

P R A T T ' S

ENERGY LAW REPORT



EDITOR'S NOTE: MANAGING DISPUTE RISKS Victoria Prussen Spears

WHY MANAGING DISPUTE RISKS IN NPP PROJECTS IS IMPORTANT

Andrew McDougall, Daniel Garton, Richard Hill, Kirsten Odynski, and Dipen Sabharwal QC

AFTER SEVEN-YEAR BATTLE, FERC AUTHORIZES ANR STORAGE COMPANY TO CHARGE MARKET-BASED RATES FOR NATURAL GAS STORAGE SERVICES James F. Bowe, Jr., and William E. Rice

COAL ASH RULE UPDATE: WILL CITIZEN GROUPS BE ABLE TO USE RCRA TO SECOND-GUESS UTILITIES' CLOSURE PLANS? Anthony G. Hopp CLIMATE CHANGE AND RENEWABLE ENERGY IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY Frederick M. Lowther

THE BROAD REACH AND LIMITATIONS OF U.S. FORFEITURE LAW Matthew J. Thomas, Jed M. Silversmith, and

FERC APPROVES ELECTRIC STORAGE RESOURCE PRACTICES IN TWO REGIONS Wilbur C. Earley

FERC PROPOSES TO REVISE QUALIFYING FACILITY RATES AND REQUIREMENTS

J. Daniel Skees, Mark C. Williams, Stephen M. Spina, and Joseph W. Lowell

Pratt's Energy Law Report

VOLUME 20	NUMBER 2	February 2020	
Editor's Note: Managing Victoria Prussen Spears	Dispute Risks		37
Why Managing Dispute Andrew McDougall, Dani Dipen Sabharwal QC	Risks in NPP Projects I s lel Garton, Richard Hill, I	s Important Kirsten Odynski, and	39
After Seven-Year Battle, I Market-Based Rates for I James F. Bowe, Jr., and W	FERC Authorizes ANR S Natural Gas Storage Serv /illiam E. Rice	torage Company to Charge ices	45
Coal Ash Rule Update: N Second-Guess Utilities' O Anthony G. Hopp	Will Citizen Groups Be A Closure Plans?	ble to Use RCRA to	50
Climate Change and Ren Frederick M. Lowther	newable Energy in the M	aritime Industry	56
The Broad Reach and Li Matthew J. Thomas, Jed 1	mitations of U.S. Forfei M. Silversmith, and Dana	s. Merkel	59
FERC Approves Electric Wilbur C. Earley	Storage Resource Practic	es in Two Regions	63
FERC Proposes to Revis J. Daniel Skees, Mark C.	e Qualifying Facility Rat Williams, Stephen M. Spi	es and Requirements na, and Joseph W. Lowell	67



QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or rep	print permission,		
please email:			
Jacqueline M. Morris at	(908) 673-1528		
Email: jacqueline.m.morri	s@lexisnexis.com		
Outside the United States and Canada, please call	(973) 820-2000		
For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:			
Customer Services Department at	(800) 833-9844		
Outside the United States and Canada, please call	(518) 487-3385		
Fax Number	(800) 828-8341		
Customer Service Website http://www.lexisne	xis.com/custserv/		
For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call			
Your account manager or	(800) 223-1940		
Outside the United States and Canada, please call	(937) 247-0293		

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0836-3 (print) ISBN: 978-1-6328-0837-0 (ebook) ISSN: 2374-3395 (print) ISSN: 2374-3409 (online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT'S ENERGY LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Ian Coles, *Rare Earth Elements: Deep Sea Mining and the Law of the Sea*, 14 PRATT'S ENERGY LAW REPORT 4 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2020 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office 230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862 www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

SAMUEL B. BOXERMAN Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

Andrew Calder Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

M. SETH GINTHER Partner, Hirschler Fleischer, P.C.

STEPHEN J. HUMES Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

> **R. TODD JOHNSON** Partner, Jones Day

BARCLAY NICHOLSON Partner, Norton Rose Fulbright

BRADLEY A. WALKER Counsel, Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC

> ELAINE M. WALSH Partner, Baker Botts L.L.P.

SEAN T. WHEELER Partner, Latham & Watkins LLP

Hydraulic Fracturing Developments ERIC ROTHENBERG Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP

Pratt's Energy Law Report is published 10 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2020 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form-by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise-or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 646.539.8300. Material for publication is welcomed-articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house energy counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in energy-related environmental preservation, the laws governing cutting-edge alternative energy technologies, and legal developments affecting traditional and new energy providers. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Pratt's Energy Law Report, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 121 Chanlon Road, North Building, New Providence, NJ 07974.

FERC Proposes to Revise Qualifying Facility Rates and Requirements

By J. Daniel Skees, Mark C. Williams, Stephen M. Spina, and Joseph W. Lowell^{*}

This article explains the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's notice of proposed rulemaking announcing its intent to revise key rules governing the status and rights of Qualifying Facilities.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") issued a notice of proposed rulemaking ("NOPR") announcing its intent to revise key rules governing the status and rights of Qualifying Facilities ("QFs"). These revisions include proposed changes to the rules for measuring QF size that could make it more difficult for certain projects to maintain QF status. The NOPR also proposes to provide greater flexibility to states in regulating the rates that QFs can receive from their interconnected utilities, as well as a number of other fundamental changes in the regulation of QFs.

