

FERC Judicial Review Tracker

Updated: February 14, 2022

The State Energy & Environmental Impact Center has created this tracker to collect court decisions reviewing orders of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).¹ This tracker will be updated as new decisions are issued. It will also be expanded to cover earlier years.

Background

Under the statutes governing judicial review of FERC orders, the Federal Power Act and the Natural Gas Act, an aggrieved party must seek rehearing from FERC before filing a petition for review.² Court decisions reviewing FERC orders thus typically review two orders – an order, and an order on rehearing.

FERC is composed of five members, with no more than 3 from any one political party. The chair is determined by the president.³ FERC must have a quorum of three commissioners participating to take an action. A commissioner might not participate in a case if they are recused due to a conflict or other issue.

In this tracker, we include the history of the FERC orders on review. We list the Commissioner composition and Chair at the time of the final FERC order that was subject to the court decision. And we note which orders include a dissent or partial dissent (commissioners also sometimes concur, but we have not separately listed that data in this tracker for brevity's sake).

Results

In cases examined from 2020, 2021, and 2022 (thus far), the petitions for review were denied in 22 cases and granted at least in part in 13 cases. The rate of success of these challenges was essentially equal when the panel of judges was majority Democrat-appointed judges (37%) versus majority Republican-appointed judges (36%).

¹ Court decisions are gathered from FERC's website, <u>https://ferc.gov/enforcement-legal/legal/court-cases/opinions</u>.

² 15 U.S.C. § 717r; 16 U.S.C. § 825/.

³ The list of current and previous chairs is available at <u>https://ferc.gov/about/commission-members/current-previous-chairmen</u>.



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW			FERC PF	OCEEDING		
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo-	Case	Description	Was challenge	FERC Orders on	Comm- issioner	Chair ⁷		per of ssioners
			logy ⁴	Туре		success- ful? ⁵	Review	Com- position ⁶		Participating	Dissenting ⁸
<u>Cogentrix</u> <u>Energy Power</u> <u>Management,</u> <u>LLC and</u> <u>Vistra</u> <u>Corporation v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Jan. 28, 2022	R	electric	Petition for review of FERC order denying recovery of certain costs incurred in complying with reliability requirements prior to the date of filing regarding those proposed costs denied.	No	ISO New England Inc., <u>171 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,160</u> (2020), order on reh'g, <u>172 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,251</u> (2020).	R	Chatterjee	3	0
<u>NGL Supply</u> <u>Wholesale,</u> <u>LLC v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Jan. 25, 2022	D	pipeline (pro- pane)	Petition for review of FERC order holding that it lacked jurisdiction over certain aspects of interconnection to pipeline and also holding that allocation of shared pipeline usage was not improper denied.	No	NGL Supply Wholesale, LLC v. Phillips 66 Pipeline LLC, <u>172 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,016</u> (2020).	R	Chatterjee	4	0

⁴ This tracker uses the affiliation of the president who nominated the reviewing judge as a proxy for the judge's ideology. If the decision was issued by a panel of judges that were not all nominated by a president of the same political party, we have indicated the party affiliation of the president for the majority of judges on the panel.

⁵ The answer is "no," the challenge was not successful, if the petition for review was denied in full. As long as the petition for review was granted at least in part, the case is categorized as "yes," successfully challenged.

⁶ This indicates the political party affiliation of the majority of the FERC commissioners participating in the last decision on review in the relevant court case. "Split" indicates that there was an even number of Democrats and Republicans on the Commission at the time.

⁷ This indicates the FERC chair at the time of the last decision on review in the relevant court case.

⁸ This includes Commissioners who dissented in part from the order or concurred in part and dissented in part.



