

of the defueled S1C Prototype reactor plant, located in Windsor, Connecticut, pursuant to Section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*, and in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA procedures (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), and Department of Energy regulations implementing NEPA procedures (10 CFR part 1021). The Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Naval Reactors (Naval Reactors) has decided to promptly dismantle the defueled S1C Prototype reactor plant. To the extent practical, the resulting low-level radioactive metals will be recycled at existing commercial facilities that recycle radioactive metals. The remaining low-level radioactive wastes will be disposed of at the Department of Energy Savannah River Site in South Carolina.

Requests for further information should be directed to Mr. Christopher G. Overton, Chief, Windsor Field Office, Office of Naval Reactors, U.S. Department of Energy, P.O. Box 393, Windsor, CT 06095, telephone (860) 687-5610.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The S1C Prototype reactor plant is located on the 10.8-acre Windsor Site in Windsor, Connecticut, approximately 5 miles north of Hartford. As a result of the end of the Cold War and the downsizing of the Navy, the S1C Prototype reactor plant was permanently shut down in March 1993. Removal of the spent nuclear fuel from the S1C Prototype reactor was completed in February 1995. After defueling, S1C Prototype reactor plant systems were drained and placed in a stable protective storage condition. Since the S1C Prototype reactor plant is the only activity at this small site and there is no further need for this plant, a decision is needed on its disposal.

The alternatives analyzed in detail in the Final Environmental Impact Statement were the preferred alternative of prompt dismantlement, a deferred dismantlement alternative, and a “no action” alternative of keeping the defueled S1C Prototype reactor plant in protective storage indefinitely.

The alternative that DOE is selecting, the preferred alternative, involves the prompt dismantlement of the reactor plant. All structures will be removed from the Windsor Site, and the Windsor Site will be released for unrestricted use. To the extent practical, the resulting low-level radioactive metals will be recycled at existing commercial facilities that recycle radioactive metals. The remaining low-level radioactive

waste will be disposed of at the DOE Savannah River Site in South Carolina. There will be an estimated total of twenty-three radioactive material shipments to the Savannah River Site and to commercial recycling facilities. One or two of the shipments to the Savannah River Site will be by rail and the remainder of the radioactive material shipments will be by truck. The Savannah River Site currently receives low-level radioactive waste from Naval Reactors sites in the eastern United States. Both the volume and radioactive content of the S1C Prototype reactor plant low-level waste fall within the projections of Naval Reactors waste provided to the Savannah River Site, which were included and analyzed in the Savannah River Site Waste Management Final Environmental Impact Statement dated July 1995.

The deferred dismantlement alternative would involve keeping the defueled S1C Prototype reactor plant in protective storage for 30 years before dismantling it. Deferring dismantlement for 30 years would allow nearly all of the gamma radiation within the reactor plant to decay away.

The “no action” alternative would involve keeping the defueled S1C Prototype reactor plant in protective storage indefinitely. This alternative would leave long-lived radioactivity at the Windsor Site indefinitely.

Naval Reactors distributed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the S1C Prototype Reactor Plant Disposal in June 1996. Comments from 28 individuals and agencies were received in either oral or written statements at a public hearing or in letters. Nearly all of the commenters expressed a preference for the prompt dismantlement alternative. The Final Environmental Impact Statement, which includes responses to public comments, has been issued and distributed to interested parties.

From an environmental perspective, no single alternative stands out as the environmentally preferred alternative. The no action alternative is the least preferable since it would leave long-lived radioactivity at the Windsor Site indefinitely and does not provide for eventual re-use of the Windsor Site. Regarding prompt dismantlement and deferred dismantlement, neither alternative stands out in this comparison, and neither is considered on balance to be environmentally preferred. Deferred dismantlement has the advantage of lower occupational radiation exposure while still providing for eventual unrestricted release of the Windsor Site. Prompt dismantlement has the advantage of not requiring long

term commitment of the land for surveillance and maintenance of the S1C Prototype reactor plant. The occupational radiation exposure associated with the prompt dismantlement alternative is comparable in magnitude to the radiation exposure routinely received during operation and maintenance of Naval prototype reactors. Also, the impacts associated with the prompt dismantlement alternative have a higher degree of certainty than those associated with actions thirty years in the future. Since prompt dismantlement will result in unrestricted release of the Windsor Site at the earliest time with little occupational exposure risk to the workers, and given that the impacts associated with prompt dismantlement have a higher degree of certainty, Naval Reactors has decided to proceed with the preferred alternative of prompt dismantlement.

