



Via Electronic Filing: [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov)  
 Copy to: [jones.toni@epa.gov](mailto:jones.toni@epa.gov)

EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC)  
 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
 Mail Code: 28221T  
 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
 Washington, DC 20460

**Attn: DOCKET ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0199**

**Re: Proposed Federal Plan requirements for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Electric Utility Generating Units Constructed on or before January 8, 2014; Model trading Rules; Amendments to Framework Regulations, 80 Fed. Reg. 64966 (October 23, 2015).**

Dear Administrator McCarthy and Staff:

In response to the above-referenced docket, American Municipal Power, Inc. (AMP) and the Ohio Municipal Electric Association (OMEA) hereby offer the following comments for the record.

**Background on AMP/OMEA**

American Municipal Power, Inc. (AMP) is the nonprofit wholesale power supplier and service provider for 132 members, including 131 member municipal electric systems in the states of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Virginia, Kentucky, West Virginia, Indiana and Maryland; as well as the Delaware Municipal Electric Corporation, a joint action agency with nine members headquartered in Smyrna, Delaware. Combined these members utilities serve approximately 640,000 customers. AMP’s core mission is to be public power’s leader in wholesale energy supply and value-added member services.

**DELAWARE** • DELAWARE MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC CORPORATION

**INDIANA** • CANNELTON

**KENTUCKY** • BENHAM • PADUCAH • PRINCETON • WILLIAMSTOWN

**MARYLAND** • BERLIN

**MICHIGAN** • CLINTON • COLDWATER • HILLSDALE • MARSHALL • UNION CITY • WYANDOTTE

**OHIO** • AMHERST • ARCADIA • ARCANUM • BEACH CITY • BLANCHESTER • BLOOMDALE • BOWLING GREEN • BRADNER • BREWSTER • BRYAN • CAREY • CELINA • CLEVELAND • CLYDE  
 COLUMBIANA • COLUMBUS • CUSTAR • CUYAHOGA FALLS • CYGNET • DESHLER • DOVER • EDGERTON • ELDORADO • ELMORE • GALION • GENOA • GEORGETOWN • GLOUSTER • GRAFTON  
 GREENWICH • HAMILTON • HASKINS • HOLIDAY CITY • HUBBARD • HUDSON • HURON • JACKSON • JACKSON CENTER • LAKEVIEW • LEBANON • LODI • LUCAS • MARSHALLVILLE • MENDON  
 MILAN • MINSTER • MONROEVILLE • MONTPELIER • NAPOLEON • NEW BREMEN • NEW KNOXVILLE • NEWTON FALLS • NILES • OAK HARBOR • OBERLIN • OHIO CITY • ORRVILLE • PAINESVILLE  
 PEMBERVILLE • PIONEER • PIQUA • PLYMOUTH • PROSPECT • REPUBLIC • SEVILLE • SHELBY • SHILOH • SOUTH VIENNA • ST. CLAIRSVILLE • ST. MARYS • SYCAMORE • TIPP CITY • TOLEDO  
 TONTOGANY • VERSAILLES • WADSWORTH • WAPAKONETA • WAYNESFIELD • WELLINGTON • WESTERVILLE • WHARTON • WOODSFIELD • WOODVILLE • YELLOW SPRINGS

**PENNSYLVANIA** • BERLIN • BLAKELY • CATAWISSA • DUNCANNON • EAST CONEMAUGH • ELLWOOD CITY • EPHRATA • GIRARD • GOLDSBORO • GROVE CITY • HATFIELD • HOOVERVILLE  
 KUTZTOWN • LANSDALE • LEHIGHTON • LEWISBERRY • MIFFLINBURG • NEW WILMINGTON • PERKASIE • QUAKERTOWN • ROYALTON • SAINT CLAIR • SCHUYLKILL HAVEN • SMETHPORT  
 SUMMERHILL • WAMPUM • WATSONTOWN • WEATHERLY • ZELIENOPLE

**VIRGINIA** • BEDFORD • DANVILLE • FRONT ROYAL • MARTINSVILLE • RICHLANDS

**WEST VIRGINIA** • NEW MARTINSVILLE • PHILIPPI

AMP offers its member municipal electric systems the benefits of scale and expertise in providing and managing energy services. AMP's primary purpose is to assist our member communities in meeting their electric and energy needs in a reliable and economic fashion. This purpose is served in a number of ways, including through the ownership of electric generating facilities, scheduling and dispatch of member-owned generation, and through power supply and transmission arrangements that AMP makes with third parties at the request of and on behalf of members. AMP has load and generation resources in both the MidContinent ISO (MISO) and the PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM) and must operate within and across MISO and PJM to effectively serve our members and optimize our resources.

