

134 FERC ¶ 61,270  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Jon Wellinghoff, Chairman;  
Marc Spitzer, Philip D. Moeller,  
John R. Norris, and Cheryl A. LaFleur.

Cameron Interstate Pipeline, LLC

Docket Nos. RP10-877-001  
RP10-877-004  
RP10-877-006

ORDER ON COMPLIANCE AND  
ANNUAL FUEL RETAINAGE PERCENTAGE FILING

(Issued March 31, 2011)

1. On July 22, 2010, in Docket No. RP10-877-004, Cameron Interstate Pipeline, LLC (Cameron) submitted proposed tariff revisions<sup>1</sup> to modify its Fuel Retainage Percentage (FRP) tariff mechanism in section 8.22 of the General Terms and Conditions (GT&C) of its tariff to comply with the Commission's May 28, 2010 order<sup>2</sup> in Docket No. RP10-396-000. Cameron requested the Commission permit the revised provisions to become effective June 15, 2010. We find the language proposed in the revised FRP provision complies with the May 28, 2010 Order and the revised FRP language is accepted effective January 1, 2011, subject to conditions, as discussed below. We also reject as moot the earlier tariff record filed June 24, 2010 in Docket No. RP10-877-001.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Terms and Conditions, General Terms and Conditions, Section 8.0, 16.0.0 to Cameron Interstate Pipeline, LLC FERC Gas Tariff, FERC NGA Gas Tariff.

<sup>2</sup> *Cameron Interstate Pipeline, LLC*, 131 FERC ¶ 61,201 (2010) (May 28, 2010 Order).

<sup>3</sup> Terms and Conditions, General Terms and Conditions, Section 8.0, 5.0.0 to Cameron Interstate Pipeline, LLC FERC Gas Tariff, FERC NGA Gas Tariff.

2. Further, on November 24, 2010, in Docket No. RP10-877-006, Cameron filed its first annual FRP adjustment to update section 4.0<sup>4</sup> of its tariff and comply with the revised section 8.22 of its GT&C. Cameron requests the Commission permit the adjusted FRP to become effective January 1, 2011. We accept the proposed revised FRP rates in section 4.0 filed November 24, 2010, in Docket No. RP10-877-006, effective January 1, 2010, subject to conditions, as discussed below.

### **Procedural History and Filings**

3. Cameron began providing transportation service pursuant to the Natural Gas Act (NGA) in late June 2009. Section 8.22 Cameron's tariff (formerly section 22)<sup>5</sup> provides that Cameron may retain gas in-kind for the percentage of fuel used to provide service for its shippers, subject to Cameron filing an annual "report" with an adjusted FRP, effective the following January to reflect revised fuel requirements. Section 8.22 requires Cameron to tender the annual filing 30 days prior to the effective date of the adjusted FRP, i.e., by December 1 of each year. Cameron's initial FRP rate was set at 0.20 percent when it went into service in June of 2009. However, Cameron failed to file its first annual FRP revision by the December 1, 2009 tariff deadline and, instead, on February 25, 2010, in Docket No. RP10-396-000, filed a request for a one-time, limited waiver of its tariff obligation to file to revise its FRP. Cameron stated that based on operational experience in 2009, its FRP would more accurately be 0.75 percent, but that it experienced some level of gas loss in connection with the commencement of commercial operations that will not be recurring. Hence, Cameron asserted its operating experience in 2009 is not representative of the actual operating conditions projected for 2010. Accordingly, Cameron proposed to defer its first annual FRP adjustment until 2011 and continue the 0.20 percent FRP.

4. In the May 28, 2010 Order, the Commission clarified existing section 8.22 as requiring Cameron to file an annual FRP adjustment filing, rather than a mere report, each year at least 30 days prior to January 1 of the next year, to be effective January 1 through December 31 of that year. As so clarified, the Commission granted the requested waiver for calendar year 2010, reminding Cameron that the next annual FRP filing is due

---

<sup>4</sup> Rates and Charges, Summary of Rates and Charges, Section 4.0, 15.0.0 to Cameron Interstate Pipeline, LLC FERC Gas Tariff, FERC NGA Gas Tariff.