As discussed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, Naval Reactors implements a large number of conservative engineering practices in its operations. These conservative engineering practices will serve to assure that environmental impacts will be very small. No additional mitigative measures have been identified which are needed to further reduce the small impacts which were described in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Accordingly, all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the preferred alternative have been adopted.

Issued at Arlington, VA this 30th day of December 1996.

F.L. Bowman,

Admiral, U.S. Navy, Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program.

[FR Doc. 97-169 Filed 1-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Granting of the Application for Interim Waiver and Publishing of the Petition for Waiver of CFM Majestic Inc. from the DOE Vented Home Heating Equipment Test Procedure. (Case No. DH-008)

AGENCY: Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Today's notice grants an Interim Waiver to CFM Majestic Inc. from the existing Department of Energy (DOE or Department) test procedure

regarding pilot light energy consumption and weighted average steady-state efficiency for its models A120, A125, A130, A132, A230, A232, AB132, D130, D132, D230, D232, D332, D334, D336, DR333, DR336, DR339, DT336, DT339, DT343, DVR33, DVR36, DVR39, DVRS3, DVT36, DVT39, DVT43, DVTS2, FS22, FS32, FSDV22, FSDV32, HE25, HE32, HEB32, and HEDV32 vented heaters.

Today's notice also publishes a "Petition for Waiver" from CFM Majestic Inc. CFM Majestic Inc.'s Petition for Waiver requests DOE to grant relief from the DOE vented home heating equipment test procedure relating to the use of pilot light energy consumption in calculating the Annual Fuel Utilization Efficiency (AFUE) and the calculation of weighted average steady state efficiency of its models A120, A125, A130, A132, A230, A232, AB132, D130, D132, D230, D232, D332, D334, D336, DR333, DR336, DR339, DT336, DT339, DT343, DVR33, DVR36, DVR39, DVRS3, DVT36, DVT39, DVT43, DVTS2, FS22, FS32, FSDV22, FSDV32, HE25, HE32, HEB32, and HEDV32 vented heaters. CFM Majestic Inc. seeks to delete the required pilot light measurement (Q_p) in the calculation of AFUE when the pilot is off, and to test at a minimum fuel input rate of two-thirds of the maximum fuel input rate instead of the specified 50 percent \pm 5 percent of the maximum fuel input rate in the calculation of AFUE. The Department is soliciting comments, data, and information respecting the Petition for Waiver.

DATES: DOE will accept comments, data, and information not later than February 5, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and statements shall be sent to: Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Case No. DH-008, Mail Stop EE-43, Room 1J-018, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585-0121, (202) 586-7140.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

William W. Hui
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Energy Efficiency and
Renewable Energy
Mail Stop EE-43
Forrestal Building
1000 Independence Avenue, SW.,
Washington, DC 20585-0121
(202) 586-9145

Eugene Margolis, Esq.
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of General Counsel
Mail Stop GC-72
Forrestal Building
1000 Independence Avenue, SW.,
Washington, DC 20585-0103

(202) 586-9507

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products (other than automobiles) was established pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended (EPCA), which requires DOE to prescribe standardized test procedures to measure the energy consumption of certain consumer products, including vented home heating equipment. The intent of the test procedures is to provide a comparable measure of energy consumption that will assist consumers in making informed purchasing decisions. These test procedures appear at Title 10 CFR Part 430, Subpart B.

The Department amended the test procedure rules to provide for a waiver process by adding § 430.27 to Title 10 CFR Part 430. 45 FR 64108, September 26, 1980. Subsequently, DOE amended the waiver process to allow the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (Assistant Secretary) to grant an Interim Waiver from test procedure requirements to manufacturers that have petitioned DOE for a waiver of such prescribed test procedures. Title 10 CFR Part 430, § 430.27(a)(2).

