

Comment date: April 12, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

8. Entergy Services, Inc.

[Docket No. ER96-1354-000]

Take notice that on March 21, 1996, Entergy Services, Inc. (ESI), acting as agent for Gulf States Utilities Company (Gulf States), submitted for filing a letter agreement between Gulf States and Cajun Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. (Cajun) for the installation of a second 69 kV breaker at Coly Substation. Cajun has committed to a contribution-in-aid-of-construction in return for Gulf States installing the breaker. Entergy Services requests that the letter agreement become effective as soon as possible but in no event later than June 1, 1996.

Comment date: April 12, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

9. Entergy Services, Inc.

[Docket No. ER96-1355-000]

Take notice that on March 21, 1996, Entergy Services, Inc. (ESI), acting as agent for Arkansas Power & Light Company (AP&L), submitted for filing the Twenty-fifth Amendment to the Power Coordination, Interchange and Transmission Service Agreement between AP&L and Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation (AECC) which makes certain modifications to the delivery points set forth in Exhibit A to the Agreement. Entergy Services requests that the Amendment become effective no later than June 1, 1996.

Comment date: April 12, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

10. Entergy Power, Inc.

[Docket No. ER96-1356-000]

Take notice that on March 21, 1996, Entergy Power, Inc. (EPI), tendered for filing an Interchange Agreement with City of Tallahassee.

EPI requests an effective date for the Interchange Agreement that is one (1) day after the date of filing, and respectfully requests waiver of the notice requirements specified in 35.11 of the Commission's regulations.

Comment date: April 12, 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-8403 Filed 4-4-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Docket Nos. CP94-29-000, CP94-29-001 and CP94-29-002]

Paiute Pipeline Company; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Paiute Pipeline Expansion II Project and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues

April 1, 1996.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental assessment (EA) that will discuss environmental impacts of the construction and operation of facilities proposed in the Paiute Pipeline Expansion II Project.¹ This EA will be used by the Commission in its decision-making process to determine whether an environmental impact statement is necessary and whether or not to approve the project. The U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit of the U.S. Forest Service (LTBMU) will be cooperating agencies in the preparation of the EA.

Summary of the Proposed Project

On October 18, 1994, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) issued a Notice of Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Paiute Expansion II Project in docket No. CP94-29-000. The purpose of the notice was to request comments on environmental issues.

On March 4, 1996, Paiute Pipeline Company (Paiute) filed an amendment to its original application in Docket No. CP94-29-002 that represents a change in the scope of the Expansion II Project.

¹ Paiute Pipeline Company's application was filed with the Commission under section 7 of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations.

From the standpoint of the environmental analysis the changes are:

- The deletion of four pipeline segments from the project, reducing the total miles of pipeline construction from 53.8 miles to 19.8 miles:

- The deletion of all new compression requirements; and
- The changes in pipeline routing of the North Tahoe Loop.

In its present application Paiute wants to expand the capacity of its facilities in Nevada to transport an additional 12,788 million cubic feet of gas to Southwest Gas Corporation-Northern Nevada and Southwest Gas Corporation-Northern California (collectively, known as Southwest Gas). To accomplish this, Paiute seeks authority to:

- Construct and operate the North Tahoe Loop consisting of 11 miles of 16-inch-diameter pipeline in Washoe County and Carson City, Nevada;
- Construct and operate the Incline Village Loop consisting of 3.0 miles of 12-inch-diameter pipeline and 200 feet of 8-inch-diameter pipeline in Washoe County, Nevada;
- Construct and operate the South Tahoe Loop consisting of 5.8 miles of 12-inch-diameter pipeline in Douglas County, Nevada;
- Modify the California Check Meter and Wadsworth Pressure Limiting Station, both located in Washoe County, Nevada; and
- Relocate the South Tahoe Pressure Limiting Station located in Douglas County, Nevada.

The general location of the project facilities is shown in appendix 1.²

In connection with Paiute's proposal, Southwest Gas plans to construct about 18.5 miles of pipeline ranging from 6 to 12 inches in diameter along various parts of its existing pipeline system. The facilities would extend from the interconnection with Paiute's facilities at the Nevada-California border in Placer County, California to Truckee, California. Southwest Gas' project is under the jurisdiction of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and is subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The CPUC completed its CEQA review of Southwest Gas' project and approved the project on April 26, 1995.

We have made a decision to not address the impacts of the nonjurisdictional facilities planned by Southwest Gas because it would be

² The appendices referenced in this notice are not being printed in the Federal Register. Copies are available from the Commission's Public Reference and Files Maintenance Branch, Room 2A, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, or call (202) 208-1371. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail.

duplicative of the review conducted by the CPUC and the project has already been approved. However, we will briefly describe their location and status in the EA.

