

Procedure. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before June 7, 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 in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-13742 Filed 6-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-305-000]

Canyon Creek Compression Company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

May 31, 1995.

Take notice that on May 26, 1995, Canyon Creek Compression Company (Canyon Creek) tendered for filing to be a part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1, Second Revised Sheet Nos. 142 and 148, to be effective May 4, 1995.

Canyon Creek states that the purpose of the filing is to conform with the Commission's Order No. 577, which changed the Commission's Rules and Regulations as follows: (1) prearranged releases of exactly one month are no longer required to have open seasons and (2) the minimum time period before a subsequent short-term prearranged release to the same replacement shipper was shortened to 28 days.

Canyon Creek requested waiver of the Commission's Regulations to the extent necessary to permit the above tariff sheets to become effective May 4, 1995, effective date of the Commission's Order No. 577.

Canyon Creek states that a copy of the filing was mailed to Canyon Creek's jurisdictional transportation customers and interested state regulatory agencies.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before June 7, 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 in the public reference room.

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-13737 Filed 6-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP95-513-000]

El Paso Natural Gas Co.; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

May 31, 1995.

Take notice that on May 24, 1995, El Paso Natural Gas Company (El Paso), P.O. Box 1492, El Paso, Texas 79978, filed in Docket No. CP95-513-000 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 construct and operate a new delivery point located in Yoakum County, Texas, under El Paso's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-435-000 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.

El Paso proposes to construct and operate a new tap, valve assembly and meter on its existing 30-inch diameter Permian-San Juan Line to provide interruptible transportation and delivery of natural gas for Exxon Company, U.S.A. (Exxon). El Paso states that Exxon will use the gas as fuel to operate its Cornell Field Compressor. El Paso mentions that Exxon had been receiving gas from Shell Western E & P, Inc.'s Wasson Plant which has been closed. El Paso asserts that it will deliver 32,850 Mcf of gas annually and 250 Mcf of gas on a peak day to Exxon. El Paso also states that the estimated \$39,800 cost of the proposed facilities would be reimbursed by Exxon and that Exxon would construct approximately 1.5 miles of 2-inch polyethylene pipeline to connect its compressor facilities to El Paso's proposed delivery point.

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. 95-13730 Filed 6-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-212-000]

Order To Show Cause

Issued May 31, 1995.

In the matter of KansOk Partnership; Kansas Pipeline Partnership; Kansas Natural Partnership; Riverside Pipeline Company, L.P.

On November 30, 1993, KansOk Partnership (KansOk) filed a petition for rate approval in Docket No. PR94-3-000 to justify its firm and interruptible transportation rates for service performed under section 311 of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (NGPA). Western Resources, Inc. (Western Resources) filed a protest contending that KansOk is an interstate pipeline, and not an intrastate pipeline as claimed, because of the interstate nature of its transportation service. The Commission will address KansOk's rate filing in Docket No. PR94-3-000 in an order issued concurrently with this order. The instant order establishes a separate show cause proceeding, pursuant to sections 5, 7, and 16 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), to investigate Western Resources' claims.¹

As discussed below, the Commission is requiring KansOk and its downstream affiliates, Kansas Pipeline Partnership (Kansas Pipeline), Kansas Natural Partnership (Kansas Natural), and Riverside Pipeline Company, L.P. (Riverside), to show cause: (1) Why all four affiliates should not be viewed collectively as one interstate pipeline system subject to the Commission's jurisdiction; and (2) in the alternative, why KansOk, by itself, should not be considered an interstate pipeline subject to the Commission's jurisdiction.

A. Description of the Pipelines

KansOk owns and operates two distinct segments of pipeline, the West Leg and East Leg, totalling approximately 114 miles of pipeline. Both the West Leg and East Leg are

¹ In addition, the Commission notes that at a staff panel proceeding convened on December 1, 1994 in Docket No. PR94-3-000, Missouri Gas Energy also argued that KansOk and its affiliates should be considered an interstate pipeline subject to Commission jurisdiction. See Tr. at 25.