

In its prior notice request filed on January 20, 2015 (in Docket No. CP15-61-000) and noticed on January 30, 2015,<sup>1</sup> Northern Natural Gas Company (Northern) proposed to construct and abandon facilities in Clark and Codington Counties, South Dakota. Protestor protested the prior notice because the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate of the Lake Traverse Reservation indicated that it would be necessary to conduct a Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) survey to ensure that no TCPs would be affected by construction. Northern had not provided the results of the TCP survey and/or updated communication with the tribe to ensure the project's compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as required under Appendix II to Subpart F of Part 157 of the Commission's regulations.

Subsequent to the filing of the protest, Northern submitted communication from the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate of the Lake Traverse Reservation that stated the project would have no effect on historic resources, and revised alignment sheets to show the revised workspace to avoid the TCP site. Thus, Protestor's environmental concern has been satisfied. Accordingly, Protestor hereby withdraws its Protest to the Proposed Blanket Certificate Activity filed in the instant docket on March 31, 2015.

Dated: April 30, 2015.

**Kimberly D. Bose,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2015-10569 Filed 5-5-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EL14-37-000]

#### PJM Interconnection, LLC; Notice Inviting Post-Technical Conference Comments

On January 7, 2015, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) staff conducted a technical conference to evaluate whether: (1) PJM Interconnection, LLC's (PJM) Financial Transmission Rights (FTR) forfeiture rules as they apply to virtual transactions, including Up-to Congestion (UTC) transactions and INC/DEC transactions, are just and reasonable; and (2) PJM's current uplift allocation rules associated with UTC

transactions and INCs/DECs are just and reasonable.

All interested persons are invited to file post-technical conference comments on any or all of the questions listed in the attachment to this Notice. These comments must be filed with the Commission no later than 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on May 29, 2015.

For more information about this Notice, please contact:

Carmen Gastilo Machuga (Legal Information), Office of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502-8657, [carmen.gastilo@ferc.gov](mailto:carmen.gastilo@ferc.gov).

Elizabeth Topping (Technical Information), Office of Energy Policy and Innovation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426 (202) 502-6731, [elizabeth.topping@ferc.gov](mailto:elizabeth.topping@ferc.gov).

Cathleen Colbert (Technical Information), Office of Enforcement, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502-8997, [cathleen.colbert@ferc.gov](mailto:cathleen.colbert@ferc.gov).

Dated: April 29, 2015.

**Kimberly D. Bose,**

*Secretary.*

#### Post-Technical Conference Questions for Comment

In addition to any further responses to the questions posed in the Commission Staff's December 10, 2014 Supplemental Notice of Technical Conference,<sup>1</sup> Commission Staff seeks responses to the following questions. Parties submitting comments need not respond to each question.

##### (1) FTR Forfeiture Rule

(a) When calculating the contribution a virtual transaction (INC, DEC, or UTC) has to power flowing across a given constraint, how should the injection/withdrawal points for the virtual transaction be identified? Should the defined "worst case" node be limited to the market participant's own transactions? Additionally, should the impact threshold(s) used for triggering the forfeiture rule remain at 75 percent regardless of the injection/withdrawal points identified? Why or why not?

(b) As an alternative to the current approach of assessing one virtual transaction at a time, should the FTR forfeiture rule collectively assess the net

impact of a market participant's entire portfolio of INCs, DEC, and UTCs? Should it assess the net impact of all virtual transactions that clear the market? In addition to virtual transactions, should a market participant's portfolio of physical transactions be considered? Why or why not? If a portfolio approach were adopted, should the impact threshold(s) continue to be 75 percent, as used in the past, or is a different threshold(s) more appropriate? How could a portfolio approach be implemented?

(c) Should counter-flow FTRs and bids that relieve congestion remain exempt from FTR forfeiture rule calculations? Should financial transactions that improve day-ahead and real-time market price convergence be exempt from the forfeiture rule? Why or why not? How, if at all, would these exemptions differ when assessing the impact of a market participant's portfolio as opposed to one INC, DEC, or UTC at a time? Are there any other currently exempt financial transactions that should be subject to FTR forfeiture calculations?

(d) Should the application of the forfeiture rule to INCs, DEC, and UTCs be revised in ways not addressed by these questions, and if so, describe in detail the proposed revision and justification for the change.

(e) If you believe that changes to the current FTR Forfeiture Rule provisions of PJM's tariff are necessary, propose appropriate tariff language that you believe addresses your concern.

##### (2) Uplift

(a) Should UTCs be assessed uplift? Explain why or why not. If so, how, if at all, should this allocation differ from the allocation to individual INCs and DEC, and "paired" INCs and DEC, Should INCs and DEC continue to be required to pay uplift charges? What effect does imposing these charges have on the ability of virtual traders to arbitrage day-ahead and real-time price differences?

(b) Do UTCs impact unit commitment decisions? If so, how? Several views were expressed during the conference. For example, one panelist cited PJM documentation stating that UTCs are not included in commitment decisions.<sup>2</sup> Other panelists expressed the view that both "paired" INCs and DEC and UTC's impact unit commitment.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> January 7, 2015 Presentation of Wesley Allen, "Incremental Offers, Decrement Bids & Up To Congestion." at pp 4-5.

