

inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-11573 Filed 5-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. QF88-218-004]

Burney Forest Products, a Joint Venture; Notice of Application for Commission Recertification of Qualifying Status of a Small Power Production Facility

May 3, 1996.

On April 30, 1996, Burney Forest Products, a Joint Venture (Burney Forest) of 35586-B, Highway 299 East, Burney, California 96013, submitted for filing an application for recertification of a facility as a qualifying small power production facility pursuant to Section 292.207(b) of the Commission's Regulations. No determination has been made that the submittal constitutes a complete filing.

According to the applicant, the biomass-fueled small power production facility is located in Shasta County, California. The Commission previously certified the capacity of the facility to be 24.0 MW. The facility consists of two wood-fired boilers and a condensing steam turbine generator. According to the applicant, the instant application for recertification was submitted solely to report a change in ownership of the facility. Applicant has also concurrently filed with the Commission in Docket No. EL96-51-000, a petition for a declaratory order requesting a determination of the appropriate methodology for calculating the maximum net capacity of the facility.

Any person desiring to be heard or objecting to the granting of qualifying status should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. All such motions or protests must be filed within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register and must be served on the applicant. 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 petition 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. 96-11567 Filed 5-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP96-215-000]

Florida Gas Transmission Co., Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

April 30, 1996.

Take notice that on April 25, 1996, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1 the following tariff sheets to become effective June 1, 1996.

Original Sheet No. 129C
Original Sheet No. 129D
Second Revised Sheet No. 184B

FGT states that its currently effective FERC Gas Tariff does not contain provisions for resolution of Unscheduled Deliveries from FGT's system. The Unscheduled Delivery provisions as proposed herein are very similar to the Unauthorized Gas provisions as contained in Section 12.D of FGT's General Terms & Conditions (GT&C). However, whereas the Unauthorized Gas provisions apply exclusively to points of receipt, the proposed Unscheduled Delivery provisions apply exclusively to points of delivery in FGT's Western Division. Unscheduled Delivery provisions are not necessary in FGT's Market Area because all Market Area delivery points are covered by Delivery Point Operator Accounts. Furthermore, pipeline interconnects are excluded because most are covered by operational balancing agreements or other arrangements with the interconnecting pipelines which are not subject to FGT's Tariff.

Unscheduled Deliveries are defined in the proposed tariff provisions as volumes delivered at non-pipeline interconnect points for which there is no volume scheduled by any shipper. Additionally, as required by Commission orders concerning FGT's Unauthorized Gas Provisions, the proposed Unscheduled Delivery provisions shall not apply at any point at which there is a volume scheduled and shall not encompass imbalance volumes. Further, the proposed provisions provided that parties responsible for Unscheduled Deliveries which occurred prior to the proposed effective date of these provisions, will be provided the opportunity to balance

by scheduling deliveries to FGT prior to being settled on a cash basis.

Similar to the Unauthorized Gas provisions, FGT is proposing that upon becoming aware of Unscheduled Deliveries, FGT will post on its Electronic Bulletin Board (EBB) for a period of thirty (30) days the volume, production month delivered and the point of delivery of such volumes. Shippers who respond during the thirty (30) day period will have thirty (30) days to schedule such volumes. Unscheduled Deliveries prior to the effectiveness of these provisions will be afforded a sixty (60) days posting period and shippers will have thirty (30) days to schedule such volumes. Unscheduled Deliveries neither claimed nor scheduled will be billed to the party physically the Unscheduled Deliveries at a rate of 120% of the St. Helena Parish Index plus a transportation rate described below.

FGT shall invoice a maximum of 12,000 MMBtu at the 120% Index rate during a twelve (12) month calendar period at any single delivery point. Volumes in excess of the maximum will be billed at a rate of 150% of the St. Helena Index. FGT has included the maximum provision to discourage potential "gaming" of Unscheduled Deliveries. Unscheduled Deliveries settled on a cash basis will be billed a transportation rate including surcharges based on a point of receipt at FGT milepost zero under Rate Schedule FTS-1 for service in FGT's Western Division. The non-transportation revenues resulting from the resolution of Unscheduled Deliveries will be accounted for pursuant to Section 19.1 of FGT's GT&C.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protect said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC, 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.211 and 385.214 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or 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. 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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-11574 Filed 5-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP96-347-000]**Granite State Gas Transmission, Inc.;
Notice of Application**

April 30, 1996.

