

emphasis on when and how VLR commitments are made as part of the SCUC process. In your response please explain why such VLR commitments are made at that time in the process instead of waiting until after the day-ahead market closes. Explain the difference between modeling VLR for planning and VLR commitments.

2. Please provide a simple example of how to calculate proxies for voltage limits.

3. Please explain the assertion that all low-voltage transmission facilities are presumed to have significant market power and should be designated for Voltage and Local Reliability (VLR) commitments. Please supplement the record with additional materials as appropriate.

4. With regard to your written answer to pre-conference question 3, it appears that some units were not economically dispatched in hours when they had zero unit headroom. Why? Is it possible to have EcoMax equal EcoMin?

5. Please provide a numerical example to illustrate how you perform the calculations detailed in Tab B of your pre-conference comments.

6. Please explain why the word “or” that previously conjoined bullets (a) through (c) in proposed tariff section 64.1.3.a.i has been changed to “and.”

Questions Directed to Potomac Economics, Ltd.

7. Your exhibit refers to units with incremental energy offer prices at half their reference level, as MISO proposes to mitigate through proposed Tariff Section 64.1.3.a.i(a). How could a market participant benefit by offering in this way?

8. Please explain your assertions that market power mitigation is necessary for any generation unit on a line rated less than 100 kV, and that constraints on facilities rated less than 100 kV are unlike constraints on facilities rated above 100 kV. Why are all low-voltage transmission facilities presumed to be locations for the exercise of significant market power? Please supplement the record with additional materials as appropriate.

9. With regard to the slide you presented from the 2010 State of the Market Report, please explain why reference levels have been rising.

10. Please explain why the word “or” that previously conjoined bullets (a) through (c) in proposed tariff section 64.1.3.a.i has been changed to “and.”

Questions Directed to All Conference Participants

11. In light of the discussion at the conference, are changes to the definition

of Voltage and Local Reliability Commitment (proposed tariff section 1.697a) necessary, and if so, what should those changes be?

12. There was discussion at the conference of whether it is possible to build a voltage component into locational marginal prices (LMP), and dispatching units for VLR via the Security-Constrained Economic Dispatch (SCUC). Please discuss the competing concerns of accurately constructing locational marginal prices and accurately allocating costs. For example, if it was possible to dispatch VLR units through the SCUC, could this be done on a purely economic basis? What would be the effect on Revenue Sufficiency Guarantee cost incurrence?

13. Conference participants discussed two competing methodologies to address cost causation for resolving voltage limits. The first methodology was allowing the market to resolve such voltage limits by sending a price signal to behind-the-meter generation. The second method was MISO's methodology of uplifting the cost of VLR commitments to local loads.

a. Please explain the advantages and disadvantages of each methodology and explain how a finding of justness and reasonableness could be made for each methodology.

b. Please explain how to take such behind-the-meter generation into account in system models and send price signals.

c. Is it possible to provide incentives for behind-the-meter generation to respond to market forces in such a way as to address voltage issues, and if so, what is the best way to achieve this?

Parties wishing to file comments on the matters discussed at the technical conference, and wishing to reply to comments filed by others, should do so on the following schedule:

Comments: Due on or before June 5, 2012.

Reply comments: Due on or before June 19, 2012.

Dated: May 18, 2012.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2012-12709 Filed 5-24-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 14385-000]

Coastal Hydropower, LLC; Notice of Preliminary Permit Application Accepted for Filing and Soliciting Comments, Motions To Intervene, and Competing Applications

On April 12, 2012, Coastal Hydropower, LLC filed an application for a preliminary permit, pursuant to section 4(f) of the Federal Power Act, proposing to study the feasibility of the Menasha-Neenah Water Power Project, which would be located on the Fox River, in Winnebago County, Wisconsin. 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: (1) Installation of 12 Very Low Head (VLH) 500-kilowatt (kW) turbine units; (2) a proposed 700-foot-long, 12-kilovolt transmission line; (3) a proposed 300-foot-long, 13-kilovolt transmission line; and (4) appurtenant facilities. The proposed Menasha-Neenah Water Power Project would have an estimated average annual generation of 31.5 gigawatt-hours.

Applicant Contact: Neil Anderson, Coastal Hydropower, LLC, Key Centre, 601 108th Avenue NE., Suite 1900, Bellevue, WA 98004; phone: (425) 943-7690.

FERC Contact: Bryan Roden-Reynolds at (202) 502-6618, or via email at bryan.roden-reynolds@ferc.gov.