<sup>5</sup> In its June 23, 2010 Order No. 714 baseline compliance filing in Docket No. RP10-877-000, Cameron re-numbered old section 22 as section 8.22. For ease of discussion in this order, we will refer to both the existing FRP provision addressed by the May 28, 2010 Order, and the proposed FRP provision in its July 22, 2010 compliance filing, as section 8.22.

before December 1, 2010. Accordingly, the Commission allowed Cameron to continue its 0.20 percent FRP rate for 2010, until December 31, 2010. However, the Commission found that section 8.22 is unjust and unreasonable and not consistent with Commission policy. The Commission found section 8.22 ambiguous as to how Cameron should calculate the FRP and fails to reflect a true-up provision. Accordingly, the Commission ordered Cameron to revise its FRP tariff provisions to include a current component and a true-up component, within 30 days of the May 28, 2010 Order. This order provided Cameron with guidance on how it should calculate the current and true-up FRP components.<sup>6</sup> However, the subsequent history of this docket reflects a confusing series of eTariff filing errors by Cameron in its effort to comply with the Commission's directives.

5. On June 24 and 25, 2010, Cameron filed to comply with the directives of the May 28, 2010 Order but incorrectly associated its compliance filings with its Baseline eTariff filing docket<sup>7</sup> and, therefore, filed in Docket Nos. RP10-877-001 and RP10-877-002.<sup>8</sup> Cameron re-submitted a corrected filing on July 22, 2010, in Docket No. RP10-877-004. In its Transmittal Letter to the June 24, 2010 compliance filing, Cameron stated that, consistent with the May 28, 2010 Order, it proposed to revise section 8.22 to

---

<sup>6</sup> May 28, 2010 Order, 131 FERC ¶ 61,201 at P 9-11.

<sup>7</sup> Cameron should have filed its compliance filing in a new root docket. *See Electronic Tariff Filings, Order Establishing Procedures Relating To Tariffs Filed Electronically*, 130 FERC ¶ 61,047, at P 13 (2010).

<sup>8</sup> On June 24, 2010, Cameron submitted in Docket No. RP10-877-001, its proposed revised compliance FRP provision, re-numbered as section 8.22 consistent with the eTariff format of its June 23, 2010 filing in Docket No. RP10-877-000, but inadvertently failed to include the actual proposed FRP compliance tariff provision in that filing. The Transmittal to the June 24, 2010 filing in RP10-877-001 contains its description of the changes to its FRP provision that it proposed to comply with the May 28, 2010 Order, but which tariff revision actually appears in its June 25 and July 22, 2010 filings. Later on July 15, 2010, Cameron submitted a letter attempting to withdraw both its filings in RP10-877-001 and 002. However, Cameron used an eTariff Type of Filing Code (TOFC) of 590 (withdrawal) associated only with the RP10-877-002 filing made on June 25, 2010. Order No. 714 provides that any action on a tariff record must be made through the eTariff portal. While Cameron properly withdrew the RP10-877-002 filing, it should have made the same type of filing TOFC of 590 (withdrawal) to withdraw the RP10-877-001 filing. As a result, we reject as moot the Docket No. RP10-877-001 filing.

separate its FRP percentage into two components: a Base FRP and an FRP True-Up Adjustment, and explained how it would calculate those two components. It also stated that it clarified its FRP provision to require it to file by December 1 of each year to update its FRP, with the new FRP to become effective the following January 1. It stated the new provision would specify that Cameron would calculate the FRP using the actual lost-and-unaccounted-for (LAUF) volumes from the previous November through October. Also, as directed, Cameron proposed to remove the first two sentences from the previous section 22.1 (now section 8.22.1) which relates to non-fuel expenditures. Finally, Cameron proposed to remove the provision in previously-numerated section 22.4 (now section 8.22.4) requiring an informational filing should its FRP increases by more than 0.075 percent. Cameron argued this provision is unnecessary now that its FRP mechanism clearly states that it must receive Commission approval for each annual FRP adjustment and, under section 4 of the Natural Gas Act, provide sufficient information to demonstrate its annual FRP adjustment is just and reasonable.

