18. Union Electric Company

[Docket No. ER96–2778–000]

Take notice that on August 22, 1996, Union Electric Company (UE), tendered for filing an Interchange Agreement dated August 13, 1996, between UE and Jacksonville Electric Authority. UE asserts that the purpose of the Agreement is to set out specific rates, terms, and conditions for the types of power and energy to be exchanged.

Comment date: September 12, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

19. Union Electric Company

[Docket No. ER96–2779–000]

Take notice that on August 22, 1996, Union Electric Company (UE), tendered for filing a Service Agreement for Non-Firm Point-to-Point Transmission Service dated August 19, 1996 between Federal Energy Sales, Inc. (FES) and UE. UE asserts that the purpose of the Agreement is to permit UE to provide transmission service to FES pursuant to UE's Open Access Transmission Tariff filed in Docket No. OA96–50–000.

Comment date: September 12, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

20. Union Electric Company

[Docket No. ER96–2780–000]

Take notice that on August 22, 1996, Union Electric Company (UE), tendered for filing an unexecuted Service Agreement for Non-Firm Point-to-Point Transmission Service between Commonwealth Edison Company (CE) and UE. UE asserts that the purpose of the Agreement is to permit UE, to provide transmission service to CE pursuant to UE's Open Access Transmission Tariff filed in Docket No. OA96–50.

Comment date: September 12, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

21. UtiliCorp United Inc.

[Docket No. ES96–39–000]

Take notice that on August 28, 1996, UtiliCorp United Inc. (UtiliCorp) filed an application, under § 204 of the Federal Power Act, seeking authorization to enter into five-year corporate guarantees in an amount of not more than $270 million to replace existing corporate guarantees authorized in Docket No. ES96–5–000.[1]

Also, UtiliCorp requests an exemption from the Commission's competitive bidding or negotiated placement requirements.

[1] 73 FERC ¶ 62,175 (1995).

Comment date: September 18, 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. 96–22767 Filed 9–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[Project No. 2365–011]

Madison Paper Industries; Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Assessment

August 30, 1996.

A final environmental assessment (FEA) is available for public review. The FEA is for an application to amend the Anson Hydroelectric Project. The application is to resurface the dam; reconfigure the permanent crest; raising the elevation from 241.67′ to 242.62′ (except for a 50-ft section which will be lowered to 242.62′) in order to accept an inflatable flashboard system; and install an inflatable flashboard system, raising the normal headpond elevation by 1.5 feet. The FEA finds that approval of the application would not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The Anson Hydroelectric Project is located on the Kennebec River in Somerset County, Maine.

The FEA was written by staff in the Office of Hydroelectric Licensing, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Copies of the FEA can be viewed at the Commission's Public Reference Room, Room 2A, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. Copies can also be obtained by calling the project manager listed below. For further information, please contact the project manager, Jean A. Potvin, at (202) 219–0022.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–22766 Filed 9–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. CP96–720–000, et al.]

Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America, et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings

August 29, 1996.

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

1. Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America

[Docket No. CP96–720–000]

Take notice that on August 16, 1996, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America (NGPL), 701 East 22nd Street, Lombard, Illinois 60148, filed an application: (1) For authorization, pursuant to section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act, to abandon (by removal) a compressor unit located at NGPL's Station No. 139 in Lea County, New Mexico; and (2) for a certificate of public convenience and necessity, pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act, authorizing NGPL to construct (i.e., relocate and upgrade) and operate the aforementioned compressor unit as part of NGPL's Station No. 346 facility in Cameron Parish, Louisiana, all as more fully set forth in the application, which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

NGPL states that the subject compressor is no longer needed at Station No. 139, and has not been utilized since January of 1993. NGPL proposes to abandon and remove the entire compressor unit (including the removal of all associated conduit, wiring, supports and piping), and have the compressor engine manufacturer upgrade it to the ''Best Available Control Technology'' (BACT) in order to reduce nitrous oxide (NOX) emissions. In addition to the BACT upgrade, NGPL proposes to increase the compressor unit to a 4,500 hp rating. NGPL proposes to relocate the upgraded compressor unit to its Station No. 346 facility on its Louisiana Line, in Cameron Parish, Louisiana, thereby increasing the Louisiana Line's capacity by 63 MMcfd. NGPL adds that it will perform certain non-jurisdictional activities as part of the Louisiana Line expansion project, including the re-wheeling of three existing compressors at its Station No. 346, and certain modifications to station piping at

NGPL's Station No. 342, in Cameron Parish, Louisiana.

