Immediately following the conclusion of the Commission Meeting, a press briefing will be held in the Commission Meeting Room. Members of the public may view this briefing in the designated overflow room. This statement is intended to notify the public that the press briefings that follow Commission meetings may now be viewed remotely at Commission headquarters, but will not be telecast through the Capitol Connection service.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Combined Notice of Filings #1

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

Docket Numbers: EG18–100–000.
Applicants: Foard City Wind, LLC.
Description: Notice of Self-Certification of Exempt Wholesale Generator Status of Foard City Wind, LLC.

Filed Date: 6/14/18.
Accession Number: 20180614–5027.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 7/5/18.

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

Applicants: Kleen Energy Systems, LLC.
Description: Notice of Non-Material Change in Status of Kleen Energy Systems, LLC.

Filed Date: 6/13/18.
Accession Number: 20180613–5125.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 7/5/18.

Applicants: Invenergy Energy Management Alliance LLC.
Description: Notice of Change in Facts Under Market-Based Rate Authority of Invenergy Energy Management Alliance LLC.

Filed Date: 6/13/18.
Accession Number: 20180613–5124.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 7/5/18.

Applicants: CF Energy International LLC.
Description: Baseline eTariff Filing: Market Based Rates to be effective 7/1/2018.

Filed Date: 6/13/18.
Accession Number: 20180613–5103.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 7/5/18.

Applicants: Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.
Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: 2018–06–13_SA 2155 Ameren Illinois-Bishop Hill 2nd Rev GIA (G545) to be effective 5/14/2018.

Filed Date: 6/13/18.
Accession Number: 20180613–5121.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 7/5/18.

Docket Numbers: ER18–1780–000.
Applicants: Southwest Power Pool, Inc.

Filed Date: 6/14/18.
Accession Number: 20180614–5034.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 7/5/18.

Docket Numbers: ER18–1781–000.
Applicants: Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: 2041R7 Kansas City Board of Public Utilities PTP Agreement to be effective 9/1/2018.

Filed Date: 6/14/18.
Accession Number: 20180614–5038.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 7/5/18.

Docket Numbers: ER18–1782–000.
Applicants: Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC.
Description: § 205(d) Rate Filing: Amendment to NCEMC NITSA SA No. 210 (2018) to be effective 7/1/2018.

Filed Date: 6/14/18.
Accession Number: 20180614–5042.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 7/5/18.

Docket Numbers: ER18–1783–000.
Applicants: PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
Description: Tariff Cancellation: Notice of Cancellation of ISA SA No. 4135; Queue No. X1–078 to be effective 6/18/2018.

Filed Date: 6/14/18.
Accession Number: 20180614–5044.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 7/5/18.

Docket Numbers: ER18–1784–000.
Applicants: PacifiCorp.
Description: Compliance filing: OATT Ancillary Erratum to Compliance Filing to be effective 7/1/2018.

Filed Date: 6/14/18.
Accession Number: 20180614–5049.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 7/5/18.

Docket Numbers: ER18–1785–000.
Applicants: Southern California Edison Company.

Filed Date: 6/14/18.
Accession Number: 20180614–5052.
Comments Due: 5 p.m. ET 7/5/18.

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

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 35.211 and 35.214) 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.

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/filingReq.pdf. For other information, call (866) 206–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Dated: June 14, 2018.

Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Notice Inviting Post-Technical Conference Comments; Old Dominion Electric Cooperative v. PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Advanced Energy Management Alliance v. PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

On April 24, 2018, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) staff convened a technical conference to obtain further information concerning the above referenced proceedings pursuant to a February 23, 2018 Commission order.1

All interested persons are invited to file post-technical conference comments on issues raised during the conference that they believe would benefit from further discussion. In addition, parties are invited to provide comments on the questions listed below, as well as the questions featured on the Supplement Notice of Technical Conference and Technical Conference Agenda issued on April 18, 2018.2 Commenters need not respond to all topics or questions asked. Commenters may reference material previously filed in this docket, including the technical conference transcript, but are encouraged to avoid repetition or replication of previous material. In addition, commenters are encouraged, when possible, to provide examples in support of their answers.

