which impounds 250 acre-feet of water, a 26,000-foot-long, 11-foot-diameter flowline, two surge tanks, two 90-inch-diameter steel penstocks, and a powerhouse with a total installed capacity of 33,000 kW.

The Cove Development consists of a concrete dam which impounds 65 acre-feet of water, a 5,700-foot-long wooden flume, a 550-foot-long diameter steel penstock and a powerhouse with an installed capacity of 7,500 kW.

k. Pursuant to 18 CFR 16.7, information on the project is available at: PacifiCorp, 920 SW 6th Avenue, Portland, OR 97204, Phone: (503) 464–5343.

l. FERC contact: Hector M. Perez (202) 219–2843.

m. Pursuant to 18 CFR 16.9(b)(1) each application for a new license and any competing license applications must be filed with the Commission at least 24 months prior to the expiration of the existing license. All applications for license for this project must be filed by October 1, 1999.

Standard Paragraphs

B. Comments, Protests, or Motions to Intervene—Anyone may submit comments, a protest, or a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.210, .211, .214. In determining the appropriate action to take, the Commission will consider all protests or other comments filed, but only those who file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules may become a party to the proceeding. Any comments, protests, or motions to intervene must be received on or before the specified comment date for the particular application.

C1. Filing and Service of Responsive Documents—Any filings must bear in all capital letters the title ''COMMENTS'', ''RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS'', ''PROTEST'', OR ''MOTION TO INTERVENE'', as applicable, and the Project Number of the particular application to which the filing refers. Any of the above-named documents must be filed by providing the original and the number of copies provided by the Commission's regulations to: The Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. A copy of any motion to intervene must also be served upon each representative of the Applicant specified in the particular application.

C2. Filing and Service of Responsive Documents—Any filings must bear in all capital letters the title ''COMMENTS,'' ''RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS,'' ''NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE COMPETING APPLICATION,'' ''COMPETING APPLICATION,'' ''PROTEST,'' or ''MOTION TO INTERVENE,'' as applicable, and the Project Number of the particular application to which the filing refers. Any of these documents must be filed by providing the original and the number of copies provided by the Commission's regulations to: The Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. A copy of a notice of intent, competing application, or 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.

Dated: May 29, 1996.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–14394 Filed 6–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[Docket No. CP96–519–000, et al.]

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

May 31, 1996.

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

1. NorAm Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP96–519–000]

Take notice that on May 13, 1996, as supplemented on May 28, 1996, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NGT), 1600 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP96–519–000, a request pursuant to Sections 157.205, 157.211 and 157.216 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 18 CFR 157.211, and 157.216) for authorization under its blanket certificate issued in Docket Nos. CP82–384–000 and CP82–384–001, pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, to abandon certain facilities in Arkansas and Louisiana and to operate their existing replacement facilities as jurisdictional facilities to provide transportation services under Subpart G of Part 284 of the Commission's regulations, all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

NGT requests authority, pursuant to 18 CFR 157.216, to abandon one 2-inch tap and 2-inch U-Shape meter station located on NGT's N Line in Caddo Parish, Louisiana. NGT relates that these facilities were originally installed in 1952, and certificated in Docket No. G–252, to serve ARKLA, a distribution division of NorAM Energy Corp. (ARKLA). Additionally, NGT requests authority, pursuant to 18 CFR 157.216, to abandon two 1-inch first-cut regulators located on NGT's Line TM–3 in Hot Spring County, Arkansas. NGT relates that these facilities were originally installed in 1967, and certificated in Docket No. CP67–83–000, to serve ARKLA. NGT says no service is to be abandoned, and the abandoned facilities will be reclaimed.

NGT seeks authority to operate the existing 4-inch tap and 4-inch Skid-mounted meter station (which replaced the one 2-inch tap and 2-inch U-Shape meter station) on NGT's Line N in Section 30, Township 17 North, Range 14 West, Caddo Parish, Louisiana in order to provide transportation services under Subpart G of Part 284 of the Commission's regulations. NGT states that these facilities were installed in April 1996, solely to provide services authorized under Section 311 of the NGPA and Subpart B of the Commission's regulations, to serve ARKLA's request for increased volumes. NGT states the estimated volumes to be delivered are approximately 127,000 MMBtu annually and 400 MMBtu on a peak day on an interruptible basis. NGT says these facilities were constructed at an estimated cost of $24,193 and ARKLA will reimburse NGT the total construction cost.