NGPL states that its gas transmission system consists of two mainlines, its Amarillo Mainline, Gulf Coast Mainline, plus NGPL's A/G Line, which connects the two mainlines. NGPL adds that its Louisiana Line consists of 30-inch and 36-inch diameter pipelines which extend along the Gulf of Mexico from St. Mary Parish, Louisiana, to near Port Arthur, at the Texas/Louisiana border, and on to an interconnection with NGPL's Gulf Coast Mainline, in Montgomery County, Texas. NGPL states that the Louisiana Line section of its system serves east coast markets by delivering a total of 1,000 MMcfd of gas to other interstate pipeline companies, with approximately 414 MMcfd of this total being delivered to the eastern terminus of the Louisiana Line at the Henry Hub.

According to NGPL, MidCon Gas Service Corporation (MidCon), a marketing affiliate of NGPL, responded to an open season that NGPL held with respect to the possible expansion of capacity on its Louisiana Line, by signing a precedent agreement with NGPL for 50 MMcfd of the proposed 63 MMcfd capacity expansion for NGPL's Louisiana Line. NGPL states that the MidCon contract is for firm transportation service at a rate of $0.20, for seven years. NGPL also states that the revenues provided by the MidCon contract will cover the cost of the additional compression, and that NGPL will endeavor to market the remaining 13 MMcfd of uncommitted capacity.

NGPL further states that it will seek to roll-in the cost of the expansion facilities in its first rate case following the Commission's certification of the subject facilities. NGPL asserts that rolled-in rate treatment will reduce general system transportation rates, because the increased transportation revenues generated by the expansion facilities will exceed the incremental cost of such facilities.

Comment date: September 19, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

2. Northern Natural Gas Company

[Docket No. CP96–731–000]

Take notice that on August 20, 1996, Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern), P.O. Box 3330, Omaha, Nebraska 68103–0330, filed in Docket No. CP96–731–000 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 new delivery point facilities located in Goodhue County, Minnesota, under Northern's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–401–000, pursuant to Section 7(c) 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.

Northern proposes to install and operate a new delivery point to accommodate natural gas deliveries to Northern States Power Company (NSP) under Northern's currently effective throughput service agreement(s) for redelivery to the community of Goodhue, Minnesota. It is indicated that NSP requests authorization to install a new delivery point due to the expansion of its distribution system into new areas. It is stated that this community does not currently have natural gas service. Northern states that the estimated volumes proposed to be delivered to NSP to the proposed delivery point are 500 MMBtu equivalent of natural gas on a peak day and 34,100 MMBtu equivalent on an annual basis. Northern states that it will own, operate, and maintain the delivery point. Northern estimates the total costs to install this delivery point to be $66,000.

Northern advises that the total volumes to be delivered to the customer after the request do not exceed the total volumes authorized prior to the request. Northern states that the proposed activity is not prohibited by its existing tariff and that it has sufficient capacity to accommodate the changes proposed herein without detriment or disadvantage to Northern's other customers.

Comment date: October 15, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

3. Northwest Pipeline Corporation

[Docket No. CP96–736–000]

Take notice that on August 21, 1996, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84158–0900, filed in Docket No. CP96–736–000 an application pursuant to Sections 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for authorization to construct and operate replacement pipeline and measurement facilities and to abandon existing pipeline and measurement facilities in LaPlata County, Colorado, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Northwest proposes to relocate the facilities because they would be submerged by the Ridges Basin Dam and Reservoir which is being constructed 2 miles southwest of the town of Durango in LaPlata County. Specifically, Northwest proposes to construct and operate approximately 6 miles of 26-inch replacement pipeline and to install a new, relocated meter station in LaPlata County. Northwest proposes to abandon by removal 0.6 mile of 26-inch existing pipeline and to abandon in place 4.02 miles of existing 26-inch pipeline and the existing Durango delivery tap. Northwest estimates the cost of the abandonment and construction at $7.3 million, which would be reimbursed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, which is building the dam and reservoir. It is stated that the proposed relocation is needed to assure the operational integrity of Northwest's mainline transmission system and to avoid significant reliability concerns associated with the inundation of the facilities by the dam and reservoir. It is asserted that the design capacity of Northwest's system would not be affected by the proposal.

Comment date: September 19, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

4. Koch Gateway Pipeline Company

[Docket No. CP96–739–000]

Take notice that on August 22, 1996, Koch Gateway Pipeline Company (Koch Gateway), P.O. Box 1478, Houston, Texas 77521–1478, filed in Docket No. CP96–739–000, an application, pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act, for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the construction and operation of compresson facilities, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Specifically, Koch Gateway requests authorization to construct and operate a 1,600 horsepower compression facility, to be known as the White Oak Compressor Station, in Gregg County, Texas. Koch Gateway states that the compression facilities are to be located on its existing 16-inch Latex-Fort Worth Main Line, designated as Index 1. Koch Gateway states that the gas requirements of its customers have changed, necessitating a directional change in the flow of natural gas, and that the proposed compression facilities will enhance its ability to move supplies through its system.