The waiver process allows the Assistant Secretary to waive temporarily test procedures for a particular basic model when a petitioner shows that the basic model contains one or more design characteristics which prevent testing according to the prescribed test procedures, or when the prescribed test procedures may evaluate the basic model in a manner so unrepresentative of its true energy consumption as to provide materially inaccurate comparative data. Waivers generally remain in effect until final test procedure amendments become effective, resolving the problem that is the subject of the waiver.

An Interim Waiver will be granted if it is determined that the applicant will experience economic hardship if the Application for Interim Waiver is denied, if it appears likely that the Petition for Waiver will be granted, and/or the Assistant Secretary determines that it would be desirable for public policy reasons to grant immediate relief pending a determination on the Petition for Waiver. Title 10 CFR Part 430, § 430.27(g). An Interim Waiver remains in effect for a period of 180 days, or until DOE issues a determination on the Petition for Waiver, whichever is sooner, and may be extended for an additional 180 days, if necessary.

On October 31, 1996, CFM Majestic Inc. filed an Application for Interim Waiver and a Petition for Waiver regarding (a) pilot light energy

consumption and (b) weighted average steady state efficiency.

CFM Majestic Inc. seeks an Interim Waiver from the DOE test provisions in section 3.5 of Title 10 CFR Part 430, Subpart B, Appendix O, that requires measurement of energy input rate of the pilot light (Q_p), and the use of this data in section 4.2.6 for the calculation of AFUE, where:

$$AFUE = \frac{(4400\eta_{ss}\eta_u Q_{in-max})}{(4400\eta_{ss}Q_{in-max} + 2.5(4600)\eta_u Q_p)}$$

Instead, CFM Majestic Inc. requests that it be allowed to delete Q_p and accordingly, the $(2.5(4600)\eta_u Q_p)$ term in the calculation of AFUE. CFM Majestic Inc. states that instructions to turn off the transient pilot by the user when the heater is not in use are in the User Instruction Manual and on a label adjacent to the gas control valve. Therefore, the additional energy savings that result when the pilot is turned off ($Q_p = 0$) should be credited. Since the current DOE test procedure does not address pilot light energy savings, CFM Majestic Inc. asks that the Interim Waiver be granted.

CFM Majestic Inc. also seeks an Interim Waiver from the DOE test provisions in section 3.1.1 of Title 10 CFR Part 430, Subpart B, Appendix O, which requires steady state efficiency of manually controlled vented heaters with various input rates to be determined at a fuel input rate of 50 percent \pm 5 percent of the maximum fuel input rate, and the use of this data in section 4.2.4 to determine the weighted average steady state efficiency needed in the calculation of AFUE. Instead, CFM Majestic Inc. requests that it be allowed to determine steady state efficiency, weighted average steady state efficiency, and AFUE at a minimum fuel input rate of two-thirds of the maximum fuel input rate for its manually controlled vented heaters which do not adjust to an input rate as low as 50 percent \pm 5 percent. Since the current DOE test procedure does not address steady state testing for manually controlled vented heaters with various input rates at fuel input rates other than 50 percent \pm 5 percent of the maximum fuel input rate, CFM Majestic Inc. asks that the waiver be granted.

Previous Petitions for Waiver to exclude the pilot light energy input term in the calculation of AFUE for home heating equipment with a manual transient pilot control and allowance to determine weighted average steady state efficiency used in the calculation of AFUE at a minimum fuel input rate no greater than two-thirds of the maximum fuel input rate instead of the specified

50 percent \pm 5 percent of the maximum fuel input rate have been granted by DOE to Appalachian Stove and Fabricators, Inc., 56 FR 51711, October 15, 1991; Valor Incorporated, 56 FR 51714, October 15, 1991; CFM International Inc., 61 FR 17287, April 19, 1996; Vermont Castings, Inc., 61 FR 17290, April 19, 1996; Superior Fireplace Company, 61 FR 17885, April 23, 1996; and Vermont Castings, Inc., 61 FR 57857, November 8, 1996.

