

regulator for the transportation of gas to Petro Chem Operating Co. (Petro Chem). The estimated annual volume to be delivered is 43,800 MMBtu and 120 MMBtu per day. The estimated cost of construction is \$81,286.36, which will be reimbursed by Petro Chem.

Comment date: May 6, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

3. Northwest Pipeline Corporation

[Docket No. CP96-257-000]

Take notice that on March 18, 1996, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84158, filed in Docket No. CP96-257-000 an application pursuant to Sections 7(c) and 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for authorization to construct and operate certain replacement natural gas facilities and for authorization to abandon and remove the facilities being replaced, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Northwest proposes to construct and operate approximately one mile of new 26-inch replacement pipeline, partially outside of Northwest's existing right-of-way, and abandon and remove approximately one mile of existing deteriorated pipeline on Northwest's Ignacio to Sumas mainline near the town of Rangely in Rio Blanco County, Colorado.

Northwest states that the installation of replacement pipeline and the removal and abandonment of the existing line is necessary to insure the integrity of its mainline transmission system.

Northwest states that the proposed pipeline replacement will not result in an increase in the capacity of its mainline.

Northwest estimates the total costs to construct the proposed pipeline and remove and abandon the existing pipeline segment at approximately \$882,500.

Comment date: April 11, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

4. Williams Natural Gas Company

[Docket No. CP96-259-000]

Take notice that on March 18, 1996, Williams Natural Gas Company (WNG), P.O. Box 3288, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101, filed in Docket No. CP96-259-000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.216 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.216) for authorization to abandon facilities in Shawnee County, Kansas under WNG's blanket certificate issued in Docket No.

CP82-479-000 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.

WNG proposes to abandon by sale to KPL, a Western Resources Company (KPL) approximately 8.25 miles of the Forbes 8-inch pipeline, measuring, regulating, and appurtenant facilities.

Comment date: May 6, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G 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 Section 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. 96-7519 Filed 3-27-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Docket No. RM96-7-000]

Regulation of Negotiated Transportation Services of Natural Gas Pipelines; Notice of Extension of Time

March 22, 1996.

On March 19, 1996, United Distribution Companies, Associated Gas Distributor, The LDC Caucus and American Gas Association (collectively Petitioners) and Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA) filed respective motions for an extension of time within which to submit initial comments in response to the Commission's Statement of Policy and Request for Comments issued January 31, 1996, in the above-docketed proceeding (61 FR 4633, February 7, 1996). In their motions, Petitioners and INGAA state that additional time for the filing deadline will provide all parties more time to analyze the legal and policy implications of the rulemaking proceeding and give the parties the time needed to develop, if possible, consensus positions. On March 21, 1996, the Independent Petroleum Association of America filed an answer in support of the extension request stating that additional time will allow the gas industry to consider the complex issues fully.

Upon consideration, notice is hereby given that an extension of time for the filing of initial comments is granted to and including May 31, 1996.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-7566 Filed 3-27-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**[FRL-5448-1]****Proposed Settlements; Accidental Release Prevention List of Substances Litigation****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Notice of proposed settlements; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 113(g) of the Clean Air Act ("Act"), notice is hereby given of proposed settlements in the following cases: *American Petroleum Institute v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*, No. 94-1273 (D.C. Cir.), and *Institute of Makers of Explosives v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*, No. 94-1276 (D.C. Cir.).

These cases involve challenges to the final rule, entitled "List of Regulated Substances and Thresholds for Accidental Release Prevention; Requirements for Petitions Under Section 112(r) of the Clean Air Act as Amended," which, *inter alia*, established a list of substances to be subject to regulation under the accident prevention provisions of the Act and threshold quantities for such substances. 59 Fed. Reg. 4478 (Jan. 31, 1994). Under the terms of the proposed settlements, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would conduct a rulemaking concerning amendment of the above-mentioned final rule to delist certain chemicals and to modify certain other provisions.

