

accordance with 18 CFR 4.34(b) and 385.2010.

Dated: February 12, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015-03444 Filed 2-18-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. OR15-14-000]

Panola Pipeline Company, LLC; Notice of Petition for Declaratory Order

Take notice that on February 10, 2015, pursuant to Rule 207(a)(2) of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.207(a)(2) (2014), Panola Pipeline Company, LLC (Panola or Petitioner), filed a petition for declaratory order seeking approval of priority service and the proposed tariff rate structure and terms of service for a planned expansion of Panola's pipeline system, as more fully explained in the petition.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest this filing must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a notice of intervention or motion to intervene, as appropriate. Such notices, motions, or protests must be filed on or before the comment date. Anyone filing a motion to intervene or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Petitioner.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the "eFiling" link at <http://www.ferc.gov>. Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

This filing is accessible on-line at <http://www.ferc.gov>, using the "eLibrary" link and is available for review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an "eSubscription" link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive email notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC

Online service, please email FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov, or call (866) 208-3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502-8659.

Comment Date: 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on March 10, 2015.

Dated: February 12, 2015.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015-03441 Filed 2-18-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EL13-88-000]

Northern Indiana Public Service Company v. Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. and PJM Interconnection, LLC; Notice of Request for Comments

February 12, 2015.

On September 11, 2013, Northern Indiana Public Service Company (NIPSCO) filed a complaint against Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (MISO) and PJM Interconnection, LLC (PJM). NIPSCO requested that the Commission order MISO and PJM to reform the interregional planning process of the Joint Operating Agreement between MISO and PJM (MISO-PJM JOA).¹ On December 18, 2014, the Commission issued an order directing Commission staff to convene a technical conference to explore issues raised in the Complaint related to the MISO-PJM JOA and the MISO-PJM seam. The Commission also directed Commission staff to issue a request for comments on these issues prior to the technical conference to inform the technical conference discussion.²

Shown below is the list of questions for which Commission staff seeks comment. The questions cover the six reforms that NIPSCO recommends to the cross-border transmission planning process that occurs under the MISO-PJM JOA, as well as certain additional issues. Commenters should discuss the potential benefits and/or drawbacks, cost concerns, and technical feasibility of implementing the following reforms and how long the reforms would take to implement if adopted.

¹ NIPSCO Complaint, Docket No. EL13-88-000 (filed Sept. 11, 2013).

² *Northern Indiana Public Service Co. v. Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc. and PJM Interconnection, LLC*, 149 FERC ¶ 61,248, at P 35 (2014).

1. Require the MISO-PJM cross-border transmission planning process to run concurrently with the MISO and PJM regional transmission planning cycles, rather than after those regional planning cycles.

2. Require MISO and PJM to develop and use a single model that uses the same assumptions in the cross-border transmission planning process. Until the joint model is developed, require that there is consistency between the PJM and MISO planning analysis and that both entities are consistent in their application of reliability criteria and modeling assumptions.

3. Require MISO and PJM to use a single common set of criteria to evaluate cross-border market efficiency projects.

4. Require MISO and PJM to amend the criteria to evaluate cross-border market efficiency projects to address all known benefits, including avoidance of future market-to-market (M2M) payments made to reallocate short-term transmission capacity in the real-time operation of the system.

5. Require MISO and PJM to have a process for joint planning and cost allocation of lower voltage and lower cost cross-border upgrades.

6. Require MISO and PJM to improve the processes within the MISO-PJM JOA with respect to new generator interconnections and generation retirements.

7. Explain the relationship between the cross-border transmission planning process (and approval of new transmission projects) and persistent M2M payments being made between the RTOs. Are persistent M2M payments a good indicator of the need for new transmission?

8. NIPSCO provides an estimate of M2M payments on pages 23-24 of its Complaint. Please comment on these estimates and provide information on other estimates of M2M payments, including whether PJM, MISO and the market monitors have identified trends in M2M payments.

9. Please provide examples of transmission projects that have been considered under the cross-border transmission planning process for the purpose of mitigating congestion and/or constraints that lead to persistent M2M payments, but that have not been developed. Provide the reason the project was not developed.

Interested parties should submit comments on or before March 16, 2015. Reply comments must be filed on or before March 31, 2015. Comments should be provided by question as enumerated above.

ADDRESSES: Parties may submit comments, identified by Docket No.