Thus, it appears likely that CFM Majestic Inc.'s Petition for Waiver for pilot light and weighted average steady state efficiency for home heating equipment will be granted. In those instances where the likely success of the Petition for Waiver has been demonstrated based upon DOE having granted a waiver for a similar product design, it is in the public interest to have similar products tested and rated for energy consumption on a comparable basis.

Therefore, based on the above, DOE is granting CFM Majestic Inc. an Interim Waiver for its models A120, A125, A130, A132, A230, A232, AB132, D130, D132, D230, D232, D332, D334, D336, DR333, DR336, DR339, DT336, DT339, DT343, DVR33, DVR36, DVR39, DVRS3, DVT36, DVT39, DVT43, DVTS2, FS22, FS32, FSDV22, FSDV32, HE25, HE32, HEB32, and HEDV32 vented heaters. CFM Majestic Inc. shall be permitted to test its models A120, A125, A130, A132, A230, A232, AB132, D130, D132, D230, D232, D332, D334, D336, DR333, DR336, DR339, DT336, DT339, DT343, DVR33, DVR36, DVR39, DVRS3, DVT36, DVT39, DVT43, DVTS2, FS22, FS32, FSDV22, FSDV32, HE25, HE32, HEB32, and HEDV32 vented heaters on the basis of the test procedures specified in Title 10 CFR Part 430, Subpart B, Appendix O, with the modifications set forth below:

(i) Delete paragraph 3.5 of Appendix O.

(ii) Delete paragraph 4.2.4 of Appendix O and replace with the following paragraph:

4.2.4 Weighted Average Steady-State Efficiency. (a) For manually controlled heaters with various input rates, the weighted average steady-state efficiency (η_{ss-wt}) is:

(1) At 50 percent \pm 5 percent of the maximum fuel input rate as measured in either section 3.1.1 to this appendix for manually controlled gas vented heaters or section 3.1.2 to this appendix for manually controlled oil vented heaters, or

(2) At the minimum fuel input rate as measured in either section 3.1.1 to this appendix for manually controlled gas vented heaters or section 3.1.2 to this

appendix for manually controlled oil vented heaters if the design of the heater is such that 50 percent \pm 5 percent of the maximum fuel input rate can not be set, provided the tested input rate is no greater than two-thirds of maximum input rate of the heater.

(b) For manually controlled heater with one single firing rate, the weighted average steady-state efficiency is the steady-state efficiency measured at the single firing rate.

(iii) Delete paragraph 4.2.6 of Appendix O and replace with the following paragraph:

4.2.6 Annual Fuel Utilization Efficiency. For manually controlled vented heaters, calculate the Annual Fuel Utilization Efficiency (AFUE) as a percent and defined as:

$$AFUE = \eta_u$$

Where:

η_u = as defined in section 4.2.5 of this appendix.

(iv) With the exception of the modification set forth above, CFM Majestic Inc. shall comply in all respects with the procedures specified in Appendix O of Title 10 CFR Part 430, Subpart B.

This Interim Waiver is based upon the presumed validity of statements and all allegations submitted by the company. This Interim Waiver may be removed or modified at any time upon a determination that the factual basis underlying the Application is incorrect.

This Interim Waiver is effective on the date of issuance by the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. The Interim Waiver shall remain in effect for a period of 180 days or until DOE acts on the Petition for Waiver, whichever is sooner, and may be extended for an additional 180-day period, if necessary.

CFM Majestic Inc.'s Petition for Waiver requests DOE to grant relief from the DOE vented home heating equipment relating to the pilot light and weighted average steady state efficiency. CFM Majestic Inc. seeks (a) to exclude the pilot light energy consumption in the calculation of AFUE, and (b) to determine the weighted average steady state efficiency used in the calculation of AFUE at a minimum fuel input rate of two-thirds of the maximum fuel input rate instead of the specified 50 percent \pm 5 percent of the maximum fuel input rate. Pursuant to paragraph (b) of Title 10 CFR Part 430.27, the Department is hereby publishing the "Petition for Waiver."

The Department solicits comments, data, and information respecting the Petition.

