

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Project No. 2030–113]

Portland General Electric Company; Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon; Notice of Application and Soliciting Comments, Motions to Intervene, and Protests

August 2, 2007.

Take notice that the following application has been filed with the Commission and is available for public inspection:

a. *Application Type*: Shoreline Management Plan (SMP).
 b. *Project No*: 2030–113.
 c. *Date Filed*: July 11, 2007.
 d. *Applicant*: Portland General Electric Company and the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (CTWS).

e. *Name of Project*: Pelton Round Butte Hydroelectric Project.

f. *Location*: The project is located on the Deschutes River in Jefferson County, Oregon. The project occupies 3,503.74 acres of federal and tribal lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA).

g. *Filed Pursuant to*: Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. 791(a)–825(r).

h. *Applicant Contact*: Ms. Julie A. Keil, Director of Hydro Licensing, Portland General Electric Company, 121 SW Salmon, Portland, OR 97204, (503) 464–8864.

i. *FERC Contact*: Any questions on this notice should be addressed to Lesley Kordella at (202) 502–6406, or by e-mail: lesley.kordella@ferc.gov.

j. *Deadline for filing comments and/or motions*: September 4, 2007.

All documents (original and eight copies) should be filed with: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, DHAC, PJ–12.1, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. Please include the project number (p–2030–113) on any comments or motions filed. Comments, protests and interventions 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.

k. *Description of Proposal*: The licensees submitted a revised SMP as required by article 428 of the project license. The SMP was developed to guide development and resource

protection on Lake Billy Chinook and Lake Simtustus. It is intended to provide a tool to manage new shoreline development within the project boundary, protect public health and safety, recognize existing uses of the shoreline, and achieve a balance of the interests of the licensees and private and commercial property owners and recreational users, while allowing the licensees to efficiently manage the project's power generating facilities and fulfill the project purposes.

1. This filing is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site 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 Online Support at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or call toll-free 1–866–208–3676, or for TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

m. Individuals desiring to be included on the Commission's mailing list should so indicate by writing to the Secretary of the Commission.

n. Comments, Protests, or Motions to Intervene—Anyone may submit comments, a protest, or a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.210, .211, .214. In determining the appropriate action to take, the Commission will consider all protests or other comments filed, but only those who file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules may become a party to the proceeding. Any comments, protests, or motions to intervene must be received on or before the specified comment date for the particular application.

o. Filing and Service of Responsive Documents—Any filings must bear in all capital letters the title "Comments," "Recommendations for Terms and Conditions," "Protest," or "Motion To Intervene," as applicable, and the Project Number of the particular application to which the filing refers. A copy of any motion to intervene must also be served upon each representative of the Applicant specified in the particular application.

p. Agency Comments—Federal, state, and local agencies are invited to file comments on the described application. A copy of the application may be obtained by agencies directly from the Applicant. If an agency does not file comments within the time specified for filing comments, it will be presumed to have no comments. One copy of an

agency's comments must also be sent to the Applicant's representatives.

Kimberly D. Bose,
 Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7–15525 Filed 8–8–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Docket No. AD07–12–000]

Reliability Standard Compliance and Enforcement in Regions With Independent System Operators and Regional Transmission Organizations; Second Notice of Technical Conference

August 2, 2007.

As announced on June 15, 2007, the staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will hold a technical conference in the above-referenced proceeding on September 18, 2007, at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington DC. It will be held in the Commission Meeting Room (Room 2C) from 9:30 a.m. until 1 p.m. (EDT).

All interested parties are invited.

The conference will explore issues associated with the cost recovery of penalties for Reliability Standard violations assessed against independent system operators (ISOs) and regional transmission organizations (RTOs) in the United States, as set forth in *Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc.*, 119 FERC ¶ 61,222 (May 31, 2007) in Docket Nos. ER07–701–000 and AD07–12–000. In that Order, the following topics were identified for discussion:

1. How each ISO's or RTO's regional tariffs and other operational agreements and protocols allocate reliability responsibilities among the parties;

2. What provisions exist in those tariffs, agreements, and protocols to establish responsibility for penalty costs associated with Reliability Standard violations, and do those provisions result in uniform responsibility for such penalty costs;

3. What provisions exist that may prevent an entity from being registered for compliance with relevant Reliability Standards if, notwithstanding its registration status, such entity's failure to perform under tariffs, agreements, and protocols could lead to a violation of Reliability Standards; and

4. What policies for any pass-through of penalty costs associated with Reliability Standard violations by ISOs

and RTOs would both best provide due process for entities that may ultimately be required to pay these penalty costs and also avoid redundant investigations and litigation of Reliability Standard violations.

