

JULY-AUGUST 2023

VOL. 23-7

PRATT'S

ENERGY LAW

REPORT



LexisNexis

EDITOR'S NOTE: IT'S ALL ABOUT POWER

Victoria Prussen Spears

NEW GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT HIGHLIGHTS ADVANCEMENTS IN FUSION AND PROVIDES POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Amy Roma and Stephanie Fishman

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY'S FINAL GOOD NEIGHBOR PLAN FOR THE 2015 OZONE NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS: NOTABLE FEATURES, IMPLICATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

James Dolphin, III, Emily Tabak, Paul D. Tanaka, P.C., and Gabe Almario

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT CANS BERKELEY GAS BAN UNDER FEDERAL LAW

David L. Wochner, Benjamin A. Mayer, John Longstreth, Nathan C. Howe, Timothy J. Furdyna and David Wang

INFLATION REDUCTION ACT OFFERS A VARIETY OF ENERGY-RELATED TAX INCENTIVES

Marcy Hart, Holly R. Camisa, Maria Z. Cortes and Olufunke Leroy

WOTUS, SCOTUS AND POTUS - ACT III, OR IS IT ACT IV?

Richard G. Leland

CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD APPROVES 100% ZERO EMISSION VEHICLE REQUIREMENTS FOR TRUCK MANUFACTURERS AND FLEETS

Maureen F. Gorsen, Justin A. Savage, Andrew R. Stewart, Caleb J. Bowers and Marie E.A. Allison

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS SETS ASIDE POWER PRICING ORDERS DURING WINTER STORM URI

Craig R. Enochs, William W. Russell and Travis R. Reed

Pratt's Energy Law Report

VOLUME 23

NUMBER 7

July-August 2023

Editor's Note: It's All About Power Victoria Prussen Spears	225
New Government Accountability Office Report Highlights Advancements in Fusion and Provides Policy Recommendations Amy Roma and Stephanie Fishman	227
Environmental Protection Agency's Final Good Neighbor Plan for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards: Notable Features, Implications and Next Steps James Dolphin, III, Emily Tabak, Paul D. Tanaka, P.C., and Gabe Almario	235
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Cans Berkeley Gas Ban Under Federal Law David L. Wochner, Benjamin A. Mayer, John Longstreth, Nathan C. Howe, Timothy J. Furdyna and David Wang	243
Inflation Reduction Act Offers a Variety of Energy-Related Tax Incentives Marcy Hart, Holly R. Camisa, Maria Z. Cortes and Olufunke Leroy	248
WOTUS, SCOTUS and POTUS – Act III, or Is it Act IV? Richard G. Leland	253
California Air Resources Board Approves 100% Zero Emission Vehicle Requirements for Truck Manufacturers and Fleets Maureen F. Gorsen, Justin A. Savage, Andrew R. Stewart, Caleb J. Bowers and Marie E.A. Allison	256
Texas Court of Appeals Sets Aside Power Pricing Orders During Winter Storm Uri Craig R. Enochs, William W. Russell and Travis R. Reed	259

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call or email:

Jessica Carnevale, Esq. at (212) 229-4942

Email: jessica.carnevale@lexisnexis.com

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385

Fax Number (800) 828-8341

Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0836-3 (print)

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0837-0 (ebook)

ISSN: 2374-3395 (print)

ISSN: 2374-3409 (online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S ENERGY LAW REPORT [page number]
(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Ian Coles, *Rare Earth Elements: Deep Sea Mining and the Law of the Sea*, 14 PRATT’S ENERGY
LAW REPORT 4 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2023 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

SAMUEL B. BOXERMAN

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

ANDREW CALDER

Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

M. SETH GINTHER

Partner, Hirschler Fleischer, P.C.

STEPHEN J. HUMES

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

R. TODD JOHNSON

Partner, Jones Day

BARCLAY NICHOLSON

Partner, Sheppard Mullin

ELAINE M. WALSH

Partner, Baker Botts L.L.P.

SEAN T. WHEELER

Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

Hydraulic Fracturing Developments

ERIC ROTHENBERG

Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP

Pratt's Energy Law Report is published 10 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2023 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Energy Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Cans Berkeley Gas Ban Under Federal Law

*By David L. Wochner, Benjamin A. Mayer, John Longstreth,
Nathan C. Howe, Timothy J. Furdyna and David Wang**

In this article, the authors examine a federal appellate court decision striking down a local ordinance banning natural gas piping in newly constructed buildings.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in *California Restaurant Association v. City of Berkeley*,¹ struck down a local ordinance banning natural gas piping in newly constructed buildings, concluding that federal law preempts the ordinance. This decision may have significant implications for similar state and local regulations, especially those in California and Washington. Building owners and operators, utilities, and other stakeholders impacted by natural gas “bans” or electrification mandates should consider whether their state or local regulation is affected.

