

permission and approval for FGT to abandon, by assignment to TGP, FGT's ownership interest in certain jointly owned facilities and for TGP to acquire and own, FGT's interest in the jointly owned facilities, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Specifically, FGT proposes to abandon by transfer to TGP, and TGP proposes to acquire and own, FGT's interest in certain jointly-owned Sabine Pass Phase I Facilities which were constructed pursuant to orders issued June 10, 1981, and October 26, 1981, in Docket No. CP80-481. FGT and TGP state that by letter agreement dated April 16, 1996, FGT and TGP mutually agreed for FGT to assign to TGP One Hundred Percent of FGT's ownership in the Sabine Pass Phase I Facilities.

FGT and TGP further state that in consideration for the transfer, TGP agrees to waive collection from FGT of: (1) Any capital related amounts from January 1, 1995, through the transfer of the Phase I Facilities, (2) certain disputed amounts for Administration and General Loading Overhead, and (3) all future O&M expenses related to the Phase I Facilities incurred following the transfer of the facilities.

Comment date: October 29, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

6. Williams Natural Gas Company

[Docket No. CP97-13-000]

Take notice that on October 4, 1996, Williams Natural Gas Company (WNG), P.O. Box 3288, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101, filed in Docket No. CP97-13-000 an application pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for authorization to uprate approximately one mile of the Jewell 2-inch pipeline located in Jewell County, Kansas, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Specifically, WNG proposes to uprate the Jewell line by increasing the maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) of the line from 133 psig to 433 psig. WNG estimates the uprate to cost \$5,000, and that such uprate would improve the efficiency of the system and eliminate the need for a high maintenance high pressure regulator setting.

Comment date: October 29, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraphs

F. Any person desiring to be heard or make any protest with reference to said filing should on or before the comment

date file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., 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 385.211 and 385.214) 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 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 filing 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 is 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 the 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 § 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. 96-26537 Filed 10-16-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

Office of Hearings and Appeals

Issuance of Decisions and Orders; Week of December 25 Through December 29, 1995

During the week of December 25, through December 29, 1995, the decision and order summarized below was issued with respect to appeals, applications, petitions, or other requests filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy.

Copies of the full text of the decision and order are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Room 1E-234, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585-0107, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., except federal holidays. They are also available in *Energy Management: Federal Energy Guidelines*, a commercially published loose leaf reporter system. Some decisions and orders are available on the Office of Hearings and Appeals World Wide Web site at <http://www.o.ha.doe.gov>.

Dated: October 7, 1996.

George B. Breznay,

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Decision List No. 952

Week of December 25 through
December 29, 1995

Personnel Security Hearing

*Albuquerque Operations Office, 12/28/
95, VSO-0051*

An OHA Hearing Officer issued an Opinion regarding the eligibility of an individual to maintain access authorization under the provisions of 10 CFR Part 710. The individual tested positive for cannabinoids on a recent drug test and also admitted to having used marijuana three times in 1974, despite having answered the drug use question on a 1988 Personnel Security Questionnaire in the negative. After considering the Individual's testimony and the record, the Hearing Officer concluded that the Individual had shown mitigating circumstances with respect to the DOE's Criterion F allegation of falsification. In considering the Individual's passive inhalation defense to the Criterion K allegations based on the positive drug test, the Hearing Officer found that while side stream smoke under realistic conditions could result in a positive drug test, the evidence did not support such a finding in this case. Accordingly, the Hearing Officer found that Criterion K had been properly invoked by DOE as a basis for revoking the Individual's security clearance and that, because of the

Individual's denial of drug use, there was no basis upon which to mitigate that finding. Because the DOE's Criterion L allegation was dependent on an affirmative finding with respect to the Criterion K allegation concerning 1995 drug use, the Hearing Officer found that it too served as a basis for

revoking the Individual's clearance. The Hearing Officer, therefore, concluded that the Individual's access authorization should not be restored.

Refund Application

The Office of Hearings and Appeals issued the following Decision and Order

concerning refund applications, which are not summarized. Copies of the full texts of the Decisions and Orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals:

Township of Ocean RF272-67847 12/28/95

[FR Doc. 96-26595 Filed 10-16-96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

Issuance of Decisions and Orders; Week of October 30 Through November 3, 1995

During the week of October 30 through November 3 1995, the decisions and orders summarized below were issued with respect to appeals, applications, petitions, or other requests 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.

Copies of the full text of these decisions and orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Room 1E-234, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585-0107, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., except federal holidays. They are also available in Energy Management: Federal Energy Guidelines, a commercially published loose leaf reporter system. Some decisions and orders are available on the Office of Hearings and Appeals World Wide Web site at http://www.oha.doe.gov.

Dated: October 7, 1996. George B. Breznay, Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Decision List No. 944

Week of October 30 Through November 3, 1995

Appeal

William M. Arkin, 10/30/95 VFA-0089

William M. Arkin filed an Appeal under the Freedom of Information Act of a determination issued to him by the Albuquerque Operations Office. Arkin had requested information concerning "blinding, dazzling, or stunning laser related counter electro-optics weapons." On Appeal, Arkin took issue with the DOE's claim that no responsive documents existed, noting that several articles concerning DOE's activities in this area had appeared in the media. The DOE found that Albuquerque had failed to adequately respond to Arkin's request and, therefore, remanded the matter for further action.

Personnel Security Hearing

Rocky Flats Field Office, 11/1/95 VSO-0043

A Hearing Officer of the Office of Hearings and Appeals issued an opinion concerning the continued eligibility of an individual for access authorization under 10 C.F.R. Part 710. The Hearing Officer found that the derogatory information presented with respect to the individual's alleged marijuana use was insufficient to raise a substantial doubt concerning the veracity of the individual's repeated denials that he ever used illegal drugs. However, the Hearing Officer found that the information presented regarding the individual's alcohol abuse was sufficient to support a denial of access authorization pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 710.8(j). The Hearing Officer also found that the individual failed to present sufficient evidence of rehabilitation or reformation to mitigate this derogatory information. Accordingly, the Hearing Officer

concluded that the individual's access authorization should not be restored.

Requests for Exception

C&B Warehouse, 11/3/95 VEE-0008

C&B Warehouse filed an Application for Exception from the requirement that it file Form EIA-782B, the "Reseller/Retailer's Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report." The DOE found that the firm was not affected by the reporting requirement in a manner different from other similar firms and, consequently, was not experiencing a special hardship, inequity, or unfair distribution of burdens. Accordingly, the firm's Application for Exception was denied.

Dixie Gas & Oil Co., 11/1/95 VEE-0009

Dixie Gas & Oil Company 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." The DOE found that the firm was suffering temporary hardship related to upgrading its computer system. Therefore, the firm was granted an exception relieving it of the requirement to submit Form EIA-782B between October 1995 and January 1996.

Refund Applications

The Office of Hearings and Appeals issued the following Decisions and Orders concerning refund applications, which are not summarized. Copies of the full texts of the Decisions and Orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals:

Table with 3 columns: Case Name, Reference Number, and Date. Includes entries like Beaufort Transfer, Inc. et al (RF272-77717, 11/03/95), Crude Oil Supple Ref Dist (RB272-57, 11/01/95), etc.