Comment date: September 19, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

5. Florida Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP96–742–000]

Take notice that on August 26, 1996, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT), 1400 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP96–

742–000 an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for permission and approval to abandon a sale for resale service for Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco) which was authorized in Docket No. CP68–111,[1] all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

FGT proposes to abandon the sale for resale service it once provided Transco under an agreement dated August 28, 1967 which is designated as Rate Schedule X–2 in FGT's FERC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 3. FGT states that the August 28, 1967 agreement expired under its own terms on April 30, 1970. FGT further states that the proposed abandonment will not result in the abandonment of facilities nor will it result in the abandonment of service to any other customer of FGT.

Comment date: September 19, 1996, in accordance with 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, N.E., 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 385.211 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. 96–22768 Filed 9–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[1] *See* 9 FERC ¶ 61,069 (1979).

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5472–8]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 OR (202) 564–7153. Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed August 26, 1996 Through August 30, 1996 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 960403, Draft EIS, NPS, MA, Cape Cod National Seashore General Management Plan, Implementation, Barnstable County, MA, Due: October 31, 1996, Contact: Maria Burks (508) 349–3785.

This EIS was inadvertently omitted from the 8–30–96 Federal Register. The official 45 day NEPA review period is calculated from 8–30–96.

EIS No. 960404, Final EIS, FRC, WI, Flambeau River Hydroelectric Projects, Big Falls (FERC No. 2930), Thornapple (FERC No. 2475), Upper (FERC No. 2640), Lower (FERC No. 2421), Pixley (FERC No. 2395) and Crowley (FERC No. 2473), Relicensing WI, Due: October 7, 1996, Contact: Frank Karwoski (202) 219–2782.

EIS No. 960405, Final EIS, FRC, ME, NH, Saco River Basin Hydropower Development, (FERC Project Nos. 2528, 2527, 2194, 2531, 2529, 2530, and 11365), Licenses and Relicenses, ME and NH, Due: October 7, 1996, Contact: Rich McGuire (202) 219–3084.

EIS No. 960406, Draft EIS, FHW, WV, WV–9 Transportation Corridor Improvements, from Martinsburg to Charles Town, Berkeley, Jefferson and Morgan Counties, WV, Due: November 1, 1996, Contact: David Leighow (304) 347–5329.

EIS No. 960407, Final EIS, FRC, VT, MA, Deerfield River Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 2323), Bear Swamp Pumped Storage Project (FERC No. 2669) and Gardners Falls Project (FERC, No. 2334), New License/Relicense Issuance, VT and MA, Due: October 7, 1996, Contact: R. Feller (202) 219–2796.

EIS No. 960408, Draft EIS, NOA, OH, Ohio Combined Coastal Management Program, Implementation, Special Management Areas (SMAs), Lake Erie, OH, Coastal Management Program, Implementation, Special Management Areas (SMAs), Lake Erie, OH, Due: November 15, 1996, Contact: Diana Olinger (301) 713–3113.

EIS No. 960409, Final EIS, AFS, OR, Upper Deschutes Wild and Scenic River and State Scenic Waterway, Management Plan, Implementation, Deschutes National Forest, Deschutes County, OR, Due: October 7, 1996, Contact: Mollie Chaudet (541) 383–4769.

EIS No. 960410, Final EIS, MMS, AL, CA, DE, LA, NJ, AK, CT, FL, MS, NY, NC, RI, VA, OR, TX, WA, Gulf of Mexico and Offshore Alaska Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing Program 1997 to 2002 for 16 Lease Sales on Five-Year Leasing Program, Due: October 7, 1996, Contact: Richard Wilderman (703) 787–1674.

EIS No. 960411, Final EIS, NPS, NB, Niobrara National Scenic River, General Management Plan, Niobrara/Missouri National Scenic Riverways, Implementation, Brown, Cherry, Keya Paha and Rock Counties, NB, Due: October 7, 1996, Contact: Warren Hill (402) 336–3970.

EIS No. 960412, Draft Supplement, EPA, CA, International Wastewater Treatment Plant and South Bay Ocean Outfall, Updated Information, Interim Operation, Tijuana River, San Diego, CA, Due: October 21, 1996, Contact: Elizabeth Borowiec (415) 744–1165.

EIS No. 960413, Draft EIS, USN, CA, Las Pulgas and San Mateo Basin, Cease and Desist Order, Sewage Effluent Compliance Project, NPDES Permit, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton,