

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Status Report of Current Regulatory and Legal Proceedings
as of September 9, 2015

The following activity, as more fully described in the attached litigation report, has occurred since the report dated August 5, 2015 was circulated. New matters/proceedings since the last Report are preceded by an asterisk '*'. Page numbers precede the matter description.

I. Complaints/Section 206 Proceedings

* 1	206 Proceeding: 2014/15 RNS Recovery of SeaLink Development Costs (EL15-85)	Aug 12 Aug 12- Sep 2 Aug 19 Aug 20	FERC institutes an FPA Section 206 proceeding to examine whether NHT's recovery of SeaLink project development costs through the RNS formula rate is just and reasonable ISO, NEPOOL, CMP, CT OCC, CT PURA, Eversource, MA AG, MOPA, National Grid, NESCOE, RI PUC, UI, VT DPS, VT Transco intervene Chief Judge Wagner appoints H. Peter Young as settlement judge Settlement Judge Young schedules 1 st settlement conference for Sep 15, 2015
3	Base ROE Complaints (2012 & 2014) Consolidated (EL14-86 & EL13-33)	Aug 7 Aug 13 Aug 26	Complainant-Aligned Parties, EMCOS, FERC Trial Staff oppose TOs' Jul 23 motion to lodge portion of testimony filed in Southwestern Public Service Co. ROE proceeding Trial Judge Sterner denies TOs' motion to lodge Complainant-Aligned Parties, TOs, EMCOS, FERC Staff submit Reply Briefs, Joint List of Appearances
5	206 Investigation: Consistency of ISO-NE (DA) Scheduling Practices with Natural Gas Scheduling Practices to be Adopted in Docket RM14-2 (EL14-23)	Aug 7-18 Aug 13 Aug 18	EPSA, Entergy, INGA, NY TO's intervene NGSA submits comments NRG files comments requesting ISOs/RTOs be directed to set their Day-Ahead offer submission deadlines to a time after fixed-price gas has started trading (i.e., 10:30 a.m. EPT) and reduce their solve times

II. Rate, ICR, FCA, Cost Recovery Filings

* 6	FCA9 Results Correction: Holliston Resource SEMA Load Zone Location (ER15-2626)	Sep 8	ISO files correction to the FCA9 zonal location for the Holliston resource; comment date Sep 29
* 6	2014/15 Power Year Transmission Rate Filing: Public Representatives' Protest (EL15-85; ER09-1532; RT04-2)	Aug 12	FERC accepts TOs' 2014/15 informational rate filing but institutes a Section 206 proceeding to examine recovery of NHT SeaLink costs in RNS rates (<i>see</i> EL15-85 in Section I above)
7	FCA9 Results Filing (ER15-1137)	Aug 19	FERC issues tolling order affording it additional time to consider UWUA <i>FCA9 Results Order</i> rehearing request
7	FCA1 Results Remand Proceeding (ER08-633)	Aug 17 Sep 2	Bridgeport Energy submits reply brief ISO answers Bridgeport Energy reply brief

III. Market Rule and Information Policy Changes, Interpretations and Waiver Requests

* 9	Reactive Capability Auditing Revisions (ER15-2628)	Sep 9	ISO and NEPOOL jointly file changes; comment date Sep 30
* 9	FCM ARA Sloped Demand Curve Changes (ER15-2404)	Aug 10 Aug 18-31 Aug 31 Sep 9	ISO and NEPOOL jointly file changes NRG, Entergy, Eversource, Dominion intervene NEPGA submits comments supporting filing ISO answers NEPGA comments
9	Jump Ball Filing: Winter Reliability Program (ER15-2208)	Aug 19 Aug 20	ISO answers pleadings and comments NEPOOL answers pleadings and comments

10	Waiver Request: FCM Interconnection Deposit Qualification Deadline (Bellingham) (ER15-1934)	Sep 1	FERC grants requested waiver
11	IMM FCM Mitigation Package (ER15-1650)	Aug 19	NEPOOL submits comments supporting ISO compliance filing
11	DNE Dispatch Changes (ER15-1509)	Aug 21	ISO submits compliance filing; comment date Sep 11

IV. OATT Amendments / TOAs / Coordination Agreements

13	ISO <i>Order 676-H</i> Compliance: Additional Schedule 24 Revisions (ER15-519)	Aug 7 Aug 12	NEPOOL files comments supporting changes ISO submits correction to additional compliance filing; comment date Sep 2
14	TOs <i>Order 676-H</i> Compliance: Additional OATT Revisions (ER15-517)	Aug 14	CSC submits errata to Jul 16 additional compliance filing; comment date Sep 4

V. Financial Assurance/Billing Policy Amendments

No Activity to Report

VI. Schedule 20/21/22/23 Changes

* 16	Schedule 21-NEP: National Grid/Old Wardour SGIA (ER15-2599)	Sep 2	National Grid submits amended SGIA with Old Wardour; comment date Sep 23
* 16	SGIA: National Grid/Vuelta (ER15-2598)	Sep 2	National Grid submits amended SGIA with Vuelta Solar; comment date Sep 23
* 16	Schedule 20A-EM: Talen Energy Marketing Updates (ER15-2578)	Aug 31	Emera Maine submits revised Schedule 20A-EM to reflect Talen Energy Marketing transaction and name change
16	Schedule 23: GMP SGIA (ER15-2289)	Aug 24	FERC accepts SGIA, effective Jun 22
16	Opinion 531-A Compliance Filing: CTMEEC (ER15-584)	Aug 7 Sep 8	FERC rejects compliance filing; directs revised compliance be filed by Sep 7 CTMEEC submits revised compliance filing; comment date Sep 29
17	Schedule 21-NSTAR Annual Informational Filing (ER09-1243; ER07-549)	Aug 14	NSTAR submits updated informational filing correcting certain outdated tax information included in Jun 1 filing

VII. NEPOOL Agreement/Participants Agreement Amendments

* 17	AR Provider Amendments (ER15-2523)	Aug 25	NEPOOL and ISO jointly file amendments to the NEPOOL Agreement and Participants Agreement to revise the definition of AR Provider and create a Large Renewable Generation Group Seat; comment date Sep 15
------	------------------------------------	--------	---

VIII. Regional Reports

* 17	Capital Projects Report - 2015 Q2 (ER15-2443)	Aug 13 Aug 19-20 Aug 27	ISO files Report NEPOOL, Entergy intervene NEPOOL files comments
* 18	ISO-NE FERC Form 3Q (2015/Q2) (not docketed)	Aug 24	ISO submits quarterly financial report for 2015 Q2

IX. Membership Filings

* 18	September 2015 Membership Filing (ER15-2584)	Aug 31	Memberships: Green Development (d/b/a Wind Energy Development); Johnston Clean Power, UIL Distributed Resources; Uncia Energy; Termination: CSG; comment date Sep 21
18	August 2015 Membership Filing (ER15-2339)	Aug 28	FERC accepts AmericaWide Energy; CLEAResult Consulting; Guzman Energy; and Harborside Energy of Massachusetts memberships, effective Aug 1

X. Misc. - ERO Rules, Filings; Reliability Standards

18	FFT Report: August 2015 (NP15-35)	Aug 31	NERC files report
18	Revised Reliability Standards: PRC-004-5; PRC-010-2 (RD15-5)	Aug 7	Peak Reliability files comments
19	NOPR: Revised TOP and IRO Reliability Standards (RM15-16)	Aug 18-24	Parties file comments, including joint comments by ISO-NE, IESO, MISO, NYISO, PJM and SPP, and individual comments by Dominion, EEI, ERCOT, and NERC
19	NOPR: Revised CIP Reliability Standards (RM15-14)	Aug 25	Power Company of New Mexico and Texas New Mexico Power file joint comments
20	Revised Reliability Standards: Transition to "Remedial Action Scheme", PRC-010-1, EOP-011-1 (RM15-13, RM15-12; RM15-7)	Aug 20-24	NERC, EEI, ITC, Peak Reliability, TAPS, Idaho Power Company file comments
20	NOPR: New Reliability Standard: TPL-007-1 (RM15-11)	Aug 17 Aug 20 Aug 31-Sep 1	NERC files notice that NERC appeal process with respect to TPL-007-1 completed, appeal denied FERC issues notice permitting comments on appeal decision on or before Sep 10 Parties file comments on appeal
21	<i>Order 810</i> : Revised Reliability Standard: BAL-001-2 (RM14-10)	Sep 1	FERC denies Powerex request for clarification or reh'g of <i>Order 810</i>
23	Removal of LSEs from Compliance Registry (RR15-4)	Aug 17	APPA, NRECA, TAPS file joint comments; Dominion files individual comments
23	Revised Regional Delegation Agreements (RR15-12)	Aug 10-21	NERC, the Western Interconnection Regional Advisory Board, Snohomish, Avista file answers
* 23	E. Morris v. NERC/SERC (EL15-93)	Aug 21 Sep 10	Morris files complaint NERC/SERC answer Complaint

XI. Misc. - of Regional Interest

* 24	CPV Towantic LGIA Cancellation (ER15-2605)	Sep 3	ISO requests cancellation of superseded CPV Towantic LGIA; comment date Sep 29
* 25	E&P Agreement Termination: CMP/Atlantic Wind (ER15-2603)	Sep 2	CMP files to terminate E&P Agreement with Atlantic Wind; comment date Sep 23
* 25	Construction Agreement: MEPCO/Number Nine Wind Farm (ER15-2451)	Aug 14	MEPCO files Construction Agreement with Number Nine
25	Study Agreement Termination: Eversource/Brookfield (ER15-2218)	Aug 13	FERC accepts notice of termination
25	E&P Agreement: MEPCO/Number Nine Wind Farm (ER15-2060)	Aug 26	FERC accepts Amended and Second Restated E&P Agreement, effective Jun 29, 2015

XII. Misc. - Administrative & Rulemaking Proceedings

- | | | | |
|----|---|---------|--|
| 27 | AWEA Petition for LGIA/LGIP Rulemaking (RM15-21) | Sep 8-9 | More than 30 sets of comments filed on AWEA Petition |
| 28 | <i>Order 812</i> : Revisions to Public Utility Filing Requirements (RM15-3) | Aug 17 | Dominion requests clarification and/or reh'g of <i>Order 812</i> |

XIII. Natural Gas Proceedings

- | | | | |
|----|---|------------------|--|
| 30 | <i>Order 809</i> : Coordination of the Scheduling Processes of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines and Public Utilities (RM14-2) | Aug 20
Aug 31 | Natural Gas Supply Association submits initial comments on proposed default recall rights for capacity release transactions
American Gas Assoc., the American Public Gas Assoc., and the Interstate Natural Gas Assoc. of America submit joint reply comments |
| 32 | Enforcement Actions: BP (IN13-15) | Aug 13 | Judge Cintron issues <i>Initial BP Decision</i> finding BP violated the FERC's regulations and section 4A of the Natural Gas Act and certifies decision and record to the Commission |

XIV. State Proceedings & Federal Legislative Proceedings*No Activity to Report***XV. Federal Courts**

- | | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| 34 | Base ROE Complaints (2012 and 2014) (15-1212) | Aug 14
Aug 20 | NETOs file unopposed motion to hold case in abeyance pending final FERC action on 2012 and 2014 ROE Complaints
Court grants NETOs' motion to hold case in abeyance |
| 34 | <i>Order 1000</i> Compliance Filings (15-1139**) | Aug 17 | Petitioners file unopposed proposed briefing format and schedule |
| 34 | Base ROE Complaint (2011) (15-1118) | Aug 10 | Petitioners file unopposed proposed briefing format and schedule |
| 34 | FCM Administrative Pricing Rules Complaint (15-1071**) | Aug 20 | NEPGA files abeyance status report and requests that case continue to be held in abeyance |
| 35 | Demand Curve Changes (15-1070**) | Aug 5 | Court issues briefing schedule |
| 35 | FCA8 Results (14-1244, 14-1246 (consolidated)) | Sep 4 | State Petitioners and Public Citizen file briefs |
| 36 | 2013/14 Winter Reliability Program (14-1104, 14-1105, 14-1103 (consolidated)) | Aug 27 | Court issues order allocating 15 minutes of oral argument time to both Petitioner and Respondent |
| 36 | Orders 745 and 745-A (FERC v. EPSA, Supreme Court, 14-840 and 14-841) | Aug 31
Sep 1
Sep 4
Sep 8 | Midwest Load-Serving Entities and EPSA submit amicus curiae briefs
CES and Dr. Silkman submit amicus curiae brief
NC PUC submits amicus curiae brief
NEI/America's Natural Gas Alliance, Robert L. Borlick, et al. submit amicus curiae briefs |

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: NEPOOL Participants Committee Member and Alternates

FROM: Patrick M. Gerity, NEPOOL Counsel

DATE: September 10, 2015

RE: Status Report on Current Regional Wholesale Power and Transmission Arrangements Pending Before the Regulators, Legislatures, and Courts

We have summarized below the status of key ongoing proceedings relating to NEPOOL matters before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”), state regulatory commissions, and the Federal Courts and legislatures through September 9, 2015. If you have questions, please contact us.¹

I. Complaints/Section 206 Proceedings
--

- **206 Proceeding: 2014/15 RNS Recovery of SeaLink Development Costs (EL15-85)**

On August 12, 2015, the FERC issued an order accepting the TOs’ July 31, 2014 informational rate filing but, in response to a protest by “Public Representatives”² (described in Section II below), instituted a Section 206 proceeding in Docket EL15-85 to examine whether the recovery by New Hampshire Transmission (“NHT”) of SeaLink project development costs through the RNS formula rate is just and reasonable.³ The FERC encouraged the parties to make every effort to settle their dispute before hearings are commenced, and will hold the hearings in abeyance pending the outcome of settlement judge procedures.⁴ Parties wishing to intervene must do so on or before September 2. Interventions were filed by ISO-NE, NEPOOL, CMP, CT OCC, CT PURA, Eversource, MA AG, MOPA, National Grid, NESCOE, RI PUC, UI, VT DPS, and VT Transco. The FERC-established refund effective date is August 19, 2015.⁵

Settlement Judge Proceedings. On August 19, Chief Judge Wager appointed Judge H. Peter Young as the Settlement Judge. On August 20, Judge Young issued an order scheduling a settlement conference for September 15, 2015. If there are questions on these proceedings, please contact Eric Runge (617-345-4735; ekrunge@daypitney.com).

- **NEPGA Peak Energy Rent (PER) Complaint (EL15-25)**

Rehearing remains pending of the FERC’s January 30 order denying NEPGA’s PER Complaint.⁶ As previously reported, the *PER Complaint Order* found that NEPGA had failed to meet its burden under Section 206 of the Federal Power Act to demonstrate that the existing ISO Tariff provisions were unjust and

¹ Capitalized terms used but not defined in this filing are intended to have the meanings given to such terms in the Second Restated New England Power Pool Agreement (the “Second Restated NEPOOL Agreement”), the Participants Agreement, or the ISO New England Inc. (“ISO” or “ISO-NE”) Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff (the “Tariff”).

² “Public Representatives” are the MA AG, CT OCC, CT PURA, the RI PUC, the Attorney General of the State of Rhode Island (“RI AG”), the Maine Public Advocate (“MOPA”) and the Vermont Department of Public Service (“VT DPS”).

³ *ISO New England Inc. Participating Transmission Owners Administrative Committee and New Hampshire Transmission, LLC*, 152 FERC ¶ 61,121 (Aug. 12, 2015).

⁴ *Id.* at P 20.

⁵ The notice of this proceeding was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on Aug. 19, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 160) p. 50,271.

⁶ *New England Power Generators Assoc., Inc. v. ISO New England Inc.*, 150 FERC ¶ 61,053 (Jan. 30, 2015) (“*PER Complaint Order*”), *reh’g requested*.

unreasonable.⁷ On March 2, NEPGA and Entergy challenged the *PER Complaint Order*. NEPGA argued the FERC should “reverse its finding ... that NEPGA did not satisfy its Section 206 burden in the Complaint with respect to the relief sought for Capacity Commitment Periods 5 through 8” and “clarify that the [FERC], not the complainant, carries the burden under Section 206 of establishing a just and reasonable “replacement” rate”. If rehearing is denied, NEPGA asked the FERC to clarify that it “did not intend to prejudice any future proceeding on the PER Adjustment issue by establishing a required evidentiary standard” in the *PER Complaint Order*. In its request, Entergy, adopting and incorporating NEPGA’s request, provided additional bases to support its request for rehearing of the *PER Complaint Order*. Entergy challenged further the FERC’s reliance on (i) the ISO’s assessment of the PER adjustment’s reliability impacts and, with respect to Capacity Commitment Periods 5-8, (ii) the stakeholder process considering changes to the PER rules. On April 1, 2015, the FERC issued a tolling order affording it additional time to consider NEPGA’s and Entergy’s rehearing requests, which remain pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Joe Fagan (202-218-3901; jfagan@daypitney.com) or Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

- **New Entry Pricing Rule Complaint (EL15-23)**

Exelon and Calpine’s request for rehearing of the FERC’s January 30 order denying the New Entry Pricing Rule Complaint⁸ remains pending. As previously reported, the *New Entry Pricing Rule Complaint Order* found that Exelon and Calpine had failed to show that the existing pricing rules governing lock-in capacity result in unjust, unreasonable or unduly discriminatory price suppression. In their rehearing request, Exelon and Calpine assert, among other things, that the *New Entry Pricing Rule Complaint Order* (i) did not provide a reasoned basis for finding that there is no artificial price suppression in post-entry FCAs; (ii) did not address Exelon/Calpine’s arguments regarding artificial price suppression in the entry FCA; and (iii) ignored arguments regarding the undue discrimination that results from the current Market Rules. On April 1, 2015, the FERC issued a tolling order affording it additional time to consider Exelon’s and Calpine’s rehearing request, which remains pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Dave Doot (860-275-0102; dt_doot@daypitney.com) or Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

- **NEPGA DR Capacity Complaint (EL15-21)**

NEPGA’s November 14, 2014 complaint remains pending before the FERC. As previously reported, the complaint requests that (i) Demand Response (“DR”) Capacity Resources be disqualified from FCA9 and (ii) the Tariff be revised to exclude DR from FCM participation going forward (as a result of *EPSA v. FERC*). Interventions were filed by AEP, Brookfield, Calpine, ConEd, CSG, Direct, Dominion, EEI, ELCON, Emera, EnergyConnect, EnerNOC, Entergy, Exelon, FirstEnergy, Maryland Public Service Commission (“MD PSC”), NextEra, NRG, PPL, and Wal-Mart stores. NEPOOL filed comments on November 26 asking the FERC to reject the NEPGA Complaint without prejudice to a complaint being resubmitted if and as appropriate following consideration of specifically-proposed changes to the Tariff within the Participant Processes. Eversource and UI jointly protested the complaint on December 3, requesting that the FERC either dismiss or hold the Complaint in abeyance. The ISO answered the Complaint on December 4. Also on December 4, Advanced Energy Management Alliance, NESCOE, Conn/RI,⁹ Enerwise, Environmental

⁷ NEPGA’s Dec. 3, 2014 complaint requested that the ISO be directed (i) to increase the daily PER Strike Price by \$250/MWh for Capacity Commitment Periods 5 through 8, and (ii) to eliminate the PER Adjustment for FCA9 and beyond, or, alternatively, to continue the \$250 per MWh increase in the PER Strike Price for FCA9. The changes proposed in the Complaint were considered but not supported by the Participants Committee at its Oct. 3, 2014 meeting.

⁸ The FERC stated that much of the complainants’ argument rested on the assertion that ISO-NE’s lock-in resource requirements differ from PJM’s. The FERC acknowledged that ISO-NE’s and PJM’s differing mechanics may yield different prices paid to existing resources, but the FERC was not persuaded that the difference itself renders ISO-NE’s rules unjust and unreasonable. *Exelon Corp. and Calpine Corp. v. ISO New England Inc.*, 150 FERC ¶ 61,067 at P 35 (Jan. 30, 2015) (“*New Entry Pricing Rule Complaint Order*”), *reh’g requested*.

⁹ “Conn/RI” is the Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (“CT PURA”), George Jepsen, Att’y Gen. for the State of Conn. (“CT AG”), the Conn. Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (“CT DEEP”), the Conn. Office of Consumer Counsel (“CT OCC”), and the Rhode Island Div. of Public Utilities and Carriers (“RI PUC”).

