

171 FERC ¶ 61,002
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Neil Chatterjee, Chairman;
Richard Glick, Bernard L. McNamee
and James P. Danly

BP Pipelines (Alaska) Inc., ConocoPhillips
Transportation Alaska, Inc., and ExxonMobil Pipeline
Company

Docket No. OR14-6-002

ORDER ON VOLUNTARY REMAND ESTABLISHING HEARING AND
SETTLEMENT PROCEEDINGS

(Issued April 1, 2020)

1. On March 6, 2019, the Commission filed with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (D.C. Circuit) an unopposed motion for voluntary remand of the above captioned proceeding.¹ Following the D.C. Circuit's granting of that voluntary remand, the Commission issued a notice affording the parties an opportunity to file pleadings, explaining that in order "[t]o help inform the Commission's decision on remand, the parties may file with the Commission . . . pleadings setting forth the parties' respective positions concerning (1) the scope of issues properly before the agency on voluntary remand, and (2) the procedures to be employed by the agency in addressing those issues."²

2. On voluntary remand, we establish hearing and settlement judge procedures for the limited purpose of supplementing the existing record to determine whether the existing Quality Bank methodology used to value Resid continues to be just and reasonable and, if not, whether the capital cost factor used in the Resid formula should be revised.

¹ *PetroStar, Inc. v. FERC*, Unopposed Motion of Respondent Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for Voluntary Remand, No. 18-1104 (filed Mar. 6, 2019) (Voluntary Remand Motion).

² Notice Affording the Parties an Opportunity to File Pleadings, Docket No. OR14-6-002 (Mar. 15, 2019) (quoting Voluntary Remand Motion at 2-3).

I. Background

3. The Trans Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS) consists of a 48-inch diameter common carrier crude oil pipeline extending approximately 800 miles from Alaska's North Slope to the Marine Terminal located in Valdez on Alaska's southeastern coast.³ TAPS provides the only means of transporting petroleum produced on the North Slope south to the Port of Valdez.⁴

4. Oil produced on the North Slope originates in several fields, each of which contains crude oil with different characteristics.⁵ Due to the fact that there are multiple shippers injecting petroleum originating from different fields into a single pipeline, TAPS operates a common stream pipeline, comingling various shippers' petroleum into a single, common stream originating at Pump Station No. 1 and transported to Valdez.⁶

5. Along the pipeline moving south to Valdez, certain refiners withdraw crude from the common stream and inject the unused portion back into the common stream.⁷ There are two delivery points along TAPS between Pump Station No. 1 and the Port of Valdez terminal: (1) the Golden Valley Electrical Association Connection, where petroleum from the common stream is taken from TAPS and processed by two refineries; and (2) the Petro Star Valdez Refinery Connection, where petroleum from the common stream is processed by one refinery, Petro Star.⁸

6. The comingling of petroleum of different and uneven qualities, as well as the removal and injection of product along TAPS, results in some shippers withdrawing petroleum that is of better quality than the product they injected into the pipeline, while others withdraw petroleum that is inferior to what they injected into the pipeline.⁹ To ensure equality of value among various shippers for the products they ship, TAPS

³ *BP Pipelines (Alaska) Inc.*, 149 FERC ¶ 61,149, at P 2 (2014) (November 2014 Order); *BP Pipelines (Alaska) Inc.*, 162 FERC ¶ 61,147, at P 3 (February 2018 Remand Order).

⁴ *OXY USA, Inc. v. FERC*, 64 F.3d 679, 684 (D.C. Cir. 1995).

⁵ *Trans Alaska Pipeline Sys.*, Opinion No. 481, 113 FERC ¶ 61,062, at P 3 (2005).

⁶ *OXY USA*, 64 F.3d at 684.

⁷ Opinion No. 481, 113 FERC ¶ 61,062 at P 3.

⁸ *BP Pipelines (Alaska) Inc.*, 147 FERC ¶ 63,008, at P 2 (2014) (Initial Decision).

⁹ *Trans Alaska Pipeline Sys.*, 29 FERC ¶ 61,123, at 61,238 (1984).

