Energy, LLC provided public notice of its request on July 26, 2013. In a letter dated September 19, 2013, the Director of the Division of Hydropower Licensing approved Cave Run Energy, LLC's request to use the Traditional Licensing Process.

k. *With this notice, we are initiating informal consultation with:* (a) The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and the joint agency regulations thereunder at 50 CFR, Part 402; and (b) the Kentucky State Historic Preservation Officer, as required by section 106, National Historical Preservation Act, and the implementing regulations of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation at 36 CFR 800.2.

l. With this notice, we are designating Cave Run Energy, LLC as the Commission's non-federal representative for carrying out informal consultation, pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

m. Cave Run Energy, LLC filed a Pre-Application Document (PAD; including a proposed process plan and schedule) with the Commission, pursuant to 18 CFR 5.6 of the Commission's regulations.

n. A copy of the PAD is available for review at the Commission in the Public Reference Room or may be viewed on the Commission's Web site (*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*, (866) 208–3676 (toll free), or (202) 502–8659 (TTY). A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction at the address in paragraph h.

o. Register online at *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/esubscription.asp* to be notified via email of new filing and issuances related to this or other pending projects. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support.

Dated: September 19, 2013.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013–23709 Filed 9–27–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. AD13–7–000]

Centralized Capacity Markets in Regional Transmission Organizations and Independent System Operators; Supplemental Notice of Technical Conference

As announced in the Notice issued on June 17, 2013, the Supplemental Notice issued on July 19, 2013, and the Supplemental Notice issued on August 23, 2013 (August 23 Notice), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) staff will hold a technical conference on September 25, 2013 from 9:00 a.m. to approximately 5:00 p.m., to consider how current centralized capacity market rules and structures in the regions served by ISO New England Inc. (ISO–NE), New York Independent System Operator, Inc. (NYISO), and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM) are supporting the procurement and retention of resources necessary to meet future reliability and operational needs.[1] The conference will be held at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. This conference is free of charge and open to the public. Commission members may participate in the conference.

An updated final agenda for this conference, including speakers, is attached.

While this conference is not for the purpose of discussing specific cases, the August 23 Notice noted that discussions at the technical conference may address matters at issue in a number of Commission proceedings that are either pending or within their rehearing period and included a list of those proceedings. The following additional Commission proceedings may also involve issues that could be addressed at the technical conference:

- ISO New England Inc. and New England Power Pool, Docket No. ER13–2313
- ISO New England Inc., Docket No. ER13–2266,
- PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Docket No. ER13–539.

Information on the technical conference will be posted on the Commission's Web site, *http://www.ferc.gov/EventCalendar/EventDetails.aspx?ID=6944&CalType=%20&CalendarID=116&Date=09/25/2013&View=Listview,* prior to the conference.

Commission conferences are accessible under section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. For accessibility accommodations, please send an email to *accessibility@ferc.gov* or call toll free 1–866–208–3372 (voice) or 202–502–8659 (TTY), or send a FAX to 202–208–2106 with the required accommodations.

For more information about the technical conference, please contact:

Shiv Mani (Technical Information), Office of Energy Policy and Innovation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–8240, *Shiv.Mani@ferc.gov mailto:*

Kate Hoke (Legal Information), Office of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–8404, *Katheryn.Hoke@ferc.gov;*

Sarah McKinley (Logistical Information), Office of External Affairs, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502–8004, *Sarah.McKinley@ferc.gov,*

Dated: September 24, 2013.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

Centralized Capacity Markets in Regional Transmission Organizations and Independent System Operators

Docket No. AD13–7–000

September 25, 2013

Final Agenda

9:00 a.m.–9:15 a.m. Welcome and opening remarks

9:15 a.m.–11:00 a.m. The role of centralized capacity markets in assuring resource adequacy

In the first morning session, ISO New England Inc. (ISO–NE), New York Independent System Operator, Inc. (NYISO), and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM) will provide a brief overview of the goals and basic structure of their respective centralized capacity markets, including a discussion of why each region chose key market

[1] While the Commission recognizes that other regions are considering similar issues, this technical conference will focus solely on the centralized capacity markets in the ISO–NE., NYISO, and PJM regions. The Commission may convene conference(s) on capacity market issues in other regions at other times.

design elements and how each market is achieving its stated goals. Each Regional Transmission Organization (RTO)/Independent System Operator (ISO) will have 15 minutes to make its presentation. Independent Market Monitors for each RTO/ISO will be provided ten minutes to provide their independent assessment of the functioning of the capacity market.

A representative from each RTO/ISO and the Independent Market Monitors will be present during the subsequent panels to answer technical questions that arise.

