

Comment date: May 30, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

27. Duke Power Company

[Docket No. ER96-1755-000]

Take notice that on May 8, 1996, Duke Power Company (Duke), tendered for filing a Schedule MR Transaction Sheet under Service Agreement No. 3 of Duke's FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 3.

Comment date: May 30, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

28. Duke Power Company

[Docket No. ER96-1756-000]

Take notice that on May 8, 1996, Duke Power Company (Duke), tendered for filing a Schedule MR Transaction Sheet supplementing the Service Agreement for Market Rate (Schedule MR) Sales between Duke and Entergy Services, Inc. under Duke's FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 3.

Comment date: May 30, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

29. Duke Power Company

[Docket No. ER96-1757-000]

Take notice that on May 8, 1996, Duke Power Company (Duke), tendered for filing a Service Agreement for Market Rate (Schedule MR) Sales between Duke and LG&E Power Marketing Inc. and a Schedule MR Transaction Sheet thereunder.

Comment date: May 30, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

30. Duke Power Company

[Docket No. ER96-1758-000]

Take notice that on May 8, 1996, Duke Power Company (Duke), tendered for filing a Schedule MR Transaction Agreement and Transaction Sheet under Service Agreement No. 4 of Duke's FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 3.

Comment date: May 30, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

31. NRG Generating (Parlin) Cogeneration Inc.

[Docket No. ES96-27-000]

Take notice that on May 9, 1996, NRG Generation (Parlin) Cogeneration Inc. filed an application, under § 204 of the Federal Power Act, seeking authorization to issue a term note in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$155 million and debt service line of credit notes in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$5

million at any one time outstanding. The final maturity would be fifteen (15) years from the date of initial issuance of the term note.

Comment date: June 4, 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. 96-12923 Filed 5-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Project No. 1951-036]

Georgia Power Company; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

May 17, 1996.

An environmental assessment (EA) is available for public review. The EA is for an application to grant a permit to Mr. Peter Lenzenhuber for dredging at the Sinclair Project, FERC No. 1951. The project is located on Lake Sinclair in Putnam County, Georgia. The primary purpose of the dredging would be to increase recreational access to a proposed subdivision, Edgewater Point Estates.

The EA was written by staff in the Office of Hydropower Licensing, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Copies of the EA can be viewed at the Commission's Reference and Information Center, Room 2A, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., 20426. Copies can also be obtained by calling the project manager, Heather Campbell at (202) 219-3097.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-12911 Filed 5-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket Nos. CP96-164-000 and CP96-254-000]

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company and Distrigas of Massachusetts Corporation; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Tennessee Domac Projects; Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting

May 17, 1996.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental assessment (EA) that will discuss the environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the facilities proposed in the Tennessee DOMAC Projects.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 to approve the projects.

Summary of the Proposed Projects

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Tennessee) wants to expand the capacity of its existing facilities to transport up to 90,000 dekatherms of natural gas per day on a firm basis for Distrigas of Massachusetts Corporation (DOMAC). Tennessee requests Commission authorization, in Docket No. CP96-164-000, to construct, operate, and abandon upon the termination of Tennessee's contractual obligations to DOMAC, the following facilities needed to transport those volumes:

- 7.56 miles of 20-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline in Saugus, Revere, Malden, and Everett, Massachusetts;
- One valve station at the northern end of the proposed pipeline in Saugus, Massachusetts; and
- A new meter station and odorization system at the southern end of the proposed pipeline at DOMAC's existing liquefied natural gas (LNG) facility in Everett, Massachusetts.

DOMAC wants to construct additional facilities at its LNG facility in Everett, Massachusetts to increase reliability and meet the anticipated need for increased vaporization capacity. DOMAC requests Commission authorization, in Docket No. CP96-254-000, to construct and operate the following facilities:

- Two vaporization trains, each with a nominal capacity rating of 75 million cubic feet per day;

¹ Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's and Distrigas of Massachusetts Corporation's applications were filed with the Commission under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations.

- About 0.1 mile of natural gas sendout pipeline; and
- Auxiliary equipment located in separate buildings required to operate the vaporization trains, including boilers, water circulation pumps, electrical switchgear, and a distributed control system.

