

exclusive, i.e., limited to pelletized sorbents, subject to a license and other rights retained by the U.S. Government, and subject to other terms and conditions to be negotiated. DOE intends to grant the license, upon a final determination in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 209(c), unless within 60 days of this notice the Office of Institutional Development, Department of Energy, Morgantown Energy Technology Center receives in writing any of the following, together with the supporting documents:

(i) A statement from any person setting forth reasons why it would not be in the best interest of the United States to grant the proposed license; or

(ii) An application for a nonexclusive license to the invention, in which applicant states that it already has brought the invention to practical application or is likely to bring the invention to practical application expeditiously, for pelletized sorbents.

The Department will review all timely written responses to this notice, and will grant the license if, after expiration of the 60-day notice period, and after consideration of written responses to this notice, a determination is made, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 209(c), that the license grant is in the public interest.

Issued: September 9, 1996.

Thomas F. Bechtel,

Director, METC.

[FR Doc. 96-24023 Filed 9-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP93-100-000; Docket Nos. RP94-208-000, RP94-87-008, RP94-122-006, RP94-169-006, RP95-195-005, RP94-249-004, RP94-260-004, RP94-305-002, and RP94-364-001; Docket Nos. RP94-222-000, RP93-151-015, RP94-39-006, RP94-202-000, and RP94-309-003; Docket Nos. RP94-298-000, and TM94-29-000; and Docket Nos. RP94-347-000, RP94-150-000, RP94-266-000, and RP94-384-000]

Notice Establishing Format for Oral Argument

September 13, 1996.

In the Matter of: Dakota Gasification Company (successor-in-interest to the Department of Energy), Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, and ANR Pipeline Company

This notice establishes the format for the oral argument which the Commission schedule in an order issued

July 17, 1996.¹ This notice does so based upon notifications from the parties of the number of representatives they wished to make presentations and the manner in which they desired to allocate their allotted time.

In addition to the notifications received from the parties, Senators Kent Conrad and Byron Dorgan, and Congressman Earl Pomeroy, in letters to Chair Moler, indicate that they wish to have an opportunity to speak concerning the Great Plains project.

In its notification filing, the Dakota Ratepayers/State Commission Group pointed out that the Commission's order announcing the oral argument provided the three principal parties opposing the Initial Decision with a total of 1 and 1/2 hours of argument, while providing Ratepayers Group, the one party supporting the Initial Decision, only 30 minutes. The Ratepayers Group also urged that they should not be "bookended", i.e., preceded and succeeded by one or more of their adversaries in this proceeding. To remedy this situation, the Ratepayers Group requests that (1) none of the three parties opposing the Initial Decision should be permitted to relinquish time to the other; (2) the Ratepayers Group should be schedule last for both the presentation of initial arguments and rebuttal; and (3) the Ratepayers Group should be allocated 30 minutes to present its arguments and 15 minutes for rebuttal.

The proposals of the Ratepayers Group have been considered and they are reasonable. In addition, both Senators from North Dakota and Congressman Pomeroy will be provided an opportunity to address the issues that the Commission has set for oral argument in this proceeding. Accordingly, consistent with the notifications concerning the oral argument filed by the parties in this proceeding, the time for the oral argument will be allocated follows:

Hon. Kent Conrad, United States Senate—10 minutes
 Hon. Byron L. Dorgan, United States Senate—10 minutes
 Hon. Earl Pomeroy, United States House of Representatives—10 minutes
 Dakota Gasification Represented by MaryJane Reynolds, Mark D. Foss—20 minutes
 The Department of Energy, Represented by Hon. Robert R. Nordhaus, James K. White, Lot Cooke—20 minutes
 The Pipelines, Represented by James F. Bendernagel, Jr., Daniel F. Collins, Michael J. Fremuth—20 minutes

The Ratepayers Group, Represented by Bruce Kiely, Robert G. Hardy—30 minutes

Rebuttal

Dakota Gasification—10 minutes
 The Department of Energy—10 minutes
 The Pipelines—10 minutes
 The Ratepayers Group—15 minutes

The oral argument will be held on Wednesday, September 25, 1996, at 1:00 p.m. in Hearing Room 1 at 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-24033 Filed 9-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP96-333-000]

National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation; Notice of Technical Conference

September 13, 1996.

In the Commission's order issued on September 5, 1996, in the above-captioned proceeding, the Commission held that the filing raises issues for which a technical conference is to be convened.

The conference to address the issues is being scheduled for Friday, September 27, 1996, at 10:30 a.m., in a room to be designated at the offices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, D.C. 20426.

All interested persons and Staff are permitted to attend.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-23997 Filed 9-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. OR96-15-000]

Ultramar Inc., Complainant v. SFPP, L.P., Respondent; Notice of Complaint

September 13, 1996.

Take notice that on August 30, 1996, pursuant to sections 9, 13(1), and 15(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 (49 U.S.C. §§ 9, 13(1), 15(1)), Rule 206 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.206), the Commission's Procedural Rules Applicable to Oil Pipeline Proceedings (18 CFR § 343.1(c)), Ultramar Inc. (Ultramar) tendered for filing a complaint against charges collected by SFPP, L.P. (SFPP) for the pipeline transportation of petroleum products. Ultramar complains against the charge collected for SFPP's drain dry system at Watson Station in California (Drain Dry).

¹76 FERC ¶ 61,036 (1996).