NGT seeks authority to operate two existing 1-inch Moonne first-cut regulators (which replaced the two 1-inch first-cut regulators) located on NGT's Line TM–3 in Section 16, Township 4 South, Range 16 West, Hot Spring County, Arkansas in order to provide transportation services under Subpart G of Part 284 of the Commission's regulations. NGT states these facilities were installed in March 1996, solely to provide services authorized under Section 311 of the NGPA and Subpart B of the Commission's regulations to serve ARKLA's distribution customers at its existing Malvern Town Border Station. NGT states the estimated volumes to be delivered through these facilities are

approximately 1,460,000 MMBtu annually and 4,000 MMBtu on a peak day on an interruptible basis. NGT says that the facilities were constructed at an estimated cost of $6,834, and ARKLA will reimburse NGT $5,150 of the construction cost.

Comment date: July 15, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

2. UtiliCorp Pipeline Systems, Inc., Complainant, v. Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company, Respondent

[Docket No. CP96–538–000]

Take notice that on May 23, 1996, UtiliCorp Pipeline Systems, Inc. (UPL), 10700 East 350 Highway, Kansas City, Missouri, 64138, filed a complaint in Docket No. CP96–538–000, pursuant to Section 5 of the Natural Gas Act and Rule 206 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. UPL charges that Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company (Panhandle) has acted in an unduly discriminatory and anticompetitive manner, and requests that Panhandle be ordered to provide an interconnection in Cass County, Missouri, with facilities to be owned by UPL's intrastate pipeline subsidiary, Missouri Pipeline Company (Missouri Pipeline), all as more fully set forth in the complaint which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

UPL also requests that, to the extent that the Commission finds that additional procedures, such as a show cause proceeding or an evidentiary hearing, are required to resolve the complaint, its complaint be consolidated with the previously filed complaints against Panhandle by Missouri Gas Energy (MGE) in Docket No. CP95–755 and by Mid Continent Market Center in Docket No. CP96–270. UPL states that the evidentiary record is more developed in those proceedings and they involve nearly identical facts and legal questions as represented in UPL's complaint.

Missouri Pipeline, a wholly-owned subsidiary of UPL, plans to acquire an abandoned oil pipeline and to convert a portion of the line to natural gas service as an intrastate pipeline extending about 32 miles from a point near Freeman, Missouri to a terminus near Sugar Creek in Jackson County, Missouri. Missouri Pipeline will use this pipeline, referred to as the Hawthorne project, to provide high pressure natural gas service to the Kansas City Power & Light Company Hawthorne Power Plant. The Hawthorne project will also have several other delivery points into MGE's local distribution system.

UPL states that it requested that Panhandle provide an interconnection with the Hawthorne project facilities, and offered to pay all the costs of the interconnection. UPL states that Panhandle responded that unless UPL had incremental firm transportation agreements for service into the Hawthorne project facilities, Panhandle would not allow an interconnection. UPL avers that Panhandle has, at other times and places, been willing to provide interconnections for interruptible service to end-users, but refuses to provide interconnections for potential competitors such as UPL, MGE, and Mid Continent Market Center.

Comment date: June 21, 1996, in accordance with the first paragraph of Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice. Answers to the Complaint shall also be due on or before June 21, 1996.

3. Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company

[Docket No. CP96–542–000]

Take notice that on May 24, 1996, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company (Panhandle), P.O. Box 1642, Houston, Texas 77251 filed in Docket No. CP96–542–000, a petition pursuant to Section 16 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Rule 207(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.207 (a)(2)), for a declaratory order concerning the present and future jurisdictional status of Mid Continent Market Center, Inc. (Mid Continent). Panhandle's reasons for its request are all more fully set forth in the petition which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Mid Continent was granted an NGA Section 1(c) ''Hindshaw'' exemption and a Section 284.224 Blanket Certificate by the Commission in 1995, see order at 72 FERC ¶ 62,274. Mid Continent has a complaint pending with the Commission against Panhandle in Docket Nos. CP96–270–000 and 001, see notices at 61 *FR* 18132 and 61 *FR* 25854. The complaint(s) concerns Panhandle's interconnection with KN Interstate Transmission Company's (KN Interstate) Haven Line pipeline segment in Reno County, Kansas. Mid Continent intends to buy the Haven Line from KN Interstate and construct a 9-mile pipeline segment to connect its system to the Haven Line.

Once such facilities are constructed and such pipeline interconnections are available to Mid Continent, Panhandle says that Mid Continent will no longer qualify for its Hindshaw exemption, because Mid Continent will be able to, and intends to, transport natural gas in interstate commerce for ultimate consumption outside the state of Kansas. Panhandle furthers says that Mid Continent will then have to file with the Commission for various certificate authorizations under Section 7 of the NGA, if it wants to initiate such interstate transportation services. Panhandle says that Mid Continent will have an unfair competitive advantage over jurisdictional interstate pipelines who have substantially more regulatory requirements, if Mid Continent is allowed to continue to operate under its Hindshaw exemption.

