meetings, and a name placed on the speakers' list.

f. You can make a difference by sending a letter addressing your specific comments or concerns about this project. Focus on the potential environmental effects of the alternatives, and methods to avoid or lessen impacts. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. Comments must be received by August 15, 1996.

g. The COE will evaluate alternatives and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts. An independent analysis of the issues will be presented in the Draft EIS, available in June 1997. A 45-day comment period will be allotted for review of the Draft EIS.

h. State and Federal agencies are asked to indicate whether they want to be cooperating agencies for the purpose of producing the EIS. Those identified to date include:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
U.S. National Park Service
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency
WV Department of Highways
WV Division of Environmental Protection
WV Division of Natural Resources
WV State Historic Preservation Office

i. These, or any other Federal, State or local agencies that want to participate as a cooperating agency should send a letter describing the extent to which you wish to be involved to the contact provided with this notice. Please provide written comments by August 15, 1996.

j. A Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register—March 11, 1996, Volume 61, No. 48, page 9681.

Gregory D. Showalter,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–17743 Filed 7–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710–GM–M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Submission for OMB review; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Director, Information Resources Group, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before August 12, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Wendy Taylor, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503. Requests for copies of the proposed information collection requests should be addressed to Patrick J. Sherrill, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW., Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202–4651.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patrick J. Sherrill, (202) 708–8196. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Director of the Information Resources Group publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g., new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment at the address specified above. Copies of the requests are available from Patrick J. Sherrill at the address specified above.

Dated: July 8, 1996.

Gloria Parker,

Director, Information Resources Group.

Office of the Under Secretary

Type of Review: New.

Title: Evaluation of School-to-Work Implementation—Survey of Local Partnerships and 18 Month Student Follow-up.

Frequency: Annually.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; State, local or Tribal Government, SEAs or LEAs.

Reporting and Recordkeeping Hour Burden:

Responses: 7,896.
Burden Hours: 9,150.

Abstract: The School-to-Work (STW) Act of 1994 directs the Secretaries of Education and Labor to evaluate progress made by States and local communities in establishing systems to promote effective school-to-work transitions. Information will be collected through surveys of local STW partnerships, case studies and surveys of high school seniors. This submission seeks clearance for surveys of local STW partnerships and an 18 month follow-up student survey. Data collected will be used in reports to Congress and to others interested in school-to-work programs.

[FR Doc. 96–17697 Filed 7–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[CFDA No: 84.278e]

Office of Vocational and Adult Education

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year (FY) 1996 for School-to-Work Opportunities State Implementation Grants (State Implementation Grants)

Purpose of Program: State Implementation Grants will enable States to implement their plans for statewide School-to-Work Opportunities systems. Such systems will offer young Americans access to programs designed to prepare them for a first job in high-skill, high-wage careers, and for further education and training. Funds awarded under section 212 of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act will serve as ''venture capital'' to allow States to build comprehensive School-to-Work Opportunities systems which provide all youth with high-quality education that integrates school-based learning, work-based learning and connecting activities, prepares young Americans for success in high-skill, high-wage careers, and increases their opportunities for further education and training.

Eligible Applicants: All States, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, that did not receive a State

Implementation Grant in FY 1994 or 1995 are eligible for Implementation Grants under this competition. In accordance with the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, the Governor must submit the application on behalf of the State.

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: August 30, 1996. Telefacsimile (FAX) applications will not be accepted.

Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: October 29, 1996.

Applications Available: Application packages will be mailed directly to both the Governor and the State School-to-Work Development Grant contact of each eligible applicant. Applications will be mailed to applicants, via overnight mail, within one day of the publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

Available Funds: Approximately $55.5 million (funding for the first twelve months).

Estimated Range of Awards: The Departments expect the minimum award to be approximately $1.5 million and the maximum award to be approximately $20 million. The Departments wish to emphasize that, in accordance with sections 212, 213, 214, and 216 of the Act, the actual amount of each award made under this competition will depend on such factors as the scope and quality of the State plan and application, the number of projected participants in programs operating within each State's School-to-Work Opportunities system, and the State's youth population. Therefore, the Departments strongly encourage applicants to consider these factors, the estimated average grant award amount, and the amount of awards made to Implementation States in prior rounds in deciding what funds to request. Applicants are discouraged from requesting significantly more funds than States with similar numbers of school-age youth received last year without a strong programmatic basis for doing so. Information on last years' awards is contained in the application package.