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW		FERC PROCEEDING				
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo-	Case Type	Description	Was challenge success-	FERC Orders on Review	Comm- issioner Com-	Chair ⁷	Commis	Der of ssioners
			logy ⁴			ful? ⁵		position ⁶		Participating	Dissenting ⁸
<u>The City and</u> <u>County of San</u> <u>Francisco v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Jan. 25, 2022	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC orders holding that PG&E was permitted to refuse to offer secondary- voltage service and that PG&E was allowed to deny service to certain areas under the tariff's grandfathering provisions granted.	Yes	20-1313: City and County of San Francisco v. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, <u>171 FERC</u> <u>¶ 61,021</u> (2020), order on reh'g <u>172</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,237</u> (2020). 20-1084: City and County of San Francisco v. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, <u>169 FERC</u> <u>¶ 61,128</u> (2019), order on reh'g <u>171</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,196</u> (2020).	R	20-1313: Chatterjee ; 20-1084: Chatterjee	20-1313: 3; 20-1084: 4	0
<u>Duke Energy</u> <u>Progress, LLC</u> <u>v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Jan. 21, 2022	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC Order holding that Power Purchase Agreement did not prohibit municipal power agency from using battery storage technology to reduce demand during peak periods denied.	No	North Carolina Eastern Municipal Power Agency, <u>172</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,249</u> , (2020), order on reh'g <u>173 FERC ¶ 61,235</u> (2020).	R	Danly	3	0



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW		FERC PROCEEDING				
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo- logy ⁴	Case Type	Description	Was challenge success-	FERC Orders on Review	Comm- issioner Com-	Chair ⁷	Numl Commis	Der of Ssioners Dissenting ⁸
<u>The City of</u> <u>Miami,</u> <u>Oklahoma v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Jan. 18, 2022	R	electric* *this case is not about elec- tricity but instead about flooding related to the dam itself	Petition for review of FERC orders denying challenge arguing that Grand River Dam Authority failed to comply with its license by not buying or compensating land subject to intermittent flooding from dam granted.	ful? ⁵	Letter from CarLisa Linton, Director, Division of Hydropower Administration and Compliance, to Dean Kruithof, City Manager, Miami, Oklahoma, <u>Project</u> <u>No. 1494-445</u> (issued Apr. 29, 2020) ("Letter Order"), order on reh'g Grand River Dam Authority, <u>172</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,255</u> (2020).	position ⁶	Chatterjee	3	1
<u>TransCanada</u> <u>Power</u> <u>Marketing v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Dec. 28, 2021	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC order granting rate adjustment using market-based paradigm to evaluate auction results and cost-based supply curve with 25% upward adjustment denied.	No	ISO New England, Inc., <u>171 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,003</u> (2020), order on reh'g <u>172 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,164</u> (2020)	R	Chatterjee	4	0



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW			FERC PR	OCEEDING		
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo- logy ⁴	Case Type	Description	Was challenge success-	FERC Orders on Review	Comm- issioner Com-	Chair ⁷	Numl Commis	per of ssioners Dissenting ⁸
<u>Keryn</u> <u>Newman and</u> <u>Alison Haverty</u> <u>v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Dec. 28, 2021	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC order allowing Potomac-Appalachian Transmission Highline LLC to recover money spent on public relations and advocacy for a transmission line via a rate increase granted.	ful? ⁵ Yes	Potomac- Appalachian Transmission Highline, LLC, 554, <u>158 FERC ¶ 61,050</u> (2017), reh'g denied 554-A, <u>170 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,050</u> (2020), 554-B <u>172 FERC ¶ 61,048</u> (2020).	position ⁶	Chatterjee (554-A); Chatterjee (554-B)	4 (554-A), 3 (554-B)	0, 0
<u>California</u> <u>Public Utilities</u> <u>Commission</u> <u>v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Dec. 17, 2022	R	electric	Petition for review of FERC's order approving CAISO's proposed Capacity Procurement Mechanism rate allowing resources above the soft-offer cap to submit cost- justified bids with going-forward costs plus a 20% adder granted.	Yes	Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp., <u>171</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,172</u> (2020) (reh'g denied by operation of law, <u>172 FERC ¶ 62,052</u> (2020)).	R	Chatterjee	3	1



