

Inland Power Pool

- (1) OA97-497-000
ER97-978-000

Michigan Electric Coordinated Systems

- (1) OA97-249-000
ER97-1166-000
(2) ER97-1168-000
(3) OA97-472-000
ER97-1023-000

MidContinent Area Power Pool

- (1) OA97-163/000
ER97-1162-000

MOKAN Power Pool

- (1) OA97-262-000
ER97-1083-000

New England Power Pool

- (1) OA97-237-000
ER97-1079-000
(2) OA97-238-000
ER97-1080-000

New York Power Pool

- (1) OA97-470-000
ER97-1162-000

Pacific Northwest Coordinating Agreement

OA97-21-000

Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Pennsylvania Interconnection

- (1) OA97-261-000
ER97-1082-000

Western Systems Power Pool

- (1) OA97-220-000
ER97-987-000

Wisconsin Power Pool

OA97-190-000

II. Submittals From Holding Companies

Allegheny Power System

OA97-500-000

American Electric Power

OA97-480-000

CSW Operating Companies

OA97-24-000
ER97-881-000

Duke Power Company

OA97-197-000
OA97-210-000

GPU Operating Companies

OA97-496-000
ER97-1055-000

Northeast Utilities

OA97-281-000

Southern Companies

OA97-489-000
ER97-976-000

Tampa Electric Company

OA97-296-000

[FR Doc. 97-2015 Filed 1-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP97-230-000]**Florida Gas Transmission Company;
Notice of Compliance Filing**

January 22, 1997.

Take notice that on January 16, 1997, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1 the following tariff sheets to become effective April 1, 1997:

First Revised Sheet No. 115
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 116
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 117
Third Revised Sheet No. 117A
Third Revised Sheet No. 121

FGT states that on October 1, 1996, FGT filed pro forma tariff sheets in Docket No. RP97-21-000 (October 1 Filing) to implement standards adopted by the Gas Industry Standards Board (GISB) in compliance with Commission Order No. 587. On November 15, 1996, the Commission issued an Order on Compliance (November 15 order) in which the Commission found that FGT's pro forma tariff language generally complied with Order No. 587 with certain exceptions. The November 15 Order required FGT to file revised pro forma tariff sheets as needed to address the exceptions noted by the Commission. On December 16, 1996, FGT filed revised pro forma tariff sheets in Docket No. RP97-21-001 (December 16 Filing) in compliance with the November 15 Order.

FGT states that in the October 1 Filing, FGT requested waiver of the portion of Standard 1.3.2 establishing a deadline of 11:30 AM for nominations leaving the control of the nominating party (11:45 AM for receipt by Transporter) to the extent necessary to permit an earlier deadline for written nominations, which FGT currently accepts. The Commission in its November 15 Order denied FGT's requested waiver of the above deadlines for written nominations, citing the objective of uniformity in such rules and timelines for the gas industry, and required FGT to apply the GISB deadlines to written nominations to the extent that FGT continues to accept written nominations. The Commission then stated that any proposals to change service offerings should be made in a separate Section 4 filing.

FGT states that during the GISB process, it was clearly understood by all participants that the accelerated timeline for receiving and confirming nominations and communicating scheduled quantities was predicated on the electronic exchange of information. As explained in the transmittal letter of FGT's December 16 Filing, because of

the additional time that is necessary to perform the manual entry and validation work associated with a written nomination, FGT states that it cannot meet the GISB confirmation and scheduling deadlines if it continues to accept written nominations and such nominations are not received until 11:45 AM.

FGT states that it currently receives all of its nominations in writing by 10:00 AM. It takes FGT approximately 7 hours to manually enter the nominations, perform iterative capacity allocations, and confirm quantities with the interconnecting parties. Currently, the scheduling process is completed by 5:00 PM. With the implementation of the GISB standards on April 1, 1997, the window for processing nominations must be shortened by 2 to 3 hours to complete the confirmation process by the 3:30 PM deadline.

Accordingly, FGT states that it is herein proposing to eliminate written nominations, except in emergency circumstances, to ensure that it is able to meet the timeline set out in Standard 1.3.2.

FGT states that on December 19, 1996, FGT advised its customers that in order to comply with the GISB timeline, it would be necessary for all customers to submit their nominations electronically beginning March 31, 1997 (for the gas day of April 1, 1997). In this letter, FGT informed its customers that they will have several options for the electronic transmission of nominations: (i) an ANSI X12 format from the customer's computer to FGT via the Internet, (ii) a standard flat file format via Internet, or (iii) use of a third party service provider using option (i) or (ii) above. FGT also included an electronic communications survey in order to facilitate the transition to electronic nominations.

