

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 § 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 If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of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. 95-2050 Filed 1-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

**[Project Nos. 2404 and 2419]**

**Thunder Bay Power Company; Proposed Restricted Service List for a Programmatic Agreement for Managing Properties Included in or Eligible for Inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places**

January 23, 1995.

Rule 2010 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure provides that, to eliminate unnecessary expense or improve administrative efficiency, the Secretary may establish a restricted service list for a particular phase or issue in a proceeding.<sup>1</sup> The restricted service list should contain the names of persons on the service list who, in the judgment of the decisional authority establishing the list, are active participants with respect to the phase or issue in the proceeding for which the list is established.

The Commission is consulting with the Michigan State Historic Preservation Officer (hereinafter, SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (hereinafter, Council) pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13 of the Council's regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, (16 U.S.C. 470f), to prepare a programmatic agreement for managing properties included in, or eligible for inclusion in,

the National Register of Historic Places at Project Nos. 2404 and 2419.

The programmatic agreement, upon approval by the Commission, the SHPO, and the Council, would satisfy the Commission's Section 106 responsibilities for all individual undertakings carried out in accordance with the agreement until the agreement expires or is terminated (36 CFR 800.13[e]). The Commission's Section 106 requirements for the above project would be fulfilled through one programmatic agreement for comments under Section 106.

Thunder Bay Power Company, as a prospective licensee for the projects, is being asked to participate in the consultation and is being invited to sign as a concurring party to the programmatic agreement.

For purposes of commenting on the programmatic agreement we propose to restrict the service list of Project Nos. 2404 and 2419 as follows:

Mr. Roger Steed, President, Thunder Bay Power Company, 10850, Traverse Highway, #1101, Traverse City, MI 49684.

Ms. Kathryn B. Eckert, Michigan State Historic Preservation Officer, Michigan Bureau of History, Department of the State, 208 North Capitol Avenue, Lansing, MI 48918.

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Eastern Office of Project Review, The Old Pose Office Building, Suite 809, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20004.

Any person on the official service list for the above-captioned proceedings may request inclusion on the restricted service list, or may request that a restricted service list not be established, by filing a motion to that effect within 15 days of this notice date. An original and 8 copies of any such motion must be filed with the Secretary of Commission (825 N. Capitol St., NE, Washington, D.C. 20426) and must be served on each person whose name appears on the official service list. If no such motions are filed, the restricted service list will be effective at the end of the 15 day period. Otherwise, a further notice will be issued ruling on the motion.

**Lois D. Cashell,**

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-2020 Filed 1-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**[Docket No. CP95-118-000]**

**East Tennessee Natural Gas Company; Technical Conference**

January 23, 1995.

A technical conference will be held to discuss issues raised in the above-captioned proceeding on Wednesday, February 22, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., in Room 2402-A at the offices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 N. Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

All interested persons and Staff are permitted to attend. However, attendance does not confer party status.

For additional information, contact Timothy W. Gordon at (202) 208-2265.

**Lois D. Cashell,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-2019 Filed 1-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**[ER-FRL-4719-7]**

**Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments**

Availability of EPA comments prepared December 26, 1994 Through December 30, 1994 pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at (202) 260-5076.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 10, 1994 (59 FR 16807).

**Draft EISs**

ERP No. D-AFS-G65060-TX Rating LO, Texas National Forests and Grasslands Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Implementation, several counties, TX.

*Summary:* EPA expressed lack of objections with the preferred alternative in the draft EIS.

ERP No. D-COE-K35036-CA Rating EC2, Montezuma Wetlands Project, Use of Cover and Non-cover Dredged Materials to restore Wetland, Implementation, Conditional-Use-Permit, NPDES and COE Section 10 and 404 Permit, Suisun Marsh in Collinsville, Solano County, CA.

*Summary:* EPA supported the proposed project, but expressed environmental concern over the lack of information regarding the practicability

<sup>1</sup> 18 CFR 385.2010 (1992).