Advocates,¹⁰ NGrid, Public Systems, and the Sustainable FERC Project opposed the Complaint; EPSA and PSEG supported the Complaint; Genbright submitted comments. On December 15, CT PURA moved to lodge the December 15 DC Circuit Court order extending the stay of the mandate in *EPSA v. FERC*. On December 19, NEPGA answered the ISO response and the other pleadings submitted in response to its Complaint. On January 7, just as they had on December 23 in the FirstEnergy Complaint (*see* Section XI below), Environmental Advocates moved to lodge the US Solicitor General’s application for an extension of time in which to file a petition for writ of certiorari, the Supreme Court Clerk’s notice to the DC Circuit that the extension had been granted, and the DC Circuit’s order extending the stay of its mandate pending the Supreme Court’s final disposition of the writ of certiorari. As noted, this matter remains pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning these matters, please contact Dave Doot (860-275-0102; dtdoot@daypitney.com) or Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

- **206 Proceeding: Importers’ FCA Offers Review/Mitigation (EL14-99; ER15-117)**

As previously reported, the FERC initiated this proceeding, on September 16, 2014, pursuant to Section 206 of the Federal Power Act (“FPA”). The FERC directed the ISO to either revise its Tariff to provide for the review and potential mitigation of importers’ offers prior to each annual Forward Capacity Auction (“FCA”) or show cause why it should not be required to do so.¹¹ The FERC directed the ISO to submit those Tariff revisions or support for why Tariff revisions should not be required on or before October 16, 2014. September 24, 2014 was the refund effective date.¹² On October 16, the ISO submitted Tariff revisions in response to the Show Cause Order and Public Citizen requested that the FERC expand this proceeding (i) to determine whether the rates produced by FCA8 are just and reasonable and if not, to fix the just and reasonable rates to be charged; and (ii) to include in this proceeding “stakeholder reform and transparency”. On December 15, 2014, the FERC conditionally accepted, subject to two additional compliance filings, the ISO’s October 16 Tariff revisions.¹³ Each of the additional compliance filings have been filed and accepted.¹⁴ All remaining requests and protests, including those of Public Citizen, were rejected. Public Citizen requested rehearing of the *Imports Mitigation Order* on January 14, 2015 (ER15-117-003). On January 26, NEPGA answered Public Citizen’s request. On February 12, 2015, the FERC issued a tolling order affording it additional time to consider Public Citizen’s rehearing request, which remains pending before the FERC. Other than FERC action on the January Public Citizen rehearing request, this matter is concluded. If you have any questions concerning these matters, please contact Dave Doot (860-275-0102; dtdoot@daypitney.com), Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com), or Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

- **Base ROE Complaints (2012 and 2014) Consolidated (EL13-33 and EL14-86)**

As previously reported, the FERC, in response to second (EL13-33¹⁵) and third (EL14-86¹⁶) complaints regarding the TOs’ 11.14% return on equity (“Base ROE”), issued orders establishing trial-type,

¹⁰ “Environmental Advocates” are the Sustainable FERC Project, Sierra Club, Environmental Defense Fund, and Acadia Center.

¹¹ *ISO New England Inc.*, 148 FERC ¶ 61,201 (Sep. 16, 2014) (“September 16 Order”).

¹² The Sep. 17 notice of this proceeding was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on Sep. 24, 2014 (Vol. 79, No. 185) p. 57,075.

¹³ *ISO New England Inc.*, 149 FERC ¶ 61,227 (2014) (“Imports Mitigation Order”), *reh’g requested*.

¹⁴ The first compliance filing corrected an incorrect cross-reference in Section III.13.1.3.5.7 (Qualification Determination Notification for New Import Capacity Resources). The second compliance filing included tariff revisions “which allow importers to submit up to five price-quantity pairs, together with any necessary mitigation provisions to address the exercise of market power” for implementation in FCA10.

¹⁵ The 2012 Base ROE Complaint, filed by Environment Northeast (now known as Acadia Center), Greater Boston Real Estate Board, National Consumer Law Center, and the NEPOOL Industrial Customer Coalition (“NICC”, and together, the “2012 Complainants”), challenged the TOs’ 11.14% return on equity, and seeks a reduction of the Base ROE to 8.7%.

¹⁶ The 2014 Base ROE Complaint, filed July 31, 2014 by the Massachusetts Attorney General (“MA AG”), together with a group of State Advocates, Publicly Owned Entities, End Users, and End User Organizations (together, the “2014 ROE

evidentiary hearings and separate refund periods. The first, in EL13-33, was issued on June 19, 2014 and established a 15-month refund period of December 27, 2012 through March 27, 2014;¹⁷ the second, in EL14-86, was issued on November 24, 2014, established a 15-month refund period beginning July 31, 2014,¹⁸ and, because of “common issues of law and fact”, consolidated the two proceedings for purposes of hearing and decision, with the FERC finding it “appropriate for the parties to litigate a separate ROE for each refund period.”¹⁹ The TOs requested rehearing of both orders. On May 14, the FERC denied rehearing of both orders.²⁰ On July 13, the TOs appealed those order to the D Circuit Court of Appeals (see Section XIV below).

Hearings. The hearings in this mater began June 25, 2015 and were completed on July 2. Just prior to the commencement of the hearing, pursuant to an unopposed motion of the TOs, Judge Sterner adopted a proposed protective order to permit the exchange and use during hearing of certain confidential materials provided by Thomson Reuters. Joint Transcript Corrections and a Final Index of Exhibits were submitted on July 13, 2015. Judge Sterner adopted the transcript corrections on July 15. On July 23, the TOs filed a motion to lodge portion of testimony filed in the Southwestern Public Service Co. ROE proceeding (EL15-8) to show inconsistent positions of FERC Trial Staff. That motion to lodge was opposed by Complainant-Aligned Parties, EMCOS, and FERC Trial Staff on August 7 and denied by Trial Judge Sterner on August 13. On July 29, 2015, a Joint Procedural History was submitted, as were initial briefs by the Complainant-Aligned Parties, TOs, EMCOS and FERC Staff. On August 26, 2015, Reply Briefs were submitted by the Complainant-Aligned Parties, TOs, EMCOS and FERC Staff, as was a Joint List of Appearances. With all briefing completed, the parties await Judge Sterner’s initial decision, which is to be issued by December 30, 2015. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Joe Fagan (202-218-3901; jfagan@daypitney.com) or Eric Runge (617-345-4735; ekrunge@daypitney.com).

- **206 Investigation: FCM Performance Incentives (Compliance Proceedings) (EL14-52; ER14-2419)**

Rehearing remains pending of the FERC’s May 30, 2014 *PI Order*²¹ on the FCM PI Jump Ball Filing and its *October 2 Order*²² on the first compliance filing in response to the *PI Order*. As previously reported, the FERC instituted this proceeding, pursuant to Section 206 of the FPA, in its May 30 *PI Order* on the FCM Performance Incentives Jump Ball filing. In the *PI Order*, the FERC concluded that the ISO’s FCM payment design was “unjust and unreasonable, because it fails to provide adequate incentives for resource performance, thereby threatening reliable operation of the system and forcing consumers to pay for capacity without receiving commensurate reliability benefits.”²³ The FERC directed the ISO to submit “Tariff revisions reflecting a modified version of its [PFP] proposal and an increase in the Reserve Constraint Penalty

Complainants”), seeks to reduce the current 11.14% Base ROE to 8.84% (but in any case no more than 9.44%) and to cap the Combined ROE for all rate base components at 12.54%. 2014 ROE Complainants state that they submitted this Complaint seeking refund protection against payments based on a pre-incentives Base ROE of 11.14%, and a reduction in the Combined ROE, relief as yet not afforded through the prior ROE proceedings.

¹⁷ *Environment Northeast, et al. v. Bangor Hydro-Elec. Co., et al.*, 147 FERC ¶ 61,235 (June 19, 2014) (“2012 Base ROE Initial Order”), *reh’g denied*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,125 (May 14, 2015).

¹⁸ *Mass. Att’y Gen. et al. -v- Bangor Hydro et al.*, 149 FERC ¶ 61,156 (Nov. 24, 2014), *reh’g denied*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,125 (May 14, 2015).

¹⁹ *Id.* at P 27 (for the refund period covered by EL13-33 (i.e., Dec. 27, 2012 through Mar. 27, 2014), the ROE for that particular 15-month refund period should be based on the last six months of that period; the refund period in EL14-86 and for the prospective period, on the most recent financial data in the record).

²⁰ *Environment Northeast, et al. v. Bangor Hydro-Elec. Co., et al. and Mass. Att’y Gen. et al. -v- Bangor Hydro et al.*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,125 (May 14, 2015).

²¹ *ISO New England Inc. and New England Power Pool*, 147 FERC ¶ 61,172 (May 30, 2014) (“*PI Order*”), *clarif. and reh’g requested*.

²² *ISO New England Inc.*, 149 FERC ¶ 61,009 (Oct. 2, 2014) (“*October 2 Order*”), *reh’g requested*.

²³ *PI Order* at P 23.

Factors, consistent with NEPOOL’s proposal.”²⁴ The FERC-established refund effective date was June 9, 2014.²⁵ Requests for clarification and/or rehearing of the *PI Order* were filed by: NEPOOL, Connecticut and Rhode Island,²⁶ Dominion, MMWEC, Indicated Generators,²⁷ NEPGA, NextEra, Potomac Economics, and PSEG/NERG. On July 28, the FERC issued a tolling order affording it additional time to consider the rehearing requests, which remain pending before the FERC.

FCM PI Jump Ball Compliance Filing I (ER14-2419-001). On October 2, 2014, the FERC accepted in part, subject to condition, and rejected in part, the ISO’s July 14, 2014 compliance filing (“Compliance Filing I”) that, as previously reported, had been filed in response to directives in the *PI Order*. While accepting nearly all of the provisions proposed in Compliance Filing I, the *October 2 Order* rejected the ISO’s compliance proposal concerning improper price signals caused by binding intra-zonal transmission constraints.²⁸ The FERC found that an exemption was not necessary for resources on the export side of an intra-zonal transmission constraint during a Capacity Scarcity Condition and directed the ISO to submit a further compliance filing (since filed and accepted) to revise Market Rule Section 13.7 by removing the language that reflected that aspect of the ISO’s July 14 compliance proposal and restoring language in Sections III.13.7.2.2(a) and III.13.7.2.2(b) ISO-NE originally proposed by the ISO in its January 17 Filing. The Tariff sections accepted were accepted effective June 9, 2014, December 3, 2014, and June 1, 2018, as requested.²⁹ Connecticut/Rhode Island³⁰ and Public Systems³¹ requested rehearing of the *October 2 Order* on November 3, 2014. On December 3, 2014, the FERC issued a tolling order affording it additional time to consider the rehearing requests, which remain pending before the FERC.

If you have any questions related to these proceedings, please contact Dave Doot (860-275-0102; dtodoot@daypitney.com), Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com), or Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

- **206 Investigation: Consistency of ISO-NE (DA) Scheduling Practices with Natural Gas Scheduling Practices to be Adopted in Docket RM14-2 (EL14-23)**

As previously reported, on March 20, 2014, the FERC initiated this proceeding, pursuant to Section 206 of the FPA, to ensure that the ISO’s scheduling, particularly its Day-Ahead scheduling practices, correlate with any revisions to the natural gas scheduling practices to be ultimately adopted by the FERC in RM14-2 (*see* Section XIII below).³² Noting its concern about the lack of synchronization between the Day-Ahead scheduling practices of interstate natural gas pipelines and electricity markets, the FERC directed each ISO and RTO, including ISO-NE, within 90 days after publication of a Final Rule in Docket RM14-2 in the *Federal Register* (or, as discussed in Section XIII below, Thursday, July 23, 2015):

(1) to make a filing that proposes tariff changes to adjust the time at which the results of its day-ahead energy market and reliability unit commitment process (or equivalent) are

²⁴ *Id.* at P 1.

²⁵ The June 3 notice of this proceeding was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on June 9, 2014 (Vol. 79, No. 110) pp. 32,937-89.

²⁶ “Connecticut and Rhode Island” are: the CT PURA, CT OCC, CT AG, CT DEEP, the United Illuminating Company (“UI”) and the RI PUC.

²⁷ “Indicated Generators” are: Exelon Corp. (“Exelon”), EquiPower Resources Management, LLC (“EquiPower”), Essential Power, LLC (“Essential Power”), and Dynegy Marketing and Trade, LLC and Casco Bay Energy Company, LLC (together, “Dynegy”).

²⁸ *October 2 Order* at P 56.

²⁹ *October 2 Order* at P 1; Ordering Paragraph (A).

³⁰ “Connecticut/Rhode Island” are the CT PURA, CT AG, CT OCC, CT DEEP, and the RI PUC.

³¹ “Public Systems” are CMEEC, MMWEC, NHEC, and VEC.

³² *Cal. Indep. Sys. Op. Corp. et al.*, 146 FERC ¶ 61,202 (Mar. 20, 2014). The New England 206 proceeding was docketed as EL14-23.

posted to a time that is sufficiently in advance of the Timely and Evening Nomination Cycles, respectively, to allow gas-fired generators to procure natural gas supply and pipeline transportation capacity to serve their obligations, or (2) to show cause why such changes are not necessary. In their responses, each ISO and RTO must explain how its proposed scheduling modifications are sufficient for gas-fired generators to secure natural gas pipeline capacity prior to the Timely and Evening Nomination Cycles.³³

ISO Response to Show Cause Order. On July 23, the ISO filed its response. In that filing, the ISO described why changes to the time at which the results of the Day-Ahead Energy Market and RAA process are posted are not necessary in response to the FERC's rule making. Comments on the ISO's filing were due on or before August 18, 2015. No party submitted adverse comments on ISO-NE's filing. In comments submitted in each of the ISO/RTO proceedings, NRG requested that the FERC direct the ISOs/RTOs to set their Day-Ahead offer submission deadlines to a time after fixed-price gas has started trading (i.e., 10:30 a.m. EPT) and reduce their solve times (NRG protested the CAISO, MISO and SPP filings; supported PJM's and was silent with respect to the NYISO and ISO-NE filings specifically). The National Gas Supply Association ("NGSA") submitted general comments. And, since the last Report, late interventions were filed by EPSA, Entergy, INGAA, and the NY TOs. The FERC expects to issue a final order in this Section 206 proceeding by October 21, 2015 (or within 90 days of the filings required under the March 20 order). If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Dave Doot (860-275-0102; dt_doot@daypitney.com), Joe Fagan (202-218-3901; jfagan@daypitney.com), or Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

II. Rate, ICR, FCA, Cost Recovery Filings

- **FCA9 Results Correction: Holliston Resource SEMA Load Zone Location (ER15-2626)**

On September 8, the ISO filed a correction to the results of the ninth FCA ("FCA9"). In its FCA9 Results Filing (*see* ER15-1137 below), the ISO reported that the Holliston resource, a new 330 kW solar facility, was located in the NEMA Load Zone and cleared in the NEMA/Boston Capacity Zone. The Holliston resource, however, is electrically located in the SEMA Load Zone and SEMA/RI Capacity Zone. Accordingly, the ISO requested that the FERC accept the correction to the FCA9 results by changing location of the Holliston resource to the SEMA Load Zone and the SEMA/RI Capacity Zone. The ISO stated that the correction would have a *de minimis* impact on the FCA9 results, with the SEMA/RI Capacity Zone still having inadequate resources and subject to Inadequate Supply administrative pricing rules for FCA9. As a new SEMA/RI Capacity Zone resource, Holliston will receive the FCA9 Starting Price of \$17.728/kW-month. Comments on this filing are due on or before September 29. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com) or Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **2014/15 Power Year Transmission Rate Filing: Public Representatives' Protest (EL15-85; ER09-1532; RT04-2)**

On August 12, 2015, the FERC issued an order accepting the TOs' July 31, 2014 informational rate filing but separately instituting a Section 206 proceeding in Docket EL15-85 to examine whether NHT's recovery of SeaLink project development costs through the RNS formula rate is just and reasonable.³⁴ The FERC encouraged the parties to make every effort to settle their dispute before hearings are commenced, and will hold the hearings in abeyance pending the outcome of settlement judge procedures.³⁵ As previously reported, "Public

³³ *Id.* at P 19.

³⁴ *ISO New England Inc. Participating Transmission Owners Admin. Comm. and New Hampshire Transmission, LLC*, 152 FERC ¶ 61,121 (Aug. 12, 2015).

³⁵ *Id.* at P 20.

Representatives³⁶ filed, on April 28, 2015, a protest, in part, of the July 31, 2014 PTO AC rate filing identifying adjustments to regional transmission service charges under Section II of the ISO Tariff for the June 1, 2014 through May 31, 2015 period. Specifically, Public Representatives protested the Annual Transmission Revenue Requirements calculation and the resulting RNS rates to the extent they included planning costs for NHT's proposed "SeaLink" project, costs they asserted were contrary to the terms of the TOA and should be disallowed from RNS rate recovery. Public Representatives stated that the partial protest was filed in April 2015, rather than closer to the July 2014 informational filing, due to lengthy, but unsuccessful, discussions between the MA AG's office and NHT to resolve this dispute. Parties wishing to intervene must do so on or before September 2. The refund effective date is August 19, 2015.³⁷ Developments going forward with respect to the hearing and settlement judge proceedings will be reported on in Section I Above. If there are questions on this proceeding, please contact Eric Runge (617-345-4735; ekrunge@daypitney.com).

- **FCA9 Results Filing (ER15-1137)**

As previously reported, the FERC accepted, on June 18, the results of FCA9, effective June 27, 2015, as requested.³⁸ On July 20, 2015, the Utility Workers Union of America Local 464 and Robert Clark ("UWUA") requested rehearing of the *FCA9 Results Order*. On August 19, 2015, the FERC issued a tolling order affording it additional time to consider the UWUA request for clarification, which remains pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com) or Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **2015/16 Power Year Transmission Rate Filing (ER09-1532; RT04-2)**

On July 31, 2015, the Participating Transmission Owners ("PTOs") Administrative Committee ("PTO AC") submitted a filing identifying adjustments to regional transmission service charges under Section II of the ISO Tariff for the period June 1, 2015 through May 31, 2016. The filing reflected the charges to be assessed under annual transmission formula rates, reflecting actual 2014 cost data, Forecasted Annual Transmission Revenue Requirements associated with projected PTF additions for the 2015 Forecast Period, and the Annual True-up including associated interest. The PTO AC states that the annual updates results in a Pool "postage stamp" RNS Rate of \$98.70 /kW-year effective June 1, 2015, an increase of \$8.90 /kW-year from the charges that went into effect on June 1, 2014. In addition, the annual update to the Schedule 1 formula rate results in a charge of \$1.61 kW-year, a \$0.09/kW-year decrease over the Schedule 1 charge that last went into effect on June 1, 2014. This filing was reviewed at the July 14-15 RC/TC Summer Meeting. The filing will not be noticed for public comment. If there are questions on this proceeding, please contact Eric Runge (617-345-4735; ekrunge@daypitney.com).

- **FCA1 Results Remand Proceeding (ER08-633)**

As previously reported, the DC Circuit issued on December 23, 2011, a *per curiam* order³⁹ that PSEG's May 2010 petition for review be granted, remanding the FERC's orders in this proceeding⁴⁰ for further consideration. In particular, the FERC was directed to (i) determine whether PSEG's position (that it should receive the full (unprorated) floor price for all its resources that it could not prorate) would be an appropriate way to interpret the then-existing Market Rules and, if not, (ii) respond to PSEG's objections that

³⁶ "Public Representatives" are the MA AG, CT OCC, CT PURA, the RI PUC, the Attorney General of the State of Rhode Island ("RI AG"), the Maine Public Advocate ("MOPA") and the Vermont Department of Public Service ("VT DPS").

³⁷ The notice of this proceeding was published in the Fed. Reg. on Aug. 19, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 160) p. 50,271

³⁸ *ISO New England Inc.*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,226 (June 18, 2015) ("*FCA9 Results Filing*").

³⁹ *PSEG Energy Res. & Trade LLC and PSEG Power Conn. LLC v. FERC*, No. 10-1103, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 25659, (D.C. Cir. Dec. 23, 2011).

⁴⁰ *ISO New England Inc.*, 123 FERC ¶ 61,290 (2008); *reh'g denied*, 130 FERC ¶ 61,235 (2010), *remanded*, *PSEG Energy Res. & Trade LLC and PSEG Power Conn. LLC v. FERC*, No. 10-1103, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 25659, (D.C. Cir. Dec. 23, 2011).

any contrary result would result in “undue discrimination” and would be “inconsistent with the fundamental policy goals” of FCM.

On June 2, 2015, in a long-awaited order, the FERC reversed its prior determination and found that, given that the ISO had prohibited resources needed for reliability from prorating quantity based on its interpretation of the Proration Rule, it was appropriate to consider resettlements to those resources that were not able to prorate quantity.⁴¹ “[W]here resources needed for reliability were prohibited from prorating quantity under the Proration Rule, they should have received the full market clearing price for each megawatt offered.”⁴² Although the FERC found that the ISO reasonably interpreted the Proration Rule as allowing it to limit certain suppliers’ ability to prorate quantity, in order to maintain reliability, and the FERC disagrees with PSEG’s argument that it would be unduly discriminatory under the FPA to make unavailable to certain resources the option to choose quantity proration instead of price proration, the FERC found that resources prevented from prorating quantity must also receive “a just, reasonable, and not unduly discriminatory or preferential rate,” (i.e. the full clearing price for each megawatt offered).

Accordingly, the FERC established a briefing schedule to permit the parties to address issues relating to the amounts of such resettlements (i.e., the difference between a resource’s actual payment and what the payment would have been had proration of the resource not been rejected for reliability reasons), and the parties to which those payments should be charged and to whom they should be paid (taking into consideration any possible changes in ownership, retirements, or similar new circumstances of the resources in question).

In its initial brief filed on July 17, the ISO identified:

- the Connecticut resources that were unable to prorate quantity in FCA1, and the number of MWs for which each resource received a CSO;
- the resettlements due to each such entity, based on the difference between (1) the prorated price that the resources did receive (4.254/kW-mo.), and (2) the un-prorated capacity clearing price that the resources would have received absent price proration (4.50/kW-mo.), plus interest (total refunds with interest will total approximately \$20.4 million);
- the parties to whom the resettlements would be charged (those with Regional Network Load within Connecticut during that time) and paid (the resource’s Lead Market Participant during each month of FCA1); and
- the mechanism by which the ISO would make such resettlements.

The ISO did not identify any considerations that would render the resettlements inappropriate or difficult. For purposes of its brief, the ISO assumed a December 14, 2015 resettlement date. Initial briefs were also submitted by Bridgeport Energy, Dominion, and Bridgeport Energy. A reply brief was submitted on August 17 by Bridgeport Energy (requesting that payments be paid to the legal entity that owned the resource at the time of the FCA 1 Commitment Period or, if that legal entity no longer exists, to the successor in interest to ownership of the subject resource). On September 2, the ISO answered Bridgeport Energy’s reply brief, advocating for resettlement payments to the Lead Market Participant during the first Capacity Commitment Period. This matter is pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com) or Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

⁴¹ *ISO New England Inc.*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,196 (June 2, 2015) (“*FCA1 Remand Order*”).

