

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Joseph T. Kelliher, Chairman;
Nora Mead Brownell, and Suedeem G. Kelly.

El Paso Natural Gas Company

Docket Nos. RP05-422-012
and RP05-422-013

ORDER REJECTING COMPLIANCE FILING

(Issued May 31, 2006)

1. On April 24, 2006, El Paso Natural Gas Company (El Paso) filed revised tariff sheets in Docket No. RP05-422-012¹ to comply with the Commission's March 23, 2006 Order² in this proceeding. El Paso filed Primary Tariff sheets and two alternate sets of tariff sheets. As explained more fully below, upon review of the tariff sheets, the Commission finds that El Paso's filing does not comply with the March 23 Order with regard to a number of significant issues. Further, El Paso has included in its compliance filing additional tariff changes not approved in the March 23 Order, as well as other materials and argument that go beyond the scope of a compliance filing. Therefore, the Commission will reject El Paso's filing and direct El Paso to refile, within 10 days of the date of the issuance of this order, one comprehensive set of tariff sheets to comply with this order and the March 23 Order.

Background

2. On June 30, 2005, El Paso filed revised tariff sheets pursuant to section 4 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) that proposed, among other things, a number of new services and changes in the terms and conditions of its existing services. On July 29, 2005, the Commission issued an order³ accepting and suspending El Paso's Primary Tariff sheets,

¹ On April 28, 2006, El Paso filed substitute tariff sheets in Docket No. RP05-422-013 to correct a typographical error in the filing. The tariff sheets are listed in the Appendices.

² 114 FERC ¶ 61,305 (2006).

³ *El Paso Natural Gas Company*, 112 FERC ¶ 61,150 (2005).

subject to conditions and the outcome of a hearing and technical conference. Technical conferences were held in September and October 2005. On November 4, 2005, El Paso submitted revised pro forma tariff sheets in response to discussion and comments at the technical conferences. On March 1, 2006, El Paso filed a motion to place its suspended rates into effect and filed tariff sheets reflecting its proposed new rate schedule as well as the new services and modifications to its terms and conditions of service, to become effective April 1, 2006.⁴

3. On March 23, 2006, the Commission issued the order on the technical conference⁵ that addressed the issues raised at the conference and El Paso's March 1, 2006 filing. The Commission accepted El Paso's proposed tariff sheets, subject to modifications, and directed El Paso to refile revised tariff sheets within 30 days to comply with the conditions in that order. On April 24, 2006, El Paso filed revised primary tariff sheets and two alternate sets of tariff sheets to comply with the Commission's March 23 Order. Various parties filed protests to El Paso's filing.⁶

Discussion

4. Section 154.203(b) of the Commission's regulations⁷ provides that filings to comply with Commission orders must include only those changes required to comply with the order. The regulation further provides that compliance filings may not be combined with other rate or tariff changes, and that compliance filings that include other changes or that do not comply with the applicable order in every respect may be rejected.

5. Thus, the purpose of a compliance filing is limited, *i.e.*, it must implement the specific directives of the Commission's order. The Commission's focus in reviewing a compliance filing is similarly limited to whether the filing complies with the

⁴ The April 1, 2006 effective date was postponed, pursuant to a Settlement Agreement between El Paso and its customers, until June 1, 2006.

⁵ 114 FERC ¶ 61,305 (2006).

⁶ Protests were filed by Arizona Public Service Company; Blythe Energy, LLC; Electric Generator Coalition; El Paso Electric Company; El Paso Municipal Customer Group; Gila River Power, L.P.; Indicated Shippers; Pinalco, Inc.; Public Service Company of New Mexico; Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District; Southwest Gas Corporation; Texas Gas Service Company; UNS Gas, Inc.; and jointly by Southern California Gas Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company.

⁷ 18 C.F.R. § 154.203(b).

Commission's previously stated directives.⁸ A compliance filing may not include new proposed tariff provisions not addressed in the Commission's order, and the Commission will reject a compliance filing that goes beyond the scope of the directives in the Commission's order.⁹ Further, a compliance filing is not a vehicle for the pipeline to provide additional justification for its rejected proposal or to refute the Commission's previous findings on any issue.¹⁰ The Commission will reject tariff sheets that are consistent with the pipeline's request for rehearing rather than with the directives of the Commission's previous order.¹¹

6. The Commission's March 23 Order directed El Paso to make a number of sets of modifications to its proposed tariff. Each of El Paso's proposed three alternative tariff sheets deviates from the Commission's directives in the March 23 Order. In addition, El Paso has included materials and argument in its compliance filing that go beyond the scope of a compliance filing and acceptance would require granting rehearing or clarification of the March 23 Order. Thus, El Paso has not complied with the requirements of section 154.203(b) of the Commission's regulations and, therefore, its compliance filing is rejected.