Comments must be submitted on or before 30 days from the date of this notice and should not exceed 30 pages.

For more information about this technical conference, please contact: John Riehl (Technical Issues) and Noah Monick (Legal Issues), Office of General Counsel, 202–502–8299, noah.monick@ferc.gov.

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary.

Post-Technical Conference Questions for Comment

Seasonal Load Variation & Alternate Market Designs

In these proceedings, parties argue that the move to a single, annual capacity product has pushed valuable summer-only resources out of the capacity market and thereby increased capacity costs with little to no reliability benefit, given that PJM is a summer-peaking system. These parties assert that procuring a portion of capacity as summer-only allows PJM to procure significantly less capacity during non-summer periods and provides equivalent reliability at lower total capacity costs. In addition, intervenors have proposed alternate market designs in PJM to better facilitate seasonal resource participation and account for seasonal load variation. These proposed alternative market designs include, but are not limited to: A re-introduction of a seasonal product, a two-season market construct, a three-season market construct, and a supplemental seasonal auction scheme approach for summer-period resources. Based on these proposed alternate market designs, please answer the following questions.

1. Some panelists indicated that the current annual construct and existing aggregation rules result in a barrier to entry. Please comment on whether or not there are barriers to entry and provide any supporting information, such as unmatched MWs of capacity. Could this be fully addressed by improving or modifying aggregation rules? If not, what other changes would be required? What would be the downside of modifying such rules?

2. According to the 2021/2022 Reliability Pricing Model (RPM) Base Residual Auction (BRA) report, cleared megawatt quantities of wind, solar, demand response, and energy efficiency resources all increased compared to the 2020/2021 RPM BRA and at higher clearing prices throughout the PJM footprint. Please comment on how these results reflect on the efficacy of PJM’s seasonal aggregation mechanism and the ability of these resource types to participate in RPM as either annual resources or aggregated resources under existing RPM rules. To the extent you view one or more of the alternative market designs mentioned above as better than the existing RPM rules, please explain how those alternative designs would yield preferable auction outcomes relative to those seen in the 2021/2022 BRA. Please provide evidence and quantitative support wherever possible.

3. Under either a two-season or three-season market construct, how would PJM optimize capacity procurement within and across seasons? Would each season have a distinct demand curve and auction that clears independently of other seasons, or would all seasonal auctions be cleared simultaneously to optimize procurement for a delivery year?

4. During the technical conference, Mr. Falin of PJM noted that PJM performs a winter-period peak load test known as a Capacity Emergency Transfer Objective and Capacity Emergency Transfer Limit (CETO CETL) analysis. Mr. Falin explained that during the winter-period CETL analysis, PJM divides its region into sub-regions and tests how many MWs of emergency imports are needed to satisfy reliability criteria given that specific sub-region’s quantity of installed reserves. Please describe the assumptions that PJM makes when it performs a CETO/CETL analysis for winter-period peak loads. What assumptions are markedly different from summer-period peak load CETO/CETL analyses? Does PJM perform winter- and summer-period CETO/CETL analyses for all sub-areas or LDAs?

5. What other implementation challenges would be involved in transitioning to a two-season or three-season market construct (aside from a lengthy stakeholder process)?

6. During the technical conference, Mr. Falin stated that PRD is a pathway for demand response resources all increased compared to the 2020/2021 RPM BRA and at higher clearing prices throughout the PJM footprint. Please comment on how these results reflect on the efficacy of PJM’s seasonal aggregation mechanism and the ability of these resource types to participate in RPM as either annual resources or aggregated resources under existing RPM rules. To the extent you view one or more of the alternative market designs mentioned above as better than the existing RPM rules, please explain how those alternative designs would yield preferable auction outcomes relative to those seen in the 2021/2022 BRA. Please provide evidence and quantitative support wherever possible.

