

FERC

Meeting Agenda Summary

In this issue...

- Electric Items
 - Miscellaneous Items
 - Hydro Items
-

18 June 2019

Authors: [Daniel Hagan](#), [Jane E. Rueger](#)

Below are brief summaries of the agenda items for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's June 20, 2019 meeting, pursuant to the agenda as issued on June 13, 2019. Agenda item H-1 has not been summarized due to omission from the agenda.

Electric

E-1 – Black Oak Energy, LLC, EPIC Merchant Energy, LP, and SESCO Enterprises, LLC v. PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (Docket No. EL08-14-012). On December 3, 2007, Black Oak Energy, L.L.C., EPIC Merchant Energy, L.L.P., and SESCO Enterprises, L.L.C. (collectively, Financial Marketers) submitted, pursuant to section 206 of the Federal Power Act, a complaint challenging the PJM transmission loss pricing methodology, and related allocation methodology, with respect to Financial Marketers. On March 6, 2008, the Commission denied the complaint finding that it was appropriate for PJM to apply marginal loss pricing to every buyer of electricity to cover transmission losses. Because marginal loss pricing treats every transmission as the marginal transmission, PJM collected more revenues than necessary to cover the cost of actual transmission losses. Accordingly, the Commission required PJM to credit the over-collection to those that pay the fixed costs of the transmission grid, including, upon clarification, Financial Marketers that paid transmission charges that contributed to the fixed costs of the transmission grid. On September 17, 2009, the Commission accepted PJM's compliance filing detailing its methodology for paying refunds. The compliance filing was followed by several requests for rehearing and clarification questioning various aspects of the refund payment methodology. On August 6, 2013, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit affirmed: 1) the Commission's determination that the Financial Marketers, *i.e.*, virtual marketers, will receive no surplus allocation in the event they paid none of the fixed costs of the grid, 2) the Commission's determination to grant rehearing and follow its traditional policy of not providing for refunds in cases involving rate design and cost allocation, and 3) the Commission's determination that it should have been clear to the virtual marketers that their refunds were subject to reconsideration. Alternatively, the court remanded the question of whether PJM, having already paid out refunds, should be permitted to recoup those refunds, finding the Commission had not directly addressed this issue. On November 19, 2015, the Commission issued an Order on Remand finding that the Financial Marketers should be

required to repay refunds, with interest, to put the parties back in the positions in which they would have found themselves if the Commission had not erred in requiring refunds in the first place. Requests for rehearing of the Order on Remand were denied. Agenda item E-1 may be an order relating to the methodology for calculating transmission losses, related allocation methodology, or the calculation and subsequent payment of refunds.

E-2 – North American Electric Reliability Corporation (Docket No. RD19-3-000). On March 7, 2019, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation submitted, pursuant to Section 215 of the Federal Power Act, a petition for the approval of proposed reliability standard CIP-008-6 Cyber Security – Incident Reporting and Response Planning and associated implementation plan. The proposed reliability standard is intended to address the Commission’s directive to require reporting of cyber security incidents that compromise, or attempt to compromise, a responsible entity’s electronic security perimeter or associated electronic access control or monitoring systems to the Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center (E-ISAC) and the Department of Homeland Security Industrial Control Systems Cyber Emergency Response Team (ICS-CERT). Agenda item E-2 may be an order relating to the approval of the proposed reliability standard.

E-3 – Transmission Planning Reliability Standard TPL-001-5 (Docket No. RM19-10-000). On December 7, 2018, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation submitted, pursuant to Section 215 of the Federal Power Act, a petition for the approval of proposed reliability standard TPL-001-5 Transmission System Planning Performance Requirements and associated implementation plan. The proposed reliability standard is intended to improve upon currently effective Reliability Standard TPL-001-4 by providing for more comprehensive and robust planning studies and address the Commission’s directives from its order approving TPL-001-4. Agenda item E-3 may be an order relating to the approval of the proposed reliability standard.

