

<-----(COLDER) SECONDARY PROGRAMMING MODE (HOTTER)--> ADJUSTMENT TEMPERATURES (F)

Wash temp. setting					Factory Pre-set (except cold setting)				
Hot	112	114	116	118	120	122	124	126	
Warm-hot	97	99	101	103	105	107	109	111	
Warm	87	89	91	93	95	97	99	101	
Warm-cold	77	79	81	83	85	87	89	91	
Cold:									
Cold water only*		54	56	58	60	62	64	66	

* Factory Preset for COLD setting.

This request for waiver is submitted because (1) The combination of five pre-set temperature selections—all with a cold water rinse—are incompatible with any of the TUF tables in Section 4 of the regulations; and (2) the requirement of section 3.2.2.6 that we test all temperature selections that use hot water is unduly burdensome. Instead, we propose modified regulations that will allow for a conservative testing protocol appropriate to this product that is also in accordance with the negotiated AHAM proposed rule.

GEA proposes an Interim Waiver and Waiver to allow testing of the machine per Appendix J with the following modifications: Add the following definition to the test procedure:

1.19 "Secondary programming mode" means an auxiliary function used to adjust temperature, water level, rinse options or other characteristics of the machine. The user must not be able to access these adjustments from the normal operating mode of the machine, and access to the secondary mode must not be necessary to operate the machine.

Change section 3.2.2.6 of the test procedure as follows:

3.2.2.6 For automatic clothes washers repeat 3.2.2.3, 3.2.2.4, and 3.2.2.5 for each of the other wash/rinse temperature selections available that use hot water except: 1) if wash temperature selections are uniformly distributed, by temperature, between "hot wash" and "cold wash", the reportable values to be used for the warm water wash setting shall be the arithmetic average of hot and cold selections measurements of 2) if wash temperature selections are non-uniformly distributed, by temperature, between "hot wash" and "cold wash", test all intermediate wash temperature selections and average the results to obtain the reportable warm wash values. For semi-automatic clothes washers. . .

For model WZSE5310 this would mean using Alternate II from the three temperature selection TUF table, section 5.3 of Appendix J Hot/Cold, Warm/Cold, Cold/Cold, and using the average of the three warm settings on the machine for Warm/Cold. This also conforms with the new test procedure proposed by AHAM section 3.5.1. (The warm setting is the default wash temperature for all cycles.)

Change section 3.5 of the test procedure as follows:

3.5.2.1 If the wash temperature offered in the normal operating mode of the machine

can be further adjusted in a secondary programming mode, the higher of the factory preset temperature or the mean of the adjustable range shall be used for testing.

For model WZSE5310 this means using the factory preset temperatures for the Hot and Warm settings and 60F for the Cold setting for testing.

The table above shows the possible temperature settings for the machine (approximate bath water temperatures). To achieve the temperatures to the right and left of the factory preset temperatures on the table, the user must read the owners' guide to learn how to enter a secondary programming mode and make a special effort to enter this mode and change the temperatures. We feel strongly that this secondary programming mode will be used very infrequently because an Australia consumer survey of 202 users showed that only about 6% of those consumers ever entered this mode to adjust temperatures. There is no U.S. consumer data showing how many consumers will enter the secondary programming mode and the frequency that the consumers will adjust the temperatures. Lacking this data, it is logical to assume that if consumers make the effort to enter the secondary mode, it is equally or more likely that the consumer will adjust the temperature down, saving energy, as it is that the consumer will raise the temperature. This is especially true since there are 4 downward adjustments and only 3 upward adjustments possible. The owners' guide will also inform the consumer that adjusting the temperature downward will save energy. Thus, we believe that the most representative wash temperatures are the factory preset temperatures.

GEA requests immediate relief by grant of the proposed Interim Waiver, justified by the following reasons:

Economic Hardship—GEA currently has no Monogram brand product in its home laundry product line. Delay of introduction of the this product will not allow GE to complete its product line. Since a Monogram dryer will be introduced with this product, its introduction would also be delayed.

Likely Approval of Waiver—The Petition for Waiver is likely to be granted because the test procedure proposed conforms as much as possible with the new test procedure supported by AHAM. This new AHAM test procedure is likely to be adopted.

Public Policy Merits—GE's Monogram washers are designed to efficiently extract more water from wet clothes by a high speed spin cycle, up to 1000 RPM. Such water

extraction is many times more energy efficient than drying the same amount of water. This innovation in clothes washer design does not affect the test method for clothes washers, but does result in increased total energy savings. GE's new washer is also factory preset to an auto water fill level. The machine senses the clothes load and uses only the amount of water necessary to clean the clothes. Because a manual High/Medium/Low water fill level is also available, we will test the machine using the manual water levels per the test procedure. However, the auto water fill feature is expected to show actual energy savings for the consumer.

Thank you for considering this petition.

Lee Bishop,
Senior Counsel Product Safety/Regulatory.
Jane Ransdell,
Energy Standards Engineer.

[FR Doc. 96-9950 Filed 4-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP96-320-000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

April 18, 1996.

