

authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

**Lois D. Cashell,**

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-15261 Filed 6-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

**City of Watertown; Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Assessment**

**[Project 2442-001 New York]**

June 16, 1995.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Regulations, 18 CFR part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 FR 47897), the Office of Hydropower Licensing has reviewed the application for major new license for the proposed Watertown Project, located in Jefferson County and has prepared a Final Environmental Assessment (EA) for the project.

On April 10, 1995, staff issued and distributed to all parties a draft EA and requested that all comments on the draft EA be filed within 30 days. All comments that were timely filed have been considered in this final EA.

In the final EA, the Commission's staff has analyzed the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and has concluded that approval of the project, with appropriate mitigation or enhancement measures, would not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Copies of the EA are available for review in the Public Reference Branch, Room 3104, of the Commission's offices at 941 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

For further information, please contact Peter Leitzke, Environmental Coordinator, at (202) 219-2803.

**Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,**

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-15265 Filed 6-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**[Docket No. CP95-552-000, et al.]**

**Seagull Natural Gas Company, et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings**

June 15, 1995.

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

**1. Seagull Natural Gas Company**

[Docket No. CP95-552-000]

Take notice that on June 8, 1995, Seagull Natural Gas Company (Seagull), 1700 First City Tower, 1001 Fannan

Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed a petition in Docket No. CP95-552-000, requesting that the Commission declare that its facilities extending from an offshore platform located in Brazos Area, Block 366, Offshore Texas to an onshore separation and dehydration facility located in Brazoria County, Texas are gathering facilities exempt from Commission jurisdiction pursuant to Section 1(b) of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the petition which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Seagull states that it owns and operates a pipeline facility in offshore Texas waters known as the Brazos 366 Line, which consists of a 12.86 mile, 8-inch line and a 0.13 mile, 4-inch line. It is indicated that the facility extends from a platform owned by Rutherford Oil and Gas Company in Brazos Area Block 366 to a separation and dehydration facility owned by Dow Hydrocarbons and Resources, Inc. (Dow) located approximately one mile onshore in Brazoria County, Texas. It is stated that the only pipeline connected to the tailgate of the Dow plant is an 8-inch line owned by Dow.

Seagull states that it uses the facility to gather gas production for others and to deliver those volumes to the Dow plant for separation and dehydration. It is also stated that, in addition to the gas produced from the Rutherford 366 Platform, the facility also transports gas produced from production platforms in Brazos Blocks 340, 375, and 376 and gathered to the Rutherford 366 Platform through lines owned either by Seagull or producers. It is also stated that volumes produced from Brazos Block 444 are delivered to the facility at its approximate mid-point through producer-owned facilities. It is also stated that most of the gas moved through the facility is destined for Texas intrastate markets or interstate markets on behalf of two shippers pursuant to Section 311(a)(2) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978. Seagull has stated that recently it has reevaluated the nature of the facility and the service it provides and concluded that the facility and the services it provides through that facility are gathering.

In support of its claim that the primary function of the pipeline is gathering, Seagull indicates that the facility meets the gathering criteria set forth in Farmland Industries, Inc., 23 FERC ¶ 61.063 (1983), as modified by later Commission orders, indicating the following:

*Length and Diameter of the Line*

Seagull states that offshore lines of comparable and greater length and

diameter, including a 45 to 60 mile, 14-inch diameter pipeline (see 69 FERC ¶ 61,272 (1994)), have been characterized as gathering. It is also indicated that the location of the Seagull facility is solely a function of the location of the production in the Brazos area in relation to the Dow plant.

*Location of Compressor and Processing Plants*

Seagull also states that it neither owns nor operates any compressors along the facility, and that the facility relies on wellhead pressure and any pressure generated from producer-owned compression located on the various platforms directly or indirectly connected to the facility. It is also indicated that the only plant near the facility is the Dow separation/dehydration facility located at the terminus of the facility.

*Extension of the Facility Beyond the Central Point in the Field*

Seagull states that, because the facility is configured solely to deliver gas to the Dow plant from various producing platforms in the offshore Brazos area, there is no true central point in the field. Seagull concludes that the application of this factor in determining whether the facility is a gathering facility is inappropriate.

*Location of Wells*

Seagull states that the facility is located in a prolific producing area and is designed to gather gas from various production platforms for delivery to a separation and dehydration facility. Seagull states that, although this criterion requires that wells be located along all or part of onshore facilities, the Commission has found that offshore facilities do not need to meet this requirement for the Commission to find that such facilities provide a gathering function. It is also noted that there is a field connection approximately at the facility's mid-point.

