Northern proposes to abandon in-place a single staged 1,080 horsepower compressor unit (Big Lake Unit No. 1) located at its Big Lake compressor station (Big Lake Station) in Reagan County, Texas. Northern indicates that currently the Big Lake Station consists of four compressor units totaling 4,360 horsepower. Northern indicates that the installation of blind flanges or weld caps during abandonment will be completed, as required, so as not to affect the operation of the remaining units at the Big Lake Station.

Northern advises that it proposes to abandon in its entirety the Pecos County No. 2 Station (Pecos Station), which currently consists of three compressor units, totaling 3,000 horsepower, and to move two of those units to a new facility to be constructed during the summer 1995, the Jal Compressor Station located in Lea County, New Mexico. Northern states that the new facility will be constructed on Northern's 16 inch transmission branchline approximately 26 miles north of the existing Kermit Compressor Station in Winkler County, Texas, and will be installed pursuant to Northern's blanket authority granted on September 1, 1982, in Docket No. CP82–401. Northern proposes to abandon the remaining unit at the Pecos Station in-place. Northern further indicates that all gas and service piping to the Pecos Station will be disconnected and sealed off either by the installation of blind flanges or weld caps.

Northern avers that it intends to utilize the remaining Pecos Station unit and the Big Lake unit No. one, or parts from these units, in the future at other locations within Northern's field area as the need for these units may arise. Northern states that in certain instances, the units proposed to be abandoned may be salvaged rather than utilized elsewhere on Northern's pipeline system. Northern indicates that it will seek, to the extent applicable, the required Commission authority in order to install and operate these compressor facilities at a new location if these facilities are to be utilized in the future. Northern further states that the Big Lake compressor Unit No. 1 and the Pecos Station are not required due to reduced deliverability in the systems located upstream of the compressor units. Northern advises that the abandonment of the Big Lake unit and the Pecos Station will not result in the abandonment of service to any of Northern's existing customers or producers, nor will the proposed abandonment adversely impact capacity since this compression is no longer needed by Northern to receive the remaining gas supplies available from upstream gathering systems.

Comment date: May 3, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

8. Texas Gas Transmission Corporation

[Docket No. CP95–313–000]

Take notice that on April 10, 1995, Texas Gas Transmission Corporation (Texas Gas), 3800 Frederica Street, Owensboro, Kentucky 42301, filed in Docket No. CP95–313–000 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 authorization to upgrade an existing delivery point through which it delivers gas to Indiana Gas Company, Inc. (Indiana Gas) in Parke County, Indiana, under Texas Gas's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–407–000 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.

It is stated that Indiana Gas has requested that Texas Gas increase the measurement capability at the Hercules Powder Meter Station to allow Indiana Gas to serve, in addition to existing requirements, new load attributable to the Wabash River Coal Gasification Project. Texas Gas proposes to upgrade the meter station by replacing the dual 2-inch meter runs, two 2-inch side valves and related piping with a dual 4-inch station at this point. It is stated that Indiana Gas will reimburse Texas Gas for the cost of upgrading the measurement facilities, which is estimated to be $92,700.

It is further stated that Indiana Gas has informed Texas Gas that it will not require any increase in existing firm contract quantities to accommodate service at the delivery point as the new load will be served with interruptible and capacity release volumes.

Comment date: May 30, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraphs

F. Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before the comment date, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate and/or permission and approval for the proposed abandonment are required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

G. 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 § 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.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–9858 Filed 4–20–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[Docket No. CP95–318–000]

Williams Gas Processing—Mid-Continent Region Company; Petition for Declaratory Order

April 17, 1995.

Take notice that on April 11, 1995, Williams Gas Processing—Mid-

Continent Region Company (WGP–MCR), Post Office Box 3102, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101, filed a petition for a declaratory order in Docket No. CP95–318–000, requesting that the Commission declare that WGP–MCR's acquisition, ownership, and operation of approximately 25.8 miles of 26-inch pipeline and appurtenant facilities located in Texas County, Oklahoma currently owned by Williams Natural Gas Company (WNG) are exempt from the Commission's Regulations pursuant to Section 1(b) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), all as more fully set forth in the petition which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

WGP–MCR states that the current filing is necessary because the subject line's function will change as a result of the construction and operation of a new processing plant, the Baker Plant. The new plant is being constructed by Williams Field Services Company (WFS), an affiliate of WGP–MCR, and will process gas from both the Straight sub-system and the Liberal-Baker subsystem as well as third-party gathering systems. WGP–MCR states that the Baker Plant will replace the Guymon drip control plant and is scheduled to be in operation by November 1, 1995. WGP–MCR states that the subject 25.8 mile pipeline is located upstream of the new Baker Plant, and upon completion of the plant the function of the subject line will be gathering.

