

request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.212) for authorization to install one delivery tap under Equitrans's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-508-000 and CP86-676-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Equitrans proposes to install the proposed delivery tap on Equitrans field gathering pipeline No. F-598 in Wetzel County, West Virginia. The tap will be instituted to provide transportation deliveries to Equitable Gas for ultimate distribution to one residential customer. Equitrans will charge Equitable the applicable transportation rate contained in Equitrans FERC Gas Tariff on file with and approved by the Commission. Equitrans projects that the 1 Mcf per day of peak service requested is within the entitlements of Equitable Gas, and will not impact Equitrans peak day and annual deliveries. Equitrans has sufficient capacity to accomplish the deliveries described herein without detriment to its other customers.

Equitrans states that the new delivery tap is not prohibited by its existing tariff and the total volumes delivered to Equitable Gas will not exceed total volumes authorized prior to the request.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after 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 If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of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. 96-28027 Filed 10-31-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP97-60-000]

**Equitrans, L.P.; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization**

October 28, 1996.

Take notice that on October 21, 1996, Equitrans, L.P. (Equitrans), 3500 Park Lane, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15275-1102 filed in Docket No. CP97-60-000 a request pursuant to §§ 157.205, and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.212) for approval and permission to install a delivery tap for Equitable Gas Company (Equitable) for ultimate distribution to a residential customer, under the blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-508-000 and transferred to Equitrans in Docket No. CP86-676-000, 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.

Equitrans states that it proposes to install a delivery tap for the ultimate distribution to Ronald and Debra McNemar, 7 Oakridge Drive, Buckhannon, West Virginia. Equitrans indicates that the quantity of gas to be delivered through the proposed tap will be approximately 1 Mcf on a peak day. Equitrans asserts that the total volumes to be delivered to Equitable after this request do not exceed the total volumes authorized prior to this request. Equitrans also asserts that its tariff does not prohibit this type of service.

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 Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214), a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to § 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 therefor, 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. 96-28029 Filed 10-31-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP97-52-000]

**Florida Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Application for Abandonment**

October 28, 1996.

Take notice that on October 22, 1996, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT), 1400 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed, in Docket No. CP97-52-000, an abbreviated application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's Regulations for an order authorizing FGT to abandon by sale to Copano Field Services/Copano Bay, L.P. (Copano), the Blind Pass Facilities, consisting of 36 miles of various diameter pipeline (ranging from 3 inches to 6 inches in diameter) and measurement facilities, with appurtenances, located in San Patricio, Aransas, and Nueces Counties, Texas, all as more fully set forth in the application.

FGT relates that the Blind Pass Facilities have not been fully utilized for several years. FGT states they were designed to move approximately 10,000 Mcf per day of natural gas to the Florida market, but the most recent twelve-month period ending May 1996, shows an average daily volume of 500 Mcf/d, less than 5% of the design capacity. FGT asserts that because it is an interstate pipeline, subject to the Commission's regulatory authority, it cannot compete effectively with the non-jurisdictional entities providing gathering services. FGT maintains that it has been unsuccessful in connecting any significant additional supplies, even though this is a production area where new reserves and production are being added each year.

FGT, therefore, proposes to sell the Blind Pass Facilities to Copano, which will operate the facilities on a non-jurisdictional basis. Copano anticipates attaching additional supplies to the Blind Pass Facilities, which will increase the throughput through FGT's Station No. 3. FGT states that inasmuch as the facilities are to be sold to Copano, the capital and operating costs of the facilities will be removed from FGT's rate base and cost-of-service, and there will be no stranded facility costs associated with the proposed abandonment. FGT believes that Copano, as a non-jurisdictional entity, will have competitive flexibility, which FGT does not, which will allow Copano to compete on a level playing field with other unregulated gathering service providers. FGT asserts that approval of the abandonment should increase the supply options available to FGT's customers, increase competition in the