Carriers established a Quality Bank. The Quality Bank values products and makes monetary adjustments to offset the effect of the quality differentials among the different types of petroleum injected into the common stream. Without a Quality Bank, some shippers tendering into the common stream petroleum of lesser quality than that of the common stream would accrue a windfall while shippers tendering higher quality petroleum than that of the common stream would suffer under-compensation.¹⁰ The Quality Bank attempts to place each shipper in the same economic position as if it received the same crude at Valdez as it delivered into TAPS on the North Slope.¹¹

7. Since 1993, the TAPS Quality Bank has used the “distillation method” to calculate monetary adjustments. The distillation method is based on the premise that crude oils are valued in the market based on the products that can be derived from them.¹² Distillation is the initial step in the petroleum refining process, involving the separation of crude oil into different components or “cuts” through heating and boiling.¹³ The nine quality bank cuts, from lightest to heaviest, are: (1) Propane; (2) Isobutane; (3) Normal Butane; (4) Light Straight Run; (5) Naptha; (6) Light Distillate; (7) Heavy Distillate; (8) Vacuum Gas Oil; and (9) Resid.¹⁴ The heavier cuts are lower quality.¹⁵ The Quality Bank methodology determines the percentage of each cut contained in every petroleum stream tendered to TAPS and calculates the percentage of each cut in the common stream.¹⁶ Each of the nine cuts is then individually valued.¹⁷ This value is then multiplied by the percentage of the cut contained in the individual tenders, and the resulting values are summed to develop the total value of each petroleum stream transported by TAPS.¹⁸ These values are used to calculate Quality Bank payments, where shippers of petroleum streams with higher values than the common stream receive payments, and shippers of

¹⁰ November 2014 Order, 149 FERC ¶ 61,149 at P 2.

¹¹ *Trans Alaska Pipeline Sys.*, 29 FERC at 61,238; *see also OXY USA*, 64 F.3d at 684.

¹² November 2014 Order, 149 FERC ¶ 61,149 at P 2.

¹³ *Petro Star v. FERC*, 835 F.3d 97, 99 (D.C. Cir. 2016).

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ November 2014 Order, 149 FERC ¶ 61,149 at P 2.

¹⁷ *OXY USA*, 64 F.3d. at 687.

¹⁸ November 2014 Order, 149 FERC ¶ 61,149 at P 2.

petroleum streams with values below the common stream make payments to the Quality Bank.¹⁹

8. The Quality Bank also accounts for the impact of refineries connected to TAPS along the route to Valdez that divert portions of the common stream for refining and return the remaining, unused petroleum to the pipeline. Because this product generally contains a higher percentage of lower-quality cuts such as Resid than the product withdrawn from the common stream, the refining process reduces the value of the common stream as it approaches Valdez.²⁰ The Quality Bank therefore compares the value of the withdrawn product to that injected back into the common stream by refiners, and charges the refiners for the reduction in the common stream's value.²¹

9. In order for the Quality Bank to function properly, accurate relative values for the nine distillation cuts must be calculated.²² The Quality Bank uses market pricing, either directly or indirectly, to determine values for all nine Quality Bank cuts after simple distillation. The Quality Bank assigns a value to each cut reflecting its actual market price as closely as possible. Six of the nine distillation cuts have published market prices, assumed to include the costs of producing the cut.²³ The three remaining cuts – Light Distillate, Heavy Distillate, and Resid – cannot be sold without additional processing, and thus have no published market price.²⁴

10. To calculate an acceptable relative value of these three cuts in the absence of published market prices, the Quality Bank starts with the published market prices for finished products that could be developed from the three cuts with additional refining.²⁵ It then ascertains the value of the pre-market cuts by deducting the additional processing costs required to produce the finished products.²⁶ Determining the amount of the

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Petro Star*, 835 F.3d at 100.

