

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Gulf South Pipeline Company, LP

Docket No. RP15-65-000

ORDER CONFIRMING RULINGS

(Issued July 24, 2015)

1. On July 1, 2015 Gulf South Pipeline Company, LP (Gulf South) filed a Motion for Partial Summary Disposition and to Strike Testimony Related to Segmentation. Answers were filed on July 16, 2015 by Atmos Energy Corporation (Atmos); the Distributor Coalition<sup>1</sup> and the United Municipal Distributors Group (UMDG); the Indicated Shippers;<sup>2</sup> QEP Energy Company (QEP) and Commission Trial Staff (Trial Staff).
2. On July 13, 2015 Gulf South filed a Motion to Compel Responses to Data Requests Related to Segmentation.<sup>3</sup> The Indicated Shippers<sup>4</sup> filed an answer on July 20, 2015.
3. Also on July 13, 2015 Gulf South filed a Motion to Compel a Response to Its Data Request or, in the Alternative, to Strike Testimony.<sup>5</sup> CenterPoint and Willmut jointly filed an answer on July 17, 2015. BP filed an answer on July 20, 2015.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Distributor Coalition includes CenterPoint Energy Resources Corp. (CenterPoint); Mobile Gas Service Corporation; Willmut Gas Company (Willmut) and the City of Vicksburg, Mississippi.

<sup>2</sup> The Indicated Shippers includes BP Energy Company (BP); Chesapeake Energy Marketing, LLC (Chesapeake); ExxonMobil Gas & Power Marketing Company (ExxonMobil); Petrohawk Energy Corporation (Petrohawk); Shell Energy North America (US), L.P. and SWEPI LP.

<sup>3</sup> On July 17, 2015, Gulf South filed a Withdrawal of Motion to Compel Responses to Data Requests Related to Segmentation with Respect to Shell Energy North America (US), L.P. and Shell Offshore Inc.

<sup>4</sup> The Indicated Shippers, in filing their July 20, 2015 Answer, includes BP; Chesapeake; ExxonMobil; and Petrohawk.

<sup>5</sup> On July 17, 2015, Gulf South filed a Withdrawal of Motion to Compel

4. Oral arguments were held on the above motions on July 23, 2015. Following oral argument the following rulings were made. Concerning the motion for partial summary disposition it was found that material issues of fact exist regarding segmentation. Therefore, for this reason and for the other reasons stated in the answers, Gulf South's Motion for Partial Summary Disposition was DENIED and the related Motion to Strike Testimony Related to Segmentation was determined MOOT. Additionally, because there exist material issues of fact relating to segmentation and responses to Gulf South's segmentation data requests could lead to discovery of relevant evidence under 18 C.F.R. § 385.402 (2014), Gulf South's Motion to Compel Responses to Data Requests Related to Segmentation was GRANTED. Additionally, since the parties raised issues relating to Asset Management Agreements in their answering testimony and because responses to Gulf South's data request could lead to the discovery of relevant evidence under 18 C.F.R. § 385.402 (2014), Gulf South's Motion to Compel a Response to Its Data Request was GRANTED. The related Alternative Motion to Strike Testimony was deemed MOOT.

SO ORDERED.

Carmen A. Cintron  
Presiding Administrative Law Judge