DOMAC stated in its application that although the proposed vaporization facilities are necessary to deliver vaporized LNG into Tennessee's proposed pipeline, its need for additional vaporization capacity is independent of Tennessee's proposal. Therefore, DOMAC proposes to construct the vaporization facilities regardless of Tennessee's action. The Commission staff has elected to analyze the two proposals in the same EA because the Tennessee and DOMAC facilities would be physically connected and would be built within the same general timeframe.

The location of the proposed facilities is shown in appendix 1.²

Land Requirements for Construction

Construction of Tennessee's facilities would require about 67.8 acres of land. About 90 percent of this land is within existing Conrail, Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), or New England Power Company (NEPCO) rights-of-way. The railroad rights-of-way range in width from 42.5 feet to 122 feet. Tennessee proposes to use all available space in these rights-of-way during construction. The NEPCO right-of-way is about 150 feet wide in the project area. In this area, and where the proposed pipeline would be outside existing rights-of-way, Tennessee proposes to use a 55-foot-wide construction right-of-way. In addition, temporary extra work spaces would be required at various locations adjacent to the construction right-of-way.

Following construction, about 15.0 acres, nearly all of which is within existing rights-of-way, would be maintained as new permanent right-of-way for the pipeline or aboveground facilities. The width of the permanent easement within the railroad rights-of-way would be determined based on negotiations with the MBTA and Conrail. Tennessee proposes to maintain a 30-foot-wide permanent easement within the NEPCO right-of-way and where the pipeline is outside existing

rights-of-way. The remaining land would be restored and allowed to revert to its former use. DOMAC's proposed facilities would be constructed within the existing fence line of DOMAC's LNG facility.

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 staff requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the EA. The staff also requests public comments on its decision to evaluate Tennessee's and DOMAC's proposed facilities in the same EA. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EA. 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 projects under these general headings:

- Geology and soils.
- Water resources and wetlands.
- Vegetation and wildlife.
- Threatened and endangered species.
- Land use.
- Cultural resources.
- Public safety.
- Air quality and noise.

We will also evaluate possible alternatives to the proposed projects or portions of the projects, 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. Depending on the comments received during the scoping process, the EA may be published and mailed to Federal, state, and local agencies, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list, and those groups and individuals that have expressed an interest in these proceedings. A comment period will be allotted for review if the EA is published. We will consider all comments on the EA before we recommend that the Commission approve or not approve the projects.

Currently Identified Environmental Issues

We have already identified several issues that we think deserve attention based on a preliminary review of the proposed facilities; our attendance at the Massachusetts Energy Facility Siting Board public hearings in Saugus, Revere, Malden, and Everett; and the environmental information provided by Tennessee and DOMAC. This is a preliminary list of issues and may be added to, subtracted from, or changed based on your comments and our analysis. Issues are:

- Effects of blasting on water wells, structures, septic systems, and natural gas pipelines;
- Crossing of 3 streams and 11 wetlands;
- Crossing of Rumney Marsh, a state-designated Area of Critical Environmental Concern;
- Clearing of trees and disturbance of wildlife habitat;
- Effects of construction on traffic, noise levels, and air quality (particularly, dust);
- Duration of construction;
- Construction near residences along the construction right-of-way and effects on existing and future land uses;
- Right-of-way maintenance;
- Crossing of a Coastal Zone Management Area;
- Crossing of Conservation Land in the Town of Saugus;
- Protection of cultural resources and historic properties;
- Potential to expose contaminated soils;
- Potential increase in shipping of LNG into, and trucking of LNG out of the DOMAC LNG facility;
- Public safety; and
- Cumulative effect of the projects when combined with other developments in the area.

Public Participation and Scoping Meeting

You can make a difference by sending a letter addressing your specific comments or concerns about the projects. You should focus on the potential environmental effects of the proposal, alternatives to the proposal (including alternative pipeline routes), and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments the more useful they will be. 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;

²The 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 3104, 888 First Street, NE, Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426, or call (202) 208-1371. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail.