Issued in Washington, DC December 27, 1996.

Christine A. Ervin,
Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

October 31, 1996.

The Honorable Christine Ervin,
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy,
United States Department of Energy,
Forrestal Building,
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20585,
USA.

Dear Madame: We would like to inform you that our name was recently changed to reflect the current growth in our company. Accordingly, CFM International Inc. which was previously granted with the same waivers mentioned below was changed to CFM Majestic Inc.

Furthermore, CFM Majestic Inc. now have four subsidiaries namely, The CFM Majestic Products Company; The Majestic Products Company; Vermont Casting Inc.; and Timberline Gas Logs Inc.

CFM Majestic Inc. models DV32, DV34, DV36, DV40, DVS2, DVS3, FA20, FS30, FSDV30, HE30, HEDV30/HEDV30-1 which were granted waivers for pilot energy consumption relief for manually controlled heaters in the calculation of Annual Fuel Utilization Efficiency (AFUE) and calculation procedure for weighted average steady state efficiency for manually controlled heaters with various input rates (please refer to Federal Register Notice dated Dec. 28, 1995 & April 19, 1996—Case No. DH-004)—have been upgraded with new logs, new ceramic front burner and new model number namely DVR33, DVR36, DVT36, DVT43, DVTS2, DVRS3, HE25, FS32, FSDV32, HE32, HEB32, HEDV32 respectively. However, the same transient pilot and manually controlled gas valve which were petitioned and granted in the aforementioned waivers were used to models DVR33, DVR36, DVT36, DVT43, DVTS2, DVRS3, HE25, FS32, FSDV32, HE32, HEB32, HEDV32.

Also, we would like to inform you that models HE40 and FADV20 which were granted waivers for pilot energy consumption relief for manually controlled heaters in the calculation of Annual Fuel Utilization Efficiency (AFUE) and calculation procedure for weighted average steady state efficiency for manually controlled heaters with various input rates (please refer to Federal Register Notice dated Dec. 28, 1995 & April 19, 1996—Case No. DH-004) will not be manufactured, hence waivers previously granted to these models are no longer required.

CFM Majestic Inc. would like to submit a Petition for Waiver and an Application for Interim Waiver pursuant to Title 10 Code of Federal Regulations 430.27, as amended on November 14, 1986 for models DVR33, DVR36, DVT36, DVT43, DVTS2, DVRS3, HE25, FS32, FSDV32, HE32, HEB32, HEDV32.

Accordingly, CFM Majestic Inc. would like to request acceptance of two waivers from the test procedures which appears at 10 CFR, part 430, subpart B, Appendix O—Uniform

Test Method for Measuring the Energy Consumption of Vented Home Heating Equipment for gas appliance models included in this request. Below are excerpts from Vermont Castings Inc.'s letter to The Honorable Christine Ervin dated July 7, 1995—explaining in detail the particulars regarding the waivers requested above.

Waiver Request No. 1

This request refers to section 3.1.1—Gas fueled vented home heating equipment and section 4.2.4—Weighted average steady state efficiency. These sections state that for manually controlled heaters with various input rates the weighted average steady state efficiency is measured at a fuel rate input rate of plus or minus 5 percent of 50 percent of the maximum fuel input rate. All the gas appliance models included in this request utilize a combination gas control which has a variable pressure regulator set point which allows the user to easily vary the manifold pressure of the appliance within a fixed range of pressures. Specifically the range of manifold pressure adjustment for Natural Gas is 3.5" w.c. to 1.7" w.c. and for Propane Gas from 10.0" w.c. to 4.9" w.c. These pressure ranges allow the user to vary the fuel input rates on all models included in this request from maximum input to minimum input which is 70% of maximum input and it is therefore not possible to obtain a rate of 50% of the maximum input when the heater is operated according to Manufacturer's Installation Operating Manual. Since the 50% rate specified in the Regulations can not be normally achieved on these products we request that this requirement be waived for the gas appliances included in this request.

