with the procedural regulations of the Department of Energy (DOE), 10 CFR Part 205, Subpart V, the Office of General Counsel, Regulatory Litigation (OGC) (formerly the Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA), Office of Enforcement Litigation), filed four Petitions for the Implementation of Special Refund Procedures with the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) on April 10, 1995, and May 2, 1995. The Petitions request that OHA formulate and implement procedures to distribute funds received by the DOE from Malcolm M. Turner (Turner), Revere Petroleum Corporation (Revere), Granite Petroleum Corporation (Granite), and Dalco Petroleum Corporation (Dalco), pursuant to court-approved settlements between the parties and the DOE, DOE consent orders or remedial orders. This Decision and Order sets forth the OHA's plan to distribute these funds.

I. Background

As indicated by the following summaries of the relevant enforcement proceedings, all of the funds that are subject to this Decision were obtained through enforcement actions involving alleged or adjudicated crude oil overcharges.

A. Malcolm Turner

Turner, the sole Director and President of Bayport Refining Co. (Bayport), was a reseller of crude oil during the period of petroleum price controls and was subject to regulations governing the pricing and allocation of crude oil set forth at 10 CFR Parts 211 and 212 of the Mandatory Petroleum Price and Allocation Regulations. As the result of an ERA audit of Turner's and Bayport's operations, the ERA issued a Proposed Remedial Order (PRO) on September 20, 1984, alleging that they violated the provisions of 10 CFR § 212.186, by charging prices for crude oil in excess of actual purchase prices without providing any service or other function traditionally and historically associated with the resale of crude oil during the period from September 1978 through December 1980. According to the PRO, those transactions resulted in overcharges amounting to $11,810,639.84. The PRO further alleged that during the period from December 1979 through December 1980, the Respondents violated the provisions of 10 CFR § 212.131 by the miscertification of crude oil. According to the PRO, those transactions resulted in overcharges amounting to $12,554,371.74. The OHA in large part affirmed the findings of the PRO and issued a Remedial Order (RO) to the Respondents on February 16, 1989. *Bayport Refining Co.*, 18 DOE ¶ 83,007, (1989). The RO was upheld by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on October 4, 1993. *Bayport Refining Company and Malcolm M. Turner*, 65 FERC ¶ 61,021 (1993). Turner appealed to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas on March 31, 1994.[1] In January 1995, the court entered an Agreed Judgment resolving the issues addressed by the RO against Turner. Pursuant to the Agreed Judgment, Turner agreed to pay to the DOE the sum of $65,000. Turner has fulfilled his financial obligation to the DOE. As of May 31, 1995, the Bayport Consent Order fund contained $65,000 in principal plus accrued interest.[2]

B. Revere Petroleum Corp.

During the period of Federal petroleum price controls, Revere was engaged in crude oil reselling.[3] The firm was therefore subject to regulations governing the pricing of crude oil set forth at 10 CFR Parts 205, 210, 211, and 212 of the Mandatory Petroleum Price and Allocation Regulations. As a result of an ERA investigation of Revere's compliance with the price and allocation regulations, the ERA issued a PRO to Revere on January 18, 1983. However, on August 9, 1983, that PRO was amended by the ERA to include additional violations of 10 CFR § 212.186, alternative violations of 10 CFR § 212.183, and five additional parties as co-respondents of the PRO.[4] On May 29, 1992, the OHA issued the Amended PRO, with modifications, as an RO. *Revere Petroleum Corp.*, 22 DOE ¶ 83,004 (1992). The RO found Revere liable for violations of 10 CFR § 212.186 in connection with its resales of crude oil during the period April 1979 through March 1980. Revere appealed to FERC (Case No;. R092–4–00). However, subsequently, this enforcement proceeding was settled when Revere and DOE entered into a settlement on an ability-to-pay basis in order to resolve DOE's claims against the firm. Revere agreed to pay the DOE the sum of $50,000.00, plus a percentage of the

[1] Bayport, which was dissolved in November 1982, did not appeal the RO. While the matter was referred for enforcement of the RO against Bayport, no funds were ever collected from the corporation.

[2] The funds submitted by Turner pursuant to the Agreed Judgment are deposited in the Bayport Consent Order fund, No. 6AOX00329.

[3] References to Revere in this Decision include Richard E. Dobyns, President of Revere, during the price control period.

