

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Pat Wood, III, Chairman;
William L. Massey, and Nora Mead Brownell.

Texas Eastern Transmission, LP	Docket Nos.	RP00-468-007, RP00-468-008, RP00-468-009 RP00-468-010, RP01-25-006, RP01-25-007, RP01-25-008, RP01-25-009, RP03-175-001, RP03-175-002, RP03-175-003, RP03-175-004
--------------------------------	-------------	--

ORDER ON REHEARING AND COMPLIANCE FILINGS

(Issued June 4, 2003)

1. This order addresses the requests for rehearing and clarification of the Commission's February 24, 2003 order,¹ (the February 24 Order), and protests and comments on the March 25, 2003, and Supplemental April 1, 2003 filings by Texas Eastern Transmission, LP (Texas Eastern) to comply with the February 24 Order. The rehearing request primarily concerns Texas Eastern's proposed delivery beyond the primary zone. Texas Eastern also submitted a second supplemental compliance filing on April 25, 2003, that addresses the unrelated issue of backup notification for Action Alerts and OFOs. No comment or protests were filed with respect to the April 25 filing.² We deny the requests for rehearing and clarification, find the protests on the compliance filing moot, accept Texas Eastern's compliance filing, as supplemented on April 1, 2003, and accept Texas Eastern's second supplemental filing of April 25, 2003. The Commission also requires

¹102 FERC ¶ 61,198 (2003), appeal pending, D.C. Cir. No. 03-1113.

²In the transmittal letter to the April 25, 2003 filing Texas Eastern stated the March 25 compliance filing included modification of the notice requirements for OFOs in Section 4.3, Action Alerts and Operational Flow Orders in one section, but did not include such modification in Sections 4.3(A)(2), 4.3(A)(4), 4.3(A)(5) and 4.3(M). Texas Eastern stated that the second supplemental compliance filing was made for the sole purpose of supplementing the March 25 filing to include provision for backup form of notification in Sections 4.3(A)(2), 4.3(A)(4), 4.3(A)(5) and 4.3(M).

Texas Eastern to revise the tariff provision governing the curtailment of firm transportation at secondary points as discussed below. The accepted tariff sheets are set forth in the Appendix to this order.

A. The Extended Delivery Issue

2. The February 24 Order addressed requests for rehearing of the Commission's February 27, 2002 order,³ which accepted, as modified by that order, Texas Eastern's compliance filings to Order Nos. 637, 587-G, and 587-L. Texas Eastern had proposed in its original Order No. 637 compliance filing tariff language that would limit firm capacity holder's use of secondary delivery points downstream of their primary delivery point within the same zone to the lowest unutilized quantity (LUQ). The tariff defined the LUQ as equal to the difference between a shipper's mainline contract demand and the highest quantity of gas it scheduled to be delivered within its Transportation Path in the same zone in which the Transportation Path for such service agreement terminates. Under Texas Eastern's proposal, LUQ transported outside the primary zone of delivery would be charged the 100% load factor rate for those volumes. Indicated Shippers protested the extended delivery rate, but not the extended delivery service itself, arguing that only the differential between the rate for the first zone, and the rate for the downstream zone should be charged.

3. The 2002 Order rejected the LUQ concept, but accepted Texas Eastern's proposal for the extended deliveries. Indicated Shippers sought rehearing of this finding arguing that charging the interruptible rate would undermine competition. The February 24 Order granted Indicated Shippers' request, finding that the proper rate for shippers flexing to points outside their zone is the rate representing a single transportation transaction, rather than the rate computed as if the shipper has conducted two transactions. The February 27 Order directed Texas Eastern to file revised tariff sheets that provide that for transportation outside the primary zone, the shipper will be charged the differential between the rates in the two zones.

4. In its March 25 filing Texas Eastern made revisions to its tariff that were required by the February 24 Order. Thus, for extended downstream delivery service, Texas Eastern provided that the charge was based on the difference between the rate already paid by an extended delivery shipper and the 100% load factor rate for a single transportation transaction to the downstream delivery point. Texas Eastern did not propose to alter or amend any other aspect of this service.

³98 FERC ¶ 61,215 (2002)(the 2002 Order).

5. Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. and Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc. (ConEd) and the KeySpan Delivery Companies (KeySpan) filed requests for rehearing or clarification as to the extended delivery ruling in the Commission's February 24 Order, arguing that the Commission should reverse its prior approval of Texas Eastern's extended downstream delivery service. They argued that such service would have an anticompetitive effect on the interstate natural gas capacity markets, that it would harm shippers on the Texas Eastern system, and that it was inextricably linked to the Commission's rejected LUQ mechanism. They urged the Commission to reject Texas Eastern's proposal, or alternatively consider certain modifications to the extended service, including the renomination of the number of rate zones in which they pay reservation charges, crediting of extended service revenues or the extension of point rights to receipt points in upstream zones.

6. On April 1, 2003, Texas Eastern made what it labeled a "Supplemental Order No. 637 Compliance Filing." After setting forth the concerns in the rehearing requests, Texas Eastern added that the extended service is not required by Order Nos. 637, et al., and it contended that it proposed the service in conjunction with the LUQ concept, which the Commission rejected in the 2002 Order. Texas Eastern asserted that:

Absent the LUQ mechanism, this extended service may have the unintended results set forth in the rehearing requests, including creating distorted pricing, lowering credits to offset reservation charges for capacity downstream capacity holders may seek to release, or acting as a detriment to competition.⁴

7. To address these concerns Texas Eastern stated it "is making this supplemental filing to eliminate tariff provisions that provide extended service to delivery point rights in downstream zones for which the shipper has not reserved capacity ('extended service')." Texas Eastern stated that the suggested modifications in the rehearing request were not acceptable to it. Texas Eastern stated that "to avoid further controversy

regarding the parameters and the appropriate rate for the extended service, Texas Eastern is eliminating these tariff provisions.⁵

⁴April 1 Supplemental Filing at 2.

⁵Texas Eastern substituted the tariff sheets included in Appendix A, to be effective July 1, 2003, in lieu of the corresponding tariff sheets filed in Appendix B of the March 25, 2003 compliance filing. Texas Eastern also submitted a second supplemental

(continued...)

8. The Indicated Shippers,⁶ Proliance Energy, LLC and Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc. protested the Supplemental Filing, and also urged the Commission to deny the rehearing requests. New Jersey Natural Gas Company, PSEG Energy Resources & Trade, LLC, KeySpan and ConEd filed in support of Texas Eastern's Supplemental Compliance Filing. Texas Eastern also moved for leave to answer and answer to the protests, and also responded to Indicated Shippers requests for clarification.⁷

9. Protestors to the Supplemental Compliance filing argue that the filing is not a compliance filing, but is an entirely new proposal. They contend that the April 1, 2003 filing is an attempt to nullify the downstream delivery rights that Texas Eastern proposed earlier in this proceeding, and which the Commission approved in the 2002 Order. They point out that in its original Order No. 637 filing, Texas Eastern proposed to expand the ability of shippers to use secondary points by establishing downstream delivery rights, but sought to limit it through the LUQ concept. The 2002 Order approved Texas Eastern's proposal to provide downstream delivery rights but rejected the LUQ concept, and no one filed for rehearing of the Commission's approval of downstream delivery rights. The only issue raised on rehearing was the rate the shipper would pay for that service. Texas Eastern's proposed rate was modified in the February 24 Order, and Texas Eastern was directed to file revised tariff sheets incorporating the rates specified in the February 24 Order. Protestors argue that there is no basis on which Texas Eastern can now seek to eliminate the downstream delivery rights.

10. They also assert that Texas Eastern's rationale for eliminating that proposal has no merit. In the April 1 Filing Texas Eastern stated that it originally proposed the downstream delivery rights as part of its proposal to limit downstream deliveries via the so-called LUQ restriction, and suggests that the Commission's rejection of the LUQ restriction rescinds the downstream delivery rights as well. Protestors note that the March 25 compliance filing followed the Commission's directive to modify the rate for downstream deliveries and nowhere in that filing did Texas Eastern suggest that the Commission's rejection of the LUQ concept nullified the downstream delivery rights.

⁵(...continued)

compliance filing on April 25, 2003, that addresses the unrelated issue of backup notification for Action Alerts and OFOs. No comment or protests were filed with respect to the April 25 filing.

⁶The Indicated Shippers consist of Amerada Hess Corporation, BP America Production Company and BP Energy Company.