7. Under either a two-season or three-season market construct, how would PJM optimize capacity procurement within and across seasons? Would each season have a distinct demand curve and auction that clears independently of other seasons, or would all seasonal auctions be cleared simultaneously to optimize procurement for a delivery year?

8. During the technical conference, Mr. Falin of PJM noted that PJM performs a winter-period peak load test known as a Capacity Emergency Transfer Objective and Capacity Emergency Transfer Limit (CETO CETL) analysis. Mr. Falin explained that during the winter-period CETO CETL analysis, PJM divides its region into sub-regions and tests how many MWs of emergency imports are needed to satisfy reliability criteria given that specific sub-region’s quantity of installed reserves. Please describe the assumptions that PJM makes when it performs a CETO/CETL analysis for winter-period peak loads. What assumptions are markedly different from summer-period peak load CETO/CETL analyses? Does PJM perform winter- and summer-period CETO/CETL analyses for all sub-areas or LDAs?

9. What other implementation challenges would be involved in transitioning to a two-season or three-season market construct (aside from a lengthy stakeholder process)?

10. During the technical conference, Mr. Falin stated that PRD is a pathway for demand response resources all increased compared to the 2020/2021 RPM BRA and at higher clearing prices throughout the PJM footprint. Please comment on how these results reflect on the efficacy of PJM’s seasonal aggregation mechanism and the ability of these resource types to participate in RPM as either annual resources or aggregated resources under existing RPM rules. To the extent you view one or more of the alternative market designs mentioned above as better than the existing RPM rules, please explain how those alternative designs would yield preferable auction outcomes relative to those seen in the 2021/2022 BRA. Please provide evidence and quantitative support wherever possible.

11. Under either a two-season or three-season market construct, how would PJM optimize capacity procurement within and across seasons? Would each season have a distinct demand curve and auction that clears independently of other seasons, or would all seasonal auctions be cleared simultaneously to optimize procurement for a delivery year?

12. During the technical conference, Mr. Falin of PJM noted that PJM performs a winter-period peak load test known as a Capacity Emergency Transfer Objective and Capacity Emergency Transfer Limit (CETO CETL) analysis. Mr. Falin explained that during the winter-period CETO CETL analysis, PJM divides its region into sub-regions and tests how many MWs of emergency imports are needed to satisfy reliability criteria given that specific sub-region’s quantity of installed reserves. Please describe the assumptions that PJM makes when it performs a CETO/CETL analysis for winter-period peak loads. What assumptions are markedly different from summer-period peak load CETO/CETL analyses? Does PJM perform winter- and summer-period CETO/CETL analyses for all sub-areas or LDAs?

13. What other implementation challenges would be involved in transitioning to a two-season or three-season market construct (aside from a lengthy stakeholder process)?

Peak Shaving

In these proceedings, intervenors argue that the practice of peak shaving produces far fewer benefits than previously understood and, thus, peak shaving practices are not a viable pathway for demand response resources in lieu of participation on the supply side of PJM’s capacity market. Based on this characterization of peak shaving’s limited impacts, please address the following questions.

1. During the technical conference, Mr. Falin of PJM indicated that PJM has put on hold possible changes to the PRD program to align the program with PJM’s annual capacity construct. Is PRD a feasible path forward for incorporating seasonal DR resources in the capacity market? Please explain why or why not.

2. During the technical conference, Mr. Falin stated that, in order for peak shaving activity to be reflected in load forecasts, peak shaving actions will need to be based on specific triggers, and commit to be interrupted a certain number of times per summer with a certain hourly duration. Direct load control programs operated by electric distribution companies that cycle air conditioners or other appliances typically have these attributes specified in their tariffs. What is the status of the recognition of these programs in PJM’s load forecasts? Please describe the mechanisms, calculations, and adjustments that PJM uses to account for load serving entity (LSE) or electric distribution company (EDC) direct load control and load management programs in PJM load forecasting. Are these load forecast adjustments performed at the request of the EDC, or are there clear and specific procedures or rules that are applied non-discriminatorily to all LSE and electric distribution company direct load control and load management programs?

