

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Morgantown Power, LLC)	
)	Docket No. ER25-3339-000
)	

PROTEST OF THE INDEPENDENT MARKET MONITOR FOR PJM

Pursuant to Rule 211 of the Commission’s Rules and Regulations,¹ Monitoring Analytics, LLC, acting in its capacity as the Independent Market Monitor (“Market Monitor”) for PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (“PJM”),² submits this protest to the request for waiver submitted by Morgantown Power, LLC (“Morgantown”) on May 7, 2025 (“May 7th Waiver Request.”) Morgantown requests a second waiver of the deadline for the expiration of Capacity Interconnection Rights (“CIRs”) for Morgantown Unit No. 5 (“Morgantown 5”). Because the request for waiver does not meet the Commission’s requirements for supporting a waiver, it should be denied.

Waiving the rules for retaining CIRs to favor Morgantown 5 over other suppliers in the interconnection queue that are seeking CIRs would be unduly discriminatory and cause harm to the public interest in the efficient procurement of capacity resources. There has been no demonstration that the unit would be returned to service as an available economic resource that would actually contribute to the reliability and efficiency of PJM markets.

¹ 18 CFR § 385.211 (2025).

² Capitalized terms used herein and not otherwise defined have the meaning used in the PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff (“OATT”), the PJM Operating Agreement (“OA”) or the PJM Reliability Assurance Agreement (“RAA”).

The prior waiver was granted for Morgantown 5 and for Morgantown Unit No. 6 (“Morgantown 6”) because of a recent decision to repair and return the units to service in response to the increases in capacity market prices.³ The waiver request states that Morgantown 6 has returned to service. Morgantown states (at 1) that it “has experienced further delays in completing the repairs on Morgantown 5 and has reluctantly concluded that the repairs may not be completed by September 30, 2025.”

The situation with Morgantown 6 shows why granting the request for a second waiver for Morgantown 5 would not be consistent with the public interest. The detailed facts about Morgantown 6 are included in a confidential attachment. The Market Monitor attaches a Model Protective Agreement that would allow parties to the proceeding to access that confidential information.

I. PROTEST

By order issued May 30, 2025, a waiver was granted to Morgantown 5 and Morgantown 6 to extend the termination date of the units’ CIRs past May 31, 2025, without including the conditions recommended by the Market Monitor.⁴ The conditions were designed to ensure that customers were protected from the consequences of failure to timely complete the indicated repairs.

The current waiver request states (at 1):

³ See *Morgantown Power, LLC*, 191 FERC ¶ 61,179 at P 4 (2025).

⁴ See 191 FERC ¶ 61,179 (2025); Answer and Motion for Leave to Answer of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM, Docket No. ER25-2190-000 (May 28, 2025). The Market Monitor argued (at 4) that waiver should not be approved unless it included these explicit conditions: (1) There should be no payment for capacity until the unit is in commercial service; (2) The unit should not be permitted to sell capacity and then declare a forced outage if it is not back in commercial service; (3) If the unit clears in the capacity market but is not in commercial service for the relevant delivery year, the unit should pay deficiency charges or purchase replacement capacity until it returns to commercial service; (4) If the unit clears in the capacity market but then determines it is not economic to return to commercial service for the relevant delivery year, the unit should pay deficiency charges or purchase replacement capacity until it returns to commercial service.

Morgantown has continued working diligently to complete the repairs necessary to bring the Morgantown Units back to service and has already successfully brought Morgantown 6 back online. Unfortunately, Morgantown has experienced further delays in completing the repairs on Morgantown 5 and has reluctantly concluded that the repairs may not be completed by September 30, 2025.