[4] Those five individuals were James J. Cross, M. Kemp McMillan, Gordon K. Walz, and Milton E. Walz, who entered into a separate Consent Order with the DOE in December 1987, and John E. Woolsey, who entered into a separate Consent Order with the DOE in September 1986.

proceeds of Revere's asset liquidation. As of May 31, 1995, Revere and the other respondents have paid to the DOE the sum of $1,310,140.13 in satisfaction of their obligations.[5] Although additional revenues may be collected, no good reason exists to delay implementing distribution of the current balance of the fund.

C. Granite Petroleum Corporation

Granite engaged in the reselling and marketing of crude oil during the period of petroleum price controls. The firm was therefore subject to regulations governing the pricing and allocation of crude oil set forth at 10 CFR Parts 211 and 212 of the Mandatory Petroleum Price and Allocation Regulations. The ERA conducted a detailed audit to determine Granite's compliance with the federal petroleum price and allocation regulations during the period from September 1, 1979 through January 27, 1981. As a result of the audit, on March 4, 1983, the ERA issued a PRO to the firm alleging violations of the crude oil price and allocation regulations (Case No. 640X00447). In September 1983, Granite and the DOE entered into a Consent Order which resolved a number of outstanding enforcement issues involving Granite. Under the terms of the settlement, Granite agreed to pay $200,000 in installment payments to the DOE.[6] As of May 31, 1995, Granite has paid to the DOE the sum of $176,698.85. Granite is currently delinquent in its payments to the DOE. Although we anticipate that additional sums may be collected from Granite, no good reason exists to forestall distribution of the current balance of the fund.

D. Dalco Petroleum Corporation

Dalco[7] was a reseller of crude oil during the period of price controls and was subject to regulations governing the pricing and allocation of crude oil set forth at 10 CFR Parts 211 and 212 of the Mandatory Petroleum Price and Allocation Regulations. As the result of an ERA audit, the ERA issued a PRO to Dalco on April 30, 1982, alleging that between March 1976 and September 1978, Dalco violated the DOE mandatory petroleum price regulations which governed the resale of domestic crude oil, pursuant to 10 CFR §§ 212.93, 212.10, 212.131, 205.202, 210.62(c), and 212.185, resulting in the illegal receipt of revenues. After the issuance of the PRO, but before a Statement of Objections was filed, Dalco filed for bankruptcy.[8] In August 1983, the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma issued an injunction which stayed the enforcement proceeding against the respondents. The bankruptcy court ultimately approved and allowed the DOE's claims against Dalco and as of May 31, 1995, Dalco has paid $3,015,560.74 to the DOE. Although the possibility exists that additional revenues will be obtained by the DOE in the Dalco bankruptcy proceeding, no reason exists to delay in implementing distribution of the current balance of the funds.[9]

II. Jurisdiction and Authority

The Subpart V regulations set forth general guidelines which may be used by the OHA in formulating and implementing a plan of distribution of fund received as a result of an enforcement proceeding. The DOE policy is to use the Subpart V process to distribute such funds. For a more detailed discussion of Subpart V and the authority of the OHA to fashion procedures to distribute refunds, *see Petroleum Overcharge Distribution and Restitution Act of 1986*, 15 U.S.C. §§ 4501 et seq.; *see also Office of Enforcement*, 9 DOE ¶ 82,508 (1981), and *Office of Enforcement*, 8 DOE ¶ 82,597 (1981).

We have considered the OGC's petitions that we implement Subpart V proceedings with respect to the Turner, Revere, Granite and Dalco funds and have determined that such proceedings are appropriate. This Proposed Decision and Order sets forth the OHA's tentative plan to distribute these funds. Before taking the actions proposed in this Decision, we intend to publicize our proposal and solicit comments from interested parties. Comments regarding the tentative distribution process set forth in this Proposed Decision and Order should be filed with the OHA within 30 days of its publication in the Federal Register.

III. Proposed Refund Procedures

A. Crude Oil Refund Policy

We propose to distribute the monies remitted pursuant to the Turner, Revere, Granite, and Dalco enforcement proceedings in accordance with DOE's Modified Statement of Restitutionary Policy in Crude Oil Cases (MSRP), 51 FR 27899 (August 4, 1986), which was issued as a result of the Settlement Agreement approved by the court in *The Department of Energy Stripper Well Exemption Litigation*, 653 F. Supp. 108 (D. Kan. 1986). Shortly after the issuance of the MSRP, the OHA issued an Order that announced that this policy would be applied in all Subpart V proceedings involving alleged crude oil violations. Order Implementing the MSRP, 51 FR 29689 (August 20, 1986) (the August 1986 Order).

