

at any time prior to March 29, 1996. An information meeting addressing this notice will be held at the DOE facility auditorium in Germantown, Maryland, from 9:00 a.m. until noon on February 13, 1996. Information packages distributed during the February 13, 1996, meeting will be made available to interested parties after February 14, 1996. Submit requests to the programmatic information contact listed below.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** All information, other than the dates, presented in the December 1995 Notice remains the same. Requests for information should be directed to: Mr. Owen W. Lowe, U.S. Department of Energy, Isotope Production and Distribution, NE-70 (GTN), 19901 Germantown Road, Germantown, MD 20874, (301) 903-5161.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on January 18, 1996.

Owen W. Lowe,

*Associate Director for Isotope Production and Distribution, Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology.*

[FR Doc. 96-1068 Filed 1-24-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

## Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP96-52-000]

### Pine Needle LNG Company, LLC; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Pine Needle LNG Project and Request for Comments on Environmental Issues and Notice of Technical Conference and Site Visits

January 19, 1996.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) will prepare an environmental assessment (EA) that will discuss the environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the facilities proposed in the Pine Needle LNG Project. This EA will be used by the Commission in its decision-making process to determine whether an environmental impact statement (EIS) is necessary and whether to approve the project.<sup>1</sup>

#### Summary of the Proposed Project

Pine Needle LNG Company, LLC (Pine Needle), is seeking approval to construct and operate a liquefied natural gas (LNG) production and storage

facility approximately 13 miles northwest of Greensboro in Guilford County, North Carolina. The purpose of the facility is to meet winter peak shaving requirements of several customers, including Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc., Public Service Company of North Carolina, Inc., North Carolina Natural Gas Corporation, and the Municipal Gas Authority of Georgia.

The primary components of the LNG facility would include:

- Two double-wall, suspended-deck LNG storage tanks, each with a gas-equivalent capacity of 2 billion cubic feet;
- A pretreatment and liquefaction system with the capacity of 20 million cubic feet per day (MMcfd);
- A boil-off recompression system;
- A vaporization and sendout system with the capacity of 400 MMcfd;
- 1.05 miles of 10- and 24-inch-diameter pipelines;
- Fire protection systems; and
- A 54.5 acre-foot firewater pond and earthen dam.

The storage tanks would be approximately 161 feet in height and 206 feet in diameter. Each storage tank would be surrounded by a 30-foot high earthen dike to form individual spill containment areas sized to hold 150 percent of the volume of LNG contained within each tank. The proposed project facilities would be designed, constructed, and maintained to comply with the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Safety Standards for Liquefied Natural Gas Facilities (49 CFR Part 193). The facilities constructed at the site would also meet the National Fire Protection Association 59A LNG standards.

Natural gas would be delivered to and from the LNG facility through a 10-inch-diameter inlet pipeline and a 24-inch-diameter outlet pipeline, respectively. These pipelines would be constructed from the LNG facility to Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation's Mainline transmission system, a distance of 1.05 miles. A new 1.6-mile-long, 100 kV transmission powerline would be provided by Duke Power Company to supply power for a step-down substation at the proposed LNG facility. The majority of this powerline would be constructed parallel and adjacent to the new pipelines.

The proposed LNG facility would be accessed during construction and operation using a 3,900-foot-long road extending from the facility eastward to a public road. The location of the proposed Pine Needle LNG Project is shown in appendix 1.<sup>2</sup>

#### Land Requirements for Construction

The proposed facilities would affect approximately 86.6 acres of an 828-acre site. Pine Needle would permanently clear approximately 57.9 acres for the LNG facility site and security buffer, 10.0 acres for the firewater pond and associated dam, 6.4 acres for the new pipeline right-of-way, and 3.0 acres for the permanent access road. An additional 9.5 acres would be temporarily disturbed during construction but would be allowed to revert back to its original condition following construction.

#### The EA Process/Environmental Issues

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the Commission to take into account the environmental impacts that could result from an action whenever it considers the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. NEPA also requires us to discover and address concerns the public may have about proposals. We call this "scoping". The main goal of the scoping process is to focus the analysis in the EA on the important environmental issues. By this Notice of Intent, the Commission requests public comments on the scope of the issues it will address in the EA and whether an EIS is necessary. All comments received are considered during the preparation of the EA. State and local government representatives are encouraged to notify their constituents of this proposed action and encourage them to comment on their areas of concern.

The EA will discuss impacts that could occur as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed project under these general headings:

- Geology and Soils.
  - Seismology and soil liquefaction.
  - Effect of blasting.
  - Erosion control.
  - Facility site and right-of-way restoration.
- Water Resources.
  - Groundwater withdrawal and discharge to surrounding surface waters.
  - Effect of dam and pond construction on Rock Branch and downstream flows.
  - The directional drilling of the Haw River and the potential to affect water quality and riparian resources.
- Biological Resources.

available from the Commission's Public Reference and Files Maintenance Branch, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, or call (202) 208-1371. Copies of the appendices were sent to all those receiving this notice in the mail.

<sup>1</sup> Pine Needle LNG Company, LLC's application was filed with the Commission under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act and Part 157 of the Commission's regulations.