The Commission has granted limited tariff waivers to applicants where the requested waiver: (1) is made in good faith; (2) is of limited scope; (3) addresses a concrete problem that will be remedied; and (4) does not have undesirable consequences.⁵

The request does not demonstrate good faith because the request does not show a diligent effort to bring the units back into service before the expiration of Morgantown 5's CIRs. Market participants should act with diligence to conform their planning to the market rules rather than attempt to alter the rules to conform to their plans.⁶

The request is not limited in scope. Morgantown has not demonstrated that there are extraordinary circumstances applicable particularly to Morgantown 5 that support changing the otherwise generally applicable rules. In addition, this is now the second waiver requested to address the same alleged problem. The waiver is not limited because there is no reason for confidence that the time requested will be sufficient and, if the request is granted, that it will

⁵ See, e.g., *Duke Energy Carolinas LLC*, 172 FERC ¶ 61,074 at P 17 (2020); *Public Service Electric and Gas Company*, 172 FERC ¶ 61,068 at P 12 (2020); *Empire Dist. Elec. Co.*, 166 FERC ¶ 61,164 (2019).

⁶ See *Oxbow Solar, LLC*, 191 FERC ¶ 61,057 at P 27 (2025) ("Specifically, we find that Oxbow Solar has not demonstrated that it has acted in good faith. Oxbow Solar does not dispute that it failed to meet the Amended Oxbow Solar GIA's September 1, 2022 milestone to issue an authorization to proceed to SWEPCO to begin construction, nor does it dispute that it issued the authorization to proceed almost two and half years late, and only shortly after SPP issued a notice of default. Although Oxbow Solar describes the circumstances that led to the original load-serving entity counterparty withdrawing from negotiations in 2022, Oxbow Solar provides only a vague explanation about 'market conditions' outside of its control that prevented it from securing financing and issuing an authorization to proceed to SWEPCO since that time. Based on the record, we find that Oxbow Solar has not shown that it acted in good faith to diligently advance the Facility, and it appears that Oxbow Solar's need for the instant waiver may have been caused, in part, by its own inaction.").

not be followed by an additional request to extend Morgantown 5's CIRs. Morgantown cites serious issues associated with repairing the unit and provides no confidence that the problems can be resolved in the defined time, as it was not during the first waiver period. In addition, Morgantown has not addressed the issue raised by the Market Monitor in its proposed conditions. The unit should not be permitted to offer and clear but then declare a forced outage because it is not yet back in service. That approach would require PJM customers to pay for capacity that is not in service and that does not contribute to actual reliability.

The request for waiver should be rejected because Morgantown has not identified a concrete problem and granting the waiver harms third parties.⁷ A concrete problem means more than simply showing that compliance with the rules has an impact on the resource.

Morgantown does not show that the alleged problem is anything other than the application of the rules. As the Commission has repeatedly explained, "Simply having to follow [the] Tariff requirements . . . is not a concrete problem that warrants waiver of the Tariff's requirements."⁸ Morgantown's problem is that it cannot repair its unit before its CIRs terminate. Morgantown does not need to retain its CIRs to repair Morgantown 5 and return it to service. Morgantown can obtain interconnection service without undue discriminatory preferences relative to its competitors. Morgantown has not shown a concrete problem required to support the extraordinary relief of waiving the applicable market rules.

⁷ See PJM Comments at 5–6, citing Rush Solar Project II, LLC, 187 FERC ¶ 61,013, at P 26 (2024); see also, e.g., Lee County Generating Station, LLC, 186 FERC ¶ 61,089 at P 20 (2024); LS Power Dev., LLC, 186 FERC ¶ 61,145 at P 14 (2024); American Electric Power Service Corp., 186 FERC ¶ 61,086 at P 21 (2024); Dunkirk Power LLC, 147 FERC ¶ 61,146 at P 13 (2014).

⁸ Erie Power, LLC, 148 FERC ¶ 61,038 at P 20 (2014), quoted in Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., et al., 192 FERC ¶ 61,004 at P 21 (2025).

Morgantown does not show that granting the waiver will solve the problem.⁹ Morgantown previously obtained a waiver for Morgantown 5 alleging the same problem.¹⁰ The waiver was granted and the problem remains.

The rules provide for the termination of CIRs for good reason. The CIR retention rule was intended to ensure that CIRs are not withheld from the market, preventing new resources from competing to enter the market.¹¹ Through CIRs, PJM allocates scarce system resources to procure capacity through competitive markets. The rules exist to avoid undue discrimination for or against competing resources. There is a substantial interconnection queue with potential entrants that need CIRs. CIRs are a scarce resource that provide access to the grid and to PJM markets for generation resources. Morgantown does not address whether the waiver would create a precedent for ignoring the CIR retention rule or why any such precedent would be a positive for the PJM markets.