⁴² *Id.* at P 14.

III. Market Rule and Information Policy Changes, Interpretations and Waiver Requests

- **Reactive Capability Auditing Revisions (ER15-2628)**

On September 9, the ISO and NEPOOL jointly filed changes to (1) add a new section III.1.5.3 to Market Rule 1 addressing reactive capability audits (in part in response to the proposed 2016 retirement of NPCC Directory #10); (2) add additional generation resource unit types to the provisions for real power audits; and (3) change the effective date for real power audits (from seven to one business day following notification of audit results). The Reactive Capability Auditing Revisions were supported by the Participants Committee at its August 7, 2015 meeting (Consent Agenda Item # 16). A December 1, 2015 effective date was requested. Comments on this filing are due on or before September 30. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

- **FCM ARA Sloped Demand Curve Changes (ER15-2404)**

On August 10, the ISO and NEPOOL jointly submitted Tariff revisions to the rules for FCM Annual Reconfiguration Auctions (“ARAs”) to reflect the use of a system-wide demand curve. The ARA Changes also make a number of other conforming and clean-up changes to the existing rules. These changes were supported by the Participants Committee at its August 7, 2015 meeting (Consent Agenda Item # 15). Comments on this filing were due on or before August 31. Interventions were filed by Dominion, Entergy, Eversource, and NRG. NEPGA submitted comments supporting the changes, but reiterating its request that the FERC confirm that it expects the ISO to file sloped zonal demand curves for effect in FCA10 (*see* NEPGA 206 Request, ER14-1639 below).⁴³ On September 9, the ISO answered NEPGA’s request, restating its position that “it would be neither practical nor wise to engage in an effort at this time to design and implement sloped zonal demand curves for FCA 10”. This matter is pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

- **CSO Terminations: Enerwise Global Technologies (ER15-2232)**

Pursuant to Market Rule 1 § 13.3.4(c), the ISO filed on July 21 to terminate CSOs for Resource #s 16700 and 37922 held by Project Sponsor Enerwise Global Technologies (“Enerwise”). The ISO indicated that, upon FERC acceptance of the filing, the ISO will draw down the applicable amount of financial assurance provided by Enerwise with respect to the CSOs and portions of the CSOs being terminated. NEPOOL filed a doc-less intervention on July 27. Comments on this filing are due on or before August 11, 2015; none were filed. This matter is pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **CSO Termination: Hampshire Council of Governments (ER15-2229)**

Also pursuant to Market Rule 1 § 13.3.4(c), the ISO filed on July 21 to terminate a CSO for Resource # 38110 held by Project Sponsor Hampshire Council of Governments. The ISO indicated that, upon FERC acceptance of the filing, the ISO will draw down the applicable amount of financial assurance provided by the Hampshire Council of Governments with respect to the CSO being terminated. NEPOOL filed a doc-less intervention on July 27. Comments on this filing are due on or before August 11, 2015; none were filed. This matter is pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **Jump Ball Filing: Winter Reliability Program (ER15-2208)**

On July 17, the ISO and NEPOOL submitted two alternative versions of Market Rule changes intended to establish a winter reliability program for winters 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18 -- the “NEPOOL Proposal” and the “ISO-NE Proposal”.

⁴³ *Motion for Clarification and Request to Direct Compliance of the New England Power Generators Association, Inc.*, Docket No. ER14-1639-002 (filed June 22, 2015).

Both Proposals are intended to address reliability challenges created by the region's increased reliance on natural gas-fueled generation and to be stop-gap measures until revised incentives for capacity resources (PFP) become fully effective in 2018. The NEPOOL Proposal is based on the design of the 2014/15 program, with three main components: (1) compensation for certain oil inventory that remains in New England following the end of each winter period; (2) compensation for unused liquefied natural gas ("LNG") contract volumes; and (3) a supplemental demand response ("DR") program. The ISO Proposal also includes the first two components of the NEPOOL Proposal, but eliminates the DR component, and provides compensation not only for fuel oil and LNG, but also for nuclear, hydro, biomass and coal-fired resources. The NEPOOL Proposal was supported by the Participants Committee at the June 25 session of the Summer Meeting; the ISO Proposal was not. The Proposals were submitted pursuant to "jump ball provision" of the Participants Agreement (Section 11.1.5). Both NEPOOL and the ISO requested a FERC order by Monday, September 14, 2015.

Protests and comments on the Jump Ball Filing were due on or before August 5, 2015. Pleadings and comments supporting the NEPOOL Proposal were filed by **NESCOE**, **CT PURA**, and **TransCanada**. **Essential Power** supported the NEPOOL Proposal, but requested that target fuel inventory be set at 15 days of continuous operation, the same target as for Winter 2014/15, asserting there is no basis for reducing that target to 10 days. **Entergy/NextEra/Dominion** supported the ISO Proposal. **Dynegy/Brayton Point** also supported the ISO Proposal in part, but requested that the ISO be directed to implement an eligible oil inventory limit of at least 15 days and to re-evaluate the volume of necessary fuel inventory prior to each winter season. Protesting both Proposals were **NEPGA/EPGA** (who also requested that ISO-NE be directed to amend the Tariff to define the formula for calculating the Winter Reliability Program payment rate) and **PSEG** (who requested that the FERC direct (i) the ISO and NEPOOL to propose market-based programs for winters 2016/17 and 2017/18; (ii) to the extent that the FERC favors the NEPOOL Proposal, the compensable inventory be increased to 15 days consistent with the previous year's program or in the alternative, require that the ISO confirm that 10 days of oil inventory, as proposed by NEPOOL, is sufficient to ensure regional fuel security for the winter in which the program applies; and (iii) To the extent the FERC favors the ISO Proposal, direct the ISO to demonstrate that expanded eligibility of resource types will result in sufficient incremental on-site inventory (above what might otherwise be available based upon market only signals) and that for the resources that participate in the oil program, only 10 days of oil inventory is sufficient to ensure fuel security for the region for the winter in which the program applies). In addition, interventions were filed by Brookfield, ConEd, Calpine, CT OCC, Emera, Exelon, Eversource, GDF Suez Energy North America, Noble Americas, NRG, UI, VT DPS.

On August 19, the ISO answered the pleadings and comments. On August 20, NEPOOL answered the Entergy/NextEra/Dominion, Essential Power, Dynegy/Brayton Point, PSEG, and NEPGA/EPGA pleadings. The NEPOOL answer emphasized that the NEPOOL Proposal, which seeks to minimize market interference, is just and reasonable as filed and is not a collateral attack on FERC authority. The NEPOOL answer also requested that the FERC deny requests that the end of winter inventory compensation cap be raised to 15 days and indicated that NEPOOL would not oppose an order to amend the Tariff to include either the Winter Reliability Program payment rate or the formula used to calculate that rate. This matter is pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Dave Doot (860-275-0102; dt_doot@daypitney.com), Joe Fagan (202-218-3901; jfagan@daypitney.com), or Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

- **Waiver Request: FCM Interconnection Deposit Qualification Deadline (Bellingham) (ER15-1934)**

On September 1, the FERC granted Northeast Energy Associates ("NEA") a one-time waiver of the FCM interconnection deposit qualification deadline, as requested.⁴⁴ As previously reported, NEA's \$50,000 interconnection deposit associated with its efforts to increase Bellingham's qualified capacity by approximately 25 MW was received by the ISO just before 9am the morning after FCA10's March 3 deadline for such deposits. In light of the missed deadline, the ISO indicated that it was not able under its Tariff to qualify NEA's increased capacity for participation in FCA10 and subsequently opposed NEA's waiver request. In the September 1 order, the FERC found that NEA's request satisfied the FERC's standards for waiver requests and granted the one-time request. Commissioner Moeller dissented, challenging the majority's differentiation analysis. Unless the

⁴⁴ *Northeast Energy Assoc., A Limited Partnership*, 152 FERC ¶ 61,175 (Sep. 1, 2015).

September 1 order is challenged, with any such challenges due on or before October 1, this matter will be concluded. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **IMM FCM Mitigation Package (ER15-1650)**

As previously reported, the FERC accepted in part, and rejected in part, revisions to the market power mitigation provisions in the FCM Market Rules (“IMM FCM Mitigation Package”).⁴⁵ The Package proposed to (i) establish a revised Pivotal Supplier Test (permitting the IMM to take into account both existing internal resources and import resources when assessing the competitiveness of supply and to conduct the Pivotal Supplier Test closer to the start of an FCA); (ii) increase, beginning with FCA10, the value below which existing resources that have chosen to be price takers in an FCA can opt to leave the auction (“Dynamic De-List Bid Threshold”), from \$3.94/kW-mo. to \$5.50/kW-mo. (with the value to be recalculated and reviewed with Participants not less than once every three years); and (iii) remove some of the flexibility in the auctions that is currently afforded to Market Participants submitting Static De-List Bids. In its *June 30 Order*, the FERC accepted the revised Pivotal Supplier Test, the increased Dynamic De-List Bid Threshold, the New Import Capacity Resource mitigation rules, and the clean-up changes proposed in the IMM FCM Mitigation Package. However, the FERC rejected the proposed changes to the Static De-List Bid rules, finding it “inconsistent with competitive market principles to prevent a capacity supplier without buyer-side market power from lowering its offer in the FCA or from withdrawing its Static De-List Bid during the post-review modification period, both actions that would tend to reduce FCA clearing prices.”⁴⁶ “Provided that a resource submits a Non-Price Retirement Request before the deadline for such a request,” the [FERC] found “no basis for precluding a supplier from making this decision during the Static De-List Bid finalization process.”⁴⁷ Accordingly, the ISO was directed to submit Tariff revisions removing the proposed Static De-List Bid rule changes on or before July 30.⁴⁸ Finally, with respect to the competitive entry exemption from buyer-side mitigation advocated by Champlain VT, the FERC found the issue beyond the scope of the proceeding and directed Champlain VT to pursue its concerns in the stakeholder process.⁴⁹ The accepted revisions were effective June 1, 2015, as requested. The *June 30 Order* was not challenged and is final and unappealable.

July 30 Compliance Filing. On July 30, the ISO submitted Tariff revisions that remove the changes to the Static De-List Bid rules. Those changes were unanimously supported by the Participants Committee via the August 7, 2015 Consent Agenda (Item No. 7). On August 19, NEPOOL filed comments supporting the compliance changes; no other comments were filed. This matter is pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

- **DNE Dispatch Changes (ER15-1509)**

As previously reported, the FERC accepted, in part, and rejected, in part, revisions to Market Rule 1, jointly submitted by the ISO and NEPOOL, to provide for the dispatch of certain wind and hydro Intermittent Power Resources using Do Not Exceed (“DNE”) Dispatch Points (“DNE Dispatch Changes”).⁵⁰ The accepted DNE Dispatch Changes will become effective April 16, 2016. In response to issues raised by RENEW and SunEdison (“Protestors”), the FERC found that the ISO did not sufficiently justify the blanket exclusion of DNE Dispatchable Generators from the regulation and reserves markets.⁵¹ Accordingly, the FERC directed the ISO “to

⁴⁵ *ISO New England Inc. and New England Power Pool Participants Comm.*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,270 (June 30, 2015) (“*June 30 Order*”).

⁴⁶ *Id.* at P 44.

⁴⁷ *Id.* at P 31.

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ *Id.* at P 64.

⁵⁰ *ISO New England Inc. and New England Power Pool Participants Comm.*, 152 FERC ¶ 61,065 (July 23, 2015) (“*DNE Dispatch Order*”).

⁵¹ *Id.* at P 25.

submit a compliance filing to remove the relevant tariff provisions. Furthermore, in recognition of the fact that, as RENEW explains, it is not currently economic for wind resources to participate in the frequency regulation market, we also encourage ISO-NE to work with its stakeholders to develop rules integrating intermittent resources into its markets.”⁵² The FERC also encouraged the ISO to work closely with its stakeholders on the issues it found not at issue in this proceeding or settled by the ISO (including implementation and timing issues, including data accuracy, transparency, and constraints to certain hydro resources).⁵³ Finally, the FERC directed the ISO to correct a typographical error identified by the FERC in Market Rule 1 Section 13.6.2.1.1.2.⁵⁴ Challenges, if any, to the *DNE Dispatch Order* will be due on or before August 24.

Compliance Filing. On August 21, the ISO submitted changes proposed in response to the *DNE Dispatch Order*. The changes were recommended for Participants Committee support by the Markets Committee and will be considered by the Participants Committee at its September 11 meeting (Consent Agenda Item No. 9). Comments on the compliance filing will also be due on September 11. If you have any questions concerning these matters, please contact Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

- **Demand Curve Changes (ER14-1639)**

As previously reported, the FERC denied rehearing of the *Demand Curve Order*,⁵⁵ but clarified (agreeing with Exelon and Entergy) that a resource that elects to utilize the renewables minimum offer price rule exemption should not also be allowed to utilize the new resource lock-in).⁵⁶ Accordingly, the FERC directed the ISO to submit, on or before March 2, 2015, a compliance filing clarifying that a resource may not utilize both the renewable resource exemption and the new resource price lock-in. That compliance filing was submitted on March 2, accepted on May 1, and became effective on May 2.⁵⁷ The petition for DC Circuit Court of Appeals review of the FERC’s Demand Curve orders, filed by NextEra, NRG and PSEG, remains pending before that Court (*see* Section XV below).

Informational Progress Report: On May 18, the ISO submitted a report to update the FERC on New England’s progress toward developing FCM zonal demand curves. Importantly, the ISO reported that improvements to the current FCM demand curve structure cannot be completed before FCA10, noting that from its perspective and despite efforts to date, the changes have “not yet achieved a design that reasonably satisfies reliability, market efficiency and pricing objectives with reasonable market power protections.” The ISO stated that it needs “additional time to address the complexities associated with the demand curve structure ... and commits to filing a further progress report no later than October 31, 2015.” In the remainder of the report, the ISO identified the three fundamental reasons that it believes make it imprudent to immediately adopt a new sloped zonal demand curve design without further analysis and stakeholder review, identified the four key factors for Demand Curve design, and noted reliability, price volatility, robustness, and market power concerns. The ISO concluded that “the best approach at this time is to maintain the current demand curve structure for the FCA 10 auction cycle and continue to analyze and discuss with stakeholders the development of robust zonal demand curve improvements that can be put in place in the future.”

NEPGA 206 Request. In response to the Informational Report and the announcement that the ISO does not intend to file sloped zonal demand curves, NEPGA filed on June 23 a request that the FERC “initiate a Section 206 proceeding on the ISO-NE Tariff and order ISO-NE to file the sloped zonal demand curves

⁵² *Id.*

⁵³ *Id.* at P 29; n. 75.

⁵⁴ *Id.* at PP 30-31.

⁵⁵ *ISO New England Inc. and New England Power Pool Participants Comm.*, 147 FERC ¶ 61,173 (May 30, 2014) (“*Demand Curve Order*”), *reh’g denied but clarif. granted*, 150 FERC ¶ 61,065 (Jan. 30, 2015).

⁵⁶ *ISO New England Inc. and New England Power Pool Participants Comm.*, 150 FERC ¶ 61,065, at P 27 (Jan. 30, 2015) (“*Demand Curve Clarification Order*”).

⁵⁷ The changes become effective with FCA10, and will not apply to the resources in FCA9, totaling 12.96 MW, that utilize both the renewable resource exemption and the price lock-in election.

developed by ISO-NE and NEPOOL stakeholders, and proposed by ISO-NE as recently as April 2015 (“Zonal Curves”), for effect in FCA 10, amended to eliminate an FCA clearing rule ISO-NE had proposed as part of its Zonal Curves design.” NEPGA asked that the ISO be compelled to make that filing within 30 days of that FERC order. The ISO answered and opposed NEPGA’s request on July 2. Comments supporting the NEPGA request were filed by EPSA on July 7. NEPOOL submitted comments on July 8 (taking no position on whether an order to implement sloped zonal demand curves generally is appropriate or justified, or whether implementation can be achieved in time for FCA10, but if such an order were to be issued, urging that any Market Rule changes be fully discussed, and voted by NEPOOL pursuant to a schedule that allows the NEPOOL stakeholder process to proceed to completion and account for the many interrelated issues associated with such Market Rule changes. NEPOOL urged the FERC to reject the NEPGA request that the FERC order a specific solution that NEPOOL voted and did not support). NEPGA’s motion remains pending before the FERC.

If you have any questions concerning these matters, please contact Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

- **Jump Ball Filing: FCM Performance Incentives (ER14-1050)**

Rehearing of the *FCM PI Order* remains pending. As previously reported, the ISO and NEPOOL submitted on January 17, 2014, two alternative versions of Market Rule changes intended to improve the operating performance of capacity resources in New England -- the “ISO-NE Proposal” and the “NEPOOL Proposal”. As explained above, on May 30, 2014, the FERC issued an order in response to the jump ball filing.⁵⁸ The FERC concluded that the existing Tariff, specifically the current FCM payment design, “is unjust and unreasonable, because it fails to provide adequate incentives for resource performance, thereby threatening reliable operation of the system and forcing consumers to pay for capacity without receiving commensurate reliability benefits” and instituted a proceeding under Section 206 of the FPA (*see* EL14-52 in Section I above). Concluding that neither the ISO-NE Proposal nor the NEPOOL Proposal, standing alone, had been shown to be just and reasonable, the FERC, drawing features from each Proposal, went on to direct the ISO to submit by July 14, 2014 Tariff revisions reflecting a modified version of the ISO-NE Proposal and an increase in the Reserve Constraint Penalty Factors, consistent with NEPOOL’s Proposal. Specifically, the compliance filing was to include (1) changes to implement ISO-NE’s proposed two-settlement capacity market design with certain modifications, and (2) changes to increase the RCPF values for Thirty-Minute Operating Reserves to \$1,000/MWh and for Ten-Minute Non-Spinning Operating Reserves to \$1,500/MWh. The FERC established a June 9, 2014 refund effective date. Requests for clarification and/or rehearing of the *PI Order* were filed by: NEPOOL, Connecticut and Rhode Island, Dominion, MMWEC, Indicated Generators, NEPGA, NextEra, Potomac Economics, and PSEG/NRG. On July 28, 2014, the FERC issued a tolling order affording it additional time to consider the requests for clarification and/or rehearing, which remain pending before the FERC.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Dave Doot (860-275-0102; dt_doot@daypitney.com), Harold Blinderman (860-275-0357; hblinderman@daypitney.com), Eric Runge (617-345-4735; ekrunge@daypitney.com) or Sebastian Lombardi (860-275-0663; slombardi@daypitney.com).

IV. OATT Amendments / TOAs / Coordination Agreements

- **Order 676-H Compliance: Revisions to Schedule 24 (ER15-519)**

As previously reported, the FERC conditionally accepted the ISO’s *Order 676-H* compliance filing, effective May 15, 2015,⁵⁹ but denied the ISO’s request for continued waiver of Version 003 NAESB Standards and of the standards relating to Network Integration Transmission Service (“NITS”) or Service Across Multiple

⁵⁸ *See PI Order.*

⁵⁹ *ISO New England Inc.*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,155 (May 19, 2015) (“*ISO Order 676-H Compliance Order*”).

Transmission Systems (“SAMTS”).⁶⁰ The *ISO Order 676-H Compliance Order* was not challenged and is final and unappealable.

Additional ISO Order 676-H Compliance Filing. On July 20, as corrected on August 12,⁶¹ the ISO filed revisions to Schedule 24 of the OATT to comply with the *ISO Order 676-H Compliance Order* (incorporating by reference all of the Version 003 NAESB standards, and excluding no standard). Those revisions were unanimously supported by the Participants Committee at its August 7 meeting (Consent Agenda Item No. 12). Comments on the July 30 compliance filing were due on or before August 10, 2015. Comments supporting the revisions were filed by NEPOOL on August 7. Comments on the errata filing were due September 2, 2015; none were filed. This matter is pending before the FERC. If you have any comments or concerns, please contact Eric Runge (617-345-4735; ekrunge@daypitney.com) or Kristin Sullivan (617-345-4657; kmsullivan@daypitney.com).

- **Order 676-H Compliance: PTOs, SSPs, CSC et al. (ER15-517)**

The FERC also conditionally accepted on May 19, 2015, the TOs’⁶² *Order 676-H* compliance filing.⁶³ As previously reported, the *TOs Order 676-H Compliance Order* denied requested waivers of certain transmission provider standards, dismissed requested waivers of reliability coordinator and balancing authority standards as unnecessary. In denying the Filing Parties’ requests for waiver of WEQ-000, WEQ-001, WEQ-002, WEQ-003, WEQ-004, WEQ-008, WEQ-011-1.2, WEQ-011-1.3, and WEQ-011-1.6, the FERC stated that the “Filing Parties are transmission providers, so the standards apply to them, and they are required to implement the standards once they perform the relevant business practices (even if they currently do not perform those practices).”⁶⁴ The May 19 order was not challenged and is final and unappealable.

Additional TOs Order 676-H Compliance Filing. On July 16, the TOs filed Tariff revisions to incorporate the complete set of Version 003 Business Practice Standards into their tariffs without modification and to remove references to waiver requests previously sought of the Version 003 NAESB standards. Changes were filed to OATT Schedules 18, 20A Common, Schedule 20A-NU, 21 Common, 21-FGE, 21-UES, 21-NEP, and 21-NU. Comments on the July 16 compliance filing are due on or before August 6, 2015. On August 14, CSC filed an errata to correct an error in Schedule 18, Attachment Z, WEQ-004, Version 003 Standard. No comments on the July 16 additional compliance filing or on CSC’s errata filing were filed. This matter is pending before the FERC. If you have any comments or concerns, please contact please contact Eric Runge (617-345-4735; ekrunge@daypitney.com) or Kristin Sullivan (617-345-4657; kmsullivan@daypitney.com).

