

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be filed as provided in Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. 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. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the public reference room.

Lois D. Cashell,  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96-4327 Filed 2-26-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**[Docket No. RP95-408-006]**

**Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Compliance Filing**

February 21, 1996.

Take notice that on February 15, 1996, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) filed to become part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, the following revised tariff sheets bearing a proposed effective date of May 1, 1996:

Substitute Twelfth Revised Sheet No. 25  
Substitute Twelfth Revised Sheet No. 26  
Substitute Twelfth Revised Sheet No. 27  
Sub Thirteenth Revised Sheet No. 28

Columbia states that the purpose of this filing is to comply with Ordering Paragraph B of the Commission's January 31, 1996 order (74 FERC ¶ 61,067) in Docket No. RP95-408-004 and RP95-408-005 which directed Columbia to recalculate and refile its Stranded Facilities Charge (SFC) effective May 1, 1996, by eliminating the component for income taxes (approximately \$2.1 million). Columbia states that consistent with the discussion in the January 31, 1996 order it reserves the right to move the May 1, 1996 level tariff sheets into effect as of that date or at any time thereafter.

Columbia states that copies of its filing have been mailed to all parties listed on the Commission's service list for this proceeding.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with § 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be filed as provided in § 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. 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 proceedings. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96-4325 Filed 2-26-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**[Docket No. GT96-47-000]**

**NorAm Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Refund Report**

February 21, 1996.

Take notice that on February 1, 1996, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NorAm) tendered for filing a Report of Gas Research Institute (GRI) Tier 1 Refunds. NorAm states that the refund report is filed in accordance with the Commission's directive contained in Opinion No. 402 [73 FERC ¶ 61,073 (1995)].

NorAm further states that the refunds, totalling \$64,120.00, were made from December 5 to 20, 1995. The report reflects the amounts allocated to each firm transportation customer.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a 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 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before February 28, 1996. 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. 96-4322 Filed 2-26-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**[Docket No. RP96-143-000]**

**Williams Natural Gas Company; Notice of GRI Reservation Surcharges**

February 21, 1996.

Take notice that on February 14, 1996, Williams Natural Gas Company (WNG), tendered for filing a schedule of refunds to be made to customers due to incorrectly collected GRI reservation surcharges.

WNG states that as a result of inquiries by certain customers and the Commission's May 3, 1995 Order Granting Clarification, WNG has determined that it incorrectly calculated the GRI reservation surcharge on capacity released by the original customer holding such capacity (releasing shipper) at less than maximum rate for the period January 1, 1994 through September 30, 1995. WNG states that the instant filing contains a schedule of refunds to be made to customers due to incorrectly collected GRI reservation surcharges, to be refunded upon Commission approval.

WNG states that a copy of its filing was served on all customers who are entitled to refunds, interested state commissions, and GRI.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest this filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with §§ 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed on or before February 28, 1996. 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 proceedings. 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 in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96-4329 Filed 2-26-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**[Project No. 11408-000]**

**Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, New York; Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Assessment**

February 21, 1996.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Regulations, 18 CFR Part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 F.R. 47897), the Office of Hydropower Licensing has reviewed the application for an original license for the existing Salmon River Hydroelectric Project located on the Salmon River in Oswego County, near the Village of Altmar, New York, and has prepared a final Environmental Assessment (EA) for the project.

Copies of the final EA are available for review in the Public Reference Branch,

Room 2-A, of the Commission's offices at 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

For further information, please contact Robert Bell, Project Manager, at (202) 219-2806.

Lois D. Cashell,  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-4324 Filed 2-26-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**[Projects Nos. 2582-002 and 2583-004]**

**Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation, New York; Notice of Availability of Final Multiple Project Environmental Assessment**

February 21, 1996.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Regulations, 18 CFR Part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 F.R. 47897), the Office of Hydropower Licensing has reviewed the applications for major new licenses for the Station 2 and Station 5 Projects, both located on the Genesee River, in Livingston and Monroe Counties, New York, and has prepared a Final Multiple Project Environmental Assessment (FMPEA) for the projects. In the FEA, the Commission's staff has analyzed the potential environmental impacts of the existing projects and has concluded that approval of the projects, with appropriate mitigation measures, would not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Copies of the FMPEA are available for review in the Public Reference Branch, Room 2-A, of the Commission's offices at 888 1st Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