Undue discrimination in favor of low value units such as Morgantown aggravates the harm to competition and the public interest. Morgantown 5 and Morgantown 6 were fully retired. The waiver requests demonstrate the difficulty of repairing the units, and the specific difficulty of repairing Morgantown 5. The confidential facts about the situation with Morgantown 6 show the issues that would be created by granting a waiver to Morgantown

⁹ See *Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., et al.*, 192 FERC ¶ 61,004 at P 21 (2025) (“[W]e find that the waiver request does not address a concrete problem because Filing Parties have not shown that expanding the study scope would address the problem the Filing Parties have identified.”); *Oxbow Solar, LLC*, 191 FERC ¶ 61,057 at P 28 (2025) (“Given the absence of a detailed explanation in the record of how the 24-month extension will allow Oxbow Solar to secure financing and achieve commercial operation, we find that Oxbow Solar has failed to sufficiently demonstrate that its waiver request will remedy a concrete problem.”).

¹⁰ *Morgantown Power, LLC*, 191 FERC ¶ 61,179 (2025).

¹¹ See OATT § 230.3.

5 and why granting that waiver would be detrimental to the public interest. The Market Monitor provides these facts in confidential Attachment A.¹²

The Market Monitor supports additional economic capacity in the PJM markets that provides the reliable energy needed by customers. However Morgantown has not established that its return to service is a better source of capacity and energy than the alternatives that it would displace. PJM needs reliable and economic energy and not just nameplate capacity. Morgantown has not provided any support for its assertion (at 7) that granting the waiver could potentially lower costs for customers.

The retention of CIRs by Morgantown does have an opportunity cost. The retained CIRs will not be available to new generation in the interconnection queue seeking capacity status in PJM. Morgantown has not demonstrated or even addressed the question of whether the retention by Morgantown of the CIRs would be better, more efficient or more cost effective for the provision of reliable energy in the PJM markets than returning the CIRs to the market and permitting competitive new entry.

II. CONCLUSION

The Market Monitor respectfully requests that the Commission afford due consideration to this protest as the Commission resolves the issues raised in this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey W. Mayes

Joseph E. Bowring
Independent Market Monitor for PJM
President
Monitoring Analytics, LLC
2621 Van Buren Avenue, Suite 160

General Counsel
Monitoring Analytics, LLC
2621 Van Buren Avenue, Suite 160

¹² Parties can access Confidential Attachment A by executing the Protective Agreement and individual Non-Disclosure Certificates included in Attachment B.

Eagleville, Pennsylvania 19403
(610) 271-8051
joseph.bowring@monitoringanalytics.com

Joel Romero Luna
Senior Analyst
Monitoring Analytics, LLC
2621 Van Buren Avenue, Suite 160
Eagleville, Pennsylvania 19403
(610) 271-8050
joel.luna@monitoringanalytics.com

Eagleville, Pennsylvania 19403
(610) 271-8053
jeffrey.mayes@monitoringanalytics.com

Michael Russo
Analyst
Monitoring Analytics, LLC
2621 Van Buren Avenue, Suite 160
Eagleville, Pennsylvania 19403
(610) 271-8050
michael.russo@monitoringanalytics.com

Dated: September 11, 2025

Attachment A –

CUI//PRIV- DO NOT RELEASE

Attachment B

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Morgantown Power, LLC

Docket No. ER25-3339-000

PROTECTIVE ORDER

(Issued September 11, 2025)

Participants in this proceeding(s) may exchange documents or materials that are deemed to contain Privileged Material and/or Critical Energy/Electric Infrastructure Information (CEII), as those terms are defined herein. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT this Protective Order shall govern the use of all such material produced by, or on behalf of, any Participant in the above-captioned proceeding(s).