E-4 – San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services Into Markets Operated by the California Independent System Operator Corporation and the California Power Exchange, et. al. (Docket Nos. EL00-95-000, EL00-98-000, EL01-10-000, PA02-2-000, IN03-10-000, EL03-165). In response to what is now commonly referred to as the California Energy Crisis, the Commission initiated numerous proceedings to address uncompetitive conduct in California’s energy markets. The energy crisis marked by widespread blackouts, elevated prices, and the collapse of one of California’s largest energy companies has been and is being addressed in numerous FERC dockets, including the investigations and hearings captioned here, and litigation in both state and federal courts. Complaints and comments were also filed by interested parties and policy makers across the State. On July 26, 2000, the Commission initiated, pursuant to Section 206 of the FPA, a Staff-led investigation to detect any defects in the operation of competitive power markets in California. On August 2, 2000, San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) submitted, pursuant to Section 206 of the Federal Power Act, a complaint requesting an emergency order capping the prices at which sellers may bid energy or ancillary services into the CAISO and California Power Exchange (PX) markets at \$250 per MW. On August 24, 2000, the Commission issued an order rejecting SDG&E’s request and initiating investigations into the rates of sellers in the CAISO and PX markets and to investigate the tariffs, contracts, institutional structures, and bylaws of California entities. On December 15, 2000, in response to complaints submitted by numerous market participants, the Commission issued an Order Directing Remedies for California Wholesale Electric Markets. On June 25, 2003, the Commission issued an Order to Show Cause directing specified entities to participate in hearings to demonstrate why certain specified conduct should not be considered gaming or anomalous market behavior. Also in response to investigations by Commission Staff, the Commission issued an Order Requiring Demonstration that Certain Bids Did Not Constitute Anomalous Market Behavior on June 25, 2003. Importantly, many of the parties in the various proceedings have engaged in settlements. Agenda item E-4 may be an order addressing resolution of outstanding claims related to the California Energy Crisis.

E-5 – Light Power & Gas of NY LLC v. New York Independent System Operator, Inc. (Docket No. EL19-39-000). On January 29, 2019, pursuant to Sections 206 and 306 of the Federal Power Act, Light Power & Gas of NY LLC (LPGNY) filed a complaint against the New York Independent System Operator, Inc. (NYISO) alleging that NYISO had unreasonably and unjustly discriminated against LPGNY by determining that LPGNY is a common law successor that is allegedly liable for various debts of bankrupt former NYISO market participant and refusing to process LPGNY’s application for registration to participate in NYISO markets. On February 19, 2019, NYISO submitted an answer to LPGNY’s complaint, stating that NYISO’s tariff gives it the authority to recognize LPGNY’s close links to the former market participant and prevent LPGNY from entering the market until the relevant debts

are paid. Various entities, including PJM Interconnection, LLC, have moved to intervene in the proceeding, and various motions and answers have been exchanged. Agenda item E-5 may be an order in the proceeding.

E-6 – Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (Docket Nos. ER19-875-000, ER19-875-001). On January 28, 2019, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (MISO) submitted proposed tariff revisions to enhance MISO's ability to coordinate with federal agencies in cyber-security emergencies. On March 22, 2019, the Commission filed a notice of deficiency in the proceeding and requested additional information from MISO regarding the sharing of information. MISO responded to the request for additional information and submitted additional tariff revisions on April 22, 2019. Agenda item E-6 may be an order regarding the proposed tariff revisions.

E-7 – PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. and Monongahela Power Company, et al. (Docket Nos. ER18-614-003, ER18-614-004, ER18-614-005, EL18-173-001). On January 5, 2018, in Docket No. ER18-614-000, PJM submitted revisions to Schedule 12-Appendix A of its Tariff to incorporate cost responsibility assignments for certain new baseline upgrades, including Targeted Market Efficiency Projects (TMEPs) that were approved as interregional transmission projects by the PJM Board of Managers. On July 2, 2018, the Commission issued an order directing PJM to submit revised cost responsibility assignments for certain of the TMEPs to include Merchant Transmission Facilities regardless of whether or not they have Firm Transmission Withdrawal Rights, including Merchant Transmission Facilities owned by Linden VFT, LLC (Linden) and Hudson Transmission Partners, LLC (Hudson), and instituted a Federal Power Act section 206 proceeding in Docket No. EL18-173-000 to require PJM Transmission Owners to refile Schedule 12 of the PJM Tariff in accordance with its order. In Docket No. ER18-614-003, on July 31, 2018, PJM submitted revisions to Schedule 12-Appendix A to allocate certain TMEP costs to Linden and Hudson to comply with the July 2 order. In Docket Nos. ER18-614-004 and EL18-173-000, on August 1, 2018, the PJM Transmission Owners submitted limited revisions to Section 12 of the PJM tariff to ensure consistency with Schedule 12-Appendix A. Linden has protested both sets of tariff revisions made in compliance with the July 2 order. Additionally, in Docket No. ER18-614-005, on August 1, 2018, requests for rehearing of the July 2 order were filed by Linden, Hudson, the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities and the New York Power Authority, asking the Commission to reconsider its finding that Merchant Transmission Facilities without Firm Transmission Withdrawal Rights are subject to cost allocations for TMEPs and the Commission's required effective date for PJM tariff changes. Agenda item E-7 may be an order in the proceeding.