Under the MSRP, 40 percent of crude oil overcharge funds will be disbursed to the federal government, another 40 percent to the states, and up to 20 percent may initially be reserved for the payment of claims to injured parties. The MSRP also specified that any funds remaining after all valid claims by injured purchasers are paid will be disbursed to the federal government and the states in equal amounts.

In April 1987, the OHA issued a Notice analyzing the numerous comments received in response to the August 1986 Order. 52 FR 11737 (April 10, 1987) (April 10 Notice). This Notice provided guidance to claimants that anticipated filing refund applications for crude oil monies under the Subpart V regulations. In general, we stated that all claimants would be required to (1) document their purchase volumes of petroleum products during the August 19, 1973 through January 27, 1981 crude oil price control period, and (2) prove that they were injured by the alleged crude oil overcharges. Applicants who were end-users or ultimate consumers of petroleum products, whose businesses are unrelated to the petroleum industry, and who were not subject to the DOE price regulations would be presumed to have been injured by any alleged crude oil overcharges. In order to receive a refund, end-users would not need to submit any further evidence of injury beyond the volume of petroleum products purchased during the period of price controls. *See City of Columbus Georgia*, 16 DOE ¶ 85,550 (1987).

The amount of money subject to this Proposed Decision is $4,567,399.72, plus accrued interest. In accordance with the MSRP, we propose initially to reserve 20 percent of those funds ($913,479.94 plus accrued interest) for direct refunds to applicants who claim that they were injured by crude oil overcharges. We propose to base refunds to claimants on a volumetric amount which has been calculated in accordance with the description in the April 10 Notice. That volumetric refund amount is currently $0.0016 per gallon. *See* 60 FR 15562 (March 24, 1995).

Applicants who have executed and submitted a valid waiver pursuant to one of the escrows established by the Stripper Well Settlement Agreement have waived their rights to apply for a crude oil refund under Subpart V. *See Mid-America Dairyman Inc.* v. *Herrington*, 878 F.2d 1448, 3 Fed. Energy Guidelines ¶ 26,617 (Temp. Emer. Ct. App. 1989); *In re Department of Energy Stripper Well Exemption Litigation*, 707 F. Supp. 1267, 3 Fed. Energy Guidelines ¶ 26,613 (D. Kan. 1987). Because the June 30, 1995, deadline for crude oil refund applications has passed, we propose not to accept any new applications from purchasers of refined petroleum products for these funds. *See Western Asphalt Service, Inc.*, 25 DOE ¶ _____, LEF–0047 (July 17, 1995). Instead, these funds will be added to the general crude oil overcharge pool used for direct restitution.[10]

B. Payments to the States and Federal Government

Under the terms of the MSRP, the remaining 80 percent of the alleged crude oil violation amounts subject to this Proposed Decision, or $3,653,919.78 plus accrued interest, should be disbursed in equal shares to the states and federal government, for indirect restitution. Refunds to the states will be in proportion to the consumption of petroleum products in each state during the

[5] Revere and all of the named individuals except Woolsey have satisfied their obligations to the DOE. Although Woolsey has made substantial payments to the DOE, he is delinquent in his payments, and the possibility exists that additional funds will be paid by him.

[6] Granite Petroleum Corporation and John E. Woolsey, President of Granite, are collectively referred to as Granite in the text. Both were parties to the Consent Order.

[7] References to Dalco in this Decision include W. Darryl Zang and Louis Porter, the firm's owners.

[8] Zang, Porter and Dalco filed for bankruptcy on August 16, 1982, June 15, 1983, and July 20, 1983 respectively.

[9] Porter has satisfied his obligations to the DOE under the PRO. Additional funds may be collected from the Dalco and Zang estates.

[10] A crude oil refund application is only required to submit one application for its share of all available crude oil overcharge funds. *See, e.g., Ernest A. Allerkamp*, 17 DOE § 85,079 at 88,176 (1988).

period of price controls. The share of ratio of the funds which each state will receive is contained in Exhibit H of the Stripper Well Settlement Agreement. When disbursed, these funds will be subject to the same limitations and reporting requirements as all other crude oil monies received by the states under the Stripper Well Agreement.

It Is Therefore Ordered That

The refund amounts remitted to the Department of Energy by Malcolm M. Turner, Revere Petroleum Corporation, Granite Petroleum Corporation, and Dalco Petroleum Corporation pursuant to their respective settlement agreements or judgments will be distributed in accordance with the foregoing Decision.

