AOG also contends that its interruptible transportation service is a gathering service that has been regulated by the Commission as a matter of convenience. Statement at 15. This argument proves too much, for if AOG's facilities are exempt gathering facilities, it should not have a blanket certificate. Indeed, AOG specifies that it does not want the Commission to declare that AOG's facilities are ''gathering.'' Statement at 17 n.25.

AOG next argues that the Commission cannot require it to amend its operating statement by including the sales provision, and adds that it is not aware that the Commission has ever required an intrastate pipeline or an Order No. 63 transporter to amend its operating statement. Statement at 18–19. AOG quotes from *Transok, Inc.*[25] for the proposition that, while the Commission can reject or suspend proposed changes in tariff provisions that interstate pipelines file under NGA section 4, it cannot reject or suspend an Order No. 63 transporter's operating statement filed under NGPA section 311. Here, the Commission is not considering whether to reject or suspend AOG's operating statement. Instead, the Commission is exercising its authority to determine whether AOG's sales provision is lawful and whether it should be included in AOG's operating statement. That is consistent with our actions in *Transok*. There, the Commission determined, *inter alia*, that an intrastate pipeline that provides section 311 service must curtail firm shippers on a nondiscriminatory basis. In that proceeding, the Commission directed Transok to amend its operating statement to meet this requirement.[26]

AOG next cites *CNG Transmission Corporation*[27] for the proposition that the Commission can only recommend (not require) the terms and conditions under which an LDC transacts business on its system. In that order, the Commission declined to specify how an LDC should broker transportation capacity to end users receiving the LDC's non-jurisdictional distribution service. Here, the Commission is exercising its authority over the terms of AOG's jurisdictional transportation.

Finally, AOG suggests that because the Commission approved its rates three times since it filed its operating statement, the sales provision is insulated from further review. Statement at 19. But the Commission never addressed the sales provision when it approved AOG's rates, and there is no indication that the Commission was aware of it.

The Commission will require AOG to show why, by including the sales provision in its interstate IT agreements, and by not disclosing this provision in its operating statement, it has not violated and is not violating NGA sections 4(a) and 4(b), NGPA section 311(a)(2) and sections 284.9(b)(1), 284.123(a) and 284.123(e) of the Commission's regulations.

The Commission orders:

(A) Within 30 days of the issuance of this order, AOG shall:

(1) File an answer to the allegations of violations that conforms to the requirements of Rule 213 of the Commission's Rules, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213 (1996). In its answer, AOG shall admit or deny, specifically and in detail, each allegation set forth in Part II of this order, and shall set forth every defense relied on. If an allegation is only partially accurate, AOG shall specify that part of the allegation it admits and that part of the allegation it denies.

(2) Show why, by including the sales provision in its interstate IT agreements, it has not violated and is not violating NGA sections 4(a) and 4(b), NGPA section 311(a)(2) and section 284.9(b)(1) of the Commission's regulations.

(3) Show why, by not disclosing the sales provision in its operating statement, it has not violated and is not violating sections 284.9(b)(1) and 284.123(e) of the Commission's regulations.

(4) AOG shall separately state the facts and the arguments that it advances. AOG must support with exhibits, affidavits and/or prepared testimony any facts that it alleges. AOG's statement of material facts must include citation to supporting data. In addition to its answer, AOG must respond to the following requests for information and documents. All materials must be subscribed and verified as set forth in sections 385.2005 (a) and (b)(2) of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. §§ 385.2005 (a) and (b)(2) (1996).

(a) State the full legal name and business address of each entity with which AOG has executed a currently effective Order No. 63 transportation agreement. For each entity identified, provide a copy of the transportation agreement, as amended. For each transportation agreement provided, state the expiration date of the agreement if it is not clearly set forth in the copy of the agreement.

(b) State whether AOG has ever invoked the sales provision (or a similar provision) for any transportation agreement provided in response to (a).

(c) For each transportation agreement for which AOG has invoked the sales provision (or a similar provision), provide the following information and documents:

(i) The date on which AOG invoked the provision;

(ii) The period during which the shipper sold gas to AOG pursuant to the provision;

(iii) The quantity and sales price of the gas the shipper sold to AOG, and the amount of the transportation charges AOG refunded to the shipper; and

(iv) All documents relating to AOG's purchase of gas under the provision or notification to the shipper that sales would no longer be required under the provision.

(B) AOG's request for confidential treatment for its June 23, 1997 statement is granted with respect to the offer of settlement contained therein and denied with respect to the remainder of the statement.