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 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/ferconline.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; call toll-free at 1-866-208-3676, or for TTY, (202) 502-8659. Although the Commission strongly encourages electronic filing, documents may also be paper-filed. To paper-file, mail an original and seven copies to: Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

More information about this project, including a copy of the application, can be viewed or printed on the "eLibrary" link of Commission's Web site at <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/elibrary.asp>. Enter the docket number (P-14385) in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, contact FERC Online Support.

Dated: May 18, 2012.

Kimberly D. Bose,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2012-12703 Filed 5-24-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RM98-1-000]

Records Governing Off-the-Record Communications; Public Notice

This constitutes notice, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.2201(b), of the receipt of prohibited and exempt off-the-record communications.

Order No. 607 (64 FR 51222, September 22, 1999) requires Commission decisional employees, who make or receive a prohibited or exempt off-the-record communication relevant to the merits of a contested proceeding, to deliver to the Secretary of the Commission, a copy of the communication, if written, or a summary of the substance of any oral communication.

Prohibited communications are included in a public, non-decisional file associated with, but not a part of, the decisional record of the proceeding. Unless the Commission determines that the prohibited communication and any responses thereto should become a part of the decisional record, the prohibited off-the-record communication will not be considered by the Commission in reaching its decision. Parties to a proceeding may seek the opportunity to respond to any facts or contentions made in a prohibited off-the-record

communication, and may request that the Commission place the prohibited communication and responses thereto in the decisional record. The Commission will grant such a request only when it determines that fairness so requires. Any person identified below as having made a prohibited off-the-record communication shall serve the document on all parties listed on the official service list for the applicable proceeding in accordance with Rule 2010, 18 CFR 385.2010.

Exempt off-the-record communications are included in the decisional record of the proceeding, unless the communication was with a cooperating agency as described by 40 CFR 1501.6, made under 18 CFR 385.2201(e)(1)(v).

The following is a list of off-the-record communications recently received by the Secretary of the Commission. The communications listed are grouped by docket numbers in ascending order. These filings are 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, please contact FERC, Online Support at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or toll free at (866) 208-3676, or for TTY, contact (202) 502-8659.

| Docket No. | Communication date | Presenter or requester |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>Prohibited:</i> | | |
| 1. EL01-10-000 | 4-27-12 | Ben Tansey. ¹ |
| 2. FA11-21-000 | 5-10-12 | Eric Morris. ² |
| 3. CP11-56-000 | 5-16-12 | Kevin Burke. |
| 4. CP11-161-000 | 5-17-12 | James C. Yardley. |
| <i>Exempt:</i> | | |
| 1. CP12-30-000 | 3-28-12 | Commission Staff. ³ |
| 2. CP07-52-000/CP07-53-000 | 4-2-12 | Commission Staff. ⁴ |
| 3. ER12-1204-000 | 4-9-12 | Robert F. Powelson. |
| 4. CP12-30-000 | 4-12-12 | Commission Staff. ⁵ |
| 5. CP11-515-000 | 4-17-12 | Hon. Nan Hayworth, M.D. |
| 6. P-12495-006 | 4-18-12 | Hon. Cathy McMorris Rodgers. |
| 7. CP12-50-000 | 4-19-12 | Hon. Kent Conrad. |
| 8. EL12-56-000 | 4-24-12 | Hon. Eliot L. Engel. |
| 9. P-2188-000 | 4-25-12 | Hon. Max Baucus. |
| 10. P-12470-000 | 5-1-12 | Commission Staff. ⁶ |
| 10. AD12-1-000/ER11-4081-000 | 5-2-12 | Justin Vickers. |
| 11. CP12-18-000 | 5-3-12 | U.S. Dept. of Interior Staff. |
| 12. P-2710-057/P-2712-074 | 5-10-12 | Hon. Susan M. Collins. |
| 13. CP11-128-000 | 5-10-12 | Hon. Jane L. Corwin. |
| 14. RM11-26-000/EL11-66-000 | 5-11-12 | Hon. Edward J. Markey. |
| 15. CP11-56-000 | 5-14-12 | Office of the Mayor, New York, NY. |
| 16. CP11-14-000 | 5-14-12 | Commission Staff. ⁷ |
| 17. AD12-1-000/ER11-4081-000 | 5-26-12 | Joseph M. Power. |

¹ Email record.

² Email record for both May 10th and May 17th.

³ Meeting record.

⁴ Telephone record.

⁵ Meeting record.

⁶ Email record.