Take notice that on April 15, 1996, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), P.O. Box 1273, Charleston, West Virginia, 25325-1273, filed in Docket No. CP96-320-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205, and 157.216(b) of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.216) for approval to abandon in place approximately 0.7 mile of its 20-inch transmission line, Line KA, and five points of delivery to Mountaineer Gas Company (Mountaineer) for service to mainline customers, under the blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-76-000, pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Columbia States that the facilities for which it seeks abandonment were

transferred to low pressure service in order to maintain service to five mainline tap customers in Docket No. CP95-240-000. Columbia indicates that the transfer was necessary due to the relocation of a pipeline corridor in deteriorating Line KA. It is indicated that the proposed abandonment will not result in any loss of service to any customer because they are currently being provided service by Wyoming Natural Gas, a local distribution company. It is further indicated that Mountaineer and the customers agree to the proposed abandonment.

Any person or the Commission's Staff may, within 45 days of the issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214), a motion to intervene 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 therefore, the proposed activities 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 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. 96-10030 Filed 4-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP96-270-000]

**Mid Continent Market Center, Inc.,
Complainant v. Panhandle Eastern
Pipe Line Company, Respondent;
Notice of Complaint**

April 18, 1996.

Take notice that on March 21, 1996, Mid Continent Market Center, Inc. (Mid Continent), P.O. Box 889, 818 Kansas Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66601, filed a complaint in Docket No. CP96-270-000, pursuant to Section 385.206 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Mid Continent charges Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company (Panhandle) with undue discrimination and anticompetitive behavior for its failure to timely agree to modify a delivery point and provide natural gas transportation service. The details of Mid Continent's allegations are more fully set forth in the complaint which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Mid Continent is a wholly owned subsidiary of Western Resources, Inc., a

combination electric and gas utility with operations in Kansas and Oklahoma. Western Resources, Inc. was authorized by the Kansas Corporation Commission to transfer certain transmission, storage and gathering facilities to Mid Continent in June 1995. Mid Continent is interconnected with four interstate and four intrastate pipelines and provides firm and interruptible natural gas transportation service as well as short-term storage and balancing services. In Docket No. CP95-684-000, the Commission granted Mid Continent a Hinshaw exemption and a Part 284 Blanket Certificate to transport, sell, and assign gas in interstate commerce (72 FERC ¶ 62,274 (1995)).

Mid Continent alleges that Panhandle has exercised undue discrimination and anticompetitive behavior by delaying and/or refusing to modify interconnect facilities with a pipeline that Mid Continent has contracted to purchase from KN Interstate Gas Transmission Company. The proposed interconnects would be in the vicinity of Panhandle's Haven, Kansas compressor station in Reno County, Kansas. The interconnects would allow Mid Continent to deliver up to 100,000 MMBtu per day into Panhandle's market area on an interruptible basis. Mid Continent also says that gas delivered to Panhandle could move via released capacity or under firm contracts held on Panhandle by Mid Continent's customers.

Mid Continent asks the Commission to order Panhandle to cease its discriminatory and anticompetitive behavior and allow modification of the interconnects, at Mid Continent's expense. According to Mid Continent, Panhandle has built interconnections for other similarly situated interruptible shippers, Kansas Pipeline Partnership (KPP) and National Steel Corporation, but has rejected other like requests. One such rejected request, made jointly by Missouri Gas Energy (MGE) and KPP, is the subject of the pending complaint by MGE in Docket No. CP95-755-000.

Mid Continent urges the Commission to stop Panhandle from preferentially providing new interruptible interconnects to certain shippers while denying interconnects to competing systems such as Mid Continent. Mid Continent says that Panhandle is restraining competition and keeping its customers captive by denying those customers access to competitive options.

Mid Continent says that Panhandle's tariff requires only that a party seeking service reimburse Panhandle or cause Panhandle to be reimbursed for the costs associated with construction or modification of the receipt and delivery

facilities to be used. Mid Continent says that it is committed to reimburse Panhandle for such costs.

Mid Continent also alleges Panhandle's actions violate the pro-competitive policies underlying antitrust laws, which the Commission is bound to apply. Mid Continent says that it needs expeditious action by the Commission so that it can construct its own related facilities in time for an opportunity to compete with Panhandle for service to Panhandle's customers as their current firm contracts expire this year. Absent relief, Mid Continent seeks a full evidentiary hearing on an expedited basis.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make protest with reference to this complaint should on or before May 3, 1996, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 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 385.214 or 385.211). 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. Answers to the complaint shall be due on or before May 3, 1996.

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-10029 Filed 4-23-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP96-4-002]

**Mid Louisiana Gas Company; Notice of
Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff**

April 18, 1996.

Take notice that on April 16, 1996, Mid Louisiana Gas Company (Mid Louisiana), tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheets:

Substitute Second Revised Sheet No. 131

Mid Louisiana states that the purpose of the filing of the Revised Tariff Sheets is to comply with the Commission's directive in order Accepting and Dismissing Tariff Sheets dated April 12, 1996, by including personnel names in the update to the listing of shared personnel and facilities.

Pursuant to Section 154.7(a)(7) of the Commission's Regulations, Mid Louisiana respectfully requests waiver