⁷We accept Texas Eastern's answer since it assists in resolving the issues.

11. Moreover, Protestors assert that, as a practical matter, the downstream delivery rights are not tied to the LUQ restriction. The LUQ restriction was simply an attempt by Texas Eastern to impose an unjustified cap on the extent of a shipper's downstream rights.

12. Finally, they argue that in approving the downstream delivery rights, and rejecting the LUQ restriction, the Commission relied on its long-standing policy that shippers must have downstream delivery rights. They assert that downstream delivery rights are an integral aspect of the Commission's policy of allowing shippers to use secondary points (so-called flexible point authority), as expressed both in Order No. 636 and Order No. 637.

13. Protestors conclude that since Texas Eastern's purported compliance filing does not specifically respond to the Commission's directives, and is outside the scope of the Commission's order, it must be rejected as provided in the Commission's regulations, citing 18 C.F.R. § 154.203(2)(b). They assert that if Texas Eastern intends to change its tariff provisions, it must proceed by application, rather than attempting to make changes within the confines of a compliance filing.

14. Parties in support of Texas Eastern's supplemental filing contend that Order No. 637 does not require the extended service that Texas Eastern had proposed in its original Order No. 637 filing, so there is no basis for not allowing Texas Eastern to withdraw that proposal. Moreover, the Commission's approval of the proposal was conditional, and required Texas Eastern to modify the rate for that service. The rehearing requests raise issues as to the rate and Texas Eastern has stated that it declines to accept the modifications proposed in the rehearing requests. Under these circumstances, Texas Eastern cannot be required to provide a service that was never implemented, or ever approved in its final form.

15. In addition to these arguments Texas Eastern also argues that the tariff provisions setting forth the extended service are not required by Order No. 637, nor permitted under Texas Eastern's amended Global Settlement,⁸ as the February 24 Order interpreted that settlement.⁹ Texas Eastern contends that the February 24 Order concluded that, to the

⁸Texas Eastern cites to Joint Stipulation and Agreement Amending Global Settlement filed on April 28, 1998 in Docket Nos. RP98-198-000 and RP85-177-126 ("Amended Global Settlement"). The Commission approved the Amended Global Settlement by letter order issued August 28, 1998. Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., 84 FERC ¶ 61,200 (1998).

⁹A rate moratorium contained in the 1998 Amended Global Settlement stated as follows:

(continued...)

extent a proposed tariff revision is not required by Order No. 637, such a change does not fall within the exception to the settlement's moratorium provision which allowed for changes required by Commission orders of general applicability.¹⁰ Since the extended delivery would not fall under this exception, Texas Eastern argues it cannot be added to the tariff, and the Commission must permit its withdrawal by Texas Eastern.

Commission Ruling

16. Texas Eastern's original Order No. 637 compliance filing added the following provisions to GT&C Section 30.5(iv), which in effect granted shippers the right to extended delivery service:

. . . provided, however, Customer may use Secondary Points as Delivery Points downstream of the rate zone(s) containing the Transportation Path subject to the requirement that Customer pay, [the rate to be charged]. . . .

⁹(...continued)

All parties and participants agree to a rate moratorium through December 31, 2003. During the rate moratorium, Texas Eastern's Base Rates (or any component thereof) and other tariff provisions for transportation and storage services . . . shall not be changed other than as otherwise expressly contemplated by this Offer of Settlement.

However, Section 5.05 of the Settlement provided a limited exception to the rate moratorium:

During the rate moratorium period, Texas Eastern shall be free to make any other tariff filings, including, without limitation, to file and place into effect . . . (iii) changes in rates or other terms and conditions of service required by legislation or Commission rule, regulation or order of general applicability, such as rules adopted by the Commission implementing recommendations of the Gas Industry Standards Board. (Emphasis added).

¹⁰ 102 FERC at PP 101, 109.

17. In the March 25 filing, Texas Eastern changed the rate to be charged to the one required by the February 24 Order. In the April 1 supplemental filing, Texas Eastern eliminated this provision from GT&C Section 30.5(iv).

18. Protestors argue that Texas Eastern should not be permitted to withdraw its proposal on the extended service because it is long-standing Commission policy "that Shippers must have downstream delivery rights."¹¹ They also take issue with the reason Texas Eastern has advanced why it now wishes to withdraw the proposal.

