AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Obligation (MDDOs) from an existing point of delivery to COH to the proposed point of delivery under Columbia's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP83–76–000 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.

Columbia proposes to construct and operate a new point of delivery for firm transportation service of 120 Dth/day for COH under Columbia's Rate Schedule SST. Columbia states that the quantities of natural gas to be provided through the new delivery point will be within Columbia's authorized level of services.

Columbia estimates the cost to construct the new point of delivery as $7,500 and states that COH will reimburse it 100% of the total actual cost of the proposed construction.

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 15.205) 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 If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of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.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–913 Filed 1–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. CP97–176–000]

Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Application

January 10, 1997.

Take notice that on December 31, 1996, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, S.E., Charleston, West Virginia 25314–1599, filed in Docket No. CP97–176–000 an application pursuant to Sections 7(b) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for permission and approval to abandon pipeline facilities in the Terra Alta Storage Field located in Preston County, West Virginia, and to construct and operate replacement facilities, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Columbia proposes to abandon 2.9 miles of various diameter segments of storage pipeline and appurtenances and to replace them with 2.6 miles of various diameter segments of pipeline and appurtenances. Columbia estimates the cost of the replacement at $2,394,700, with a net debit to accumulated provisions for depreciation for the abandoned facilities of $462,816. It is stated that the proposal is part of Columbia's ongoing program of upgrading its storage fields to ensure reliable operation of its pipeline system. It is asserted that the proposal will not affect the reservoir performance of the storage field or deliveries and that Columbia is not requesting authorization for any new or additional service.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before January 31, 1997, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 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 385.214 or 385.211) 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 the 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 application 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 Columbia to appear or be represented at the hearing.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–930 Filed 1–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. ER96–1663–000]

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company Notice of Technical Conference and Potential Broadcast of Technical Conference

Issued January 8, 1997.

As previously announced in the Commission's order issued on December 18, 1996, *Pacific Gas and Electric Company, et al.,* 77 FERC ¶61,265 (1996), the Commission will convene a technical conference in the above captioned proceeding to be held on Friday, January 17, 1997, at the offices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. The technical conference will commence at 9:30 a.m. and will be open to all interested persons. The Commissioners and Staff will participate in the technical conference, which will address options for mitigating the market power of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company, who have jointly filed an application for authorization to sell power at market-based rates through a power exchange.

The Conference will consist of three panels, as outlined on the Attachment to this notice. In addition, all interested persons are invited to submit written comments addressing topics discussed at the technical conference. (There is no need to reiterate comments that already have been made in pleadings filed in these dockets.) Comments must be received on or before January 27, 1997. The comments should not be longer than 25 pages in length, double-spaced, on 8½″ x 11″ paper, with standard margins. Parties submitting comments must submit fourteen (14) written copies of their comments and also must submit two copies of the file on a computer diskette, one in Wordperfect 5.1 format, and one in a DOS file in the ASCII format (with 1″ margins and 10 characters per inch.). The two computer files should be labeled (—.WP and —.ASC) to avoid confusion. Comments must include a one-page executive summary and must be filed with the Office of the Secretary, Federal Energy

Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426 and reference Docket No. ER96–1663–000. All written comments will be placed in the Commission's Public files and will be available for inspection or copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room during normal business hours. The Commission also will make all comments available to the public on its electronic bulletin board (EBB).

Broadcast of Technical Conference

If there is sufficient interest, the Capitol Connection will broadcast the technical conference on January 17, 1997, to interested persons. Persons interested in receiving the broadcast for a fee should contact Julia Morelli at the Capitol Connection (703–993–3100) no later than January 14, 1997.

