

North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. A copy of any motion to intervene must also be served upon each representative of the Applicant specified in the particular application.

D2. Agency Comments—Federal, state, and local agencies are invited to file comments on the described application. A copy of the application may be obtained by agencies directly from the Applicant. If an agency does not file comments within the time specified for filing comments, it will be presumed to have no comments. One copy of an agency's comments must also be sent to the Applicant's representatives.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-18668 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP95-613-000, et al.]

Florida Gas Transmission Company, et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings

July 24, 1995.

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

1. Florida Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP95-613-000]

Take notice that on July 13, 1995, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT), 1400 Smith Street, P.O. Box 1188, Houston, Texas 77251-1188, filed in Docket No. CP95-613-000 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 small volume metering facility for the City of Clearwater, under FGT's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-553-000 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.

FGT proposes to construct and operate a new small volume facility at the existing Clearwater North Station on the 4-inch Clearwater North Lateral in Pinellas County, Florida. The proposed new metering facility will serve as an additional delivery point to Clearwater under two existing firm transportation service agreements pursuant to FGT's Rate Schedules FTS-1 and FTS-2 and under an existing interruptible transportation service agreement pursuant to FGT's Rate Schedule ITS-1. FGT indicates that Clearwater would reimburse FGT for the construction costs which is estimated to be \$37,000.

Comment date: September 7, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

2. East Tennessee Natural Gas Company

[Docket No. CP95-622-000]

Take notice that on July 17, 1995, East Tennessee Natural Gas Company (East Tennessee), a Tennessee Corporation, P.O. Box 2511, Houston, Texas 77252, filed a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.212) and under its blanket authority granted September 1, 1982, in Docket No. CP82-412-000, for authorization to install a delivery point for continuing firm service to Dunlap Natural Gas (Dunlap), a municipal corporation, located in Marion County, Tennessee, all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Specifically, East Tennessee states that Dunlap is replacing its distribution mainline and has requested East Tennessee to install a new delivery station at M.P. 3211-1+1.54 in Marion County, Tennessee, to replace existing station No. 75-9018 located at M.L.V. 3211-1. East Tennessee proposes to install, own, and operate and maintain a two-inch hot tap; approximately twenty-five feet of two-inch interconnecting pipe, and measurement facilities, including electronic gas measurement equipment. The hot tap and interconnecting pipe will be located on East Tennessee's existing right-of-way. The measurement facilities will be located on a site provided by Dunlap, adjacent to East Tennessee's existing right-of-way.

East Tennessee states that the total quantities to be delivered to Dunlap will not exceed the total quantities authorized. East Tennessee asserts that the establishment of the proposed delivery point is not prohibited by East Tennessee's tariff, and that it has sufficient capacity to accomplish the deliveries at the proposed new delivery point without detriment or disadvantage to any of East Tennessee's other customers.

Comment date: September 7, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

3. Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America

[Docket No. CP95-624-000]

Take notice that on July 17, 1995, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America (Natural), 701 East 22nd Street, Lombard, Illinois 60148, filed in Docket

No. CP95-624-000 an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for permission and approval to abandon by sale to Lone Star Gas Company (Lone Star), one 10-inch meter and appurtenant facilities in Fashing Field, Atascosa County, Texas, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Comment date: August 14, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

4. Northwest Pipeline Corporation

[Docket No. CP95-627-000]

Take notice that on July 19, 1995, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84158, filed a prior notice request with the Commission in Docket No. CP95-627-000 pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (NGA) for authorization to construct and operate a cross-over tie on the Grants Pass Lateral in Multnomah County, Oregon, under Northwest's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-433-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the NGA, all as more fully set forth in the request which is open to the public for inspection.