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW		FERC PROCEEDING				
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo- Iogy ⁴	Case Type	Description	Was challenge success- ful? ⁵	FERC Orders on Review	Comm- issioner Com- position ⁶	Chair ⁷	-	ber of ssioners Dissenting ⁸
Louisiana Public Service Commission <u>v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Dec. 7, 2021	R	electric	Petition for review of FERC's order excluding certain sales from a cost recovery decision, as well as FERC's order finding that the Settlement Agreement dissolving a relationship between six utilities precluded the Louisiana Public Service Commission (a party to the Agreement) from bringing a separate complaint against one of the utilities for those excluded energy sales, denied.	No	La. Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. Entergy Corp., <u>169 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,113</u> (2019), order on reh'g <u>169 FERC ¶</u> <u>61, 179</u> (2019) (regarding exclusion of certain sales from cost recovery), reh'g denied <u>172 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,056</u> (2020) (regarding separate cost recovery complaint).	R	2019 - Chatterjee ; 2020 - Chatterjee	2019 - 3; 2020 - 4	0
<u>Oklahoma</u> <u>Gas And</u> <u>Electric</u> <u>Company v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Aug. 27, 2021	R	electric	Petition for review of FERC's authority over retroactive waiver of billing requirement denied.	No	Southwest Power Pool, Inc., <u>166 FERC</u> <u>¶ 61,160</u> (2019), order on reh'g & clar., <u>170</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,125</u> (2020).	R	Chatterjee	3	0



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW			FERC PR	OCEEDING		
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo- logy ⁴	Case Type	Description	Was challenge success-	FERC Orders on Review	Comm- issioner Com-	Chair ⁷		ber of ssioners Dissenting ⁸
						ful? ⁵		position ⁶			2.0000.10.18
<u>Louisiana</u> <u>Public Service</u> <u>Commission</u> <u>v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Aug. 20, 2021	R	electric	Petition for review of FERC order on Entergy operating companies' allocation of production costs denied.	No	Louisiana Pub. Serv. Comm'n, v. Entergy Services, Inc., <u>167</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,186</u> (2019), reh'g denied, <u>169 FERC ¶ 61,247</u> (2019).	R	Chatterjee	3	0
<u>Public Citizen</u> <u>v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Aug. 6, 2021	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC orders on market manipulation complaints in MISO capacity market granted in part, denied in part.	Yes	Public Citizen, Inc., et al. v. Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., <u>168</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,042</u> (2019), reh'g denied, <u>170 FERC ¶ 61,227</u> (2020).	R	Chatterjee	3	1
<u>Vecinos para</u> <u>el Bienestar</u> <u>de la</u> <u>Comunidad</u> <u>Costera, et al.</u> <u>v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Aug. 3, 2021	D	gas	Petition for review of FERC authorizations for three LNG export terminals in Cameron County, Texas, and the construction and operation of two related pipelines granted in part and denied in part as moot.	Yes	Rio Grande LNG, LLC & Rio Bravo Pipeline Co., LLC <u>170 FERC ¶ 61,046</u> (Aug. 13, 2020), order on reh'g, <u>174</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,048</u> (2021).	R	Chatterjee	3	1



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW			FERC PR	OCEEDING		
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo-	Case Type	Description	Was challenge success-	FERC Orders on Review	Comm- issioner Com-	Chair ⁷	Numb Commis	sioners
			logy ⁴	71		ful? ⁵		position ⁶		Participating	Dissenting ⁸
<u>National Parks</u> <u>Conservation</u> <u>Association v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	9th Circuit	July 29, 2021	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC's denial of motion to intervene in post-licensing proceeding for the Eagle Mountain Pumped Storage Hydroelectric Project denied, further found no violation of the Federal Power Act in failing to provide public notice.	No	Eagle Crest Energy Co., <u>167 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,117</u> (2019), reh'g denied, <u>168 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,186</u> (2019).	R	Chatterjee	3	1
<u>Entergy</u> <u>Services Inc.</u> <u>v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	July 13, 2021	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC-ordered damages payment for misallocation of energy sales denied.	No	Louisiana Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. Entergy Corp., Op. No. 521, <u>139 FERC ¶ 61,240</u> (2012), order on reh'g, <u>155 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,064</u> (2016), order on reh'g, <u>160 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,109</u> (2016); Op. No. 548, <u>155 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,065</u> (2017), reh'g denied, <u>161 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,072</u> (2017); Op. No. 565, <u>165 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,022</u> (2018), reh'g denied, <u>169 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,179</u> (2019).	R	Chatterjee	3	0