Estimated Average Size of Awards: $4.5 million.

Estimated Number of Awards: Up to 13.

Note: The Departments are not bound by any estimates in this notice.

Project Period: Up to five years (five twelve-month grant periods).

Applicable Regulations: In accordance with the authority provided in the Act, the Departments have determined that the administrative provisions contained in the Education Department General Administrative Regulations, 34 CFR parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 82, 85, and 86, will apply to grants awarded to State partnerships under this competition. The selection criteria and definition published in this notice, as well as the instructions contained in the application package and the eligibility and other requirements specified in the Act, apply to this competition.

Definition

All definitions in the Act apply to School-to-Work Opportunities systems funded under this and future State Implementation Grant competitions. Since the Act does not contain a definition of the term ''administrative costs'' as used in section 217 of the Act, the Departments apply the following definition to competitions for State Implementation Grants:

The term ''administrative costs'' means the activities of a State or local partnership that are necessary for the proper and efficient performance of its duties under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act and that are not directly related to the provision of services to participants or otherwise allocable to the system's allowable activities listed in section 215(b)(4) and section 215(c) of the Act. Administrative costs may be either personnel costs or non-personnel costs, and direct or indirect. Costs of administration shall include, but not be limited, to—

(a) Costs of salaries, wages, and related costs of the grantee's staff engaged in—

(1) Overall system management, system coordination, and general administrative functions;

(2) Preparing program plans, budgets, and schedules, as well as applicable amendments;

(3) Monitoring of local initiatives, pilot projects, subrecipients, and related systems and processes;

(4) Procurement activities, including the award of specific subgrants, contracts, and purchase orders;

(5) Developing systems and procedures, including management information systems, for assuring compliance with the requirements under the Act;

(6) Preparing reports and other documents related to the Act; and

(7) Coordinating the resolution of audit findings.

(b) Costs for goods and services required for administration of the system;

(c) Costs of system-wide management functions; and

(d) Travel costs incurred for official business in carrying out grant management or administrative activities.

Note on Administrative Cost Cap: In accordance with section 215(b)(6) of the Act, a local partnership receiving a subgrant from State Implementation Grant funds awarded under the competition may use no more than 10 percent of that subgrant for administrative costs associated with carrying out School-to-Work program activities in one fiscal year. This notice clarifies that a 10 percent cap on administrative costs applies to both State Implementation grantees and all State-funded local partnerships.

Selection Criteria and Review Process

Under this School-to-Work Opportunities Implementation Grant competition, the Departments will use the following selection criteria in evaluating applications. These criteria were published in final in the Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for School-to-Work State Implementation Grants in FY 1995 (60 FR 26812). The Departments will utilize a two-phase review process. In the first phase, review teams, including peer reviewers, will evaluate applications using the selection criteria and the associated point values. In the second phase, review teams, including peers, will visit high-ranking States to gain additional information and further assess State plans. The following selection criteria will apply to both review phases. The Departments will base final funding decisions on information obtained during the site visits, the ranking of applications as a result of the first-phase review, and such other factors as replicability, sustainability, innovation, and geographic balance and diversity of program approaches.

Note: If the initial round of site visits yields fewer States in the competitive range than the Departments anticipated funding, and funds remain to finance additional awards, a second round of visits may be conducted. Candidates for site visits will be selected from States for which site visits have not been previously conducted, according to the scores following the peer review of applications. All site visit determinations will be made in a manner consistent with the process outlined above, and one or more of these States may also be recommended for funding.

Selection Criterion 1: Comprehensive Statewide System.

Points: 35.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider—

(a) *20 points.* The extent to which the State has designed a comprehensive statewide School-to-Work Opportunities plan that—

(1) Includes effective strategies for integrating school-based and work-

based learning, integrating academic and vocational education, and establishing linkages between secondary and postsecondary education;

(2) Is likely to produce systemic change in the way youth are educated and prepared for work and for further education, across all geographic areas of the State, including urban and rural areas, within a reasonable period of time;

(3) Includes strategic plans for effectively aligning other statewide priorities, such as education reform, economic development, and workforce development into a comprehensive system that includes the School-to-Work Opportunities system and supports its implementation at all levels—State, regional and local;

(4) Ensures that all students, including school dropouts, will have a range of options, including options for higher education, additional training and employment in high-skill, high-wage jobs; and

(5) Ensures coordination and integration with existing local education and training programs and resources, including those School-to-Work Opportunities systems established through local partnership grants and Urban/Rural Opportunities grants funded under Title III of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, and related Federal, State, and local programs.