19. The Commission is not persuaded that Texas Eastern should not be permitted to withdraw the extended service proposal. Indicated Shippers argument cites to the Commission's policy on flexible point authority in Order No. 636, as continued in Order No. 637.

20. The Commission, however, has not established a consistent policy of requiring pipelines to permit shippers to use flexible points outside of the zones for which the shipper pays. In Order No. 636, the Commission established that firm shippers have flexible point rights, but only "within the firm transportation capacity to which the shipper is entitled and for which it pays." (Order No. 636, FERC Stats. & Regs. Regulations Preambles ¶ 30,939, at 30,429; Order No. 636-A, FERC Stats. & Regs. Regulations Preambles ¶ 30,950, at 30,585 (1992). In Order No. 637, the Commission also did not require pipelines to provide for segmentation or flexible points outside of the zones for which the shipper pays. (Order No. 637-A, FERC Stats. & Regs. Regulations Preambles ¶ 31,099 at 31,591-92.

21. Although there is language in Great Lakes which seems to suggest that firm shippers have a right to use flexible points in downstream zones, the Commission has not established a firm policy requiring that pipelines offer such flexibility, but it has approved such provisions where the pipelines allowed it. For example, in a case cited by Indicated Shippers, the pipeline permitted it, and the Commission merely indicated that where the shipper goes beyond the primary zone, it "must pay the additional charges in the extra zone," but the Commission did not impose that obligation on the pipeline.¹²

¹¹Indicated Shippers Protest at 6. Indicated Shippers cite to Great Lakes Gas Transmission, 64 FERC ¶ 61,017, p. 61,178, order on reh'g, 65 FERC ¶ 61,004 (1993); Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., 86 FERC ¶ 61,290, p. 62,034 (1999); ANR Pipeline Co., 66 FERC ¶ 61,340, pp. 62,130-62,131 (1994).

¹²See Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., 86 FERC ¶ 61,290 at p. 62,034 (1999).

22. Moreover, the February 24 Order did not accept Texas Eastern's proposal as such, but required Texas Eastern to revise the rate to be charged. The rate, as well as the right itself, has become an issue. For whatever reason, Texas Eastern would now rather not grant this extended service right. Since there is nothing in Commission policy that requires a pipeline to grant that right, we will accept the supplemental filing. This moots the rehearing requests to the extent they were directed at this issue.

23. Although Texas Eastern may withdraw its proposal to permit firm shippers to use flexible points in downstream zones, Texas Eastern cannot refuse to sell interruptible service in a downstream zone (at the maximum rate for that zone) to a firm shipper wishing to extend service into the downstream zone. Texas Eastern must also schedule the interruptible service in the downstream zone taking into account that the service is being fed by firm service. (See Order No. 637, FERC Stats. & Regs. Regulations Preambles ¶ 31,091 at 31,307.)

B. Other Issues

24. Indicated Shippers raise two other issues in its request for rehearing. First, they refer to Texas Eastern's revision of Section 30.6(d) of its GT&C in response to the Commission's Remand Order in Docket No. RM98-10-011, 101 FERC ¶ 61,127 (2002) to implement forward hauls and back hauls to the same point. Texas Eastern had proposed to revise Section 30.6(d) of its GT&C to include the following:

In addition, any movement of gas that traverses a segment(s) in which the firm contractual entitlement is less than the nominated quantity shall be deemed to be outside of the Transportation Path.

25. The February 24 Order stated that Texas Eastern had provided no explanation of why this tariff language is required by the Remand Order and is necessary in order to implement forward hauls and back hauls to the same point, and the purpose or intent of this provision was not clear. The Commission rejected the proposed language, but permitted Texas Eastern to justify it when it made its compliance filing to the February 24 Order.

26. In the March 25 filing Texas Eastern again included the above-quoted provision, but added the following phrase, "for that portion of the nominated quantity that exceeds the firm contractual entitlement." Texas Eastern also included Appendix C to explain how this provision would operate and how the quantity, would be calculated, and the scheduling priority in the event of overlapping nominations in any segment in the capacity release situation.

