well (BDW–1, or Mitchell 1). The intent was to determine if the six authorized brine disposal wells could be constructed using directional drilling technology from a single location near the gas storage area. Drilling continues as of this date. If successful, directional drilling would substantially reduce the environmental impact of the project by eliminating the need to drill six brine disposal wells at the previously approved locations and approximately 5 miles of brine pipeline. The Director of OPR must still give his final approval for constructing directionally drilled brine disposal wells.

The EA Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, or as in this case, an amendment to an existing certificate. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. We call this ''scoping''. The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this Notice of Intent, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the supplemental EA. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the supplemental EA. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

The supplemental EA will discuss only those impacts associated with the proposed modifications to the project, and how these impacts differ from those associated with the currently authorized project.

At this time it appears that the most substantive environmental issue is the protection of the Cohocton River fishery resource. Specific issues we will address include:

- Whether the direct surface water withdrawal would be environmentally less disruptive than groundwater use;
- reduced air and noise emissions from conversion to electric motor-driven compressors; and
- other changes and impacts due to construction of:

> 1,800 feet of additional pipeline and a river intake structure;

> 6 caverns instead of 5 caverns; and

> a larger (tripleheader) meter station.

We will also evaluate reasonable alternatives to the proposed project modifications, and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

Our independent analysis of the issues will be in the supplemental EA. Depending on the comments received during the scoping process, the supplemental EA may be published and mailed to Federal, state, and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, affected landowners, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list for this proceeding. A comment period will be allotted for review if the supplemental EA is published. We will consider all comments on the supplemental EA before we recommend that the Commission approve or not approve the project modifications.

Site Visit

The FERC staff will conduct a site visit on November 8, 1995, to inspect the locations of the newly proposed facilities. Anyone who desires to accompany the FERC staff on this site visit is welcome to participate. Any interested parties must provide their own transportation. Call Lonnie Lister, Project Manager, at (202) 208–2191 for details on when and where to meet.

Public Participation

You can make a difference by sending a letter addressing your specific comments or concerns about the project. You should focus on the potential environmental effects of the proposal, alternatives to the proposal and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. Please follow the instructions below to ensure that your comments are received and properly recorded:

- Address your letter to: Lois Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426;
- Reference Docket No. CP94–161–003;
- Send a *copy* of your letter to: Mr. Lonnie Lister, EA Project Manager, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol St., N.E., Room 7312, Washington, D.C. 20426; and
- Mail your comments so that they will be received in Washington, D.C. on or before November 27, 1995.

If you wish to receive a copy of the supplemental EA, you should request one from Mr. Lister at the above address.

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, you may want to become an official party to the proceeding or become an ''intervenor''. Among other things, intervenors have the right to receive copies of case-related Commission documents and filings by other intervenors. Likewise, each intervenor must provide copies of its filings to all other parties. If you want to become an intervenor you must file a motion to intervene according to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214). You do not need intervenor status to have your scoping comments considered.

Additional information about the proposed project is available from Mr. Lonnie Lister, EA Project Manager, at (202) 208–2191.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–27175 Filed 11–1–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. CP95–119–003, et al.]

Steuban Gas Storage Company, et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings

October 26, 1995.

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

1. Steuben Gas Storage Company

[Docket No. CP95–119–003]

Take notice that, on October 24, 1995, in compliance with the Commission's July 28, 1995, Preliminary Determination issued in Docket Nos. CP95–119–000 and CP95–119–001, Steuben Gas Storage Company (Steuben), 500 Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan 48243, filed a revised pro forma tariff for the Thomas Corners Storage Field and its responses to questions posed by the Commission in its Preliminary Determination order.

Comment date: November 2, 1995, in accordance with the first paragraph of Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

2. Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation

[Docket No. CP96–25–000]

Take notice that on October 13, 1995, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Applicant), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, S.E., Charleston, West Virginia 25314–1599, filed under Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for a certificate authorizing the construction and operation of 0.1 mile of 36-inch pipeline loop, on its transmission line, all as more fully described in the petition on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

The proposed construction is designated as line WB–5, is located in Clay County, West Virginia and will enable Applicant to provide 1,200 Dth/d of firm service to Schuller International, Incorporated under Part 284 of the Commission's Regulations. The project will cost $184,000.