Panelists should be prepared to discuss the following topics and questions:

1. What are the key goals of the existing centralized capacity market in your region?

2. How successful has the current capacity market design been in meeting those goals?

3. What are the metrics used to measure the success of the centralized capacity market?

4. What design elements are key to the functioning of the centralized capacity market in your region? How were those elements derived? How have those elements evolved over time? How does capacity market design account for the interrelationship between design elements?

5. Going forward, what are the key challenges facing centralized capacity markets in your region? How is each RTO/ISO going about addressing those challenges?

Panelists

1. Robert Ethier, ISO–NE
2. Rana Mukerji, NYISO
3. Andy Ott, PJM
4. Joe Bowring, Monitoring Analytics
5. David Patton, Potomac Economics

11:00 a.m.–12:30 p.m. Mechanics of current centralized capacity markets

The second morning session will address basic design elements of centralized capacity markets, such as the forward commitment period, the demand curve and the establishment of locational and regional planning requirements, as well as the interaction among these design elements with energy and ancillary services markets. Panelists will be asked to address these issues in the context of the goals and objectives of the centralized capacity markets.

Panelists should be prepared to discuss the following topics and questions:

1. How effective are the existing centralized capacity markets in assuring that resource adequacy needs are met at just and reasonable rates?

2. What modifications, if any, would you recommend be made to capacity markets in general or to specific capacity market design elements?

3. Centralized capacity market design elements necessarily interact with each other and with the energy and ancillary services markets. Are there problems created by this interaction that should be addressed to improve the functioning of centralized capacity markets or energy markets?

4. Regional capacity markets also interact with each other. What are the implications of regional differences in capacity market designs?

5. What is the impact on centralized capacity markets of transmission system upgrades and expansions? Can transmission planning be more effectively integrated with or accounted for in the design elements of centralized capacity markets?

Panelists

1. Dan Curran, EnerNOC
2. Lee Davis, NRG Energy Inc.
3. Julien Dumoulin-Smith, UBS Investment Research
4. James Jablonski, Public Power Association of New Jersey
5. Richard Miller, ConEd
6. Roy Shanker, Independent Consultant
7. Todd Snitchler, Chairman, Public Utilities Committee of Ohio

12:30 p.m.–1:30 p.m. Lunch

1:30 p.m.–3:00 p.m. Adapting to industry changes

The first afternoon session builds on the previous panel and introduces for discussion the impact of state and federal policy considerations and emerging technologies on the goals and objectives of centralized capacity markets. Panelists will be asked to identify current and potential policy drivers (e.g., environmental regulations, renewable portfolio standards, state resource planning policies, emerging technologies and fuels such as shale gas, price responsive demand and electric storage) and address their impacts on centralized capacity markets.

Panelists should be prepared to discuss the following topics and questions:

1. Do centralized capacity markets effectively accommodate various federal and state policies, such as state resource planning policies, renewable portfolio standards, and compliance with environmental regulations? If not, how can such policy considerations be better accommodated in centralized capacity market design?

2. Are there specific aspects of capacity market design or specific capacity market design elements that create barriers to effective implementation of federal or state resource procurement, planning, energy or environmental policies?

3. Are there aspects of centralized capacity market designs that create barriers to entry for new and emerging technologies to participate in centralized capacity markets? If so, how can those barriers be addressed?

4. How does the changing resource mix (i.e., increased reliance on natural gas-fired generation, increasing market share for variable energy resources and emerging technologies such as distributed resources, and demand response) impact the centralized capacity markets?

Panelists

1. Jeffrey Bentz, New England States Committee on Electricity
2. Robert Erwin, General Counsel, Maryland Public Service Commission
3. James Holodak, National Grid
4. Judith Judson, Electricity Storage Association
5. Shahid Malik, PSEG Energy Resources and Trade
6. William Massey, COMPETE Coalition
7. John Moore, The Sustainable FERC Project
8. Ed Tatum, Old Dominion Electric Cooperative

3:00 p.m.–3:15 p.m. Break

3:15 p.m.–4:45 p.m. Considerations for the future

The second afternoon session will address potential future directions for centralized capacity markets as a resource adequacy mechanism. This panel will focus on whether new mechanisms and design tools could prospectively augment, supplement or substitute for typical centralized capacity market design elements in order to meet current and anticipated market challenges, and how capacity markets can accommodate evolving market developments and future risks. The RTOs/ISOs will be given an opportunity to respond to panelists' comments and address implementation issues.

Panelists should be prepared to discuss the following topics and questions:

1. What are the main challenges facing centralized capacity markets today or that can be anticipated going forward? Are the current centralized capacity market designs able to effectively manage those challenges? If not, what change in current design elements should be pursued going forward?