E-8 – Southwest Power Pool, Inc. (Docket No. ER15-2028-000 and ER15-2028-001). On June 26, 2015, the Southwest Power Pool, Inc. (SPP) submitted revisions to its Open Access Transmission Tariff (SPP Tariff) to include the Corn Belt Formula Rate, which provides for the recovery of Corn Belt Power Cooperative's (Corn Belt) Annual Transmission Revenue Requirement for Corn Belt's facilities and certain facilities of its member-customers, and to identify certain of Corn Belt's existing contracts as Grandfathered Agreements under the SPP Tariff. Various entities intervened and submitted protests. On September 30, 2015, the Commission accepted the tariff revisions for filing and set the return on equity and Formula Rate for hearing and settlement judge procedures. Numerous settlement conferences and technical conferences were held, and the settlement participants eventually agreed to all portions of a Settlement submitted on July 12, 2017 except for the Settlement's rate treatment of the Grandfathered Agreements. On October 27, 2017, the Settlement Judge issued a report of contested settlement, and on November 1, 2017, settlement judge procedures were terminated. On June 13, 2018, Corn Belt and Northwest Iowa Power Cooperative filed a request for the Commission to take administrative notice of *Southwest Power Pool, Inc.*, 163 FERC ¶ 61,109 (2018) ("*Tri-State*"), a recent FERC order addressing a similar cost-shifting issue as that presented in the settlement conferences, or in the alternative, a limited motion to reopen the record in the proceeding to accept certain calculations regarding alleged cost shifts. On June 28, 2018, Commission Trial Staff submitted an answer opposing the request to take administrative notice of *Tri-State* or reopen the record. Agenda item E-8 may be an order in the proceeding.

E-9 – Southwest Power Pool, Inc. (Docket Nos. ER15-2115-000, ER15-2115-001). On September 7, 2015, Southwest Power Pool, Inc. (SPP) filed the Annual Transmission Revenue Requirement (ATRR) and Formula Rate Template (Formula Rate) for Northwest Iowa Power Cooperative (NIPCO). The filing proposed to modify the SPP Tariff to allow for cost recovery of NIPCO facilities and detail the associated accounts and costs, as well as pre-existing NIPCO contracts. Following the filing, a number of stakeholders submitted motions to intervene and substantive comments, outlining concerns with the NIPCO ATRR and Formula Rate proposal. On September 30, 2015, the Commission issued an order accepting the revisions to the SPP Tariff and setting the matter for hearing

and settlement judge procedures. The Commission approved the requested 50 basis point adder contingent on an updated discounted cash flow analysis affirming that the base return on equity (ROE) was just and reasonable. On July 12, 2017, SPP submitted a Joint Offer of Settlement and Settlement Agreement, reflecting deliberations that had occurred since October of 2015 between itself and the intervening parties. The settlement modifies the depreciation and amortization rates for NIPCO and provides for a total ROE of 10.1 percent, inclusive of the 50 basis point adder as approved by the Commission originally. Consistent with guidance documents in the SPP Tariff, NIPCO has adjusted its rate base facilities that will be reflected in the Formula Rate by removing several transmission line segments and one transmission substation that did not qualify for cost recovery. During the comment period, Commission Trial Staff, Missouri River Energy Services, and Western Area Power Administration (collectively, the Contesting Participants) filed comments opposing the treatment of two grandfathered agreements (GFAs) as contemplated in the settlement. The Contesting Participants allege the rate treatment of the GFAs is unjust and unreasonable, stating that other transmission owners will essentially subsidize transmission loads and shifts the cost from NIPCO and its customers to the transmission owners. As such, the Contesting Participants propose that an adjustment to the Formula Rate is necessary, either by modifying how to calculate a charge for the GFA transmission load for NIPCO or by requiring NIPCO to include its GFA transmission in the Divisor. Agenda item E-9 may be an order on the contested portions of the settlement as set forth by SPP and NIPCO.