CALIFORNIA RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION V. CITY OF BERKELEY

In July 2019, the City of Berkeley, California (Berkeley or the City) adopted Ordinance No. 7,672-N.S., titled “Prohibition of Natural Gas Infrastructure in New Buildings” (Ordinance). The Ordinance amends the Berkeley Municipal Code to prohibit natural gas infrastructure in new buildings.² Natural gas infrastructure is defined as “fuel gas piping, other than service pipe, in or in connection with a building, structure, or within the property lines of premises, extending from the point of delivery at the gas meter.”³ By prohibiting natural gas piping in newly constructed buildings, Berkeley sought to “eliminate obsolete natural gas infrastructure and associated greenhouse gas emissions in new buildings where all-electric infrastructure can be most practicably integrated, thereby reducing the environmental and health hazards produced by the consumption and transportation of natural gas.”⁴

In November 2019, the California Restaurant Association (CRA) sued Berkeley in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California,

* The authors, attorneys with K&L Gates LLP, may be contacted at david.wochner@klgates.com, ben.mayer@klgates.com, john.longstreth@klgates.com, nathan.howe@klgates.com, tim.furdyna@klgates.com and david.wang@klgates.com, respectively.

¹ *California Restaurant Association v. City of Berkeley*, No. 21-16278 (Apr. 17, 2023) (CRA Decision).

² Ordinance § 12.80.040(A).

³ Id. § 12.80.040(E).

⁴ Id. § 12.80.010(H).

arguing among other things that the federal Energy Policy and Conservation Act (EPCA)⁵ preempted the Ordinance. EPCA is a federal statute that regulates the energy efficiency of several consumer products, including water heaters; furnaces; stoves; and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems (together, covered products). EPCA does not cover piping, however. EPCA preempts state and local regulations concerning the energy efficiency, energy use, or water use of any covered product that has a federal energy conservation standard.⁶

The district court originally dismissed the CRA's challenge, concluding that EPCA must be "interpreted in a limited manner." According to the district court, broad federal preemption under EPCA would cause federal law to "sweep into areas that are historically the province of state and local regulation," including "local natural gas infrastructure."⁷ Thus, EPCA could supersede only those state and local regulations that focus on a covered product, and directly require a particular energy use for that product.

The Ninth Circuit reversed the district court, holding that EPCA expressly preempts state and local regulations concerning the energy use of many natural gas appliances, including those used in household and restaurant kitchens. The Ninth Circuit held that EPCA's preemption clause supersedes state and local regulations that "relate" to the quantity of energy directly consumed by certain appliances at the place where those products are used. A preemption clause that covers regulations on "energy use" "fairly encompasses an ordinance that effectively eliminates the 'use' of an energy source." Critically, the panel reasoned that EPCA's purpose was to ensure that states and localities "could not prevent consumers from using covered products in their homes, kitchens, and businesses." EPCA's preemption clause therefore extends to regulations that (i) directly address the covered products, or (ii) affect the on-site infrastructure related to the use of those products. The Ninth Circuit concluded that EPCA preempted Berkeley's ban because it prohibited the onsite installation of natural gas infrastructure necessary to support covered natural gas appliances.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT'S DECISION

On Wednesday, May 31, 2023, Berkeley sought en banc review from the Ninth Circuit, may still appeal the Ninth Circuit's decision to the U.S. Supreme Court. As it stands now, the opinion's immediate effect is that it strikes

⁵ 42 U.S.C. § 6201 et seq.

⁶ 42 U.S.C. § 6297(c). This particular provision contains several exceptions, but the Ninth Circuit determined that none of the exceptions were applicable to this case.

⁷ *California Restaurant Association v. City of Berkeley*, 547 F. Supp. 3d 878, 891 (N.D. Cal. 2021).

down Berkeley's Ordinance. It may also spell the end for similar regulations banning natural gas in states and municipalities in the Ninth Circuit.⁸ On Monday, May 22, 2023, for example, three gas utilities in Washington state, a trade group, and labor groups filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington challenging provisions in the Washington State Energy Code that ban or substantially limit the use of gas appliances in homes and businesses under EPCA. The decision may also have other wide-ranging effects.