6. Finally, on November 24, 2010, Cameron submitted its annual FRP adjustment for the 2011 calendar year, in Docket No. RP10-877-006 instead of in a new root docket, to become effective January 1, 2011.<sup>9</sup> Following the FRP mechanism set out in its FRP compliance proposal in its July 22, 2010 compliance filing in Docket No. RP10-877-004, Cameron proposed a revised total FRP of 1.57 percent in revised section 4.0 of its tariff record. Cameron explained that the revised FRP rate consisted of a “Base FRP” of 1.04 percent and a “True-Up” component of 0.53 percent. Cameron explained that the 1.04 percent Base FRP is the LAUF experienced during November 1, 2009, through October 31, 2010, and that the 0.53 percent True-Up component is the actual under-recovery it experienced during the same period. Later, in a Supplemental Answer to a protest to the filing, Cameron stated that it had incorrectly calculated the proposed Base FRP and now proposed a Base FRP of 0.74 percent, not 1.04 percent. Accordingly, Cameron stated that the total FRP should be 1.27 percent instead of 1.57 percent as originally proposed. However, Cameron did not file a tariff record amendment to revise section 4.0 to reflect the corrected FRP rate.

---

<sup>9</sup> Cameron incorrectly associated this filing with its baseline eTariff filing in Docket No. RP10-877-000, rather than properly filing in a new root docket. Further, Cameron incorrectly used a TOFC of 580 (Compliance) for this filing, thereby designating this filing as a compliance filing, and not as a new filing under section 4 of the NGA. Accordingly, the 30-day notice provision of section 4(d) of the NGA does not apply to the filing in Docket No. RP10-877-006. *See Electronic Tariff Filings, Order Establishing Procedures Relating To Tariffs Filed Electronically*, 130 FERC ¶ 61,047, at P5 and n. 5 (2010).

**Notice, Protests, and Answers**

7. Notices of Cameron's electronic tariff filings in the captioned Docket Nos. RP10-877-001, RP10-877-004, and RP10-877-006 issued on June 28, July 26, and December 3, 2010, respectively. Interventions and protests were due as provided by section 154.210 of the Commission's regulations.<sup>10</sup> Pursuant to Rule 214,<sup>11</sup> all timely filed motions to intervene and any unopposed motion to intervene out-of-time filed before the issuance date of this order are granted. Granting late intervention at this stage of the proceeding will not disrupt this proceeding or place additional burdens on existing parties. On December 8, 2010, Eni USA Gas Marketing LLC (Eni) filed a protest to the November 24, 2010 filing in Docket No. RP10-866-006. On December 16, 2010, Cameron filed an answer to Eni's protest and, on December 17, 2010, filed a supplement to its December 16, 2010 answer. We will accept the answers as they have aided us in the disposition of the issues raised by the filing.

**Protest**

8. Eni filed a protest to the annual FRP adjustment filing in Docket No. RP10-877-006. Eni argues that Cameron should have followed the existing FRP mechanism in section 22 (8.22) of its pre-compliance tariff, rather than the mechanism in its FRP compliance filing, because the Commission has yet to approve the FRP compliance filing and it is not yet set forth in the currently effective tariff. Accordingly, Eni requests a summary rejection of the annual FRP adjustment as a patent violation of the filed rate doctrine.<sup>12</sup> Eni further argues that Cameron failed to follow the requirements in section 22.4 which obligates it to report on the cause of its increased FRP and take all reasonable measures to remedy those causes. Eni further argues that Cameron failed to meet its burden of proof under NGA section 4 to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that its FRP only covers fuel costs that were prudently incurred.

9. Citing *Crossroad Pipeline Co.*,<sup>13</sup> Eni further argues that "the unapproved methodology that Cameron proposed in Docket No. RP10-877-005 (sic)<sup>14</sup> is unjust and

---

<sup>10</sup> 18 C.F.R. § 154.210 (2010).

<sup>11</sup> 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2010).

<sup>12</sup> Eni protest at 5.

<sup>13</sup> 121 FERC ¶ 61,249, at P 34 (2007) (*Crossroads*).

<sup>14</sup> Cameron's proposed compliance FRP provision was contained in its June 23 and July 22, 2010 submissions in Docket Nos. RP10-877-002 and RP10-877-004,

(continued...)

unreasonable and should not be approved by the Commission,” because “when implementing a new tracker and true-up mechanism, a pipeline may not include in the initial true-up any under-recoveries that occurred prior to the effective date of the tariff provision.”<sup>15</sup> Finally, Eni argues that Cameron’s FRP proposed increase from 0.20 percent to 1.57 percent is so large (685 percent) that it cannot be reconciled with normal pipeline operations, and thus may be rejected as unjust and unreasonable on those grounds as well.

