

140 FERC ¶ 61,251
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Jon Wellinghoff, Chairman;
Philip D. Moeller, John R. Norris,
Cheryl A. LaFleur, and Tony T. Clark.

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC

Docket No. RP12-993-000

ORDER ACCEPTING AND SUSPENDING TARIFF RECORDS
SUBJECT TO REFUND AND ESTABLISHING
HEARING PROCEDURES

(Issued September 28, 2012)

1. On August 31, 2012, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC (Transco) filed the revised tariff records listed in the Appendices reflecting a general rate increase under section 4 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA). According to Transco, this filing satisfies a requirement in the Stipulation and Agreement approved by the Commission in Docket No. RP06-569-000, *et al.* (Settlement), Transco's last general rate case, for it to file an NGA section 4 general rate case no later than August 31, 2012.¹ Transco requests that the tariff records become effective on October 1, 2012. For the reasons discussed below, the Commission (A) accepts and suspends, subject to refund, the proposed tariff records listed in Appendix A to be effective March 1, 2013; and (B) accepts, without suspension, the proposed tariff records listed in Appendix B to be effective October 1, 2012; acceptance of all tariff records is subject to the outcome of hearing procedures established herein.

I. Filing

2. Transco's proposed rates are based on a cost of service for a twelve-month base period ending May 31, 2012, as adjusted for known and measurable changes through the test period ending February 28, 2013. The proposed rates would increase Transco's current revenue requirement by \$326 million, from \$959 million to \$1,285 million. Transco's proposed rate base would increase by \$639 million. The filing reflects an

¹ *Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp.*, 122 FERC ¶ 61,213 (2008).

overall after-tax rate of return of 9.51 percent comprised of return on equity (ROE) of 11.74 percent and weighted average cost of debt capital of 5.81 percent, based on Transco's own capital structure of 37.59 percent debt and 62.41 percent equity.

3. Transco attributes the proposed rate increase primarily to increased expenses for Operations & Maintenance (O&M), depreciation, and asset retirement obligations (ARO), and to certain expansion projects which were placed in service after the effective date of the rate case in Docket No. RP06-569. Transco has also proposed adjusting its rate base and cost of service to reflect a pending application in Docket No. CP11-551-000 to partially abandon its Eminence storage facilities and services.

4. Transco proposes to increase depreciation rates and/or decrease associated negative salvage rate for the following:

- onshore production (gathering) plant;
- offshore production (gathering) plant;
- underground storage plant;
- onshore transmission plant – other;
- Solar turbine compressor engines;
- offshore transmission plant; and
- Maiden Lateral.

Transco also proposes to decrease the depreciation rate for LNG storage plant and increase the associated negative salvage rate. Transco proposes to leave unchanged the annual depreciation accrual rates for all of its other plant categories.

5. Transco states that its filing reflects ARO expenses of \$5,245,875 for production (gathering) plant, \$31,997,865 for transmission plant, and \$13,119,193 for underground storage plant. Transco states that this filing also includes an ARO expense for the terminal abandonment of the entire Eminence facility.²

6. For O&M and Administrative & General (A&G) costs, Transco proposes an increase from \$23 million to \$51 million, with \$21 million in O&M expenses and

² Transmittal Letter at 5.

\$30 million in A&G expenses. Transco states that it assigned O&M costs directly to incremental projects where possible, and allocated remaining O&M expenses using appropriate allocation factors that take into consideration the integrated nature and operations of its system.

7. Transco currently allocates approximately \$7.6 million of storage function costs to transportation services. Transco proposes to rebalance cost allocations so that some costs of its Leidy/Wharton and Washington storage fields are assigned away from its storage services (Rate Schedules WSS, GSS, LSS, SS-2, and S-2) and to transportation services. This would result in an allocation to transportation services of approximately \$14.9 million of storage costs, comprised of \$8.1 million of Transco storage costs and \$6.8 million of tracked third-party storages costs. Transco states that any future change in third-party storage costs will be tracked entirely to the appropriate Transco storage service pursuant to the terms of the applicable storage rate schedule.

