

# "FERC THREATS AND OPPORTUNITIES TO REDUCE/AVOID ELECTRICITY COSTS"

May 1, 2018
Industrial Energy Consumers of America
Spring Meeting

Robert A. Weishaar, Jr.

**Privileged and Confidential** 



#### **DISCLAIMER**

The views expressed in this presentation are those of the speaker, and should not be interpreted or construed as representing the views of McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC or its other attorneys or professionals, or its clients. Thank you.

#### CHAIRMAN KEVIN J. MCINTYRE



- Nominated by President Donald J. Trump in August 2017
- Confirmed by the U.S. Senate on November 2, 2017
- Sworn in December 7, 2017
- Term expires June 30, 2018; expected to be renewed
- Was energy attorney in private practice at Jones Day (DC)
- Republican

#### **COMMISSIONER CHERYL A. LAFLEUR**



- First nominated by President Barack Obama to the Commission in 2010
- Confirmed for a 2<sup>nd</sup> term by the Senate in 2014
- Has served briefly as Chairman and Acting Chairman
- Former utility executive from New England
- Term expires June 30, 2019

### **COMMISSIONER NEIL CHATTERJEE**



- Nominated by President Trump in May 2017
- Confirmed in August 2017 by the U.S. Senate
- Was energy advisor to Senator Mitch McConnell (Ky.)
- Served as FERC Chairman from August 2017 to December 2017
- Term expires June 30, 2021
- Republication

#### COMMISSIONER RICHARD GLICK



- Nominated by President Trump in August 2017
- Confirmed by the US Senate on November 2, 2017
- Previously, was General Counsel for Democrats on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee
- Term expires June 30, 2022
- Democrat

#### **COMMISSIONER ROBERT F. POWELSON**



- Nominated by President Trump in May 2017
- Confirmed by U.S. Senate on August 4, 2017
- Previously served at Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission from June 2008-2015, including as Chairman
- Commission expires on June 30, 2020
- Republican

# IMPACT OF FERC ACTIONS ON INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS VARIES DEPENDING ON 3 KEY FACTORS:

- Are your facilities in a regulated or deregulated state?
  - If deregulated, impact tends to be higher.
- Are your facilities in a region where a Regional Transmission Organization (RTO) or Independent System Operator (ISO) exists?
  - If yes, the impact tends to be higher.
- Are your facilities located in ERCOT?
  - If yes, the impact tends to be lower.

# NERC (IMPACTS ALL STATES AND ALL CUSTOMERS)

- Three key responsibilities: Standardssetting; Audits; Enforcement
- Transmission owners and utilities still play dominant role, due to resource allocation and engineering expertise
- NERC standards subject to FERC review and approval
- NOTE: "Resilience" (however ultimately defined) will continue to pervade NERC discussions – more on that later



- Most transmission owners have moved to formula transmission rates
- Formula rates allow transmission owners to recover full and actual costs
- Formula rates include Protocols that allow customers to review and object to cost passthrough
- Transmission owner-specific cases at FERC
  - Opportunity: (1) Challenge formula rate filing (2)
     Review/challenge annual updates

- Return on equity (ROE) remains highly contentious and litigious
  - Industry still waiting on additional direction from FERC after D.C. Circuit remand of New England ROE case
  - Opportunity: Capital markets still supporting much lower ROEs than are currently in rates

- Transmission cost allocation remains highly contentious and litigious
  - Examples:
    - Zonal placement issues in SPP
    - Artificial Island project in PJM

- Opportunity: FERC has recently placed much more emphasis on <u>TRANSPARENCY</u> in transmission planning and other aspects of transmission
  - Provides opportunities for customers to review transmission projects BEFORE substantial costs are incurred

- Opportunity: Stagnant or declining demand growth should reduce need for transmission (although transmission owners resorting to other agenda for justify cap ex)
- Opportunities: (1) Clarity and new rules around transmission facility ratings (2) Greater openness around transmission planning in RTO/ISO regions and in other regions (3) FERC Policy Statement tying prudence standard to transparency? (4) Order 1000 competition enhancements in ALL regions.