FGT states that it is currently testing the standard GISB X12/ Internet process with its customers which have expressed an interest in this process. This testing has been conducted on the servers which will be used for production on April 1, 1997. In addition, FGT has participated in the related pilot testing of the standard GISB process which allows any customer to upload X12 files to its test server.

FGT states that it is also offering another capability for its customers to upload nominations electronically. This capability specifies a flat file format which can easily be created by a variety of inexpensive, widely available software products including spreadsheets. This eliminates the requirement that the customer maintain an X12 translator. FGT customers can

upload the flat file using a Web browser to access a Web page located on FGT's Web server. The uploaded file will be processed and a result returned interactively to the Web browser. FGT's customers can also use a part-time, dial-up connection to the Internet to implement this alternative. This capability is currently available for testing at <http://x12.enron.com:5713/interhome.htm>.

FGT states that the changes submitted in the instant filing provide for the elimination of written nominations effective for the gas day of April 1, 1997, in accordance with FGT's implementation of GISB Standard 1.3.2.1. The changes reflected in the attached tariff sheets are made in order to allow FGT to effectively implement Standard 1.3.2 (which provides for deadlines of 11:45 AM for the receipt of nominations by FGT, noon for a quick response, and 3:30 PM for receipt of completed confirmations by FGT from upstream and downstream connected parties, with the scheduling process being completed by 4:30 PM). Nominations for the April 1 gas day will be physically submitted on March 31, 1997. FGT has also included a provision providing for the submission of written nominations on an emergency basis in the event of a failure of electronic nomination communication equipment, such as phone lines, servers, or the Internet. The changes proposed herein also incorporate the changes previously proposed to the affected tariff sheets on a pro forma basis in FGT's October 1 and December 16 Filings. Upon acceptance of the changes proposed herein, it will not be necessary for FGT to refile these tariff sheets when it makes its filing to implement the proposed GISB changes following the completion of the Commission's review of FGT's pro forma filings in Docket Nos. RP97-21-000 and -001.

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, NE, Washington, DC, 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.211 and 385.214 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before February 12, 1997. 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 in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-1971 Filed 1-27-97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. RP97-102-001]

Mississippi River Transmission Corporation; Notice of Filing

January 22, 1997.

Take notice that on January 15, 1997, Mississippi River Transmission Corporation (MRT) submitted for filing worksheets reflecting the calculation of Gas Supply Realignment Costs (GSRC) in compliance with the December 31, 1996 Order issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in this proceeding. As explained in its filing, MRT's worksheets set out explanations and support for the calculation of its GSRC.

MRT states that copies of the compliance filing have been mailed to all parties on the official service list.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC, 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211). All such protests must be filed on or before January 29, 1997. 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. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-1969 Filed 1-27-97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. TM97-3-25-001]

Mississippi River Transmission Corporation; Notice of Compliance Filing

January 22, 1997.

Take notice that on January 15, 1997, Mississippi River Transmission Corporation (MRT) submitted for filing worksheets reflecting the calculation of Miscellaneous Revenues in compliance with the December 31, 1996 Order issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in this proceeding. As explained in its filing, MRTs worksheets set out explanations and support for the calculation of its imbalance purchases and sales and for the cashout rate

applied in each of MRTs cashout transactions.

MRT states that copies of the compliance filing have been mailed to all parties on the official service list.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211). All such protests should be filed on or before January 29, 1997. 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. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-1973 Filed 1-27-97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket No. CP97-195-000]

Missouri Gas Energy, A Division of Southern Union Company, Complainant, v. Williams Natural Gas Company, Respondent; Notice of Complaint

January 22, 1997.

Take notice that on January 13, 1997, Missouri Gas Energy, A Division of Southern Union Company (MGE), 504 Lavaca, Suite 800, Austin, Texas 78701, filed a complaint in Docket No. CP97-195-000, pursuant to Section 5 of the Natural Gas Act and Rules 206 and 212 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. MGE requests that the Commission order Williams Natural Gas Company (Williams) to immediately cease construction of pipeline facilities for the purpose of providing service to the Hawthorn Power Plant located in Jackson County, Missouri, and charges that the proposed construction clearly violates Section 311 of the NGPA, all as more fully set forth in the complaint which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

MGE believes that Williams' proposed pipeline project is an inappropriate circumvention of the Commission's jurisdiction under Section 7 of the NGA, because the service proposal does not satisfy the requirements of Section 284.102(d) of the Commission's Regulations. In addition, MGE charges that Williams has failed to comply with Section 284.11 of the Commission's Regulations which require that a pipeline give at least 30 days notice prior to the commencement of any