8. Transco also proposes discount adjustments for interruptible and short-term firm transportation. Transco argues that it agreed to discounted rates in order to meet competition, and that granting adjustments would be consistent with Commission policy and precedent.³

9. Finally, Transco explains several other changes or features of its proposed rate design throughout its transmittal and exhibits, including a billing change for certain customers and a prospective roll-in of electric compression costs incurred at Station 115.

II. Notice

10. Public notice of the filing was issued on September 5, 2012. Interventions and protests were due September 12, 2012, as provided in section 154.210 of the Commission's regulations.⁴ Pursuant to Rule 214,⁵ all timely filed unopposed motions to intervene and any unopposed motions 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. Thirty-

³ Transmittal Letter at 5 (citations omitted).

⁴ 18 C.F.R. § 154.210 (2012).

⁵ 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2012).

eight parties filed timely protests. On September 21, 2012, Transco filed a motion to answer the protests.⁶

III. Protests

11. All of the protestors make similar assertions that Transco has not shown its proposed rates to be just and reasonable. Therefore, they request establishment of a hearing to consider the lawfulness of Transco's proposed rates and services; suspension of the filing for the maximum statutory period; and that the filing's effectiveness be made subject to refund pending final resolution of this proceeding.⁷ The particular concerns of the most detailed protests are summarized below. In addition, several protests call on the Commission to schedule a hearing based on the general complexity of the filing, or the magnitude of the increase in rates.

12. National Grid⁸ is generally concerned about the impact of Transco's proposed \$26 million, or 18 percent increase in its companies' annual revenue responsibility. Among its concerns, National Grid mentions Transco's proposed (1) increased depreciation rates, and new or revised negative salvage rates; (2) increased ARO expenses; (3) roll-in of currently incremental electric power costs incurred at Transco's Station 115; (4) allocation of \$51 million of transmission O&M and A&G expenses to incremental transportation services; (5) inclusion in its rates of costs for support and management services by its corporate parent; (6) discount adjustment to billing determinants; and (7) establishment of rates based on the projected determinants set forth in Schedules G-1 and G-1.

⁶ Rule 213(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.213 (a)(2) (2012), prohibits answers to protests or answers unless otherwise permitted by the decisional authority. We will accept the answer as it aids in the disposition of the issues raised by the protests.

⁷ As described further, several protestors also request that Transco's proposed incremental rates for service utilizing certain expansion facilities and LNG facilities be allowed to go into effect October 1, 2012, as Transco requested.

⁸ The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY; KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid; Boston Gas Company, Colonial Gas Company, collectively d/b/a National Grid; Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid; and The Narragansett Electric Company d/b/a National Grid, all subsidiaries of National Grid USA, Inc.

13. Louisiana Municipal Gas Authority expresses concern, as an IT shipper delivering to three municipalities in Transco's Louisiana production zone, that the proposed increase in the IT rate will place an undue hardship on its high priority human needs customers. It notes that IT service is the only service offered by Transco in that zone.

14. Washington Gas Light Company (Washington Gas) maintains that Transco's proposed billing determinants reflect numerous adjustments that are not supported. For instance, Washington Gas challenges the extrapolation of IT quantities, cost allocation to the commodity component of its incremental rates, and increase in the Eminence storage service rates. Washington Gas expresses particular concern about Transco's proposed increase in ARO funding, and asserts that Transco's ability to collect any ARO amounts is open to review under the terms of the Settlement.⁹

15. Indicated Shippers¹⁰ state that they are particularly concerned about the allocation of storage, A&G, S&E, and O&M costs to and among Transco's transportation and gathering services. They believe the allocation of such costs to non-incremental transportation and gathering services is excessive and discriminatory.

16. The Producer Coalition¹¹ express concern about the magnitude of the proposed increases in Transco's maximum IT rates and maximum interruptible gathering rate, noting that the gathering rate would increase from 4.503 cents/Dth to 55.094 cents/Dth. The Producer Coalition argue that such rate increases will erase their sales profits, causing them either to shut in production or possibly postpone drilling near Transco's facilities. Such an outcome, they argue, would be to the detriment of coastal and other US markets' access to low cost offshore gas supplies, and therefore not in the public

⁹ Washington Gas Protest at 3 (citing Article I of the Settlement, Section A.1. – A.4).