(C) Notice of this proceeding will be published in the **Federal Register**. Interested parties will have 20 days from the date of publication of the notice to intervene.

By the Commission.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–21613 Filed 8–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[25] 54 FERC ¶61,229 at 61,672 n.5 (1991).

[26] *Id.* at 61,676. In response, Transok filed an amended operating statement that deleted a provision that the Commission determined might discriminate against interstate shippers. 56 FERC ¶61,275 at 62,083 n.12 (1991).

[27] 55 FERC ¶61,189 at 61,627 (1991).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP97–663–000]

CNG Transmission Corporation; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authority

August 11, 1997.

Take notice that on July 23, 1997, CNG Transmission Corporation (CNG), 445 West Main Street, Clarksburg, West Virginia 26301, filed in Docket No. CP97–663–000 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, 157.211 and 157.216) for authorization to expand the facilities at the existing Jefferson Measuring and Regulation Station (Jefferson Station) near Jefferson, Frederick County, Maryland, under CNG's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–537–000 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.

CNG states that the existing Jefferson Station must be expanded to provide additional natural gas service to Washington Gas Light Company (Washington Gas Light). CNG states that Washington Gas Light has requested an increase from 2,000 Dth/day to 24,000 Dth/day in the natural gas service CNG provides them through the Jefferson Station. CNG states that the maximum daily design delivery capacity of the modified Jefferson Station equipment is 24,000 Dth/day.

CNG states that under Letter Agreement dated May 29, 1997, Washington Gas Light has consented to execute a new service agreement with CNG for additional deliveries of gas. CNG also states that the total estimated cost of the construction is $1,200,000, and that Washington Gas Light will reimburse CNG for one half of the costs of such expansion upon completion of the station.

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 therefor, 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–21610 Filed 8–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP97–681–000]

Florida Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

August 11, 1997.

Take notice that on August 4, 1997, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT), 1400 Smith Street, Houston, Florida 77002, filed in Docket No. CP97–681–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.212) for authorization to construct and operate a delivery point in Levy County, Florida under FGT's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–553–000 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.

FGT proposes to construct, operate, and own an additional delivery point for West Florida Natural Gas Company (West Florida) at or near mile post 53.2 on its existing Inglis Lateral in Levy County, Florida. FGT states that the subject delivery point will include a tap, a valve, minor connecting pipe, electronic flow measurement equipment, and other related appurtenant facilities necessary for FGT to deliver up to a maximum of 200 MMBtu per day and 73,000 per year. FGT will be reimbursed for the construction costs which is estimated at $57,000. FGT further states that West Florida will construct, own, and operate the meter and regulation station.

FGT states that the delivery point is not prohibited by its existing tariff and that it has sufficient capacity to accomplish deliveries without detriment or disadvantage to other customers. The proposed delivery point will not have an effect on FGT's peak day and annual deliveries and the total volumes delivered will not exceed total volumes authorized prior to this 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 therefor, 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–21611 Filed 8–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 1218]

Georgia Power Company; Notice of Availability of Study Results and Request for Additional Studies

August 11, 1997.

Georgia Power Company is currently engaged in the process of obtaining from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) a new license for the Flint River Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 1218). The current license for the project is due to expire on September 30, 2001. The project is located on the Flint River, near the City of Albany, in Dougherty and Lee Counties, Georgia. Under the Commission's Regulations, an application for license for the project must by filed by September 30, 1999. Georgia Power Company is managing relicensing activities in cooperation with a team of federal and state resource agencies, conservation groups, and local governments (the Consultation Team).

Pursuant to the Energy Policy Act of 1992, and the Commission's Regulations, Georgia Power Company intends to prepare a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) as part of the license application, to be filed with the Commission, for the project. A public scoping meeting was held on September 12, 1995 to identify the scope of environmental issues that should be analyzed in the DEA.

Based on information contained in Scoping Document I, and following receipt of additional informational from resource agencies and other interested parties, Georgia Power Company prepared and circulated Scoping Document II. Study plans, designed to address the environmental concerns raised during the scoping process, were subsequently prepared by Georgia Power Company and their environmental consultant. The study plans were then finalized, and studies were undertaken from late Spring 1996 through late Spring 1997. During the field studies, Georgia Power Company and their environmental consultant worked closely with the participating agencies to coordinate and refine the studies. During the period from August 15, 1997 until October 14, 1997, these study reports will be available for public review in Georgia Power Company's public library at its offices at 333 Piedmont Avenue in Atlanta, Georgia. The study reports will also be available in the Commission's Public Reference Room at 888 1st Street, NE in