AMP's diverse energy portfolio makes our organization a progressive leader in the deployment of renewable and advanced power assets, which include a variety of baseload, intermediate and distributed peaking generation using hydropower, wind, landfill gas, solar and fossil fuels, as well as a robust energy efficiency (EE) program.

In recent years, AMP has undertaken a strategic generation asset development effort with new resources in four states. On average, these projects will reduce our members' energy market exposure to about 36 percent of their portfolio and will result in a portfolio that is more than 20 percent renewable in the next year. Our fossil fuel assets today consist of a 368 MW ownership share of the 1,600 MW coal-fired Prairie State Generating Co. (PSGC) located in Lively Grove, Illinois, as well as the 707 MW (fired) natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) AMP Fremont Energy Center (AFEC) in Fremont, Ohio. Our renewable resources include more than 400 MW of hydropower between old and new assets, as well as wind, solar and landfill gas. AMP also has partnered with the Vermont Energy Investment Corporation to run Efficiency Smart, a robust energy efficiency program available to our members.

The OMEA was formed in 1962 and represents the state and federal legislative interests of AMP and 80 Ohio municipal electric systems. The OMEA is closely aligned with AMP.

Because of AMP's structure as a non-profit wholesale power provider, we closely follow regulatory initiatives that have the potential to impact the costs and reliability of our members' energy and capacity supply. Ultimately, the policies that impact our members impact their residential, commercial and industrial customers. To that end, these comments on the proposed rule reflect expected impacts of a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP), as well as the model trading rules on AMP and member units, as well as to other units in the region from which our members expect to acquire varying proportions of their power supply through wholesale market purchases. We also incorporate by reference the comments filed by the American Public Power Association, AFFORD Coalition and Prairie State Generating Company to the extent our specific comments do not differ.

### **Timing and Interrelationship with CEIP and other EPA Initiatives**

The Clean Power Plan (CPP) is currently subject to multiple legal challenges, including Petitions for Stay before the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. There is a strong likelihood that the D.C. Circuit will rule on the petitions for stay near the end of the FIP comment period. USEPA should extend the FIP comment period in order to provide additional time for the D.C. Circuit to rule, as well as provide additional certainty for states and regulated EGUs to provide substantive comment of the proposed FIP.

USEPA should also extend and align the comment period on the proposed Clean Energy Incentive Program (CEIP) with any extended comment period for the draft FIP. The CEIP is extensively intertwined with the complex provisions of the draft FIP. As such, it should be considered an interrelated proposal and made a part of the formal docket. The USEPA's consideration of the CEIP as a non-regulatory action that does not warrant full notice and comment opportunities is contrary to law and USEPA practice. The docket for the proposed CEIP was opened without a Federal register notice on November 4, 2015, with comments originally due in

December. The CEIP is an important component of the proposed FIP and will form an essential part of any compliance strategy. The CEIP should be subject to notice and comment procedures under the Clean Air Act, the Administrative Procedures Act, and due process. Further, given the interrelationship of the CEIP and CPP, there is no question that the CEIP proposal should have been joined with the FIP and CPP proposals.

Because the October 23, 2015, rule proposed both FIP procedures and model trading rules for both rate-based and mass-based approaches, and cross references multiple provisions within the final CPP guidelines, it is difficult to consistently manage the various concepts as separate. AMP believes that by combining multiple actions within one rulemaking, particularly since it overlaps with the CPP but comes after the CPP comment period has closed, the Agency has rendered an already complicated regulatory initiative even more so.