¹⁰ Indicated Shippers is an ad hoc group comprising the following shippers on Transco's pipeline system: Anadarko Energy Services Company, Apache Corporation, BP Energy Company, Chevron U.S.A. Inc.; ConocoPhillips Company; ExxonMobil Gas & Power Marketing Company, a Division of Exxon Mobil Corporation; Hess Corporation; Noble Energy, Inc. and Shell Offshore, Inc. Each of these companies has filed a motion for leave to intervene in this proceeding on an individual basis.

¹¹ The Producer Coalition are interruptible transportation customers developing reserves in the Gulf of Mexico. They are comprised of Century Exploration New Orleans, LLC, Dynamic Offshore Resources, LLC, Energy XXI (Bermuda) Ltd., Hilcorp Energy Company, Inc, McMoRan Oil & Gas LLC, Pisces Energy LLC, and W&T Offshore, Inc.

interest. The Producer Coalition also object to the proposed depreciation rates, downward throughput adjustments to IT and IT Feeder volumes, and increases in ARO. They specifically criticize as empirically flawed the methodology Transco used to make the aforementioned throughput adjustments. Other shippers raise similar concerns related to the impact of the filing on Transco's offshore gathering and transmission facilities.

17. Municipalities¹² object to the magnitude of Transco's proposed rate increases, ranging from 10.9 percent to 102.1 percent above current rates, by Municipalities' calculations. Municipalities object to the proposed return on equity of 11.74 percent, which they describe as above the equity returns approved by the Commission in recent orders, and more than 1000 basis points above the currently effective long-term Treasury rates. Finally, Municipalities argue that Transco's proposed equity rate is premised on inappropriate adjustments to the Commission's standard method of conducting a discounted cash flow analysis.

18. Municipalities also request scrutiny of test period adjustments for costs related to the partial failure of Transco's Eminence storage field, resulting in Transco's pending application in Docket No. CP11-551-000 for partial abandonment of the field. They note that Transco has included a \$95 million ARO expense for terminal abandonment of the field, which it proposes to amortize over a 15-year period. In this regard, Municipalities request consideration in this proceeding of who should benefit from Transco's proposal in the abandonment proceeding to sell surplus Eminence base gas, and whether any expenses related to the abandonment may be defrayed by insurance payments.

19. Municipalities request summary rejection of Transco's proposed calculation of ROE, claiming that it violates requirements regarding the use of Master Limited Partnerships (MLP) in the Commission's Policy Statement on the composition of proxy groups to determine a company's ROE.¹³ Other shippers also assert that the proposed ROE is overstated and not consistent with Commission precedent.

20. Finally, Municipalities request that, before Transco moves rates into effect, the Commission order Transco to remove from its rate base and cost of service any costs, which prior to the end of the test period, have either not been incurred or are associated with any facilities not placed in service.

¹² For the purposes of this docket, Municipalities refers to the Municipal Gas Authority of Georgia and the Transco Municipal Group, each of which represent several municipalities that are Transco customers.

¹³ Municipalities Protest at 13 (citation omitted).

21. Similarly, the North Carolina Utilities Commission objects to Transco's various "anticipated" test period adjustments as not consistent with the "known and measurable" standard for such adjustments, and request that all issues in the filing related to Transco's pending application in Docket No. CP11-551-000 for partial abandonment of the Eminence storage facility be set for hearing to ensure that Transco's rates are just and reasonable and that only prudently incurred costs are recovered.

22. Atmos Energy Corporation and Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc. similarly protest Transco's proposed allocation of storage costs to transportation, the roll-in of Station 115 electric power costs, and the ARO increases.

23. Florida Power & Light states in its protest that it is particularly interested in the allocation of costs to the Mobile Bay lateral and how Transco takes into account the bi-directional flows of gas on the lateral to determine the throughput.

