

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

August 5, 2010

In Reply Refer To:  
CenterPoint Energy Gas Transmission Co.  
Docket No. RP10-383-000

CenterPoint Energy Gas Transmission Company  
P.O. Box 21734  
Shreveport, LA 71151

Attention: Lawrence O. Thomas, Senior Director

Reference: Additional Information Filing

Ladies and Gentlemen:

1. On April 1, 2010, CenterPoint Energy Gas Transmission Company (CEGT) filed additional information to comply with the Commission's letter order issued on March 18, 2010, in Docket No. RP10-383-000 (March 18 Order).<sup>1</sup> CEGT includes with its filing a response to the Motion to Require Supplemental Information filed by ConocoPhillips Company (ConocoPhillips) in response to the March 18 Order. As discussed below, we accept CEGT's additional information filing.

2. In its March 18 Order, the Commission accepted various tariff changes that CEGT proposed subject to CEGT filing additional information. One change the Commission conditionally accepted was CEGT's proposal to incorporate into section 2.14 of Rate Schedule PHS<sup>2</sup> the name "AutoPal" for a balancing service offered under that rate schedule. Commission staff was unsure whether CEGT was simply renaming an existing service as the AutoPal, or offering a new service. As a result, in the March 18 Order, the

---

<sup>1</sup> *CenterPoint Energy Gas Transmission Company*, 130 FERC ¶ 61,222 (2010).

<sup>2</sup> Rate Schedule PHS is the Perryville Hub Service, which is both a wheeling and park and loan service.

Commission directed CEGT to clarify (1) whether its AutoPal is a new or existing service; (2) the mechanics of how AutoPal works; and (3) how it proposes to price Autopal.

3. In its additional information filing, CEGT clarifies that AutoPal was simply a new name given to an existing service the Commission approved by letter order issued on December 14, 2006, in Docket No. RP07-72-000. CEGT states it was merely proposing to change the name of the service to AutoPal to distinguish it from its nomination balancing service. CEGT asserts the tariff changes the Commission accepted in the March 18 Order do not alter the AutoPal service in any way. In its additional information filing, CEGT also explains how the AutoPal service works and the pricing of the service under Rate Schedule PHS.

4. On March 22, 2010, ConocoPhillips filed a Motion to Require Supplemental Information. ConocoPhillips states that the Commission should supplement its additional information request to CEGT to seek greater detail on CEGT's AutoPal service. It asserts that the expanded additional information would assist the Commission in its decision-making process, ensure a complete record, and assist CEGT's customers in obtaining a greater understanding of CEGT's proposal. ConocoPhillips lists 14 specific questions it requests the Commission direct CEGT to answer. In general, the questions address, among other things, end-user protocol, hypothetical system imbalances, posting of nomination balancing service availability, the relationship between shipper MDQ and CEGT selling available capacity for its nomination balancing service, the need for a nomination balancing service, and the relationship between the nomination balancing service and pooling.

5. In its additional information filing, CEGT states it opposes ConocoPhillips' motion, asserting it should not have to answer data requests related to a tariff filing that has already been conditionally accepted by the Commission, especially with respect to questions not related to its AutoPal service. CEGT does, however, provide answers to the questions that ConocoPhillips poses, stating that doing so will address and alleviate any confusion with regard to its AutoPal service. CEGT offers specific answers to questions 11 through 13 posed by ConocoPhillips. With regard to questions 1 through 10 and question 14, CEGT includes with its filing a Frequently Asked Question form from its website which it states answers those remaining questions that ConocoPhillips poses.

6. After a review of CEGT's additional information filing and its response to ConocoPhillips' Motion to Require Supplemental Responses, we find that CEGT has satisfactorily complied with the conditions set forth in the March 18 Order, and has in addition attempted to respond to its shipper's concerns. As CEGT is merely changing the name of an existing service to AutoPal, and not modifying any elements of the service, no further data was required in this compliance filing beyond the information sought by the underlying order. Accordingly, we accept CEGT's additional information filing as in

compliance with the March 18 Order and deny ConocoPhillips' Motion to Require Supplemental Responses.

By direction of the Commission.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,  
Deputy Secretary.

cc: All Parties

Daniel W. Sanborn  
Assistant General Counsel, Pipeline Group  
CenterPoint Energy Gas Transmission Company  
P.O. Box 1700  
Houston, TX 77210-1700