

129 FERC ¶ 61,160  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Jon Wellinghoff, Chairman;  
Sudeen G. Kelly, Marc Spitzer,  
and Philip D. Moeller.

Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership

Docket No. RP10-149-000

ORDER INSTITUTING INVESTIGATION AND SETTING MATTER FOR  
HEARING PURSUANT TO SECTION FIVE OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT

(Issued November 19, 2009)

1. As discussed in more detail below, based upon our review of publicly available information on file with the Commission, it appears that Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership (Great Lakes) may be substantially over-recovering its cost of service, causing Great Lakes' existing rates to be unjust and unreasonable. Therefore, the Commission will initiate an investigation, pursuant to section 5 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), to determine whether the rates currently charged by Great Lakes are just and reasonable and set the matter for hearing. The Commission directs Great Lakes to file a full cost and revenue study within 45 days of the issuance of this order.

**I. Background**

2. Great Lakes owns and operates approximately 2,100 miles of interstate natural gas pipelines which transports natural gas from the international boundary near Emerson, Manitoba across and within the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan to points on the international boundary near Sault Ste. Marie and Sarnia, Ontario, Canada.

3. Great Lakes' current base tariff rates were established as part of a settlement filed in September 1992 in its NGA section 4 rate case, in Docket No. RP91-143-000, *et al.*<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership*, 62 FERC ¶ 61,103 (1993). The September 1992 Settlement resolved cost of service and throughput issues, and reserved cost classification, allocation and rate design issues for separate litigation. For the resolution of the reserved issues, *see Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership*, 57 FERC ¶ 61,140 (1993)(Opinion No. 367); 57 FERC ¶ 61,141 (1991)(Opinion No. 368); 62 FERC ¶ 61,101 (1991) (Opinion No. 367-A); 62 FERC ¶ 61,102 (1993)(Opinion No. 368-A); *remanded, TransCanada Pipelines, Ltd. v. FERC*, 24 F.3d 305 (D.C. Cir. 1994); *modified on remand*; 72 FERC ¶ 61,081 (1995), *order on reh'g*, 75 FERC ¶ 61,089 (1996).

with revisions to reflect its restructuring pursuant to Order No. 636.<sup>2</sup> A subsequent settlement filed in Docket No. RP00-428-000 on July 31, 2000, provided for a reduced depreciation rate on transmission properties and a five year rate moratorium with respect to Great Lakes' base rates through November 1, 2005.<sup>3</sup> Great Lakes' total cost of service as set forth in the settlement in Docket No. RP91-143-018 is about \$235.3 million. The components of that settlement cost of service include, among other things, a pre-tax return of about \$127.4 million. Great Lakes recovers its system's fuel requirements and lost and unaccounted for gas pursuant to a tracking mechanism set forth in section 27 of its General Terms and Conditions (GT&C). Great Lakes is currently under no obligation to file a new rate case at any time in the future.

## II. Discussion

4. In March 2008, the Commission issued Order No. 710,<sup>4</sup> a Final Rule to change the forms and reporting requirements for interstate natural gas pipelines to enhance the transparency of financial reporting and better reflect current market and cost information relevant to interstate natural gas pipelines and their customers. The revised forms included FERC Form No. 2 (Form 2), the annual report for major natural gas companies, and FERC Form No. 3-Q (Form 3-Q), the quarterly financial report of natural gas companies, electric utilities and licensees. The Commission stated that the revised forms and reporting requirements would provide, in greater detail, the information the Commission needs to carry out its responsibilities under the NGA to ensure just and reasonable rates. The Commission required major interstate pipelines to use the revised Form 2 in making their annual reports for calendar year 2008.

5. In April 2009, Great Lakes filed its Form 2 for 2008. Upon review of the cost and revenue information in that form, the Commission is concerned that Great Lakes' level of earnings may substantially exceed its actual cost of service, including a reasonable return on equity. Using the cost and revenue information provided by Great Lakes in its 2008 Form 2, the Commission developed a cost of service with an estimated 12.00 percent

---

<sup>2</sup> *Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership*, 64 FERC ¶ 61,017, as modified, 65 FERC ¶ 61,004 (1993).

<sup>3</sup> *Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership*, 93 FERC ¶ 61,076 (2000). Great Lakes filed the 2000 settlement, without making a new rate filing under NGA section 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Revisions to Forms, Statements, and Reporting Requirements for Natural Gas Pipelines*, Order No. 710, 73 FR 19389 (Apr. 10, 2008), FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,267 (2008), *reh'g and clarification*, Order No. 710-A, 123 FERC ¶ 61,278 (2008).

return on equity<sup>5</sup> and compared this to Great Lakes' actual revenues.<sup>6</sup> The total revenue reported by Great Lakes, as adjusted, is \$290,122,247, and the cost of service calculated by the Commission is \$233,949,397. The difference between Great Lakes' reported revenues and the Commission calculated cost of service indicates an over recovery of \$56,172,850 for 2008, resulting in an estimated return on equity, net of income taxes, of about 20.83 percent.

