

108 FERC 61,230  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

September 10, 2004

In Reply Refer To:  
Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation  
Docket No. RP04-407-000

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation  
P.O. Box 1396  
Houston, TX 77251

Attention: Marg Camardello  
Manager of Tariffs and Certificates

Reference: First Revised Sheet No. 256A and Eighth Revised Sheet No. 257 to  
FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1

Ladies and Gentlemen:

1. On July 21, 2004, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco) filed tariff sheets to modify its billing provisions to provide that it will render its bills electronically, unless a customer elects to have bills rendered via U.S. mail. Transco's tariff sheets are accepted, effective September 11, 2004, as proposed, subject to the conditions discussed below. Transco is directed to file revised tariff sheets within 15 days of the date of this letter order.
2. Transco proposes to modify section 6 of its General Terms and Conditions (GT&C) to provide that monthly invoices of its customers shall be rendered electronically, and shall be considered duly delivered to customers by posting the invoices on Transco's ILine system, or if requested by a customer in writing on or before September 20, 2004, by mailing the invoice to the customer by regular U.S. mail. Further, the proposed tariff revisions provide that customers may elect to receive e-mail notification from Transco that monthly bills have been rendered electronically.
3. Public notice of the instant filing was issued on July 26, 2004, with interventions and protests due on or before August 2, 2004. Notices of intervention and unopposed timely filed motions to intervene are granted pursuant to the operation of Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2004). Any opposed or untimely filed motion to intervene is governed by the provisions of Rule 214. The Process Gas Consumers Group (PGC) filed a limited protest out of time. On

August 18, 2004, Transco filed an answer in response to PGC's protest. Waiver of Rule 213 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 C.F.R. §385.213 (2004)) is granted as the Answer provides additional information that may aid in addressing the issues raised by the instant filing. PGC's protest and Transco's response are addressed below.

4. PGC states that it does not oppose Transco's efforts to streamline the billing process; however, PGC believes that the tariff modifications are not in keeping with recent Commission precedent. PGC notes that the proposed tariff language provides that a Shipper "may elect, on ILine, to receive e-mail notification...when bills are rendered electronically." PGC believes that it should not be the Shipper's obligation to elect to receive e-mail notification of the monthly invoice. Moreover, PGC claims that since the Commission recently directed Texas Eastern Transmission, L.P., to file tariff language providing that it will send an e-mail notification contemporaneously to its customers when the monthly invoices have been finalized and posted,<sup>1</sup> Transco should be directed to do so here. PGC states that receipt of the e-mail notification is a key component in assuring that the new invoice process is successful and requests that the Commission direct Transco to modify its proposed tariff language to require that Transco send an e-mail notification contemporaneously to all customers receiving electronic invoices, once those invoices have been posted on the ILine system. Finally, PGC also requests that the Commission require Transco, as it did Texas Eastern, to include tariff language allowing shippers to designate an agent to receive the e-mail notification.

5. In response to PGC's protest, Transco provides that under its electronic invoicing process, notification to all customers that invoices are approved or final will be accomplished via its ILine system. Transco adds that it will post that notification on its informational posting website and each customer contemporaneously will receive that notification (*i.e.*, electronic notification) in its private mailbox in the ILine system. According to Transco, this will eliminate the need for a separate and duplicative requirement for an e-mail notification to each customer. In addition, Transco states that in other contexts, Transco's customers have expressed the desire not to receive unnecessary e-mails. It is for those reasons that Transco states that its current tariff provisions afford customers a choice whether to be notified via e-mail when bills are rendered, and its proposed tariff modifications continue to provide that choice to its customers, including members of the PGC.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Texas Eastern Transmission, L.P.*, 106 FERC ¶ 61,078 (2004).

6. Finally, Transco responds that PGC's request to require Transco to include tariff language allowing Shippers to designate an agent to receive the e-mail notification is unnecessary and should be rejected by the Commission. Transco states that under its current tariff, customers have the ability to appoint an agent to perform any function under a service agreement on behalf of the customer, including invoicing and payment functions.<sup>2</sup>

7. In its Answer, Transco clarifies that it will send an electronic notification to a customer's private mailbox on the 1Line system contemporaneously with the posting that invoices are approved or final on its informational posting website. However, Transco's tariff does not specify that Transco will send the electronic notification. The Commission believes that this fact is a key component of Transco's electronic invoicing process and should be included in section 6 (c) of Transco's GT&C. Therefore, Transco is directed to incorporate this information into its tariff and file a revised tariff sheet within 15 days of the date of this order. The Commission will not require Transco to send out separate e-mail notifications to customers that approved or final invoices are posted, as requested by PGC, because such e-mail notifications would be duplicative of the electronic notification that will be provided to each customer by the 1Line system and because PGC has not shown why two notifications are necessary.

8. With respect to PGC's concern about whether shippers can designate an agent to receive e-mail notification that approved or final invoices have been posted, Transco states that its Form of Service Agreement for 1Line service already provides that the customer's agent will receive all appropriate notifications on behalf of the customer. The Commission agrees with Transco that this would include the notification that the customer's invoices are approved or final. It is therefore unnecessary to require Transco to include tariff language to that effect.

By direction of the Commission.

Magalie R. Salas,  
Secretary.

---

<sup>2</sup>Substitute Seventh Revised Sheet No. 512. Specifically, section 2 of the Form of Service Agreement for 1Line Service, states that "the Company agrees that it will recognize the appointment of an Agent by Customer to access and perform functions on 1Line on Customer's behalf."