(b) *15 points.* The extent to which the State plan demonstrates the State's capability to achieve the statutory requirements and to effectively put in place the system components in Title I of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, including—

(1) The work-based learning component that includes the statutory mandatory activities and that contributes to the transformation of workplaces into active learning components of the education system through an array of learning experiences, such as mentoring, job-shadowing, unpaid work experiences, school-sponsored enterprises, supported work experiences, and paid work experiences;

(2) The school-based learning component that will provide students, as well as school dropouts, with high level academic skills consistent with academic standards that the State establishes for all students, including, where applicable, standards established under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act;

(3) A connecting activities component to provide a functional link between school and work activities and employers and educators for both students and school dropouts; and

(4) A plan for an effective process for assessing students' skills and knowledge required in career majors, and the process for issuing portable skill certificates that are benchmarked to high quality standards such as those the State establishes under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and for periodically assessing and collecting information on student outcomes, as well as a realistic strategy and timetable for implementing the process.

Selection Criterion 2: Commitment of Employers and Other Interested Parties.

Points: 15.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider the following:

(a) The extent to which the State has obtained the active involvement of employers and other interested parties listed in section 213(d)(5) of the Act, such as locally elected officials, secondary schools and postsecondary educational institutions (or related agencies), business associations, industrial extension centers, employees, labor organizations or associations of such organizations, teachers, related services personnel, students, parents, community-based organizations, rehabilitation agencies and organizations, registered apprenticeship agencies, local vocational education agencies, vocational student organizations, State or regional cooperative education associations, and human service agencies, as well as State legislators.

(b) Whether the State plan demonstrates an effective and convincing strategy for continuing the involvement of employers and other interested parties in the statewide system, such as the parties listed in section 213(d)(5) of the Act, as well as State legislators.

(c) The extent to which the State plan proposes to include private sector representatives as joint partners with educators in the oversight and governance of the overall School-to-Work Opportunities system.

(d) The extent to which the State has developed strategies to provide a range of opportunities for employers to participate in the design and implementation of the School-to-Work Opportunities system, including membership on councils and partnerships; assistance in setting standards, designing curricula and determining outcomes; providing worksite experience for teachers; helping to recruit other employers; and providing worksite learning activities for students, such as mentoring, job shadowing, unpaid work experiences, supported work experiences, and paid work experiences.

Selection Criterion 3: Participation of All Students.

Points: 15.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will refer to the definition of the term ''all students'' in section 4(2) of the Act, and consider the following:

(a) The extent to which the State will implement effective strategies and systems to—

(1) Provide all students with equal access to the full range of program components specified in sections 102 through 104 of the Act and related activities such as recruitment, enrollment and placement activities; and

(2) Ensure that all students have meaningful opportunities to participate in School-to-Work Opportunities programs.

(b) Whether the plan identifies potential barriers to the participation of any students, and the degree to which the plan proposes effective ways of overcoming these barriers.

(c) The degree to which the State has developed realistic goals and methods for assisting young women to participate in School-to-Work Opportunities programs leading to employment in high-performance, high-paying jobs, including nontraditional jobs and has developed realistic goals to ensure an environment free from racial and sexual harassment.

(d) The feasibility and effectiveness of the State's strategy for serving students from rural communities with low population densities.

(e) The State's methods for ensuring safe and healthy work environments for students, including strategies for encouraging schools to provide students with general awareness training in occupational safety and health as part of the school-based learning component, and for encouraging employers to provide risk-specific training as part of the work-based learning component.

Note: Experience with the FY 1994 and FY 1995 School-to-Work Opportunities State Implementation Grant applications has shown that many applicants do not give adequate attention to designing programs that will serve school dropouts and programs that will serve students with disabilities. Therefore, the Departments would like to remind applicants that reviewers will consider whether an application includes strategies to specifically identify the barriers to participation of dropouts and students with disabilities and proposes specific methods for effectively overcoming such barriers and for integrating academic and vocational learning, integrating work-based learning and school-based learning, and

linking secondary and postsecondary education for dropouts and students with disabilities. Applicants are reminded that JTPA Title II funds may be used to design and provide services to students who meet the appropriate JTPA eligibility criteria.