7. As discussed more fully below, El Paso must refile tariff sheets within 10 days of the date of this order to comply with this order and the Commission's March 23 Order. These tariff sheets must include changes to the tariff provisions regarding the penalties and force majeure. The Commission will provide further guidance on these issues below.

8. Various protestors and El Paso raised issues that are beyond the scope of a compliance proceeding. These issues include the basis for the tolerance percentage threshold, the volume to which a penalty applies if in excess of the tolerance level, whether tolerances are defined at the delivery point or contract level, whether tolerances apply to overruns, the definition of "offending shipper," acceptance of the daily variance charge, and the applicability of an hourly overrun charge for FT-2 shippers. The Commission will address these issues in a future rehearing/clarification, compliance or related order.

⁸ *North-Western Corp.*, 113 FERC ¶ 61,215 at P 9 (2005).

⁹ *See, e.g.,* *Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline, LLC*, 105 FERC ¶ 61,356 at P11 (2003); *Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp.*, 101 FERC ¶ 61,154 (2002).

¹⁰ The pipeline, like all other parties, may challenge Commission rulings in a timely request for rehearing.

¹¹ *E.g., Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.*, 34 FERC ¶ 61,384 at 61,712 (1986).

A. Daily Penalties

9. The March 23 Order was clear in rejecting El Paso's proposal to impose daily scheduling penalties and directing El Paso to refile tariff sheets eliminating provisions for daily scheduling penalties. Specifically, the Commission stated that El Paso's "proposed daily scheduling penalty is unjustified and thus is rejected,"¹² and that it "rejects [El Paso's] proposal for adding daily scheduling penalties to its tariff."¹³

10. El Paso, however, states that the March 23 Order was not clear on this issue. Therefore, El Paso submitted primary and alternate tariff sheets to implement several "possible interpretations" of the order. El Paso also included in Tab C to its compliance filing additional information and argument on this issue.

11. Because the Commission specifically rejected the daily scheduling penalty, any tariff sheets that contain a daily scheduling penalty are not in compliance with the March 23 Order. The Commission therefore will reject El Paso's compliance filing. The Commission will also reject the contents of Tab C. A compliance filing is not an appropriate vehicle for the pipeline to provide additional argument or justification for its proposal.

B. HEEN Service

12. The Commission's March 23 Order accepted El Paso's proposal to offer Hourly Entitlement Enhancement Nominations (HEEN) service to Firm Transportation (FT-1), Hourly Firm Transportation (FT-H), No Notice Transportation Hourly Service (NNTH), and No Notice Transportation Daily Service (NNTD) shippers. In its proposal El Paso specified that "...quantities delivered, or caused to be delivered, for Shipper's account may not exceed in any hour 1/24th of the scheduled quantity resulting from the flowing gas nomination coupled with the HEEN nominations..."¹⁴

13. In its compliance filing, El Paso included Primary Tariff Sheets that employ a new definition of HEEN service. Specifically, on its proposed 2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 145J, El Paso states "Shippers shall pay an hourly scheduling penalty...on those cumulative hourly gas quantities taken that are in excess of the daily flowing gas quantity scheduled at such point."

¹² March 23 Order at P 91.

¹³ *Id.* at P 118. See also *id.* at Ordering Paragraph B.

¹⁴ Currently Effective First Revised Sheet No. 110A.

14. The Commission finds that El Paso's Primary Tariff Sheets include tariff changes not previously proposed and not addressed in the March 23 Order. Specifically, El Paso has included changes that may place new limitations on HEEN. These changes are beyond the scope of a compliance filing and thus must be rejected in this proceeding without prejudice to El Paso filing the tariff changes in a new section 4 filing.¹⁵

C. Crediting of Penalties

15. In Order No. 637, the Commission explained that a penalty is any charge imposed by the pipeline that is designed to deter shippers from engaging in certain conduct and reflects more than simply the costs incurred as a result of the conduct.¹⁶ The Commission further stated that the term "penalty" is intended to encompass more than just imbalance penalties, and includes, for example, scheduling, Operational Flow Orders (OFO), and *unauthorized overrun penalties*, as well.