[FR Doc. 95–23230 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Office of Fossil Energy

[FE Docket Nos. 95–60–NG, 95–61–NG]

Phibro Inc.; Order Granting Blanket Authorization To Import and Export Natural Gas, Including Liquefied Natural Gas, From and To Canada and Mexico

AGENCY: Office of Fossil Energy, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of order.

SUMMARY: The Office of Fossil Energy of the Department of Energy gives notice that it has issued an order granting Phibro Inc. (Phibro) authorization to import up to 200 billion cubic feet (Bcf) of Canadian natural gas, including liquefied natural gas (LNG) and to import up to 200 Bcf of Mexican natural gas. Phibro is also authorized to export up to 200 Bcf of natural gas to Canada and to export up to 200 Bcf of natural gas to Mexico. Phibro's authorization is for a two-year term beginning on the date of first delivery of imported natural gas or LNG, or exported natural gas.

This order is available for inspection and copying in the Office of Fuels Programs Docket Room, 3F–056, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20585, (202) 586–9478. The docket room is open between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Issued in Washington, D.C., September 11, 1995.

Clifford P. Tomaszewski,

Director, Office of Natural Gas, Office of Fuels Programs, Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 95–23232 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

[FE Docket No. 95–59–NG]

Universal Resources Corporation; Order Granting Blanket Authorization to Export Natural Gas to Canada

AGENCY: Office of Fossil Energy, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of order.

SUMMARY: The Office of Fossil Energy of the Department of Energy gives notice that it has issued an order granting Universal Resources Corporation blanket authorization to export up to 50 Bcf of natural gas to Canada. This authorization is for a period of two years beginning on the date of the first delivery.

This order is available for inspection and copying in the Office of Fuels Programs Docket Room, 3F–056, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585, (202) 586–9478. The docket room is open between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on September 5, 1995.

Clifford P. Tomaszewski,

Director, Office of Natural Gas, Office of Fuels Programs, Office of Fossil Energy.

[FR Doc. 95–23233 Filed 9–18–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Western Area Power Administration

Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie Project Transmission Service, Phoenix Area

AGENCY: Western Area Power Administration, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of sale of additional capacity on the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie Project.

SUMMARY: The Western Area Power Administration (Western) is requesting comments on the proposed sale of firm transmission service available as a result of the completion of construction of the Mead-Phoenix and Mead-Adelanto Transmission Projects which are a part of the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie Project (AC Intertie).

DATE: Comments from all interested parties will be accepted until October 19, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. J. Tyler Carlson, Area Manager, Phoenix Area Office, Western Area Power Administration, P.O. Box 6457, Phoenix, AZ 85005–6457, Telephone: (602) 352–2521, Facsimile: (602) 352–2630.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Mead-Phoenix Project (MPP) is an electrical transmission system that consists of 256 miles of 500-kV alternating current, convertible to direct current, transmission line constructed from the Perkins Switchyard, located next to Westwing Substation, northwest of Phoenix, Arizona; through Mead Substation, located south of Boulder City, Nevada; and on to Marketplace Switching Station. Mead-Adelanto Project (MAP) is an electrical transmission system that consists of 202 miles of 500-kV AC transmission line from Marketplace Substation to Adelanto Switching Station in southern California. The 500-kV Marketplace Switching Station will be constructed adjacent to and interconnected with the existing McCullough Switching Station in southern Nevada. As part of the MPP, a 1300 megavolt-ampere (MVA), 500/230-kV transformer will be added to the Mead Substation. Western will have approximately 525 MW of capacity entitlement on this transformer.

Marketing Issues

Western is requesting comments on the proposed sale of additional capacity in the AC Intertie created by the completion and availability of MPP and MAP. The quantity of marketable capacity will be limited by Western's entitlement to the available capacity. The additional capacity on the AC Intertie is anticipated to be available as of January 1, 1996. Western's contracted firm transmission service will begin after the MPP and MAP are released for commercial service.

Marketing Criteria

Western will be marketing the capacity from MPP and MAP by line segments in each direction. The following priority method will be used in selecting allotees for this additional capacity and will be based on requests for usage of each line segment as follows:

1. Perkins to Mead, Mead to Marketplace or Marketplace to Adelanto
   (a) Both directions, same amount
   (b) Both directions, different amounts
   (c) one direction only
2. Perkins to Marketplace or Mead to Adelanto
   (a) Both directions, same amount
   (b) Both directions, different amounts
   (c) one direction only
3. Perkins to Adelanto
   (a) Both directions, same amount
   (b) Both directions, different amounts
   (c) one direction only.