

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, L.L.C.; Notice of Request for Comments

On September 11, 2013, Northern Indiana Public Service Company (NIPSCO) filed a complaint against Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (MISO) and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM).¹ NIPSCO requested that the Commission order MISO and PJM (the RTOs) to reform the interregional planning process of the Joint Operating Agreement between MISO and PJM (MISO–PJM JOA). On June 15, 2015, the Commission held a technical conference to explore issues raised in the Complaint related to the MISO–PJM JOA and the MISO–PJM seam.

Shown below are post-technical conference questions for which the Commission seeks further comment. To the extent that any response calls for specific revisions to the MISO–PJM JOA, the Commission requests that parties also provide redline revisions to the MISO–PJM JOA where possible.

1. According to comments made at the technical conference, it appears that several MISO and/or PJM stakeholder groups are currently working on potential revisions to the MISO–PJM JOA, MISO tariff and/or PJM tariff (*e.g.*, models and assumptions, Market Efficiency Project and Cross Border Market Efficiency Project criteria, etc.). Please comment on the status of that effort, the potential revisions being considered, and the timing of any proposed revisions to be filed with the Commission for consideration.

2. Provide specific examples of types of facilities that could have a significant benefit (*e.g.*, relieving congestion across the seam) but may not pass MISO's regional Market Efficiency Project and/or Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project criteria. To the extent such facilities would have significant benefit, what steps do the RTOs need to take to address the matter?

3. What specific revisions would need to be made to the MISO–PJM JOA in order to better align the existing regional transmission planning cycles with the interregional transmission planning process?

4. Would revisions to the MISO–PJM JOA to require the RTOs to, annually, or at some other regular interval, conduct a joint interregional transmission planning study help to address the issues created by the configuration of the PJM and MISO planning regions? If so, what specific revisions to the MISO–PJM JOA would be required?

5. Based on comments at the technical conference, it appears that projects that successfully navigate the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee process must be studied and approved two more times—once through the MISO regional planning process and once through the PJM regional planning process. Please give specific examples of reforms that could be made to address this “triple hurdle”² (*e.g.*, creation of a new project category for interregional transmission projects to be eligible for selection in the two RTOs' respective regional transmission plans).

6. Please explain whether the avoidance of market-to-market payments should be included in the assessment of the benefits of Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects.

7. Should the MISO–PJM JOA be revised to include the process and study scope of the “Quick Hit”³ study process? Please explain why or why not.

8. Explain ways in which the RTOs can better coordinate planning of new generator interconnection and generator retirement. Would using models with the same assumptions and criteria be one way to better coordinate? What specific revisions would need to be made to the MISO–PJM JOA?

Interested parties should submit comments in response to the questions above on or before August 14, 2015. Reply comments must be filed on or before August 31, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Parties may submit comments by one of the following methods: Agency Web site: <http://www.ferc.gov/>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments via the eFiling

² Various panelists referred to this process as the “triple hurdle” problem.

³ MISO and PJM state that under the newly initiated PJM and MISO “Quick Hit” study, the RTOs are considering near-term upgrades to remedy recent historical interregional congestion issues. MISO and PJM explain that this study allows projects to be identified more quickly and alleviate the underlying issues promptly. MISO and PJM Joint Comments at 3, n.10 (filed Mar. 31, 2015). See also PJM/MISO Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting Presentation at 4 (The “Quick Hit” study goal is to identify valuable projects on the MISO–PJM seam. Valuable projects are those that will relieve known Market-to-Market issues, are completed in a relatively short time frame, have a quick payback on investment, and are not greenfield projects.)

link found under the “Documents and Filing” tab.

Mail: Those unable to file comments electronically may mail or hand-deliver comments to: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Secretary of the Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

All comments submitted should be identified by Docket No. EL13–88–000.

For further information contact: Jason Strong (Technical Information) Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of Energy Market Regulation 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426

(202) 502–6124

jason.strong@ferc.gov

Ben Foster (Technical Information) Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of Energy Policy and

Innovation 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426

(202) 502–6149

ben.foster@ferc.gov

Lina Naik (Legal Information) Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Office of the General Counsel 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426

(202) 502–8882

lina.naik@ferc.gov

Dated: July 15, 2015.

Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–17811 Filed 7–20–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. CP15–525–000; PF15–9–000]

UGI Sunbury, LLC; Notice of Application

Take notice that on July 1, 2015, UGI Sunbury, LLC (Sunbury), 460 N. Gulph Road, King of Prussia, PA 19406, filed an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and Parts 157 and 284 of the Commission's Regulations requesting: (i) A certificate authorizing Sunbury to construct, own, and operate new interstate natural gas pipeline facilities (Sunbury Pipeline Project); (ii) a blanket certificate authorizing Sunbury to construct and/or abandon certain eligible facilities, and (iii) a blanket certificate authorizing Sunbury authority to provide open-access transportation services with pre-granted abandonment authority. The Sunbury Pipeline Project is designed to add an additional 200,000 Dth/d of new

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

pipeline capacity to industrial and residential users and would require the construction of approximately 34.4 miles of 20-inch-diameter pipeline in Snyder, Union, Northumberland, Montour, and Lycoming Counties, Pennsylvania.