### Answers

10. Cameron filed two answers in response to Eni. In its first answer, Cameron argues the Commission should accept both its FRP compliance filings and its annual FRP adjustment as just and reasonable. Cameron contends that “the fact that the Commission has not yet acted on the ... compliance filing hardly warrants rejection.”<sup>16</sup> Cameron counters that Eni’s argument, that Cameron should instead use its pre-existing FRP methodology, is legally flawed since the May 28, 2010 Order explicitly found that provision to be unjust and unreasonable. Regarding Eni’s argument that Cameron failed to provide sufficient information, Cameron avers Eni misreads section 22.4 (currently, section 8.22.4), and notes that it proposed to delete the language Eni cites.

11. Cameron also provided additional information justifying its change in FRP and clarifying how it is working to mitigate the causes of the increase. Cameron states the pipeline system is well under capacity because its primary delivery point, the Cameron Liquefied Natural Gas Terminal, also operates well under capacity. It argues that, since a certain amount of fuel loss and retainage occurs even at minimal flows, FRP is typically proportionally larger for limited throughput volumes. Nevertheless, Cameron explains, it has engaged both in regular maintenance and repairs and also corrective actions to mitigate lost and unaccounted for fuel levels. Cameron also argues that it is appropriate for it to use true-up to collect for its under-recovery in 2010. Cameron argues its situation is distinguishable from *Crossroads*, because that order involved a pipeline’s voluntary decision to shift from a fixed recovery percentage to a periodic true-up,

---

respectively. Docket No. RP10-877-005, which Eni incorrectly refers to, was assigned to Cameron’s September 8, 2010 corrected baseline eTariff filing, which reflects the existing FRP provision (re-designated as section 8.22) found unjust and unreasonable by the May 28, 2010 Order. The filing in Docket No. RP10-877-005 was conditionally accepted by letter order issued February 11, 2011.

<sup>15</sup> Eni Protest at 7.

<sup>16</sup> Cameron December 16, 2010 Answer at 5.

whereas Cameron had been compelled to do so. Cameron also asserts that the May 28, 2010 Order did not prohibit or otherwise restrict Cameron's ability to include the 2010 under-recovery in its initial FRP filing.

12. In its second answer filed on December 17, 2010, as noted above, Cameron corrected an error in its initial FRP filing. It stated that the data in its initial FRP filing are correct, but that it performed the calculation of the Base FRP incorrectly. As a result, the Base FRP should be 0.74 percent, not 1.04 percent. Cameron states that it calculated correctly the FRP True-Up Adjustment as 0.53 percent, yielding a total FRP of 1.27 percent.

## **Discussion**

### **Compliance FRP Tariff Mechanism**

13. We find that Cameron's proposed FRP provision (section 8.22) in its July 22, 2010 filing in Docket No. RP10-877-004, which was unprotested, complies with the directives of the May 28, 2010 Order and is just and reasonable. However, the tariff record must be re-filed because section 8.22 as filed does not conform to Cameron's baseline format that was conditionally accepted in Docket No. RP10-877-005. Accordingly, we accept Cameron's proposed tariff revisions to section 8.22 to be effective January 1, 2011, subject to Cameron filing within 15 days of the date this order issues a revised section 8.22 of its tariff's GT&C that includes the approved FRP tariff language filed in Docket No. RP10-877-004 in the format conditionally accepted in Docket No. RP10-877-005.

14. Eni's protest filed December 8, 2010 in Docket No. RP10-877-006, at page 7, in response to Cameron's annual FRP rate filing in that docket, refers to the new proposed section 8.22, but is a misplaced objection to the FRP rate filing and not to the proposed section 8.22 itself. Eni asserts that the proposed section 8.22 is unjust and unreasonable because it is being used to attempt to true-up for under-recoveries that occurred prior to the effective date of the tariff provision and is purportedly recovering gas losses outside the scope of normal operations. Eni does not, in fact, actually protest the proposed true-up methodology itself; it only protests the types and level of fuel costs Cameron seeks to include for recovery under that provision in its annual FRP rate filing in Docket No. RP10-877-006, which we address below. Moreover, as we discuss below, by accepting the new FRP section 8.22, including its true-up provision, to be effective January 1, 2011, we preclude Cameron from using it to recover under-recoveries of fuel that may have occurred prior to that date.