6. The Commission finds that, based upon its preliminary analysis, Great Lakes' currently effective tariff rates may be unjust and unreasonable. The Commission's analysis indicates that Great Lakes' currently effective tariff rates may allow Great Lakes to recover revenue substantially in excess of its estimated costs of service. While NGA section 4 permits Great Lakes to seek authorization from the Commission to adjust its rates to establish just and reasonable rates, Great Lakes has not filed a general NGA section 4 rate case in over 18 years. Accordingly, the Commission will initiate an investigation to examine the justness and reasonableness of Great Lakes rates pursuant to section 5 of the NGA and set the matter for hearing.

7. As the Commission has done in other cases initiating section 5 investigations of a pipeline's rates,<sup>7</sup> it directs Great Lakes to file a cost and revenue study within 45 days of the date this order issues. The cost and revenue study required by this order should include actual data for the latest 12-month period available as of the date of this order. The filing should include all the schedules required for submission of a section 4 rate proceeding as set forth in section 154.312 of the Commission's regulations,<sup>8</sup> with one exception. Because Great Lakes does not have a NGA section 4 burden in this section 5 proceeding and will be filing testimony in response to other parties, Great Lakes does not need to file the Statement P required by section 154.312(v) of the Commission's

---

<sup>5</sup> In this order, we make no finding as to what would constitute a just and reasonable return on equity for Great Lakes. That is among the issues set for hearing by this order and should be decided consistent with the Commission's Policy Statement in *Composition of Proxy Groups for Determining Gas and Oil Pipeline Return on Equity*, 123 FERC ¶ 61,048 (2008).

<sup>6</sup> The details of the Commission's cost and revenue analysis are contained in the Appendix.

<sup>7</sup> See *Panhandle Complainants v. Southwest Gas Storage Co.*, 117 FERC ¶ 61,318 (2006); *Pub. Serv. Comm'n of New York v. National Fuel Gas Supply Corp.*, 115 FERC ¶ 61,299 (2006).

<sup>8</sup> 18 C.F.R. § 154.312 (2009).

regulations at this juncture.<sup>9</sup> In addition, Great Lakes does not need to file nine months of post-base period adjustment data required by section 154.303(a) at this point in the proceeding.<sup>10</sup>

8. Finally, due to the potential of continued over-recovery of revenues, the Commission will establish a date for an initial decision from an administrative law judge. Such a date will expedite the proceeding. We believe that conducting the hearing in this case pursuant to the Administrative Law Judges' Track II Hearing Timeline is reasonable, with an initial decision to issue within 47 weeks of the designation of the presiding judge.

The Commission orders:

(A) Pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by section 402(a) of the Department of Energy Organization Act and by the Natural Gas Act, particularly section 5 thereof, and pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure and the regulations under the Natural Gas Act, a public hearing shall be held concerning whether Great Lakes' rates are unjust, unreasonable, or otherwise unlawful.

(B) A Presiding Administrative Law Judge, to be designated by the Chief Administrative Law Judge for that purpose pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 375.304, shall, within thirty (30) days of the date of this order, convene a prehearing conference in these proceedings in a hearing or conference room of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426. The prehearing conference shall be held for the purpose of clarification of the positions of the participants and consideration by the presiding judge of any procedural issues and discovery dates necessary for the ensuing hearing. The Presiding Administrative Law Judge is authorized to conduct further proceedings in accordance with this order and the Rules of Practice and Procedure.

(C) The Commission directs that the hearing be conducted pursuant to the Track II hearing timeline and that an initial decision be issued in this proceeding within 47 weeks of the designation of the presiding judge, as discussed in the body of this order.

---

<sup>9</sup> See *Pub. Serv. Comm'n of New York*, 115 FERC ¶ 61,368 at P 6 (2006).

<sup>10</sup> See *Id.*

(D) Great Lakes shall file a cost and revenue study within 45 days of this order. The filing should include actual data for the latest 12-month period available as of the date of this order. The filing should include all of the schedules required for the submission of a section 4 rate proceeding as set forth in section 154.312 of the Commission's regulations (18 C.F.R. § 154.312), except Statement P.

(E) Any person wishing to become a party to this proceeding must file a notice of intervention or motion to intervene, as appropriate, in accordance with Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 C.F.R. § 385.214). Such notice or motion must be filed within 30 days of the date of this order. The Commission encourages electronic submission of interventions in lieu of paper using the "eFiling" link at <http://www.ferc.gov>. Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 14 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20426.

By the Commission. Commissioner Spitzer concurring with a separate statement attached.

