

Docket No. ¹	Transporter/seller	Recipient	Date filed	Part 284 sub-part	Est. max. daily quantity ²	Aff. Y/A/N ³	Rate sch.	Date commenced	Projected termination date
ST95-3603	Public Service Co. of Colorado.	Williams Gas Marketing Co.	08-28-95	G-S	80,000	N	I	06-30-95	Indef.

¹ Notice of transactions does not constitute a determination that filings comply with Commission regulations in accordance with order No. 436 (Final Rule and Notice requesting supplemental comments, 50 FR 42,372, 10/10/85).

² Estimated maximum daily volumes includes volumes reported by the filing company in MMBTU, MCF and DT.

³ Affiliation of reporting company to entities involved in the Transaction. A "Y" indicates affiliation, an "A" indicates marketing affiliation, and a "N" indicates no affiliation.

[FR Doc. 95-26243 Filed 10-23-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP95-421-001]

Koch Gateway Pipeline Company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

October 18, 1995.

Take notice that on October 16, 1995, Koch Gateway Pipeline Company (Koch Gateway) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Fifth Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheets to be effective November 1, 1995:

Eighth Revised Sheet No. 20
Eighth Revised Sheet No. 21
Eighth Revised Sheet No. 22
Eighth Revised Sheet No. 24
Third Revised Sheet No. 3904
Second Revised Sheet No. 3905

Koch Gateway states that this filing is submitted in compliance with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") September 29, 1995 order in which the Commission required Koch Gateway to recalculate the proposed surcharges for the recovery of stranded Account No. 191 costs in accordance with Section 32.3 of Koch Gateway's tariff which sets forth the recovery method for stranded costs.

Koch Gateway further states that the Commission ordered Koch Gateway to respond to the protest of the Indicated Shippers regarding the Fuel Use adjustment to Account No. 803. Koch Gateway states that this adjustment was made in its Account No. 191 balance as shown in its supporting schedules in its initial filing.

Koch Gateway also states that copies of its filing are being served upon the official service list as determined by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.211 of the Commission's Regulations. All such protests should be filed on or before October 25, 1995. Protests will be considered by the

Commission in determining appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceedings. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-26242 Filed 10-23-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. PR95-18-000]

Delhi Gas Pipeline Corporation; Notice of Petition for Rate Approval

October 18, 1995.

Take notice that on September 15, 1995, Delhi Gas Pipeline Corporation (Delhi) filed pursuant to section 284.123(b)(2) of the Commission's Regulations, a petition for rate approval requesting that the Commission approve as fair and equitable a rate of \$0.335 per MMBtu for transportation services performed under Section 311(a)(2) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (NGPA).

Delhi states that it owns and operates non-interconnected pipeline systems in the States of Oklahoma and Texas. Delhi proposes to continue to charge a rate of \$0.335 per MMBtu, which rate was previously approved by Commission letter order dated July 21, 1993, in Docket No. PR92-19.

Pursuant to Section 284.123(b)(2)(ii), if the Commission does not act within 150 days of the filing date, the rate will be deemed to be fair and equitable and not in excess of an amount which interstate pipelines would be permitted to charge for similar transportation service. The Commission may, prior to the expiration of the 150-day period, extend the time for action or institute a proceeding to afford parties an opportunity for written comments and for the oral presentation of views, data, and arguments.

Any person desiring to participate in this rate proceeding must file a motion to intervene in accordance with Sections 385.211 and 385.214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures. All motions must be filed

with the Secretary of the Commission on or before November 3, 1995. The petition for rate approval is on file with the Commission and is available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-26241 Filed 10-23-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. ER95-1455-000]

Long Island Lighting Company; Notice of Filing

October 18, 1995.

Take notice that on September 14, 1995, Long Island Lighting Company tendered for filing a Notice of Withdrawal in the above-referenced docket.

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 October 30, 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.

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-26240 Filed 10-23-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP96-13-000]

CNG Transmission Corporation; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

October 18, 1995.

Take notice that on October 6, 1995, CNG Transmission Corporation (CNGT),

445 West Main Street, Clarksburg, West Virginia 26301, filed a prior notice request with the Commission in Docket No. CP96-13-000 pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (NGA) for authorization to construct and operate a delivery point and appurtenant metering and regulating equipment in Upshur County, West Virginia, to serve Hope Gas, Inc. (Hope) under CNGT's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-537-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the NGA, all as more fully set forth in the request which is open to the public for inspection.

CNGT proposes to install a 4-inch hot tap and metering and regulating equipment to serve as a delivery point to Hope, a West Virginia local distributor and CNGT affiliate. Hope would operate the metering and regulating equipment as it delivers a maximum of 1,560 Mcf of natural gas per day to the Trus Joist Facility. CNGT states that Hope would fully reimburse CNGT for the estimated \$9,484 construction cost of the proposed facilities.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after the Commission has issued this notice, 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 NGA (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the allowed time, 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 NGA.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-26239 Filed 10-23-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP94-267-003]

NorAm Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Amended Application

October 18, 1995.

Take notice that on October 10, 1995, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NGT), formerly Arkla Energy Resources Company, 1600 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP94-267-003 an amended application pursuant to Section 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for authorization to replace and reroute segments of its Line

F in Louisiana and to make other minor pipeline changes, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

NGT states that it filed an application in Docket No. CP94-267-000 on March 4, 1994, to replace and rearrange an existing mainline pipeline, abandon minor storage and gas supply facilities and make minor mainline enhancements to its pipeline system in Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas. NGT relates that on October 4, 1994, it filed in Docket No. CP94-267-001, an amendment to its application to modify the compression facilities that were originally proposed to be installed and rearranged in the existing Ruston Storage Compressor yard. NGT reports that on April 5, 1995, the Commission issued an order in Docket Nos. CP94-267-000 and CP94-267-001 authorizing the construction, operation, and abandonment of facilities.¹ NGT notes that on May 5, 1995, it filed a request for rehearing and clarification of the April 5, 1995 order and, on June 16, 1995, it requested that the Commission take no further action in this docket pending its evaluation of recent developments that could affect the enhancements and replacements proposed by NGT.

NGT states that it has completed its evaluation and is filing to amend its application to modify its proposed replacements and abandonments and to eliminate nearly all the proposed system enhancements. NGT explains that its original application sought authority to spend approximately \$48.6 million to make various replacements and rearrangements. NGT relates that its amended proposal involves a request for authority to spend approximately \$23.7 million, a decrease of approximately \$25 million, to replace and rearrange parts of its pipeline system.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said amended application should on or before November 8, 1995, 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 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 is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its 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 NGT to appear or be represented at the hearing.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-26238 Filed 10-23-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP93-685-002]

Tuscarora Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Petition To Amend

October 18, 1995.

Take notice that on October 13, 1995, Tuscarora Gas Transmission Company (Tuscarora), 6100 Neil Road, P.O. Box 30150, Reno, Nevada 89520-3057, pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) filed in Docket No. CP93-685-002 an abbreviated petition to amend its certificate of public convenience and necessity issued on May 31, 1995. Tuscarora proposes to amend its certificate to update the estimated costs of the project and to establish reduced initial transportation rates prior to the in-service date for the pipeline, all as more fully set forth in the petition to amend which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Tuscarora says that although construction has proceeded relatively smoothly, the estimated cost of the project has risen approximately 4% from \$125.2 million to \$130.3 million. Tuscarora says the estimated project cost has increased largely because of unanticipated material and environmental compliance cost increases. Further, Tuscarora says these cost increases have more than absorbed

¹ 71 FERC 61,017 (1995).