storage field boundary for its Loreed Storage Field located in Lake and Osceola Counties, Michigan, pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act and Section 157.7 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Regulations, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

ANR states that is requesting approval of the proposed storage field boundary because there has been a gradual expansion of the storage reservoir over the years, and the grant of authority sought will help ANR to acquire, through eminent domain if necessary, the property it needs to protect the integrity of the Loreed Storage Field and the gas stored therein. ANR also states that approval of the proposed boundary of Loreed Storage Field will not increase the storage capacity or the deliverability of the field. ANR estimates that the cost of storage and mineral rights will be $357,125.

Comment date: May 17, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

7. NorAm Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP96–342–000]

Take notice that on April 22, 1996, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NGT), 1600 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP96–342–000 an application pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act to continue operating the Dunn Junction compressor station in Logan County, Arkansas, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

NGT states that on July 23, 1987, in Docket No. CP87–458, NGT filed an application to certificate, among other things, existing facilities that were originally constructed and operated as non-jurisdictional intrastate facilities. NGT further states that on June 8, 1989, the Commission issued an order authorizing the continued operation of these facilities; however, although the need for certification for the Dunn Junction compressor station was described in the body of the 1987 application, due to an administrative oversight, Dunn Junction was not specifically highlighted as a facility requiring certification on the exhibits accompanying the application. Therefore, in order to prevent any ambiguity as to the status of the Dunn Junction compressor station, NGT requests an order authorizing the operation of the station as a jurisdictional facility.

Comment date: May 17, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraphs

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, 888 First Street, N.E., 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 385.211 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.

G. Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after the 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 therefore, 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–10990 Filed 5–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[Docket No. PL94–4–001]

Pricing Policy For New and Existing Facilities Constructed by Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines; Order Denying Rehearing

Issued: April 29, 1996.

On May 31, 1995, the Commission issued a Statement of Policy (Policy Statement) on the approach the Commission intended to follow in establishing rates for new construction of pipeline facilities.[1] The Policy Statement focused on whether projects would be priced on a rolled-in basis (rolling-in the expansion costs with the existing facilities) or an incremental basis (establishing separate cost-of-services and separate rates for the existing and expansion facilities). The Policy Statement provided that a preliminary determination of rate design would be made when the pipeline filed its certificate application for the project. Fourteen parties seek rehearing and clarification of the Policy Statement.[2]

Summary of the Requests for Rehearing and Clarification

Some parties contended the Policy Statement did not adopt a sufficiently strong presumption in favor of rolled-in rates. Others raised questions about how the presumption will operate, i.e., is it a bright-line test, how will the rate impact be determined in specific cases, and how thoroughly will the Commission review projects that meet the presumption? The parties also raised questions about how the Commission will weigh the system-wide benefits against the rate impact. In particular, some parties suggested the Commission should not consider several of the types of system-wide benefits which the Commission identified in the Policy Statement.

The parties similarly raised questions about how the Commission will

[1] Pricing Policy For New And Existing Facilities Constructed By Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines, 71 FERC ¶ 61,241 (1995).

[2] Alberta Department of Energy; American Forest and Paper Association; Fuel Managers Association; Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership; JMC Power Projects; Midland Cogeneration Venture Limited Partnership; Natural Gas Supply Association; Northern Illinois Gas Company; Public Service Electric and Gas Company; Selkirk Cogen Partners, L.P.; UGI Utilities, Inc.; United Distribution Companies; Viking Gas Transmission Company; Washington Natural Gas Company.

determine whether mitigation of rate impact is needed and how the mitigation will be done. Some argued that no mitigation is needed when the benefits are proportionate to the rate impact, while others argued mitigation should apply in every instance when the rate impact exceeds 5%.

Finally, the parties raised questions about the procedures for addressing rate design questions in certificate proceedings. They requested clarification as to the role of shippers in the certificate proceedings, such as whether the shippers will be able to present evidence opposing the pipelines' proposed rate design. They also raised questions about how the declaratory order will be applied in subsequent rate cases under section 4 of the Natural Gas Act when pipelines propose rolled-in pricing.

Discussion

The purpose of the Policy Statement was to provide the industry with guidance on the criteria the Commission would apply when evaluating rate design for new pipeline construction and to establish the procedures for making this analysis. In the Policy Statement, the Commission contemplated that the resolution of pricing methodology would take place in individual proceedings based on the facts and circumstances of the project at issue.[3] The Commission finds that the issues raised in the rehearing requests generally are not susceptible to a generic resolution, but need to be considered in the context of a specific filing. Indeed, since issuing the Policy Statement, the Commission has addressed some of these issues in individual cases.[4] Accordingly, the Commission declines to consider the issues raised in the requests for rehearing and/or clarification in this docket, but will consider such issues and arguments in the specific cases in which they apply.

By the Commission.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–11047 Filed 5–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[3] 71 FERC at 61,915.