The Sunbury Pipeline Project would run generally north to south, interconnecting with the pipeline facilities of Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Company and the MARC I Pipeline at its northern end and also interconnecting with the distribution facilities of UGI Penn Natural Gas and UGI Central Penn Gas. At its southern terminus the Sunbury Pipeline would connect to the proposed Hummel Station Generating Facility at the existing site of the coal-fired Sunbury Generating Facility in Snyder County, Pennsylvania. The estimated cost of the Project is \$178,243,345. The filing may be viewed on the web at <http://www.ferc.gov> using the "eLibrary" link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, contact FERC at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or call toll-free, (886) 208-3676 or TTY, (202) 502-8659.

Any questions concerning this application should be directed to Anthony C. Cox, Director, UGI Sunbury, LLC, One Meridian Blvd., Suite 2C01, Wyomissing, PA 19610, phone: (610) 373-7999, facsimile: (610) 374-4288, email: acox@sunburypipeline.com, or Janna R. Chesno, Hogan Lovells US LLP, 555 Thirteen Street NW., Washington, DC 20004, phone: (202) 637-5600, facsimile: (202) 637-5910, email: janna.chesno@hoganlovells.com.

On December 30, 2014 the Commission granted Sunbury's request to utilize the Pre-Filing Process and assigned Docket No. PF15-9-000 to staff activities involved in the Sunbury Pipeline Project. Now, as of the filing of the July 1 application, the Pre-Filing Process for this Project has ended. From this time forward, this proceeding will be conducted in Docket No. CP15-525-000 as noted in the caption of this Notice.

Pursuant to section 157.9 of the Commission's rules, 18 CFR 157.9, within 90 days of this Notice the Commission staff will either: complete its environmental assessment (EA) and place it into the Commission's public record (eLibrary) for this proceeding, or issue a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review. If a Notice of Schedule for Environmental Review is issued, it will indicate, among other milestones, the anticipated date for the Commission staff's issuance of the final

environmental impact statement (FEIS) or EA for this proposal. The filing of the EA in the Commission's public record for this proceeding or the issuance of a Notice of Schedule will serve to notify federal and state agencies of the timing for the completion of all necessary reviews, and the subsequent need to complete all federal authorizations within 90 days of the date of issuance of the Commission staff's FEIS or EA.

There are two ways to become involved in the Commission's review of this project. First, any person wishing to obtain legal status by becoming a party to the proceedings for this project should, on or before the comment date stated below, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the NGA (18 CFR 157.10). A person obtaining party status will be placed on the service list maintained by the Secretary of the Commission and will receive copies of all documents filed by the applicant and by all other parties. A party must submit 5 copies of filings made with the Commission and must mail a copy to the applicant and to every other party in the proceeding. Only parties to the proceeding can ask for court review of Commission orders in the proceeding.

However, a person does not have to intervene in order to have comments considered. The second way to participate is by filing with the Secretary of the Commission, as soon as possible, an original and two copies of comments in support of or in opposition to this project. The Commission will consider these comments in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but the filing of a comment alone will not serve to make the filer a party to the proceeding. The Commission's rules require that persons filing comments in opposition to the project provide copies of their protests only to the party or parties directly involved in the protest.

Persons who wish to comment only on the environmental review of this project should submit an original and two copies of their comments to the Secretary of the Commission. Environmental commenters will be placed on the Commission's environmental mailing list, will receive copies of the environmental documents, and will be notified of meetings associated with the Commission's environmental review process. Environmental commenters will not be required to serve copies of filed

documents on all other parties. However, the non-party commenters will not receive copies of all documents filed by other parties or issued by the Commission (except for the mailing of environmental documents issued by the Commission) and will not have the right to seek court review of the Commission's final order.

Motions to intervene, protests and comments may be filed electronically via the internet in lieu of paper; see, 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site under the "e-Filing" link. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filings.

Comment Date: August 5, 2015.

Dated: July 15, 2015.

Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015-17810 Filed 7-20-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings #2

Take notice that the Commission received the following exempt wholesale generator filings:

Docket Numbers: EG15-105-000.

Applicants: Prairie Breeze Wind Energy III LLC.

Description: Notice of Self-Certification of Exempt Wholesale Generator Status of Prairie Breeze Wind Energy III LLC.

Filed Date: 7/15/15.

Accession Number: 20150715-5103.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/5/15.

Take notice that the Commission received the following electric rate filings:

Docket Numbers: ER10-2881-014; ER14-787-002; ER13-1541-008; ER13-1101-009; ER10-2886-014; ER10-2885-014; ER10-2884-014; ER10-2883-014; ER10-2882-014; ER10-2663-014; ER10-2641-014; EL15-39-000.

Applicants: Alabama Power Company, Southern Power Company, Mississippi Power Company, Georgia Power Company, Gulf Power Company, Oleander Power Project, Limited Partnership, Southern Company—Florida LLC, Southern Turner Cimarron I, LLC, Spectrum Nevada Solar, LLC, Campo Verde Solar, LLC, Macho Springs Solar, LLC.

Description: Answer of Alabama Power Company, et al., to the April 27, 2015 Order.

Filed Date: 6/26/15.

Accession Number: 20150701-0178.