- FERC Order 2003 had established rules to prevent undue discrimination in generation interconnection process
  - Designed to eliminate transmission owner roadblocks to new generation that would, in many cases, be competing with the transmission owner's generation

- Actual experience under Order 2003 revealed that problems still existed (non-transparency, delay, discrimination, etc.)
- Last week, FERC issued Final Rule to enhance the Order 2003 process

To improve certainty for interconnection customers, Final Rule: (1) removes a limitation on an interconnection customer's ability to construct interconnection facilities and stand alone network upgrades; and (2) requires that all transmission providers establish moreaccessible interconnection dispute resolution procedures.



To improve transparency and to promote more informed interconnection decisions, the Final Rule: (1) requires transmission providers to outline and make public a method for determining contingent facilities; (2) requires transmission providers to list the study processes and assumptions for forming the network models used for interconnection studies; (3) revises the definition of "Generating Facility" to explicitly include electric storage resources; and (4) establishes reporting requirements for aggregate interconnection study performance.

To enhance the efficiency of the interconnection process, the Final Rule: (1) allows an interconnection customer to request a level of interconnection service that is lower than its generating facility capacity; (2) requires transmission providers to allow for provisional interconnection agreements that provide for limited operation of a generating facility prior to completion of the full interconnection process; (3) requires transmission providers to create a process for the use of surplus interconnection service; and (4) requires transmission providers to set forth a procedure to assess and, if necessary, study changes in an interconnection customer's proposed technology that occur during the interconnection process to determine if such changes would constitute a material modification.

#### Benefits:

- Customers seeking to interconnect customer-owned generation should have an easier process
- All customers would benefit from an enhanced interconnection process that allows new generation to interconnect efficiently

- Tremendous generation shift from coal/nuclear to natural gas/renewable occurring largely outside of FERC authority
  - Response to commodities markets, environmental/emissions limits, state RPS requirements, and other forces

- However, some states have taken or are considering actions that impact FERC-jurisdictional markets
  - Illinois- Zero Emission Credits (ZECs)
  - New York ZECs
  - New Jersey passed legislation (awaiting Gov. signature) to provide ZECs

- Pennsylvania discussions ongoing
- Ohio discussions about Zero Emission Nuclear (ZEN) credits suspended (for now)
- Other states initiatives to subsidize offshore wind, large-scale solar, and other renewable technologies

#### Impact:

- (1) Negative: Crowding out of generation that is efficient AND WILLING TO PUT ITS OWN CAPITAL AT RISK
- (2) Negative: Customers in those states saddled with costs of subsidies
- (3) Potential positive: Lower capacity and energy prices because subsidized supply is participating in markets

- FERC Response addressing several competing tensions:
  - Should customers get benefit of generation they are subsidizing?
  - What generation gets to clear subsidized generation? new, non-subsidized generation? some combination of the two?
  - Should market-clearing prices or market offers or both be "ratcheted up" to offset the subsidy impact?

#### FERC Orders – "varied"

- MISO: Mostly regulated; little or no corrective action in MISO capacity auctions
- New England: Multiple market clearings (approach known as CASPR - Competitive Auctions with Sponsored Policy Resources) recently approved by FERC; rehearings and appeals HIGHLY likely
- PJM: Recently filed "jump ball" proposal: (1) Capacity Repricing – roughly comparable to New England CASPR; and (2) Enhanced Minimum Offer Price Rule (MOPR-Ex) to recalibrate market offers to offset subsidy impact; increases probability that subsidized resources do not clear

#### "RESILIENCE"

- Outgrowth of DOE NOPR proceeding at FERC
- Resilience has taken on overtures of "generation bailout"
- ISOs/RTOs filed comments in March
  - Comments varied: MISO and SPP say little need for changes; PJM comments suggested far-reaching changes
- Stakeholder comments due May 9

### **OTHER ISSUES**

#### PURPA

 Cogeneration being swept up in concerns over proliferation of PURPA small power production facilities (renewables)

#### Distributed Energy Resources

 Utilities and ISOs/RTOs looking for information on behind the retail meter operations (generation or otherwise)

#### Electric Storage

Worthwhile objective, but raises concerns about reach behind the retail meter

# **QUESTIONS?**

Robert A. Weishaar, Jr.
1200 G Street, NW – Suite 800
Washington, DC 20002
202-898-0688
bweishaar@mcneeslaw.com