CFM Majestic Inc. requests to utilize the test procedure proposed by DOE on August 23, 1993—58 FR 44538. Accordingly, we request to calculate the weighted average steady state efficiency using the minimum obtainable fuel input rate provided this rate is no greater than $\frac{2}{3}$ the maximum input rate of the heater. Specifically, the models included in this request will be tested at $\frac{2}{3}$ of maximum fuel input rate.

The current test procedure does not credit CFM Majestic Inc. for the additional energy savings that occur when the minimum fuel input rate is limited to 70% of maximum input rate. Test data shows a significant increase in the actual overall AFUE when compared to results obtained at a rate of 50% of maximum fuel input rate. Copies of confidential test data confirming the energy savings will be forwarded to you upon request.

Waiver Request No. 2

This request refers to section 3.5—Pilot Light Measurement and section 4.2.6—Annual Fuel Utilization Efficiency (AFUE). These sections require the measurement of energy input to the pilot light (Q_p) and the use of this data in the calculation of AFUE for the energy consumed by the pilot light when the heater is not in operation.

All gas appliance models included in this request are designed with a transient pilot

which is to be turned off by the user when the heater is not in use. The control knob on the combination gas control in these heaters has three positions—"OFF", "PILOT" and "ON". Gas flow to the pilot is obtained by rotating the control knob from "OFF" to "PILOT", depressing the knob, holding in, and pressing the piezo ignitor. When the pilot heats a thermocouple element, sufficient voltage is supplied to the combination gas control for the pilot to remain lit when the knob is released and turned to the "ON" position. The main burner can then be ignited by moving an "ON/OFF" switch to the "ON" position. Since the current test procedure does not credit CFM Majestic Inc. for the additional savings that occur when the pilot is turned off, we request the requirement to include energy input to the pilot light in AFUE calculation be waived for these appliances.

CFM Majestic Inc. requests to utilize the test procedure proposed by DOE on August 23, 1993—58 FR 44538. Specifically, we request the term involving the pilot light energy consumption be deleted from the calculation of AFUE for all gas appliance models included in this request. This results in an AFUE which is equal to the heating seasonal efficiency.

Test data shows a significant increase in the actual overall AFUE when compared to results obtained when energy input to the pilot is included in the overall AFUE. Copies of confidential test data confirming the energy savings will be forwarded to you upon request.

CFM Majestic Inc. is confident that both of these waivers will be granted, as similar waivers have been granted in the past to Vermont Casting Inc., CFM International Inc. and other U.S. manufacturers. Also, the revisions to the test procedures which we request have been published by DOE as proposed changes on August 23, 1993—58 FR 44538.

Any question regarding this subject, please contact me at the above address. Your help is highly appreciated. Thank you.

Yours Truly,

Ferdinand M. Francisco,

Lab. Manager, CFM Majestic Inc.

[FR Doc. 97-168 Filed 1-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP97-158-000]

Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

December 30, 1996.

Take notice that on December 17, 1996, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company (Panhandle), Post Office Box 1642, Houston, Texas 77251-1642, filed in Docket No. CP97-158-000 a request pursuant to §§ 157.205 and 157.211 of

the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.211) for authorization to upgrade the Indiana Gas Company, Inc.'s (Indiana Gas) Bloomingdale Meter and Regulation Station, an existing delivery point located in Parke County, Indiana. Panhandle makes such request under its blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83-83-000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Panhandle proposes to replace certain inefficient and undersized facilities with more efficient upgraded facilities so as to allow increased pressure at this delivery point. The proposed facility upgrade is classified as minor, above ground modifications, which will include the upgrade of internal components of the regulators, such as removing the current 500 psi maximum spring in the pilot of each of the four 3-inch Mooney regulators and replacing it with a 400-900 psi range spring. It is stated that such facility upgrade is proposed to increase the maximum capacity of the Bloomingdale meter station to approximately 23,700 Mcf per day, and increase the operating pressure from 275 psig to 500 psig. Panhandle indicates that the increased service availability will be provided within Indiana Gas' existing entitlements.

The estimated cost of upgrading the proposed facilities is \$5,000. Panhandle states that Indiana Gas will reimburse the cost of the facilities.

Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after 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 therefor, 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. 97-113 Filed 1-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M