Panhandle petitions the Commission to make a finding that Mid Continent will no longer qualify for its Hindshaw exemption from the Commission's jurisdiction, and that Mid Continent will become a ''natural gas company'' subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, if Mid Continent completes its purchase of the Haven Line. Panhandle also wants the Commission to confirm that as a natural gas company, Mid Continent cannot continue its interstate operations unless it is granted:

(1) A Section 7(c) certificate to acquire the Haven Line;

(2) A Section 7(c) certificate to construct and/or operate any facilities connected to the Haven Line;

(3) A Section 284.221 Blanket Certificate; and,

(4) Approval of a Part 284 open access FERC Gas Tariff.

Further, Panhandle suggests that Mid Continent may be presently providing substantial interstate transportation service between various interstate pipelines within the state of Kansas, rather than interstate transportation service for its parent company, Western Resources, Inc., a local distribution company (LDC) in Kansas, and that LDC's customers. Panhandle says that Mid Continent's Hindshaw exemption was based on the later and intimates that Mid Continent's Hindshaw exemption may already be in jeopardy in light of the various recent Commission rulings cited.

Comment date: June 21, 1996, in accordance with the first paragraph of Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

4. Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation

[Docket No. CP96–545–000]

Take notice that on May 29, 1996, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco), P. O. Box 1396, Houston, Texas 77251, filed in Docket No. CP96–545–000 an application pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for authorization to construct and operate

certain pipeline facilities on Transco's system in order to create additional firm transportation capacity of the dekatherm equivalent of 115,000 Mcf of gas per day (Mcf/d) from points of receipt on Transco's Leidy Line to points of delivery in Transco's Northeast Market area by a proposed in-service date of November 1, 1997 (the SeaBoard Expansion Project), all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Transco states that the firm transportation service under the SeaBoard Expansion Project will be provided to seven shippers under Rate Schedule FT of Transco's FERC Gas Tariff, Volume No. 1, and Transco's blanket certificate under Part 284(G) of the Commission's regulations, and therefore, the SeaBoard firm transportation service will be subject to the terms and conditions of Transco's tariff as amended from time-to-time. Transco states that the Seaboard shippers have committed to firm transportation service for terms ranging from 15 to 21 years subject to the receipt of necessary regulatory approvals (including rolled-in rates) and the construction of the necessary facilities. It is stated that the SeaBoard Expansion Project will provide SeaBoard shippers with access to diverse natural gas supply sources at the Leidy area, including but not limited to, gas supplies sources on three interconnecting pipelines, purchased from suppliers, or delivered from third party storage providers at Leidy, Pennsylvania.

In order to provide the firm transportation service to the SeaBoard shippers, Transco proposes to construct, install and operate five pipeline loop segments and add a 15,000 horsepower (hp) compressor at its existing Compressor Station No. 205.

Transco states that it conducted an open season from August 7 through September 6, 1995, during which requests were accepted for up to 115,000 Mcf/d of firm transportation from points of receipt on Transco's Leidy Line to most points of delivery on the Transco system. As a result of the open season, Transco contends that it executed precedent agreements with seven shippers for a total of 115,000 Mcf/d of firm transportation capacity, fully subscribing the project. It is stated that the list of shippers participating in the SeaBoard Expansion Project and their corresponding transportation quantities and contract terms are set forth in the following table.

Shipper	Contract term (Yrs)	Total transportation contract quantity (Mcf/d)
Delmarva Power & Light Company	20	5,000
Enron Capital & Trade Resources Corp.	15	28,985
Penn Fuel Gas, Inc.	20	1,500
Pennsylvania Gas & Water Company	20	39,515
Renaissance Energy, Inc.	15	15,000
Sun Company, Inc.	21	15,000
Union Pacific Fuels, Inc.	15	10,000
Total	.....	115,000

Consistent with the Commission's Statement of Policy and after the facilities necessary to serve the market for the Project had generally been determined, Transco states that it solicited permanent capacity relinquishment offers to be effective on November 1, 1997 from existing shippers not submitting open season nominations to reduce the costs of the SeaBoard Expansion Project, to prevent the construction of unnecessary facilities, and to make use of unwanted firm capacity on the Transco system. Transco states that it received permanent capacity release offers from The Brooklyn Union Gas Company and Williams Energy Services Company (WESCO). Transco further states that it determined that the capacity offered in these release offers would not reduce the facilities required to provide firm service to the SeaBoard shippers. In addition, it is stated that the release capacity offered by WESCO was located outside the capacity path of the Project. Transco avers that it also received conditional capacity release offers from Public Service Electric & Gas Company (PSE&G) and UGI Utilities, Inc. (UGI) which were expressly contingent upon those shippers receiving an equivalent amount of firm transportation service in the SeaBoard Expansion Project. It is stated that the conditional nature of the capacity release offers was contrary to the Commission's Statement of Policy and to the purpose for which Transco solicited these offers which was to make use of unwanted firm transportation capacity on the system. Transco states that PSE&G and UGI were given the opportunity of either participating in the SeaBoard Expansion Project or offering permanently released capacity on an unconditional basis; however, both PSE&G and UGI declined.