( S E A L )

Kimberly D. Bose,  
Secretary.

## Appendix

GREAT LAKES TRANSMISSION	Form 2 Reference	Line	Amount
<b>Rate Base</b>			
Gas Plant in Service	p. 110; ln. 2	1	\$2,047,046,401
Accumulated Depreciation	p. 110; ln. 5	2	(\$1,125,779,267)
Gas Stored - Base Gas			
Account 117.1 (Base Gas)	p. 220; ln. 5, col. D	3	\$0
Account 117.2 (System Balancing)	p. 220; ln.5, col. C	4	\$0
Working Capital			
Prepayments	p. 230a; ln. 6	5	\$2,960,624
Materials and Supplies	p. 111; ln. 45	6	\$12,027,453
ADIT			
Account 190	p. 235; ln. 7, col. K	7	\$15,161,591
Account 282	p. 275; ln. 7, col. K	8	(\$163,645,233)
Account 283	p. 276; ln. 7, col. K	9	(\$381,409)
Regulatory Assets	p. 232; ln. 40, col. G	10	\$126,972
Regulatory Liabilities	p. 278; ln. 45, col. G	11	(\$49,129)
<b>Total Rate Base</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>\$787,468,003</b>
<b>Capital Costs</b>			
Cost of Debt	p. 218a; col. D	13	7.81%
Rate of Return on Equity		14	12.00%
<b>Capitalization</b>			
Debt	p. 218a; col. c	15	50.78%
Equity	p. 218a; col. c	16	49.22%
Weighted Cost of Debt		17	3.97%
Weighted Cost of Equity		18	<u>5.91%</u>
Total Return		19	9.88%
<b>Cost of Service</b>			
Return		20	\$77,741,345
Composite Income Tax (39.05%)		21	\$29,799,097
Other Taxes	p. 114; ln. 14	22	\$20,788,144
Depreciation	p. 336; ln. 12	23	\$58,521,455
O&M (Net of Gas Costs)			
Production & Gathering	p. 317; ln. 30	24	\$0
Net Storage Costs	p. 322; ln. 177 (less ln. 106)	25	\$0
Net Transmission Costs	p. 323; ln. 201 (less ln. 184)	26	\$20,691,547
A&G	p. 325; ln. 270	27	<u>\$26,407,809</u>
<b>Total Cost of Service</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>\$233,949,397</b>
<b>Operating Revenues</b>			
ACA Revenues	p. 300; ln. 21, col. D	29	\$1,464,271
Exclude Sales for Resale (Act. 480-484)	p. 301; ln. 4, col. F	30	\$0
Other Revenue	p. 301; ln. 21, col. F	31	\$285,665,976
Account 495	p. 308; ln. 12	32	<u>\$2,992,000</u>
<b>Total Adjusted Revenue</b>		<b>33</b>	<b>\$290,122,247</b>
Cost Over (Under) Recovery		34	\$56,172,850
<b>Estimated Return on Equity*</b>		<b>35</b>	<b>20.83%</b>

\* (12% Rate of Return on Equity (\$46,511,010) + Cost Over Recovery Net of Income Taxes (\$34,237,632)) / Equity Rate Base (\$387,591,751)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Great Lakes Gas Transmission LP

Docket No. RP10-149-000

(Issued November 19, 2009)

SPITZER, Commissioner, concurring:

I generally support our initiation of an investigation under Section 5 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA)<sup>1</sup> against Great Lakes Gas Transmission Limited Partnership (Great Lakes). I am writing separately, however, to express my views on the historical and economic context of this review and to encourage the parties to consider whether settlement discussions could accelerate the resolution of this proceeding.

In 1992, the Commission issued Order No. 636.<sup>2</sup> That order ushered in an open access, competitive interstate natural gas market. American consumers have benefitted greatly from these reforms. While we placed increased emphasis on competition and market forces, pipeline rate proceedings remain linked to cost of service. Pipeline capacity and gas storage are critical components of natural gas markets. Since Order No. 636, interstate pipelines have added over 98.1 billion cubic feet per day (Bcf/d) of new pipeline capacity and over 854 Bcf/d of storage capacity with over 35,922 MMcf/d of deliverability.

---

<sup>1</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 717d.

<sup>2</sup> *Pipeline Service Obligations and Revisions to Regulations Governing Self-Implementing Transportation; and Regulation of Natural Gas Pipeline After Partial Wellhead Decontrol*, Order No. 636, FERC Stats. & Regs. Regulations Preambles January 1991 – June 1996 ¶ 30,939, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 636-A, FERC Stats. & Regs. Regulations Preambles January 1991 – June 1996 ¶ 30,950, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 636-B, 61 FERC ¶ 61,272 (1992), *notice of denial of reh'g*, 62 FERC ¶ 61,007 (1993), *aff'd in part and vacated and remanded in part sub nom., United Distribution Co. v. FERC*, 88 F.3d 1105 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (per curiam) *cert. denied*, 520 U.S. 1224 (1997), *order on remand*, Order No. 636-C, 78 FERC ¶ 61,186 (1997), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 636-D, 83 FERC ¶ 61,210 (1998) (collectively, Order No. 636).

