

4. Portland General Electric Company
[Docket No. ER96-605-000]

Take notice that on December 18, 1995, Portland General Electric Company (PGE), tendered for filing under FERC Electric Tariff, 1st Revised Volume No. 2, an executed Service Agreement between PGE and Power Exchange Corporation.

Pursuant to 18 CFR 35.11 and the Commission's order issued July 30, 1993 (Docket No. PL93-2-002), PGE respectfully requests the Commission grant a waiver of the notice requirements of 18 CFR 35.3 to allow the executed Service Agreement to become effective January 1, 1996.

Copies of this filing were served upon the entity listed in the body of the filing letter.

Comment date: January 16, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

5. The Montana Power Company

[Docket No. ER96-606-000]

Take notice that on December 18, 1995, The Montana Power Company (Montana Power), tendered for filing pursuant to Part 35 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) Regulations under the Federal Power Act its proposed Rate Schedule REC-1, applicable for sales of electricity by Montana Power for resale to Central Montana Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., (Central Montana) (Rate Schedule FPC No. 39). Montana Power states that this filing has been served upon Central Montana. Montana Power has requested that the Commission allow the revised rates to be effective as of February 15, 1996.

Montana Power states that Rate Schedule REC-1 will provide it with an annual increase in revenues from sales to these customers of \$960,000 as a result of a rate settlement agreement accepted by the above-mentioned parties.

Comment date: January 16, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

6. Cinergy Services, Inc.

[Docket No. ER96-607-000]

Take notice that on December 18, 1995, Cinergy Services, Inc., tendered for filing on behalf of its operating companies, The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company (CG&E) and PSI Energy, Inc. (PSI), an Interchange Agreement, dated November 1, 1995, between Cinergy, CG&E, PSI and Sonat Power Marketing, Inc. (SONAT).

The Interchange Agreement provides for the following service between Cinergy and SONAT.

1. Exhibit A—Power Sales by SONAT
 2. Exhibit B—Power Sales by Cinergy
- Cinergy and SONAT have requested an effective date of January 1, 1996.

Copies of the filing were served on Sonat Power Marketing, Inc., the Alabama Public Service Commission, the Kentucky Public Service Commission, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio and the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission.

Comment date: January 16, 1996, 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, N.E., Washington, D.C. 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. 96-343 Filed 1-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Project No. 2496-OR]

Eugene Water & Electrical Board; Notice of Intent To Hold Public Meeting in Springfield, OR, To Discuss the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Proposed Relicensing of the Leaburg-Waltermville Hydroelectric Project

January 4, 1996.

On October 13, 1995, the Commission staff mailed the DEIS to the Environmental Protection Agency, resource and land management agencies, and interested organizations and individuals. This document evaluates the environmental consequences of the proposed relicensing of the Leaburg-Waltermville Hydroelectric Project at the installed capacity of 21.5 megawatts. The project is located on the McKenzie River in Lane County, Oregon.

A public meeting, to be recorded by a court reporter, is scheduled to be held at 7 p.m. on Wednesday, January 17,

1996 at the Thurston High School auditorium which is located just off Highway 126, at 333 North 58th Street, Springfield, Oregon. At the meeting, Commission Staff will summarize major DEIS findings and recommendations. Resource agency personnel and other interested persons will have an opportunity to submit oral and written comments on the DEIS for the public record. Written comments on the DEIS may also be sent to: The Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 1st Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. Comments must be received before January 19, 1996 and should be identified by project name and number.

The DEIS considers recommendations of government agencies, nongovernmental organizations, affected Indian tribes, the public, Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB), and the Commission's staff. It evaluates natural and social resource benefits, the economic costs, and the project-specific and cumulative environmental impacts associated with relicensing the project.

To maintain and enhance the project's power generation efficiency and capacity, the DEIS recommends raising Leaburg Lake by 1.5 feet, installing structures in the McKenzie River near the Waltermville intake, excavating the Waltermville tailrace, and upgrading powerhouse generation equipment. The environmental impacts of these actions would be minor and could be mitigated by staff recommended measures.

To enhance highly valued McKenzie River fishery resources, EWEB would install a fish screen in the Waltermville canal intake and would install tailrace barriers in the Leaburg and Waltermville tailraces. To further improve fish habitat and boating opportunities, enhanced year-around minimum in-stream flows, including a flow allotment that could be used during late-summer low-flow conditions are recommended.