IV. Discussion

A. Request for Minimum Suspension

24. Washington Gas, Municipalities, and AGLR¹⁴ state that Transco proposes rate reductions for certain services and request that the Commission make the rate reductions effective on October 1, 2012.¹⁵ Washington Gas states that it is an incremental transportation customer taking service on Transco's Potomac, Leidy East, and Market Link Projects. It states that Transco has proposed to reduce the reservation charges for those projects, while increasing the usage charge. It states that the combined rate for each of those services is substantially lower than the currently effective combined rates. Washington Gas requests that the Commission accept the rates for these services effective immediately on October 1, 2012. It also requests that the Commission suspend the usage components of the rates for these services for the minimum period, making them subject to refund. Municipalities state that Transco has proposed to reduce the reservation charges for its Sundance, Momentum, and Cherokee Expansion Projects. They request that the Commission suspend the rates for those projects for a minimal period, to be effective October 1, 2012, subject to refund. Municipalities argue that the

¹⁴ Atlanta Gas Light Company, Pivotal Utility Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Elizabethtown Gas in New Jersey, Pivotal Utility Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Elkton Gas in Maryland, and Virginia Natural Gas, Inc., all of which are subsidiaries of AGL Resources Inc.

¹⁵ Appendix B identifies the expansion and LNG services.

Commission has previously granted nominal suspensions for one service in a general rate case, even when other rates which were increasing were suspended.¹⁶

25. AGLR similarly asserts that Transco has proposed rate decreases for the Cherokee, South Coast, and Sentinel Expansions and request that the Commission make those rate decreases effective immediately. AGLR also asserts that Transco has proposed minimal increases in its Demand charge and Storage Capacity Quantity charge for its LNG services under Rate Schedule LNG and LG-A, but that Transco has proposed very significant decreases in the Quantity Injected and Quantity Withdrawn usage charges for those services. The AGLR states that the magnitude of the usage charge rate reductions for these services is significant enough that the Commission should make the rates for Transco's LNG's services effective immediately, particularly given that a five month suspension period would encompass part of the winter withdrawal period. AGLR requests that rates for these services also be made subject to refund but does not expressly request suspension of those rates.

26. Transco included an appendix to its answer comparing its proposed rates for its incremental projects with its existing rates for those projects. According to that appendix, Transco has proposed to reduce the reservation charge for its Trenton Woodbury project, while leaving the usage charge at zero. Transco also states that it has proposed overall net rate decreases for all services for seven other projects,¹⁷ based on a comparison of the proposed rates to the existing rates on a 100 percent load factor basis. For each of those projects, Transco has proposed to reduce the reservation charge, while increasing the usage charge by a less significant amount. Transco states that all its other incremental projects would experience overall rate increases for some or all rate zones under its rate proposal.

27. Transco contends that the protesters' request for a minimal suspension or outright acceptance of its proposed reservation charge reductions, while suspending the increased usage charge proposal for the maximum period are contrary to the Commission's approach of either accepting or suspending for the same period a pipeline's entire rate proposal for a particular service. Transco also points out that it did not include in its filing a motion to place suspended rates into effect. Therefore, Transco states that, if the Commission desires Transco's proposed rate reductions for particular services to go into effect immediately, it must accept those rate proposals without suspension.

¹⁶ Municipalities Protest at 9-11.

¹⁷ These are the Pocono, Market Link, Sundance, Leidy East, Leidy to Long Island, Potomac, and Sentinel Projects.

28. The Commission accepts, effective October 1, 2012, without suspension, Transco's proposed rates for its Trenton Woodbury, Pocono, Market Link, Sundance, Leidy East, Leidy to Long Island, Potomac, and Sentinel Projects. Similarly, the Commission accepts Transco's proposed rates for its LNG services effective October 1, 2012, without suspension. This action will ensure that Transco's proposed overall rate decreases for those services take effect immediately. The Commission accepts and suspends for five months, subject to refund, Transco's proposed rates for all its other services, because those rate proposals will result in overall rate increases for some or all shippers.