In order to create the 115,000 Mcf/d of capacity to provide firm transportation service to the SeaBoard shippers, Transco proposes to construct and operate the following facilities:

(1) 10.57 miles of 36-inch diameter pipeline loop beginning at milepost 161.29 in Lycoming County, Pennsylvania and ending at milepost 171.86 in Clinton County, Pennsylvania.

(2) 6.67 miles of 36-inch diameter pipeline loop beginning at milepost 142.74 in Lycoming County, Pennsylvania and ending at milepost 149.41 in Lycoming County, Pennsylvania.

(3) 5.46 miles of 42-inch diameter pipeline loop beginning at milepost 1802.73 in Middlesex County, New Jersey and ending at milepost 1808.19 in Union County, New Jersey.

(4) 7.10 miles of 36-inch diameter pipeline loop beginning at milepost 18.96 in Burlington County, New Jersey and ending at milepost 26.06 in Burlington County, New Jersey.

(5) The replacement of an existing 6.3 miles of 12-inch diameter pipeline loop beginning at milepost 30.53 and ending at milepost 36.83 in Burlington County, New Jersey, with a 36-inch diameter pipeline loop. The 12-inch pipeline segment will be removed and the 36-inch replacement pipeline will be installed in the same trench.

(6) The addition of a new 15,000 hp, electric motor-driven compressor unit at Transco's existing Compressor Station 205 located at milepost 1773.30 in Mercer County, New Jersey.

(7) Modifications to the existing Milltown regulator station located at milepost 1790.84 in Middlesex, New Jersey, to increase the discharge

pressure into Transco's mainline E to 800 psig.

(8) Modifications to the existing Linden regulator station located at milepost 1808.19 in Union County, New Jersey, to reduce the pressure in Transco's 42-inch Mainline E from 800 psig to 638 psig.

(9) Addition of a 12-inch tap on Transco's existing Mainline A at milepost 1711.67 in Chester County, Pennsylvania to tie-in to an existing Transco 16-inch lateral.

(10) Installation of a pressure control valve and related piping, and a 290 hp nameplate uprating of six existing reciprocating engines (for a total nameplate uprating of 1,740 hp) at Transco's existing Compressor Station 200 located at milepost 1722.24 in Chester County, Pennsylvania.

Transco estimates that the proposed facilities will cost $117.7 million. Transco requests that the Commission grant rolled-in rate treatment of the costs of the SeaBoard facilities in Transco's next Section 4 rate proceeding which becomes effective following the in-service date of the Project. It is stated that the rate impact on existing customers of rolling in the costs of the SeaBoard Expansion Project is below the five percent threshold specified in the Commission's Statement of Policy, 71 FERC ¶ 61,241 (1995), for establishing a presumption in favor of rolled-in rates and the Project will produce significant system-wide operational and financial benefits and will be operated on an integrated basis with its existing facilities.

To meet the proposed in-service date for the SeaBoard Expansion Project, Transco requests that the Commission issue a preliminary determination approving all aspects of the application other than environmental matters by November 1, 1996, with a final determination and all appropriate certificate authorizations by January 24, 1997.

Comment date: June 21, 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.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–14347 Filed 6–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5516–2]

Agency Information Collection Activities Up for Renewal; Monthly Progress Reports.

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that EPA is planning to submit the following continuing Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB): Monthly Progress Reports, OMB Control Number 2030–0005. Before submitting the ICR to OMB for review and approval, EPA is soliciting comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection as described below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before August 6, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Acquisition Management (3802F), 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. Attention: Edward N. Chambers.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edward N. Chambers. (202) 260–6028 / FAX: (202) 260–1203 / CHAMBERS.ED@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Affected entities: Entities potentially affected by this action are EPA contractors.

Title: Monthly Progress Reports, OMB Control Number 2030–0005, expiration date 11–30–96.

Abstract: On a monthly basis, contractors are required to provide a progress report detailing what was accomplished on the contract for that period of time, what remains to be done, as well as a general listing of expenditures for that period of time. This allows EPA to monitor the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the work being performed. Once the information is received, it is reviewed against existing financial data, contractor deliverables, invoices, and agency records for verification. These reports are prescribed under clauses in EPA contracts.

Monthly progress reports contain confidential business information and are protected from release in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. No sensitive information is required.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information