FERC's proposed rulemaking would affect two classes of power generators: small power production facilities and cogeneration facilities. Small power production facilities are generally those producing 80 MW or fewer using predominately renewable, biomass, waste, or geothermal resources. Cogeneration facilities are those that make use of the thermal energy that normally results from the production of electricity using fossil fuels. These two classes receive special rates and regulatory treatment intended to encourage their development. Because the regulatory rights and exemptions held by small power production QFs turn on their total generation capacity, the proposed changes to the means by which FERC determines their capacity can have significant effects on the commercial advantages of those projects.

BACKGROUND

FERC's proposed revisions represent its first comprehensive review of the regulations promulgated pursuant to the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 ("PURPA"), apart from certain less significant changes, largely affecting only cogeneration QFs, that were adopted following the Energy Policy Act of 2005. According to FERC, a combination of greater oil and gas reserves discovered in the last two decades, deregulation and decoupling of electric

^{*} J. Daniel Skees (daniel.skees@morganlewis.com), Mark C. Williams (mark.williams@morganlewis.com), and Stephen M. Spina (stephen.spina@morganlewis.com) are partners at Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP. Joseph W. Lowell (joseph.lowell@morganlewis.com) is of counsel at the firm. Resident in the firm's Washington, D.C., office, the authors focus their practices on a wide range of energy sector matters.

generation and delivery and the resultant markets, and other federal and state programs to incentivize electric generation through renewable resources has prompted these proposed revisions.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED REVISIONS

One proposed revision would alter how FERC determines whether separate production sites operated by the same or affiliated entities constitute one facility for purposes of measuring the total capacity of a Small Power QF, to which FERC capacity size limitations apply. Currently, FERC regulations consider a generation site to be part of a facility seeking qualification if the site is within one mile of the facility (measured from generation facility to generation facility), or if a hydroelectric generator, it uses water from the same impounded water source. Under FERC's proposal, the one-mile rule would remain. However, expressing concern that developers were circumventing the regulations by siting facilities strategically to qualify as small power production facilities, FERC has proposed allowing both the Commission itself and other interested parties to show that affiliated small power production facilities more than one mile apart but within 10 miles of each other constitute a single facility.

Under its existing policies, FERC presumes that affiliated facilities located more than one mile apart are separate facilities for purposes of QF qualification, but the NOPR would make that presumption rebuttable. Nonexhaustive factors FERC would consider include whether the sites share the same infrastructure or property, sell to the same utility, were built or placed into operation within 12 months of each other, or use common financing. Facilities within 10 miles affirmatively certified by FERC to be separate would be free from future challenge absent a showing of changed circumstances. Facilities further than 10 miles apart would possess an irrebuttable presumption that they are separate facilities. In summary, affiliated facilities located more than one mile apart but less than 10 miles from each other would only possess a rebuttable presumption that they are separate. FERC does not propose to "grandfather" any small power QF, but indicates that only self-certifications and self-recertifications filed after the rulemaking's effective date would be subject to the new 10-mile regulatory structure.

A second proposal would permit states to rely more directly on markets to set the energy component of the rate a utility pays for electricity produced by a QF. For utilities located within a Regional Transmission Organization ("RTO") or an Independent System Operator ("ISO"), states could require the energy rates paid to QFs be based on the market's locational marginal price or similar market price. For utilities outside of an RTO/ISO, states could require a competitive price for the energy rate, determined by liquid market hub energy prices or formula rates based on observed natural gas prices and a specified heat rate. Further, states would have the flexibility to set energy and capacity rates pursuant to a competitive solicitation process conducted pursuant to transparent and nondiscriminatory procedures. States could also require that energy rates under contracts and other legally enforceable obligations be determined at the time of delivery rather than at predetermined fixed rates, or for RTO/ISO markets, states could require that fixed energy rates be determined based on estimates of the present value of the future locational marginal price or similar market price. FERC also proposes to clarify that states may require that both energy and capacity rates be determined though a competitive process.

Another proposed change would permit protests of a facility's selfcertification of its qualification. Self-certification, the more common method of certification, is effective upon certification, and typically is neither published in the *Federal Register* nor evaluated by FERC. Accordingly, a party opting to protest a self-certification must petition FERC for a declaratory order and pay the associated significant filing fee, which is currently \$28,990. Concerned that this places the burden to challenge a self-certification on a protestor rather than the entity seeking QF regulatory status, FERC has proposed allowing interested parties to intervene and protest in the QF's self-certification within 30 days of its filing with FERC, and thus avoid the fee attendant to filing a petition for declaratory order. While a protest is pending, the self-certificated facility would continue to hold QF status, and FERC expects that it would ordinarily act within 90 days of the protest filing.

Further changes include relieving a utility of the obligation to purchase energy or capacity from a QF if its supply obligations are reduced by a state's retail choice program, and reducing the threshold at which a qualifying power small production facility has a rebuttable presumption of nondiscriminatory market access from 20 MW to 1 MW. In organized markets where FERC has found a rebuttable presumption of market access for QFs, this latter change, if adopted, would only obligate utilities to purchase from a QF sized between 20 MW and 1 MW if the QF can rebut the presumption and demonstrate that it does not have nondiscriminatory access to the market.

Finally, the proposed rulemaking would require states to establish objective and reasonable criteria by which the state would determine the commercial viability of a QF before the QF becomes entitled under PURPA to a power sales contract or other legally enforceable obligation with a utility. This requirement would enable states to establish financial viability requirements, such as:

- (1) Obtaining site control adequate to commence construction of the project at the proposed location;
- (2) Filing an interconnection application with the appropriate entity;
- (3) Securing local permitting and zoning; or

PRATT'S ENERGY LAW REPORT

(4) Meeting other criteria that demonstrate a QF's commercial viability and financial commitment to construct the facilities.