

transmission projects that are not subject to a competitive transmission development process? If so, what risk mitigation measures should the Commission encourage through application of the incentive policy?

3. In light of the emphasis that Order No. 1000 places on regional transmission planning, do the risks and challenges of a particular transmission project remain an appropriate focal point for incentives requested pursuant to Federal Power Act section 219? If not, what are the attributes that warrant incentives?

4. What, if any, changes are needed to the framework the Commission uses to evaluate return on equity adders and other transmission incentives for transmission projects that use cost containment provisions?

5. Order No. 1000 requires public utility transmission providers in regions to have an ex ante cost allocation method for transmission facilities selected in the regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation. To what extent does the ex ante cost allocation method reduce risks to transmission developers?

6. Transmission developers face at least two types of risks: risk associated with participation in the transmission planning processes and risk associated with developing a transmission project. The Commission's current incentive policies focus on the latter. Please comment on risks associated with participation in the transmission planning processes and indicate what, if any, changes to the planning processes could mitigate the risk.

7. Do public utility transmission providers in regions consider that a transmission developer may request and be awarded transmission incentives when evaluating transmission proposals and, if so, how? For example, how would public utility transmission providers in regions consider a proposal with a potential transmission incentive given that the incentive might or might not be granted? Should a competitive transmission development process clearly state whether, and, if so, how incentives should be part of a developer's proposal and how requests and grants of such incentives will be evaluated by the public utility transmission providers in the region? Is there an optimal time for submission of incentive requests to the Commission and for Commission decisions upon them?

Panel Four: Interregional Transmission Coordination Issues

1. What factors have contributed to the lack of development of interregional

transmission facilities (*i.e.*, a transmission facility that is located in two or more transmission planning regions)? Are there actions the Commission could take to facilitate such development?

2. What would be the advantages and disadvantages to the use of common models and assumptions by public utility transmission providers in regions in their interregional coordination processes? Are there problems that such an approach would solve or create? If such common models and assumptions could be developed, how should they be developed and by which entity or entities?

3. Should the Commission revisit Order No. 1000's requirement that an interregional transmission facility be selected in the regional transmission plan of all transmission planning regions where the facility will be located before it is eligible for interregional cost allocation? Why or why not?

4. What reforms, if any, could the Commission adopt to facilitate the identification of shared interregional transmission needs?

5. Do interregional cost allocation methods accepted by the Commission, such as the "avoided cost only" method, impede interregional transmission coordination?³ If so, are there alternative cost allocation methods that could better facilitate interregional transmission development? Would those methods be consistent with interregional transmission coordination processes or would the interregional transmission coordination processes need to change to accommodate such alternative cost allocation methods?

Panel Five: Regional Transmission Planning and Other Transmission Development Issues

1. To maximize the benefits of competition, should the Commission broaden or narrow the type of transmission facilities that must be selected through competitive transmission development processes? If so, how?

2. Has the introduction of competition into the regional transmission planning processes led public utility transmission providers to focus more on developing local transmission facilities or other transmission facilities not subject to competitive transmission development processes?

³ See, e.g. *Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 150 FERC ¶ 61,045, at PP 176-180 (2015) (describing an "avoided-cost only method" and finding such an approach can comply with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1).

3. Are there other competitive approaches compared to the existing competitive transmission development processes that could potentially reduce the time and cost to conduct the process, or the risk of litigation over proposal selection, but still benefit consumers? If so, what are the strengths and weaknesses of such approaches and could they be used in transmission planning regions in specified circumstances, for example, for transmission projects needed in the near-term to address reliability needs, in conjunction with existing competitive transmission development processes?

4. What types of information (please be specific) could be used to measure the impact of the Order No. 1000 reforms on transmission development? For example, what information could be used to evaluate whether the more efficient or cost-effective transmission facilities are being selected within and between transmission planning regions? How should that information be tracked and reported or posted? Should common metrics be developed for evaluation of the information?

5. How do the sponsorship model and competitive bidding model, respectively, and variations on these models, capture the benefits of competition, such as increased innovation and selection of the more efficient or cost-effective transmission facilities? What are the positive features and drawbacks of each model? How can their drawbacks be addressed?

6. Are changes to the Commission's current application of the Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) analysis needed to better accommodate nonincumbent transmission developers, in particular with respect to the identification of appropriate proxy groups? If so, what changes are necessary?

[FR Doc. 2016-18826 Filed 8-8-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings

Take notice that the Commission has received the following Natural Gas Pipeline Rate and Refund Report filings:

Filings Instituting Proceedings

Docket Numbers: RP16-1109-000.

Applicants: Wyoming Interstate Company, L.L.C.

Description: Section 4(d) Rate Filing; Negotiated Rate Non Conforming

Agreement Filing to be effective 8/1/2016.

Filed Date: 7/27/16.

Accession Number: 20160727–5061.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/8/16.

Docket Numbers: RP16–1110–000.

Applicants: Equitrans, L.P.

Description: Section 4(d) Rate Filing: Assignment of Mercuria Energy Gas Trading Agreements to Mercuria Energy America to be effective 8/1/2016.

Filed Date: 7/27/16.

Accession Number: 20160727–5078.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/8/16.

Docket Numbers: RP16–1111–000.

Applicants: Pine Prairie Energy Center, LLC.