For instance, while any FIP imposed on a state will have a trading regime, the model trading rules also need to be considered separately from the FIP since a state that is not subject to a FIP may utilize one of the model trading rules because of their presumptive approvability. There may be significant differences between the model rules and the FIP trading regime, such as the scope of eligible resources for Emission Rate Credits (ERC) or allowances under the FIP versus a state plan submitted under the CPP.

Additionally, the timing of the compliance obligations compared to the development of related initiatives is troubling. The state plans are due under the final CPP on September 6, 2016. Most states that choose to submit a plan will more than likely utilize one of the model trading rules. However, USEPA has indicated that it plans to issue one type of FIP -- mass or rate based -- by mid-summer 2016. It is rational and prudent for the states to compare the FIP to any plans they are developing, but the short time between the issuance of the FIP and the deadline for state plans does not provide adequate time for such a comparison, let alone a directional change based upon analysis. For trading purposes, there are obvious benefits to a state to have a trading program that mirrors the federal decision on a rate-based or mass-based approach. Not knowing what direction USEPA will go on rate-base or mass-base until several weeks before a state plan or commitment is due could result in rushed or forced decision making.

### **The FIP should Include Both Rate-Based and Mass-Based Options**

Under the proposal, a FIP for any given state would take the form of either the rate-based model trading rule or the mass-based model trading rule, and USEPA has asked for comment on which approach should be used if they permit only a single approach.

While a mass-based rule builds on the experience of similar, already tested programs, the agency should not limit the final rule to just one option. The CPP is, by its very nature, a precedential approach to reducing carbon emissions. To the extent components of the CPP can build on proven approaches, potential implementation barriers will be reduced. However, this alone does not warrant eliminating other options that may provide better opportunities for states.

AMP and its members are actively involved in nine different states, and it is conceivable that we could be navigating both mass-based and rate-based programs, some a result of a FIP and others the result of a state-developed plan. It is critical that the FIP not be structured in a way that impedes the generation, flow and/or use of Renewable Energy (RE), Energy Efficiency (EE) or output based ERCs and allowances under either approach.

### **Rate-based Approach**

In the rate-based approach, affected EGUs need to meet an emission standard derived from the final CPP Emission Guidelines (EG) expressed as a rate of pounds of CO<sub>2</sub> per megawatt hour (lbs./MWh). In its simplest form, an EGU subject to a rate-based FIP must demonstrate compliance by achieving a stack emission rate less than or equal to the rate-based emission

standard and, if the source emits above the assigned rate, the EGU must acquire an adequate number of ERCs to otherwise meet its compliance target. Each ERC represents a zero-emitting MWh and may be bought, sold or banked for later use. ERCs are generated by affected EGUs or by other entities that supply zero or low emitting electricity to the grid through an approval and recognition process that USEPA will manage. With the rate-based FIP approach, USEPA basically acts as the state, issuing ERCs and implementing and enforcing the standards.

*USEPA should not limit the low and zero emitting measures eligible for ERCs*

Only a subset of the potentially creditable ERC resources discussed are actually being proposed as part of the FIP, while the rest are part of the model trading rules. The ERC resources proposed for the federal plan must meet the following criteria: (1) they are in the following categories: on-shore wind, solar, geothermal, hydro, new nuclear and capacity upgrades at existing nuclear, and (2) they can provide quantified generation data from a revenue quality meter. Discussion of all other measures, such as energy efficiency (EE), is proposed only for the model rule. However, to limit the scope of sources of low or zero emitting electricity in FIP states eligible to generate ERCs essentially results in the FIP being more stringent than a state-submitted plan, which may include broader categories of eligible RE. USEPA has repeatedly avowed that states that elect the federal plan, rather than submitting a state plan, will not be penalized, but that is the exact result if ERC sources are limited under the FIP.

Further, there is not any reasonable basis to limit the issuance of ERCs to anything less than the full scope of options discussed in the final CPP. Doing so would hinder innovation and efforts to develop sources of zero or low emitting RE.

AMP appreciates USEPA's request for comment on an additional category of ERCs under a rate-based plan: other low and zero emitting non-Best System of Emission Reduction (BSER) measures. At present, that category may include wind, solar, geothermal, and hydropower, each of which meets the eligibility requirements of the CPP EG and the proposed FIP.