Take notice that on April 23, 1996, Granite State Gas Transmission, Inc. (Granite State), filed in Docket No. CP96-347-000, an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act requesting authorization for the abandonment of: (1) approximately 15.26 miles of 6-inch pipeline located between Exeter, New Hampshire and Haverhill, Massachusetts; and (2) a compressor station located in Plaistow, New Hampshire, comprised of two 375 HP Ingersoll-Rand reciprocating engines, valves, station piping and appurtenant equipment, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

According to Granite State, the proposed interstate pipeline that the Portland Natural Gas Transmission System (PNGTS) plans to construct and operate in its pending application before the Commission, Docket No. CP96-249-000, involves a routing south from Portland to Haverhill which closely parallels Granite State's existing pipeline. From Exeter south to Haverhill, the routing of the PNGTS is alongside Granite State's existing pipeline. Granite State says that it owns and operates parallel 6- and 10-inch pipelines for a distance of approximately 15.26 miles. Granite State requests authority to abandon its 6-inch pipeline in order to make way for and provide space for the location of the new PNGTS 20-inch line, which will allow the PNGTS pipeline to be laid in the existing right-of-way, alongside Granite State's 10-inch pipeline.

According to Granite State, the abandoned 6-inch line will be removed from its existing location and disposed off by PNGTS at no cost to Granite State. At the time the 6-inch is removed, PNGTS will reimburse Granite State for the undepreciated cost, which as of December 31, 1995 was \$44,099.00. Granite State says it will convey to PNGTS the right to use the right-of-way occupied by the 6-inch line at a price to be negotiated later. The actual abandonment and removal of the 6-inch line and the compressor station will not occur until the construction of the PNGTS 20-inch pipeline begins in the Exeter to Haverhill area, sometime during the 1998 construction season. Granite State further requests that a Commission order approving the requested abandonment be issued contemporaneously with a Commission

ordered issuing a certificate to PNGTS in Docket No. CP96-249-000. According to Granite State, there will be no loss of service or decrease in service to any of its customers as a result of the proposed abandonments.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before May 21, 1996, 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 permission and approval for the proposed abandonments 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 provide for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Granite State to appear or be represented at the hearing.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-11575 Filed 5-8-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP96-217-000]**Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited
Partnership; Notice of Proposed
Changes in FERC Gas Tariff**

April 30, 1996.

Take notice that on April 26, 1996, Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership (Great Lakes) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff,

Second Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheets to become effective June 1, 1996:

Second Revised Sheet No. 1
First Revised Sheet No. 2
First Revised Sheet No. 9
First Revised Sheet No. 10
First Revised Sheet No. 13
First Revised Sheet No. 14
First Revised Sheet No. 16
First Revised Sheet No. 21
First Revised Sheet No. 22
First Revised Sheet No. 29
First Revised Sheet No. 30
First Revised Sheet No. 31
First Revised Sheet No. 32
First Revised Sheet No. 33
First Revised Sheet No. 34
Original Sheet No. 34A
First Revised Sheet No. 35
First Revised Sheet No. 40
Original Sheet No. 40A
Original Sheet No. 40B
First Revised Sheet No. 42
First Revised Sheet No. 43
First Revised Sheet No. 44
First Revised Sheet No. 45
First Revised Sheet No. 50B
First Revised Sheet No. 50C
First Revised Sheet No. 51
First Revised Sheet No. 52
First Revised Sheet No. 53
First Revised Sheet No. 56
First Revised Sheet No. 57
Original Sheet No. 57A
First Revised Sheet No. 58
First Revised Sheet No. 59
First Revised Sheet No. 61
First Revised Sheet No. 62
First Revised Sheet No. 63
Second Revised Sheet No. 64
Second Revised Sheet No. 65
Second Revised Sheet No. 67
First Revised Sheet No. 68
First Revised Sheet No. 70
Original Sheets No. 84 through 89

Great Lakes also tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 2, the following tariff sheet to become effective June 1, 1996:

Forty-Second Revised Sheet No. 1

Great Lakes states that the above-referenced tariff sheets are being filed to implement procedural and operational changes deemed necessary in the competitive post-Order No. 636 environment. Great Lakes further states that all of the proposed changes are being made in an effort to provide shippers with greater ease and flexibility in obtaining service, while preserving the operational integrity of Great Lakes' system. None of the proposed changes will affect any of Great Lakes' currently effective rates and charges, it is stated.

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.