16. In its March 23 Order, the Commission stated that authorized overrun charges constitute a fee for providing transportation of additional quantities of gas, and thus are not considered penalties.¹⁷ As a result, the Commission stated that revenue crediting is inappropriate with regard to authorized overrun charges because they represent an additional cost of service provided by the pipeline. The Commission stated that scheduling penalties assessed for quantities taken above nominations but below contract, however, do meet the Commission's definition of a penalty and thus must be credited to non-offending shippers.

17. The Commission clarifies that "authorized overrun" charges constitute a fee required to provide transportation of additional quantities of gas, and thus are not considered penalties. Authorized overruns instituted by El Paso are no more than the 100 percent load factor rate, and thus, constitute only the fee required to provide transportation service for additional quantities of gas.

18. El Paso's compliance filing provides that "critical condition - unauthorized overrun" charges will be credited back to shippers.

¹⁵ New proposals that differ from that which was originally proposed and approved by the March 23 Order may only be addressed through the initiation of a section 4 filing. The proposal of new tariff provisions in a compliance filing is inappropriate.

¹⁶ See Order No. 637-A, FERC Stats. & Regs., Regulations Preambles, ¶ 31,099 (2000).

¹⁷ This applies to authorized overrun charges where the charge is the prevailing IT rate.

19. The Commission finds that the unauthorized overrun charges instituted by El Paso during both critical and non-critical conditions are greater than the 100 percent load factor rate, and thus constitute penalties above the cost of providing transportation. For the reasons stated above, the Commission will require El Paso to revise section 36.4 of the GT&C of its tariff to reflect unauthorized overruns during both critical and non-critical conditions as eligible for revenue crediting.

D. El Paso's Tariff Sheets May Not Penalize Shippers Twice For The Same Deliveries

20. In the March 23 Order, the Commission clarified the distinction between scheduling penalties and overrun charges. The Commission explained that the term "overrun" refers to quantities of gas taken in excess of a shippers' contract demand, not simply above scheduled quantities. Scheduling penalties apply to deviations from scheduled quantities that are less than contract demand.¹⁸ This is consistent with the policy that shippers should not be subject to more than one penalty or charge for the same event.¹⁹

21. While El Paso has appropriately defined these terms in its compliance filing,²⁰ the filing requires additional clarification to assure that in no circumstances will a shipper be subject to more than one charge or penalty for the same delivery. El Paso is directed to revise its tariffs sheets to clarify that in no circumstances will shippers be subject to two penalties for the same deliveries.

E. Tolerance Levels

22. The Commission, in its March 23 Order, found that El Paso must extend the proposed daily variance tolerances to the hourly scheduling and overrun penalties. The Commission stated that each shipper would be entitled in critical periods to hourly flexibility equal to the greater of 103 percent or 100 Dth and daily flexibility equal to the greater of 103 percent or 2,000 Dth in critical periods and, in non-critical periods, hourly flexibility equal to the greater of 107 percent or 100 Dth and daily flexibility equal to the greater of 107 percent or 2,000 Dth. The Commission stated that such a modification is

¹⁸ March 23 Order at P 130.

¹⁹ See March 23 Order at P 95.

²⁰ The tariff sheets provide that a scheduling penalty applies when a shipper takes quantities at a delivery point in excess of the quantities scheduled at that point. Overrun charges apply when a shipper take quantities in excess of the shipper's contract demand; these amounts may be either authorized overruns or unauthorized overruns.

consistent with the Commission's policy of ensuring equitable service for shippers of all sizes and would simplify the penalty structure that shippers face.

23. In its compliance filing, El Paso states that the percentage and absolute tolerance levels are based on the daily variance tolerances. El Paso also states that the March 23 Order is susceptible to different interpretations of how the absolute tolerance would be applied. El Paso states that it understands the March 23 Order to require that shippers, under each contract, will have a penalty tolerance level of up to 7 percent with a minimum tolerance level of no less than 2,000 Dth per day or 100 Dth per hour for the applicable transportation service agreement in non-critical conditions. El Paso states that it also understands the March 23 Order to require that for transportation service agreements during critical conditions, there is a tolerance level of up to 3 percent with a minimum tolerance level of no less than 2,000 Dth per day or 100 Dth per hour. El Paso states that tolerance levels would not apply to amounts above Maximum Delivery Quantities (MDQ) for hourly rights or above Transportation Contract Demand (TCD) for daily rights.