<sup>3</sup> January 7, 2015 Technical Conference on Financial Transactions in PJM, Transcript 240:15-241:4 (Adam Keech); Id. at 242: 14-16 (Joseph Bowring).

<sup>1</sup> Notice of the request was published in the *Federal Register* on February 5, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 6,512).

<sup>1</sup> *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Supplemental Notice of Technical Conference*, Docket No. EL14-37-000 (December 10, 2014). <http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/common/opennat.asp?fileID=13707421>.

(c) Should market participants be allowed to net INC and DEC transactions for the purpose of uplift allocations? Why or why not? If yes, should netting within a market participant's portfolio (intra-market participant) be allowed or should market-wide (inter-market participant) netting be allowed? Should physical assets be included in the netting process? Please discuss the advantages and disadvantages to both approaches.

(d) Are there other cost-causation approaches that should be considered? What advantages, disadvantages, and operational challenges would be associated with implementing such approaches in PJM?

(e) If virtual transactions are assessed uplift, should the uplift be designed as a fixed amount known in advance to permit the traders to assess the costs of the trade versus the potential arbitrage differences between day-ahead and real-time?

(f) If you believe that changes to the current Uplift provisions of PJM's tariff are necessary, propose appropriate tariff language that you believe addresses your concern.

[FR Doc. 2015-10559 Filed 5-5-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 2323-206]

#### TransCanada Hydro Northeast, Inc.; Notice of Application Accepted for Filing, Soliciting Comments, Motions To Intervene, and Protests

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

a. *Type of Application*: Request to Amend License Articles 409, 410, 411, and 413.

b. *Project No.*: 2323-206.

c. *Date Filed*: March 31, 2015.

d. *Applicant*: TransCanada Hydro Northeast, Inc. (licensee).

e. *Name of Project*: Deerfield River Hydroelectric Project.

f. *Location*: Windham and Bennington counties, Vermont and Franklin and Berkshire counties, Massachusetts.

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

h. *Applicant Contact*: John Ragonese, FERC License Manager, (603) 498-2851, or [john\\_ragonese@transcanada.com](mailto:john_ragonese@transcanada.com).

i. *FERC Contact*: Alicia Burtner, (202) 502-8038, or [alicia.burtner@ferc.gov](mailto:alicia.burtner@ferc.gov).

j. *Deadline for filing comments, motions to intervene, protests, and*

recommendations is 30 days from the issuance date of this notice by the Commission.

All documents may be filed electronically via the Internet. See, 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site at <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling.asp>. If unable to be filed electronically, documents may be paper-filed. To paper-file, an original and seven copies should be mailed to: Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426. Commenters can submit brief comments up to 6,000 characters, without prior registration, using the eComment system at <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/ecomment.asp>. You must include your name and contact information at the end of your comments.

Please include the project number (P-2323-206) on any comments, motions, or recommendations filed.

k. *Description of Request*: The licensee requests the deletion or suspension of the requirements of license Articles 409, 410, 411, and 413 and the associated Atlantic Salmon Radio-Tagging Plan, as approved by the Commission on March 31, 1998. The requirements pertain to monitoring and restoring Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) in the Connecticut River and its tributaries. Article 409 requires the licensee to construct, operate, and maintain a permanent upstream fish passage facility. Article 410 requires a plan to capture upstream migrating Atlantic salmon below the dam and transport them to river reaches above the dam or to hatchery facilities until permanent passage facilities, are completed. Article 411 requires monitoring of Atlantic salmon smolts through project fish passage facilities, and Article 413 requires an Atlantic Salmon Radio-Tagging Plan. The licensee indicates that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which had been actively stocking Atlantic salmon in the Connecticut River and its tributaries, has officially withdrawn support for the restoration program due to unsatisfactory results. The licensee indicates that its efforts under Articles 409, 410, 411, and 413 have no feasible chance of success without the U.S. Fish and Wildlife's stocking component.

l. *Locations of the Application*: A copy of the application is available for inspection and reproduction at the Commission's Public Reference Room, located at 888 First Street NE., Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426, or by calling (202) 502-8371. This filing may also be viewed on the Commission's Web site at <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/>

[elibrary.asp](http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling.asp). Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. You may also register online at <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/esubscription.asp> to be notified via email of new filings and issuances related to this or other pending projects. For assistance, call 1-866-208-3676 or email [FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov](mailto:FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov), for TTY, call (202) 502-8659. A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction at the address in item (h) above.

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 filing must (1) bear in all capital letters the title "COMMENTS", "PROTEST", or "MOTION TO INTERVENE" as applicable; (2) set forth in the heading the name of the applicant and the project number of the application to which the filing responds; (3) furnish the name, address, and telephone number of the person protesting or intervening; and (4) otherwise comply with the requirements of 18 CFR 385.2001 through 385.2005. All comments, motions to intervene, or protests must set forth their evidentiary basis and otherwise comply with the requirements of 18 CFR 4.34(b). All comments, motions to intervene, or protests should relate to project works which are the subject of the variance. Agencies may obtain copies of the application directly from the applicant. A copy of any protest or motion to intervene must be served upon each representative of the applicant specified in the particular application. If an intervener files comments or documents with the Commission relating to the merits of an issue that may affect the responsibilities of a particular resource agency, they must also serve a copy of the document on that resource agency. A copy of all other filings in reference