²¹ *Id.*

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.* at 100-01.

deduction requires an estimation of the costs associated with operating a hypothetical refinery capable of performing such processing.²⁷

11. Resid, one of the three cuts without a published market price, is a highly viscous material that resembles asphalt. It is what remains after all the lighter hydrocarbons have boiled out of crude during the distillation process. The value of Resid is relatively low, as there are very few uses for Resid in an unprocessed state. With additional refining, however, Resid can be developed into higher value products that have a published market price.²⁸ By constructing an expensive refinery processing unit known as a coker, a refiner can further process Resid into high-valued products such as diesel or gasoline. The current Quality Bank methodology determines the value for Resid based on the assumption that Resid will be used as a coker feedstock. Under the Quality Bank formula, the value of Resid is the value of the products from the coking process less the cost of the equipment and material used in coking.²⁹ This cost deduction includes a 20% capital investment allowance that accounts for the capital investment that would be required to build a hypothetical refinery capable of processing the pre-market Resid cut into a marketable product such as Petroleum Coke.³⁰ The current capital cost deduction is determined by multiplying the total capital costs by an annual 20% capital recovery factor.³¹

II. Procedural History

12. This proceeding began when Flint Hills Resources Alaska, LLC (Flint Hills) filed a complaint against the TAPS Owners³² alleging that the currently existing Quality Bank formula failed to accurately produce a just and reasonable value for the Resid cut and asking the Commission to issue an order adopting a new methodology for valuing Resid.

²⁷ *Id.* at 101.

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ November 2014 Order, 149 FERC ¶ 61,149 at P 4.

³⁰ *Petro Star*, 835 F.3d at 101. The Quality Bank methodology includes similar 20% capital recovery allowances in valuing the other pre-market cuts, Light Distillate and Heavy Distillate.

³¹ *Id.*

³² At the time the original complaint was filed, the TAPS Owners consisted of BP Pipelines (Alaska) Inc. (BP), ConocoPhillips Transportation Alaska Inc. (ConocoPhillips), and ExxonMobil Pipeline Company (ExxonMobil).

13. The Commission dismissed Flint Hills' complaint on procedural grounds, but initiated its own investigation under section 15(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act (ICA) and established a hearing to investigate the questions of fact and law on the continued lawfulness of the existing Quality Bank methodology for valuing Resid, as raised in Flint Hills' initial complaint.³³ The Commission allowed intervenors in Flint Hills' original complaint to be parties in the new investigation and hearing before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). Following that order, an expedited hearing commenced on February 11, 2014 and concluded on February 24, 2014. During the hearing, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil, Tesoro Alaska Company and Anadarko Petroleum Corporation, BP, Flint Hills, and Petro Star filed testimony, exhibits, and briefs. Commission Trial Staff also filed briefs at hearing.

14. On May 8, 2014, the ALJ issued an Initial Decision finding that Flint Hills and Petro Star failed to demonstrate that the existing Quality Bank methodology was unjust and unreasonable.³⁴ On November 20, 2014, the Commission issued an order affirming the Initial Decision. In affirming the Initial Decision, the Commission found that the existing Quality Bank methodology must be found to be unjust and unreasonable in order to be changed, and the existing Quality Bank methodology continued to enjoy a presumption of justness and reasonableness.³⁵ Additionally, the Commission affirmed the finding in the Initial Decision that a capital investment allowance remains appropriate for purposes of valuing Resid in the Quality Bank methodology.³⁶

15. On January 15, 2015, Petro Star filed with the D.C. Circuit a Petition for Review of the Commission's November 2014 Order. In a decision issued on August 30, 2016, the D.C. Circuit concluded that the Commission failed to respond meaningfully to the evidence presented by Petro Star to support its argument that the Quality Bank methodology undervalues Resid in an unjust and unreasonable manner, thus rendering the Commission's decision in the November 2014 Order arbitrary and capricious.³⁷ The D.C. Circuit granted Petro Star's petition for review and remanded the order back to the

³³ *Flint Hills Resources Alaska, LLC v. BP Pipelines (Alaska) Inc.*, 145 FERC ¶ 61,117 (2013).

³⁴ Initial Decision, 147 FERC ¶ 63,008 at PP 116 and 138.

³⁵ November 2014 Order, 149 FERC ¶ 61,149 at PP 52-53.

³⁶ *Id.* P 80.

³⁷ *Petro Star*, 835 F.3d 97.