- **Order 1000 Interregional Compliance Filings (ER13-1960; ER13-1957)**

As previously reported, the FERC conditionally accepted, subject to compliance filings made July 14, revisions to the ISO Tariff to comply with the interregional coordination and cost allocation requirements of *Orders 1000* and *1000-A* and (ii) an Amended and Restated Northeastern ISO/RTO Planning Coordination Protocol (“Protocol”).⁶⁵ The *Order 1000 Interregional Compliance Changes* included (i) revisions to Attachment

⁶⁰ If, however, the ISO continues to believe that renewed waiver of specific standards is warranted, it may file a subsequent request for a waiver detailing the circumstances that it believes warrant a waiver. *Id.* at n. 20.

⁶¹ The August 12 errata filing corrected citations to the following five WEQ Standards: WEQ-000, WEQ-001, WEQ-002, WEQ-003, and WEQ-013.

⁶² For purposes of this proceeding, the “TOs” are the Participating Transmission Owners (“PTOs”), the Schedule 20A Service Providers (“SSPs”), Cross-Sound Cable Company, LLC (“CSC”), New England Power Company (“NGrid”), Northeast Utilities Service Company (“NUSCO”), Unitil Energy Systems, Inc., Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company, and the ISO.

⁶³ *Participating Transmission Owners Admin. Comm.*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,154 (May 19, 2015) (“*TOs Order 676-H Compliance Order*”).

⁶⁴ *Id.* at P 32.

⁶⁵ *ISO New England Inc.*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,133 (May 14, 2015) (“*Order 1000 Interregional Compliance Filing Order*”).

K to add provisions describing the interregional coordination provisions included in the Amended Protocol, as well as adding other provisions facilitating the consideration of interregional solutions to regional needs; (ii) a new Schedule 15 reflecting the methodology for allocation among ISO-NE and NYISO of the costs of approved interregional transmission projects; (iii) revisions to Schedule 12 describing the regional cost allocation within New England of the costs of approved interregional transmission projects; and (iv) conforming changes to Tariff Section I.

Second Order 1000 Interregional Compliance Changes. On July 13, the ISO filed revisions to the ISO-NE Tariff and to the Protocol in response to the *Order 1000 Interregional Compliance Filing Order* (“Second Order 1000 Interregional Compliance Changes”). The Second Order 1000 Interregional Compliance Changes were supported by the Participants Committee at the June 25 session of the Summer Meeting. On August 3, NEPOOL filed comments summarizing that support. This matter is pending before the FERC. If you have any comments or concerns, please contact Eric Runge (617-345-4735; ekrunge@daypitney.com).

- **Order 1000 Compliance Filing (ER13-193; ER13-196)**

As previously noticed, the FERC issued, on March 19, 2015, its Order on Rehearing and Compliance⁶⁶ of the region’s *Order 1000* compliance filing.⁶⁷ A memo summarizing the 200-page order in more detail was circulated by NEPOOL Counsel on March 23 and posted on the NEPOOL website Litigation Report Updates page.

ISO Request for Clarification and/or Rehearing. On April 20, the ISO requested clarification and/or re-hearing of the *Order 1000 Compliance Rehearing Order*. Specifically, the ISO requested clarification (i) that the FERC’s concerns with the non-discriminatory applicability of the “hold harmless” clause contained in the Non-Incumbent Transmission Developer Operating Agreement (“NTDOA”) could be addressed by the inclusion of a similar clause in the Transmission Operating Agreement (“TOA”); and (ii) that no changes are required to comply with Regional Cost Allocation Principle 4 and that language providing that “the costs of any external impacts of New England regional projects will not be borne by New England customers” need not be removed from Schedule 15 of the OATT. On May 4, the TOs submitted comments supporting the ISO’s request. On May 15, the FERC issued a tolling order affording it additional time to consider the ISO’s request for rehearing, which remains pending before the FERC.

3rd Regional Order 1000 Compliance Filing. On May 18, the ISO and PTO AC jointly submitted revisions to Sections I and II of the ISO Tariff (-005) and to the TOA (-004) to comply with the Mar 19 order on the 2nd Regional *Order 1000* compliance filing. The compliance materials, which were not ready in time for NEPOOL consideration before the May 18 filing deadline, were considered and unanimously supported at the June 5 Participants Committee meeting. On June 5, the Participants Committee filed comments supporting the filing. On June 8, LS Power filed a protest, requesting that the FERC require the ISO to revise Attachment K Section 4.3(k) and the definition of Backstop Transmission Solution as described in its protest. The ISO answered the LS Power protest on June 18. LS Power answered the ISO answer on June 26. The 3rd regional *Order 1000* compliance filing remains pending before the FERC.

If you have any comments or concerns, please contact Eric Runge (617-345-4735; ekrunge@daypitney.com).

V. Financial Assurance/Billing Policy Amendments

No Activity to Report

⁶⁶ *ISO New England Inc.*, 150 FERC ¶ 61,209 (Mar. 19, 2015) (“*Order 1000 Compliance Rehearing Order*”), *clarif. and/or reh’g requested*.

⁶⁷ *ISO New England Inc.*, 143 FERC ¶ 61,150 (May 17, 2013) (“*Order 1000 Compliance Order*”), *order on reh’g* 150 FERC ¶ 61,209 (Mar. 19, 2015).

VI. Schedule 20/21/22/23 Changes

- **Schedule 21-NEP: National Grid/Old Wardour SGIA (ER15-2599)**

On September 2, National Grid filed an amended SGIA between itself and Old Wardour. The amended SGIA, with revisions to reflect changes in circumstances regarding the Milestones schedule, protective equipment to be installed, and estimated cost for equipment, addresses the interconnection of Wardour's 4.875 MW photovoltaic generating facility located in Spencer, Massachusetts. An August 5, 2015 effective date was requested. Comments on the amended SGIA are due on or before September 23. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **Schedule 21-NEP: National Grid/Vuelta Solar SGIA (ER15-2598)**

On September 2, National Grid filed an amended SGIA between itself and Vuelta Solar, LLC. The amended SGIA, with revisions to reflect changes in circumstances regarding the Milestones schedule, protective equipment to be installed, and estimated cost for equipment, addresses the interconnection of Vuelta's 4.875 MW photovoltaic generating facility located in East Brookfield, Massachusetts. An August 5, 2015 effective date was requested. Comments on the amended SGIA are due on or before September 23. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **Schedule 20A-EM: Talen Energy Marketing Updates (ER15-2578)**

On August 31, Emera Maine filed changes to Schedule 20A-EM to reflect the Talen Energy Marketing transaction and name change. An October 30, 2015 effective date was requested. Comments on this filing are due on or before September 21. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **Schedule 23: Green Mountain Power SGIA (ER15-2289)**

On August 24, the FERC accepted a non-conforming SGIA between Green Mountain Power ("GMP"), as both the Interconnection Customer and the Interconnecting Transmission Owner, and the ISO. The SGIA is non-conforming in that it contains certain deviations from Schedule 23's *pro forma* SGIA that accommodate GMP's dual status. The SGIA was accepted effective June 22, 2015, as requested. Unless the August 24 order is challenged, this proceeding will be concluded. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **Opinion 531-A Compliance Filing: CTMEEC (ER15-584)**

On August 7, the FERC rejected the Connecticut Transmission Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative's ("CTMEEC") changes to Attachment B to Schedule-21 CTMEEC to conform Schedule-21 CTMEEC to the holdings in *Opinions 531* and *531-A*.⁶⁸ The FERC found that tariff language concerning "aggregate ROE"⁶⁹ did not comply with FERC directives in *Opinion 531-A*, or the FERC's policy on transmission incentive ROE adders as it would have "allowed CTMEEC to average the ROE earned on its facilities under Schedule 21-CTMEEC, which would allow CTMEEC to earn an equity return on certain assets, for which incentive ROE adders have been granted, at a level that exceeds the zone of reasonableness produced by the DCF methodology—i.e., a return above the level that has been shown to be just and reasonable."⁷⁰ Accordingly, the FERC directed CTMEEC to submit, on or before September 7, a revised compliance filing with tariff provisions ensuring that CTMEEC does not recover an ROE of more than 11.74% on any transmission asset and that each incentive ROE adder granted to CTMEEC applies only to the facility or facilities for which it was granted. CTMEEC submitted its revised compliance filing on September 8. Comments, if any, on the revised compliance filings are due on or before September 29. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

⁶⁸ *ISO New England Inc.*, 152 FERC ¶ 61,115 (Aug. 7, 2015).

⁶⁹ "The Localized Incremental Return on Equity will be adjusted accordingly so that the aggregate ROE does not exceed the top of the range for the aggregate allowed ROE set forth by the Commission."

⁷⁰ *Id.* at P 10.

- **Schedule 21-NSTAR Annual Informational Filing (ER09-1243; ER07-549)**

On June 1, 2015, NSTAR submitted an informational filing containing the true-up of billings under Schedule 21-NSTAR for the period January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014. NSTAR stated that the filing complies with the requirements of Section 4 and Attachment D of Schedule 21-NSTAR, as well as the Settlement Agreement previously approved by the FERC.⁷¹ On June 30, 2015, NSTAR supplemented its June 1 annual informational filing with a “CWIP Supplement” in accordance with Section 4.1(i) and (ix) of Schedule 21-NSTAR as added and supplemented by Article 4.2 of the 2008 Settlement. The CWIP Supplement was provided primarily on a project-specific basis, and included NSTAR’s 2015 long-range construction forecast. On August 14, Eversource re-submitted the entire Informational Filing to correct certain outdated tax information contained in the June 1, 2015 Informational Filing, identified during the preparation of, and in order to be consistent with, the data used in the TOs’ July 31, 2015/2016 Power Year Transmission Rate Filing (ER09-1532; RT04-2) (*see* Section II above). The FERC will not notice any of these filings for public comment, and absent further activity, no further FERC action is expected. No comments have been filed on any of these NSTAR informational filings. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

VII. NEPOOL Agreement/Participants Agreement Amendments

- **AR Provider Amendments (ER15-2523)**

On August 25, NEPOOL and the ISO jointly filed amendments to the NEPOOL Agreement and the Participants Agreement that (i) revise the AR Provider definition to allow the AR Sector and the Participants Committee, together, to determine that a Participant has a Substantial Business Interest in Alternative Resources, sufficient to qualify the Participant as an AR Provider, (ii) create group representation in the AR Sector, similar to the group seat arrangement that currently exists in the Generation Sector, in which RGs with five MW or more of Renewable Generation Resources would be eligible and could voluntarily elect to participate; and (iii) implement a number of clean-up changes that update certain defined terms and remove references to arrangements no longer in effect. These amendments were approved by the Participants Committee by way of the 125th and 127th Agreements Amending the NEPOOL Agreement and Amendment Nos. 7 & 8 to the Participants Agreement. Comments on this filing are due on or before September 15, 2015. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

VIII. Regional Reports

- **Capital Projects Report - 2015 Q2 (ER15-2443)**

In a new matter since the last Report, the ISO filed on August 13 its Capital Projects Report and Unamortized Cost Schedule covering the second quarter (“Q2”) of calendar year 2015 (the “Report”). The ISO is required to file the Report under Section 205 of the FPA pursuant to Section IV.B.6.2 of the Tariff. Highlights include the following new projects: (i) Wind Integration Phase II/ DNE Dispatch (\$5.14 million); (ii) FCA10 (\$2.715 million); (iii) NERC CIP v5 Compliance (\$2.229 million); (iv) Business Continuity Plan Infrastructure Enhancements Phase III – Remote Desktop (\$726,800); (v) Zonal Load Forecast (\$680,000); (vi) IT Hardware & Software Asset Management (\$317,200); (vii) Internet Explorer v11 Upgrade (\$302,000); (viii) Web Content Management System (“CMS”) Enhancements 2015 (\$179,000); and (ix) Synchrophasor Initiatives (\$165,000). Projects reported to have had a significant change are: (i) Generator Dynamics Data Management (\$105,000 decrease); and (ii) due to resource constraints and higher priority work, 2015 capital budget resources will not be allocated to the Power System Modeling, VPN System Upgrade, or the Quarterly Release Projects. On August 27, NEPOOL filed comments supporting the filing. A doc-less intervention was filed by Entergy. This matter is pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Paul Belval (860-275-0381; pnbelval@daypitney.com) or Kristin Sullivan (617-345-4657; kmsullivan@daypitney.com).

⁷¹ *See NSTAR Elec. Co.*, 123 FERC ¶ 61,270 at P 5 (2008).

- **Opinion 531-A Refund Report: FG&E (EL11-66)**

On June 29, 2015, FG&E filed its refund report for its customers taking local service during the refund period in accordance with *Opinion 531-A*. Comments, if any, on this filing were due on or before July 20; none were filed and this matter is pending before the FERC. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **ISO-NE FERC Form 3Q (2015/Q2) (not docketed)**

On August 24, the ISO submitted its 2015/Q2 FERC Form 3Q (Quarterly financial report of electric utilities, licensees, and natural gas companies). FERC Form 3-Q is a quarterly regulatory requirement which supplements the annual FERC Form 1 financial reporting requirement. These filings are not noticed for comment.

IX. Membership Filings

- **September 2015 Membership Filing (ER15-2584)**

On August 31, NEPOOL requested that the FERC accept the membership of Green Development, LLC d/b/a Wind Energy Development, LLC (AR Sector, Small RG Group Member); Johnston Clean Power (Provisional Member); UIL Distributed Resources [Related Person of UI – Transmission Sector]; and Uncia Energy (Supplier Sector). Comments on this filing are due on or before September 21, 2015.

- **August 2015 Membership Filing (ER15-2339)**

On August 28, the FERC accepted the membership of AmericaWide Energy (Supplier Sector); CLEAResult Consulting (AR Sector, DG Sub-Sector); Guzman Energy (Supplier Sector); and Harborside Energy of Massachusetts (Supplier Sector).

X. Misc. - ERO Rules, Filings; Reliability Standards

Questions concerning any of the ERO Reliability Standards or related rule-making proceedings or filings can be directed to Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **FFT Report: August 2015 (NP15-35)**

NERC submitted on August 31, 2015 its Find, Fix, Track and Report (“FFT”) informational filing for the month of August 2015. The August FFT resolves 1 possible violation of a Reliability Standard that posed a risk minimal risk to bulk power system (“BPS”) reliability, but which has since been remediated.⁷² FFT filings are for information only and are not be noticed for public comment by the FERC.

- **Revised Reliability Standards: PRC-004-5; PRC-010-2 (RD15-5)**

On June 8, 2015, NERC filed for approval changes to PRC-004-5 (Protection System Misoperation Identification and Correction) and PRC-010-2 (Under Voltage Load Shedding). The proposed Reliability Standards address misoperation of undervoltage load shedding (“UVLS”) equipment and were developed as Phase 2 of NERC’s pending proposal to consolidate UVLS Program Reliability Standards. Comments on this filing were due on or before July 9, 2015; none were filed. On July 7, NERC proposed revisions to the Violation Risk Factors (“VRF”) for Requirements R1 through R6 of PRC-004-5 (as well as for PRC-004-3 and PRC-004-5). Comments on the July 7 filing were due on or before August 7, and one set was filed by Peak Reliability. This matter is pending before the FERC.

⁷² Only possible violations that pose a minimal risk to Bulk-Power System reliability are eligible for FFT treatment. See *N. Am. Elec. Reliability Corp.*, 138 FERC ¶ 61,193 (Mar. 15, 2012) at PP 46-56.

- **NOPR: Revised TOP and IRO Reliability Standards (RM15-16)**

On June 18, 2015, the FERC issued a NOPR proposing to approve changes reflected in the following Transmission Operations (“TOP”) and Interconnection Reliability Operations and Coordination (“IRO”) Reliability Standards:⁷³

- ▶ TOP-001-3 (Transmission Operations);
- ▶ TOP-002-4 (Operations Planning);
- ▶ TOP-003-3 (Operational Reliability Data);
- ▶ IRO-001-4 (Reliability Coordination – Responsibilities);
- ▶ IRO-002-4 (Reliability Coordination –Monitoring and Analysis);
- ▶ IRO-008-2 (Reliability Coordinator Operational Analyses and Real-time Assessments);
- ▶ IRO-010-2 (Reliability Coordinator Data Specification and Collection);
- ▶ IRO-014-3 (Coordination Among Reliability Coordinators); and
- ▶ IRO-017-1 (Outage Coordination).

NERC indicated that the TOP/IRO Standards, which supersede the changes submitted in RM13-15, -14, and -12, but concurrently withdrawn, include improvements over the currently effective TOP and IRO Reliability Standards in key areas such as: (1) operating within SOLs and IROLs; (2) outage coordination; (3) situational awareness; (4) improved clarity and content in foundational definitions; and (5) requirements for operational reliability data. NERC requested that the TOP/IRO Changes be approved as of the first day of the first calendar quarter that is 12 months after the date that the Standards are approved, with the exception of TOP-003-3 and proposed IRO-010-2, which were requested to be approved 3 months earlier. On May 12, NERC supplemented its March 18 filing by removing Load Serving Entities (“LSEs”) from the applicability of proposed Reliability Standard TOP-001-3 in light of the FERC’s order on NERC’s Risk-Based Registration (“RBR”) initiative.⁷⁴ Comments on this NOPR were due on or before August 24, 2015,⁷⁵ and more than 14 sets of comments were filed, including joint comments by ISO-NE, IESO, MISO, NYISO, PJM and SPP, and individual comments by Dominion, EEI, ERCOT, and NERC. The TOP/IRO NOPR is pending before the FERC.

- **NOPR: Revised Reliability Standards: CIP-003-6, CIP-004-6, CIP-006-6, CIP-007-6, CIP-009-6, CIP-010-2, CIP-011-2 (RM15-14)**

On July 16, 2015, the FERC issued a NOPR proposing to approve changes to seven CIP (“Critical Infrastructure Protection”) Reliability Standards to improve the cyber security protections required by the CIP Standards and address four directives from *Order 791* (the “Supply Chain Cyber Controls Changes”).⁷⁶ NERC stated that the Supply Chain Cyber Controls Changes (i) remove the “identify, assess, and correct” language from the 17 requirements in the CIP Version 5 Standards that included such language; (ii) require responsible entities to implement cyber security plans for assets containing low impact BES Cyber Systems; (iii) include specific requirements applicable to transient devices to further mitigate the security risks associated with such devices; and (iv) require entities to implement security controls for non-programmable components of communication networks at Control Centers with high or medium impact BES Cyber Systems. NERC requested that the Supply Chain Cyber Controls be approved, effective on **April 1, 2016**. Comments on the *Revised CIPs NOPR* are due on or before September 21, 2015.⁷⁷ Thus far, comments have been filed by Power Company of New Mexico and Texas New Mexico Power.

⁷³ *Transmission Operations Reliability Standards and Interconnection Reliability Operations and Coordination Reliability Standards*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,236 (May 14, 2015) (“*TOP/IRO NOPR*”).

⁷⁴ *N. Am. Elec. Reliability Corp.*, 150 FERC ¶ 61,213 (2015) (“*RBR Order*”).

⁷⁵ The *TPL/IRO NOPR* was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on June 24, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 121) pp. 36,280-36,293.

⁷⁶ *Revised Critical Infrastructure Protection Reliability Standards*, 152 FERC ¶ 61,054 (July 16, 2015) (“*Revised CIPs NOPR*”).

⁷⁷ The *Revised CIPs NOPR* was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on July 22, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 140) pp. 43,354-43,367.

- **Revised Reliability Standards: Transition to “Remedial Action Scheme”, PRC-010-1, EOP-011-1 (RM15-13, RM15-12; RM15-7)**

On June 18, the FERC issued a NOPR⁷⁸ proposing to approve three related NERC petitions that revise (i) the definition of “Remedial Action Scheme” and nearly 20 Reliability Standard to insert that term in place of the term “Special Protection System”, which are used interchangeably throughout the Reliability Standards (the “RAS Changes”) (RM15-13); (ii) PRC-010-1 (Undervoltage Load Shedding), a definition of “Undervoltage Load Shedding Program (UVLS Program)”, and associated VRFs and VSLs (together, the “UVLS Changes”) (RM15-12); and (iii) EOP-011-1 (Emergency Operations), a revised definition of “Energy Emergency”, and associated VRFs and VSLs (together, the “Emergency Operations Changes”) (RM15-7). Comments on this NOPR were due on or before August 24, 2015,⁷⁹ and were filed by NERC, EEI, ITC, Peak Reliability, TAPS, and the Idaho Power Company. This matter is pending before the FERC.

- **NOPR: New Reliability Standard: TPL-007-1 (RM15-11)**

On May 14, 2015, FERC issued a NOPR proposing to approve a new Reliability Standard -- TPL-007-1 (Geomagnetic Disturbance Operations) -- and one new definition (Geomagnetic Disturbance Vulnerability Assessment), associated VRFs and VSLs (together, the “GMD Operations Changes”).⁸⁰ In addition, the FERC proposes to direct NERC (i) to develop modifications to the benchmark GMD event definition set forth in TPL-007-1 Attachment 1 so that the definition is not based solely on spatially-averaged data and (ii) to submit a work plan, and subsequently one or more informational filings, that address specific GMD-related research areas. As previously reported, NERC stated that the GMD Operations Changes address the FERC’s directive in *Order 779* that NERC develop a Reliability Standard that requires owners and operators of the Bulk-Power System to conduct initial and on-going vulnerability assessments of the potential impact of benchmark geomagnetic disturbance events on the Bulk-Power System equipment and the Bulk-Power System as a whole.⁸¹ NERC requested the FERC approve a five-year phased implementation plan for compliance with TPL-007-1. Comments on this NOPR were due on or before July 27, 2015⁸² and were filed by over 20 parties, including ISO-NE/NYIOS/PJM/MISO/IESO, EEI, Exelon, and NERC. On August 17, NERC filed a notice that the appeal panel appointed under NERC’s process for Standards appeals had concluded NERC appeal proceedings by using a final decision finding that the objections of appellant Foundation for Resilient Societies, Inc. were afforded fair and equitable treatment during the TPL-007-1 development process. Comments on that panel’s decision are due on or before September 10. Thus far, four sets of comments were filed.