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW			FERC PR	OCEEDING		
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo- logy ⁴	Case Type	Description	Was challenge success-	FERC Orders on Review	Comm- issioner Com-	Chair ⁷		ber of ssioners Dissenting ⁸
<u>Delaware</u> <u>Division of the</u> <u>Public</u> <u>Advocate, et</u> <u>al. v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	July 9, 2021	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC's orders on PJM capacity auction revisions (Variable Resource Requirement Curve) granted in part and denied in part.	ful? ⁵ Yes	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., <u>167 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,029</u> (2019), reh'g denied, <u>171 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,040</u> (2020).	position ⁶	Chatterjee	4	1
<u>North Carolina</u> <u>Department of</u> <u>Environmental</u> <u>Quality v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	4th Circuit	July 2, 2021	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC license to McMahan Hydroelectric for the Bynum Hydroelectric Project granted in part, disagreeing with FERC's conclusion that the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality waived its rights under Clean Water Action section 401 and remanding to FERC to re-issue license to include water quality conditions.	Yes	McMahan Hydroelectric, LLC, <u>168 FERC ¶ 61,185</u> (2019), reh'g denied, <u>171 FERC ¶ 61,04</u> 6 (2020).	R	Chatterjee	4	1



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW		FERC PROCEEDING					
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo-	Case Type	Description	Was challenge success-	FERC Orders on Review	Comm- issioner Com-	Chair ⁷	Numb Commis		
			logy ⁴	Type		ful? ⁵	Review	position ⁶		Participating	Dissenting ⁸	
<u>Environmental</u> <u>Defense Fund</u> <u>v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	June 22, 2021	D	gas	Petition for review of FERC certificate for the Spire STL Pipeline granted in part, vacating and remanding certificate.	Yes	Spire STL Pipeline LLC, <u>164 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,085</u> (2018), order on reh'g, <u>169 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,134</u> (2019).	R	Chatterjee	3	1	
<u>Shafer &</u> <u>Freeman</u> <u>Lakes</u> <u>Environmental</u> <u>Conservation</u> <u>Corporation,</u> <u>et al. v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Mar. 26, 2021	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC approval of dam procedures and Fish and Wildlife Service's Biological Opinion granted in part and denied in part.	Yes	N. Indiana Pub. Serv. Co. LLC, <u>163 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,212</u> (2018), reh'g denied, <u>166 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,030</u> (2019).	Split	Chatterjee	4	0	
<u>New York</u> <u>State</u> <u>Department of</u> <u>Environmental</u> <u>Conservation</u> <u>and Sierra</u> <u>Club v. FERC</u>	2nd Circuit	Mar. 23, 2021	D	gas	Petition for review of FERC finding that New York Department of Environmental Conservation waived its Clean Water Act section 401 authority denied.	No	Millennium Pipeline Co., L.L.C., <u>164</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,084</u> (2018); reh'g denied <u>167 FERC ¶ 61,007</u> (2019).	D	Chatterjee	3	0	
<u>Public Service</u> <u>Electric and</u> <u>Gas Company</u> <u>v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Mar. 2, 2021	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC adoption of cost allocation methodology in PJM denied.	No	Del. Pub. Serv. Comm'n. v. P.J.M. Interconnection, L.L.C., et al., <u>164</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,035</u> (2018), reh'g denied, <u>166 FERC ¶ 61,161</u> (2019).	Split	Chatterjee	4	0	