3. During the technical conference, Mr. Falin stated that PJM conducts its load forecast modeling and calculates model forecast accuracy, at the PJM system level. Mr. Falin also stated that PJM compared forecasted zonal load to average historical contribution of each zone to the PJM’s overall peak and that number is within a tenth or two-tenths of a percent of PJM’s zonal forecast. Did PJM observe any differences in the model errors by zone, especially for the zones that have operated summer-focused load management programs’ deployment, especially their infrequent deployment during system peaks, impact PJM load forecasts and
the calculated model errors at the zonal level?

4. According to information provided in the AEMA complaint in Docket No. EL17–36–000, Baltimore Gas & Electric (BGE) worked with PJM in Maryland Public Service Commission Rate Case No. 9406 to reflect its air-conditioner direct control program into an alternate load forecast for its zone, but not at the full load reduction that the program can produce. Please describe the processes involved in creating that alternative load forecast and the assumptions underlying BGE’s partial adjustment.

5. In PJM’s June 2017 white paper “Demand Response Strategy”, PJM stated “Ideally, PJM would have a truly unrestricted peak-load forecast with a complete understanding of explicit (dispatch and/or managed by PJM) versus implicit (managed by LSE, EDC or end-use customer) DR, allowing more visibility to quantify forecast risk.” 9 Please describe the steps PJM is taking to accomplish this goal. Are these steps sufficient to accomplish this goal? Why or why not? How is PJM working to change its load forecasting methodology to achieve this goal?

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 2331–083]

Notice of Application Accepted for Filing, Soliciting Comments, Motions To Intervene, and Protests: Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC

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

a. Type of Application: Non-Project Use Application.

b. Project No: 2331–083.

c. Date Filed: May 25, 2018.


Specifically:

e. Name of Project: Ninety-Nine Islands Hydroelectric Project.

f. Location: The project is located on the Broad River in Cherokee County South Carolina.

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

h. Applicant Contact: Jeff Lineberger, Director, Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, 526 S. Church Street—Mail Stop EC12Y, Charlotte, NC 28202, Jeff.Lineberger@duke-energy.com.

i. FERC Contact: Michael Calloway at 202–502–8041, or michael.calloway@ferc.gov.

j. Deadline for filing comments, motions to intervene, and protests is 30 days from the issuance of this notice by the Commission. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filing. Please file motions to intervene, protests, and comments using the Commission’s eFiling system at http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling.asp. 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. For assistance, please contact FERC Online Support at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov. (866) 208–3676 (toll free), or (202) 502–8659 (TTY). In lieu of electronic filing, please send paper copy to: Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20426. The first page of any filing should include docket number P–2331–083.

k. Description of Request: The licensee requests Commission approval to allow Thomas Sand Company, Inc. to utilize 33.51 acres of project lands and waters in the upper part of the project reservoir for mining and processing sand. The mining facility has the capacity to withdraw 2.88 million gallons of water per day for processing sand even though it does not achieve this amount daily in practice. The water is returned to the river after processing. The mine has extracted 42,000 tons of sand per year on average since operations began. The licensee proposes that the Thomas Sand Mine will operate under the conditions of South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (South Carolina DHEC) Section 401 Water Quality Certification P/N SAC 2017–01073, South Carolina DHEC Mining Permit No. 0869, and National Pollutant Discharge Permit for Discharges Associated with Nonmetal Mineral Mining Facilities Permit No. SCG730627.

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 website at http://www.ferc.gov, the “eLibrary” link. 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/subscription.asp to be notified via email of new filings and issuances related to this or other pending projects. For assistance, call 866–208–3676 or email 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 the non-project use application. 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 intervenor 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 to this application must be accompanied by proof of service on all persons listed in the service list prepared by the