Comment date: November 16, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

3. Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America

[Docket No. CP96–27–000]

Take notice that on October 18, 1995, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America (Natural), located at 701 East 22nd Street, Lombard, Illinois 60148, filed in Docket No. CP96–27–000 an application pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act and Subpart A of Part 157 of the Commission's Regulations. Natural seeks a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the construction and operation of certain facilities which will increase the capacity of its system. Natural proposes to transport up to 345,000 Mcf per day of additional volumes on its Amarillo mainline system eastward from its Compressor Station No. 109 at Harper, Iowa, to the Chicago area.

Natural states that it holds precedent agreements for 550,000 Mcf per day of new firm service away from Harper. It says that it is planning to use roughly 205,000 Mcf per day of existing capacity expected to become available, plus the 345,000 Mcf per day of proposed additional capacity, for these services. Natural further states that its application is largely dependent on the amended application filed by Northern Border Pipeline Company (Northern Border) on October 13, 1995, in Docket No. CP95–194–001. There, Northern Border has, among other things, proposed the expansion of its existing system to Harper.

Natural specifically requests certificate authority to construct and operate the following loop line and compression facilities which are estimated to cost $87,467,000:

(1) Two 14,500 h.p. compressors—by means of retrofitting one existing 12,000 h.p. compressor and one existing 12,500 h.p. compressor (each to 14,500 h.p.) at Natural's Compressor Station No. 199 in Muscatine County, Iowa;

(2) Approximately 37.5 miles of 36-inch pipeline loop in Muscatine County and Rock Island County, Illinois;

(3) One 7,250 h.p. compressor at Natural's existing Compressor Station No. 110 in Henry County, Illinois; and,

(4) Approximately 38.6 miles of 36-inch pipeline loop in Henry and Bureau Counties, Illinois.

Natural filed Precedent Agreements with eleven shippers representing 550,000 Mcf per day of new firm transportation service between Harper and the Chicago area. Natural says that eight of the eleven shippers, representing 505,000 Mcf per day (or 92% of the total), are directly dependent upon related volumes being transported on Northern Border's proposed expansion. Natural says that these eight shippers are affiliated with parent producers or represent a producer pool and, therefore, currently own or control the supplies necessary to fully utilize the new contract volumes. Natural also says that of the three remaining shippers, one is rearranging existing transportation, and two are looking to purchase gas at Harper for transportation into the midwest markets.

Natural plans to charge its effective rates under its Rate Schedule FTS for the new firm transportation services performed using the new capacity created by the new facilities proposed in this docket. Natural is not requesting a determination of the appropriate rate treatment of these facilities in this docket as provided for by the Commission's Policy Statement in Docket No. PL94–4–000. Natural says it is willing to have this issue considered in a future Section 4 rate case. Further, Natural says that its willingness to go forward with its proposed expansion is not, (and the above new shipper commitments are not), dependent on a rate treatment determination being made in this certificate docket.

Natural says that it will be able to complete construction of the proposed facilities within 18 months after receipt of Commission authorization and acceptance by Natural. Natural requests that a Commission order in this docket be issued by the end of 1996—thereby allowing the entirety of 1997 for the facilities to be built. Natural says that the in-service date for the facilities proposed here should coincide with the in-service date for those expansion facilities on Northern Border needed to provide the necessary upstream transportation service for Natural's shippers.

Comment date: November 20, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

4. Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America

[Docket No. CP96–29–000]

Take notice that on October 19, 1995, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America (Natural), 701 East 22nd Street, Lombard, Illinois 60148, filed in Docket No. CP96–29–000 an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for permission and approval to abandon certain certificated facilities, located in Eddy County, New Mexico, by transfer to an affiliate, MidCon Gas Products of New Mexico Corp (MGP of New Mexico), all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Natural proposes to transfer laterals, meters, taps, a booster station, and appurtenant facilities that were authorized in Docket Nos. CP75–59, CP75–161, CP76–460, and CP77–608 as well as other non-certificated facilities that are located in the same geographic area, its Big Eddy System, to MGP of New Mexico. Natural states that it will sell its entire Big Eddy System for $4,433,328 which represents the net book value on October 1, 1995. Natural mentions that the entire Big Eddy System would be operated as a non-jurisdictional gathering system.