29. NGA section 4(e) gives the pipeline discretion whether to move a suspended rate into effect. Therefore, as the court recognized in *Northeast Energy Assoc., et al. v. FERC*¹⁸ and the Commission stated in its order on remand,¹⁹ if a pipeline has not included in its filing a motion to move its proposed rates into effect, the Commission can only require a proposed rate change to be implemented immediately by accepting it without suspension.²⁰ Here, Transco has not included such a motion in its filing. Therefore, in order to require Transco to implement the overall rate decreases for the relevant incrementally priced expansion services and LNG services, the Commission is accepting the relevant tariff records without suspension.²¹

30. The Commission rejects the protesters' requests that we suspend the proposed increased usage charges for incremental services for the maximum five month period, while accepting the reduced reservation charges outright or with a minimal suspension. Pursuant to NGA section 4(e), the Commission may only require pipelines to order refunds of proposed rate increases above the level of the pipeline's prior rates. The Commission has held that the reservation and usage components of the rate for a particular service are properly considered together as one filed rate charge for one rate increase for one service for purposes of calculating refunds.²² Therefore, the

¹⁸ 158 F.3d 150 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (*Northeast Energy*).

¹⁹ *Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp.*, 89 FERC ¶ 61,249, at 61,746-47 (1999).

²⁰ 18 C.F.R. § 154.206(b) (2012).

²¹ For example, some protesters oppose Tennessee's proposal to make quarterly fuel tracking filings, and request that such filings be made annually.

²² *Northwest Pipeline Corp.*, Opinion No. 396, 71 FERC ¶ 61,253 (1995), *order on reh'g*, Opinion No. 396-A, 76 FERC ¶ 61,068, at 61,425 (1996) (citing *Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.*, 73 FERC ¶ 61,287, at 61,790 (1995) (citing *Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.*, 40 FERC ¶ 61,335 (1987))).

Commission will only order refunds in situations where the pipeline proposes an overall rate increase for a service, and the Commission finds that the pipeline has not supported a portion of that rate increase. It follows that, where the pipeline proposes an overall rate decrease for a service, the Commission cannot order refunds, and no point would be served by a rate suspension. At the hearing, parties are free, however, to seek prospective further rate decreases pursuant to NGA section 5.

31. The Commission is also rejecting the Municipalities' and AGLR's requests for an immediate effective date for the proposed rates for the Cherokee, Momentum, and SouthCoast projects. While Transco has proposed reduced reservation charges for those projects, Transco's proposal leads to an overall rate increase for all customers on the Cherokee project; it also leads to a rate increase for some customers on the Momentum and SouthCoast projects, depending upon the rate zone they use. Accordingly, the Commission accepts and suspends the rates for those projects for five months, to be effective March 1, 2013, subject to refund.

B. Eminence Abandonment Filing

32. Transco has also proposed adjusting its rate base and cost of service to reflect a pending application in Docket No. CP11-551-000 to partially abandon its Eminence storage facilities and services. This order does not prejudge the issues in Docket No. CP11-551-000, which will be considered in a separate order. However, Transco and the protestors have raised issues as to how the abandonment will affect the rates at issue in this proceeding.

33. To the extent the Commission acts in Docket No. CP11-551-000 prior to the conclusion of the test period in this proceeding, then the parties may discuss the effect of abandonment on the rates at issue in this proceeding. If the abandonment application is approved within the Test Period, Transco must update its statements with actual data for each month of the adjustment period within 45 days of the end of the Test Period.²³ Further, if Transco moves the suspended rates into effect where there have been changes to facilities during the adjustment period, the motion must be filed at least one day prior to the effective date and the rates must be adjusted to remove plant not certificated and in service.²⁴

²³ 18 C.F.R. § 154.311 (2012).

²⁴ 18 C.F.R. § 154.206(a) (2012). The Commission expects any such filing by Transco would contain all the work documents in the appropriate electronic format necessary to fully support the recalculated rates.

34. If, however, the Commission does not act in Docket No. CP11-551-000 prior to the end of the test period, then the expected accounting changes as a result of abandonment would not be known and measurable changes under the Commission regulations²⁵ and cannot be considered as a part of this rate proceeding. In this case, or if the Commission acts to deny the requested abandonment, then Transco must file to remove any effect of the abandonment from its rates.