The Commission's regulations¹³ and its policy governing the labelling of controlled unclassified information (CUI),¹⁴ establish and distinguish the respective designations of Privileged Material and CEII. As to these designations, this Protective Order provides that a Participant:

- A. *may* designate as Privileged Material any material which customarily is treated by that Participant as commercially sensitive or proprietary or material subject to a legal privilege, which is not otherwise available to the public, and which, if disclosed, would subject that Participant or its customers to risk of competitive disadvantage or other business injury; and
- B. *must* designate as CEII, any material that meets the definition of that term as provided by 18 C.F.R. §§ 388.113(a), (c).

For the purposes of this Protective Order, the listed terms are defined as follows:

- C. Participant(s): As defined at 18 C.F.R. § 385.102(b).

¹³ Compare 18 C.F.R. § 388.112 with 18 C.F.R. § 388.113.

¹⁴ Notice of Document Labelling Guidance for Documents Submitted to or Filed with the Commission or Commission Staff, 82 Fed. Reg. 18632 (Apr. 20, 2017) (issued by Commission Apr. 14, 2017).

D. Privileged Material:¹⁵

- i. Material (including depositions) provided by a Participant in response to discovery requests or filed with the Commission, and that is designated as Privileged Material by such Participant;¹⁶
- ii. Material that is privileged under federal, state, or foreign law, such as work-product privilege, attorney-client privilege, or governmental privilege, and that is designated as Privileged Material by such Participant;¹⁷
- iii. Any information contained in or obtained from such designated material;
- iv. Any other material which is made subject to this Protective Order by the Presiding Administrative Law Judge (Presiding Judge) or the Chief Administrative Law Judge (Chief Judge) in the absence of the Presiding Judge or where no presiding judge is designated, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission), any court, or other body having appropriate authority, or by agreement of the Participants (subject to approval by the relevant authority);
- v. Notes of Privileged Material (memoranda, handwritten notes, or any other form of information (including electronic form) which copies

¹⁵ The Commission's regulations state that "[f]or the purposes of the Commission's filing requirements, non-CEII subject to an outstanding claim of exemption from disclosure under FOIA will be referred to as privileged material." 18 C.F.R. § 388.112(a). The regulations further state that "[f]or material filed in proceedings set for trial-type hearing or settlement judge proceedings, a participant's access to material for which privileged treatment is claimed is governed by the presiding official's protective order." 18 C.F.R. § 388.112(b)(2)(v).

¹⁶ See *infra* P 11 for the procedures governing the labeling of this designation.

¹⁷ The Commission's regulations state that "[a] presiding officer may, by order . . . restrict public disclosure of discoverable matter in order to . . . [p]reserve a privilege of a participant. . . ." 18 C.F.R. § 385.410(c)(3). To adjudicate such privileges, the regulations further state that "[i]n the absence of controlling Commission precedent, privileges will be determined in accordance with decisions of the Federal courts with due consideration to the Commission's need to obtain information necessary to discharge its regulatory responsibilities." 18 C.F.R. § 385.410(d)(1)(i).

or discloses Privileged Material);¹⁸ or

vi. Copies of Privileged Material.

vii. Privileged Material does not include:

- a. Any information or document that has been filed with and accepted into the public files of the Commission, or contained in the public files of any other federal or state agency, or any federal or state court, unless the information or document has been determined to be privileged by such agency or court;
- b. Information that is public knowledge, or which becomes public knowledge, other than through disclosure in violation of this Protective Order; or
- c. Any information or document labeled as “Non-Internet Public” by a Participant, in accordance with Paragraph 30 of FERC Order No. 630.¹⁹

E. Critical Energy/Electric Infrastructure Information (CEII): As defined at 18 C.F.R. §§ 388.113(a), (c).

F. Non-Disclosure Certificate: The certificate attached to this Protective Order, by which Participants granted access to Privileged Material and/or CEII must certify their understanding that such access to such material is provided pursuant to the terms and restrictions of this Protective Order, and that such Participants have read the Protective Order and agree to be bound by it. All executed Non-Disclosure Certificates must be served on all Participants on the official service list maintained by the Secretary of the Commission for this proceeding.