Commission to reconsider the methodology used to value Resid or to provide a more reasoned explanation for its decision.³⁸

16. After additional filings from the parties, the Commission issued the February 2018 Remand Order providing additional explanation and affirming the justness and reasonableness of the current Quality Bank methodology used to value Resid.³⁹

17. Following the February 2018 Remand Order, on April 20, 2018, Petro Star filed another petition for review with the D.C. Circuit. On March 6, 2019, the Commission filed an unopposed motion for voluntary remand, and on March 7, 2019, the D.C. Circuit granted the Commission's Voluntary Remand Motion.⁴⁰ On March 15, 2019, the Commission issued a notice affording parties an opportunity to file additional pleadings outlining their positions regarding: (1) the scope of issues properly before the Commission on remand; and (2) the procedures to be employed by the Commission in addressing those issues.⁴¹

18. Initial pleadings were filed May 6, 2019, and responses were filed June 5, 2019. The State of Alaska, Joint Parties,⁴² Petro Star, and Indicated TAPS Carriers⁴³ filed initial comments. Joint Parties, Petro Star, and Indicated TAPS Carriers filed reply comments. On June 20, 2019, Petro Star filed an answer to Joint Parties' reply comments. On June 27, 2019, Joint Parties filed an answer to Petro Star's June 20, 2019 answer.

III. Responses to the March 15, 2019 Notice

19. Petro Star comments that the Commission should reopen the record and hold a hearing to determine whether the existing Quality Bank methodology for valuing Resid is just and reasonable, and, if not, what adjustments should be made to the methodology to

³⁸ *Id.* at 99.

³⁹ February 2018 Remand Order, 162 FERC ¶ 61,147 at P 52.

⁴⁰ *PetroStar, Inc. v. FERC*, No. 18-1104, Order (issued Mar. 7, 2019)

⁴¹ Notice Affording the Parties an Opportunity to File Pleadings, Docket No. OR14-6-002 (Mar. 15, 2019).

⁴² Joint Parties consist of Anadarko Petroleum Corporation, BP Exploration (Alaska) Inc., ConocoPhillips Alaska, Inc., Exxon Mobil Corporation, and Tesoro Alaska Company LLC.

⁴³ Indicated TAPS Carriers consist of BP, ConocoPhillips and ExxonMobil.

ensure a just and reasonable result.⁴⁴ Petro Star states that the hearing should examine, among other things, the capital recovery factor,⁴⁵ the product yields from a hypothetical West Coast coker,⁴⁶ and “any elements of the existing [Quality Bank] methodology that may have become stale”⁴⁷ Petro Star also argues that the initial hearing process was “extraordinarily expedited” which limited parties’ abilities to obtain discovery and fully develop the record.⁴⁸ In order to achieve a full review and ensure the record can be fully developed, Petro Star argues that the Commission should direct that a hearing is conducted pursuant to the Track III timeline.⁴⁹

20. Joint Parties state that the Commission should deny Petro Star’s request to reopen the record to present arguments that Petro Star had previously waived, including the procedural unfairness argument that the Initial Decision was based on a truncated hearing and that the capital cost factor for valuation of Resid should be some amount between zero and 20%.⁵⁰ Additionally, Joint Parties argue that the Commission’s previous orders affirming the Initial Decision and finding the current Quality Bank methodology for Resid is just and reasonable were thoroughly explained and supported by the record evidence.⁵¹

21. The State of Alaska comments that, while it does not have sufficient information to take a position on the merits of Petro Star’s claim, there is significant value in the Quality Bank methodology being stable and economically efficient.⁵²

⁴⁴ Petro Star Initial Comments at 21.

⁴⁵ *Id.* at 23-26.

⁴⁶ *Id.* at 26-31.

⁴⁷ *Id.* at 31.

⁴⁸ *Id.* at 21.

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 35. The Track III timeline is reserved for exceptionally complex cases with a schedule allowing for hearing to commence 42 weeks from the date of an order designating a Presiding Judge and an Initial Decision 63 weeks following an order designating a Presiding Judge, <https://www.ferc.gov/legal/admin-lit/time-sum.asp>.

⁵⁰ Joint Parties Initial Comments at 19-22.

⁵¹ *Id.* at 34-38.

⁵² State of Alaska Initial Comments at 2-3.