24. The Commission finds that El Paso's proposed tariff sheets fail to fully comply with the March 23 Order in several respects in regard to safe harbor tolerances. In several of its proposed tariff sheets El Paso imposes a daily limit of 2,000 Dth on hourly imbalances. This provision implies that daily and hourly tolerances are interrelated, a conclusion which would allow El Paso to charge a penalty to a shipper who stayed within its safe harbor tolerance each hour but exceeded the daily absolute tolerance level. Thus, it is inconsistent with the Commission's determination that shippers' are entitled to an hourly safe harbor tolerance of the greater of 7 percent or 100 Dth per hour for each hour of the day. Furthermore, the Commission finds that El Paso's proposed tariff language regarding the relationship between proportional and absolute tolerances lacks sufficient clarity to support compliance with the March 23 Order. In particular, the Commission finds that El Paso has failed to mirror the language of the March 23 Order which clearly explains that each shipper is entitled to a safe harbor tolerance equal to the greater of a proportion or an absolute tolerance. El Paso is directed to refile tariff sheets consistent with this determination.

F. Amount of Overrun and Penalty Charges

25. The Commission stated in the March 23 Order that scheduling penalties imposed in non-critical periods that provide for a charge not to exceed two times the maximum Interruptible Transportation (IT) rate are appropriate.²¹ The March 23 Order also

²¹ March 23 Order at P 107.

reflected the Commission's policy of limiting authorized overrun penalties to two times the IT rate in non-critical conditions.²²

26. El Paso's proposed tariff sheets for Rate Schedules FT-1, FT-H, NNTD, and NNTH include hourly and daily unauthorized overrun penalties for non-critical periods that are based on two times the 100 percent load factor rate of the relevant rate schedule (for example, for Rate Schedule FT-1, the overrun charges are based on the 100 percent FT-1 rate).

27. El Paso's proposed unauthorized overrun penalties for non-critical periods for Rate Schedules FT-1, FT-H, NNTD, and NNTH do not comply with the March 23 Order which established two times the IT rate as the appropriate level for unauthorized overrun penalties in non-critical periods. El Paso is directed to file revised tariff sheets to reflect the appropriate penalty.

28. Further, the Commission finds that El Paso's use of the words "not more than" and "not less than" in describing its penalty levels is inconsistent with Commission precedent. In the past the Commission has rejected proposals by other pipelines seeking to create negotiated penalty levels.²³ Therefore, the Commission will require El Paso to revise its tariff sheets to indicate fixed levels for penalties.

G. Force Majeure

29. The Commission accepted El Paso's revised *force majeure* provisions conditioned on El Paso filing certain modifications. The Commission required El Paso to restore the phrase "freezing of wells or pipelines" to the definition of *force majeure* in section 7 of the General Terms & Conditions (GT&C). The Commission also required El Paso to remove the phrase "at reasonable cost" from section 7. The Commission further required El Paso to restore "negligence" language to section 7. Finally, the Commission directed El Paso to modify section 7 to state that scheduled maintenance and repairs are to be treated as non-*force majeure* events and that El Paso will exercise reasonable diligence to schedule maintenance so as to minimize or avoid service interruptions.²⁴

30. El Paso states that it made the following revisions to its *force majeure* provisions: (1) section 7.1 now states that "freezing of wells or pipelines" is included as a *force*

²² March 23 Order at P 128.

²³ See *Northern Natural Gas Company*, 76 FERC ¶ 61,026 (1996); *Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company*, 76 FERC ¶ 61,224 (1996); *CNG Transmission Corp.*, 79 FERC ¶ 61,240 (1997).

²⁴ *March 23 Order* at P 274-280.

majeure event; (2) the economic feasibility language has been removed; (3) negligence language has been inserted in section 7.4 to state that a *force majeure* event resulting from the negligence of either El Paso or the shipper does not relieve the negligent party of liability; and (4) section 7.2 clarifies that unplanned maintenance and repairs will be treated as *force majeure* events.