*Geographic Configuration of the Facility*

Seagull states that the facility is a straight line gathering platform from various platforms for delivery to an onshore separation plant, a configuration similar to numerous other offshore systems previously determined to be gathering.

*Operating Pressure*

Seagull states that the maximum operating pressure of the facility is 800 psig, and that the Commission has determined that other offshore facilities with much higher pressures are gathering facilities.

**Primary Function**

Seagull indicates that the primary business purpose of owning and operating the facility is to gather gas that is owned by non-affiliated third-party producers in the offshore Brazos area for delivery to the Dow plant. It is also indicated that neither Seagull or any of its affiliates owns or purchases any of the gas gathered by the facility, and that neither Seagull or any of its affiliates owns or operates any facilities subject to the Commission's Natural Gas Act jurisdiction.

*Comment date:* July 6, 1995, in accordance with the first paragraph of Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

**2. Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America**

[Docket No. CP95-555-000]

Take notice that on June 9, 1995, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America (Natural) 701 East 22nd Street, Lombard, Illinois 60148, filed in Docket No. CP95-555-000 an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, and Sections 157.7 and 157.18 of the Commission's Regulations thereunder for permission and approval to abandon a natural gas exchange service with Columbia Gulf Transmission Company (Columbia Gulf) all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Natural proposes to abandon the exchange service between Natural and Columbia Gulf provided under Natural's Rate Schedule X-125. Natural states that pursuant to a gas transportation and exchange agreement (Agreement) between Natural and Columbia Gulf dated September 30, 1980, Natural made available for exchange up to 10,000 Mcf of natural gas per day to Columbia Gulf at Columbia Gulf's Pecan Island Plant located in Vermilion Parish, Louisiana. Natural explains that from Pecan Island, Columbia Gulf transported Natural's gas to Columbia Gulf's Rayne Compressor Station located in Acadia Parish, Louisiana at which point it became Columbia Gulf's by exchange. Natural further explains that Columbia Gulf then redelivered to Natural equivalent volumes of natural gas available to Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation at the outlet of Texaco Inc.'s Henry Plant located in Vermilion Parish, Louisiana.

Natural states that by settlement agreement between Natural and Columbia Gulf dated May 15, 1995, Natural and Columbia Gulf agreed to terminate the Agreement (and Natural's Rate Schedule X-125 exchange service)

through the payment of a negotiated exit fee by Natural to Columbia Gulf in consideration for Columbia Gulf's early termination and abandonment of, among other things, the transportation and exchange service performed under the exchange agreement.

*Comment date:* July 6, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

**3. CNG Transmission Corporation**

[Docket No. CP95-562-000]

Take notice that on June 12, 1995, CNG Transmission Corporation (CNG), 445 West Main Street, Clarksburg, West Virginia 26301, filed in Docket No. CP95-562-000 an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for permission and approval to abandon by removal a 1.2 mile segment of 6-inch diameter pipeline located in Tyler County, West Virginia, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

CNG states that the pipeline was installed by CNG's predecessor, Hope Natural Gas Company (Hope) in 1925 and authorized by the Commission under Hope's grandfather certificate in 1942 in Docket No. G-290. It is stated that the line was installed to provide service to a customer of Hope Gas, Inc. It is further stated that the pipeline segment had deteriorated and had to be closed off in May 1984, with the customer relocated to receive service from another line in the vicinity. It is asserted that the proposed abandonment would have no impact on service to any customer since the single customer being served has been relocated.

*Comment date:* July 6, 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.

**Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,**  
Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-15259 Filed 6-21-95; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

**FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION****Security for the Protection of the Public Financial Responsibility to Meet Liability Incurred for Death or Injury to Passengers or Other Persons on Voyages; Issuance of Certificate (Casualty)**

Notice is hereby given that the following have been issued a Certificate of Financial Responsibility to Meet Liability Incurred for Death or Injury to Passengers or Other Persons on Voyages pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Pub. L. 89-777 (46 U.S.C. 817(d)) and the Federal Maritime Commission's implementing regulations at 46 CFR part 540, as amended

American Classic Voyages Company, Two North Riverside Plaza, Suite 600, Chicago, Illinois 60606

Vessel: AMERICAN QUEEN

Dated: June 16, 1995.

**Joseph C. Polking,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-15313 Filed 6-21-95; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6730-01-M

**Ocean Freight Forwarder License Revocations**

Notice is hereby given that the following ocean freight forwarder