22. Indicated TAPS Carriers do not take a position on the Quality Bank methodology and state that their only interest is to ensure that the methodology the Commission approves is capable of being administered.⁵³

23. In its reply comments, Petro Star responds to Joint Parties' comments that Petro Star waived certain arguments, including arguments regarding how the value of Resid is determined for Quality Bank valuation purposes. Petro Star asserts that the D.C. Circuit directed the Commission to "broadly . . . reconsider the methodology used to value Resid"⁵⁴ and, as such, Petro Star argues that it is not limited to only issues raised in the prior complaint and hearing.⁵⁵

24. In their reply comments, Joint Parties contend that Petro Star's request for a Track III timeline of a hearing is inconsistent with section 4412 (b)(2) of the Motor Carrier Safety Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Motor Carrier Act),⁵⁶ which imposes a strict limitation on the time within which the Commission must issue a final order after a Quality Bank complaint is filed.⁵⁷

25. Indicated TAPS Carriers filed reply comments again noting they take no position on the issue before the Commission, but stating that they are ready to comply with any Commission order and provide data requested that is available and within their possession as the Administrator of the Quality Bank.⁵⁸

26. On June 20, 2019, Petro Star filed an answer to Joint Parties' reply comments challenging Petro Star's requested hearing schedule. Petro Star argues that the Motor Carrier Act, and its requirement that a Commission final order must issue not later than 15 months after a Quality Bank claim is filed, does not apply here because: (1) this proceeding was the result of a Commission-initiated investigation; and (2) the relevant section of the Motor Carrier Act does not apply to a remand by the Court of Appeals.⁵⁹

⁵³ Indicated TAPS Carriers Initial Comments at 2.

⁵⁴ Petro Star Reply Comments at 9 (citing *Petro Star*, 835 F. 3d at 99).

⁵⁵ *Id.*

⁵⁶ Pub. L. No. 109-59, 119 Stat. 1144 (2005).

⁵⁷ Joint Parties Reply Comments at 19-20.

⁵⁸ Indicated TAPS Carriers Reply Comments at 2.

⁵⁹ Petro Star Answer at 3.

27. On June 27, 2019, Joint Parties filed an answer to Petro Star's answer. Joint Parties challenge Petro Star's argument that the Motor Carrier Act is not applicable to this proceeding.⁶⁰

IV. Discussion

A. Procedural Matters

28. Rule 213(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2) (2019), prohibits an answer to an answer unless otherwise ordered by the decisional authority. We accept the answers as they have provided information that assisted us in our decision-making process.

B. Commission Determination

29. As discussed below, we establish further hearing proceedings to supplement the record for purposes of determining whether the existing Quality Bank valuation formula for Resid continues to be just and reasonable, and, if not, whether the capital cost factor used in the Resid formula should be revised.

30. In *Petro Star*, the D.C. Circuit directed the Commission to "reconsider the methodology used to value Resid or provide a more reasoned explanation for its approach."⁶¹ The Commission sought to address these issues in the February 2018 Remand Order based upon the existing record.⁶² However, upon further consideration, we find that this issue cannot be resolved absent further hearing procedures. The hearing should address whether the current 20% capital cost recovery adjustment remains just and reasonable, and, if not, what amount of capital cost recovery is just and reasonable for valuing Resid in the Quality Bank methodology. In addressing this issue, the parties may update the existing record with supplemental information on West Coast coker data and capital recovery amounts from February 24, 2014 through December 31, 2019. The hearing may also address any of the issues identified by the D.C. Circuit in *Petro Star* as requiring further consideration on remand.⁶³ We limit the scope of this hearing proceeding to the appropriate Quality Bank valuation for Resid,

⁶⁰ Joint Parties Answer at 3.

⁶¹ *Petro Star*, 835 F.3d at 99.

⁶² February 2018 Remand Order, 162 FERC ¶ 61,147.