WGP–MCR asks that the Commission process this petition for declaratory order and WNG's related abandonment application, but it does not request an order until the Baker Plant begins operations. WGP–MCR states that it will use the same default contract for services on the subject facilities as was submitted to the Commission in Docket No. CP94–196–000.

WGP–MCR asserts that the Baker Plant will be capable of processing greater volumes and of removing more liquids compared to the capabilities of the Guymon drip control plant, and this will result in better value to the gathering and processing customers. WGP–MCR claims that the location of the plant was chosen for primarily two reasons: (1) Located in the middle of the production facilities owned by third parties—whereas the Guymon drip control plant could only process gas from the Straight facilities; and (2) the location of the Baker Plant is conducive to the formation of a hub, with other transmission pipelines located in the vicinity.

WGP–MCR states that it will provide gathering services consistent with open-access principles and will operate as a company separate and independent from WNG. WNG currently provides transportation service to one direct delivery irrigation customer connected to the subject pipeline. WGP–MCR asserts that it will assume WNG's obligations and provide gathering services to this customer following abandonment.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make a protest with reference to said petition should, on or before May 8, 1995, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426 a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–9856 Filed 4–20–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

Office of Hearings and Appeals

New Filing Deadline in Special Refund Proceeding Involving Crude Oil Overcharge Refunds

AGENCY: Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of new deadline for filing applications for refund in the crude oil overcharge special refund proceeding.

SUMMARY: The Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy has determined that the period for filing applications for refund in the crude oil overcharge special refund proceeding shall close on June 30, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas L. Wieker, Deputy Director, Virginia Lipton, Assistant Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586–2390 (Wieker), (202) 586–2400 (Lipton).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 1, 1994, the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) of the Department of Energy (DOE) issued a Notice stating that it would reopen the period for filing Subpart V crude oil overcharge refund applications and take comments on the issue of the appropriate closing date for filing refund claims in this proceeding. In the Notice we set a new tentative filing deadline of June 3, 1996. 59 FR 55656 (November 8, 1994). The Notice further stated that comments regarding this issue should be provided by April 3, 1995. The period for filing comments has now closed. We have carefully reviewed the comments we received in order to set a final deadline for submission of refund applications.

In all, we received comments from ten firms and individuals. Nine of these comments were submitted by entities that file refund claims on behalf of Subpart V crude oil overcharge refund claimants. We refer to such representatives as ''filing services.'' The tenth comment was filed by an attorney who represents a group of States. [Under the DOE's Modified Statement of Restitutionary Policy, the States and Territories of the United States and the federal government will receive the balance of any funds remaining after all disbursements to Subpart V crude oil overcharge claimants have been made.]

The comments submitted by filing services that represent smaller claimants tended to favor extending the filing deadline as long as possible, even beyond the tentative June 3, 1996 deadline. These filing services believe that there are still many eligible claimants who have not applied for a refund. One commenter in this group estimated that there are between 500,000 and 1 million entities that used more than 65,500 gallons of refined petroleum products during the August 1973 through January 1981 refund period. This commenter believes that since the OHA has received only 100,000 Subpart V crude oil overcharge refund claims, there are many potential applicants who have not yet applied. Although they offer no supporting statistics, the other commenters in this group agree that there are many potential refund applicants who have not yet been contacted. In this regard, the commenters state that after the prior June 30, 1994 deadline passed, they closed their operations that focused on searching for these claimants. They suggest that they are now actively seeking new clients and that it will require significant additional time for them to fully reopen their searching processes and solicit new claimants. They therefore seek an extended additional refund application period.

We are certainly aware that many potential refund applicants have not filed a crude oil overcharge refund claim. However, this fact, in and of itself, is not a reason to allow for