E-10 – Pacific Gas and Electric Company (Docket No. ER17-910-001). On January 31, 2017, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) submitted proposed revisions to a service agreement with the City and County of San Francisco (San Francisco) in order to reflect new, modified, or cancelled points of delivery, reflect work performed for existing points of delivery during the fourth quarter of 2016, and update a previously-filed project to revise the cost of ownership and payment schedule from assessment of monthly charges to a one-time payment. On February 21, 2017, San Francisco filed a protest to challenge the filing, alleging that PG&E failed to justify the costs for required facilities under the service and interconnection agreements and include projects for which PG&E should have tendered draft specifications for service or work performance agreements to San Francisco. On March 28, 2017, the Commission issued an order accepting the revisions suspended for a nominal period, subject to refund, and set the matter for hearing and settlement judge procedures. Following numerous settlement conferences and deliberations among the parties, on December 14, 2018, PG&E submitted a joint offer of partial settlement which resolved certain issues in the proceeding. Agenda item E-10 may be an order on the partial settlement as set forth by PG&E and San Francisco.

E-11 – Ambit Northeast, LLC (Docket No. ER19-158-002). On October 22, 2018, Ambit Northeast, LLC (Ambit) filed an application for authorization to purchase and resell electricity, energy, and related services at market-based rates. Public Citizen, Inc. (Public Citizen) filed a protest on October 29, 2018, disputing that Ambit should not be able to withhold disclosure of the names of certain ultimate shareholders owning more than 10 percent of Ambit and stating that the information should not be considered as privileged by the Commission. On January 29, 2019, the Commission issued an order indicating that it will grant the protest of Public Citizen and publicly release certain information for which Ambit had requested privileged treatment. On February 6, 2019, Ambit filed a request for rehearing of the January 29 order or a request for stay for an additional sixty days of a final Commission order if the rehearing request is rejected. Agenda item E-11 may be an order on the request for rehearing brought forward by Ambit.

E-12 – Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. and Ameren Illinois Company (Docket No. ER17-2323-002). On August 17, 2017, Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (MISO) and Ameren Illinois Company (Ameren) submitted an application pursuant to section 205 of the Federal Power Act (FPA) proposing revisions to the Ameren formula rate for transmission service on file in the MISO Tariff. The revisions involve the addition items to the income tax calculation of the formula rate, primarily including returning to or recovering from customers any excess or deficient accumulated deferred income taxes (ADIT) stemming from tax law or rate changes. On September 7, 2017, Southwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Southwestern) filed a motion to intervene and protest, asserting that the revisions would not result in just and reasonable rates. In particular, Southwestern advocated that excess ADIT be returned to customers within a five-year period. On May 31, 2018, the Commission issued an order accepting the proposed revisions to the Ameren formula rate. As a result, Southwestern filed a request for rehearing on July 2, 2018, stating that the order will suppress future

investigations of income tax-related issues and lead to unjust and unreasonable transmission rates. Agenda item E-12 may be an order on the request for rehearing by Southwestern.

E-13 – ALLETE, Inc. (Docket No. ER19-283-001). On November 2, 2018, ALLETE, Inc. (ALLETE) filed a proposed revised reactive power revenue requirement for implementation under the MISO Tariff. ALLETE submitted the terminated revenue requirement of Boswell Energy Center Units 1 and 2, scheduled for retirement on December 31, 2018. On December 31, 2018, the Commission issued an order accepting the filing, suspending the proposed rate schedule, and establishing hearing and settlement judge procedures. The Commission asserted that ALLETE had not satisfied the requirement to submit a redline comparison of its proposed reactive power revenue requirement and the 1996 Black Box Settlement. On January 30, 2019, ALLETE filed a request for clarification and expedited action of the December 31 order, stating that the redline requirement is not applicable in this instance as it is not modifying Tariff sheets on file with the Commission and such review is not necessary for consideration of the proposed revised revenue requirement. Agenda item E-13 may be an order on the request for clarification brought forward by ALLETE.