For a period of thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, EPA will receive written comments relating to the settlements from persons who were not named as parties to the litigation in question. The Agency or the Department of Justice may withhold or withdraw consent to the proposed settlements if the comments disclose facts or circumstances that indicate that such consent is inappropriate, improper, inadequate, or inconsistent with the requirements of the Act. Copies of the settlements are available from Samantha Hooks, Air and Radiation Division (2344), Office of General Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, (202) 260-7606. Written comments should be sent to Jon Averbach at the above address and must be submitted on or before April 29, 1996.

Dated: March 21, 1996.
Scott C. Fulton,
Acting, General Counsel.
[FR Doc. 96-7599 Filed 3-27-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[FRL-5448-3]**Proposed Settlement Agreement, Clean Air Act Citizen Suit****AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.**ACTION:** Notice of proposed settlement; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 113(g) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, ("Act"), notice is hereby given of a proposed partial consent order, which was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") on November 29, 1995, in a lawsuit filed by the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund. This lawsuit, which was filed pursuant to section 304(a) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7604(a), concerns, among other things, EPA's alleged failure to meet mandatory deadlines under section 112 (d), (e), and (n)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act.

Since the time that the initial proposed consent order was lodged with the Court, the EPA was shut-down for three weeks due to a lack of appropriated funds. For this and other reasons, EPA and Sierra Club have agreed to reassess the feasibility of the dates in the proposed order.

After providing notice to plaintiff, EPA did not submit the mercury study to Congress pursuant to section 112(n)(1)(B) of the CAA, in accordance with the date in the proposed order. The parties have agreed that such study shall be submitted by April 15, 1996. The revised date will be included in a new proposed consent order that will be lodged with the Court.

With respect to the dates for issuing the maximum achievable control technology (MACT) standards, as established in paragraph 2 of the proposed order, the parties have agreed to revise the dates to provide two additional months for issuance of the standards. The parties plan to lodge an amended proposed order with the Court, which will revise the list in paragraph 2 as follows:

| Source category | Date |
|---|---------|
| Acrylonitrile-Butadiene-Styrene Production. | 5/15/96 |
| Butyl Rubber Production | 7/15/96 |

| Source category | Date |
|---|---------|
| Epichlorohydrin Elastomers Production. | 7/15/96 |
| Ethylene-Propylene Rubber Production. | 7/15/96 |
| Hypalon (TM) Production | 7/15/96 |
| Methyl Methacrylate-Acrylonitrile-Butadiene-Styrene Production. | 5/15/96 |
| Neoprene Production | 7/15/96 |
| Nitrile Butadiene Rubber Production | 7/15/96 |
| Polybutadiene Rubber Production ... | 7/15/96 |
| Polystyrene Production | 5/15/96 |
| Polysulfide Rubber Production | 7/15/96 |
| Styrene-Butadiene Rubber and Latex Production. | 7/15/96 |

The parties plan to file the amended proposed consent order with the Court shortly. The new order will incorporate the revisions described above concerning the submission of the mercury study to Congress and the issuance of twelve MACT standards under section 112(d) of the CAA. Because today's notice provides the schedules that will be incorporated into the revised order, it will not matter if this notice is published before the new consent order is filed with the Court, because this notice will provide adequate notice under section 113(g) of the CAA with respect to the new dates for the mercury study and the twelve MACT categories.

For a period of thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the proposed partial consent order, as modified by this notice, from persons who were not named as parties to the litigation in question. EPA or the Department of Justice may withhold or withdraw consent to the proposed partial consent order if the comments disclose facts or circumstances that indicate that such consent is inappropriate, improper, inadequate, or inconsistent with the requirements of the Act. Unless EPA or the Department of Justice determines, following the comment period, that consent is inappropriate, the final consent order will establish deadlines for the regulations covered by § 112(d) and the study provided for by § 112(n)(1)(B).

A copy of the proposed consent order was lodged with the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia on November 29, 1995. The dates in that draft consent order will be modified to reflect the date identified in this notice. A revised consent order will be lodged with the Court shortly. Copies of the current November 29, 1995 draft consent order are also available from Sonja Lee, Air and Radiation Division (2344), Office of General Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401