G. Reviewing Representative: A person who has signed a Non-Disclosure Certificate and who is:

- i. Commission Trial Staff designated as such in this proceeding;

¹⁸ Notes of Privileged Material are subject to the same restrictions for Privileged Material except as specifically provided in this Protective Order.

¹⁹ FERC Stat. & Reg. ¶ 31,140.

- ii. An attorney who has made an appearance in this proceeding for a Participant;
- iii. Attorneys, paralegals, and other employees associated for purposes of this case with an attorney who has made an appearance in this proceeding on behalf of a Participant;
- iv. An expert or an employee of an expert retained by a Participant for the purpose of advising, preparing for, submitting evidence or testifying in this proceeding;
- v. A person designated as a Reviewing Representative by order of the Presiding Judge, the Chief Judge, or the Commission; or
- vi. Employees or other representatives of Participants appearing in this proceeding with significant responsibility for this docket.

Privileged Material and/or CEII shall be made available under the terms of this Protective Order only to Participants and only to their Reviewing Representatives as provided in Paragraphs 6-10 of this Protective Order. The contents of Privileged Material, CEII or any other form of information that copies or discloses such materials shall not be disclosed to anyone other than in accordance with this Protective Order and shall be used only in connection with this specific proceeding.

All Privileged Material and/or CEII must be maintained in a secure place. Access to those materials must be limited to Reviewing Representatives specifically authorized pursuant to Paragraphs 7-9 of this Protective Order.

Privileged Material and/or CEII must be handled by each Participant and by each Reviewing Representative in accordance with the Non-Disclosure Certificate executed pursuant to Paragraph 9 of this Protective Order. Privileged Material and/or CEII shall not be used except as necessary for the conduct of this proceeding, nor shall they (or the substance of their contents) be disclosed in any manner to any person except a Reviewing Representative who is engaged in this proceeding and who needs to know the information in order to carry out that person's responsibilities in this proceeding. Reviewing Representatives may make copies of Privileged Material and/or CEII, but such copies automatically become Privileged Material and/or CEII. Reviewing Representatives may make notes of Privileged Material, which shall be treated as Notes of Privileged Material if they reflect the contents of Privileged Material.

If a Reviewing Representative's scope of employment includes any of the activities listed under this Paragraph 7, such Reviewing Representative may not use information contained in any Privileged Material and/or CEII obtained in this proceeding for a

commercial purpose (e.g. to give a Participant or competitor of any Participant a commercial advantage):

- H. Energy marketing;
- I. Direct supervision of any employee or employees whose duties include energy marketing; or
- J. The provision of consulting services to any person whose duties include energy marketing.

In the event that a Participant wishes to designate a person not described in Paragraph 3.E above as a Reviewing Representative, the Participant must seek agreement from the Participant providing the Privileged Material and/or CEII. If an agreement is reached, the designee shall be a Reviewing Representative pursuant to Paragraph 3.D of this Protective Order with respect to those materials. If no agreement is reached, the matter must be submitted to the Presiding Judge for resolution.

A Reviewing Representative shall not be permitted to inspect, participate in discussions regarding, or otherwise be permitted access to Privileged Material and/or CEII pursuant to this Protective Order until three business days after that Reviewing Representative first has executed and served a Non-Disclosure Certificate.²⁰ However, if an attorney qualified as a Reviewing Representative has executed a Non-Disclosure Certificate, any participating paralegal, secretarial and clerical personnel under the attorney's instruction, supervision or control need not do so. Attorneys designated Reviewing Representatives are responsible for ensuring that persons under their supervision or control comply with this Protective Order, and must take all reasonable precautions to ensure that Privileged Material and/or CEII are not disclosed to unauthorized persons. All executed Non-Disclosure Certificates must be served on all Participants on the official service list maintained by the Secretary of the Commission for the proceeding.

