(FGT) 1400 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed under Sections 157.205 and 157.216 of the Commission's Regulations to abandon and remove a meter station located in Dade County, Florida, all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

FGT proposes to abandon and remove the PGS Miami Beach Meter Station which serves as a delivery point to TECO Peoples Gas (TECO). Minor re-piping will also be made through the existing PGS Miami Meter Station. FGT states that the proposed abandonment will not result in any disruption of service to TECO, nor disadvantage any of FGT's existing customers.

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 Section 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefore, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a request. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of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.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–13065 Filed 5–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98–520–000]

Koch Gateway Pipeline Company; Notice of Request Under Blanket Authorization

May 12, 1998.

Take notice that on May 5, 1998, Koch Gateway Pipeline Company (Koch Gateway), P.O. Box 1478, Houston, Texas 77251–1478, filed in Docket No. CP98–520–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.211 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.211) for authorization to operate as a jurisdictional facility, a two-inch tap and a two-inch meter station, located in Harrison County, Mississippi, under Koch Gateway's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–430–000, pursuant to Section 7(c) 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.

Koch Gateway proposes to operate as a jurisdictional facility in interstate commerce, a two-inch tap and a two-inch meter station previously installed and placed in service under Section 311(a) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 and Section 284.3(c) of the Commission's regulations. Koch Gateway states that the proposed certification of facilities will enable Koch Gateway to provide transportation services under its blanket transportation certificate through a tap serving Entex, Inc. (Entex), a local distribution company in Harrison County, Mississippi, for Warren Paving, Inc., an end user.

Once this delivery point is certificated as a jurisdictional facility, Koch Gateway asserts Entex will be able to receive gas shipped to this point pursuant to jurisdictional open-access transportation agreements as well as Section 311 agreements. Koch Gateway declares Entex estimates its peak day and average day requirements for the delivery point to be 1,630 MMBtu and 104 MMBtu, respectively. Koch Gateway states they were reimbursed by Entex approximately $102,000 for the construction costs.

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 Section 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) 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.

David P. Boergers,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–13064 Filed 5–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. CP98–528–000]

Koch Gateway Pipeline Company; Notice of Application

May 12, 1998.

Take notice that on May 7, 1998, Koch Gateway Pipeline Company (Applicant), 600 Travis Street, P.O. Box 1478, Houston, Texas, 77251–1478, filed in Docket No. CP98–528–000 an abbreviated application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, and Sections 157.7 and 157.18 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) regulations thereunder, for permission and approval to abandon an obsolete transportation service for Midcoast Marketing, Inc. (Midcoast), successor by merger to Mid Louisiana Gas Company (Mid La), all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Applicant proposes to abandon a firm transportation service formally provided to Midcoast pursuant to Applicant's Rate Schedule X–90. Applicant asserts that Midcoast concurs to the proposed abandonment and that no facilities are proposed to be abandoned.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before June 2, 1998, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 of 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 the proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition 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 on this application if no petition to intervene is filed within the time required herein, and if the Commission on its own review of the

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