31. The Commission finds that El Paso has not fully complied with the March 23 Order with regard to its *force majeure* provisions. El Paso states in its transmittal letter that it has modified section 7.2 to clarify that unplanned maintenance and repairs will be treated as *force majeure* events. However, the proposed section 7.2 provides: “A force majeure event shall include shutdowns for purposes of necessary repairs, relocations, or construction of facilities associated with any of the unplanned events described in section 7.1 above.” The revised language does not treat “unplanned” maintenance and repairs as *force majeure* events, but addresses maintenance repairs related to “unplanned” *force majeure* events. El Paso states in its transmittal letter (at footnote 30) that its proposed language is identical to that approved in *Florida Gas Transmission Company*,²⁵ as referenced in the March 23 Order.²⁶ However, upon review of Florida Gas’s *force majeure* provision, the Commission disagrees with El Paso’s assertion that its language is identical. Florida Gas’s definition of *force majeure* events provides:

[t]he term “force majeure” as employed herein shall generally mean unplanned or unanticipated events or circumstances that are not within the control of the party claiming suspension of its obligations and which such party could not have avoided through the exercise of reasonable diligence, but shall specifically include ... the necessity for making repairs or alterations to machinery or lines of pipe due to an unplanned event...²⁷

32. El Paso’s definition of *force majeure* does not include the language used by Florida Gas that the *force majeure* events are “unplanned or unanticipated events or circumstances that are not within the control of the party” and which could not have been avoided “through the exercise of reasonable diligence.” Thus, El Paso’s revised language does not clearly state that scheduled maintenance and maintenance that is within El Paso’s control, even if related to unplanned *force majeure* events, is not a *force majeure* event in and of itself. The Commission concludes that El Paso has not complied with the Commission’s directive to treat scheduled maintenance and repairs as non-*force majeure* events. The Commission directs El Paso to modify its tariff accordingly.

²⁵ *Florida Gas Transmission Co.*, 107 FERC ¶ 61,074 (2004).

²⁶ March 23 Order at P 278 & n.179.

²⁷ See section 8.c of Florida Gas’s General Terms and Conditions, Sheet No. 112.

33. In addition, El Paso has not included a provision stating that it will exercise reasonable diligence to schedule maintenance so as to minimize or avoid service interruptions, as required by the Commission. El Paso is required to file revised tariff sheets to include such language.

The Commission orders:

(A) El Paso's compliance filing tariff sheets, listed in the Appendices to this order, are rejected.

(B) El Paso is directed to file, within 10 days of the date of this order, only one comprehensive set of tariff sheets that includes the modifications required by the Commission in this order and the March 23 Order, without alternatives or arguments.

By the Commission.

(S E A L)

Magalie R. Salas,
Secretary.

Appendix A
Page 1 of 8

EL PASO NATURAL GAS COMPANY
Docket No. RP05-422-012
Order on Compliance Filing
Rejected Tariff Sheets
Second Revised Volume No. 1-A

Primary Tariff Sheets

Third Revised Sheet No. 28A
Second Substitute Original Sheet No. 28B
Substitute First Revised Sheet No. 28C
Third Substitute Original Sheet No. 28D
Third Substitute Original Sheet No. 28E
Third Substitute Original Sheet No. 28F
Second Substitute Original Sheet No. 28G
Substitute Fifth Revised Sheet No. 103
Substitute Fourth Revised Sheet No. 104
Second Substitute Original Sheet No. 106
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 106A
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 106B
Substitute First Revised Sheet No. 110A
Substitute Ninth Revised Sheet No. 111
Substitute Ninth Revised Sheet No. 114
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 114A
Substitute First Revised Sheet No. 115
Third Revised Sheet No. 116
Substitute Fourth Revised Sheet No. 125
Original Sheet No. 125A
Substitute Third Revised Sheet No. 126
Sixth Revised Sheet No. 127
Substitute Fifth Revised Sheet No. 128
Original Sheet No. 128A
Substitute Fourth Revised Sheet No. 129
Original Sheet No. 130
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 145F
Original Sheet No. 145F.01
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 145G
Original Sheet No. 145G.01
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 145H
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 145I

EL PASO NATURAL GAS COMPANY
Docket No. RP05-422-012
Order on Compliance Filing

Rejected Tariff Sheets
Second Revised Volume No. 1-A

Primary Tariff Sheets

2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 145J
Original Sheet No. 145J.01
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 145K
Original Sheet No. 145K.01
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 145L
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 145M
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 146D
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 146E
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 147C
Original Sheet No. 147C.01
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 147D
Original Sheet No. 147D.01
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 147E
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 147F
Original Sheet No. 147F.01
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 147G
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 147H
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 148B
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 148F
Original Sheet No. 148F.01
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 148G
Original Sheet No. 148G.01
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 148H
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 148I
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 148J
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 148K
Original Sheet No. 148K.01
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 148L
Original Sheet No. 148L.01
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 148M
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 148N
Second Substitute Original Sheet No. 150

EL PASO NATURAL GAS COMPANY
Docket No. RP05-422-012
Order on Compliance Filing
Rejected Tariff Sheets
Second Revised Volume No. 1-A