- **NOPR: Revised Reliability Standard: PRC-005-4 (RM15-9)**

On April 16, 2015, the FERC issued a NOPR proposing to approve changes to PRC-005-4 (Protection System, Automatic Reclosing, and Sudden Pressure Relaying Maintenance), one new (Sudden Pressure Relaying) and four revised definitions (Protection System Maintenance Program, Component Type, Component, and Countable Event), and the associated VRFs and VSLs (together, the “PRC-005 Changes”).⁸³ As previously reported, NERC stated that the PRC-005 Changes address FERC concerns expressed in the *Order 758* proceeding that NERC’s proposed interpretation of PRC-005-1 may not include all components that serve in some protective

⁷⁸ Revisions to Emergency Operations Reliability Standards; Revisions to Undervoltage Load Shedding Reliability Standards; Revisions to the Definition of “Remedial Action Scheme” and Related Reliability Standards, 151 FERC ¶ 61,230 (June 18, 2015).

⁷⁹ The NOPR was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on June 24, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 121) pp. 36,293-36,301.

⁸⁰ *Reliability Standard for Transmission System Planned Performance for Geomagnetic Disturbance Events*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,134 (May 14, 2015) (“TPL-007 NOPR”).

⁸¹ *Reliability Standards for Geomagnetic Disturbances*, Order No. 779, 143 FERC ¶ 61,147 (“Order 779”).

⁸² The TPL-007 NOPR was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on May 26, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 100) pp. 29,990-30,001.

⁸³ *Protection System, Automatic Reclosing, and Sudden Pressure Relaying Maintenance Reliability Standard*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,026 (Apr. 16, 2015) (“Protection System NOPR”).

capacity.⁸⁴ NERC requested that the PRC-005 Changes be approved, effective on the first day of the first calendar quarter following FERC approval. Comments on this NOPR were due on or before June 22, 2015⁸⁵ and were filed by: EEI, NERC, NRECA, Southern Company Services, and TVA. This matter is pending before the FERC.

- **New Reliability Standard: PRC-026-1 (RM15-8)**

On December 31, 2014, NERC filed for approval a new Standard, PRC-026-1 (Relay Performance During Stable Power Swings) and associated VRFs and VSLs (the “PRC-026 Standard”) in response to the FERC’s directive in *Order 733*⁸⁶ to develop a Reliability Standard addressing undesirable relay operation due to stable power swings. NERC requested that PRC-026 be approved, effective as follows: R1 on the first day of the first full calendar year that is 12 months after FERC approval; R2-R4 on the first day of the first full calendar year that is 36 months after FERC approval. As of the date of this Report, the FERC has not noticed a proposed rulemaking proceeding or otherwise invited public comment.

- **NOPR: Revised Reliability Standard: PRC-002-2 (RM15-4)**

On April 16, 2015, the FERC issued a NOPR proposing to approve changes to PRC-002-2 (Disturbance Monitoring and Reporting Requirements), associated VRFs and VSLs, and the retirement of PRC-002-1 (Define Regional Disturbance Monitoring and Reporting Requirements) and PRC-018-1 (Disturbance Monitoring Equipment Installation and Data Reporting) (together, the “PRC-002 Changes”).⁸⁷ As previously reported, NERC stated that the PRC-002 Changes address FERC concerns expressed in *Order 693*⁸⁸ with the “fill in the blank” aspects in PRC-002-1 and PRC-018-1.⁸⁹ NERC requested that the PRC-002 Changes be approved, effective on the first day of the first calendar quarter six months following FERC approval. Comments on this NOPR were due on or before June 22, 2015⁹⁰ and were filed by APPA, Bonneville, and NERC. NERC submitted reply comments on July 13. This matter is pending before the FERC.

- **Order 810: Revised Reliability Standard: BAL-001-2 (RM14-10)**

Also on April 16, the FERC approved changes to BAL-001-2 (Real Power Balancing Control Performance) (“BAL-001 Changes”).⁹¹ In addition, the FERC required NERC (i) to submit an informational filing addressing the impact of the proposed Reliability Standard on inadvertent interchange and unscheduled power flows and (ii) to revise the definition of Reporting ACE.⁹² As previously reported, the BAL-001 Changes add a frequency component to the measurement of a Balancing Authority’s Area Control Error (“ACE”) and

⁸⁴ *Interpretation of Protection System Reliability Standard*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 133 FERC ¶ 61,223 (2010) at P 11; *Interpretation of Protection System Reliability Standard*, Order No. 758, 138 FERC ¶ 61,094 (“*Order 758*”), *order on reh’g*, 139 FERC ¶ 61,227 (2012).

⁸⁵ The *Protection System* NOPR was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on Apr. 22, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 77) pp. 22,444-22,449.

⁸⁶ *Transmission Relay Loadability Reliability Standard*, Order No. 733, 130 FERC ¶ 61,221 (2010); *order on reh’g and clarif.*, Order No. 733-A, 134 FERC ¶ 61,127 (2011); *clarified*, Order No. 733-B, 136 FERC ¶ 61,185 (2011) (“*Order 733*”).

⁸⁷ *Disturbance Monitoring and Reporting Requirements Reliability Standard*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,042 (Apr. 16, 2015) (“*PRC-002 NOPR*”).

⁸⁸ *Mandatory Reliability Standards for the Bulk-Power System*, Order No. 693, 72 FR 16416, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,242, at PP 1131-1222, *order on reh’g*, Order No. 693-A, 120 FERC ¶ 61,053 (2007) (“*Order 693*”).

⁸⁹ *Interpretation of Protection System Reliability Standard*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 133 FERC ¶ 61,223 (2010) at P 11; *Interpretation of Protection System Reliability Standard*, Order No. 758, 138 FERC ¶ 61,094 (“*Order 758*”), *order on reh’g*, 139 FERC ¶ 61,227 (2012).

⁹⁰ The *PRC-002 NOPR* was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on Apr. 22, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 77) pp. 22,441-22,444.

⁹¹ *Real Power Balancing Control Performance Rel. Standard*, Order No. 810, 151 FERC ¶ 61,048 (“*Order 810*”), *clarification and/or reh’g denied*, 152 FERC ¶ 61,176 (Sep. 1, 2015).

⁹² *Id.* at P 20.

allow for the formation of “Regulation Reserve Sharing Groups.” The BAL-001 Changes will become effective June 1, 2016. On May 18, Powerex requested clarification or, in the alternative, rehearing of *Order 810*, requesting that the FERC (i) direct all Balancing Authorities in the Western Interconnection to disclose and publish their clock-minute ACE data no later than 30 days after the end of each month; and (ii) clarify that the informational filing should detail the extent to which unscheduled flows associated with BAA imbalances required curtailment of transmission schedules or other mitigation measures. On June 12, the FERC issued a tolling order affording it additional time to consider the Powerex request. On September 1, the FERC denied Powerex’s request for clarification or rehearing of *Order 810*,⁹³ concluding this matter.

- **NOPR: Revised Reliability Standard: MOD-001-2 (RM14-7)**

The MOD-001-2 NOPR remains pending before the FERC. On June 19, 2014, the FERC issued a NOPR proposing to approve changes to MOD-001-2 (Modeling, Data, and Analysis - Available Transmission System Capability) (“MOD Changes”) proposed by NERC. The MOD Changes replace, consolidate and improve upon the Existing MOD Standards in addressing the reliability issues associated with determinations of Available Transfer Capability (“ATC”) and Available Flowgate Capability (“AFC”). MOD-001-2 will replace the six Existing MOD Standards⁹⁴ to exclusively focus on the reliability aspects of ATC and AFC determinations. NERC requested that the revised MOD Standard be approved, and the Existing MOD Standards be retired, effective on the first day of the first calendar quarter that is 18 months after the date that the proposed Reliability Standard is approved by the FERC. NERC explained that the implementation period is intended to provide NAESB sufficient time to include in its WEQ Standards, prior to MOD-001-2’s effective date, those elements from the Existing MOD Standards, if any, that relate to commercial or business practices and are not included in proposed MOD-001-2. The FERC seeks comment from NAESB and others whether 18 months would provide adequate time for NAESB to develop related business practices associated with ATC calculations or whether additional time may be appropriate to better assure synchronization of the effective dates for the proposed Reliability Standard and related NAESB practices. The FERC also seeks further elaboration on specific actions NERC could take to assure synchronization of the effective dates. Comments on this NOPR were due August 25, 2014,⁹⁵ and were filed by NERC, Bonneville, Duke, MISO, and NAESB. On December 19, 2014, NAESB supplemented its comments with a report on its efforts to develop WEQ Business Practice Standards that will support and coordinate with the MOD Standards proposed in this proceeding. As noted above, the MOD-001-2 NOPR remains pending before the FERC.

- **NOPR: BAL-002-1a Interpretation Remand (RM13-6)**

This May 16, 2013 NOPR, which proposes to remand NERC’s proposed interpretation of BAL-002 (Disturbance Control Performance Reliability Standard) filed February 12, 2013 (which would prevent Registered Entities from shedding load to avoid possible violations of BAL-002), remains pending.⁹⁶ NERC asserted that the proposed interpretation clarifies that BAL-002-1 is intended to be read as an integrated whole and relies in part on information in the Compliance section of the Reliability Standard. Specifically, the proposed interpretation would clarify that: (1) a Disturbance that exceeds the most severe single Contingency, regardless if it is a simultaneous Contingency or non-simultaneous multiple Contingency, would be a reportable event, but would be excluded from compliance evaluation; (2) a pre-acknowledged Reserve Sharing Group would be treated in the same manner as an individual Balancing Authority; however, in a dynamically allocated Reserve Sharing Group, exclusions are only provided on a Balancing Authority member by member basis; and (3) an excludable Disturbance was an event with a magnitude greater than the magnitude of the most severe single Contingency. The FERC, however, proposes to remand the proposed interpretation because it believes the interpretation changes the requirements of the Reliability Standard, thereby exceeding the permissible scope for interpretations.

⁹³ *Real Power Balancing Control Performance Reliability Standard*, 152 FERC ¶ 61,176 (Sep. 1, 2015).

⁹⁴ The 6 existing MOD Standards to be replaced by MOD-001-2 are: MOD-001-1, MOD-004-1, MOD-008-1, MOD-028-2, MOD-029-1a and MOD-030-2.

⁹⁵ The MOD-001-2 NOPR was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on June 26, 2014, (Vol. 79, No. 123) pp. 36,269-36,273.

⁹⁶ *Electric Reliability Organization Interpretation of Specific Requirements of the Disturbance Control Performance Standard*, 143 FERC ¶ 61,138 (2013) (“BAL-002-1a Interpretation Remand NOPR”).

Comments on the *BAL-002-1a Interpretation Remand NOPR* were due on or before July 8, 2013,⁹⁷ and were filed by NERC, EEI, ISO/RTO Council, MISO, NC Balancing Area, Northwest Power Pool Balancing Authorities, NRECA, and WECC. This NOPR remains pending before the FERC.

- **Compliance Filing: BES Exclusions for Local Network Configurations (RM12-6)**

On July 1, 2015, NERC submitted, pursuant to *Order 773*, a compliance filing identifying in detail the types of local network configurations that may be excluded from the bulk electric system (“BES”) following the implementation of the revised definition of the BES under Exclusion E3 of that definition. As of the date of this Report, the FERC has not noticed the compliance filing or otherwise invited public comment.

- **Removal of LSE Category from NERC Compliance Registry (RR15-4)**

On July 17, 2015, NERC filed for FERC approval the removal of the Load-Serving Entity (“LSE”) functional registration category from the NERC Compliance Registry (“NCR”), as well as additional limited changes to the NERC Rules of Procedure (“ROP”). Comments on this filing were due on or before August 17, 2015, and were filed jointly by APPA, NRECA, and TAPS, and individually by Dominion. This matter is pending before the FERC.

- **Revised Regional Delegation Agreements (RR15-12)**

On June 26, NERC requested approval of revised Regional Delegation Agreements (“RDAs”) with each of the eight Regional Entities, including NPCC, to be effective January 1, 2016, replacing the currently effective RDAs whose terms expire December 31, 2015. The revised RDAs will have five-year terms that automatically renew for another five-year term unless either party gives notice to terminate one year in advance of the end of the term. NERC stated that it and the Regional Entities believe the revised RDAs will enhance clarity and consistency in the operations of the ERO, and will also provide for flexibility without diminishing NERC’s oversight authority over the Regional Entities’ performance of their delegated functions. Comments on the RDA revisions were due on or before July 27. Joint comments were submitted by APPA/TAPS, the Large Public Power Council, Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County, WA (“Snohomish”), and Avista, Idaho Power, Portland General Electric, Puget Sound Energy, and the Tri-State Generation Association (with respect to the WECC Delegation Agreement. Answers were filed by NERC, the Western Interconnection Regional Advisory Board, Snohomish, and Avista. This matter is pending before the FERC.

- **E. Morris v. NERC/SERC (EL15-93)**

On August 21, Eric S. Morris (“Morris”) filed a formal complaint against NERC and SERC Reliability Corporation (“SERC”) (collectively, “Respondents”), alleging that the Respondents violated NERC’s Rules of Procedure Appendix 4B Sanction Guidelines in assessing a penalty on Entergy (*see* NP15-31, filed July 30, 2015). Morris alleges that the Respondents failed to follow the Sanction Guidelines by failing to clearly identify that an alternative frequency or duration was used in determining the penalty and providing no supporting rationale. Morris asks that the Notice of Penalty be withdrawn or denied, and resubmitted with either the clear identification of the alternative frequency and duration with rationale or with a settlement base amount “re-adjusted into the multi-million dollar range.” Interventions and comments on the protest were due on or before September 10. NERC and SERC answered the Complaint on September 10. No other interventions or comments were filed and this matter is pending before the FERC.

XI. Misc. - of Regional Interest

- **203 Application: CSC/AIA Energy (EC15-122)**

On June 1, the FERC authorized a transaction whereby Cross-Sound Cable (“CSC”) will become an indirect, wholly-owned subsidiary of AIA Energy North America LLC (“AIA Energy”) (and no longer a Related

⁹⁷ The *BAL-002-1a Interpretation Remand NOPR* was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on May 23, 2013 (Vol. 78, No. 99) pp. 30,245-30,810.

Person of Brookfield Energy Marketing).⁹⁸ CSC and AIA Energy must notify the FERC within 10 days of the date that the disposition of jurisdictional facilities has been consummated. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **203 Application: Iberdrola/CMP/ Emera (EC15-103)**

On June 2, the FERC authorized a transaction whereby UIL Holdings Corp (“UI”) will become an indirect, wholly-owned subsidiary of Iberdrola, S.A (and a Related Person of Central Maine Power Company, Iberdrola Renewables, LLC, and New York State Electric & Gas Corporation).⁹⁹ Iberdrola and UI must notify the FERC within 10 days of the date that the disposition of jurisdictional facilities has been consummated. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **FirstEnergy PJM DR Complaint (EL14-55)**

On May 23, 2014, the same day that DC Circuit vacated *Order 745* (see Section XV below), FirstEnergy filed a complaint against PJM requesting that the FERC require the “removal of all portions of the PJM Tariff allowing or requiring PJM to include demand response as suppliers to PJM’s capacity markets.” FirstEnergy also requested that the results of the PJM capacity auction due to be released that same day, to the extent it included and cleared demand response resources, be considered void and legally invalid. PJM’s response, and all comments and interventions were initially due on or before June 12, 2014. However, on June 11, the FERC extended that date to 30 days after the submission by FirstEnergy of an amended complaint. FirstEnergy filed its amended complaint on September 22, 2014.

Comments on the FirstEnergy Complaint were due October 22, 2014. More than 40 parties filed comments or responses to the FirstEnergy amended complaint. Many parties filed comments supporting the complaint (including Calpine, PSEG and PPL), while others opposed the complaint in its entirety (including Direct Energy and Enerwise). PJM’s response argued that the complaint failed to justify the market disruption that would result from recalculating past capacity auction results, PJM was instead more focused on minimizing “litigation risk.” A number of parties filed supporting comments in favor of removing demand response resources from the PJM tariff moving forward, but opposed to recalculating the results of past capacity auctions (including Exelon, the PJM IMM and NRG). Comments were also filed by National Grid and NYISO. A number of New England parties intervened, including NEPOOL (stressing that the FERC should not apply any ruling in this docket to the New England Market), Dominion, Duke Energy, Dynegy, Essential Power, Macquarie Energy, NEPGA, NESCOE, and NextEra. On November 14, FirstEnergy filed an answer to the answers, protests and comments submitted in response to its Complaint and Amended Complaint. Environmental Advocates¹⁰⁰ filed an answer to FirstEnergy’s answer on November 21. Since the last Report, CPower and Advanced Energy Management Alliance filed answers to the FirstEnergy and other answers and pleadings. On December 23, Environmental Advocates moved to lodge the US Solicitor General’s application for an extension of time in which to file a petition for writ of certiorari, the Supreme Court Clerk’s notice to the DC Circuit that the extension had been granted, and the DC Circuit’s order extending the stay of its mandate pending the Supreme Court’s final disposition of the writ of certiorari. This matter remains pending before the FERC. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Jamie Blackburn (jblackburn@daypitney.com; 202-218-3905) or Pat Gerity (pmgerity@daypitney.com; 860-275-0533).

- **CPV Towantic LGIA Cancellation (ER15-2605)**

On September 3, the ISO filed a notice of cancellation of an LGIA among the ISO, Eversource (CL&P) and CPV Towantic. The ISO indicated that the LGIA was superseded by a new three-party *pro forma* LGIA, which need not be filed, but instead will be reported going forward through the ISO’s EQRs. A

⁹⁸ *Cross-Sound Cable Co., LLC and AIA Energy North America, LLC*, 151 FERC ¶ 62,145 (June 1, 2015).

⁹⁹ *Iberdrola, S.A. et al.*, 151 FERC ¶ 62,148 (June 2, 2015).

¹⁰⁰ “Environmental Advocates” are Sustainable FERC Project, Natural Resources Defense Council (“NRDC”), Sierra Club, Environmental Defense Fund, Environmental Law and Policy Center, and Acadia Center (f/k/a Environment Northeast).

