

Opinion No. 154-A

Williams Pipe Line Company
22 FERC ¶ 61,087 (1983)

Opinion No. 154-A (22 FERC ¶ 61,087 (1983)) is the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's order denying rehearing of its Opinion No. 154. Opinion No. 154 prescribed the Commission's initial policy for the regulation of oil pipeline rates and services. Certain shippers filed for rehearing of Opinion No. 154. The Commission stated in Opinion No. 154-A that the shippers' application for rehearing made many points, but none were considered new. Each point was carefully considered in the lengthy deliberations that led to Opinion No. 154, and no showing was made that indicated further proceedings would be fruitful.

Accordingly, the Commission denied the application for rehearing.

Opinion No. 154-A

Williams Pipe Line Company,
Opinion and Order Denying Rehearing
22 FERC ¶ 61,087 (1983)

[¶ 61,086]**Williams Pipe Line Company, Docket No. OR79-1-016****Opinion No. 154-A; Opinion and Order Denying Rehearing**

(Issued January 31, 1983)

Before Commissioners: C. M. Butler III, Chairman; Georgiana Sheldon, A. G. Sousa and Oliver G. Richard III.**[Note: Opinion No. 154, issued November 30, 1982, appears at 21 FERC ¶ 61,260.]****I.**

Our Opinion No. 154 charted the course that we plan to follow in our oil pipeline work. That Opinion dealt with basic questions of regulatory principle. The legal sufficiency of our answers to them is now under attack in the courts.¹

The judicial inquiry that this attack calls for is of considerable public policy import. Its pendency engenders significant uncertainties. These have an adverse impact on pipeline owners, on pipeline users, and on this Commission. And the sums at stake are very large.

Accordingly, it seems clear to us that everyone concerned would benefit from an expeditious judicial resolution of the controversies with which we grappled in No. 154. So we were not inclined to look with favor on the shipper-complainants' petition for an administrative rehearing.² Our study of that document has not altered this view.

II.

The shippers' rehearing application makes many points. But none of them is new. Each was carefully considered in the lengthy deliberations that led to our prior Opinion. No showing has been made that further proceedings here would be fruitful.

III.

Accordingly, the shipper-complainants' petition for a rehearing of the Commission's decision of November 30, 1982, in the first phase of this proceeding is denied.

— Footnotes —

¹ Six petitions for judicial review have been filed.

² The shippers filed a petition before the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit before they asked us for rehearing.