USEPA's main concern seems to be on limiting eligibility to measures that can be directly metered using existing metering infrastructure. AMP understands and agrees with USEPA's concern. However, it is important to note that utility-scale projects, and even many smaller RE generation projects already have utility grade metering capability. For example, in furtherance of AMP's purpose of meeting our members' energy needs, AMP is finalizing the construction and commissioning of four hydroelectric power projects designed to further diversify AMP's generation portfolio.

Specifically, AMP is completing the Willow Island hydropower project, a 35 MW plant in West Virginia, the Smithland hydropower project, a 72 MW plant in Kentucky, the Cannelton hydropower project, an 84 MW plant in Kentucky, and the Meldahl hydropower project, a 105 MW plant in West Virginia. These projects, which total just under 300 MW and \$1.6 billion in investment, represent the largest development of new run-of-the-river hydropower in the United States today, and will join two AMP member-owned operating hydropower projects on the Ohio River (Belleville, a 42 MW plant in West Virginia and Greenup, a 70 MW plant in Ohio). AMP is also partnering with its Member community of Hamilton, Ohio, on the Meldahl plant and, after commercial operation of Meldahl, AMP will obtain a 48.6% percent share of the existing 70 MW Greenup project currently owned by Hamilton on the Ohio River. Each of AMP's projects are run-of-the-river facilities at existing Army Corps of Engineer locks and dams along the Ohio River. The power from these projects, once online, will benefit our participating member municipal electric customers across five out of AMP's current nine-state footprint. Further, the projects resulted in more than 1,200 construction jobs and contracts for vendors from at least five states.

These are clearly large, utility scale renewable energy projects with utility grade meters and advanced telemetry. While AMP agrees that eligibility should be limited to those that can be

directly metered with utility grade metering, USEPA should not categorically exclude RE measures that can otherwise meet the eligibility requirements and have revenue quality metering.

Moreover, expanding eligibility presents an important opportunity for entities such as AMP that could provide needed GHG reductions, which is the impetus for this action in the first place. For example, if landfill gas (LFG) were included as a resource eligible for ERC generation, it could reduce emissions of methane, which is the second most prevalent GHG emitted in the U.S. from human activities, accounting for about 10% of all domestic GHG from human activities. Pound for pound, the comparative impact of methane on climate change is 25 times greater than CO<sub>2</sub> over a 100-year period.<sup>1</sup>

AMP is supportive of a structure for ERC issuance that does not impose barriers to any opportunity for zero or low emitting resources. In the rate-based proposal, USEPA opened the door for consideration of LFG gas as a pre-approved qualified biomass fuel.<sup>2</sup> While USEPA has stated that they are limiting these additional ERCs sources to just the model rule, the agency has requested comment regarding including additional ERC sources in the FIP. AMP currently has two contracts with WM Renewable Energy for the Geneva and Mahoning landfills, both of which commenced in 2013. The ability to generate ERCs associated with LFG will encourage and incentivize the further utilization of LFG beyond current domestic levels. AMP strongly encourages USEPA consider the use of LFG and other low and zero emitting non-BSER measures as a source of ERCs.

Behind-the-meter (BTM) generation offers another important resource that would see the advantage of expanded eligibility. Municipal systems often take advantage of these types of distributed systems in order to offset the costs of purchased grid power. USEPA has already stated in the existing unit final rule that cost-effective opportunities for distributed generation alone could satisfy one-third to over one-half of the stringency associated with building block 3. When developed on a utility scale using revenue quality metering these technologies are equally capable of replacing generation from affected EGUs and thereby reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. AMP is currently in development of additional distributed, behind-the-meter solar generation and encourages the USEPA to recognize the value of this additional generation resource.

Finally, in terms of the rate-based proposal, it currently allows unlimited banking of ERCs within and between the interim and final compliance periods. USEPA is requesting comment on whether there should be a quantitative limit or cap on the number of ERCs that could be banked. After careful review of the proposal, AMP fails to see any persuasive argument for establishing a cap on the amount of ERCs that can be banked within a given period. Establishing a cap seems to run contrary to the goal of the CPP, and will serve as a disincentive for zero or low emitting generation.