November 1, 2014 effective date was requested. Comments, if any, on the cancellation are due on or before September 24. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **E&P Agreement Termination: CMP/Atlantic Wind (ER15-2603)**

On September 2, CMP filed to terminate an Engineering and Procurement Agreement (“E&P Agreement”) between CMP and Atlantic Wind, LLC (“Atlantic Wind”). CMP reported that the MPUC issued an August 5, 2015 order denying CMP’s request for approval of the E&P Agreement. Based on the lack of required MPUC approval, CMP is not able to perform the contemplated engineering and procurement services. A November 1, 2015 effective date was requested. Comments, if any, on the cancellation are due on or before September 23. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **Construction Agreement: MEPCO/Number Nine Wind Farm (ER15-2451)**

On August 14, MEPCO filed a Construction Agreement between itself and Number Nine Wind Farm LLC (“Number Nine”) (designated as service agreement MEPCO-CA-1 under MEPCO’s eTariff files) related to the planned 250 MW wind farm in Aroostook County, Maine. The Construction Agreement sets forth the terms and conditions under which MEPCO will commence construction activities for the All Dielectric Self-Supporting (“ADSS”) fiber optic work that may be necessary for the project, but prior to the completion of applicable Interconnection Studies and the execution of a LGIA under Schedule 22 of the OATT. MEPCO requested that the Construction Agreement be accepted for filing as of August 13, 2015. Comments on this filing were due on or before September 4, 2015, and none were filed. This matter is pending before the FERC. If there are questions on these matters, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **Study Agreement Termination: Eversource/Brookfield (ER15-2218)**

On August 13, the FERC accepted a notice of termination filed by Eversource of a Study Agreement between Eversource (PSNH) and Brookfield Power US Asset Management LLC (“Brookfield”) (designated as service agreement SA-1 under PSNH’s eTariff files). As previously reported, the Agreement compensated PSNH for the costs incurred for the now completed study of the potential upgrades to the Coos Loop that could increase the Total Transfer Capability of the Coos Loop. The termination of the Agreement was accepted for filing as of July 1, 2015, as requested. Unless this August 13 order is challenged, this proceeding will be concluded. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **E&P Agreement: MEPCO/Number Nine Wind Farm (ER15-2060)**

On August 26, the FERC accepted an Amended and Restated Second E&P Agreement between MEPCO and Number Nine Wind Farm LLC (designated as service agreement MEPCO-EP-2 under MEPCO’s eTariff files). The E&P Agreement sets forth the terms and conditions under which MEPCO will provide engineering and procurement services to Number Nine in connection with Number Nine’s planned 250 MW wind farm in Aroostook County, Maine. The FERC accepted the E&P Agreement effective as of June 29, 2015, as requested. Unless the August 26 order is challenged, this proceeding will be concluded. If there are questions on this proceeding, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **EPC Agreement: Blue Sky West & Emera Maine (ER15-1459)**

As previously reported, Emera Maine filed on April 7 an executed Engineering, Procurement, and Construction Agreement (“EPC Agreement”) Agreement with Blue Sky West, LLC (“Blue Sky West”) to facilitate the interconnection of the Blue Sky West’s 191 MW wind farm in Bingham, Mayfield Township and Kingsbury Plantation, Maine. While the Blue Sky West facility will be located in CMP’s service territory, upgrades and modifications at Orrington Substation, in part owned by Emera Maine, are required and will be covered under the EPC Agreement. A March 6, 2015 effective date was requested. SunEdison filed a doc-less intervention. No comments on the EPC Agreement filing were submitted before the April 28

comment date. This matter remains pending before the FERC. If there are questions on this matter, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

- **Emera MPD OATT Changes (ER15-1429)**

On April 1, Emera Maine filed changes to the Open Access Transmission Tariff (“OATT”) for Maine Public District (“MPD OATT”), including to the rates, terms, and conditions set forth in MPD OATT Attachment J. Emera Maine, as successor to Maine Public Service Company (“Maine Public”), provides open access to Emera Maine’s transmission facilities in northern Maine (the “MPD Transmission System”) pursuant to the MPD OATT. The changes to the MPD OATT are needed to ensure that, in light of the filing by Emera of consolidated FERC Form 1 data (data comprising both the former Bangor Hydro and Maine Public systems), charges for service under the MPD OATT reflect only the costs of service over the MPD Transmission System. Emera Maine also proposed additional, limited changes to the MPD OATT. A June 1, 2015 effective date was requested. On April 9, the “Maine Customer Group”¹⁰¹ filed a motion to reject (“Motion to Reject”) the April 1 Filing, asserting the April 1 Filing was deficient because, rather than actual rates, it included proxy rates that MPD said would be replaced with 2014 Form 1 numbers when MPD’s 2014 Form 1 was available. On April 22, the Maine PUC and the Maine Customer Group protested the filing. The MPUC challenged three aspects of the filing: (i) the proposed increase of ROE from 9.75% to 10.20% based on anomalous economic conditions; (ii) the change from a measured loss factor calculation to a fixed loss factor; and (iii) the use of end-of-year account balances, rather than average 13-month account balances, for determination of facilities that are included in rate base. In addition to those aspects, the Maine Customer Group further challenged: (iv) inclusion of an out-of-period adjustment to rate base for forecasted transmission; (v) the proposed capital structure, which they assert is artificially distorted to accommodate a requirement resulting from the merger of Emera Maine’s predecessor companies; and (vi) the proposed new cost allocation scheme. On April 24, Emera Maine answered the Maine Customer Group’s Motion to Reject. On April 29, the Maine Customer Group answered Emera Maine’s April 24 answer. On May 1, Emera Maine filed an amendment and errata to its April 1 filing, in part reflecting 2014 FERC Form 1 data rather than estimated data. On May 7, Emera Maine answered the April 22 Maine PUC and MCG protests and the MCG’s April 29 answer. On May 8, MCG moved to compel revision to Emera’s May 1 filing, asserting that it was not filed in accordance with Emera’s OATT, and specifically the Protocols for Implementing and Reviewing Charges Established by the Attachment J Rate Formulas (the “Protocols”). MCG also protested the May 1 filing on May 22. On May 26, Emera Maine answered MCG’s May 8 Motion to Compel, which MCG answered the next day. This matter remains pending before the FERC.

- **MISO Methodology to Involuntarily Allocate Costs to Entities Outside Its Control Area (ER11-1844)**

On December 18, 2012, Judge Sterner issued his 374-page initial decision which, following hearings described in previous reports, found at its core that “it is unjust, unreasonable, and unduly discriminatory to allocate costs of Phase Angle Regulating Transformers (“PARs”) of the International Transmission Company (“ITC”) to NYISO and PJM”,¹⁰² which the Midwest ISO (“MISO”) and ITC proposed unilaterally to do (without the support of either PJM or NYISO) in its October 20, 2010 filing initiating this proceeding. For a summary of specific findings, please refer to any of the January to June 2013 Reports.

On January 17, 2013, ITC and MISO challenged the Initial Decision through their Brief on Exceptions. Briefs opposing exceptions were filed by the FERC Trial Staff, MISO TOs, NYISO, NY TOs, PJM, and the PJM TOs. On February 25, Joint Applicants moved to strike a portion of the PJM Brief Opposing Exceptions. On March 12, PJM answered Joint Applicants February 25 motion. MISO (now called “Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.”) moved to lodge a NYISO “Broader Regional Markets Informational Report” filed March 19, 2014 in ER08-1281 and a related January 16, 2014 “Ontario-

¹⁰¹ The “Maine Customer Group (“MCG”) is comprised of: the Maine Office of the Public Advocate (“MOPA”), Houlton Water Company (“Houlton”), Van Buren Light and Power District (“Van Buren”), and Eastern Maine Electric Cooperative, Inc. (“EMEC”).

¹⁰² *Midwest Indep. Trans. Sys. Op., Inc.*, 141 FERC ¶ 63,021 (Dec. 18, 2012) (“*MISO Initial Decision*”) at P 923.

Michigan Interface PAR Performance Evaluation Report” (“Evaluation Report”) prepared by MISO, IESO and PJM. Oppositions to that motion to lodge were filed by FERC Staff, NYISO, NY TOs, PJM, and PSEG. This matter remains pending before the FERC. If there are any questions on this matter, please contact Eric Runge (617-345-4735; ekrunge@daypitney.com).

- **FERC Enforcement Action: Staff Notices of Alleged Violations (IN__ - __)**

Etracom/M. Rosenberg. On July 27, 2015, the FERC issued a notice that Staff has preliminarily determined that Etracom LLC (“Etracom”) and Michael Rosenberg violated the FERC’s Anti-Manipulation Rule by engaging in manipulative virtual trading at the New Melones Intertie in the CAISO footprint during May 2011. Enforcement has preliminarily determined that Etracom’s trades were intended to artificially lower the day-ahead LMP to benefit Etracom’s congestion revenue rights positions sourced at the same location. During the period in question, Rosenberg was Etracom’s principal trader and majority owner.

Recall that Notices of Alleged Violations (“NoVs”) are issued only after the subject of an enforcement investigation has either responded, or had the opportunity to respond, to a preliminary findings letter detailing Staff’s conclusions regarding the subject’s conduct.¹⁰³ NoVs are designed to increase the transparency of Staff’s nonpublic investigations conducted under Part 1b of its regulations. A NoV does not confer a right on third parties to intervene in the investigation or any other right with respect to the investigation.

XII. Misc. - Administrative & Rulemaking Proceedings

- **Price Formation in RTO/ISO Energy & Ancillary Services Markets (AD14-14)**

On June 19, 2014, the FERC initiated a proceeding to evaluate price formation issues in RTO/ISO energy and ancillary services markets. The FERC held a series of staff workshops to facilitate a discussion on existing market rules and operational practices related to the use of uplift payments, offer price mitigation and offer price caps, scarcity and shortage pricing, and operator actions that affect price. The first workshop, held September 8, 2014, focused on the technical, operational and market issues that give rise to uplift payments and the levels of transparency. The second workshop, held October 28, 2014, focused on the technical, operational, and market issues related to offer price mitigation and offer price caps, and scarcity and shortage pricing in energy and ancillary services markets operated by RTOs/ISOs. In advance of the second workshop, FERC staff posted two reports, one on shortage pricing in RTO/ISO markets (<http://www.ferc.gov/legal/staff-reports/2014/AD14-14-pricingrto-iso-markets.pdf>), the other on energy offer mitigation in RTO/ISO markets (<http://www.ferc.gov/legal/staff-reports/2014/AD14-14-mitigation-rto-iso-markets.pdf>). The third and final workshop, held December 9, 2014, focused on RTO/ISO operator actions that affect price. Speaker materials from each of the workshops are posted in the FERC’s eLibrary.

Post-Technical Workshop Comments. On January 16, 2015, the FERC invited all interested to file post-technical workshop comments on any or all of the 12 questions listed in the attachment to its January 16 Notice. More than 40 sets of comments were submitted, including by: ISO-NE, APPA, Brookfield, Calpine, Direct Energy, EEI, EPSA, Exelon, and PSEG. The FERC web page for this issue is at <http://www.ferc.gov/industries/electric/indus-act/rto/energy-price-formation.asp>.

- **AWEA Petition for LGIA/LGIP Rulemaking (RM15-21)**

On June 19, the American Wind Energy Association (“AWEA”) petitioned the FERC to conduct a rulemaking to revise provisions of the FERC’s *pro forma* Large Generator Interconnection Procedures (“LGIP”) and *pro forma* Large Generator Interconnection Agreement (“LGIA”). AWEA states that various aspects of the LGIP and LGIA are out of date in comparison to current market conditions and do not ensure that the generation interconnection process is just, reasonable, and not unduly discriminatory or preferential. AWEA indicated that the rulemaking would address reforms to improve (i) certainty in the study and restudy

¹⁰³ See *Enforcement of Statutes, Regulations, and Orders*, 129 FERC ¶ 61,247 (Dec. 17, 2009), *order on requests for reh’g and clarification*, 134 FERC ¶ 61,054 (Jan. 24, 2011).

process, (ii) transparency in the interconnection process, (iii) certainty of network upgrade costs, and accountability in the interconnection process. Comments in response to this petition were due on or before September 8, 2015. More than 30 sets of comments were filed, including by ISO-NE, NESCOE, ISO/RTO Council (“IRC”), APPA/NRECA/Large Public Power Council, EEI, EPSA, NextEra, NRG, and PSEG. This matter is pending before the FERC.

- **Order 812: Revisions to Public Utility Filing Requirements (RM15-3)**

On July 16, the FERC issued *Order 812*¹⁰⁴ revising its regulation to eliminate the requirement for (i) RTOs/ISOs and EWGs to submit FERC-566 (Annual Report of a Utility’s 20 Largest Customers), (ii) for public utilities that have not made any reportable sales under FERC-566 in any of the three preceding years to submit a FERC-566, and (iii) public utilities, when submitting FERC-566, to identify individual residential customers by name and address. The *Order 812* changes will become effective October 6, 2015.¹⁰⁵ On August 17, Dominion Resources Services, Inc. (“Dominion”) requested clarification and/or rehearing of *Order 812* (seeking clarification that an entity that is both an EWG and QF is not required to file a FERC-566, or rehearing if not so clarified). The Dominion request is pending before the FERC, with FERC action required on or before September 18, 2015, or the Dominion request will be deemed denied.

- **NOPR: Third-Party Provision of Primary Frequency Response Service (RM15-2)**

On February 19, the FERC issued a NOPR proposing to foster competition in the sale of primary frequency response service¹⁰⁶ by permitting its sale at market-based rates by sellers with market-based rate authority for energy and capacity. The FERC stated that this NOPR is an extension of its policy reforms begun with *Order 784*¹⁰⁷ and anticipates the potential interest in purchase of primary frequency response service from third-parties as a result of a new reliability standard (BAL-003-1) that requires a Balancing Authority to maintain a minimum frequency response obligation. Comments on this NOPR were due on or before April 27, 2015¹⁰⁸ and were filed by nearly 20 parties. The NOPR is pending before the FERC.

- **NOPR: MBR Authorization Refinements (RM14-14)**

On June 19, the FERC issued a NOPR proposing to revise its current standards, and to streamline certain aspects of its filing requirements, for obtaining market-based rates (“MBR”) for sales of electric energy, capacity, and ancillary services.¹⁰⁹ In addition, the FERC clarified certain standards for obtaining and retaining MBR authority. Among other changes, the FERC proposes (i) to permit sellers in RTO/ISO markets with Commission-approved market monitoring and mitigation to include a statement that they are relying on such mitigation to address any potential horizontal market power concerns in lieu of submitting the indicative screens; (ii) to permit sellers to explain that their qualified capacity is fully committed in lieu of including indicative screens in their filings in order to satisfy the FERC’s horizontal market power tests and to submit a change in status filing when there is a net increase of 100 MW or more; (iii) to relieve sellers of their obligation to file quarterly land acquisition reports and of the obligation to provide information on sites for generation capacity development in market-based rate applications and triennial updated market power analyses; (iv) to require a change in status filing if there is a 100 MW increase in cumulative nameplate capacity added in any relevant geographic market; and (v) require corporate org charts with all MBR applications and notices of change in status. Comments on this

¹⁰⁴ *Revisions to Public Util. Filing Reqs.*, Order No. 812, 152 FERC ¶ 61,032 (July 16, 2015) (“*Order 812*”).

¹⁰⁵ *Order 812* was published in the Fed. Reg. on July 23, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 141) pp. 43,619-43,625.

¹⁰⁶ Primary frequency response service would be a reserve product that involves dedicating capacity on a generator or other resource for autonomous, automatic, and rapid action to change its output (within seconds) to rapidly dampen large changes in frequency.

¹⁰⁷ *Third-Party Provision of Ancillary Services; Accounting and Financial Reporting for New Electric Storage Technologies*, Order No. 784, 78 Fed. Reg. 46,178 (July 30, 2013), FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,349, at PP 6-7 (2013), *order on clarif.*, Order No. 784-A, 146 FERC ¶ 61,114 (2014) (“*Order 784*”).

¹⁰⁸ The NOPR was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on Feb. 26, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 38) pp. 10,426-10,432.

¹⁰⁹ *Refinements to Policies and Procedures for Market-Based Rates for Wholesale Sales of Elec. Energy, Capacity and Ancillary Svcs. by Public Utils.*, 147 FERC ¶ 61,232 (June 19, 2014) (“*MBR NOPR*”).

NOPR were due September 23, 2014.¹¹⁰ Over 25 parties filed comments and Berkshire Hathaway, Barrick Mines, and EPSA filed reply comments. This NOPR is pending before the FERC.

- **Order 807: Open Access and Priority Rights on ICIF (RM14-11)**

On March 19, the FERC issued *Order 807*,¹¹¹ which waives the Open Access Transmission Tariff (“OATT”) requirements of 18 CFR 35.28 (2013), the Open Access Same-Time Information System (“OASIS”) requirements of Part 37 of its regulations, 18 CFR 37 (2013), and the Standards of Conduct requirements of Part 358 of its regulations, 18 CFR 358 (2013), for any public utility that is subject to such requirements solely because it owns, controls, or operates Interconnection Customer’s Interconnection Facilities (“ICIF”),¹¹² in whole or in part, and sells electric energy from its Generating Facility. *Order 807* also finds that those seeking interconnection and transmission service over ICIF that are subject to the blanket waiver adopted in *Order 807* may follow procedures applicable to requests for interconnection and transmission service under sections 210, 211, and 212 of the FPA, which also allows the contractual flexibility for entities to reach mutually agreeable access solutions. *Order 807* establishes a modified rebuttable presumption for a 5-year safe harbor period to reduce risks to ICIF owners eligible for the blanket waiver during the critical early years of their projects. Finally, *Order 807* modifies several elements of the NOPR, including the entities eligible for the OATT waiver, the date on which the safe harbor begins, the rebuttable presumption that the ICIF owner should not be required to expand its facilities during the safe harbor, and the facilities covered by *Order 807*. *Order 807* will become effective June 30, 2015.¹¹³ Requests for rehearing and/or clarification of *Order 807* were filed on April 20 by APPA/TAPS and NRECA. On May 15, the FERC issued a tolling order affording it additional time to consider the requests for rehearing, which remain pending before the FERC.

- **Order 771: Availability of e-Tag Information to FERC Staff (RM11-12)**

Rehearing of portions of *Order 771* has been requested and remains pending. As previously reported, *Order 771*,¹¹⁴ issued December 20, 2012, granted the FERC access, on a non-public and ongoing basis, to the complete electronic tags (“e-Tags”) used to schedule the transmission of electric power interchange transactions in wholesale markets. *Order 771* requires e-Tag Authors (through their Agent Service) and Balancing Authorities (through their Authority Service) to take steps to ensure FERC access to the e-Tags covered by this Rule by designating the FERC as an addressee on the e-Tags. The FERC stated that the information made available under this Final Rule will bolster its market surveillance and analysis efforts by helping it detect and prevent market manipulation and anti-competitive behavior. In addition, *Order 771* requires e-Tag information be made available to RTO/ISOs and their Market Monitoring Units, upon request to e-Tag Authors and Authority Services, subject to appropriate confidentiality restrictions. *Order 771* became effective February 26, 2013.¹¹⁵ In response to requests for clarification and/or rehearing of *Order 771* filed by EEI/NRECA, Open Access Technology International, Inc., NRECA (separately), and Southern Companies (collectively, the “Rehearing Requests”), the FERC issued, on March 8, 2013, *Order 771-A*.¹¹⁶ *Order 771-A* addressed only those issues that needed to be answered on an expedited basis to allow affected entities to comply with the requirement to ensure FERC access in a timely manner to the e-Tags covered by *Order 771*.¹¹⁷ The FERC noted that it would issue an additional

¹¹⁰ The *MBR NOPR* was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on July 25, 2014 (Vol. 79, No. 143) pp. 43,536-43,572.

¹¹¹ *Open Access and Priority Rights on Interconnection Customer’s Interconnection Facilities*, Order No. 807, 150 FERC ¶ 61,211 (Mar. 19, 2015) (“*Order 807*”), *reh’g requested*.

¹¹² ICIF is the term used by the FERC in the NOPR to refer to “generator tie lines”.

¹¹³ *Order 807* was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on Apr. 1, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 62) pp. 17,654-17,682.

¹¹⁴ *Availability of E-Tag Info. to Comm’n Staff*, Order No. 771, 141 FERC ¶ 61,235 (Dec. 20, 2012) (“*Order 771*”), *order on reh’g and clarif.*, 142 FERC ¶ 61,181 (2013).

¹¹⁵ *Order 771* was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on Dec. 28, 2012 (Vol. 77, No. 249) pp. 76,367-76,380.

¹¹⁶ *Availability of E-Tag Info. to Comm’n Staff*, Order No. 771-A, 142 FERC ¶ 61,181 (Mar. 8, 2013) (“*Order 771-A*”).

¹¹⁷ *Order 771-A* clarified that: (1) Balancing Authorities and their Authority Services will have until 60 days after publication of this order to implement the validation requirements of *Order 771*; (2) validation of e-Tags means that the Sink Balancing Authority, through its Authority Service, must reject any e-Tags that do not correctly include the FERC in the CC

rehearing order, addressing the remaining issues raised on rehearing and clarification, which therefore remain pending before the FERC.

XIII. Natural Gas Proceedings

For further information on any of the natural gas proceedings, please contact Joe Fagan (202-218-3901; jfagan@daypitney.com), Jennifer Galiette (860-275-0338; jgaliette@daypitney.com) or Jamie Blackburn (202-218-3905; jblackburn@daypitney.com).

- **Inquiry Into Natural Gas Trading, and Proposal to Establish an Electronic Information and Trading Platform (AD14-19)**

On September 18, 2014, Commissioner Moeller convened a meeting to discuss issues related to how transactions are conducted on the natural gas system and potential transactional improvements to address the needs of electric generators for natural gas. The meeting included representatives/speakers from various sectors of the natural gas and electric industries (load, suppliers, marketers, exchanges, gas associations, and ISOs) and environmental interests. Representatives from NYISO and PJM were among the speakers on the electric side (ISO-NE was not present). A summary of that meeting is posted on the Litigation Updates & Reports webpage (http://nepool.com/uploads/Lit_Supp_AD14-19_20140918_Mtg_Summary.pdf). Written comments on issues discussed at the meeting, limited to 5 pages, were due on or before October 1, 2014. Comments were filed by more than 30 parties. There was no published activity in this proceeding since the last Report.

- **Order 809: Coordination of the Scheduling Processes of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines and Public Utilities (RM14-2)**

On April 16, the FERC issued *Order 809*,¹¹⁸ which changes the nationwide Timely Nomination Cycle nomination deadline for scheduling natural gas transportation from 11:30 a.m. Central Clock Time (CCT) to 1:00 p.m. CCT and revises the intraday nomination timeline, to include adding an additional intraday scheduling opportunity during the gas operating day (Gas Day). *Order 809* also modifies the scheduling practices used by interstate pipelines to schedule natural gas transportation service and provides additional contracting flexibility to firm natural gas transportation customers through the use of multi-party transportation contracts. *Order 809* DOES NOT change the start time of the nationwide natural Gas Day (which remains 9:00 a.m. CCT), as had been proposed in the underlying NOPR.¹¹⁹ *Order 809* established an implementation date of April 1, 2016.¹²⁰ On July 23, in response to *Order 809*, ISO-NE described why changes to the time at which the results of the Day-Ahead Energy Market and RAA process are posted are not necessary in response to the FERC's rule making. Comments on the ISO's filing were due on or before August 18, 2015 and no party submitted adverse comments on ISO-NE's filing (the ISO's response was filed in EL14-23; see Section I above).

Requests for rehearing and/or clarification of *Order 809* were filed by Desert Southwest Pipeline Stakeholders and the American Gas Association. On May 19, the Natural Gas Council asked the FERC to defer NAESB consideration of confirmation process improvements until "after the two industries have had sufficient

field; (3) the requirement for the FERC to be included in the CC field on the e-Tags applies only to e-Tags created on or after March 15, 2013; (4) the FERC will deem all e-Tag information made available to the FERC pursuant to *Order 771* as being submitted pursuant to a request for privileged and confidential treatment under 18 CFR 388.112; (5) the FERC is to be afforded access to the Intra-Balancing Authority e-Tags in the same manner as interchange e-Tags; and (6) the requirement on Balancing Authorities to ensure FERC access to e-Tags pertains to the Sink Balancing Authority and no other Balancing Authorities that may be listed on an e-Tag.