<sup>2</sup> The appendices referenced in this notice are not being printed in the Federal Register. Copies are

- Effect of facility construction and operation on wildlife and fisheries habitat, including threatened, endangered, or sensitive animal and plant species and their habitats (*i.e.*, Carolina darter and burreed community).
- Effect on wetland habitats.
  - Cultural Resources.
- Effect on historic and prehistoric sites.
- Native American and tribal concerns.
  - Socioeconomics.
- Impact of a peak workforce of about 115 workers on the surrounding area.
- Long-term effects of increased employment and taxes on the local economy.
  - Land Use.
- Impact on state areas of critical environmental concern.
- Effect of aboveground facilities on visual aesthetics in the area.
- Consistency with local land use plans and zoning.
- Impact on residences and recreation areas.
  - Air Quality and Noise.
- Air quality and noise impacts associated with construction.
- Impact on regional air quality and noise-sensitive areas associated with operation of the proposed LNG facility.
  - Public Safety.
- Compliance with 49 CFR 193 for exclusion zones (thermal and vapor gas dispersion), siting criteria, seismic criteria, and cryogenic criteria.
- Consequences of a major spill.
- Safety concerns associated with design of firewater pond dam.

We will also evaluate possible site and technology alternatives to the proposed project or portions of the project, and make recommendations on how to lessen or avoid impacts on the various resource areas.

Our independent analysis of the issues will be in the EA. Depending on the comments received during the scoping process, the EA may be published and mailed to Federal, state, and local agencies, public interest groups, interested individuals, affected landowners, newspapers, libraries, and the Commission's official service list for this proceeding. A comment period will be allotted for review if the EA is published. We will consider all comments on the EA before we recommend that the Commission approve or not approve the project.

#### Public Participation/Scoping Meeting

You can make a difference by sending a letter addressing your specific comments or concerns about the project.

You should focus on the potential environmental effects of the proposal, alternatives to the proposal (including alternative sites), and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impact. The more specific your comments, the more useful they will be. Please follow the instructions below to ensure that your comments are received and properly recorded:

- Address your letter to: Lois Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First St., NE., Washington, DC 20426;
- Reference Docket No. CP96-52-000;
- Send a copy of your letter to: Mr. Michael Boyle, EA Project Manager, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First St., NE., Room 72-59, Washington, DC 20426; and
- Mail your comments so that they will be received in Washington, DC on or before March 22, 1996.

If you wish to receive a copy of the EA, you should request one from Mr. Boyle at the above address.

Beyond asking for written comments, we invite you to attend our public scoping meeting that will be held on February 15, 1996, at 7:00 p.m., at the Stokesdale Elementary School, Stokesdale, North Carolina. This public meeting will be designed to provide you with more detailed information and another opportunity to offer your comments on the proposed project. The staff will also visit the proposed site on February 15, 1996.

On March 19, 1996, at 9:00 a.m., the FERC staff will meet with representatives of Pine Needle to conduct a cryogenic design and engineering review of the proposed LNG facilities. This technical conference will be held at the Stokesdale Town Hall, U.S. Hwy 158, Stokesdale, North Carolina. The staff will also visit the proposed site area.

#### Becoming an Intervenor

In addition to involvement in the EA scoping process, you may want to become an official party to the proceeding or become an "intervenor". Among other things, intervenors have the right to receive copies of case-related Commission documents and filings by other intervenors. Likewise, each intervenor must provide copies of its filings to all other parties. If you want to become an intervenor you must file a motion to intervene according to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214) (see appendix 2).

The date for filing timely motions to intervene in this proceeding has passed. Therefore, parties now seeking to file

late interventions must show good cause, as required by section 385.214(b)(3), why this time limitation should be waived. Environmental issues have been viewed as good cause for late intervention. You do not need intervenor status to have your scoping comments considered.

Additional information about the proposed project and site visits is available from Mr. Michael Boyle, EA Project Manager, at (202) 208-0839. Additional information concerning the March 19 cryogenic design and engineering technical conference is available from Mr. Robert Arvedlund, Chief, Environmental Review and Compliance Branch I, at (202) 208-0091. Lois D. Cashell, Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-1110 Filed 1-24-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

#### [Docket No. RP96-92-000]

#### Amoco Production Company vs. ANR Pipeline Company; Notice of Complaint and Request for Refunds

January 19, 1996.

Take notice that, on December 22, 1995, Amoco Production Company (Amoco), 501 Westlake Park Blvd., Houston, Texas 77079, filed a complaint and request for refunds, pursuant to sections 4 and 5 of the Natural Gas Act and Rules 206 and 212 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.206 and 385.212), against ANR Pipeline Company (ANR) regarding the charges ANR assesses to the Mooreland Plant owners for the transportation of gas used to replace [make-up] gas removed at the Mooreland Plant as plant fuel and shrinkage resulting from processing, *i.e.*, Plant Thermal Reduction (PTR), all as more fully set forth in the application, which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

The Mooreland Plant is located in Oklahoma and is operated by Amoco. Amoco asserts that ANR owns and operates an extensive gathering system behind the Mooreland Plant, which gathers gas from hundreds of wells but does not perform a transportation service with respect to field production delivered to the inlet of the Mooreland Plant.

Amoco claims that ANR has classified certain of its pipeline facilities upstream of the Mooreland Plant as transmission facilities (including a portion of ANR pipeline that connects the rest of ANR's gathering system to the Mooreland Plant and a portion of ANR's Mooreland Compression Station which is used to