### **Mass-based Approach**

Under this option, USEPA would create a state emissions budget equal to the total tons of CO<sub>2</sub> allowed to be emitted by EGUs in each state based on the mass goals set up in the final CPP. Under this approach, USEPA would initially distribute the allowances within each states' budget based on the historical generation of each EGU; however, there are three allowance set-asides for: (1) the Clean Energy Incentive Program (CEIP); (2) support for RE; and (3) NGCC units that increase their level of generation compared to the previous compliance period (output-based). The total number of allowances distributed in each state for each year would add up to the state's mass goal for that year. Each allowance would authorize the emissions of one short ton of CO<sub>2</sub> during the compliance period. Allowances are distributed to impacted EGUs subject to the set-aside programs. As in the rate-based approach, allowances can be transferred, bought and sold on the open market or banked.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases/ch4.html>

All states subject to a mass-based FIP will be able to trade with one another, as well as with those states that have adopted a mass-based model rule. Based on analysis conducted by numerous parties, greater success will be achieved by states working together, either through joint plans or by linking with other mass-based states, to establish robust interstate trading programs.

*Mass-balance set-asides to address leakage*

Under the proposed mass-based FIP and model rule, USEPA proposes to allocate allowances to existing sources based on historical generation minus certain set-asides that the agency believes will help mitigate emissions leakage to new sources. Leakage is defined as the potential of an alternative form of BSER to create a larger incentive for affected fossil-fired EGUs to shift generation to new fossil fired EGUs. This concern is valid as the CAA section 111(b) new source standard is largely viewed as less stringent than the CAA section 111(d) existing source standard. Leakage can take the form of shifts to new EGUs that are not subject to the CPP, but it can also be a function of states with relatively low emission rate targets increasing their electricity imports from states with high targets.

In order to satisfy the requirements in the final CPP that mass-based plans demonstrate that they have addressed the risk of leakage to new, unaffected EGUs, USEPA has proposed two set-aside programs. The set-asides would establish a pool of allowances that would be allocated to affected EGUs or other entities based on set criteria. If a state were to adopt allowance set-aside provisions exactly as they are outlined in the mass-based model rule, the requirements for a state plan to address leakage would be considered presumptively approvable.

The first leakage-related set aside is an output-based allocation beginning in the second compliance period where a portion of the total allowances within each mass-based FIP state would be allocated to existing NGCC units based, in part, on their level of electricity generation during the previous compliance period. The more an eligible NGCC generates the more allowances it would receive. This approach does not modify the actual number of total allowances, which is finite, but rather modifies the distribution.

The second leakage related set-aside would provide allowances for distribution to RE in each state covered by a mass-based FIP and is also a component of the model rule. Under this program, USEPA would reserve a percentage of each state's allowances and developers of RE projects could apply to receive the allowances based on projected generation from eligible RE capacity. This set-aside raises a number of issues directly impacting AMP.

In order to receive set aside allowances, the RE project must meet the same eligibility requirements for rate-based ERC issuance.<sup>3</sup> This means, for example, that only capacity incremental to 2012 is eligible for the RE set aside. Eligible projects must also be located in the mass-based state for which the set-aside has been designated, although the agency has asked for comment on whether capacity outside the state should be recognized and how that could be implemented.

AMP strongly disagrees with the provision that eligible projects must be located in the mass-based state for which the set-aside has been designated. With an entity such as AMP, with assets and involvement by multiple vested members in multiple states for any given RE project, this provision seems arbitrary. If the RE displaces carbon based generation in state A, it should not matter that it is located in state B. The goal of the set-aside is to prevent leakage to new EGU's not subject to the existing source standards. If AMP were to develop solar assets in one state, but the set-aside allowances were used to prevent leakage that might occur in an adjacent state, the solar project still meets the overall goal of this effort. Limiting control of potential allowances under the set-aside may also serve to limit the development of RE projects, as developers will not have the same degree of control over allowances. The developer of the RE

---

<sup>3</sup> As outlined in IV.C. and VIII.K of the final CPP.

should have the highest degree of control over where the allowance is assigned to ensure they receive the greatest value for their investment.

