

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY****Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. OA96-70-001]

**Boston Edison Company; Notice of Filing**

September 9, 1997.

Take notice that on July 9, 1997, Boston Edison Company of Boston, Massachusetts tendered for filing an index of its service agreements under its open-access transmission tariff pursuant to the Commission's order in Allegheny Power System, Inc., 80 FERC ¶61,143 (1997).

Boston Edison states that copies of this filing have been served on the affected customers and the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities.

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, in accordance 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 September 19, 1997. Protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it 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.

**Lois D. Cashell,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-24361 Filed 9-12-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY****Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. TM98-1-123-000]

**Crossroads Pipeline Company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff**

September 9, 1997.

Take notice that on September 3, 1997, Crossroads Pipeline Company (Crossroads) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Sixth Revised Tariff Sheet No. 6. Crossroads asserts that this filing is being made to comply with the Commission's notice of August 20, 1997 and Section 154.402 of the Commission's regulations.

Crossroads states that the purpose of the filing is to add an Annual Charge Adjustment (ACA) unit charge to its tariff. Crossroads requests an effective date of October 1, 1997 for the proposed tariff sheet and a waiver of Section 154.207 of the Commission's regulations.

Crossroads states further that copies of the filing were served on its current firm and interruptible customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest this filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., 20426, in accordance with Sections 385.211 and 385.214 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 in this proceeding, 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 Crossroads' filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

**Lois D. Cashell,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-24371 Filed 9-12-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY****Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. RP97-363-001]

**Egan Hub Partners, L.P.; Notice of Compliance Filing**

September 9, 1997.

Take notice that on September 4, 1997, Egan Hub Partners, L.P. (Egan Hub), filed tariff sheets to reflect compliance with Order No. 587 et seq. and an "Order on Compliance Filing" issued on June 30, 1997, 79 FERC ¶61,423 (1997), (hereinafter the "June 30 Order"). In addition to filing tariff sheets that have been revised to comply with changes ordered by the Commission in the June 30 Order, Egan Hub states that it is also filing those tariff sheets that were approved by the Commission in the June 30 Order. In addition to the foregoing changes, Egan Hub states that it has also corrected spelling and similar errors.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,

888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such 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 the protestants parties to the proceeding. A copy of this filing is on file with the Commission and is available for public inspection in the public reference room.

**Lois D. Cashell,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-24366 Filed 9-12-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY****Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. RP97-514-000]

**Huntsville Utilities Gas System City of Huntsville, Alabama v. Midcoast Interstate Gas Transmission, Inc.; Notice of Complaint and Motion for Expedited Relief**

September 9, 1997.

Take notice that on September 4, 1997, Huntsville Utilities Gas System, City of Huntsville, Alabama, (Huntsville) tendered for filing a complaint against Midcoast Gas Transmission, Inc. (Midcoast) and a motion for expedited relief, pursuant to Section 5 of the Natural Gas Act, Order No. 636-A, and Rules 206 and 212 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Huntsville submits its complaint against the alleged unlawful auction procedures of Midcoast and the improper bids by Midcoast's marketing affiliate, Midcoast Marketing, Inc. (MMI), with respect to certain firm transportation capacity Huntsville has on Midcoast that is subject to expiring service agreements for which Huntsville has a tariff right of first refusal (ROFR). Midcoast Gas Tariff, General Terms and Conditions, Section 3.14(e).

Among other things, Huntsville contends that the terms of the auction were inconsistent with the Commission's May 30, 1997, Order in docket No. RP97-331, which among other things stays abandonment authority relating to service to Huntsville until April 1, 1998. Huntsville also contends that MMI, which is the sole bidder on its expiring capacity, bid on the Huntsville capacity, without having market support for its bids, in an effort to manipulate the auction and force Huntsville to exercise