

Dated: July 12, 2013.

**Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,**

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2013-17307 Filed 7-18-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6717-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. TX13-1-000]

#### Watson Cogeneration Company; Notice of Filing

Take notice that on July 12, 2013, pursuant to sections 202(b), and 210 of the Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. 824a(b), and 824i, Part 36 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) Regulations, 18 CFR 36.1, Watson Cogeneration Company filed an application requesting that the Commission direct (1) Southern California Edison (SCE) to continue providing the existing physical interconnection to the Watson facility; (2) direct SCE and California Independent System Operator Corporation to execute the interconnection agreement; and (3) establish the effective date of the interconnection agreement to be contemporaneous with the future and to-be-established effective date of the Watson Transition Power Purchase Agreement.

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](mailto: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 August 12, 2013.

Dated: July 12, 2013.

**Kimberly D. Bose,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2013-17283 Filed 7-18-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6717-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. AD13-5-000]

#### Flexible and Local Resources Needed for Reliability in the California Wholesale Electric Market; Notice of Staff Technical Conference

This notice establishes the agenda and topics for discussion at the technical conference directed by the Commission in an Order on California Independent System Operator Corporation's (CAISO) proposal to implement an interim flexible capacity and local reliability resource retention mechanism (FLRR).<sup>1</sup> The technical conference will be held on July 31, 2013 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. (Pacific Time) in the Byron Sher Auditorium at the California Environmental Protection Agency Headquarters Building, 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California, 95812. *Please note the changed venue for the conference and the truncation of the conference to a single day.* The technical conference will be led by FERC staff, with presentations from panelists. Commissioners may attend and participate in the conference.

The agenda and questions to be discussed during this conference are attached. The technical conference is intended to facilitate a structured dialogue on the reliability and risk-of-retirement concerns raised in the FLRR proceeding, including, how those concerns relate to the joint CAISO/CPUC Multi-Year Reliability Framework proposal.

The technical conference will not be transcribed. However, there will be a free audiocast of the conference. The

audiocast will allow persons to listen to the conference, but not participate.

Anyone with Internet access who wants to listen can do so by navigating to the Calendar of Events at [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov) and locating the technical conference in the Calendar. The FERC Web site's link to the technical conference will contain a link to the audiocast. The Capitol Connection provides technical support for the audiocast. If you have questions, visit [www.CapitolConnection.org](http://www.CapitolConnection.org) or call 703-992-3100.

FERC conferences are accessible under section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. For accessibility accommodations please send an email to [accessibility@ferc.gov](mailto:accessibility@ferc.gov) or call toll free 1-866-208-3372 (voice) or 202-208-8659 (TTY), or send a fax to 202-208-2106 with the required accommodations.

For more information on this conference, please contact Colleen Farrell at [colleen.farrell@ferc.gov](mailto:colleen.farrell@ferc.gov) or (202) 502-6751; or Katheryn Hoke at [katheryn.hoke@ferc.gov](mailto:katheryn.hoke@ferc.gov) or (202) 502-8404.

Dated: July 11, 2013.

**Kimberly D. Bose,**

*Secretary.*

#### Agenda for the Technical Conference on Flexible and Local Resources Needed for Reliability in the California Wholesale Electric Market July 31, 2013

The technical conference is intended to facilitate a structured dialogue on the reliability and risk-of-retirement concerns raised in the FLRR proceeding, including discussion of the possible development of a durable, market-based mechanism to provide incentives to insure reliability needs are met.

The CAISO and CPUC staff recently announced a joint Multi-Year Reliability Framework proposal (joint proposal) for revising the CPUC's resource adequacy program and CAISO's capacity procurement mechanism tariff provisions, that is related to this subject.<sup>2</sup> Thus, this technical conference will also examine whether and how the joint proposal addresses the reliability needs raised in the FLRR proceeding.

Following a presentation by CAISO and CPUC staff, the conference will be divided into two panels. The first panel will examine the reliability issues raised in the FLRR proceeding and will also consider implications of the joint proposal for a Multi-Year Reliability Framework. The second panel will review possible solutions to the

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp.*, 142 FERC ¶ 61,248 (2013).

