

Comment date: July 13, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

11. PacifiCorp

[Docket No. ER95-1240-000]

Take notice that on June 20, 1995, PacifiCorp, tendered for filing in accordance with 18 CFR Part 35 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, a copy of its proposed FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 9 (Network Integration Transmission Service Tariff) and its proposed FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 10 ("Point-to-Point Transmission Service Tariff").

PacifiCorp requests that an effective date of August 7, 1995 be assigned to the Tariff.

Copies of this filing were supplied to the Public Utility Commission of Oregon and the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission.

Comment date: July 13, 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. 95-16656 Filed 7-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Docket No. RP90-95-010]

Colorado Interstate Gas Company; Notice of Compliance Filing

June 30, 1995.

Take notice that on June 28, 1995, Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG), tendered for filing a semiannual compliance filing consisting of work papers detailing accrued interest payments made by CIG to its affected customers related to the unused portion

of transportation credits in the instant docket.

CIG states that copies of the filing were served upon all of the parties to this proceeding and affected state commissions and affected parties.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests should be filed on or before July 10, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make protestant parties to the proceeding. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-16657 Filed 7-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-261-001]

Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

June 30, 1995.

Take notice that on June 28, 1995, Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership (Great Lakes), tendered for filing the following revised tariff sheets to its FERC Gas Tariff, proposed to be effective May 4, 1995 and August 1, 1995:

Second Revised Volume No. 1

Substitute First Revised Sheet No. 40—Effective May 4, 1995
Substitute First Revised Sheet No. 41—Effective May 4, 1995
Second Revised Sheet No. 40—Effective August 1, 1995

Great Lakes states that Substitute First Revised Sheet Nos. 40 and 41 are being filed to conform with the effective date of the Commission's Order No. 577, 70 FERC ¶ 61,359 (1995). Great Lakes originally filed these tariff sheets proposed to be effective May 1, 1995. On May 31, 1995 the Commission issued a Letter Order in RP95-261 accepting such sheets effective May 4, 1994.

Great Lakes further states that Second Revised Sheet No. 40 is being filed to reflect the changes to the capacity release regulations pursuant to Order No. 577-A, 71 FERC ¶ 61,254 (1995) regarding short-term capacity releases.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rule 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211). All such protests should be filed on or before July 10, 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. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-16658 Filed 7-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-360-000]

National Fuel Customer Group, et al. v. National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation; Notice of Complaint

June 30, 1995.

Take notice that on June 27, 1995, the National Fuel Customer Group, Elizabethtown Gas Company, and consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Petitioners) filed a motion requesting the Commission to issue an order directing National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation (National Fuel) to comply with the settlement in *Penn-York Energy Corporation*, 64 FERC ¶ 61,040 (1993) (Penn-York settlement) by implementing as of May 1, 1995, subject to refund, the rolled-in rates accepted by the Commission in its June 14, 1995 order in Docket Nos. RP95-298-000 and RP95-31-007.

Petitioners assert that National Fuel made a commitment in the Penn-York settlement to effectuate rolled-in rates. Petitioners submit that when National Fuel made this commitment it waived any discretion it had as to the date on which it would move rolled-in rates into effect. Petitioners contend that Article VIII of the Penn-York settlement requires National Fuel, by specified deadlines, to make an NGA section 4 rate change filing to implement rolled-in rates. Petitioners argue that the Penn-York settlement further obligates National Fuel to actively support its rolled-in rate proposal by participating in any hearing on the issue, filing supporting testimony, and, if necessary, requesting rehearing, and intervening in support of nay petitions for review. In return for this commitment, petitioners asserts National Fuel obtained numerous, substantial benefits.

Petitioners complain that National Fuel, however, has repeatedly reneged