

130 FERC ¶ 61,258
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

March 30, 2010

In Reply Refer To:
Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC
Docket No. RP10-402-000

Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC
5151 San Felipe, Suite 2500
Houston, TX 77056

Attention: James R. Downs,
Vice President of Rates & Regulatory Affairs

Reference: Electric Power Costs Adjustment

Dear Mr. Downs:

1. On February 26, 2010, Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC (Columbia Gas) filed revised tariff sheets¹ reflecting its annual revisions to its Electric Power Cost Adjustment (EPCA) pursuant to section 45 of the General Terms and Conditions of its tariff. The Commission accepts Columbia Gas' revised tariff sheets effective April 1, 2010, as proposed.

2. Columbia Gas' proposed EPCA rates consist of a current EPCA component reflecting a projection of costs for a prospective twelve-month period, and an EPCA surcharge rate component, which is a true up for actual activity within the deferral period. Columbia Gas adjusted the EPCA rates in order to collect \$14,078,177 in projected annual electricity costs to be incurred for compression and LNG service, and to collect \$2,633,966 in electricity costs under-collected for the deferral period January 1, 2009

¹ Ninth Revised Sheet Nos. 25 and 26, Seventh Revised Sheet No. 27, Twelfth Revised Sheet No. 28, Ninth Revised Sheet Nos. 29 and 30, and Second Revised Sheet No. 36 to FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1.

through December 31, 2009. The projected level of electric costs is an increase of \$1,655,975 over Columbia Gas' previous annual filing of \$12,422,202 in Docket No. RP09-391-000.

3. Notice of Columbia Gas' filing was issued on March 1, 2010, with interventions and protests due as provided in section 154.210 of the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 154.210 (2009). Pursuant to Rule 214, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2009), all timely motions to intervene and any motions to intervene out-of-time filed before the issuance of this order are granted. Granting late intervention at this stage of the proceeding will not disrupt the proceeding or place additional burdens on existing parties. Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (BGE) filed a protest. Columbia Gas filed an answer to the protest.² The protest and answer are discussed below.

4. BGE asserts that Columbia Gas' use of different billing determinants than those reflected in Columbia Gas' concurrent transportation tracker filing in Docket No. RP10-401-000 seems to be related to discount adjustments to the billing determinants used to design the rates in this EPCA tracker filing that were not previously approved and reflected in base rates. BGE further asserts that the Commission has previously ruled that EPCA surcharges must reflect base rate discounts only, as there are no provisions in the EPCA mechanism itself for discount adjustments such as those being proposed, citing *Columbia Gas Transmission, LLC*, 106 FERC ¶ 61,128, *order on reh'g*, 109 FERC ¶ 61,355 (2004). BGE objects to the use of EPCA-only discount adjustments and argues they are unsupported even if allowed.

5. In its answer, Columbia Gas responds that it has not made any discount adjustments in calculating the EPCA rates. Further, Columbia Gas filed revised workpapers showing the billing determinants used to calculate the EPCA rates, without reference to the filing in Docket No. RP10-401-000. Columbia Gas states that, after informal discussions with BGE, it believes that the revised workpapers will satisfy BGE's concerns regarding the billing determinants used to calculate the EPCA rates. Columbia Gas further states that it will include workpapers that separately state the EPCA billing determinants in all future EPCA filings.

6. The Commission finds that Columbia Gas has adequately supported its filing. Columbia Gas has affirmed with supporting workpapers that it has not made discount adjustments to the billing determinants used to design the proposed EPCA rates.

² While the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure generally prohibit answers to protests, the Commission will accept Columbia Gas' answer to allow a fuller understanding of the issues. *See* 18 C.F.R. § 385.213 (a)(2) (2009).

Therefore, BGE's protest is rejected. In all future EPCA filings, Columbia Gas must include workpapers that separately support the EPCA billing determinants.

By direction of the Commission.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.