Description: Section 4(d) Rate Filing: Pine Prairie Energy Center, LLC—Proposed Revisions to FERC Gas Tariff to be effective 8/27/2016.

Filed Date: 7/27/16.

Accession Number: 20160727–5110.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/8/16.

Docket Numbers: RP16–1112–000.

Applicants: Tallgrass Interstate Gas Transmission, L.

Description: Section 4(d) Rate Filing: Neg Rate 2016/7/28 Ethanol to be effective 8/1/2016.

Filed Date: 7/28/16.

Accession Number: 20160728–5000.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/9/16.

Any person desiring to intervene or protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date. Protests may be considered, but intervention is necessary to become a party to the proceeding.

Filings in Existing Proceedings

Docket Numbers: RP16–1097–001.

Applicants: KO Transmission Company.

Description: Tariff Amendment: KO Transmission Amendment Filing Docket No. RP16–1097 to be effective 9/1/2016.

Filed Date: 7/27/16.

Accession Number: 20160727–5098.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/8/16.

Any person desiring to protest in any of the above proceedings must file in accordance with Rule 211 of the Commission's Regulations (18 CFR 385.211) on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on the specified comment date.

The filings are accessible in the Commission's eLibrary system by clicking on the links or querying the docket number.

eFiling is encouraged. More detailed information relating to filing requirements, interventions, protests, service, and qualifying facilities filings

can be found at: <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling/filing-req.pdf>. For other information, call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: July 28, 2016.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2016–18804 Filed 8–8–16; 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 electric rate filings:

Docket Numbers: ER10–2564–006; ER10–2600–006; ER10–2289–006.

Applicants: Tucson Electric Power Company, UNS Electric, Inc., UniSource Energy Development Company.

Description: Supplement to December 31, 2015 Triennial Market Power Update for the Southwest Region of the Fortis, Inc. subsidiaries, et al.

Filed Date: 8/1/16.

Accession Number: 20160801–5130.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 9/30/16.

Docket Numbers: ER10–2641–026; ER10–2663–026; ER10–2881–026; ER10–2882–027; ER10–2883–026; ER10–2884–026; ER10–2885–026; ER10–2886–027; ER13–1101–022; ER13–1541–021; ER14–661–013; ER14–787–015; ER15–54–007; ER15–55–007; ER15–647–004; ER15–1475–008; ER15–2191–003; ER15–2453–003; ER15–2593–007; ER16–452–007; ER16–705–005; ER16–706–005; ER16–1154–005.

Applicants: Oleander Power Project, L.P., Southern Company—Florida LLC, Southern Power Company, Alabama Power Company, Georgia Power Company, Mississippi Power Company, Gulf Power Company, Southern Turner Cimarron I, LLC, Spectrum Nevada Solar, LLC, Campo Verde Solar, LLC, SG2 Imperial Valley LLC, Macho Springs Solar, LLC, Lost Hills Solar, LLC, Blackwell Solar, LLC, Kay Wind, LLC, North Star Solar, LLC, Grant Wind, LLC, Passadamkeag Windpark, LLC, Desert Stateline LLC, RE Tranquillity LLC, RE Garland A LLC, RE Garland LLC, Parrey, LLC.

Description: Notification of Non-Material of Change in Status of Oleander Power Project, Limited Partnership, et al.

Filed Date: 8/1/16.

Accession Number: 20160801–5157.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/22/16.

Docket Numbers: ER16–2327–000.

Applicants: California Independent System Operator Corporation.

Description: Compliance filing: 2016–07–29 Petition Limited Waiver BART LSE to be effective N/A.

Filed Date: 7/29/16.

Accession Number: 20160729–5227.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/8/16.

Docket Numbers: ER16–2338–000.

Applicants: Emera Energy Services Subsidiary No. 4 LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Amend Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 7/1/2016.

Filed Date: 8/1/16.

Accession Number: 20160801–5072.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/22/16.

Docket Numbers: ER16–2339–000.

Applicants: Emera Energy Services Subsidiary No. 5 LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Amend Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 7/1/2016.

Filed Date: 8/1/16.

Accession Number: 20160801–5074.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/22/16.

Docket Numbers: ER16–2340–000.

Applicants: Emera Energy Services Subsidiary No. 6 LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Amend Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 7/1/2016.

Filed Date: 8/1/16.

Accession Number: 20160801–5077.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/22/16.

Docket Numbers: ER16–2341–000.

Applicants: Emera Energy Services Subsidiary No. 7 LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Amend Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 7/1/2016.

Filed Date: 8/1/16.

Accession Number: 20160801–5083.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/22/16.

Docket Numbers: ER16–2342–000.

Applicants: Emera Energy Services Subsidiary No. 8 LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Amend Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 7/1/2016.

Filed Date: 8/1/16.

Accession Number: 20160801–5086.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/22/16.

Docket Numbers: ER16–2343–000.

Applicants: Emera Energy Services Subsidiary No. 9 LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Amend Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 7/1/2016.

Filed Date: 8/1/16.

Accession Number: 20160801–5087.

Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 8/22/16.

Docket Numbers: ER16–2344–000.

Applicants: Emera Energy Services Subsidiary No. 10 LLC.

Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Amend Market-Based Rate Tariff to be effective 7/1/2016.