[4] *See, e.g.,* CNG Transmission Company, 74 FERC ¶ 61,073 (1996); Paiute Pipeline Company, 74 FERC ¶ 61,049 (1996); Northwest Pipeline Company, 73 FERC ¶ 61,353 (1995), *reh'g denied,* 75 FERC ¶ 61,008 (1996); El Paso Natural Gas Company, 73 FERC ¶ 61,352 (1995); Southern Natural Gas Company, 73 FERC ¶ 61,085 (1995); Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, 73 FERC ¶ 61,012 (1995).

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–5469–1]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7167 OR (202) 564–7153.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed April 22, 1996 through April 26, 1996 pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 960190, DRAFT EIS, FHW, WI, Burlington Bypass State Trunk Highway Project, Construction, from WI–36, WI–11 and WI–83, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, City of Burlington, Racine and Walworth Counties, WI, Due: June 24, 1996, Contact: Richard Madrzak (608) 829–7510.

EIS No. 960191, FINAL EIS, BLM, CA, Clear Creek Management Area, Land and Resource Management Plan Amendment, Implementation, San Benito and Fresno Counties, CA, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Meg Pearson (408) 637–8183.

EIS No. 960192, FINAL EIS, FAA, NY, Syracuse Hancock International Airport, Land Acquisition and Construction of Runway 10 L–28R, Funding and Airport Layout Plan Approval, Onondaga County, NY, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Frank Squeglia (718) 553–3325.

EIS No. 960193, DRAFT EIS, COE, NJ, Absecon Island Interim Feasibility Study, Storm Damage Reduction, Brigantic Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, Atlantic County, NJ, Due: June 25, 1996, Contact: Ltc. Robert Magnifico (215) 656–6555.

EIS No. 960194, DRAFT EIS, FHW, FL, Port of Miami Tunnel and Access Improvements, I–395 via MacArthur Causeway Bridge, Dade County, FL, Due: June 17, 1996, Contact: J. R. Skinner (904) 942–9582.

EIS No. 960195, FINAL SUPPLEMENT, COE, CA, Richmond Harbor Deep Draft Navigation Improvements, Updated and Additional Information, to Improve Navigation Efficiency into the Potrero, San Francisco Bay, Contra Costa County, CA, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Linda Ngim (415) 744–3341.

EIS No. 960196, DRAFT EIS, USN, United States Navy Shipboard Solid Waste Disposal, Implementation, MARPOL Special Areas: Designation Baltic Sea, North Sea, Wilder Caribbean, Antarctic Ocean, Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea and Red Sea, Gulf Regions: Persian Gulf and Gulf of Oman, Due: June 17, 1996, Contact: Robert K. Ostermueller (610) 595–0759.

EIS No. 960197, FINAL SUPPLEMENT, IBR, NM, CO, Animas-La Plata Project, Additional Information concerning Agricultural, Municipal and Industrial Water Supplies, Animas and La Plata Rivers, San Juan County, NM and La Plata and Montezuma Counties, CO, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Ken Beck (970) 385–6558.

EIS No. 960198, FINAL EIS, DOE, NM, Medical Isotopes Production Project (MIPP), Establishment and Production of a Continuous Supply of Molybdenum-99 and Related Isotopes, Bernalillo County, NM, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Wade Carroll (301) 903–7731.

EIS No. 960199, FINAL EIS, USN, WA, Disposal of Decommissioned, Defueled Cruiser, Ohio Class and Los Angeles Class Naval Reactor Plants, Site Selection, U.S. Department of Energy's Hanford Site, Benton, Franklin and Grant Counties or Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, WA, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: John Gordon (360) 476–7111.

EIS No. 960200, FINAL EIS, DOE, WA, Adoption—Disposal of Decommissioned, Defueled Cruiser, Ohio Class and Los Angeles Class Naval Reactor Plants, Site Selection, U.S. Department of Energy's Hanford Site, Benton, Franklin and Grant Counties or Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, WA, Due: June 03, 1996, Contact: Paul F.X. Dunigan (509) 376–6667.

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), has adopted the U.S. Department of the Navy's FEIS #960199, filed with the Environmental Protection Agency on 04–26–96. DOE is a cooperating agency on this project. Recirculation of the document is not necessary under Section 1506.3(c) of the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 960007, DRAFT EIS, GSA, DC, Central and West Heating Plants (CHP/WHP) Construction and Operation, Air Quality Improvement Project, District Heating System (DHS), City of Washington, DC, Due: May 24, 1996, Contact: Frank L. Thomas (202) 708–5334. Published FR 01–19–96—Review Period Extended.

EIS No. 960115, DRAFT EIS, FHW, RI, Rhode Island Northeast Corridor Freight Rail Improvement Project, Major Investment Study, Implementation, Boston Switch in Central Falls to the Quonset Point/Davisville Industrial Park in North Kingtown, Funding, COE Section 10 and 404 Permits, Providence County, RI, Due: May 13, 1996, Contact: K. Robert Sikora (401) 528–4541.