To enhance recreation access and opportunities along the McKenzie River, EWEB proposes trust fund donations to acquire lands along the river for access and habitat protection. EWEB also proposes several lesser measures to enhance wildlife habitat values and recreation opportunities on project lands.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-304 Filed 1-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP96-109-000, et al.]

**Williams Natural Gas Company, et al.;
Natural Gas Certificate Filings**

January 2, 1996.

Take notice that the following filings have been made with the Commission:

1. Williams Natural Gas Company

[Docket No. CP96-109-000]

Take notice that on December 18, 1995, Williams Natural Gas Company (Williams), P.O. Box 3288, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 74101, filed in Docket No. CP96-109-000 a request pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205.) for approval to extend an existing 4-inch loop line an additional 1.3 miles to provide increased delivery volumes to Missouri Gas Energy (MGE) for the Simmons chicken farm located in McDonald County, Missouri under Williams' blanket certificate authority issued in Docket No. CP82-479-000, 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.

Williams indicates that the original loop line was constructed pursuant to Docket No. CP86-634-000. Williams states that the total construction cost is estimated to be \$407,956 which cost will be offset by the execution of a new firm transportation agreement by MGE. It is indicated that the new loop extension will provide an additional 1.87 Mmcf per day of capacity to MGE on a peak day.

Comment date: February 16, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

2. East Tennessee Natural Gas Company

[Docket No. CP96-115-000]

Take notice that on December 21, 1995, East Tennessee Natural Gas Company (East Tennessee), P.O. Box 2511, Houston, Texas 77252, filed in Docket No. CP96-115-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.212) for authorization to switch its existing 2-inch connection to an existing 6-inch connection for continuing firm service to Knoxville Utilities Board (KUB), under East Tennessee's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-412-000 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.

East Tennessee proposes to construct and operate a side valve and 20 feet of 6-inch pipeline at M.P. 3114-1+2.97 of the KUB Storage Facility Line located in Knox County, Tennessee in order to use an existing, plugged 6-inch tap located next to the 2-inch tap currently being used. East Tennessee states that these new facilities would cost \$10,600 and the existing 2-inch connection would be removed once the physical connection to the 6-inch tap has been placed in service. East Tennessee mentions that KUB requested this modification because of increased residential growth in its service area.

East Tennessee asserts that the proposed connection is not prohibited by its tariff and the total quantities of natural gas to be delivered to KUB after switching its connection would not exceed the total quantities authorized to be delivered. East Tennessee also mentions that it has sufficient capacity to accomplish deliveries at the proposed delivery point without detriment or disadvantage to its other customers.

Comment date: February 16, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

3. MarkWest Hydrocarbon Partners, Ltd.

[Docket No. CP96-121-000]

Take notice that, on December 22, 1995, in Docket No. CP96-121-000, MarkWest Hydrocarbon Partners, Ltd. (MarkWest), 5613 DTC Parkway, Suite 400, Englewood, Colorado 80111, filed a petition with the Commission, pursuant to Rule 207 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.307), for a declaratory order disclaiming jurisdiction over gas processing facilities that MarkWest is constructing on land it purchased from Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) at Columbia's Kenova Processing Plant (a.k.a. the Kenova Station or the Kenova plant), all as more fully set forth in the application, which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

In a related proceeding, in Docket No. CP96-118-000, Columbia filed an abbreviated application for permission and approval to abandon the Kenova plant, by sale to MarkWest.

MarkWest states that, since its 1988 acquisition of the Siloam, Kentucky fractionation plant from Columbia Hydrocarbon (a former affiliate of Columbia), MarkWest has been contractually obligated to purchase natural gas liquids (NGL) from Columbia, and Columbia has been contractually obligated to deliver, to

MarkWest, the NGL that Columbia extracted at its Kenova and Cobb processing plants. MarkWest adds that, because the Kenova plant is old, inefficient, and outmoded, having been built in 1958, Columbia decided to replace it, and undertook a competitive bidding process to solicit proposals from third parties interested in: (1) purchasing and replacing the existing Kenova plant; (2) demolishing and remediating the old facility site; (3) taking over the Kenova plant processing function with Columbia's shippers; and (4) dealing with the Columbia-MarkWest contract. MarkWest, as the winning bidder, has since moved to construct a new Kenova processing plant, and states that it expects the new facility to be in service by mid-to-late December, 1995.