E-14 – Entergy Services, Inc. (Docket No. ER10-1350-007). On December 17, 2015, the Commission issued Opinion No. 545, an order that affirmed in part and rejected in part an Initial Decision involving the fourth annual bandwidth filing, covering the year of 2009, submitted by Entergy Services, Inc. (Entergy). This matter comprises only a segment of a long period of litigation over the allocation of the production costs of electric power plants among the Entergy Operating Companies under its system agreement. The system agreement allows Entergy to plan, construct, and operate their generation and transmission facilities as a unified electric system; however, in 2005, the Commission issued Opinion No. 480, finding that production costs across the multistate system were not equal and were unduly discriminatory. The Commission imposed a remedy reallocating costs that deviated from an established “bandwidth” around the system average, as determined in annual proceedings. On May 27, 2010, Entergy submitted its bandwidth formula in the fourth bandwidth filing pursuant to Opinion No. 480. On September 19, 2014, the presiding judge issued the Initial Decision in the proceeding, finding that Entergy did not properly include the fuel inventory balance from FERC Form No. 1 as an input to the bandwidth formula for the 2009 test year. Opinion No. 545 affirmed this finding as well as certain remedies relating to the treatment of ADIT. On January 19, 2016, the Arkansas Public Service Commission, the Louisiana Public Service Commission (LPSC), and Entergy filed requests for rehearing of Opinion No. 545. The Commission granted in part and denied in part the requests for rehearing on September 22, 2016. The only outstanding item for Commission scrutiny is the contra-securitization ADIT issue which arose from hurricane-related costs from 2005 to 2008. The Commission required Entergy to remove both securitized asset ADIT and contra-securitized asset ADIT from the bandwidth calculation. On October 24, 2016, the LPSC filed a request for rehearing of Opinion No. 545 and the order on rehearing and clarification on September 22, 2016. Agenda item E-14 may be an order on the request for rehearing brought forward by LPSC.

E-15 – Louisiana Public Service Commission v. System Energy Resources, Inc. and Entergy Services, Inc. (Docket No. EL18-142-001). On April 27, 2018, the Louisiana Public Service Commission (LPSC) filed a complaint against System Energy Resources, Inc. (SERI) and its affiliate Entergy Services, Inc. (Entergy), seeking modifications to the formula rate used by SERI in charging costs of the Grand Gulf nuclear unit under a Unit Power Sales Agreement (UPSA) to its Entergy-related affiliates (LPSC Complaint). The LPSC Complaint sought changes in the UPSA's formula rate to correct alleged unjust and unreasonable aspects of the formula provisions for billing the return on equity (ROE), the amount of equity in the capital structure, and depreciation expense. On August 24, 2018, the Commission issued an order (August 2018 Order) granting, in part, the LPSC Complaint with respect to the ROE element, establishing hearing and settlement judge procedures, and setting a refund effective date of April 27, 2018, the date the LPSC Complaint was filed. The August 2018 Order also denied the LPSC Complaint with respect to the capital structure elements, and dismissed the LPSC Complaint with respect to the depreciation rate elements. On September 24, 2018, SERI, Entergy, and the LPSC requested rehearing of the August 2018 Order. Agenda item E-15 may be an order on the SERI, Entergy, and LPSC requests for rehearing.

E-16 – Ameren Illinois Company (Docket No. ER17-1198-000). On March 14, 2017, pursuant to previous Commission orders and the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.'s (MISO) Open Access Transmission, Energy and Operating Reserve Markets Tariff (Tariff) Attachment O formula rate protocols, Ameren Illinois Company (AIC), submitted supporting information reflecting AIC's projected net revenue requirement

effective January 1, 2017 and AIC's calendar year 2015 annual true-up (AIC Information Filing). On April 17, 2017, Southwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc. submitted a formal challenge to the AIC Information Filing. Agenda item E-16 may be an order on the AIC Information Filing.

Miscellaneous

M-1 – Revisions to the Filing Process for Commission Forms (Docket No. RM19-12-000). On January 17, 2019, the Commission issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NOPR) proposing to change the software and coding language used to submit certain data to the Commission, as the current submission software, Visual FoxPro, is no longer supported by its developer. Specifically, the NOPR proposes that the Commission transition from using Visual FoxPro software to file the Commission's Form Nos. 1, 1-F, 2, 2-A, 3-Q electric, 3-Q natural gas, 6, 6-Q, 60, and 714, and instead use Xtensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL), which is a type of extensible markup language. The NOPR states that the Commission believes the use of XBRL will decrease the costs over time of preparing data for submission to the Commission. Agenda item M-1 may be an order on the NOPR and the use of XBRL for Commission filings.