Lois D. Cashell,  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-4323 Filed 2-26-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**Office of Hearings and Appeals**

**Notice of Issuance of Decisions and Orders During the Week of May 8 Through May 12, 1995**

During the week of May 8 through May 12, 1995, the decisions and orders summarized below were issued with respect to applications for exception or other relief filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy. The following summary also contains a list of submissions that were dismissed by the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

**Requests for Exception**

*Lovelace Gas Service, Inc., 5/11/95 LEE-0131*

Lovelace Gas Service, Inc. (Lovelace) filed an Application for Exception from the Energy Information Administration (EIA) requirement that it file Form EIA-782B, the "Resellers'/Retailers' Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report." In considering Lovelace's request, the DOE found that the firm was not suffering a gross inequity or serious hardship. On October 4, 1994, the DOE issued a Proposed Decision and Order determining that the exception request should be denied. A Statement of Objections to the Proposed Decision and Order was filed by William Lovelace, President of the company. After analyzing the arguments in the Statement of Objections, the DOE determined that Mr. Lovelace had not offered any additional evidence that the firm was experiencing a serious hardship or gross inequity. Therefore, the DOE issued a final Decision and Order denying Lovelace's Application for Exception.

**Personal Security Hearing**

*Albuquerque Operations Office, 5/12/95 VSO-0020*

An OHA Hearing Officer issued an opinion concerning the access authorization of an individual whose security clearance was suspended because he used illegal drugs. The individual, who represented himself, indicated at the hearing that he had been advised not to say anything at the hearing, and therefore did not present any witnesses, cross-examine the DOE's witnesses or offer any evidence on his own behalf. The Hearing Officer found that under the applicable regulations the purpose of a hearing is to allow the individual to provide support for his access eligibility. If he does not wish to offer such support, the regulations indicate that the Manager of the relevant Operations Office is to make a determination as to the access authorization issue. Accordingly, the Hearing Officer determined that the case file should be closed and the matter resolved by the Manager on the basis of the existing record.

*Oak Ridge Operations Office, 5/8/95, VSO-0014*

An Office of Hearings and Appeals Officer issued an opinion concerning the continued eligibility of an individual for access authorization under 10 CFR Part 710, entitled, "Criteria and Procedures for Determining Eligibility for Access Authorization to Classified Matter or Special Nuclear Material." After

considering the record in view of the standards set forth in Part 710, the Hearing Officer found that the individual: (i) Had been diagnosed by a board-certified psychiatrist as having a mental disorder which could cause a significant defect in the individual's judgment or reliability; (ii) was a user of alcohol habitually to excess and had been diagnosed by a board-certified psychiatrist as "alcohol dependent"; and (iii) had engaged in criminal behavior which cast aspersions on the individual's reliability. In rejecting the individual's claim that he had been rehabilitated from his alcohol problem, the Hearing Officer found that the individual had not abstained from using alcohol for a sufficient period of time. With respect to the individual's mental disorder, the Hearings Officer found that there was no evidence in the record that the individual's condition was in remission or controlled by medication to the extent that recurrence of the condition was small. As for the individual's criminal conduct, the Hearing Officer found that the individual's alcohol problem and mental disorder were inextricably intertwined with the incident which resulted in criminal charges being brought against the individual. Next, the Hearing Officer found that the circumstances surrounding the individual's criminal behavior raised questions about his reliability in a security context. Finally, the Hearing Officer concluded that there were no mitigating factors present in the case which could overcome the security concerns raised by the Department of Energy's Oak Ridge Operations Office. Accordingly, the Hearing Officer found that the individual's access authorization should not be restored.

**Refund Applications**

*Morgan Products, Inc., 5/10/95, RF272-92251*

The DOE issued a Decision and Order concerning the Application for Refund of a claimant in the Subpart V crude oil overcharge refund proceeding. The DOE determined that the applicant resold the refined petroleum products that formed the basis of its application and thus passed on the costs of any crude oil overcharges to its customers. Therefore, the DOE concluded that the claimant was not injured by any of the overcharges associated with the gallons that it purchased. Accordingly, the DOE denied the Application for Refund.

**Refund Applications**

The Office of Hearings and Appeals issued the following Decisions and Orders concerning refund applications,