Selection Criterion 4: Stimulating and Supporting Local School-to-Work Opportunities Systems.

Points: 15.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider the following:

(a) The effectiveness of the State's plan for ensuring that local partnerships include employers, representatives of local educational agencies and local postsecondary educational institutions (including representatives of area vocational education schools, where applicable), local educators (such as teachers, counselors, or administrators), representatives of labor organizations or nonmanagerial employee representatives, and students, and others such as those included in section 4(11)(B) of the Act.

(b) The extent to which the State assists local entities to form and sustain effective local partnerships serving communities in all parts of the State.

(c) Whether the plan includes an effective strategy for addressing the specific labor market needs of localities that will be implementing School-to-Work Opportunities systems.

(d) The effectiveness of the State's strategy for building the capacity of local partnerships to design and implement local School-to-Work Opportunities systems that meet the requirements of the Act.

(e) The extent to which the State will provide a variety of assistance to local partnerships, as well as the effectiveness of the strategies proposed for providing this assistance, including such services as: developing model curricula and innovative instructional methodologies, such as creative strategies for meeting the needs of school dropouts; expanding and improving career and academic counseling services; and assisting localities in the use of technology-based instructional techniques.

(f) The effectiveness of the State's strategy for providing staff development to teachers, employers, mentors, counselors, related services personnel, and others who are critical to successful implementation of School-to-Work Opportunities systems for all youth, such as staff in alternative learning environments.

(g) The ability of the State to provide constructive assistance to local partnerships in identifying critical and emerging industries and occupational clusters.

Selection Criterion 5: Resources.

Points: 10.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider the following:

(a) The amount and variety of other Federal, State, and local resources the State will commit to implementing its School-to-Work Opportunities plan, as well as the specific use of these funds, including funds for JTPA Summer and Year-Round Youth programs and Perkins Act programs.

(b) The feasibility and effectiveness of the State's long-term strategy for using other resources, including private sector resources, to maintain the statewide system when Federal resources under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act are no longer available.

(c) The extent to which the State is able to limit administrative costs in order to maximize the funds spent on the delivery of services to students, as required in section 214(b)(3)(B) of the Act, while ensuring the efficient administration of the School-to-Work Opportunities system.

Criterion 6: Management Plan.

Points: 10.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider the following:

(a) The adequacy of the management structure that the State proposes for the School-to-Work Opportunities system.

(b) The extent to which the State's management plan anticipates barriers to implementation and proposes effective methods for addressing barriers as they arise.

(c) Whether the application includes an evaluation plan containing feasible, measurable goals for the School-to-Work Opportunities system, based on performance measures contained in section 402(a) of the Act.

(d) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes an effective method for collecting information relevant to the State's progress in meeting its goals, and is likely to assist the State to meet its School-to-Work Opportunities system objectives, to gauge the success of the system in achieving those objectives, to continuously improve the system's effectiveness, and to contribute to the review of results across all States.

(e) Whether the plan includes a feasible workplan for the School-to-Work Opportunities system that includes major planned objectives over a five-year period.

Additional Priority Points

As required by section 214(a)(1) and (a)(2) of the Act, the Departments will give priority to applications that demonstrate the highest level of concurrence among State partners with the State plan, and to applications that require paid, high quality work-based learning experiences as an integral part of the School-to-Work Opportunities system by assigning additional points—above the 100 points described in the criteria—as follows:

(a) *Highest Levels of Concurrence—5 Points*

Up to 5 points will be awarded to applications that can fully demonstrate that each of the State partners listed in section 213(b)(4) of the Act concurs with the State School-to-Work Opportunities plan, and that the State partners' concurrence is backed by a commitment of time and resources to implement the plan.

(b) *Paid, High-quality Work-based Learning—10 Points*

Up to 10 points will be awarded to applications that demonstrate that the State—

(1) Has developed effective plans for requiring, to the maximum extent feasible, paid, high-quality work experience as an integral part of the State's School-to-Work Opportunities system, and for offering the paid, high-quality work experiences to the largest number of participating students and school dropouts as is feasible; and

(2) Has established methods for ensuring consistently high quality work-based learning experiences across the State.