MarkWest asserts that the Commission's jurisdiction under the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. § 717) is limited to natural gas, which has been construed to mean methane, not the heavier hydrocarbons that constitute NGL, while the primary purpose of new Kenova processing plant will be to continue the Columbia-MarkWest contract function, which (from MarkWest's perspective) will be the extraction of NGL for sale by MarkWest.

MarkWest further states that there was no Federal Power Commission certification for the Kenova plant. Therefore, MarkWest believes that its construction, ownership, and operation of the new processing plant will be outside the Commission's certificate jurisdiction under section 7 of the Natural Gas Act. Accordingly, to the extent that the Commission deems it necessary to act on Columbia's abandonment application, MarkWest requests the Commission to issue an order finding that the new Kenova processing plant is outside the Commission's certificate jurisdiction under section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

Comment date: January 23, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

4. Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation

[Docket No. CP96-118-000]

Take notice that on December 22, 1995, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, S.E., Charleston, West Virginia 25314-1599, filed an abbreviated application in Docket No. CP96-118-000, pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act, Part 157 of the Commission's Regulations, and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, for permission and approval to abandon its Kenova Processing Plant

(a.k.a. the Kenova Station or the Kenova plant), by sale to MarkWest Hydrocarbon Partners, Ltd. (MarkWest), all as more fully set forth in the application, which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

In a related proceeding, in Docket No. CP96-121-000, MarkWest filed a petition with the Commission for a declaratory order disclaiming jurisdiction over the gas processing facilities that MarkWest is constructing on land purchased from Columbia at the Kenova plant site.

The Kenova plant is located in Wayne County, West Virginia. It was designed and built in 1957-1958, and was designed to remove essentially all of the propane and heavier hydrocarbons (i.e., natural gas liquids, or NGL) and water vapor from the gas stream entering Columbia's transmission system. The gas processed at the Kenova plant originates as production from fields in southern West Virginia and eastern Kentucky. Since it began operation in 1958, the NGL removed from this gas stream at the Kenova plant is recovered as one mixed liquid and is transported via a pipeline owned by MarkWest to Siloam, Kentucky, for further separation, purification, and sale of the NGL by MarkWest.

Columbia states that the Kenova plant needs to be replaced, because of its age and deteriorating condition, with more modern and efficient gas processing facilities. Columbia adds that it believes the public interest can best be served through its abandonment of the existing Kenova plant, thereby allowing a non-jurisdictional company to continue the processing service now being provided. Columbia notes that MarkWest has purchased the existing facilities at the Kenova site, that those facilities are being removed, and that MarkWest is constructing and will operate new gas processing facilities at the Kenova site, thereby allowing MarkWest to remove certain hydrocarbons from the natural gas being transported on Columbia's pipeline system.

To Columbia's knowledge, no certificate exists for the Kenova plant, due to the Commission's historical view that its jurisdiction generally does not encompass processing plants. However, to the extent deemed necessary by the Commission, Columbia requests authorization to abandon the existing Kenova plant, by sale to MarkWest.

Comment date: January 23, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F 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 the 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. 96-342 Filed 1-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Docket No. RP96-106-000]

ANR Pipeline Company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

January 4, 1996.

Take notice that on December 29, 1995, ANR Pipeline Company (ANR), tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, the tariff sheets as listed in Attachment A to the filing, to be effective February 1, 1996. With respect to the Volumetric Buyout Buydown Surcharges, the proposed charges are designed to recover \$1.2 million less on an annual basis than the currently effective volumetric surcharge. With respect to Fixed Monthly Charges, the proposed charges are designed to recover \$30,864 less on an annual basis than the currently effective Fixed Monthly Charges.

ANR states that the referenced tariff sheets are being submitted as part of ANR's Seventh Annual Reconciliation of buyout buydown costs being recovered by means of Volumetric Buyout Buydown Surcharges contained in Docket Nos. RP91-33, et al., RP91-192, RP92-4, RP92-199, RP93-29, RP93-149 and RP96-10 and Fixed Monthly Charges associated with Docket No. RP96-10.

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, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426 in accordance with Sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. Pursuant to Section 154.210 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. Pursuant to Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations, all such motions or protests must be filed not later than 12 days after the date of the filing noted above. 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 application are on file with the Commission and are available for public