Land Requirements for Construction

Construction of the proposed facilities would require about 101.3 acres of land. Following construction, about 79.1 acres would be maintained as permanent right-of-way, 94 percent of which is Paiute's existing pipeline right-of-way. Only 4.4 acres would be new permanent right-of-way. The remaining 22.2 acres would be restored and allowed to revert to its former use. No land disturbance would be associated with the modification of either the California Check Meter or the Wadsworth Pressure Limiting Station.

The EA Process

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. We call this "scoping". The Main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this Notice of Intent, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the EA. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EZ. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

The EA will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed project under these general headings:

- Geology and soils.
- Endangered and threatened species.
- Water resources and fisheries.
- Vegetation and wildlife.
- Public safety.
- Air quality and noise.
- Wetland and riparian habitats.
- Land use and visual resources.
- Cultural resources.

We will also evaluate possible alternatives to the proposed project, or portions of the project, and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

Our independent analysis of the issues will be in the EA. The EA will then be mailed to Federal, state, and

local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, affected landowners, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list for these proceedings. We will consider all comments on the EA before we recommend that the Commission approve or not approve the project.

Currently Identified Environmental Issues

We have already identified several issues that we think deserve attention based on a preliminary review of the proposed facilities and the environmental information provided by Paiute. Keep in mind that this is a preliminary list:

- Construction within or adjacent to roads could affect traffic flow and access to businesses and residences. Construction would occur within or adjacent to U.S. Route 50 for the North Tahoe Loop; U.S. Route 395, State Route 57, State Route 206 for the South Tahoe Loop; and Sugarpine Drive, Knotty Pine Drive, Silvertip Drive, Ponderosa Avenue, and State Route 28 for the Incline Village Loop.

- The North Tahoe loop would cross 3.4 miles of land managed by the BLM, including a 0.7-mile-long crossing of Centennial Park.

- The North Tahoe Loop would cross 1.0 mile of Washoe Lake Nevada State Park.

- The North Tahoe Loop would cross 0.4 mile of land managed by the U.S. Forest Service, Toiyabe National Forest.

- Seven perennial streams would be crossed and a total of 0.2 acre of wetland would be affected.

- About 56 residences would be within 50 feet of the proposed construction rights-of-way.

The list of issues may be added to, subtracted from, or changed based on your comments and our analysis.

Public Participation

You can make a difference by sending a letter addressing your specific comments or concerns about the project. You should focus on the potential environmental effects of the proposal, alternatives to the proposal (including alternative routes), and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. You do not need to re-submit comments if you have already done so. Please follow the instructions below to ensure that your comments are received and properly recorded:

- Address your letter to: Lois Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426;

- Reference Docket Nos. CP94-29-000 *et al.*;

- Send a copy of your letter to: Ms. Lauren O'Donnell, EA Project Manager, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., PR-11.1, Washington, DC 20426; and

- Mail your comments so they will be received in Washington, DC on or before May 2, 1996.

If you wish to receive a copy of the EA, you should request one from Ms. O'Donnell at the above address.

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, you may want to become an official party to the proceedings or an "intervenor". Among other things, intervenors have the right to receive copies of case-related Commission documents and filings by other intervenors. Likewise, each intervenor must provide copies of its filings to all other parties. If you want to become an intervenor you must file a motion to intervene according to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214) (see appendix 2). You do not need intervenor status to have your scoping comments considered.

Additional information about the proposed project is available from Ms. Lauren O'Donnell, EA Project Manager, at (202) 208-0325.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-8450 Filed 4-4-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

Notice of Amendment of License

April 1, 1996.

Take notice that the following hydroelectric application has been filed with the Commission and is available for public inspection.

a. Type of Application: Amendment of License.

b. Project No.: 1494-120.

c. Date Filed: March 12, 1996.

d. Applicant: Grand River Dam Authority.

e. Name of Project: Pensacola Project.

f. Location: On the Grand (Neosho) River in Craig, Delaware, Mayes, and Ottawa Counties, Oklahoma.

g. Filed Pursuant to: Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. 791(a)-825(r).

h. Applicant Contact: Mr. Robert W. Sullivan, Assistant General Manager, Grand River Dam Authority, P.O. Box 409, Vinita, OK 74301-0409, (918) 256-5545.

i. FERC Contact: Paul Shannon, (202) 219-2866.

j. Comment Date: May 20, 1996.