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW			FERC PR	OCEEDING		
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo-	Case	Description	Was challenge	FERC Orders on	Comm- issioner	Chair ⁷		per of ssioners
	court	Dute	logy ⁴	Туре	Description	success- ful? ⁵	Review	Com- position ⁶	Chair	Participating	Dissenting ⁸
<u>Gregory R.</u> <u>Swecker and</u> <u>Beverly F.</u> <u>Swecker v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Feb. 22, 2021	D	electric	Petition for review of Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act matter denied on jurisdictional grounds.	No	Gregory and Beverly Swecker v. Midland Power Coop., et al., <u>170 FERC ¶ 61,289</u> (2020), reconsideration denied, <u>171 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,193</u> (2020).	R	Chatterjee	4	0
International Transmission Company, et al. v. FERC	D.C. Circuit	Feb. 19, 2021	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC's orders on reduction of authorized return on equity denied.	No	Consumers Energy Co., et al. v. Intern'tl Transm. Co., et al., <u>165 FERC ¶ 61,021</u> (2018), reh'g denied, <u>168 FERC ¶ 61,035</u> (2019).	Split	Chatterjee	4	1
<u>Louisville Gas</u> <u>& Electric</u> <u>Company;</u> <u>Kentucky</u> <u>Utilities</u> <u>Company v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	6th Circuit	Feb. 17, 2021	R	electric	Petition for review of FERC's contract analysis granted.	Yes	Owensboro Municipal Utils. v. Louisville Gas and Elec. Co. and Kentucky Utils. Co., <u>166 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,131</u> (2019), reh'g denied, <u>169 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,030</u> (2019).	R	Chatterjee	3	0



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW			FERC PR	OCEEDING		
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo-	Case	Description	Was challenge	FERC Orders on	Comm- issioner	Chair ⁷		per of sioners
	court	Dute	logy ⁴	Туре	Description	success- ful? ⁵	Review	Com- position ⁶	Chan	Participating	Dissenting ⁸
<u>Aircraft</u> <u>Service</u> <u>International,</u> <u>Inc., D/B/A</u> <u>Menzies</u> <u>Aviation, et al.</u> <u>v. FERC and</u> <u>United States</u> of America	D.C. Circuit	Jan. 22, 2021	R	petro- leum (jet fuel)	Petition for review of FERC finding it lacked jurisdiction to regulate rates for transporting jet fuel denied.	No	Aircraft Service International Group, Inc., et al. v. Central Florida Pipeline, LLC, et al., Op. 567, <u>169</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,119</u> (2019).	R	Chatterjee	3	0
<u>Enable</u> <u>Mississippi</u> <u>River</u> <u>Transmission,</u> <u>LLC and</u> <u>Enable Gas</u> <u>Transmission,</u> <u>LLC v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Aug. 14, 2020	D	gas	Petition for review of FERC policy on tax allowances for pipeline partnerships dismissed as moot.	No	Inquiry Regarding the Commission's Policy for Recovery of Income Tax Costs, <u>162 FERC ¶ 61,227</u> (2018), order on reh'g, <u>164 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,030</u> (2018).	R	McIntyre	5	0
<u>SFPP, L.P. v.</u> <u>FERC and</u> <u>United States</u> <u>of America</u>	D.C. Circuit	July 31, 2020	D	petro- leum	Petition for review of FERC orders denying an income tax allowance denied.	No	SFPP, Inc., Op., <u>162</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,228</u> , order on reh'g, <u>166</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,142</u> (2019).	Split	Chatterjee	4	0



				JUDICIA	L REVIEW		FERC PROCEEDING				
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo-	Case	Description	Was challenge	FERC Orders on Review	Comm- issioner	Chair ⁷		ber of ssioners
			logy ⁴	Туре		success- ful? ⁵	Review	Com- position ⁶		Participating	Dissenting ⁸
<u>El Paso</u> <u>Natural Gas</u> <u>Company,</u> <u>L.L.C. v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	July 24, 2020	D	gas	Petition for review of FERC rate orders denied.	No	El Paso Natural Gas Co., Op. No. 528, <u>145 FERC ¶ 61,040</u> (2013), order on reh'g and compl., <u>154</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,120</u> (2016), order on compl. and reh'g, <u>163</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,079</u> (2018).	R	McIntyre	5	0
<u>National</u> <u>Association of</u> <u>Regulatory</u> <u>Utility</u> <u>Commissioner</u> <u>s v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	July 10, 2020	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC order removing barriers to participation in wholesale electric markets for storage resources denied.	No	Electric Storage Participation in Markets Operated by Regional Transmission Organizations and Independent System Operators, Order 841, <u>162 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,127</u> (2018), order on reh'g and clar., Order 841-A, <u>167</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,154</u> (2019).	Split	Chatterjee	4	1