For Applications or Information Contact: Karen Clark, National School-to-Work Office, 400 Virginia Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20024. Telephone: (202) 401–6222 (this is not a toll-free number). Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

Information about the Department's funding opportunities, including copies of application notices for discretionary grant competitions, can be viewed on the Department's electronic bulletin board (ED Board), telephone (202) 260–9950; or on the Internet Gopher Server at GOPHER.ED.GOV (under Announcements, Bulletins and Press Releases). However, the official application notice for a discretionary grant competition is the notice published in the Federal Register.

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6101 *et seq.*

Dated: July 9, 1996.

Timothy M. Barnicle,

Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor.

Patricia W. McNeil,

Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education, Department of Education.

[FR Doc. 96–17870 Filed 7–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Office of Fossil Energy

[FE Docket Nos. 96–25–NG, 96–27–NG, 96–28–NG, 96–30–NG, 96–32–NG, 96–33–NG and 96–34–NG]

The Brooklyn Union Gas Company, et al.; Orders Granting Authorization to Import and/or Export Natural Gas

AGENCY: Office of Fossil Energy, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of orders.

SUMMARY: The Office of Fossil Energy of the Department of Energy gives notice that it has issued Orders authorizing various imports and/or exports of natural gas. These Orders are summarized in the attached Appendix.

These Orders are available for inspection and copying in the Office of Fuels Programs Docket Room, 3–F056, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586–9478. The Docket Room is open between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 1, 1996.

Clifford P. Tomaszewski,

Director, Office of Natural Gas, Office of Fuels Programs, Office of Fossil Energy.

APPENDIX—IMPORT/EXPORT AUTHORIZATIONS GRANTED

[DOE/FE AUTHORITY]

Order No.	Date issued	Importer/exporter FE docket No.	Import volume	Export volume	Comments
1168	05/23/96	The Brooklyn Union Gas Company (96–25–NG).		50 Bcf/term	Blanket for 2 years from and to Canada.
1169	5/23/96	The Brooklyn Union Gas Company (96–27–NG).		50 Bcf/term	Blanket for 2 years to Mexico.
1170	05/29/96	The Brooklyn Union Gas Company (96–28–NG).	50 Bcf/term		Blanket for 2 years from Mexico.
1171	06/03/96	Onyx–CCGM, L.C. (96–30–NG)	110 Bcf/term	Combined total (See import).	Blanket for 2 years from and to Mexico.
1172	06/07/96	National Fuel Resources, Inc. (96–32–NG)	8 Bcf/term	8 Bcf/term	Blanket for 2 years from and to Canada.
1173	06/07/96	Michigan Consolidated Gas Company (96–33–NG).	73 Bcf/term		Blanket for 2 years from Canada.
1174	06/14/96	CU Energy Marketing, Inc. (96–34–NG)	200 Bcf/term		Blanket for 2 years from Canada.

[FR Doc. 96–17754 Filed 7–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP96–299–000]

Carnegie Interstate Pipeline Company; Notice of Proposed Change in FERC Gas Tariff

July 8, 1996.

Take notice that on July 1, 1996, Carnegie Interstate Pipeline Company (''CIPCO'') tendered for filing the following revised tariff sheet to its FERC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 1, to become effective on August 1, 1996:

Eighth Revised Sheet No. 7

CIPCO states that this is its quarterly filing pursuant to Section 32.2 of the General Terms and Conditions of its FERC Gas Tariff to reflect prospective changes in transportation costs associated with unassigned upstream capacity held by CIPCO on Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation (''Texas Eastern'') for the 3-month period commencing August 1, 1996 and ending October 31, 1996. The filing reflects an increase in the Transportation Cost Rate (''TCR'') from $0.8558 to $0.9786. The new TCR includes a TCR Adjustment of $1.4691 and a TCR Surcharge credit of $0.4905.

CIPCO states that copies of its filing were served on all jurisdictional customers and 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, NE., Washington, DC. 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. All such motions or protests must be filed as provided in Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. 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. 96–17719 Filed 7–11–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. RP96–298–000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

July 8, 1996.

Take notice that on July 1, 1996, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) filed the following revised tariff sheets to its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1 (Tariff) bearing a proposed effective date of August 1, 1996.

Thirteenth Revised Sheet No. 25
Thirteenth Revised Sheet No. 26
Thirteenth Revised Sheet No. 27
Fourteenth Revised Sheet No. 28

Columbia states that this filing is being made pursuant to Section 46 (Stranded Facilities Charge (SFC)) of the General Terms and Conditions (GTC) of Columbia's FERC Gas Tariff, Second