- Reference Docket Nos. CP96-164-000 and/or CP96-254-000;

- Send a copy of your letter to: Ms. Lauren O'Donnell, EA Project Manager, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Room 72-57, Washington, DC 20426; and

- Mail your comments so that they will be received in Washington, DC on or before June 21, 1996.

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

Beyond asking for written comments, we invite you to attend our public scoping meeting that will be held on June 11, 1996, at 7:00 p.m., at the Saugus High School, Pierce Street, Saugus, Massachusetts. This public meeting will provide you with more detailed information and another opportunity to offer your comments on the proposals. We will also be visiting the project location on June 11 and 12, 1996.

Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, you may want to become an official party to the proceedings or become 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).

- The date for filing of timely motions intervene in these proceedings has passed. Therefore, parties now seeking to file late interventions show good cause, as required by section 385.214(b)(3), why this time limitation should be waived. Environmental issues have been viewed as good cause for late intervention. You do not need intervenor status to have your scoping comments considered.

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

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-12915 Filed 5-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP96-501-000, et al.]

Northwest Pipeline Corporation, et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings

May 15, 1996.

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

1. Northwest Pipeline Corporation

[Docket No. CP96-501-000]

Take notice that, on May 6, 1996, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84108, filed an abbreviated application in Docket No. CP96-501-000, pursuant to section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act and Section 157.7(a) of the Commission's regulations, for authorization to remove its previously abandoned in-place, 10-inch diameter South Seattle Lateral crossing and adjacent 10-inch diameter lateral loop line crossing of Madsen Creek, in Section 26, T23N, R5E, King County, Washington, all as more fully set forth in the application, which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Northwest states that it relocated and replaced the above referenced 175-foot long Madsen Creek crossing segments in 1993, pursuant to its blanket certificate authority in Docket No. CP82-433 (20 FERC ¶ 62,412), but did not remove the two replaced and exposed pipeline segments. Instead, these pipeline segments were abandoned in-place in order to avoid further damage to the Madsen Creek ravine.

Northwest states that (as reported in Docket No. CP82-433) it intended to remove these pipeline segments in 1994, as part of the project area restoration, but the planned restoration was not completed and the pipeline segments were not removed, due to Northwest's prolonged negotiations with King County over plans for the restoration and bank stabilization of the Madsen Creek ravine. According to Northwest, it has reached agreement with King County regarding the restoration and bank stabilization plans for the Madsen Creek ravine, and now plans to remove the two exposed pipeline segments in July of 1996. Northwest states that (consistent with the plans negotiated with King County) it seeks the requisite Commission approvals to remove the previously abandoned pipeline segments, and estimates that the project will cost approximately \$45,000.

Comment date: June 5, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

2. K N Interstate Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP96-509-000]

Take notice that on May 7, 1996, K N Interstate Transmission Company (K N Interstate), P. O. Box 281304, Lakewood, Colorado 80228, filed in Docket No. CP96-509-000 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 install and operate nineteen new delivery taps and appurtenant facilities located in Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska and Wyoming under K N Interstate's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-140-000 et. al. 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.

K N Interstate states that the proposed delivery points would be located on its main transmission system in Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska and Wyoming. The counties involved are Phillips and Yuma Counties in Colorado; Norton and Scott Counties in Kansas; Adams, Clay, Franklin, Hall, Harlan, Keith, Phelps, Stanton, Thayer and Webster Counties in Nebraska; and Goshen and Platte Counties in Wyoming. These proposed taps will be added as delivery points under an existing transportation service agreement between K N Interstate and K N Energy, Inc. (K N) and will be used by K N to facilitate natural gas delivery to direct retail customers.

K N Interstate states that these new delivery facilities are not prohibited by its existing tariff and that it has sufficient capacity to accomplish deliveries without detriment or disadvantage to other customers. The proposed delivery facilities will not have an effect on K N Interstate's peak day and annual deliveries and the total volumes delivered will be within the current maximum transportation quantities set forth in K N Interstate's transportation service agreement with K N.

Comment date: July 1, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

3. NorAm Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP96-513-000]

Take notice that on May 8, 1996, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NGT), 1600 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP96-513-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.211 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.211) for authorization to construct