27. Indicated Shippers assert that any quantities that exceed the MDQ of the underlying contract constitute overrun service, and the Commission's long-standing policy is that overrun service should have the same priority as interruptible service. Consequently, Indicated Shippers assert the Commission should require Texas Eastern to give overlap quantities the same priority as interruptible service.

28. In its Answer, Texas Eastern asserts that the Commission should reject the request. It asserts that the added language merely clarifies how Texas Eastern will assign priorities if there is an overlap, even though the releasing shipper and the replacement shipper nominate within their respective contract amounts. It asserts that pipelines are not required to permit shippers to nominate overlapping quantities in excess of contract demand since the Commission has stated in Order No. 637 that the nominations by a shipper or a combination of releasing and replacement shippers should not exceed the contract demand of the underlying contract on any segment.

29. We have reviewed the examples included in Appendix C, and find they are consistent with Commission policy. They show that Texas Eastern uses the "outside the path" term for scheduling purposes to determine whether the releasing or replacement shipper will be scheduled when quantities overlap. Texas Eastern has indicated that the nomination of any such overlapping quantities will be treated as a secondary outside the path transaction and will be accorded that priority and not be scheduled because the nomination would result in an overlap in excess of contract demand. We will accept Texas Eastern's proposal that includes the clarifying clause.

30. Indicated Shippers is addressing a different question: whether the shipper that is not scheduled can acquire overrun quantities with an interruptible priority. Under the standards promulgated by the Wholesale Gas Quadrant of the North American Energy Standards Board (WGQ), and adopted by the Commission, "overrun quantities should be requested on a separate transaction." (Standard 1.3.19). Thus, if overlapping quantities are not scheduled, the shipper whose nomination is reduced can request overrun quantities at the next intra-day nomination opportunity.

31. Finally, Indicated Shippers request that the Commission clarify that what Texas Eastern had proposed in its May 29, 2002 original compliance filing as to how overlapping nominations would be treated would allow a releasing shipper to designate the attribution of overlap quantities between itself and the replacement shipper.¹³ Texas Eastern in its Answer, states that Section 30.1(1) of the GT&C sets forth how this will be handled and provides that the relative priority of the nominations will be determined first and that if the

¹³Indicated Shippers cites to GT&E § 3.14(m).

priorities are the same, allocation will be made according to the overlap priorities in the releasing shipper's release notice. In the event that a releasing shipper does not designate priorities in its notice, Texas Eastern will allocate capacity to the overlapping nominations pro rata based on the nominations. Accordingly, no further clarification is required.

C. Curtailement of Firm Transportation at Secondary Points

32. In Texas Eastern's original Order No. 637 compliance filing, it proposed new tariff language in Section 30.6 of the GT&C to specify the scheduling and curtailment procedures for firm transportation service involving secondary points as follows.

33. First, for scheduling purposes, the highest priority would be accorded to customers transporting from secondary points of receipt within the path to primary delivery points. The next priority level is for customers shipping from secondary receipt points within the path to secondary delivery points within the path, and for customers shipping from primary receipt points to secondary delivery points within the path.

34. The third level of scheduling priority is for customers shipping from: (a) secondary receipt points outside the path but within the same zone to primary delivery points within the path; (b) secondary receipt points within the path to secondary delivery points outside the path but within the same zone; (c) secondary receipt points outside the path but within the same zone to secondary delivery points within the path; (d) secondary receipt points outside the path but within the same zone to secondary delivery points outside the path but still within the same zone; (e) primary receipt points to secondary delivery points outside the path but within the same zone.

35. In Section 30.6(c) Texas Eastern proposed to curtail firm service in the reverse order of scheduled firm service.¹⁴

36. The 2002 Order addressed concerns raised by several parties with respect to within the path priority. The 2002 Order stated:

The Commission finds that Texas Eastern's proposed revisions are consistent with the requirement of Order No. 637 with regard to within the path capacity allocation. Order No. 637 required only that scheduling priority be provided to within-the-path transactions over outside the path transactions to provide shippers with certainty as to their capacity rights. Since Texas Eastern's

¹⁴ See Sheet No. 649, Section 30.6(c).

proposal accomplishes this goal, the protests contending for a different priority scheme are rejected.¹⁵