Primary Tariff Sheets

2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 150A
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 150B
Substitute Ninth Revised Sheet No. 200
Tenth Revised Sheet No. 202
First Revised Sheet No. 202C
First Revised Sheet No. 202D
Eighth Revised Sheet No. 210
Sixth Revised Sheet No. 210.01
Original Sheet No. 210.02
Ninth Revised Sheet No. 211
Substitute Eighth Revised Sheet No. 211A
Fifth Revised Sheet No. 212
Substitute Fourth Revised Sheet No. 213
Fourteenth Revised Sheet No. 214
Fifth Revised Sheet No. 214A
Third Revised Sheet No. 219A
Second Revised Sheet No. 219B
Third Revised Sheet No. 219C
Second Revised Sheet No. 226
Third Revised Sheet No. 227
First Revised Sheet No. 238A
Second Revised Sheet No. 242
Second Revised Sheet No. 247
First Revised Sheet No. 292C
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 310
Third Revised Sheet No. 311
Second Revised Sheet No. 321
Third Revised Sheet No. 331
Seventh Revised Sheet No. 352
Substitute Second Revised Sheet No. 358
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 362N
Third Revised Sheet No. 363

EL PASO NATURAL GAS COMPANY
Docket No. RP05-422-012
Order on Compliance Filing

Rejected Tariff Sheets
Second Revised Volume No. 1-A

Primary Tariff Sheets

First Revised Sheet No. 363B
Third Revised Sheet No. 364
Second Revised Sheet No. 367
Substitute Fifth Revised Sheet No. 373
Fifth Revised Sheet No. 405
Second Substitute Original Sheet No. 410
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 420
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 446
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 480C
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 482C
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 483C
Second Substitute Original Sheet No. 485
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 485A
2nd Substitute Original Sheet No. 485C

EL PASO NATURAL GAS COMPANY
Docket No. RP05-422-012
Order on Compliance Filing

Rejected Tariff Sheets
Second Revised Volume No. 1-A

First Alternate Tariff Sheets

Alt Sub Ninth Revised Sheet No. 114
Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 145J
Alternate Original Sheet No. 145J.01
Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 147F
Alternate Original Sheet No. 147F.01
Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 148K
Alternate Original Sheet No. 148K.01

EL PASO NATURAL GAS COMPANY
Docket No. RP05-422-012
Order on Compliance Filing

Rejected Tariff Sheets
Second Revised Volume No. 1-A

Second Alternate Tariff Sheets

Alternate Third Revised Sheet No. 28A
Alt Sub Original Sheet No. 28B
Alternate First Revised Sheet No. 28C
Alt 3rd Sub Original Sheet No. 28D
Alt 3rd Sub Original Sheet No. 28E
Alt 3rd Sub Original Sheet No. 28F
Alt Sub Fifth Revised Sheet No. 103
Alt Sub Fourth Revised Sheet No. 104
Fourth Revised Sheet No. 105
2nd Alt Sub Ninth Revised Sheet No. 114
Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 114A
Alternate First Revised Sheet No. 115
Alternate Third Revised Sheet No. 116
Substitute Eleventh Rev Sheet No. 117
Alt Sub Fifth Revised Sheet No. 128
Alternate Original Sheet No. 128A
Alt Sub Fourth Revised Sheet No. 129
Original Sheet No. 129A
2nd Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 145J
2nd Alternate Original Sheet No. 145J.01
Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 145K
Alternate Original Sheet No. 145K.01
Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 145L
Original Sheet No. 145L.01
Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 145M
2nd Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 147F
2nd Alternate Original Sheet No. 147F.01
Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 147G
Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 147H
Original Sheet No. 147H.01
2nd Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 148K
2nd Alternate Original Sheet No. 148K.01

Appendix C
Page 7 of 8

EL PASO NATURAL GAS COMPANY
Docket No. RP05-422-012
Order on Compliance Filing

Rejected Tariff Sheets
Second Revised Volume No. 1-A

Second Alternate Tariff Sheets

Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 148L
Alternate Original Sheet No. 148L.01
Alt 2nd Sub Original Sheet No. 148M
Alt 2nd d Sub Original Sheet No. 148N
Original Sheet No. 148O

Appendix D
Page 8 of 8

EL PASO NATURAL GAS COMPANY
Docket No. RP05-422-013
Order on Compliance Filing

Rejected Tariff Sheets
Second Revised Volume No. 1-A

Third Substitute Original Sheet No. 28B
Fourth Substitute Original Sheet No. 28D