15. Regarding the effective date of this new FRP section 8.22, although Cameron requested a June 15, 2010 effective date, we accept it to be prospectively effective January 1, 2011, to coincide with the effectiveness of its annual FRP rate filing in Docket No. RP10-877-006, subject to the condition below. The Commission actually could

accept the proposed FRP provision effective as early as May 28, 2010, when the Commission initially directed Cameron to file to establish a true-up provision.<sup>17</sup> That order gave adequate notice to Cameron's shipper-customers that their then-current rates could be subject to future revision through a true-up to make up for fuel under- or over-recoveries incurred following the date of the Commission's order. However, consistent with granting waiver of Cameron's tariff obligation to file an FRP adjustment for the 2010 calendar year so that it would continue to charge an FRP of 0.20 percent for the entire calendar year 2010, the Commission's intent was for Cameron to establish clear and unambiguous current component (Base FRP rate) and true-up methodologies in the tariff to apply prospectively to Cameron's next FRP period, effective January 1, 2011, rather than for Cameron to re-calculate and revise its FRP rate in mid-stream for the remainder of 2010.

### **November 24, 2010 Annual FRP Adjustment Filing**

#### **Base Rate Component**

16. In its November 24, 2010 annual FRP rate filing in Docket No. RP10-877-006, Cameron proposed a revised total FRP of 1.57 percent, reflecting a Base FRP of 1.04 percent calculated consistent with its proposed FRP methodology in proposed section 8.22.2. However, in its second answer, filed on December 17, 2010, Cameron indicated it calculated incorrectly the Base FRP component and now proposes a Base FRP of 0.74 percent. Eni protested this filing because Cameron failed to meet its NGA section 4 burden of proof to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate its FRP only covers fuel costs that were prudently and appropriately incurred during normal operations. Further, Eni argues that Cameron failed to follow the requirements of section 8.22.4 of its existing FRP provision.<sup>18</sup> That provision, which Cameron replaced,

---

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., *Chevron Pipe Line Co.*, 116 FERC ¶ 61,309, at P 16 (2006) (September 29, 2006 letter order accepting fuel tracker rates, effective October 1, 2006, subject to Chevron filing to establish a true-up provision later accepted effective October 1, 2006). See also *Sabine Pipe Line LLC*, 127 FERC ¶ 61,267, at P 3 (2009) (recounting history of Sabine's, formerly Chevron Pipe Line Company's, proposal to add a true-up provision, filed October 27, 2006, in compliance with the September 29, 2006 Letter Order, and later accepted effective October 1, 2006, by unreported letter order issued February 15, 2007).

<sup>18</sup> Eni also asserts that Cameron failed to comply with existing section 8.22.4 which, in the event of an increase in the FRP by more than 0.075 percent, requires Cameron to "promptly take all reasonable measures to determine the cause(s) of the increase and to remedy such cause(s)" and goes on to provide that "[n]o later than

(continued...)

now requires Cameron to promptly take action to determine and remedy the causes of increase in FRP of more than 0.075 percent. In its first answer, Cameron responded to Eni's protest by providing further information regarding its fuel use. In particular, Cameron describes a program of both regular and corrective maintenance and repair, and also argues that it can attribute much of its increase in FRP to the fact that its system is operating well under its certificated capacity level due to low demand at the upstream Cameron Liquefied Natural Gas Terminal. Further, Cameron proposes to delete the provision found in former section 22.4 that Eni claims Cameron failed to meet.

17. In light of Cameron's answers, we find that Cameron now provides sufficient information to demonstrate that its underlying FRP fuel costs were prudently incurred. Further, because we accept its proposed FRP methodology to be prospectively effective January 1, 2011, we find it appropriate that Cameron's proposed Base FRP rate also to become effective January 1, 2010, was calculated pursuant to its proposed tariff section 8.22.2. However, even if we were agree with Eni that Cameron should have followed its existing tariff section 8.22 in this annual FRP rate filing, we find that Cameron's proposed 0.74 Base FRP rate complies with the existing tariff section 8.22. Although the Commission found existing section 8.22 ambiguous as to precisely how Cameron should calculate the FRP rate, that existing provision clearly authorizes Cameron to recover its projected fuel costs by retaining a percentage of the gas it transports for its shippers in a FRP rate to be effective for a one calendar year period beginning January 1 of each year. As we find that Cameron designed its proposed Base FRP rate to recover projected fuel costs over the next calendar year 2011, is fully supported, and is calculated using a just and reasonable methodology, we find that the proposed 0.74 percent Base component is just and reasonable and consistent with both its existing and proposed tariff section 8.22.

