matter finds that the abandonment is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a petition for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provide for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–13067 Filed 5–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. CP98–527–000; CP96–385–000; CP96–386–000, et al. and CP97–127–000]

Mountaineer Gas Company, Complainant, v. Columbia Natural Resources, Inc., Respondent, Columbia Natural Resources, Inc., Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation; Notice of Complaint

May 12, 1998.

Take notice that on May 4, 1998, Mountaineer Gas Company (Mountaineer), 414 Summer Street, Charleston, West Virginia 25332, filed a complaint in Docket No. CP98–527–000 pursuant to Section 5 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Rule 206 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Mountaineer requests that the Commission institute an investigation into certain representations made by Columbia Natural Resources, Inc. (CNR) (or on its behalf), in Docket No. CP96–385–000 and in Docket No. CP96–386–000, *et al.*, which led to Commission approval of the abandonment of certain Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) gathering facilities by sale to CNR; and to re-open those aspects of Docket No. CP97–127–000 involving Groups 16, 17 and 18 in order to prevent further transfers of gathering facilities to CNR.

Mountaineer explains that in Docket No. CP96–386–000, *et al.*, Columbia filed for permission and approval to abandon, by sale to CNR, certain certificated facilities as a necessary component of the transfer to CNR of a larger, 18 system, group of gathering facilities. Mountaineer states that the application indicated that two distinct types of services were being provided by Columbia through such facilities; the first service consisting of a conventional gathering function and the second service consisting of the transportation, by displacement, of gas received on Columbia's transmission system under firm transportation rates schedules to certificated points of delivery on the gathering system. Mountaineer further states that the services then rendered by Columbia through the gathering facilities, whether conventional service or the displacement delivery service for Mountaineer and other local distribution companies, were subject to the Commission's open access transportation regulations. Mountaineer states that it withdrew its protest of Columbia's proposed abandonment after reaching an agreement in principle with CNR on the continuation of the displacement delivery service to Mountaineer previously rendered by Columbia, as part of an overall November 22, 1996 settlement of various Columbia rate and service issues.

Mountaineer states that concurrently with Columbia's abandonment application, CNR filed in Docket No. CP96–385–000, a petition requesting the Commission to disclaim jurisdiction over the gathering facilities to be transferred from Columbia. Mountaineer states that in said petition, CNR stated that it intended to provide substitute nonjurisdictional alternatives to the service provided by Columbia.

Mountaineer states that in early 1998, a dispute arose between Mountaineer and CNR concerning Mountaineer's request for a new point of delivery on the gathering facilities transferred to CNR. Mountaineer states that the purpose of the new delivery point was to permit Mountaineer to compete for a service to a new, large-volume consumer. Mountaineer states that CNR subsequently denied Mountaineer's request, leaving Mountaineer to believe that the primary, if not exclusive, basis for CNR's denial of transportation access was to eliminate Mountaineer as a competitor for this new market, so that CNR's sales function could render the service instead. Mountaineer states that CNR now maintains that the commitment it made during the abandonment proceedings in Docket No. CP96–386–000, *et al.*, such as, to continue open access transportation principles, applies solely to the gathering service it renders, and not to the displacement delivery service rendered for Mountaineer.

Mountaineer maintains that denial of open access transportation service will have serious implications for Mountaineer and its consumers. Mountaineer states that CNR's position, if unchecked, will lead to a result where the only access CNR will provide Mountaineer for new requirements is for small-volume accounts that CNR's sales function finds economically unattractive.

Mountaineer states that recent correspondence with CNR reveals that, from the inception of the abandonment process, CNR never intended to extend open access transportation principles to the displacement delivery service provided to Mountaineer. Mountaineer alleges that through its affiliate, however, CNR caused an abandonment application to be submitted that represented the contrary. Mountaineer maintains that CNR's petition did not disclose its intention to limit open access principles to gathering services only. Mountaineer alleges that CNR's misrepresentation of, or failure to disclose, its intent not to apply open access principles to Mountaineer's transportation service represents a clear violation of Section 157.5 of the regulations and that the facts and circumstances of this violation warrant an investigation.

Mountaineer further requests that the Commission reopen certain aspects of the abandonment application filed in Docket No. CP97–127–000. Mountaineer states that as a result of the auction conducted by Columbia concerning the facilities abandoned in Docket No. CP97–127–000, CNR is the prospective purchaser of the facilities in Groups 16, 17 and 18, all of which serve Mountaineer. Mountaineer states that the purchase and sale transaction for these groups has not yet reached closing and accordingly, the facilities have not yet been transferred from Columbia to CNR. Mountaineer states that these three facility groups provide Mountaineer with displacement delivery service to 26 town border stations, 18 unmeasured points of delivery for over 160 consumers and over 1700 mainline tap consumers. Mountaineer maintains that given CNR's disclosure that it will not abide by open access principles for transportation service to Mountaineer, reopening is require by the public interest.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said petition should on or before June 11, 1998, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., 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). 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 the proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules. Answers to the complaint shall be due on or before June 11, 1998.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–13066 Filed 5–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP98–215–000]

Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

May 12, 1998.

Take notice that on May 7, 1998, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America (Natural) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Sixth Revised Volume No. 1, certain tariff sheets to be effective July 1, 1998.

Natural states that the purpose of this filing is to modify Rate Schedule NSS to provide customers more flexibility in contracting for service by pipeline leg.

Natural requested any waivers which may be required to permit the tendered tariff sheets to become effective on July 1, 1998.

Naturla states that copies of the filing have been mailed to its customers and interested state regulatory agencies.

Any persons desiring to be heard or to protest this filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed as provided in Section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. 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 proceedings. 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.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–13072 Filed 5–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–02–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. OA96–161–003]

Puget Sound Energy, Inc.; Notice of Filing

May 12, 1998.

Take notice that on August 14, 1997, Puget Sound Energy, Inc. tendered for filing Revision Sheets to its Open Access Transmission Tariff, FERC Electric Tariff, Original Vol. 7 pursuant to the Commission's Order on Compliance Tariff Rates and Generic Clarification of Implementation Procedures, issued July 31, 1997.

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, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, inaccordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before May 19, 1998. 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.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–13070 Filed 5–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. ER98–441–000 and ER98–1019–000; ER98–495–000, ER98–1614–000, and ER98–2145–000; ER98–496–000 and ER98–2160–000; ER98–441–001, ER98–495–001, and ER98–496–001 (consolidated)]

Southern California Edison Company California Independent System Corp., Pacific Gas & Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, Pacific Gas & Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company; Notice of Informal Settlement Conference

May 12, 1998.

Take notice that an informal settlement conference will be convened in the subject proceedings on Monday, May 18, 1998, at 10:00 AM, through Wednesday, May 20, 1998. The conference will be held at the offices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

Any party, as defined by 18 CFR 385.102(c), or any participant, as defined by 18 CFR 385.102(b), may attend. Persons wishing to become a party must move to intervene and receive intervenor status pursuant to section 385.214 of the Commission's regulations.

For additional information, please contact Paul B. Mohler at (202) 208–1240, or by e-mail at paul.mohler@ferc.fed.us.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–13068 Filed 5–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP98–99–001]

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company; Notice of Pro Forma Compliance Filing

May 12, 1998.

Take notice that on May 7, 1998, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Tennessee) tendered for filing the following pro forma tariff sheets:

Pro Forma Sheet No. 231
Pro Forma Sheet No. 232
Pro Forma Sheet No. 232A
Pro Forma Sheet No. 234
Pro Forma Sheet No. 235

Tennessee states that the proposed pro forma tariff sheets are filed in compliance with the Commission's