C. Hearing Procedures

35. All protestors argue that Transco has not shown its rates to be just and reasonable, and expressly urge the Commission to resolve these factual disputes through hearing procedures. Collectively, the protestors have challenged, either on generic or specific grounds, all of the factual evidence Transco has submitted thus far, as well as Transco's rate methodology.

36. Transco's filing raises many typical rate case issues that warrant further investigation. Accordingly, the Commission will establish a hearing to explore the evidentiary and rate issues set forth in the protests regarding Transco's proposed cost of service, cost allocation, and rate design. The Commission finds that it is appropriate to examine these issues in the context of a hearing where a factual record can be developed by the parties. If any public record or record subject to a request for privileged treatment²⁶ is certified to the Commission, these items must be in the Commission's official document repository, eLibrary. Records may include spreadsheets in native file format.²⁷

37. Municipalities request summary rejection of Transco's proposed calculation of ROE, claiming that it violates requirements regarding the use of MLP in the Commission's Policy Statement on the composition of proxy groups to determine a company's ROE. Transco opposes the motion for summary disposition. We deny the request for summary disposition concerning Transco's proposed ROE. In our 2008 policy statement on the *Composition of Proxy Groups for Determining Gas and Oil Pipeline Return on Equity*, we stated our intent to evaluate specific return on equity proposals based on the facts relevant to a particular pipeline and to address any concerns

²⁵ 18 C.F.R. § 154.303 (2012).

²⁶ 18 C.F.R. § 388.112(a) (2012).

²⁷ *Filing Via the Internet*, Order No. 703, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,259, at P 25 (2007).

regarding our natural gas pipeline return on equity policies on a case by case basis.²⁸ That approach is consistent with our longstanding practice of including return on equity issues in hearings established in general section 4 rate cases filed by pipelines.²⁹ Accordingly, we include Transco's return on equity proposal in the hearing established in this proceeding.

D. Suspension

38. Based upon review of the filing, the Commission finds that the proposed tariff records set forth in the Appendices have not been shown to be just and reasonable, and may be unjust, unreasonable, and unduly discriminatory or otherwise unlawful. Accordingly, the Commission shall accept and suspend the effectiveness of the tariff records in Appendix A for five months, subject to refund and hearing, as set forth in this order. The tariff records in Appendix B are accepted, without suspension, to be effective October 1, 2012, for the reasons discussed above.

39. The Commission's policy regarding suspensions is that tariff filings generally should be suspended for the maximum period permitted by statute where preliminary study leads the Commission to believe that the filing may be unjust, unreasonable, or inconsistent with other statutory standards.³⁰ It is recognized, however, that shorter suspensions may be warranted in circumstances where suspension for the maximum period may lead to harsh and inequitable results.³¹ Such circumstances do not exist for the tariff records set forth in Appendix A. The Commission will exercise its discretion to suspend them for the maximum period, to be effective March 1, 2013 or an earlier date set forth in a subsequent order, subject to refund and the outcome of the hearing procedures ordered herein.

²⁸ *Composition of Proxy Groups for Determining Gas and Oil Pipeline Return on Equity*, 123 FERC ¶ 61,259, at P 5 (2008).

²⁹ *See e.g., Equitrans. L.P.*, 81 FERC ¶ 61,030, at 61,159 (1997) (setting for hearing the issue of how the Commission's rate of return policy would apply in a particular case).

³⁰ *See Great Lakes Gas Transmission Co.*, 12 FERC ¶ 61,293 (1980) (five-month suspension).

³¹ *See Valley Gas Transmission, Inc.*, 12 FERC ¶ 61,197 (1980) (one-day suspension).

The Commission orders:

(A) Appendix A sets forth the tariff records that are accepted and suspended effective March 1, 2013, subject to refund and the outcome of the hearing established in this order.

(B) Appendix B sets forth the tariff records that are accepted effective October 1, 2012, subject to the outcome of the hearing established in this order.

