

1997. The OES also requests clarification that it has met the Commission's requirement for unbundling. If the Commission determines that the steps taken by OES are not sufficient, then the OES requests additional time to meet such requirements.

All affected parties and rate schedules are identified in an exhibit submitted with the filing. A copy of the filing was served upon the affected parties and the State Utility Regulatory Commissions of Ohio and Pennsylvania.

Comment date: April 25, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraph

E. 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 Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date. 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.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-10084 Filed 4-17-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP97-25-000]

Northern Natural Gas Company; Notice of Availability of the Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Peak Day 2000 Expansion Project

April 14, 1997.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) on the natural gas pipeline facilities proposed by Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern) in the above-referenced docket.

The EA was prepared to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. The staff concludes that approval of the proposed

project, with appropriate mitigating measures, would not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

The EA assesses the potential environmental effects of the construction and operation of the proposed pipeline looping facilities including:

- Three 30-inch-diameter mainline loops in Hardin County, Iowa and Rice and Washington Counties, Minnesota;
- Four branchline loops (6-, 6-, 6-, and 12-inch-diameter pipelines in Dakota, Scott, Wright, and Carver Counties, Minnesota and Dickinson County, Iowa;
- One 8-inch-diameter branchline replacement (Carver County, Minnesota) and one 6-inch-diameter branchline tie-over (Jackson County, Iowa);
- Three new compressor stations and six modified compressor stations in Washington, Steele, Rice, and Dakota Counties, Minnesota, Guthrie and Hardin Counties, Iowa, Clay County, Kansas, and Gage and Otoe County, Nebraska; and
- Three new town border stations and 31 modified town border stations in various counties in Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Nebraska.

The purpose of the proposed facilities would be to provide about 267,161 thousand cubic feet per day (Mcf/d) of gas to 26 local distribution companies, commercial, and industrial customers in Northern operational zones ABC, D, and EF.

The EA has been placed in the public files of the FERC and is available for public inspection at: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Public Reference and Files Maintenance Branch, 888 First Street, NE., Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426, (202) 208-1371.

Copies of the EA have been mailed to Federal, state and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, newspapers, and parties to this proceeding. A limited number of copies of the EA are available from the above address.

Specific Comment Request

Areas residents, local or state governments, intervenors, Northern, and other interested parties are asked to provide specific comments on whether the Rockford branchline alternative is reasonable and practicable and environmentally preferable to the proposed facilities. Comments should also address any effect on project timing and related cost/benefits.

Comment Procedures

Any person wishing to comment on the EA may do so. Written comments

must reference Docket No. CP97-25-000, and be addressed to: Office of the Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Room 1A, Washington, DC 20426.

Comments should be filed as soon as possible, but must be received no later than May 16, 1997, to ensure consideration prior to a Commission decision on this proposal.

Comments will be considered by the Commission but will not serve to make the commentator a party to the proceeding. Any person seeking to become a party to the proceeding must file a motion to intervene pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures (18 CFR 385.214).

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-10051 Filed 4-17-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5813-1]

Proposed Settlement; Acid Rain Allowance Allocations and Reserves Rule Litigation

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed settlement; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 113(g) of the Clean Air Act ("Act"), notice is hereby given of a proposed settlement of *Duke Power Company v. Environmental Protection Agency*, No. 93-1343 (D.C. Cir.) and a consolidated case.

This case involves a challenge to the final rule, entitled "Acid Rain Allowance Allocations and Reserves," which, *inter alia*, established provisions concerning the allocation of early reduction credit allowances under section 404(e) of the Act. 58 FR 15634 (March 23, 1993).

For a period of thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Environmental Protection Agency will receive written comments relating to the settlement from persons who were not named as parties to the litigation in question. The Agency or the Department of Justice may withhold or withdraw consent to the proposed settlement if the comments disclose facts or circumstances that indicate that such consent is inappropriate, improper, inadequate, or inconsistent with the requirements of the Act. Copies of the settlement are available from