Any Reviewing Representative may disclose Privileged Material and/or CEII to any other Reviewing Representative as long as both Reviewing Representatives have executed a Non-Disclosure Certificate. In the event any Reviewing Representative to whom Privileged Material and/or CEII are disclosed ceases to participate in this proceeding, or

²⁰ During this three-day period, a Participant may file an objection with the Presiding Judge or the Commission contesting that an individual qualifies as a Reviewing Representative, and the individual shall not receive access to the Privileged Material and/or CEII until resolution of the dispute.

becomes employed or retained for a position that renders him or her ineligible to be a Reviewing Representative under Paragraph 3.D of this Protective Order, access to such materials by that person shall be terminated. Even if no longer engaged in this proceeding, every person who has executed a Non-Disclosure Certificate shall continue to be bound by the provisions of this Protective Order and the Non-Disclosure Certificate for as long as the Protective Order is in effect.²¹

All Privileged Material and/or CEII in this proceeding filed with the Commission, submitted to the Presiding Judge, or submitted to any Commission personnel, must comply with the Commission's *Notice of Document Labelling Guidance for Documents Submitted to or Filed with the Commission or Commission Staff*.²² Consistent with those requirements:

- K. Documents that contain Privileged Material must include a top center header on each page of the document with the following text: CUI//PRIV. Any corresponding electronic files must also include this text in the file name.
- L. Documents that contain CEII must include a top center header on each page of the document with the following text: CUI//CEII. Any corresponding electronic files must also include this text in the file name.
- M. Documents that contain both Privileged Material and CEII must include a top center header on each page of the document with the following text: CUI//CEII/PRIV. Any corresponding electronic files must also include this text in the file name.
- N. The specific content on each page of the document that constitutes Privileged Material and/or CEII must also be clearly identified. For example, lines or individual words or numbers that include both Privileged Material and CEII shall be prefaced and end with "BEGIN CUI//CEII/PRIV" and "END CUI//CEII/PRIV".

The Secretary shall place any Privileged Material and/or CEII filed with the Commission in a non-public file. By placing such documents in a non-public file, the Commission is not making a determination concerning any claim of privilege or CEII status. The Commission retains the right to make determinations with regard to any privilege or CEII claim, as well as the discretion to release information necessary to carry out its

²¹ See *infra* P 21.

²² 82 Fed. Reg. 18632 (Apr. 20, 2017) (issued by Commission Apr. 14, 2017).

jurisdictional responsibilities. For documents submitted to Commission Trial Staff, the notification procedures specified at 18 C.F.R. § 388.112 must be followed before making public any Privileged Material.

If any Participant desires to include, utilize, or refer to Privileged Material or information derived from Privileged Material in testimony or other exhibits during the hearing in this proceeding in a manner that might require disclosure of such materials to persons other than Reviewing Representatives, that Participant first must notify both counsel for the disclosing Participant and the Presiding Judge, and identify all such Privileged Material. Thereafter, use of such Privileged Material will be governed by procedures determined by the Presiding Judge.

Nothing in this Protective Order shall be construed as precluding any Participant from objecting to the production or use of Privileged Material and/or CEII on any appropriate ground.

Nothing in this Protective Order shall preclude any Participant from requesting the Presiding Judge (or the Chief Judge in the Presiding Judge's absence or where no presiding judge is designated), the Commission, or any other body having appropriate authority, to find this Protective Order should not apply to all or any materials previously designated Privileged Material pursuant to this Protective Order. The Presiding Judge (or the Chief Judge in the Presiding Judge's absence or where no presiding judge is designated), the Commission, or any other body having appropriate authority may alter or amend this Protective Order as circumstances warrant at any time during the course of this proceeding.

Each Participant governed by this Protective Order has the right to seek changes in it as appropriate from the Presiding Judge (or the Chief Judge in the Presiding Judge's absence or where no presiding judge is designated), the Commission, or any other body having appropriate authority.

Subject to Paragraph 18, the Presiding Judge (or the Chief Judge in the Presiding Judge's absence or where no presiding judge is designated), or the Commission shall resolve any disputes arising under this Protective Order pertaining to Privileged Material according to the following procedures. Prior to presenting any such dispute to the Presiding Judge, the Chief Judge or the Commission, the Participants to the dispute shall employ good faith best efforts to resolve it.