Our actions today are not intended to upset the post-Order No. 636 competitive market framework of natural gas pipeline regulation. Nor does this proceeding signal a departure from our policies of encouraging natural gas infrastructure. Rather, competition works best where the prices for essential services accurately reflect the costs associated with providing those services.<sup>3</sup>

Part of the bargain struck in Order No. 636 was that interstate natural gas pipelines are no longer required to file periodic rate cases.<sup>4</sup> Under NGA § 4,<sup>5</sup> the Commission can neither compel nor preclude a pipeline from filing a rate case. Nonetheless, the Commission may initiate an investigation and “any state, municipality, State commission, or gas distributing company” has the opportunity to file a complaint against a pipeline under NGA § 5.

During its review of the sufficiency of FERC Form No. 2 (Form 2), the Commission heard from many shippers that Form 2 did not contain enough information to provide a basis for a NGA § 5 complaint. We therefore revised Form 2 “to provide a level of information that would enhance the ability of the Commission and the pipeline customers to assess the justness and reasonableness of pipeline rates.”<sup>6</sup> We recognized, however, that the new information would not “affect the burden of proof in [NGA §] 5 proceedings. A party filing a [NGA §] 5 complaint would still have the burden to show why the information in the Commission's financial forms support an allegation that the pipeline's existing rates are unjust and unreasonable.”<sup>7</sup> When we overhauled the Form 2, we also suggested that

---

<sup>3</sup> *Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp.*, 106 FERC ¶ 61,299 at P 210 (2004).

<sup>4</sup> *See Dominion Cove Point LNG, LP*, 118 FERC ¶ 61,006 at P 18-19 (2007); and *Public Service Comm'n of the State of New York v. FERC*, 866 F.2d 487, 492 (D.C. Cir. 1989).

<sup>5</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 717c.

<sup>6</sup> Revisions to Forms, Statements & Reporting Requirements for Natural Gas Pipelines, Order No. 710, 73 FR 19389 (Apr. 10, 2008), FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 1,267 (2008), *reh'g and clarification*, Order No. 710-A, 123 FERC ¶ 61,278 at P 16 (2008).

<sup>7</sup> Order No. 710 at P 12.

the Commission would monitor pipeline submissions and evaluate a pipeline's cost of service.<sup>8</sup>

Today, we take the unprecedented step, post-Order No. 636, of initiating an NGA § 5 investigation against Great Lakes, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America, and Northern Natural Gas Company. We do not lightly undertake these proceedings. Although we recognize that pipeline rates remained stable in nominal dollars and in real dollars perhaps declined; by Staff's calculation, each of the three pipelines before us has an estimated return on equity that requires further scrutiny. Moreover, none of these pipelines is under an obligation to file a rate case in the future.

I recognize that a rate case may be costly for all parties, may create uncertainty during a lengthy litigation process, and may not always result in a rate reduction. Although the Commission bears the initial burden in this proceeding, I nevertheless believe that it may be in the best interest of the pipelines, its shippers, and the Commission to resolve this dispute expeditiously and consensually, rather than through litigation.<sup>9</sup> Indeed, reaching a settlement could provide just and reasonable rates more rapidly than through a long and tedious litigation process. Consequently, I would have preferred to have held the hearing in abeyance for a short period of time pending settlement discussions pursuant to Rule 603 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Nonetheless, I note that participants are free to negotiate amongst themselves or to "file a motion requesting the appointment of a settlement judge with the presiding officer,

---

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* ("The requested data is designed to provide the Commission and pipeline customers with information that will aid their ability to make a reasonable assessment of a pipeline's cost of service. Greater transparency is essential to the Commission's oversight responsibilities and, as implemented here, will not affect the burden of proof in section 5 proceedings.")

<sup>9</sup> The Commission has long encouraged the consensual resolution of proceedings by settlement. *See Columbia Gas Transmission Corp., et al.*, 64 FERC ¶ 61,366 (1993). *See also United Municipal Distributors Group v. FERC*, 732 F.2d 202 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *aff'g United Gas Pipeline Co.*, 22 FERC ¶ 61,094 (1983), *reh'g denied*, 23 FERC ¶ 61,101 (1993).

or if there is not presiding officer for the proceeding, with the Commission,”<sup>10</sup> during the ambitious Track II hearing schedule.

For these reasons, I respectfully concur in the Order.

---

Marc Spitzer  
Commissioner

---

<sup>10</sup> 18 C.F.R. § 385.603(c) (2009).