In addition, National Narrowcast Network's Hearings-On-the Line service covers all Commission meetings live by telephone so that anyone can listen without special equipment. Call 202–966–2211 for details. Billing is based on time on-line.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David E. Mead, Office of Economic Policy, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 208–1024.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

Attachment—Panels, WEPEX Market Power Conference, January 17, 1997

Panel 1: Structural Mitigation Options

A number of options have been proposed which alter the market structure or create incentives to reduce market power. Issues associated with these options include:

- Divestiture: are the current divestiture proposals adequate to mitigate market power so that the Commission can approve market-based rates?
- Consumer access: how much do retail competition and real-time pricing mitigate horizontal market power?
- Existing entry barriers (generation and transmission): what are they and how can they be remedied? Who has the authority to remove any such barriers?
- Call contracts: how do call contracts mitigate market power for energy, capacity and ancillary services? What are the details that should be included in the contracts? How should the call contract prices be determined? Which units should be subject to call contracts?
- Transmission constraints: how do transmission constraints affect market power? How do transmission rights mitigate market power?
- Bidding trusts: what is needed to mitigate market power? Should bidding trusts be made a permanent mitigation measure?

Panelists

Paul Joskow, Elizabeth and James Killian Professor of Economics and Management; Head, Department of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Representative, Sacramento Municipal Utility District
Jan Smutney-Jones, Executive Director, Independent Energy Producers Association
Jim Macias, Vice President and General Manager, Transmission Business Pacific Gas & Electric Company
Representative, California Public Utilities Commission
Jeffrey D. Watkiss, Coalition for a Competitive Electric Market

Panel 2: Mitigation—Institutional

When structural options are unavailable or inappropriate, a number of other options are available which remove the incentive or ability of entities to exercise market power. These options could be applied to all market participants and serve to ensure that market power is mitigated or applied to individual entities if the exercise of market power is detected.

- Bidding rules: what are appropriate bidding rules? In competitive markets, generators would be expected to bid their running costs.
- Bidding incentives: what is the effect of the CTC (e.g., as a revenue cap for the California IOUs)?
- Ancillary services: how may ancillary services interact with other services to encourage market power? How should ancillary services be procured to create competition and mitigate market power?

Panelists

William Hieronymous, Putnam Hayes and Bartlett, on behalf of San Diego Gas and Electric Company
W. Kent Palmerton, Manager of Industry Restructuring Programs, Northern California Power Agency
John Jurewitz, Manager of Regulatory Policy, Southern California Edison Company
Barbara Barkovitch, California Large Energy Consumers Association, or Keith McRae, Attorney for California Manufacturers Association
Eric Woychik, Utility Consumers Action Network and Toward Utility Rate Normalization

Panel 3: Monitoring for Market Power

- Information: what is the effect of widely available information on the ability to detect market power? What information should be collected and how will market power be identified?
- How do the physical properties of the network change market power analysis?
- How should capacity availability and withholding be identified and examined?
- Who should be responsible for monitoring? What are the appropriate roles for the ISO and the PX? What should the Commission do to monitor market power?

Panelists

Larry Ruff, Managing Director, Putnam, Hayes and Bartlett (invited)

Michael Florio, Toward Utility Rate Normalization

Representative, California Energy Commission

Joe D. Pace, Pacific Gas & Electric Company

Representative, Electricity Consumers Resource Counsel

[FR Doc. 97–914 Filed 1–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. CP97–179–000]

Questar Pipeline Company; Notice of Application

January 9, 1997.

Take notice that on January 2, 1997 Questar Pipeline Company (Questar) 79 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111, filed in Docket No. CP97–179–000 an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act, for permission and approval to abandon, by removal, the above ground Drunkard's Wash No. 1 Measuring and Regulating Station located in Carbon County, Utah that serves as a jurisdictional receipt point on Questar's interstate transmission system, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

It is stated that the Drunkard's Wash No. 1 measuring and regulating station consist of a 4-inch Daniel senior meter run, a 3-inch Rockwell valve, telemetry and appurtenances housed in a 4-foot by 6-foot skid mounted meter building. Questar explains that the Drunkard's Wash No. 1 station was established as a temporary facility to receive natural gas volumes produced solely by River Gas Corporation (River Gas) into Questar's interstate transmission