18. However, the Commission will not accept revisions to tariff filing in pleadings; the filing company must file revised tariff records.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, Cameron must file a revised section 4.0 to its tariff to revise its Base FRP rate to 0.74 percent. Accordingly, we accept revised section 4.0 of Cameron's eTariff filing in Docket No. RP10-877-006

---

30 days after completing its investigation of the cause(s), [Cameron] shall inform all shippers of its findings." Eni December 8, 2010 Protest, Docket No. RP10-877-006, at 5-6. Even though we accept Cameron's proposed revised section 8.22.4 effective January 1, 2011, which deletes these requirements, we find that Cameron effectively complied with the existing provision through its first answer.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. 18 C.F.R. §§ 154.3, 154.4, 154.5, and 154.205(b) (2010); *Dominion Transmission, Inc.*, 132 FERC ¶ 61,179, at P 13-14 (2010).

effective January 1, 2011, subject to Cameron filing within 15 days of the date this order issues, a revised tariff record to reflect a 0.74 percent Base FRP rate component.

### **True-Up Rate Component**

19. In its November 24, 2010 filing, Cameron's proposed revised total FRP of 1.57 percent reflects a proposed True-up component of 0.53 percent to recover its actual under-recovery experienced during November 1, 2009, through October 31, 2010, as calculated consistent with the FRP methodology in proposed section 8.22.3. Cameron must re-file to include a True-up component in its section rate provision and to reduce its True-up component to 0.00 percent effective January 1, 2011, because Cameron calculated the proposed 0.53 percent True-up rate to recover fuel under-recoveries incurred during the period that precedes the January 1, 2011 effective date of the tariff provision establishing the section 8.22.3 True-up rate methodology. As Eni notes, the Commission previously held that a true-up mechanism cannot permit recovery of unrecovered fuel costs incurred prior to the effective date of the true-up mechanism.<sup>20</sup>

20. Accordingly, acceptance of Cameron's November 24, 2010 annual FRP filing in Docket No. RP10-877-006 is further conditioned upon Cameron re-filing section 4.0 of the rate section of its eTariff within 15 days of the date this order issues to include a True-up rate component of 0.00 percent, effective January 1, 2011.

21. Therefore, to summarize our order on Cameron's annual FRP rate filing of November 24, 2010, Cameron must re-file section 4.0 of its tariff within 15 days of the date this order issues to reflect a total FRP rate of 0.74 percent consisting of two rate components shown in section 4.0: a Base FRP rate component of 0.74 percent and a True-up FRP rate component of 0.00 percent, both effective January 1, 2011.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> See *Sabine Pipe Line LLC*, 124 FERC ¶ 61,144, at P 10 (2008), *reh'g denied*, 127 FERC ¶ 61,267 (2009) ("when implementing a new tracker and true-up mechanism, a pipeline may not include in the true-up any under-recoveries that occurred prior to the effective date of the tariff provision" citing *Crossroads*, 121 FERC ¶ 61,249 at P 34; *High Island Offshore System, LLC*, 112 FERC ¶ 61,050, at P 145 (2005) (*HIOS*)).

<sup>21</sup> If Cameron began recovering the higher as-filed FRP rates on January 1, 2011, Cameron must net any such over-charged quantities (i.e., the difference between the quantities under the FRP rate as filed and the quantities under the FRP rates as approved herein) from the FRP quantities to be recovered from its customers over the course of the next full billing month following this order.

The Commission orders:

(A) Cameron's FRP tariff text proposed in section 8.22 and filed on July 22, 2010, in Docket No. RP10-877-004, is accepted as in compliance with the May 28, 2010 Order, to be effective January 1, 2011, subject to Cameron filing a revised section 8.22 of its GT&C's that includes the approved FRP tariff language filed in Docket No. RP10-877-004 in the format conditionally approved in Docket No. RP10-877-005, within 15 days of the date this order issues.

(B) The tariff record filed in Cameron's June 24, 2010 filing, in Docket No. RP10-877-001 is rejected as moot.

(C) Cameron's proposed FRP rate in section 4.0 of its tariff, filed November 24, 2010, in Docket No. RP10-877-006, is accepted to be effective January 1, 2011, subject to Cameron filing within 15 days of the date this order issues, a revised section 4.0 to reflect a total FRP rate of 0.74 percent consisting of a Base FRP rate component of 0.74 percent, and a True-Up FRP rate component of 0.00 percent.

By the Commission.

( S E A L )

Kimberly D. Bose,  
Secretary.