37. Upon further review of Texas Eastern's tariff, the Commission finds that the 2002 Order, while focusing on issues concerning scheduling of firm transportation service, did not address the appropriateness of Texas Eastern's proposal with respect to curtailment of firm transportation service. The Commission finds that Section 30.6(c) of Texas Eastern's proposed tariff does not conform with the Commission's policy for the curtailment of firm service. In Order No. 636-B, the Commission held that once secondary firm capacity is scheduled, primary firm capacity does not have a higher priority for purposes of bumping or curtailing firm service.¹⁶ Thus, "once primary and secondary points have been scheduled, curtailment would treat such points on an equal pro rata basis."¹⁷ The firm shipper with secondary points pay the same firm reservation rates as a shipper with scheduled primary capacity, and will rely on the scheduled firm service to meet its market deliveries. Accordingly, Texas Eastern is directed to revise Section 30.6(c) of its GT&C within fifteen days of the date of this order to provide that scheduled firm service will be curtailed on a pro rata basis. Sheet No. 649 is accepted subject to Texas Eastern making this revision to Section 30.6(c).

The Commission orders:

(A) The requests for rehearing are denied.

(B) Texas Eastern's compliance filings of March 25, 2003, April 1, 2003, and April 25, 2003, are accepted subject to the conditions as discussed above.

By the Commission.

(S E A L)

¹⁵ 98 FERC at 61,835 P 52.

¹⁶ Order No. 636-B, 61 FERC ¶ 61,272 at 62,013 (1992). See also, Northwest Pipeline Corporation, 63 FERC ¶ 61,124 at 61,812-13 (1993); and Algonquin Gas Transmission Co., 62 FERC ¶ 61,132 at 61,896 (1993).

¹⁷ Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Co., 62 FERC ¶ 61,144 at 62,052 (1993).

Magalie R. Salas,
Secretary.

APPENDIX

**Texas Eastern Transmission, L P
Seventh Revised Volume No. 1**

Docket No. RP00-468-007, et al.

ACCEPTED Effective April 1, 2003:

Sub First Revised Sheet No. 2	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 559
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 10	Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 560
Sub Original Sheet No. 51A	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 561
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 301	Sub Original Sheet No. 561A
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 302	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 562
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 347	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 563
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 348	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 564
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 349	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 566
Sub Original Sheet No. 350	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 567
Sub Original Sheet No. 351	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 568
Sub Original Sheet No. 352	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 581
Sub Original Sheet No. 353	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 582
Sub Original Sheet No. 354	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 591
Sub Original Sheet No. 355	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 592
Sub Original Sheet No. 356	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 619
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 502	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 629
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 503	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 644
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 504	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 645
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 510	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 800
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 511	Sub Original Sheet No. 942
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 512	Sub Original Sheet No. 943
Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 537	Sub Original Sheet No. 944
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 554	Sub Original Sheet No. 945
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 556	Sub Original Sheet No. 945A
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 557	

Docket No. RP00-468-007, et al.

ACCEPTED Effective July 1, 2003:

Sub First Revised Sheet No. 208	Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 503
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 219	Sub First Revised Sheet No. 518
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 231	Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 529
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 383	Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 530
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 500	Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 531
Sub Third Revised Sheet No. 503	Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 532

Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 533
Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 534
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 535
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 539
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 548
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 553
Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 554
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 555
Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 556

Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 557
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 608
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 609
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 610
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 646
Sub Original Sheet No. 646
Sub Original Sheet No. 646A
Sub Original Sheet No. 650

Docket No. RP00-468-009, et al.

ACCEPTED, Subject tto Conditions, Effective July 1, 2003:

Second Sub First Revised Sheet No. 647
Second Sub Original Sheet No. 647
Second Sub First Revised Sheet No. 648

Second Sub Original Sheet No. 648
Second Sub First Revised Sheet No. 649
Second Sub Original Sheet No. 649

Docket No. RP00-468-010, et al.

ACCEPTED Effective April 1, 2003:

Second Sub Original Sheet No. 560A
Second Sub Original Sheet No. 560B

Second Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 569

Docket No. RP00-468-007, et al.

REJECTED:

Sub Original Sheet No. 560A
Sub Original Sheet No. 560B
Sub Second Revised Sheet No. 569
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 647
Sub Original Sheet No. 647

Sub First Revised Sheet No. 648
Sub Original Sheet No. 648
Sub First Revised Sheet No. 649
Sub Original Sheet No. 649