⁶³ *Petro Star*, 835 F.3d at 99.

which has been the sole subject of the investigation in this proceeding from its inception.⁶⁴

31. We are not persuaded by Joint Parties' argument that additional hearing procedures are inconsistent with section 4412(b)(2) of the Motor Carrier Act. The Motor Carrier Act, including its requirements that a Commission order issue not later than 15 months after a Quality Bank complaint is filed, does not apply here because this proceeding was the result of a Commission-initiated investigation.⁶⁵ Other issues raised by the comments regarding the hearing schedule and discovery can be addressed at hearing. While we do not believe that this matter requires a Track III timeline, particularly as the issues to be addressed at hearing are relatively narrow, we leave the timing of the hearing to the discretion of the Chief Judge.⁶⁶

32. Although we are setting this matter for hearing, we encourage the parties to make every effort to settle their dispute before hearing procedures commence. To aid the parties in their settlement efforts, we will hold the hearing in abeyance and direct that a settlement judge be appointed, pursuant to Rule 603 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.⁶⁷ If the parties desire, they may, by mutual agreement, request a specific judge as the settlement judge in this proceeding. The Chief Judge, however, may not be able to designate the requested settlement judge based on workload requirements which determine judges' availability.⁶⁸ The settlement judge shall report to the Chief Judge and the Commission within 30 days of the date of the appointment of the settlement judge concerning the status of settlement discussions. Based on this report,

⁶⁴ November 2014 Order, 149 FERC ¶ 61,149 at ordering para. (B).

⁶⁵ *Flint Hills*, 145 FERC ¶ 61,117 at P 48. Moreover, to the extent the Motor Carrier Act could be construed as applying here, the Commission satisfied the Motor Carrier Act's 15-month requirement by issuing a final order on November 20, 2014 which was exactly 15 months after the Flint Hills complaint was filed and approximately 12 months after the Commission issued the order initiating its own investigation. The 15-month requirement would not apply to any subsequent Commission action on remand from the D.C. Circuit.

⁶⁶ 18 C.F.R. § 375.304(b)(1)(v) (2019).

⁶⁷ 18 C.F.R. § 385.603 (2019).

⁶⁸ If the parties decide to request a specific judge, they must make their joint request to the Chief Judge by telephone at (202) 502-8500 within five days of this order. The Commission's website contains a list of Commission judges available for settlement proceedings and a summary of their background and experience (<http://www.ferc.gov/legal/adr/avail-judge.asp>).

the Chief Judge shall provide the parties with additional time to continue their settlement discussions or provide for commencement of a hearing by assigning the case to a presiding judge.

The Commission orders:

(A) Pursuant to the authority conferred on the Commission by the ICA, and pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure and the regulations under the ICA, a public hearing shall be held concerning whether the existing Quality Bank methodology used to value Resid continues to be just and reasonable and, if not, whether the capital cost factor used in the Resid formula should be revised. However, the hearing shall be held in abeyance to provide time for settlement judge procedures, as discussed in Ordering Paragraphs (C) and (D) below.

(B) Pursuant to Rule 603 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.603 (2019), the Chief Judge is hereby directed to appoint a settlement judge in this proceeding within 15 days of the date of this order. Such settlement judge shall have all powers and duties enumerated in Rule 603 and shall convene a settlement conference as soon as practicable after the Chief Judge designates the settlement judge. If the parties decide to request a specific judge, they must make their request to the Chief ALJ within five days of the date of this order.

(C) Within 30 days of the appointment of the settlement judge, the settlement judge shall file a report with the Commission and the Chief Judge on the status of the settlement discussions. Based on this report, the Chief Judge shall provide the parties with additional time to continue their settlement discussions, if appropriate, or assign this case to a presiding judge for a trial-type evidentiary hearing, if appropriate. If settlement discussions continue, the settlement judge shall file a report at least every 60 days thereafter, informing the Commission and the Chief Judge of the parties' progress towards settlement.

(D) If settlement judge procedures fail and a trial-type evidentiary hearing is held, a presiding judge, to be designated by the Chief Judge, shall, within 15 days of the date of the presiding judge's designation, convene a prehearing conference in these proceedings in a hearing room of the Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426. Such a conference shall be held for the purpose of establishing a procedural schedule. The presiding judge is authorized to

establish procedural dates, and to rule on all motions (except motions to dismiss) as provided in the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

By the Commission.

(S E A L)

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.