¹¹⁸ *Coordination of the Scheduling Processes of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines and Public Utilities*, Order No. 809, 150 FERC ¶ 61,049 (Apr. 16, 2015) ("*Order 809*").

¹¹⁹ *Coordination of the Scheduling Processes of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines and Public Utilities*, 146 FERC ¶ 61,201 (Mar. 20, 2014).

¹²⁰ *Order 809* was published in the *Fed. Reg.* on Apr. 24, 2015 (Vol. 80, No. 79) pp. 23,198-23,227.

time to implement and operate reliably under both the new gas scheduling timeline and changes to RTO/ISO dispatch schedules to conform with the newly-approved gas scheduling timeline.” On May 28, 2015 the American Gas Association, the American Public Gas Association, and the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America filed a request for the Commission to clarify the manner in which all pipelines should implement the standards on April 1, 2016, and a request for clarification relating to interpretations of recall rights under existing capacity release contracts in light of the transition from two to three intraday nomination cycles.

On July 31, 2015, the FERC issued an Order on Request for Clarification and Notice of Comment Procedures.¹²¹ The FERC explained that the new day-ahead nomination timelines will apply as of March 31, 2016 for those nominations that will become effective April 1, 2016. Furthermore, with respect to capacity releases, the new biddable release schedule will start at 9:00 a.m. CCT on March 31, 2016, for all releases with contracts to be effective on March 31, 2016, April 1, 2016, or thereafter. Non-biddable releases effective on March 31, 2016 will follow the existing posting schedule for the Intraday 1 and Intraday 2 Nomination Cycles, and will follow the new day-ahead nomination schedule for the Timely and Evening Nomination Cycles.

- **Posting of Offers to Purchase Capacity (Section 5 Proceeding) (RP14-442)**

Similar to the ISO/RTO 206 Order in EL14-22 et al. (*see* Section I above), the FERC also instituted a proceeding under Section 5 of the Natural Gas Act to examine whether interstate natural gas pipelines are providing notice of offers to purchase released pipeline capacity in accordance with section 284.8(d) of the Commission’s regulations.¹²² On or before May 19, natural gas pipelines were required to either revise their respective tariffs to provide for the posting of offers to purchase released capacity, or otherwise demonstrate that they are in full compliance with FERC regulations.¹²³ The FERC also requested that NAESB develop business practice and communication standards specifying: (1) the information required for requests to acquire capacity; (2) the methods by which such information is to be exchanged; and (3) the location of the information on a pipeline’s website. The Show Cause Order required each pipeline to explain in its compliance filing how it will fully comply with section 284.8(d) until NAESB develops, and the FERC implements, the requested standards, including how the pipeline will provide shippers the ability to post offers to purchase capacity on the Informational Posting section of its Internet website.

In total, the FERC received, and addressed in one omnibus order, 157 compliance filings.¹²⁴ Of the 157 filings, 64 pipelines revised their respective tariffs to provide for the posting of offers to purchase released capacity in a manner that complies with section 284.8(d), and 23 pipelines demonstrated that their tariffs already comply with that section. The FERC found that, and identified in its omnibus order on the compliance filings the, 69 compliance filings that did not appear to be in full compliance with that section, and directed further compliance filings from those companies as described in the omnibus order.

¹²¹ *Coordination of the Scheduling Processes of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines and Public Utilities*, 152 FERC ¶ 61,095 (July 31, 2015).

¹²² *Posting of Offers to Purchase Capacity*, 146 FERC ¶ 61,203 (Mar. 20, 2014).

¹²³ *Id.* at P 6.

¹²⁴ *See BR Pipeline Co. et al.*, 149 FERC ¶ 61,031 (Oct. 16, 2014).

- **Natural Gas-Related Enforcement Actions**

The FERC continues to closely monitor and enforce compliance with regulations governing open access transportation on interstate natural gas pipelines. Since the last report, the major development was Judge Cintron's Initial Decision in the BP case summarized below.

BP (INI13-15). On August 13, Judge Cintron issued her Initial Decision finding that BP America Inc., BP Corporation North America Inc., BP America Production Company, and BP Energy Company (collectively, "BP") violated Section 1c.1 of the Commission's regulations and section 4A of the Natural Gas Act.¹²⁵ Judge Cintron findings related to civil penalty statutory factors included findings that:

- There were at least 48 violations on 49 days;
- BP's manipulation resulted in financial losses of \$1,375,482 to \$1,927,728 on the next-day natural gas markets at Houston Ship Channel (HSC) and Katy during the Investigative Period;
- the violation was less than five years after a prior FERC adjudication and adjudications of similar misconduct by the CFTC and DOJ (warranting a 2 point increase in BP's culpability score);
- BP's conduct contravened the terms of a permanent injunction with the CFTC (warranting a 2 point increase in BP's culpability score);
- BP did not have an effective compliance program; and
- the BP Texas team's gross profits from the manipulation were between \$233,330 and \$316,170 and net profits between \$165,749 and \$248,589.

Judge Cintron certified the *BP Initial Decision* and the record to the Commission also on August 13, and this matter is now pending before the FERC.

- **New England Pipeline Proceedings**

The following New England pipeline projects are currently before the FERC:

- **Algonquin Incremental Market Project (AIM Project) (CP14-96)**

- Algonquin Gas Transmission filed for Section 7(b) and 7(c) certificate Feb. 28, 2014
- 342,000 dekatherms/day of firm capacity to NY, CT, RI and MA.
- 37.6 miles of take-up, loop and lateral pipeline facilities in NY, CT, and MA and system modifications in NY, CT and RI. The system upgrades would also require the removal of some facilities.
- 10 firm shippers: Yankee Gas, NSTAR, Connecticut Natural Gas, Southern Connecticut, Narragansett Electric, Colonial Gas, Boston Gas, Bay State, Norwich Public Utilities, and Middleborough Gas and Electric (eight LDCs and two municipal utilities).
- Final EIS issued on Jan. 23, 2015.
- Certificate of public convenience and necessity granted Mar. 3, 2015 (must be constructed and in service within two years).¹²⁶
- Construction began in May 2015.
- In-service: Nov. 2016 (anticipated).

- **Connecticut Expansion Project (CP14-529)**

- Tennessee Gas Pipeline filed for Section 7(c) certificate July 31, 2014.
- 72,100 dekatherms/day of firm capacity.

¹²⁵ *BP America Inc. et al.*, 152 FERC ¶ 63,016 (Aug. 13, 2015) ("*BP Initial Decision*").

¹²⁶ Order Issuing Certificate and Approving Abandonment, *Algonquin Gas Transmission LLC*, 150 FERC ¶ 61,163 (Mar. 3, 2015), *reh'g requested*.

- ▶ 13.26 miles of three looping segments and facility upgrades/modifications in NY, MA and CT.
- ▶ Three firm shippers: Connecticut Natural Gas, Southern Connecticut Gas, and Yankee Gas.
- ▶ Notice of Schedule issued Sept. 1 with FERC EA to be issued Oct. 23 and 90-day Federal Authorization Decision Deadline set at Jan. 21, 2016.
- ▶ Construction expected to begin Winter/Spring 2016.
- ▶ In-service: Nov 2016 (anticipated).
- **Constitution Pipeline (CP13-499) and Wright Interconnection Project (CP13-502)**
 - ▶ Constitution Pipeline Company and Iroquois Gas Transmission (Wright Interconnection) concurrently filed for Section 7(c) certificates on June 13, 2013.
 - ▶ 650,000 dekatherms/day of firm capacity from Susquehanna County, PA through NY to Iroquois/Tennessee interconnection (Wright Interconnection).
 - ▶ New 122-mile interstate pipeline.
 - ▶ Two firm shippers: Cabot Oil & Gas and Southwestern Energy Services.
 - ▶ Final EIS completed on Oct 24, 2014.
 - ▶ Certificates granted Dec 2, 2014 (must be constructed and in service within two years);
 - ▶ Construction expected to begin third/fourth quarter 2015 (after final Federal Authorizations).
- **Salem Lateral Project (CP14-522)**
 - ▶ Algonquin Gas Transmission filed application Jul 10, 2013.
 - ▶ 115,000 dekatherms/day of firm capacity.
 - ▶ 1.2 miles of pipeline to 630 MW Salem Harbor Station and other Salem, MA facilities.
 - ▶ Footprint Power sole firm customer.
 - ▶ FERC environmental assessment issued Dec 2, 2014.
 - ▶ Certificate granted May 14, 2015 (must be constructed and in service within two years).¹²⁷
 - ▶ Construction began in May 2015.
 - ▶ In-Service: fourth quarter 2015 (anticipated).

XIV. State Proceedings & Federal Legislative Proceedings

No Activity to Report.

XV. Federal Courts

The following are matters of interest, including petitions for review of FERC decisions in NEPOOL-related proceedings, that are currently pending before the federal courts (unless otherwise noted, the cases are before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit). An “**” following the Case No. indicates that NEPOOL has intervened or is a litigant in the appeal. The remaining matters are appeals as to which NEPOOL has no organizational interest but that may be of interest to Participants. For further information on any of these proceedings, please contact Pat Gerity (860-275-0533; pmgerity@daypitney.com).

¹²⁷ Order Issuing Certificate, *Algonquin Gas Transmission LLC*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,118 (May 14, 2015).

- **Base ROE Complaints (2012 and 2014) (15-1212)**
Underlying FERC Proceedings: EL13-33; EL14-86¹²⁸
Appellants: New England Transmission Owners

On July 13, 2015, the TOs filed a petition for review of the FERC's orders in the 2012 and 2014 ROE complaint proceedings. On July 16, the Court issued a scheduling order directing, among other things, a statement of issues and procedural motions to be filed by August 17 and dispositive motions to be filed by August 31; briefing was deferred until further order of the court. However, on August 14, 2015, NETOs filed an unopposed motion to hold this case in abeyance pending final FERC action on the 2012 and 2014 ROE Complaints (*see* Section I above). On August 20, 2015, the Court granted NETOs' motion to hold case in abeyance.

- **Order 1000 Compliance Filings (15-1139, 15-1141**) (consolidated)**
Underlying FERC Proceedings: ER13-193; ER13-196¹²⁹

Appellants: New England Transmission Owners (NETOs); NESCOE/CT DEEP/CT PURA, et al.

On May 15, 2015, NETOs¹³⁰ and NESCOE, *et al.*, filed a petition for review of the FERC's orders in the *Order 1000* Compliance Filing proceeding. On June 15, the parties filed a joint statement of issues and unopposed motion regarding briefing format. On June 18, a Joint Statement of issues and docketing statement was filed. On July 2, the Court granted all motions to intervene. On August 17, Petitioners filed an unopposed proposed briefing format and schedule.

- **Base ROE Complaint (2011) (15-1118, 15-1119, 15-1121**) (consolidated)**
Underlying FERC Proceedings: EL11-66¹³¹
Appellants: NETOs

On April 30, 2015, NETOs filed a petition for review of the FERC's orders in the 2011 Base ROE Complaint Proceeding. Motions for leave to intervene have been filed by NEPOOL, EMCOS,¹³² NJ Division of Rate Counsel, NHEC, MMWEC, CT PURA, CT OCC, CT AG, NJ BPU, Delaware PSC, and Coalition of MISO Transmission Customers. The Court granted all motions to intervene on June 23. On August 10, Petitioners filed an unopposed proposed briefing format and schedule.

- **FCM Administrative Pricing Rules Complaint (15-1071**) (consolidated)**
Underlying FERC Proceedings: EL14-7¹³³
Appellants: NEPGA

On March 31, 2015, NEPGA filed a petition for review of the FERC's orders on NEPGA's FCM Administrative Pricing Rules Complaint. A Docketing Statement Form, Statement of Issues to be Raised, and Petitioners' Appearances were filed on April 23, 2015. Also on April 23, 2015, NEPGA requested that the case be held in abeyance pending the FERC's issuance of an order on rehearing of its initial order in *Exelon Corporation v. ISO New England Inc. (EL15-23)*. Motions for leave to intervene have been filed by NEPOOL, CT PURA, CT OCC, NESCOE, NECPUC, NHEC, and PSEG. On May 22, the Court granted all motions to intervene and NEPGA's motion to hold the case in abeyance pending a decision in EL15-23. Motions to govern future proceedings are due 30 days from the completion of the FERC proceedings in EL15-23. NEPGA was directed to, and did, file an abeyance status report on or before August 20, 2015. In its August 20 report, NEPGA

¹²⁸ 147 FERC ¶ 61,235 (June 19, 2014); 149 FERC ¶ 61,156 (Nov. 24, 2014); 151 FERC ¶ 61,125 (May 14, 2015).

¹²⁹ 150 FERC ¶ 61,209 (Mar. 19, 2015); 143 FERC ¶ 61,150 (May 17, 2013).

¹³⁰ "NETOs" are Emera Maine; Central Maine Power Co., National Grid; New Hampshire Transmission ("NHT"), Eversource (on behalf of its electric utility company affiliates CL&P, WMECO, PSNH, and NSTAR), UI, and Vermont Transco.

¹³¹ 150 FERC ¶ 61,165 (Mar. 3, 2015); 149 FERC ¶ 61,032 (Oct. 16, 2014); 147 FERC ¶ 61,234 (June 19, 2014).

¹³² "EMCOS" are Taunton, Reading, Hingham, and Braintree.

¹³³ 150 FERC ¶ 61,064 (Jan. 30, 2015); 146 FERC ¶ 61,039 (Jan. 24, 2014).

indicated that the FERC had not taken final action in EL15-23 and requested the Court continue to hold the case in abeyance.

- **Demand Curve Changes (15-1070**)**
Underlying FERC Proceedings: ER14-1639¹³⁴
Appellants: NextEra, NRG and PSEG

On March 30, 2015, NextEra, NRG and PSEG filed a petition for review of the FERC's orders in the Demand Curve Changes proceedings. Motions for leave to intervene have been filed by NEPOOL, the ISO, CT PURA, NHEC, CPV, Entergy, and NESCOE. A Docketing Statement Form, Statement of Issues to be Raised, and Appearances were filed by Petitioners on April 30, 2015. The Petitioners' Non-Binding Statement of Issues laid out various challenges to the renewables exemption that was approved as part of the FERC's Demand Curve Orders. On May 28, the Court granted all filed motions to intervene and ordered intervenors to show by June 29 cause why they should not be limited to one joint brief in support of the FERC. On June 26, CT PURA filed a statement requesting permission from the Court to file its own brief in support of the FERC. Also on June 26, NESCOE, CPV and NHEC filed a statement regarding briefing format. On August 5, the Court issued a briefing schedule, which call for brief for Petitioners by October 5; brief for Intervenor Supporting Petitioners by October 20; brief for Respondent by December 4; brief of Intervenor CT PURA Supporting Respondent by December 21; and brief of other Intervenor Supporting Respondent by December 21, 2015.

- **FCA8 Results (14-1244, 14-1246 (consolidated))**
Underlying FERC Proceedings: ER14-1409¹³⁵
Appellants: Public Citizen and CT AG

On November 14, 2014, Public Citizen and the CT AG filed petitions for review of the FERC's action on the FCA8 Results Filing, which became effective by operation of law on September 16, 2014. These proceedings have been consolidated. A Docketing Statement Form and Statement of Issues to be Raised were filed by Petitioners by December 22, 2014. On January 2, 2015, the FERC filed a motion to dismiss the petitions for lack of jurisdiction. The FERC argued that the Court lacks jurisdiction because Petitioners did not challenge a FERC "order" within the meaning of section 313 of the FPA, or "agency action" reviewable under the Administrative Procedures Act. On January 15, EPSA and NEPGA jointly filed a motion supporting the FERC's motion to dismiss. On January 26, Connecticut¹³⁶ and Public Citizen opposed the FERC's motion to dismiss. On February 5, the FERC replied to the Public Citizen and CT AG responses. On April 7, the Court ordered that the motion to dismiss be referred to the merits panel and parties were directed to address in their briefs the issues presented in the motion to dismiss rather than incorporate those arguments by reference. On April 9, the FERC filed an unopposed motion for a schedule setting a minimum 60-day briefing interval for the FERC. On April 10, the Court ordered that parties submit proposed formats for the briefing of the consolidated cases by May 11. The parties filed a joint proposed briefing schedule on May 11. On July 1, the Court issued a briefing schedule -- brief for State Petitioners due 9/4/2015; brief for Public Citizen due 9/4/2015; brief for Respondent due 11/3/2015; brief for FERC/Intervenors due 11/18/2015; reply briefs for Petitioners due 12/2/2015; final briefs due 12/23/2015. In accordance with that schedule, briefs of State Petitioners and Public Citizen were filed on September 4.

¹³⁴ 150 FERC ¶ 61,065 (Jan. 30, 2015); delegated letter order (Nov. 13, 2014); 147 FERC ¶ 61,173 (May 30, 2014).

¹³⁵ Notice of Filing Taking Effect by Operation of Law, *ISO New England Inc.*, Docket No. ER14-1409 (Sep. 16, 2014); Notice of Dismissal of Pleadings, *ISO New England Inc.*, Docket No. ER14-1409 (Oct. 24, 2014).

¹³⁶ For purposes of this proceeding, "Connecticut" means the CT AG, CT PURA and CT OCC.

- **2013/14 Winter Reliability Program (14-1104, 14-1105, 14-1103 (consolidated))**
Underlying FERC Proceedings: ER13-1851¹³⁷ and ER13-2266¹³⁸
Appellants: TransCanada and RESA

On June 6, 2014, TransCanada and the Retail Energy Supply Association filed petitions for review of the FERC's orders on the 2013/14 Winter Reliability Program (14-1104 and 14-1105, respectively). Also on June 6, 2014, TransCanada filed a petition for review of FERC's orders on the 2013/14 Winter Reliability Program Bid Results Filings (ER14-1103). On July 3, 2014, these proceedings were consolidated. On July 7, 2014, the FERC requested a minimum of 60 days after Petitioners' opening briefs to file its brief. On July 23, leave to intervene was granted to ISO-NE, NEPGA, PSEG and Essential Power. On September 29, 2014, TransCanada, RESA, FERC, ISO-NE, Essential Power MA, PSEG and NEPGA filed a proposed joint, unopposed briefing format and schedule. A Joint Brief for Petitioners was filed on November 24 (as corrected on December 1). At the FERC's request, the Court ordered that a revised briefing schedule be applied in this case (effectively extending the overall briefing schedule by one month. Briefs for Respondent and Respondent-Intervenors were filed February 13 and March 2, respectively. Petitioners' Joint Reply Brief was filed on March 25; the Deferred Appendix, April 1, 2015. Final Briefs were filed on April 15, 2015. Oral argument before a merits panel [to be named 30-days ahead of the oral argument], was scheduled for September 15, 2015. Since the last Report, on August 27, the Court issued an order allocating oral argument time –15 minutes each to both Petitioner and Respondent.

- **New England's Order 745 Compliance Filing (12-1306)**
Underlying FERC Proceedings: ER11-4336¹³⁹
Appellants: EPSA and NEPGA

On July 16, 2012, EPSA and NEPGA filed a petition for review of FERC's orders on New England's *Order 745* (Demand Response Compensation) filings. On August 16, 2012, EPSA and NEPGA filed a statement of issues as well as an unopposed motion to hold case in abeyance pending the final resolution of Case Nos. 11-1486, et al. (*EPSA et al. v. FERC*) (see Orders 745 and 745-A below). On August 23, 2012, the Court granted the motion to hold the case in abeyance. Motions to govern future proceedings will be due 30 days following the issuance of the mandate in the *Order 745* appeal.

- **Orders 745 and 745-A (FERC v. EPSA, Supreme Court, 14-840 and 14-841)**
Underlying FERC Proceedings: RM10-17-000¹⁴⁰
Appellants: FERC and EnerNOC

On January 15, the Solicitor General of the United States, on behalf of the FERC, filed with the Supreme Court a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of the District Court's May 23 Decision.¹⁴¹ Respondents brief in opposition to that writ, pursuant to an order of the Court extending the time for responses, was filed on March 19. Petitioner's reply was filed on April 7. The Supreme Court granted certiorari on May 4, 2015. On May 27, the Supreme Court granted extensions to file petitioners' briefs to July 9, 2015 and respondents' brief to August 31, 2015. On July 9, briefs were submitted by EnerNOC, FERC, CA PUC, Joint States, and PJM. A number of amicus curiae briefs were submitted on July 16. Since the last Report, amicus curiae briefs were submitted by Midwest Load-Serving Entities and EPSA on August 31; by CES and Dr. Silkman on September 1; by the NC PUC on September 4; and on September 8 by NEI/America's Natural Gas Alliance and Robert L. Borlick, et al. Oral argument is scheduled for October 14, 2015.

¹³⁷ 144 FERC ¶ 61,204 (Sep. 16, 2013); 147 FERC ¶ 61,026 (Apr. 8, 2014).

¹³⁸ 145 FERC ¶ 61,023 (Oct. 7, 2013); 147 FERC ¶ 61,027 (Apr. 8, 2014).

¹³⁹ 138 FERC ¶ 61,042 (Jan. 19, 2012); 139 FERC ¶ 61,116 (May 17, 2012).

¹⁴⁰ 134 FERC ¶ 61,187 (Mar. 15, 2011); 137 FERC ¶ 61,215 (Dec. 15, 2011).

¹⁴¹ *EPSA v. FERC*, 753 F.3d 216 (May 23, 2014).