USEPA has proposed that the same RE measures eligible for ERCs under the rate-based plan would be eligible for set-aside allowances under a mass-based plan, namely on-shore wind, solar, geothermal, and hydropower. As with the rate-based plan, the eligible RE should not be limited in a mass-based plan.

#### *Mass-based early action incentives under the CEIP*

One of the most significant changes from the proposed version of the CPP was the decision to remove end-use EE as the fourth BSER building block. However, while EE is no longer included as part of BSER, it remains a part of the final CPP and FIP in the form of the CEIP under both the rate-base and mass-base approaches. While USEPA has taken a position that the CEIP is not part of the formal proposal, the CEIP is included in this discussion.

USEPA is proposing to implement the CEIP by issuing early action allowances for two types of eligible resources located in or benefitting the state: (1) RE investments that generate metered MWh from any type of RE with revenue grade metering, and (2) demand side EE programs and measures implemented in low-income communities that result in quantified and verified electricity savings. Like the rate-based plan, under the mass-based proposal eligible projects must commence construction in the case of RE, or commence operations in the case of low income EE, after September 6, 2018. These projects will receive incentives based on the zero-emitting MWh they generate, or the energy savings they achieve, during 2020 and/or 2021.

While AMP would have appreciated the opportunity to comment on the CEIP within the CPP, the concept was not part of the proposal subject to comment. However, whether contained within the FIP or the CPP, to the extent USEPA were to adopt a mass-based approach, AMP supports the CEIP as a process for the issuance of early action allowances. However, it is important that USEPA clearly define what falls within a “metered” project, and how distributed power projects could satisfy eligibility.

In addition, because actions have already, or will be undertaken soon, to position entities to take advantage of the CEIP, USEPA needs to clearly define what activities initiated before September 6, 2018 would disqualify a project. For instance, are site clearing activities considered “commencing construction.” Likewise, for EE projects, the activities that fall within the scope of USEPA’s concept of “implementation” should be well defined. A project that is too expeditious presents a hurdle as the CEIP restricts eligibility to projects that start construction [after a state's compliance plan is finalized \(or after September 6, 2018 for states that do not submit a compliance plan\)](#). RE projects that start construction prior to the effective date will not be entitled to USEPA’s matching allowances under the CEIP even if they go online during 2020/2021. Thus, definitive “construction” and “implementation” thresholds are critical elements of the CEIP, and AMP requests that USEPA clarify those thresholds in the final rule.

Although AMP supports the CEIP in concept, we do not support the CEIP current design or eligibility requirements as it arbitrarily chooses winners and losers in overcoming the challenges related to climate change. AMP believes that all renewable and emission-free technologies, and the MWhs they generate, need to be treated equally and given the same opportunities to reduce carbon emission and participate in incentive programs such as the CEIP.

#### **Energy Efficiency and EM&V**

Though not a part of the BSER, the EPA envisions EE as being an integral part of a state’s compliance options. Two of the three compliance approaches discussed by the EPA (i.e., the rate-based emission standard approach and the state measures approach) require an approved

Evaluation, Measurement, & Verification (EM&V) process to provide a high level of surety as to the claimed kWh savings resulting from EE.

AMP currently offers a robust energy efficiency program (called Efficiency Smart) to its subscribing members. Efficiency Smart is a performance-based program that guarantees a specified level of savings to its participating communities. Accordingly, AMP employs an independent EM&V consultant to analyze the program's claimed savings on an annual basis. Four years of EM&V reports have resulted in an average realization rate (i.e., the ratio of verified savings to claimed savings) above 96%.

AMP's annual EM&V process employs a methodology that seemingly meets the criteria listed in the proposed model trading rule for a "presumptively approvable" EM&V plan. Specifically, AMP's EM&V methodology: 1) adheres to industry-standard protocols (e.g., International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol; PJM Manual 18B); 2) quantifies kWh savings on an ex-post basis; 3) adheres to industry "best practices" on the selection of its Common Practices Baseline (CPB); 4) employs deemed savings and project-based M&V to quantify savings on an annual basis; 5) normalizes for independent variables; 6) verifies installation before incentives are paid; 7) utilizes industry "best practices" in its evaluation and measurement work (e.g., surveys, engineering reviews, site inspections, metering, representative sampling); 8) T&D losses are quantified and applied; 9) uses industry "best practices" to determine the duration of the kWh savings; and, 10) employs a 90% confidence interval +/- 10%.