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

5. Transwestern Pipeline Company

[Docket No. CP96–33–000]

Take notice that on October 24, 1995, Transwestern Pipeline Company (Transwestern), 1400 Smith Street, P.O. Box 1188, Houston, Texas 77251–1188, filed an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for permission and approval to abandon by sale to NGC Intrastate Pipeline Company (NGC) the S. Gene Hall farm tap located in Gray County, Texas, and the related no-notice transportation service number under Transwestern's Rate Schedule FTS–2, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Transwestern states that it is currently authorized to provide a firm no-notice transportation service to the S. Gene Hall farm tap under Transwestern's Rate Schedule FTS–2, under a service agreement dated July 27, 1978. It is stated that by letter to Transwestern, S. Gene Hall notified Transwestern that NGC has agreed to continue to provide comparable service to S. Gene Hall and that S. Gene Hall does not oppose transfer of these facilities to NGC.

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

Standard Paragraph

F. Any person desiring to be heard or make any protest with reference to said

filing should on or before the comment date file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) 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 filing 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 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 the applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–27197 Filed 11–1–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. QF95–302–000]

Brooklyn Navy Yard Cogeneration Partners, L.P.; Notice of Amendment to Filing

October 27, 1995.

On October 19, 1995, Brooklyn Navy Yard Cogeneration Partners, L.P. tendered for filing a supplement to its filing in this docket.

The supplement pertains to the ownership structure and technical aspects of the facility. No determination has been made that the submittal constitutes a complete filing.

Any person desiring to be heard or objecting to the granting of qualifying status should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. All such motions or protest must be filed by November 20, 1995, and must be served on the Applicant. 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 petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–27177 Filed 11–1–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. ER94–1161–006]

Direct Electric, Inc.; Notice of Filing

October 27, 1995.

Take notice that on October 10, 1995, Direct Electric, Inc. tendered for filing certain information as required by the Commission's letter order dated July 18, 1994. Copies of the informational filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–27178 Filed 11–1–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

Florida Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Transition Cost Recovery Report

October 27, 1995.

Take notice that on October 25, 1995, Florida Gas Transmission Company (''FGT'') tendered for filing a Transition Cost Recovery Report pursuant to Section 24 of the General Terms and Conditions of its FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1.

FGT states that the Transition Cost Recovery Report filed summarizes the activity which has occurred in its TCR Account and Order 636 Account through October, 1995 and includes $338,770 of recoverable 636 transition costs not previously reported. Because the currently effective TCR and 636 reservation charge and TCR usage surcharge rates are at the maximum levels permitted by FGT's tariff, no tariff revisions are required as a result of this filing.

Copies of the report were mailed to all customers serviced under the rate schedules affected by the report and the interested state commissions.

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, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426 in accordance with Sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before November 3, 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 in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–27179 Filed 11–01–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. ER95–1421–001]

JPower Inc.; Notice of Filing

October 27, 1995.

Take notice that on October 19, 1995, JPower Inc. filed certain information as required by the Commission's August 25, 1995, order in Docket No. ER95–1421–000. Copies of JPower Inc.'s informational filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–27180 Filed 11–1–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. ER96–104–000]

Montaup Electric Company; Notice of Filing

October 27, 1995.

Take notice that on October 17, 1995, Montaup Electric Company (Montaup), tendered for filing 1) executed unit sales service agreements under Montaup's FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. III, and 2) executed service agreements for the sale of system capacity and associated energy under Montaup's FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. IV with the following companies (Buyers):

1. PECO Energy Company (PECO);
2. Phibro, Inc. (Phibro);
3. Electric Clearinghouse, Inc. (ECI);
4. Coastal Electric Services Company (CESC);