Case	JUDICIAL REVIEW						FERC PROCEEDING					
	Court	Date	Judge Ideo- logy ⁴	Case Type	Description	Was challenge success-	FERC Orders on Review	Comm- issioner Com-	Chair ⁷	Number of Commissioners		
						ful? ⁵		position ⁶		Participating	Dissenting ⁸	
<u>Allegheny</u> <u>Defense</u> <u>Project, et al.</u> <u>v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	June 30, 2020	D	gas	En banc rehearing finding that FERC's use of tolling orders for rehearing requests is not action on the request under the plain statutory language and context, but denying petition for review of certificate issued for the Atlantic Sunrise Pipeline on the merits.	Yes	Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Co., LLC, <u>158 FERC ¶ 61,125</u> (2017), order on reh'g, <u>161 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,250</u> (2017).	R	Chatterjee	3	0	
<u>Nebraska</u> <u>Public Power</u> <u>District v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	8th Circuit	Apr. 30, 2020	R	electric	Petition for review of FERC's order on cost allocation issue in SPP denied.	No	Southwest Power Pool, Inc., Op. No. 562, <u>163 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,109</u> (2018), reh'g denied, Op. No. 562- A, <u>166 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,019</u> (2019).	Split	Chatterjee	4	0	
<u>Gulf South</u> <u>Pipeline</u> <u>Company,</u> <u>LLP v. FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Apr. 10, 2020	R	gas	Petition for review of FERC's rejection of incremental-plus rates for gas pipeline granted, petition for review denied in other respects.	Yes	Gulf South Pipeline Co., LP, <u>163 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,124</u> (2018), reh'g denied, <u>166 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,089</u> (2019).	Split	Chatterjee	4	0	



	JUDICIAL REVIEW						FERC PROCEEDING				
Case	Court	Date	Judge Ideo- logy ⁴	Case Type	Description	Was challenge	FERC Orders on	Comm- issioner	Chair ⁷	Number of Commissioners	
						success- ful? ⁵	Review	Com-		Participating	Dissenting ⁸
<u>Baltimore Gas</u> <u>and Electric</u> <u>Company v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Mar. 27, 2020	R	electric	Petition for review of FERC's rejection of rate revisions to recover taxes denied.	No	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., <u>161 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,163</u> (2017), order on reh'g & clar., <u>164</u> <u>FERC ¶ 61,173</u> (2018).	Split	McIntyre	4	0
<u>FERC v.</u> <u>Powhatan</u> <u>Energy Fund</u> <u>LLC, et al.</u>	4th Circuit	Feb. 11, 2020	D	electric	Petition for review of FERC enforcement action denied (statute of limitations challenge).	No	N/A, appeal from district court ruling (FERC filed suit against these financial firms, seeking penalties, and this appellate decision comes from that suit rather than an appeal of a FERC administration decision).	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<u>Narragansett</u> Indian Tribal <u>Historic</u> <u>Preservation</u> <u>Office v.</u> <u>FERC</u>	D.C. Circuit	Feb. 7, 2020	D	gas	Petition for review of FERC order denying motion to amend FERC regulations around the National Historic Preservation Act brought by Narragansett Tribe denied for lack of standing.	No	Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., L.L.C., <u>162 FERC ¶ 61,013</u> (2018) (and earlier 4/12/17 notice to proceed), reh'g denied, <u>165 FERC ¶</u> <u>61,170</u> (2018).	D	Chatterjee	3	0