- O. Any Participant that contests the designation of material as Privileged Material shall notify the Participant that provided the Privileged Material by specifying in writing the material for which the designation is contested.
- P. In any challenge to the designation of material as Privileged Material, the

burden of proof shall be on the Participant seeking protection. If the Presiding Judge, the Chief Judge, or the Commission finds that the material at issue is not entitled to the designation, the procedures of Paragraph 18 shall apply.

- Q. The procedures described above shall not apply to material designated by a Participant as CEII. Material so designated shall remain subject to the provisions of this Protective Order, unless a Participant requests and obtains a determination from the Commission's CEII Coordinator that such material need not retain that designation.

The designator will have five (5) days in which to respond to any pleading requesting disclosure of Privileged Material. Should the Presiding Judge, the Chief Judge, or the Commission, as appropriate, determine that the information should be made public, the Presiding Judge, the Chief Judge, or the Commission will provide notice to the designator no less than five (5) days prior to the date on which the material will become public. This Protective Order shall automatically cease to apply to such material on the sixth (6th) calendar day after the notification is made unless the designator files a motion with the Presiding Judge, the Chief Judge, or the Commission, as appropriate, with supporting affidavits, demonstrating why the material should continue to be privileged. Should such a motion be filed, the material will remain confidential until such time as the interlocutory appeal or certified question has been addressed by the Motions Commissioner or Commission, as provided in the Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. §§ 385.714, .715. No Participant waives its rights to seek additional administrative or judicial remedies after a Presiding Judge or Chief Judge decision regarding Privileged Material or the Commission's denial of any appeal thereof or determination in response to any certified question. The provisions of 18 C.F.R. §§ 388.112 and 388.113 shall apply to any requests under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. § 552) for Privileged Material and/or CEII in the files of the Commission.

Privileged Material and/or CEII shall remain available to Participants until the later of 1) the date an order terminating this proceeding no longer is subject to judicial review, or 2) the date any other Commission proceeding relating to the Privileged Material and/or CEII is concluded and no longer subject to judicial review. After this time, the Participant that produced the Privileged Material and/or CEII may request (in writing) that all other Participants return or destroy the Privileged Material and/or CEII. This request must be satisfied with within fifteen (15) days of the date the request is made. However, copies of filings, official transcripts and exhibits in this proceeding containing Privileged Material, or Notes of Privileged Material, may be retained if they are maintained in accordance with Paragraph 5 of this Protective Order. If requested, each Participant also must submit to the Participant making the request an affidavit stating that to the best of its knowledge it has satisfied the request to return or destroy the Privileged Material and/or CEII. To

the extent Privileged Material and/or CEII are not returned or destroyed, they shall remain subject to this Protective Order.

Regardless of any order terminating this proceeding, this Protective Order shall remain in effect until specifically modified or terminated by the Presiding Judge, the Chief Judge, or the Commission. All CEII designations shall be subject to the “[d]uration of the CEII designation” provisions of 18 C.F.R. § 388.113(e).

Any violation of this Protective Order and of any Non-Disclosure Certificate executed hereunder shall constitute a violation of an order of the Commission.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Morgantown Power, LLC

Docket No. ER25-3339

NON-DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify my understanding that access to Privileged Material and/or Critical Energy/Electric Infrastructure Information (CEII) is provided to me pursuant to the terms and restrictions of the Protective Order in this proceeding, that I have been given a copy of and have read the Protective Order, and that I agree to be bound by it. I understand that the contents of Privileged Material and/or CEII, any notes or other memoranda, or any other form of information that copies or discloses such materials, shall not be disclosed to anyone other than in accordance with the Protective Order. I acknowledge that a violation of this certificate constitutes a violation of an order of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

By: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____

Representing: _____

Date: _____

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Dated at Eagleville, Pennsylvania,
this 11th day of September, 2025.



Jeffrey W. Mayes

General Counsel

Monitoring Analytics, LLC

2621 Van Buren Avenue, Suite 160

Eagleville, Pennsylvania 19403

(610) 271-8053

jeffrey.mayes@monitoringanalytics.com