Emphasis on the Use of Covered Products

First, the Ninth Circuit's focus on "use" puts in question state and local regulations prohibiting or affecting – even indirectly – the "use" of natural gas in homes and buildings. Since 2019, over 70 state and local jurisdictions around the country have passed provisions requiring or incentivizing all-electric or zero-emissions new buildings and new construction in existing buildings, including many in California and Washington state.⁹

EPCA Preemption of Local Building Codes

Second, the Ninth Circuit observed that EPCA can also preempt local building codes. Building codes may survive preemption, however, under two circumstances. First, EPCA would not preempt any state or local regulation enacted or prescribed before 8 January 1987. Second, a state or local building code can survive EPCA preemption if the following seven requirements are met:¹⁰

1. The code allows a builder to meet an energy consumption or conservation objective for a building by selecting items whose combined energy efficiencies meet that objective;
2. The code does not specifically require any Covered Products to exceed federal standards for energy efficiency (unless granted a waiver from the secretary of energy);
3. The code offers options for compliance on a "one-for-one equivalent energy use or equivalent cost basis";
4. The code bases any baseline building design used by the code on a

⁸ The Ninth Circuit covers nine states (Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington) and two territories (Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands).

⁹ See Zero Emissions Building Ordinances, BUILDING DECARBONIZATION COALITION, <https://buildingdecarb.org/zeb-ordinances>.

¹⁰ CRA Decision, citing 42 U.S.C. § 6297(f)(1)-(3).

building with covered products that do not exceed federal standards (unless granted a waiver from the secretary of energy);

5. The code offers at least one optional combination of energy consumption-related items that does not exceed federal standards for any covered product (assuming the code offers such combinations);
6. The code frames any energy target as total energy consumption for the entire building; and
7. The code uses test procedures specified in EPCA to determine the energy consumption of covered products.¹¹

According to the Ninth Circuit, Berkeley's natural gas ban was in a building code that failed to meet these requirements. The CRA Decision indicates that courts will look to the outcome of a state or local regulation and see if it affects the "use" of a product covered by EPCA. If so, under the Ninth Circuit's decision, EPCA preemption is likely triggered, and the state or local regulation is likely preempted, unless one of EPCA's exceptions applies. EPCA preemption could conceivably also cover a plethora of other state and local regulations related to testing and labeling requirements,¹² energy use,¹³ energy efficiency standards,¹⁴ and water use.¹⁵

WHERE GAS BANS GO FROM HERE

The Ninth Circuit may have struck down Berkeley's natural gas ban, but other state and local bans and electricity mandates could still stand if they are within a building code that meets EPCA's preemption exceptions. Other federal courts may also be ruling on similar cases in the future, which would affect state and local regulations in states outside of the Ninth Circuit and could create a conflict among the circuits.

Stakeholders now face uncertainty regarding assumptions and projections made with now potentially defunct gas bans in mind. For instance, building owners and operators may have invested in electric appliances or infrastructure to comply with a local prohibition or mandate. Gas and electric utilities serving local jurisdictions subject to a natural gas ban may have designed integrated resource plans or other long-term energy plans with certain assumptions on the rise of electric service and the decline of gas. Local jurisdictions that have

¹¹ 42 U.S.C. § 6297(f)(3)(A)-(G).

¹² 42 U.S.C. § 6297(a).

¹³ *Id.* § 6297(b).

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

experienced difficulty implementing electricity infrastructure may use the CRA Decision to justify continued reliance on natural gas. Moreover, providers of renewable natural gas and hydrogen may market their fuel as a legally compliant, low-carbon alternative to investing in all-electric infrastructure.

Furthermore, the CRA Decision may ease concerns by gas utilities faced with potential “stranded assets” – investments in infrastructure that have remaining useful life but have been retired early as a result of underutilization – due to state and local policies that are intended to reduce or wind-down consumption of natural gas. Such assets often give rise to thorny policy questions as to whether the utility or ratepayers should be responsible for these sunk costs, particularly when the investments were prudent when made. The Ninth Circuit’s confirmation that EPCA requires in many cases continued access to natural gas infrastructure by new customers supports continued prudent investment by utilities to meet this additional demand – and, accordingly, bolsters the case for cost recovery for these investments in utility rates.