As previously reported, the DC Circuit vacated *Order 745*¹⁴² in its entirety as impermissibly encroaching on “states’ exclusive jurisdiction to regulate the retail market” in a 2-1 decision (“Decision”) issued on May 23, 2014. The DC Circuit vacated *Order 745* on two separate and independent grounds. First, it held that the FERC does not have jurisdiction to regulate demand response. The Court reasoned that: (i) the states retain exclusive authority to regulate the retail market; (ii) absent an express statutory grant of authority, the FERC cannot regulate areas left to the states; (iii) the FPA provides the FERC with authority over wholesale sales of electricity, but demand response is not such a sale; (iv) the authority of the FERC to regulate wholesale power rates under the FPA cannot be read so broadly as to allow direct regulation of demand response; and (v) demand response, while not necessarily a retail sale, is part of the retail market, involving retail customers, their decision whether to purchase at retail, and the levels of retail electricity consumption. Therefore, the Court concluded, the FERC has no authority to directly regulate demand response. “FERC’s authority over demand response resources is limited: its role is to assist and advise state and regional programs.”

As an alternative and secondary basis for its decision against *Order 745*, the Court concluded that the FERC order was “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” The Court found that the FERC failed to reasonably consider and address arguments that *Order 745* will result in over-compensation of demand response resources, resulting in unjust and discriminatory rates. The Court further found that the FERC failed to demonstrate how its proposed pricing construct would result in just compensation. The Decision and preliminary implications of the Decision were summarized in more detail in the memo included with the supplemental materials circulated and posted for the June 6 meeting.

On July 7, the FERC petitioned the Court for rehearing *en banc* of the May 23 Decision. On July 18, the Court, on its own motion, directed EPSA, APPA, NRECA, Old Dominion and EEI (“Petitioners”) to file a joint response to the FERC petition for rehearing. That response was filed on August 4, 2014. The petition for rehearing *en banc* was denied on September 17, 2014. As previously reported, the DC Circuit directed its clerk to withhold the Court’s mandate pending the Supreme Court’s final disposition.

- **CPV Maryland, LLC v. PPL EnergyPlus et al. (Supreme Court, 14-623)**

A petition for a writ of certiorari in this case was filed on November 26, 2014 and placed on the Supreme Court’s docket on November 28, 2014 as No. 14-623. The parties consented to the filing of amicus curiae briefs, and such briefs were filed by NARUC, the State of Connecticut, and APPA. Respondents (PPL EnergyPlus, LLC, et al.) filed a response on February 11. Petitioner CPV Maryland, LLC replied on February 24. On March 23, the Court invited the Solicitor General to file a brief in the case expressing the views of the United States. This matter is now before the Court.

As previously reported, on June 2, 2014, the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the September 30, 2013 decision of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland¹⁴³ which found that a Maryland Public Service Commission (“MD PSC”) order directing three Maryland distribution utilities to enter into a ‘contract for differences’ for capacity and energy in the PJM control area (the “CfD”) with a gas-fired merchant generator selected by the MD PSC (the “MD PSC Order”) violated the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution and cannot be enforced.¹⁴⁴ In affirming the District Court decision, the 4th Circuit found the MD PSC Order both field¹⁴⁵ and conflict pre-empted.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴² *Order 745* required RTOs and ISOs to include provisions in their tariffs that assured demand response would be paid at LMP for interrupting their loads when such interruption was cost effective.

¹⁴³ *PPL EnergyPlus, LLC v. Nazarian*, 974 F.Supp. 2d 790 (D. Md. Sep. 30, 2013); 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 140210, 2013 WL 5432346 (“*District Court Decision*”). The *District Court Decision* was summarized in past Litigation Reports.

¹⁴⁴ *PPL EnergyPlus, LLC v. Nazarian*, 753 F.3d 467; 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 10155.

¹⁴⁵ “Field preemption” is a doctrine based on the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution that holds that any federal law, including regulations of a federal agency, takes precedence over any conflicting state law. Preemption can be implied when federal law/regulation “occupies the field” in which the state is attempting to act/regulate. Field preemption

With respect to field pre-emption, the 4th Circuit stated that a “wealth of case law confirms FERC’s exclusive power to regulate wholesale sales of energy in interstate commerce, including the justness and reasonableness of the rates charged.”¹⁴⁷ It found the federal scheme (i.e. the PJM Market) “carefully calibrated to protect a host of competing interests” (representing “a comprehensive program of regulation that is quite sensitive to external tampering”),¹⁴⁸ and leaving “no room either for direct state regulation of the prices of interstate wholesales of [energy], or for state regulations which would indirectly achieve the same result.” Accordingly, the 4th Circuit concluded that the MD PSC Order “field preempted because it functionally sets the rate that CPV receives for its sales in the PJM auction.”¹⁴⁹ The MD PSC Order “compromises the integrity of the federal scheme and intrudes on FERC’s jurisdiction” because the MD PSC Order “effectively supplants the rate generated by the auction with an alternative rate preferred by the state.” The 4th Circuit rejected arguments that the CfD payments “represented a separate supply-side subsidy implemented entirely outside the federal market.”¹⁵⁰ And, even if the presumption against preemption were to apply, the Court found that that it was “overcome by the text and structure of the FPA, which unambiguously apportions control over wholesale rates to FERC.”¹⁵¹

With respect to conflict pre-emption, the 4th Circuit found that the MD PSC Order “presents a direct and transparent impediment to the functioning of the PJM markets, and is therefore preempted”.¹⁵² Preemption was appropriate because of the “extensive and disruptive” impact of the MD PSC Order on matters within federal control (the PJM markets). It found that the MD PSC Order had “the potential to seriously distort the PJM’s auction’s price signals, thus ‘interfer[ing] with the method by which the federal statute (i.e. the PJM Markets) was designed to reach its goals.’”¹⁵³ “Maryland’s initiative disrupts [the PJM scheme] by substituting the state’s preferred incentive structure for that approved by FERC.”¹⁵⁴ “Maryland has sought to achieve through the backdoor of its own regulatory process what it could not achieve through the front door of FERC proceedings. Circumventing and displacing federal rules in this fashion is not permissible.”¹⁵⁵

occurs when there is “no room” left for state regulation. Accordingly, a state may not pass a law or take any action in a field, like the regulation of wholesale power sales, pervasively regulated by federal law/regulation.

¹⁴⁶ “Conflict preemption” occurs where there is a conflict between a state law and a federal law. (“[E]ven if Congress has not occupied the field, state law is naturally preempted to the extent of any conflict with a federal statute.”). Such a conflict occurs when “the challenged state law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress. The court must look to ‘the entire scheme of the statute’ and determine ‘[i]f the purpose of the [federal] act cannot otherwise be accomplished--if its operation with its chosen field [would] be frustrated and its provisions be refused their natural effect. Where a state law conflicts with a federal law, the Court does not balance the competing federal and state interests. Any state law, however clearly within a State’s acknowledged power, which interferes with or is contrary to federal law, must yield.”

¹⁴⁷ Slip op. at p. 14.

¹⁴⁸ *Id.* at p. 10.

¹⁴⁹ *Id.* at p. 16.

¹⁵⁰ *Id.* at pp. 18-19.

¹⁵¹ *Id.* at p. 20. The Court noted the limited scope of its holding, which “is addressed to the specific program at issue” and did not “express an opinion on other state efforts to encourage new generation.” *Id.* at p. 21.

¹⁵² *Id.* at p. 27.

¹⁵³ *Id.* at p. 23.

¹⁵⁴ *Id.* at p. 24. (“Two features of the Order render its likely effect on federal markets particularly problematic. First, as noted, the CfDs are structured to actually set the price received at wholesale. They therefore directly conflict with the auction rates approved by FERC. Second, the duration of the subsidy -- twenty years -- is substantial.”)

¹⁵⁵ *Id.* at p. 25.

Petitions for rehearing *en banc* were filed by MD PSC and CPV Maryland on June 16, 2014. On June 17, 2014, the 4th Circuit stayed the mandate pending the *en banc* ruling on the Petitions. On June 30, 2014, the 4th Circuit denied the petitions for rehearing *en banc*.

- **CPV Power Development, Inc., et al. v. PPL EnergyPlus, LLC, et al. (Supreme Court, 14-634, 14-694)**

Petitions for a writ of certiorari in this case were filed on November 26, 2014 and December 10, 2014 and placed on the Supreme Court's docket as Case Nos. 14-634 and 14-694, respectively. The parties consented to the filing of amicus curiae briefs, and such briefs were filed by NARUC, the State of Connecticut, APPA, AWEA, and the NY PSC. Since the last Report, Respondents (PPL EnergyPlus, LLC, et al.) filed a brief opposing the writ of certiorari on February 11. Petitioners (CPV Power Development, Inc., et al.) replied to that brief on February 20. On March 23, the Court invited the Solicitor General to file a brief in the case expressing the views of the United States.

As previously reported, on September 11, 2014, the 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed¹⁵⁶ the analogous October 11, 2013 decision of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey declaring unconstitutional (and therefore null and void) New Jersey's Long Term Capacity Agreement Pilot Program Act ("LCAPP").¹⁵⁷ In affirming the New Jersey District Court's decision, the 3rd Circuit concluded:

LCAPP compels participants in a federally-regulated marketplace to transact capacity at prices other than the price fixed by the marketplace. By legislating capacity prices, New Jersey has intruded into an area reserved exclusively for the federal government. Accordingly, federal statutory and regulatory law preempts and, thereby, invalidates LCAPP and the Standard Offer Capacity Agreements.¹⁵⁸

No petition for rehearing or rehearing *en banc* was filed on or before September 25, 2014. Accordingly, the mandate was issued on October 3, 2014. As noted above, petitions for *certiorari* to the U.S. Supreme Court were filed and are pending before the Supreme Court.

- **Entergy Nuclear Fitzpatrick, LLC et al v. Zibelman et al (NY PSC Commissioners) (N.D.N.Y. 5:15-cv-00230-DNH-TWD)**

Entergy¹⁵⁹ filed, on February 27, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York, a Complaint that seeks a declaratory judgment that the NYPSC Commissioners' order ("Order") approving an agreement to keep NRG's 435 MW Dunkirk facility in the NYISO market, "repowered" as a natural gas-fired (rather than coal-fired) plant (the "Term Sheet")¹⁶⁰ is preempted by the FPA and invalid under the dormant Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution. Entergy also seeks a permanent injunction requiring the NYPSC Commissioners to withdraw its Order and/or preventing the NYPSC Commissioners from continuing to treat the Order as valid and binding. This case is noteworthy given the relationship of the issues raised to the Maryland and New Jersey CfD cases summarized above.

¹⁵⁶ *PPL EnergyPlus, LLC v. Hanna*, 977 F.Supp.2d 372 (D. NJ. Oct. 11, 2013); 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 147273, ("NJ Order").

¹⁵⁷ *PPL EnergyPlus, LLC v. Hanna*, 766 F.3d 241; 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 17557 (Sep. 11, 2014).

¹⁵⁸ *Id.* slip op. at 31.

¹⁵⁹ Plaintiffs are Entergy Nuclear FitzPatrick, LLC ("FitzPatrick"); Entergy Nuclear Power Marketing, LLC ("ENPM"); and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. ("ENOI").

¹⁶⁰ The Term Sheet provides that, in exchange for Dunkirk's commitment to participate in the NYISO energy and capacity markets through 2025, Dunkirk will receive out-of-market payments of \$20.4 million per year from National Grid and a \$15 million one-time subsidy from a New York State agency. Entergy asserts that the contract structure will lead Dunkirk to bid below its actual costs in the capacity auction, causing the auction market to "clear" at a lower price than otherwise would have resulted, and resulting in all generators receiving lower capacity revenues than they otherwise would have received.

INDEX
Status Report of Current Regulatory and Legal Proceedings
as of September 9, 2015

I. Complaints/Section 206 Proceedings

206 Investigation: Consistency of ISO-NE (DA) Scheduling Practices with Natural Gas Scheduling Practices to be Adopted in Docket RM14-2	(EL14-23)	5
206 Investigation: FCM Performance Incentives (Compliance Proceeding).....	(EL14-52; ER14-2419).....	4
206 Proceeding: 2014/15 RNS Recovery of SeaLink Development Costs	(EL15-85)	1
206 Proceeding: Importers' FCA Offers Review/Mitigation	(EL14-99; ER15-117).....	3
Base ROE Complaints (2012 and 2014) (Consolidated)	(EL13-33 and EL14-86).....	3
NEPGA DR Capacity Complaint	(EL15-21)	2
NEPGA Peak Energy Rent (PER) Complaint	(EL15-25)	1
New Entry Pricing Rule Complaint	(EL15-23)	2

II. Rate, ICR, FCA, Cost Recovery Filings

2014/15 Power Year Transmission Rate Filing: Public Representatives' Protest	(EL15-85; ER09-1532; RT04-2)	6
2015/16 Power Year Transmission Rate Filing	(ER09-1532; RT04-2).....	7
Base ROE Complaints (2012 and 2014) (Consolidated)	(EL13-33 and EL14-86).....	3
FCA1 Results Remand Proceeding.....	(ER08-633)	7
FCA9 Results Filing	(ER15-1137)	7
FCA9 Results Correction: Holliston Resource SEMA Load Zone Location.....	(ER15-2626)	6

III. Market Rule and Information Policy Changes, Interpretations and Waiver Requests

206 Investigation: Consistency of ISO-NE (DA) Scheduling Practices with Natural Gas Scheduling Practices to be Adopted in Docket RM14-2	(EL14-23)	5
206 Investigation: FCM Performance Incentives (Compliance Proceeding).....	(EL14-52; ER14-2419).....	4
206 Proceeding: Importers' FCA Offers Review/Mitigation	(EL14-99; ER15-117).....	3
CSO Terminations: Enerwise Global Technologies	(ER15-2232)	9
CSO Termination: Hampshire Council of Governments	(ER15-2229)	9
Demand Curve Changes	(ER14-1639)	9
DNE Dispatch Changes	(ER15-1509)	11
FCM ARA Sloped Demand Curve Changes	(ER15-2404)	9
FCM PI Jump Ball Compliance Filing I	(ER14-2419-001).....	4
FCM PI Jump Ball Compliance Filing II	(ER14-2419-002).....	4
IMM FCM Mitigation Package	(ER15-1650)	11
ISO Response to Show Cause Order	(ER15-117)	3
Jump Ball Filing: FCM Performance Incentives	(ER14-1050)	13
Jump Ball Filing: Winter Reliability Program.....	(ER15-2208).....	9
NEPGA DR Capacity Complaint	(EL15-21)	2
NEPGA Peak Energy Rent (PER) Complaint	(EL15-25)	1
New Entry Pricing Rule Complaint	(EL15-23)	2
Reactive Capability Auditing Revisions.....	(ER15-2628)	9
Waiver Request: FCM Interconnection Deposit Qualification Deadline (Bellingham)	(ER15-1934)	10

IV. OATT Amendments/Coordination Agreements

<i>Order 676-H</i> Compliance: TOs	(ER15-517)	14
<i>Order 676-H</i> Compliance: TOs Additional Filing	(ER15-517)	14
<i>Order 676-H</i> Compliance: Revisions to Schedule 24	(ER15-519)	13
<i>Order 676-H</i> Compliance: ISO Additional Revisions to Schedule 24	(ER15-519)	13
<i>Order 1000</i> Compliance: Initial Regional Compliance Filing	(ER13-193; ER13-196)	15
<i>Order 1000</i> Compliance: 2nd (Nov 15 Order) Regional Compliance Filing	(ER13-193; ER13-196)	15
<i>Order 1000</i> Compliance: 3rd Regional Compliance Filing	(ER13-193; ER13-196)	15
<i>Order 1000</i> Interregional Requirements: Initial Compliance Filing	(ER13-1960; ER13-1957)	14
2nd <i>Order 1000</i> Interregional Compliance Changes	(ER13-1960; ER13-1957)	14

V. Financial Assurance/Billing Policy Amendments

No Activity to Report

VI. Schedule 20/21/22/23 Updates

<i>Opinion 531-A</i> Compliance Filing: CTMEEC	(ER15-584)	16
Schedule 20A-EM: Talen Energy Marketing Updates	(ER15-2578)	16
Schedule 21-NEP: National Grid/Old Wardour SGIA	(ER15-2599)	16
Schedule 21-NEP: National Grid/Vuelta Solar SGIA	(ER15-2598)	16
Schedule 21-NSTAR Annual Informational Filing	(ER09-1243; ER07-549)	17
Schedule 23: Green Mountain Power SGIA	(ER15-2289)	16

VII. NEPOOL Agreement/Participants Agreement Amendments

AR Provider Amendments	(ER15-2523)	17
------------------------------	-------------------	----

VIII. Regional Reports

Capital Projects Report - 2015 Q2	(ER15-2443)	17
ISO-NE FERC Form 3Q (2015/Q2)	(not docketed)	18
<i>Opinion 531-A</i> Refund Report: FG&E	(EL11-66)	18

IX. Membership Filings

August 2015 Membership Filing	(ER15-2339)	18
September 2015 Membership Filing	(ER15-2584)	18

X. Misc. - ERO Rules, Filings; Reliability Standards

Compliance Filing: BES Exclusions for Local Network Configurations	(RM12-6)	23
E. Morris v. NERC/SERC	(EL15-93)	23
FFT Report: August 2015	(NP15-35)	18
New Reliability Standard: PRC-026-1	(RM15-8)	21
NOPR: BAL-002-1a Interpretation Remand	(RM13-6)	22
NOPR: New Reliability Standard: TPL-007-1	(RM15-11)	20
NOPR: Revised Rel. Standards: CIP-003-6, CIP-004-6, CIP-006-6, CIP-007-6, CIP-009-6, CIP-010-2, CIP-011-2	(RM15-14)	19
NOPR: Revised Rel. Standard: MOD-001-2	(RM14-7)	22
NOPR: Revised Rel. Standard: PRC-002-2	(RM15-4)	21
NOPR: Revised Rel. Standard: PRC-005-4	(RM15-9)	20
NOPR: Revised TOP and IRO Reliability Standards	(RM15-16)	19
<i>Order 810</i> : Revised Rel. Standard: BAL-001-2	(RM14-10)	21
Removal of LSE Category from NERC Compliance Registry	(RR15-4)	23
Revised Regional Delegation Agreements	(RR15-12)	23
Revised Reliability Standards: PRC-004-5; PRC-010-2	(RD15-5)	18
Revised Reliability Standards: Transition to "Remedial Action Scheme"	(RM15-13)	20

XI. Misc. Regional Interest

203 Application: CSC/AIA Energy	(EC15-122)	23
203 Application: Iberdrola/UI	(EC15-103)	24
Construction Agreement: MEPCO/Number Nine Wind Farm	(ER15-2451)	25
CPV Towantic LGIA Cancellation	(ER15-2605)	24
Emera MPD OATT Changes	(ER15-1429)	26
E&P Agreement: MEPCO/Number Nine Wind Farm	(ER15-2060)	25
E&P Agreement Termination: CMP/Atlantic Wind	(ER15-2603)	25
EPC Agreement: Blue Sky West & Emera Maine	(ER15-1459)	25
FERC Enforcement Action: Staff Notices of Alleged Violations (Etracom/M. Rosenberg)	27
FirstEnergy PJM DR Complaint	(EL14-55)	24
MISO Methodology to Involuntarily Allocate Costs to Entities Outside Its Control Area ..	(ER11-1844)	26
Study Agreement Termination: Eversource/Brookfield	(ER15-2218)	25

XII. Misc: Administrative & Rulemaking Proceedings

AWEA Petition for LGIA/LGIP Rulemaking	(RM15-21)	27
NOPR: MBR Authorization Refinements	(RM14-14)	28
NOPR: Third-Party Provision of Primary Frequency Response Service	(RM15-2)	28
<i>Order 771</i> : Availability of E-Tag Information to FERC Staff	(RM11-12)	29
<i>Order 807</i> : Open Access and Priority Rights on ICIF	(RM14-11)	29
<i>Order 812</i> : Revisions to Public Utility Filing Requirements	(RM15-3)	28

XIII. Natural Gas Proceedings

206 Investigation: Consistency of ISO-NE (DA) Scheduling Practices with Natural Gas Scheduling Practices to be Adopted in Docket RM14-2	(EL14-23)	5
Enforcement Actions: BP Initial Decision	(IN15-13)	32
Inquiry Into Natural Gas Trading, and Proposal to Establish an Electronic Information and Trading Platform	(AD14-19)	30
New England Pipeline Proceedings	32
<i>Order 809</i> : Coordination of the Scheduling Processes of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines and Public Utilities	(RM14-2)	30
Posting of Offers to Purchase Capacity (Section 5 Proceeding)	(RP14-442)	31

XIV. State Proceedings & Federal Legislative Proceedings

No Activity to Report

XV. Federal Courts

2013/14 Winter Reliability Program and Bid Results	14-1104 (DC Cir.)	36
Base ROE Complaint (2011)	15-1118 (DC Cir.)	34
Base ROE Complaints (2012 and 2014)	15-1212 (DC Cir.)	34
<i>CPV Maryland, LLC v. PPL EnergyPlus et al.</i>	14-623 (Supreme Court)	37
<i>CPV Power Development, Inc., et al. v. PPL EnergyPlus, LLC, et al.</i>	14-634/694 (Supreme Ct)	39
Demand Curve Changes	15-1070 (DC Cir.)	35
<i>Energry Nuclear Fitzpatrick, LLC et al. v. Zibelman et al.</i>	5:15-cv-00230 (N.D.N.Y.)	39
FCM Administrative Pricing Rules Complaint	15-1071 (DC Cir.)	34
FCA8 Results	14-1244 (DC Cir.)	35
New England's <i>Order 745</i> Compliance Filing	12-1306 (DC Cir.)	36
<i>Orders 745/745-A</i>	14-840 (Supreme Court)	36
<i>Order 1000</i> Compliance Filings	15-1139 (DC Cir.)	34