(C) Pursuant to the Commission's authority under the Natural Gas Act, particularly sections 4, 5, 8, and 15, and the Commission's rules and regulations, a public hearing is to be held in Docket No. RP12-993-000 concerning the lawfulness of Transco's proposed tariff records.

(D) 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 (2012), must convene a prehearing conference in this proceeding to be held within twenty (20) days after issuance of this order, 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 establishment of a procedural schedule. The Presiding Administrative Law Judge is authorized to conduct further proceedings in accordance with this order and the rules of practice and procedure.

By the Commission.

(S E A L)

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.

Appendix A

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC
FERC NGA Gas Tariff
Fifth Revised Volume No. 1

Tariff records accepted and suspended, to be effective March 1, 2013, subject to refund,
and the outcome of a hearing.

[Section 1.1.1, FT - Non-Incremental Rates, 7.0.0](#)
[Section 1.1.2, FT - SunBelt Expansion Rates, 7.0.0](#)
[Section 1.1.3, FT - Maiden Delivery Lateral Rates, 2.0.0](#)
[Section 1.1.5, FT - Cherokee Expansion Rates, 6.0.0](#)
[Section 1.1.6, FT - Southcoast Expansion Rates, 6.0.0](#)
[Section 1.1.10, FT - Momentum Expansion Rates, 7.0.0](#)
[Section 1.1.15, FT - 85 North Expansion Rates, 8.0.0](#)
[Section 1.1.16, FT - Pascagoula Expansion Rates, 4.0.0](#)
[Section 1.1.17, FT - Mid-South Expansion Rates, 2.0.0](#)
[Section 1.2, Rate Schedule FT-G Rates, 7.0.0](#)
[Section 1.3, Rate Schedule FTN Rates, 8.0.0](#)
[Section 1.4, Rate Schedule FDLS Rates, 4.0.0](#)
[Section 2.1, Rate Schedule IT Rates, 7.0.0](#)
[Section 2.2, Rate Schedule IDLS Rates, 4.0.0](#)
[Section 3.1, Rate Schedule WSS-Open Access Rates, 4.0.0](#)
[Section 3.3, Rate Schedule ESS Rates, 1.0.0](#)
[Section 3.4, Rate Schedule EESWS Rates, 1.0.0](#)
[Section 4.1, Rate Schedule ISS Rates, 3.0.0](#)
[Section 5.2, Rate Schedules X-269, X-270, X-274 through X-276 Rates, 5.0.0](#)
[Section 7.1, Rate Schedule GSS Rates, 10.0.0](#)
[Section 7.2, Rate Schedule LSS Rates, 10.0.0](#)
[Section 7.4, Rate Schedule SS-2 Rates, 11.0.0](#)
[Section 7.5, Rate Schedule S-2 Rates, 10.0.0](#)
[Section 9.1, Firm and Interruptible Gathering Rates, 2.0.0](#)
[Section 10.2, Trading Fees and Fuel Retention Percentages, 6.0.0](#)

Appendix B

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC
FERC NGA Gas Tariff
Fifth Revised Volume No. 1

Tariff records accepted, to be effective October 1, 2012, subject to the outcome of a hearing.

[Section 1.1.4, FT - Pocono Expansion Rates, 6.0.0](#)

[Section 1.1.7, FT - Market Link Expansion Rates, 6.0.0](#)

[Section 1.1.8, FT - Sundance Expansion Rates, 7.0.0](#)

[Section 1.1.9, FT - Leidy East Expansion Rates, 6.0.0](#)

[Section 1.1.11, FT - Trenton Woodbury Expansion Rates, 1.0.0](#)

[Section 1.1.12, FT - Leidy to Long Island Expansion Rates, 6.0.0](#)

[Section 1.1.13, FT - Potomac Expansion Rates, 6.0.0](#)

[Section 1.1.14, FT - Sentinel Expansion Rates, 7.0.0](#)

[Section 3.5, Rate Schedule LNG Rates, 3.0.0](#)

[Section 7.6, Rate Schedule LG-A Rates, 3.0.0](#)