h. Applicant Contacts:

Timothy L. Huffman, Senior Engineer, Duke Power Company—EC12V, P.O. Box 1006, Charlotte, NC 28201–1006, (704) 382–5185.

Mark Sundquist, President, Northbrook Carolina Hydro, L.L.C., 225 W. Wacker Driver, Suite 2330, Chicago, IL 60606, (312) 553–2136.

- *i. FERC Contact:* David W. Cagnon, (202) 219–2693.
- j. Comment Date: November 6, 1996. k. Description of Transfer: The Transfer of License is being sought in connection with the acquisition of the project by Northbrook Carolina Hydro, L.L.C. from Duke Power Company.

l. This notice also consists of the following standard paragraphs: B, C2, and D2.

B. Comments, Protests, or Motions to Intervene—Anyone may submit comments, a protest, or a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.210, .211, .214. In determining the appropriate action to take, the Commission will consider all protests or other comments filed, but only those who file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules may become a party to the proceeding. Any comments, protests, or motions to intervene must be received on or before the specified comment date for the particular application.

C2. Filing and Service of Responsive Documents—Any filings must bear in all capital letters the title "COMMENTS,"

"RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS," "NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE COMPETING APPLICATION," "COMPETING APPLICATION," "PROTEST," or "MOTION TO INTERVENE," as applicable, and the Project Number of the particular application to which the filing refers. Any of these documents must be filed by providing the original and the number of copies provided by the Commission's regulations to: The Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 818 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. A copy of a notice of intent, competing application, or motion to intervene must also be served upon each representative of the Applicant specified in the particular application.

D2. Agency Comments—Federal, state, and local agencies are invited to file comments on the described application. A copy of the application may be obtained by agencies directly from the applicant. If an agency does not file comments within the time

specified for filing comments, it will be presumed to have no comments. One copy of an agency's comments must also be sent to the Applicant's representatives.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–26546 Filed 10–16–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

Notice of Transfer of License

October 10, 1996.

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

- a. Type of Application: Transfer of License.
 - b. Project No.: 2607-006.
 - c. Date Filed: October 1, 1996.
- *d. Applicant:* Duke Power Company, Northbrook Carolina Hydro, L.L.C.
- e. Name of Project: Spencer Mountain Hydroelectric Project.
- f. Location: On the South Fork Catawba River, in Gaston County, North Carolina, near the Town of Gastonia. g. Filed Pursuant to: Federal Power
- Act, 16 U.S.C. § 791(a)-825(r).

h. Applicant Contacts:

Timothy L. Huffman, Senior Engineer, Duke Power Company—EC12V, P.O. Box 10065, Charlotte, NC 28201– 1006, (704) 382–5185.

Mark Sundquist, President, Northbrook Carolina Hydro, L.L.C., 225 W. Wacker Drive, Suite 2330, Chicago, IL 60606, (312) 553–2136.

- *i. FERC Contact:* David W. Cagnon, (202) 219–2693.
- j. Comment Date: November 6, 1996.
- k. Description of Transfer: The Transfer of License is being sought in connection with the acquisition of the project by Northbrook Carolina Hydro, L.L.C. from Duke Power Company.
- I. This notice also consists of the following standard paragraphs: B, C2, and D2.
- B. Comments, Protests, or Motions to Intervene—Anyone may submit comments, a protest, or a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.210, .211, .214. In determining the appropriate action to take, the Commission will consider all protests or other comments filed, but only those who file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules may become a party to the proceeding. Any comments, protests, or motions to intervene must be received on or before the specified comment date for the particular application.

C2. Filing and Service of Responsive Documents—Any filings must bear in all capital letters the title "COMMENTS,"

"RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS." "NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE COMPETING APPLICATION," "COMPETING APPLICATION," "PROTEST," or "MOTION TO INTERVENE," as applicable, and the Project Number of the particular application to which the filing refers. Any of these documents must be filed by providing the original and the number of copies provided by the Commission's regulations to: The Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. A copy of a notice of intent, competing application, or motion to intervene must also be served upon each representative of the Applicant specified in the particular application.

D2. Agency Comments—Federal, state, and local agencies are invited to file comments on the described application. A copy of the application may be obtained by agencies directly from the Applicant. If an agency does not file comments within the time specified for filing comments, it will be presumed to have no comments. One copy of an agency's comments must also be sent to the Applicant's representatives.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-26547 Filed 10-16-96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP96-255-001, et al.]

Trunkline LNG Company, et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings

October 8, 1996.

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

1. Trunkline LNG Company

[Docket No. CP96-255-001]

Take notice that on October 3, 1996, Trunkline LNG Company (Applicant), P.O. Box 1642, Houston, Texas 77251-1642 filed in Docket No. CP96-255-001 an abbreviated application for amended abandonment authorization pursuant to Section 7 (b) of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, and Part 157 of the Commission's Regulations thereunder. Applicant is requesting amended authority to permit: (1) The abandonment of Unit 2204-JB by sale to Kvaerner Energy a. s. (Kvaerner), and (2) the abandonment of a 50 percent interest in Unit 2204-JA (8 megawatts) to PanEnergy Lake Charles Generation,

Inc. (PELCG), all as more fully set forth in the application to amend which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Applicant states that it would retain a 50 percent interest in Unit 2204-JA for use as a source of back-up power and to serve its peak power requirements for ship unloading at the terminal, which is equivalent to the 8 megawatts of capacity for the combined units approved by the Commission's May 15, 1996, Order Approving Abandonment. Applicant asserts that the proposed amended authority will facilitate its continued use of up to 8 megawatts of electric power as a back-up power source through its retention of a 50 percent interest in Unit 2204-JA. Applicant further asserts that approval of the requested authority will also provide PELCG with the ability to run Unit 2204–JA at a higher load than Applicant, which will result in a more efficient use of that asset and the avoidance of a low load factor operation which is detrimental to the unit's service life.