Hydro

H-1 – Omitted

H-2 – Boyce Hydro Power, LLC (Docket No. P-10808-066). On March 15, 2019, Boyce Hydro Power, LLC (BHPLLC), former licensee for the Edenville Hydro Electric Project, FERC Project No. 10808 (Edenville Project), submitted a motion for reconsideration of two previous Commission orders that revoked the Edenville Project's license. BHPLLC's motion also included an application for approval to transfer the Edenville Project's license to Wolverine Hydro, LLC (WHLLC). BHPLLC asserts in its motion that revocation of the Edenville Project's license is no longer necessary due to changed financial circumstances that will allow a licensee to comply with all of the license's requirements. BHPLLC further asserts that reinstatement of the Edenville Project's license, coupled with transfer of the license to WHLLC, is in the public interest. Agenda item H-2 may be an order on the request to reinstate and transfer the Edenville Project's license to WHLLC.

H-3 – Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington (Docket No. P-2114-300). On March 31, 2017, as supplemented on April 28, 2017, Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington, licensee for the Priest Rapids Hydroelectric Project No. 2114, filed an update to its Recreation Resource Management Plan pursuant to Article 418 of the project license. On February 19, 2019, the Commission issued an order the Project's recreational resource management plan. On March 20, 2019, Pat Kelleher filed a request for rehearing of the Commission's February 19 order. Agenda item H-3 may be an order on the request for rehearing.

H-4 – Southern California Edison (Docket No. P-2290-117). On June 4, 2015, Southern California Edison (SCE), licensee for the Kern River No. 3 Hydroelectric Project No. 2290, filed an application to amend the license conditions requiring the whitewater flows. On January 30, 2019, the Commission issued an order approving the proposed amendments. On March 1, 2019, Brett Harding Duxbury filed a request for rehearing of the Commission's January 30 order. Agenda item H-4 may be an order on the request for rehearing.

H-5 – Alginis, Inc. (Docket Nos. P-14896-001, P-14897-001, P-14898-001, P-14899-001, P-14900-001, P-14901-001, P-14902-001, P-14903-001, P-14904-001, P-14905-001, P-14906-001, P-14907-001, P-14908-001, P-14909-001, P-14910-001, P-14911-001, P-14912-001, P-14913-001, P-14914-001, P-14915-001, P-14916-001, P-14917-001, P-14918-001, P-14919-001, P-14920-001, P-14921-001, P-14922-001, P-14923-001, P-14924-001, P-14925-001, P-14926-001, P-14927-001, P-14928-001, P-14929-001, P-14930-001, P-14931-001, P-14932-001, P-14933-001, P-14934-001, P-14935-001, P-14936-001, P-14937-001, P-14938-001, P-14939-001, P-14940-001, P-14941-001, P-14942-001, P-14943-001, P-14944-001, P-14945-001, P-14946-001, P-14947-001, P-14948-001, P-14949-001, P-14950-001, P-14951-001, P-14952-001, P-14953-001, P-14954-001 & P-14955-001). Applicant Alginis, Inc. submitted applications for preliminary permits at nuclear power plants throughout the United States in the above-referenced dockets. On February 22, 2019, Commission staff issued a delegated letter order dismissing the applications because the Commission lacks jurisdiction over the proposed projects. On March 22,

2019, Algnis filed a request for rehearing of the February 22, 2019 letter order. Agenda item H-5 may be an order on the request for rehearing.

H-6 – ECOsponsible, LLC (Docket No. P-9709-069). On August 1, 2018, ECOsponsible, LLC (ECOsponsible), licensee for the Herkimer Hydroelectric Project No. 9709, filed a request to extend the expiration date of its license, extending the license from its current expiration date on March 31, 2027 for 10 years so that it expires on March 31, 2037. On February 21, 2019, the Commission issued an order denying extension of the license term. On March 22, 2019, ECOsponsible filed a request for rehearing of the Commission's February 21 order. Agenda item H-6 may be an order on the request for rehearing.

White & Case LLP
701 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20005-3807
United States

T +1 202 626 3600

In this publication, White & Case means the international legal practice comprising White & Case LLP, a New York State registered limited liability partnership, White & Case LLP, a limited liability partnership incorporated under English law and all other affiliated partnerships, companies and entities.

This publication is prepared for the general information of our clients and other interested persons. It is not, and does not attempt to be, comprehensive in nature. Due to the general nature of its content, it should not be regarded as legal advice.