Northwest proposes to construct and operate a 3-inch tap, two 4-inch regulators, a relief valve, and appurtenances on its 20-inch diameter Grants Pass Lateral loop line as an additional tie-in for the Reynolds Metal meter station. Northwest states that the proposed tie-in would provide an alternate means of gas supply whenever the Grants Pass Lateral line is out of service. Northwest also states that since it needs to construct the proposed tie-in in order to maintain service to Reynolds Metal whenever the Grants Pass Lateral line is out of service, Northwest would pay the estimated \$78,000 construction cost for the facilities. Northwest further states that the design capacity and delivery pressure of the meter station would not change as a result of the proposed loop line tie-in.

Comment date: September 7, 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. 95-18700 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Docket Nos. RP95-326-000 and RP95-242-000]

Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America; Notice of Continuing Technical Conference

July 25, 1995.

Take notice that the technical conference in this proceeding which was convened on July 13, 1995, will continue on Thursday, August 3, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., in the Commission Meeting Room at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. All interested persons and staff are permitted to attend.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-18669 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

Western Area Power Administration

Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie Project—Proposed Firm and Nonfirm Transmission Service Rates for the Phoenix Area

AGENCY: Western Area Power Administration, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Rates for Firm Transmission Service and Nonfirm Transmission Service for the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie Project Rate Adjustment.

SUMMARY: The Western Area Power Administration (Western) is proposing two rates for firm transmission service and a rate for nonfirm transmission service for the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie Project (AC Intertie).

The power repayment study indicates that the proposed rates for firm and nonfirm transmission service are necessary because of increases in operation and maintenance expenses, and the anticipated decrease in current marketable capacity from the 500-kilovolt (kV) transmission lines. The proposed rates for firm and nonfirm transmission service will supersede the existing rates that became effective August 1, 1993, and were extended on May 17, 1995 (60 FR 26433) until October 1, 1996. The proposed rates for firm and nonfirm transmission service are to become effective January 1, 1996.

The existing firm transmission service rate for the 230/345-kV transmission lines is \$4.46 per kilowatt per year (kW/year) and the existing nonfirm transmission service rate is 1.00 mills per kilowatthour (mills/kWh).

The proposed firm transmission service rate for the 230/345-kV transmission lines is \$7.37/kW/year; the

proposed rate for the 500-kV transmission lines is \$16.00/kW/year; and the proposed combined nonfirm transmission service rate is 2.11 mills/kWh.

The Acting Assistant Secretary of Energy for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy of the Department of Energy (DOE), approved the existing rates on an interim basis for firm and nonfirm transmission service on July 14, 1993. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) confirmed and approved the rates on a final basis for firm and nonfirm transmission service on March 24, 1994 (66 FERC ¶62,180). The existing rates were designed to recover all annual costs and investment repayment of both the existing 230/345-kV lines and the new 500-kV lines. The existing rates for firm and nonfirm transmission service were placed in effect on August 1, 1993, and consisted of a two-step rate adjustment process. Step one of the firm transmission service rate was approved to be in effect through September 30, 1995, and step two of the existing rates was to become effective on October 1, 1995, and continue through July 31, 1998.

During the last AC Intertie rate adjustment process (WAPA-56), the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, the Arizona Power Authority, the Arizona Subcontractor Group, the Arizona Power Pooling Association, Inc., and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District filed a Motion to Intervene and Protest FERC confirmation and approval of the AC Intertie rates described in Rate Order No. WAPA-56. On December 28, 1993, Western filed a Stipulation Agreement signed by Western and these customers in which the intervenors withdrew their protests and Western agreed to re-examine the issues raised as well as commence a new rate adjustment proceeding during fiscal year 1995.

Western has re-examined the issues raised during the last rate adjustment process along with the current issues regarding the rate impact from the additional capacity. Due to customer request, Western has developed and is proposing two firm transmission service rates and a nonfirm transmission service rate for the AC Intertie Project to supersede step one of the existing rates which were extended for firm and nonfirm transmission service. The major difference between step two of the existing rates and the proposed rates is the separate marketing and rate-setting design of the 500-kV system.

In response to additional AC Intertie customer requests, Western is proposing a rate design for the firm transmission