Furthermore, USEPA has gained first-hand knowledge of AMP's EM&V process through the regular submittals AMP made regarding its Efficiency Smart program as part of the Consent Decree relating to the Richard H. Gorsuch Generating Station. Specifically, the above-mentioned Consent Decree (in *United States of America v. American Municipal Power, Inc.*, Case No. 2:10-CV-438-MHW) required AMP's Efficiency Smart program to save at least 70,000 MWh over a specified period of time for the program participants, which included participants in the Gorsuch project. Accordingly, EPA was concerned about the veracity of the project's claimed savings and scrutinized the EM&V reports that AMP submitted. Thus, USEPA has already approved AMP's EM&V plan in a very real sense.

In addition, PJM has also accepted the EM&V performed on the Efficiency Smart projects submitted to its Third Incremental Auction for the 2015/16 Delivery Year as part of its RPM capacity auction process.

Given its multi-state footprint, however, AMP could face the real prospect of having to deal with different EM&V requirements in each footprint state's SIP. AMP is also concerned about how a FIP (with EM&V requirements) imposed on one (or more) of its footprint states would interact with the EM&V requirements in the SIPs of the remaining SIP states. Accordingly, AMP believes the EPA needs to provide additional clarity as to how differing EM&V approaches contained in any SIP and/or FIP could be successfully "harmonized" as encouraged in State Plan Considerations TSD. Given the potential that this EM&V harmonization process could potentially result in an untenable result for one or more parties, AMP also believes that EPA should articulate an arbitration process that parties could readily access.

In addition, AMP believes that USEPA needs to provide greater clarity as to its expectations regarding the content and the degree of evidence it envisions in any EM&V plan in the discussion of the specific protocols/guidance utilized in an EM&V study along with how these protocols were applied. USEPA should also clarify the methodology utilized to determine the duration of the kWh savings and the normalization process for independent variables.

Finally, AMP is concerned about the requirement that encourages states to include in their EM&V plans a description of how the state "...will ensure that the skills of workers installing demand-side EE...as well as the skills of workers who perform the EM&V...will be certified by a third-party entity that...develops a competency based program...". This "encouragement" could

potentially result in additional costs for EM&V compliance and may be totally unnecessary since the need for compliance (either through a SIP and FIP) should induce the desired utilization of energy efficiency and a resulting market response to provide the necessary workforce. If this requirement is retained, at a minimum, USEPA should provide greater clarity as to what the agency expects from the states as an appropriate response.

## **Conclusion**

It is conceivable that a number of states may find themselves subject to a FIP, either implemented by USEPA or by the state through a delegation. It is also reasonable to expect the states will look to the model trading rules as a linchpin of their programs due to the fact that they increase the approve-ability of state plan in a timely manner and allow states to avoid development of a trading structure from scratch. USEPA should allow states to choose either a rate-based or mass-based trading approach, and not limit the final action to one option. AMP encourages USEPA to finalize a FIP that minimizes any barriers to the development of zero or low emitting generation, that encourages and promotes allowance and/or ERC trading that applies broadly among states and that offers clarity in implementation and functionality. Finally, in the mass-based concept, the requirement that RE projects be located in the state for which the set-aside has been designated to be eligible for allowances ignores realities associates with developing, siting, and financing these projects. The value and marketability of allowances has to be maximized to truly incentivize these projects designed to replace carbon-based generation.

While by no means exhaustive, the comments provided represent issues of most concern to AMP/OMEA relative to the proposed FIP and model rules. We thank USEPA for this opportunity to provide input to the agency on these important matters. Please let us know if you need additional information.

Respectfully Submitted,



---

Jolene M. Thompson  
AMP Executive Vice President  
& OMEA Executive Director  
[jthompson@amppartners.org](mailto:jthompson@amppartners.org)  
614.540.1111