2. In order to achieve resource adequacy goals, should centralized capacity markets be expected to meet specific reliability and operational system needs (i.e., accommodating new and emerging technologies such as variable energy resources, distributed resources, or demand-side resources)? If so, how should capacity markets be designed to procure resources with specific operational attributes and what should those attributes be?

3. Going forward, should centralized capacity markets be designed to meet additional or different goals than those established to date?

Panelists

1. Peter Cramton, University of Maryland
2. Michael Hogan, The Regulatory Assistance Project
3. Susan Kelly, APPA
4. Michael Schnitzer, Northbridge Group, EPSA
5. Sue Tierney, Analysis Group
6. James Wilson, Wilson Energy Economics

Respondents

1. ISO–NE
2. NYISO
3. PJM

4:45 p.m.–5:00 p.m. Wrap up and closing remarks

[FR Doc. 2013–23719 Filed 9–27–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. EL13–91–000; QF83–142–002; QF83–143–002; QF83–144–002; QF92–64–002]

Clearwater Paper Corporation; Notice of Petition for Enforcement

Take notice that on September 20, 2013, pursuant to section 210(h) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (PURPA) Clearwater Paper Corporation filed a Petition for Enforcement, requesting the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) to initiate enforcement action against the Idaho Public Utilities Commission (IPUC), or in the alternative declare that Final IPUC Order No. 32697 [1] and IPUC Order No. 32802 [2] are inconsistent with PURPA.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest this filing must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a notice of intervention or motion to intervene, as appropriate. Such notices, motions, or protests must be filed on or before the comment date. On or before the comment date, it is not necessary to serve motions to intervene or protests on persons other than the Applicant.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the ''eFiling'' link at *http://www.ferc.gov*. Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 5 copies of the protest or intervention to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

This filing is accessible on-line at *http://www.ferc.gov*, using the ''eLibrary'' link and is available for review in the Commission's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC. There is an ''eSubscription'' link on the Web site that enables subscribers to receive email notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please email *FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov*, or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

Comment Date: 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on October 11, 2013.

Dated: September 23, 2013.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2013–23750 Filed 9–27–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[1] *In the Matter of the Commission's Review of PURPA QF Contract Provisions Including the Surrogate Avoided Resource (SAR) and Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) Methodologies for Calculating Avoided Cost Rates,* IPUC Case No. GNR–E–11–03, Order No. 32697 (December 18, 2012).

[2] *In the Matter of the Commission's Review of PURPA QF Contract Provisions Including the Surrogate Avoided Resource (SAR) and Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) Methodologies for Calculating Avoided Cost Rates,* IPUC Case No. GNR–E–11–03, Order No. 32802 (May 6, 2013)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 13519–003]

Lock+ Hydro Friends Fund XIX, LLC; Notice of Preliminary Permit Application Accepted for Filing and Soliciting Comments, Motions to Intervene, and Competing Applications

On April 2, 2013, Lock+ Hydro Friends Fund XIX, LLC filed an application for a preliminary permit, pursuant to section 4(f) of the Federal Power Act (FPA), proposing to study the feasibility of a hydropower project to be located at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) Claiborne Lock & Dam on the Alabama River near the town of Monroeville in Monroe County, Alabama. The sole purpose of a preliminary permit, if issued, is to grant the permit holder priority to file a license application during the permit term. A preliminary permit does not authorize the permit holder to perform any land-disturbing activities or otherwise enter upon lands or waters owned by others without the owners' express permission.

The proposed project would consist of the following: (1) a concrete lined intake channel with a trash rack system; (2) a 166.5-foot-long, 165.2-foot-wide powerhouse containing two generating units with a total capacity of 22 megawatts; (3) a 250-foot-long, 165-foot-wide tailrace; (4) a 13.8/115 kilo-Volt (kV) substation; and (5) a 5.5-mile-long, 69kV transmission line. The proposed project would have an average annual generation of 145,850 megawatt-hours, and operate as directed by the Corps.

Applicant Contact: Mr. Wayne Krouse, Lock+ Hydro Friends Fund, LLC, 4900 Woodway, Suite 745 Houston, TX 77056; Phone: (877) 556–6566 ext.709

FERC Contact: Christiane Casey, *christiane.casey@ferc.gov*, (202) 502–8577.

Deadline for filing comments, motions to intervene, competing applications (without notices of intent), or notices of intent to file competing applications: 60 days from the issuance of this notice. Competing applications and notices of intent must meet the requirements of 18 CFR 4.36. Comments, motions to intervene, notices of intent, and competing applications may be filed electronically via the Internet. See 18 CFR 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site *http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling.asp*. Commenters can submit brief comments up to 6,000 characters,