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

2. Michigan Gas Storage Company [Docket No. CP97–2–000]

Take notice that on October 1, 1996, Michigan Gas Storage Company (MGSCo), 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201, filed, in Docket No. CP97–2–000, an application pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity establishing (i) annual cyclic storage capacity, and (ii) expected deliverability for each of MGSCo's previously certificated underground gas storage fields, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

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

3. Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation; ANR Pipeline Company

[Docket No. CP97-5-000]

Take notice that on October 2, 1996, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation (Texas Eastern), 5400 Westheimer Court, Houston, Texas 77056–5310 and ANR Pipeline Company (ANR), 500 Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan 48243, filed in Docket No. CP97–5–000 a joint application pursuant to Section 7(b) and Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for permission and approval to abandon by sale of an undivided 50 percent interest by ANR and the

acquisition of such undivided 50 percent interest by Texas Eastern in ANR's Springboro Meter Station, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

It is stated that the Springboro Meter Station consists of a 10-inch tap on the 36-inch Lebanon Pipeline jointly owned by Texas Eastern and ANR, two 8-inch turbine meters and appurtenant facilities. It is stated that the Springboro Meter Station was originally constructed by ANR pursuant to Section 311 of the Natural Gas Policy Act in order to make deliveries of natural gas to Cincinnati Gas & Electric (CG&E) for resale. It is further stated that in Docket No. CP93-86-000, ANR obtained certificate authority to operate the Springboro Meter Station under Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act.

ANR states that it has agreed to the sale of an undivided 50 percent interest and Texas Eastern states that it has agreed to acquire such undivided 50 percent interest in the Springboro Meter Station. It is stated that Texas Eastern and ANR will each utilize the Springboro Meter Station as a delivery point on the Lebanon Pipeline. ANR states that it will continue to operate and maintain the Springboro Meter Station. Texas Eastern states that it will provide up to 50,000 dekatherms per day of firm transportation service to CG&E pursuant to Texas Eastern's Part 284 blanket transportation certificate and Rate Schedule LLFT included in Texas Eastern's FERC Gas Tariff, Sixth Revised Volume No. 1.

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

4. NorAm Gas Transmission Company [Docket No. CP97–10–000]

Take notice that on October 3, 1996, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NGT), 1600 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP97-10-000 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, modify and operate certain facilities located in Sebastian and Logan Counties Arkansas under NGT's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82-384–000, 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.

Specifically, NGT proposes to operate an existing 2-inch delivery tap on NGT's Line "O" (NGT's Witcherville delivery point) in Section 36, Township 6 North,

Range 31 West, Sebastian County, Arkansas, originally installed in 1990 to provide transportation services solely under Section 311 of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (NGPA) to Arkansas Oklahoma Gas Company (AOG) under Subpart G of Part 284 of the Commission's Regulations. NGT states that will deliver approximately 20,000 MMBtu per day and approximately 3,600,000 MMBtu annually to AOG pursuant to a firm transportation agreement. NGT also states that its 2inch L-Shape meter station installed under Section 311 of the NGPA would be abandoned and reported on its 1996 annual report, and that AOG would install a 6-inch meter run, regulators and approximately 50 feet of 4-inchdiameter pipeline from their meter station to NGT's 2-inch tap.

In addition, NGT proposes to construct and operate a 3-inch tap and first-cut regulator (NGT's Chismville delivery point) on NGT's Line "O" in Section 15, Township 6 North, Range 28 West, Logan County, Arkansas to deliver gas to AOG. The estimated volumes to be delivered to this delivery tap pursuant to a firm transportation agreement between NGT and AOG are approximately 12,000 MMBtu on a peak day and 2,160,000 MMBtu annually. The estimated cost of construction of the tap and first-cut regulator is \$2,250 and AOG agrees to reimburse NGT for all construction costs. NGT also states that AOG will install a 4-inch meter run, with regulators and electronic flow measurement equipment. NGT states that AOG will own and operate the metering facilities and NGT will own and operate the tap.

NGT states that it will transport gas to AOG and provide service under its tariff, that the volumes delivered are within AOG's certificated entitlement and NGT's tariff does not prohibit the addition of new delivery points. NGT states that it has sufficient capacity to accomplish the deliveries without detriment or disadvantage to its other customers.

Comment date: November 22, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

5. Florida Gas Transmission Company; Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company

[Docket No. CP97-11-000]

Take notice that on October 3, 1996, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT), P.O. Box 1188, Houston, Texas 77251–1188 and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (TGP), P.O. Box 2511, Houston, Texas 77252–2511, filed in Docket No. CP97–11–000 a joint application pursuant to Section 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for

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.oha.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