157.7 and 157.18). Northern's amendment reflects a change in the parties involved in the purchase and sale of Northern's Montana facilities and requests abandonment of services rendered by Northern through the Montana facilities, all as more fully set forth in the amendment which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Northern originally proposed to abandon its Montana facilities by sale to NGC Energy Resources, Limited Partnership (NGC Energy); however, the Asset Purchase Agreement between Northern and NGC Energy has been terminated. On December 16, 1994, Northern states that it entered into an Asset Purchase Agreement with UMC Petroleum Corporation (UMC) providing for the sale and purchase of the Montana facilities by UMC or its designee. Northern states that the amendment includes the same facilities as the original application.

Comment date: February 16, 1995, in accordance with the first paragraph of Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

2. Northwest Pipeline Corporation

[Docket No. CP95-165-000]

Take notice that on January 19, 1995, Northwest Pipeline Corporation (Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84158, filed in Docket No. CP95–165–000 an application pursuant to sections 7(c) and 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for authorization to construct and operate certain replacement natural gas facilities and for authorization to abandon and remove the facilities being replaced, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Northwest proposes to construct and operate approximately 0.2 mile of new 26-inch replacement pipeline, partially outside of Northwest's existing right-ofway, and abandon and remove approximately 0.2 mile of existing 26inch deteriorated pipeline on Northwest's Ignacio to Sumas mainline in the Philadelphia Creek area of Rio Blanco County, Colorado.

Northwest states that the installation of replacement pipeline and the removal and abandonment of the existing line is necessary to insure the integrity of its mainline transmission system.

Northwest states that the proposed pipeline replacement will not result in an increase in the capacity of its mainline.

Northwest estimates the total costs to construct the proposed pipeline and remove and abandon the existing pipeline segment at approximately \$311,700.

Comment date: February 25, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

3. Sea Robin Pipeline Company

[Docket No CP95-168-000]

Take notice that on January 20, 1995, Sea Robin Pipeline Company (Sea Robin), P.O. Box 2563, Birmingham, Alabama 35202–2563, filed a petition for a declaratory order in Docket No. CP95–168–000, requesting that the Commission declare that its facilities are gathering facilities not subject to the Commission jurisdiction under Section 1(b) of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the petition which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Sea Robin states that it is an offshore pipeline company which gathers natural gas and condensate from numerous production fields, offshore Louisiana, including the East Cameron, West Cameron, Eugene Island, Ship Shoal, South Marsh Island and Vermilon Areas. Sea Robin states that its system consists of a 438 mile network of pipelines in the form of an inverted "Y" which range from 4 inches to 36 inches in diameter. Sea Robin states that its system extends from East Cameron Block 335 and Ship Shoal Block 222 at the end points of the "Y" and terminates onshore in Vermilion Parish, Louisiana, near Erath, Louisiana, where the gas is processed and delivered to four interstate and one intrastate transmission companies.

In the petition, Sea Robin requests that the Commission issue a declaratory order ruling that its facilities are exempt from all Commission jurisdiction under section 1(b) of the Natural Gas Act based on the primary function test set forth in Farmland Industries, Inc., 23 FERC ¶ 61,063 (1983). Sea Robin states that the characteristics of its system and its business purpose in gathering unprocessed gas supplies offshore meet the requirements of the primary function test enumerated in applicable Commission precedent. Upon such ruling, Sea Robin also requests that the Commission rescind the certificate of public convenience and necessity issued to Sea Robin in Docket No. CP69–48 and all other certificate authorizations and rate schedules associated with its jurisdictional operations.

Comment date: February 16, 1995, in accordance with the first paragraph of Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

4. Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation

[Docket No. CP95-170-000]

Take notice that on January 20, 1995, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, S.E., Charleston, West Virginia 25314– 1599, filed in Docket No. CP95–170–000 an abbreviated application pursuant to Sections 7(c) and 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) for authorization to construct and operate certain natural gas facilities and for permission and approval to abandon the facilities being replaced, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Columbia requests NGA Section 7(c) authorization for the construction and operation of approximately 6.8 miles of 30-inch pipeline and Section 7(b) authorization for the replacement of two existing segments of 20-inch looped pipelines, designated as Lines X52–M1 and X52–M1–Loop, each of which is approximately 6.8 miles in length and located in Kanawha County, West Virginia.

Columbia does not request authorization for any new or additional service. Columbia states that the segments of pipeline to be replaced have become physically deteriorated to the extent that the replacement is deemed advisable. The estimated cost of the proposed construction is \$9,156,000.

Comment date: February 16, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

5. Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation

[Docket No. CP95-171-000]

Take notice that on January 20, 1995, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia), 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, S.E., Charleston, West Virginia 25314, filed in Docket No. CP95-171-000 a request pursuant to §§ 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 and operate a new delivery point in Mason County, Kentucky 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 delivery point in Mason County, Kentucky for firm transportation service to Columbia Gas of Kentucky, Inc. Columbia states that there will be no impact on Columbia's