

Pursuant to the provisions of § 35.11 of the Commission's Regulations, Midwest respectfully requests a waiver of Commission's Regulations and notice requirements to allow Amendment No. 1 to be effective on January 1, 1995.

Midwest states that copies of this filing were served on Cedar Falls Utilities and the Iowa Utilities Board.

*Comment date:* June 30, 1995, 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, 825 North Capitol 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.

**Linwood A. Watson, Jr.**

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-15260 Filed 6-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

#### [Project No. 5728-014 New Hampshire]

#### Sandy Hollow Power Company, Inc.; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

June 16, 1995.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Regulations, 18 CFR part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 FR 47910), the Office of Hydropower Licensing (OHL) reviewed the application for amendment for the Sandy Hollow Hydroelectric Project. The application proposes to install a 160 kilowatt turbine with a siphon-fed penstock on the Indian River, in Jefferson County, near the Village of Philadelphia, New York. The staff prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the action. In the EA, staff concludes that approval of the licensee's amendment application 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 Reference and Information Center, Room 3308, of the Commission's offices at 941 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

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

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-15267 Filed 6-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

#### [Docket No. CP95-109-000]

#### CNG Transmission Corporation; Notice of Availability of the Environmental Assessment for the Proposed TL-470 Extension 5 Project

June 16, 1995.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) on the natural gas pipeline facilities proposed by CNG Transmission Corporation (CNG) in the above-referenced docket.

The EA was prepared to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. The staff concludes that approval of the proposed project, with appropriate mitigating measures, would not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

The EA assesses the potential environmental effects of the construction and operation of about 4.73 miles of 30-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline loop in Rooterdam Township, Schenectady County, New York.

The proposed loop would be constructed parallel and adjacent to CNG's existing facilities and would begin at a new gate station on CNG's system near Gregg Road and end at a new gate station near Burdeck Street.

The purpose of the proposed facilities would be to maintain pressure requirements to meet CNG's delivery obligations to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation's distribution system which serves the Albany, New York area.

The EA has been placed in the public files of the FERC and is available for public inspection at: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Public Reference and Files Maintenance Branch, 941 North Capitol Street, N.E., Room 3104, Washington, D.C. 20426, (202) 208-1371.

Copies of the EA have been mailed to Federal, state and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, newspapers, and parties to this proceeding.

A limited number of copies of the EA are available from: Mr. Howard Wheeler, Environmental Project Manager, Environmental Review and

Compliance Branch II, Office of Pipeline Regulation, Room 7312, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, (202) 208-2299.

Any person wishing to comment on the EA may do so. Written comments must reference Docket No. CP95-109-000, and be addressed to: Office of the Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

Comments should be filed as soon as possible, but must be received no later than July 17, 1995, to ensure consideration prior to a Commission decision on this proposal. A copy of any comments should also be sent to Mr. Howard Wheeler, Environmental Project Manager, Room 7312, at the above address.

Comments will be considered by the Commission but will not serve to make the commentator a party to the proceeding. Any person seeking to become a party to the proceeding must file a motion to intervene pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures (18 CFR 385.214).

The date for filing timely motions to intervene in this proceeding has passed. Therefore, parties now seeking to file late interventions must show good cause, as required by Section 385.214(b)(3), why this time limitation should be waived. Environmental issues have been viewed as good cause for late intervention. You do not need intervenor status to have your comments considered.

Additional information about this project is available from Mr. Howard Wheeler, Environmental Project Manager.

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

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-15262 Filed 6-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

#### [Docket No. CP95-544-000, et al.]

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

June 14, 1995.

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

#### 1. Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America

[Docket No. CP95-544-000]

Take notice that on June 5, 1995, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America (Natural), 701 East 22nd Street, Lombard, Illinois 60148, filed in Docket No. CP95-544-000 an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for permission and approval to

abandon a natural gas receipt point located in Cass County, Texas, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Natural proposes to remove a 4-inch meter and a 4-inch tap that were originally constructed in April, 1984, to receive and transport approximately 8 MMCF of gas per day for Dow Pipeline Company (Dow) pursuant to Section 311(a)(1) of the NGPA. Natural states that its gas exchange agreement with Dow terminated on March 10, 1986. Natural asserts that it subsequently certificated the subject facilities in 1988, under its blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-402-000, in order to provide interruptible transportation service for Cabot Energy Marketing Corporation pursuant to Subpart G of Part 284 of the Commission's Regulations. Natural mentions that the subject facilities were last used in September, 1988, and will not be used in the future.

*Comment date:* July 5, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

## 2. Williams Natural Gas Company

[Docket No. CP95-551-000]

Take notice that on June 8, 1995, Williams Natural Gas Company (WNG), P.O. Box 3288, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101, filed in Docket No. CP95-551-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.216(b) of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act for authorization to abandon certain facilities under its blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-479-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

WNG proposes to abandon by reclaim 235 feet of 10-inch pipeline and to abandon in place 625 feet of 10-inch pipeline located in Douglas County, Kansas. WNG explains that a new section of 16-inch pipeline would be constructed under its blanket certificate authority issued in Docket No. CP82-479-000. WNG further explains that the reclaim cost is estimated to be \$500 with a salvage value of \$289.

WNG states that this change is not prohibited by an existing tariff and it has sufficient capacity to accomplish the deliveries specified without detriment or disadvantage to its other customers.

*Comment date:* July 31, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

## 3. Columbia Gas Transmission

[Docket No. CP95-556-000]

Take notice that on June 9, 1995, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, S.E., Charleston, West Virginia 25314-1599, filed in Docket No. CP95-556-000 a request pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) for authorization to establish a new point of delivery for firm transportation service and abandon an existing point of delivery and reassign 5,000 dth/day in Maximum Daily Delivery Obligations between points of delivery to Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. (COH), in Franklin County, Ohio, under Columbia's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-76-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Columbia states that it would construct and operate a new point of delivery for firm transportation service and would provide the service pursuant to Columbia's Blanket Certificate issued in Docket No. CP86-240-000 under existing authorized rate schedules and within certificated entitlements.

Columbia states further that the new point of delivery has been requested by COH for firm transportation service for residential and commercial use. The estimated cost, it is said, would be approximately \$36,200 and would be reimbursed by COH.

*Comment date:* July 31, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

## 4. Pacific Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP95-560-000]

Take notice that on June 12, 1995, Pacific Gas Transmission Company (PGT), 160 Spear Street, San Francisco, California 94105-1570, filed in Docket No. CP95-560-000 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 a new tap and meter station under PGT's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-530-000 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.

PGT proposes to install a new tap and meter station near Hermiston, Oregon for delivery of gas to Cascade Natural Gas Corporation.

*Comment date:* July 31, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G 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.

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 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. 95-15261 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.