There will be three panels. The first panel will consist of RTOs and ISOs. The second panel will consist of representative entities potentially subject to paying penalties incurred by the RTOs or ISOs, either through the general allocation of an RTO or ISO penalty or through the direct assignment of a penalty by an RTO or ISO on the grounds such entity did not perform reliability functions that led to the penalty. The third panel will consist of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation and the Regional Entities.

Topics for discussion in each panel are as follows:

Panel One

Panelists should be prepared to address Commission Topics 1, 2, 3 and 4. In addition, panelists are requested to consider the following:

A. Should penalties associated with Reliability Standard violations by RTOs or ISOs be allocated to all of its members, customers, owners or participants (collectively, members)? If so, should this allocation be handled by tariff or by contract? What allocation method would fairly apportion the cost burden amongst an RTO's or ISO's members?

B. If an RTO or ISO is permitted to pass on to its members the reliability penalties assessed against it, how should the Commission ensure that the RTO/ISO has adequate incentives to comply with the Reliability Standards?

C. Should an RTO or ISO be permitted to directly assign to one or more or a group of specific members, reliability penalties assessed against it but that were caused by the members? If so, who should investigate these entities to determine the degree of culpability, how will these entities be given due process and how can duplicative proceedings that overlap the ERO or Regional Entity penalty proceedings be avoided?

D. Should only non-monetary penalties be applied to RTOs and ISOs (and other non-profit organizations)?

Panel Two

Panelists should be prepared to address Commission Topics 1, 2, 3 and 4. In addition, panelists are requested to consider the following:

A. Should an RTO or ISO be permitted to allocate to its members reliability penalties assessed against it pursuant to section 215 of the FPA? If so, should this be handled by tariff or

by contract? What allocation method would fairly apportion the cost burden?

B. If an RTO or ISO is not permitted to pass on reliability penalty costs assessed against it, what source of funds is suggested for payment?

C. Should an RTO or ISO be permitted to directly assign to specific members reliability penalties assessed against it, and if so, how should duplicative proceedings be avoided and due process ensured?

Panel Three

Panelists should be prepared to address Commission Topics 3 and 4. In addition, panelists are requested to consider the following:

A. Would the ERO or Regional Entity investigation of an alleged Reliability Standard violation by an RTO or ISO incorporate an investigation of any RTO or ISO members that have been alleged to contribute to the violation both in the instance where these members are registered in the ERO's compliance registry and in the instance where these members are not registered? If these members are investigated, would there be an assessment of the extent each of the members and the RTO or ISO contributed to the violation?

B. How would Regional Entities and the ERO address in enforcement proceedings assessment of penalties for matters in which an RTO or ISO and one or more members violated the same Reliability Standard, different Reliability Standards or multiple Reliability standards?

C. Should the Regional Entity identify not just the entity that violated a Reliability Standard, but also any entities which may have contributed to the RTO's or ISO's Reliability Standard violation? Should the Regional Entity also quantify the degree to which each entity contributed to the violation?

D. If an RTO or ISO asserts that an entity that is not listed in NERC's compliance registry is responsible for the RTO's or ISO's violation of a Reliability Standard, in an enforcement hearing pursuant to section 215 of the FPA, will Regional Entities or NERC inquire if the root cause of the violation lies with that entity and provide the entity an opportunity to participate in the proceeding?

Participants on the panels will be announced in a subsequent notice. There is *no* registration fee to attend. A free webcast of this event will be available through <http://www.ferc.gov>. Anyone with Internet access who desires to view this event can do so by navigating to <http://www.ferc.gov>'s Calendar of Events and locating this event in the Calendar. The event will

contain a link to its webcast. The Capitol Connection provides technical support for the webcasts and offers access to the meeting via a phone bridge for a fee. If you have any questions, visit <http://www.CapitolConnection.org> or contact Danelle Perkowski or David Reininger at 703-993-3100.

Transcripts of the meeting will be available immediately for a fee from Ace Reporting Company (202-347-3700 or 1-800-336-6646). They will be available for free on the Commission's eLibrary system and on the events calendar approximately one week after the meeting.

FERC conferences and meetings are accessible under section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. For accessibility accommodations please send an e-mail to accessibility@ferc.gov or call toll free (866) 208-3372 (voice) or 202-502-8659 (TTY), or send a fax to 202-208-2106 with the required accommodations.

Questions about the conference should be directed to Don LeKang by e-mail at donald.lekang@ferc.gov or by phone at 202-502-8127.

Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7-15527 Filed 8-8-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0225; FRL-8452-4]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Populations, Usage and Emissions of Nonroad Diesel Equipment in EPA Region 7; EPA ICR No. 2156.01, OMB Control No. 2060-0553

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that EPA is planning to submit a request to renew an existing approved Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). This ICR is scheduled to expire on November 30, 2007. Before submitting the ICR to OMB for review and approval, EPA is soliciting comments on specific aspects of the proposed information collection as described below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before October 9, 2007.