<sup>2</sup> See [http://www.caiso.com/Documents/NewStakeholderInitiativeMulti-YearReliabilityFramework\\_ISO-CPUCJointWorkshopJul17\\_2013.htm](http://www.caiso.com/Documents/NewStakeholderInitiativeMulti-YearReliabilityFramework_ISO-CPUCJointWorkshopJul17_2013.htm).

concerns that were raised in the FLRR proceeding as they pertain to flexible and local resources and whether the joint Multi-Year Reliability Framework offers a potential solution. This notice provides focus areas around which speakers should concentrate their comments. Each panelist should limit his presentation to 8 minutes. The panels will be followed by questions from Commissioners and CPUC and FERC staff, with an opportunity for audience members to participate.

#### Technical Conference Schedule

9:00 a.m.–9:15 a.m. Opening Remarks  
Greeting and Opening Remarks

9:15 a.m.–10:15 a.m. Joint CAISO/  
CPUC presentation

The presentation is expected to last 30 minutes and will be followed by Q&A

10:15 a.m.–11:15 a.m. Panel discussion on the risk-of-retirement problem and its contribution to reliability

Each panelist should limit his presentation to 8 minutes. The panel will be followed by questions from Commissioners and CPUC and FERC staff.

Panel one will be comprised of:

- Todd Strauss representing Pacific Gas & Electric Company;
- Pedro Pizarro representing Edison Mission Energy;
- Gary Ackerman representing Western Power Trading Forum;
- Kevin Woodruff representing The Utility Reform Network;
- Carl Zichella representing the National Resources Defense Council; and
- Kevin Carden representing Astrape Consulting.

Questions for Panel One: With respect to the reliability concerns raised in the FLRR proceeding, staff requests that panelists include in the presentations discussion of some of the questions below.

> In the FLRR proceeding, CAISO identified reliability concerns resulting from the retirement of resources needed for reliable operations. Are the resources necessary to ensure reliability over a forward looking period entering the market? If not, why not? For instance, how do the current CAISO market and bilateral capacity market structures influence resources' decisions to enter the market or retire? Are additional compensation structures required to ensure that resources needed for reliability are available over a forward period? What factors, besides compensation, may be influencing retirement and entry decisions in CAISO?

> What sort of operational and reliability conditions, including those that could lead to NERC/WECC reliability standard violations, will CAISO face based on assessments of a forward-looking period including projections of resources that enter the market, resources that will retire, load projections, demand response, etc.?

> What are the appropriate planning and operating assumptions to use in determining the forward-looking system needs for flexible resources that are needed to ensure overall system reliability? How much flexible capacity will be needed to ensure that the resource mix in CAISO is able to ensure reliable operations?

> How would a resource qualify as a flexible resource and what is an appropriate range of performance characteristics? Should there be an ongoing certification process for flexible resources? What other resource characteristics are important to ensure reliability in CAISO?

> Are there barriers to extracting flexible capability out of the existing fleet of resources?

> What are the causes of a resource being at risk-of-retirement? How is the market informed that a resource is at risk-of-retirement?

> How should local capacity needs and potential reliability issues associated with deliverability be addressed? Does the need to retain resources for local reliability require a mechanism that is unique from a market-based option for flexible capacity retention?

> What are the appropriate procurement targets for system, flexible and local capacity in the two- and three-year forward periods? How should the technical assessment be updated from year-to-year to account for changing market conditions, changing system configuration and changes in demand over the forward period?

> Would the provision in the joint proposal to limit load serving entities' participation in the residual capacity auction impact the effectiveness of forward procurement for reliability purposes? Why or why not?

11:15 a.m.–12:15 p.m. Open Discussion Time

12:15 p.m.–1:15 p.m. Lunch

1:15 p.m.–2:30 p.m. Panel discussion exploring whether a multi-year resource adequacy framework with a CAISO backstop is a solution to risk of retirement

Each panelist should limit his presentation to 8 minutes. The panels will be followed by questions from Commissioners, CPUC and FERC staff.

Panel two will be comprised of:

- Marc Ulrich representing Southern California Edison Company;
- Mark Smith or Matthew Barmack representing Calpine;
- Tony Braun representing California Municipal Utilities Association;
- Joe Como representing the CPUC Division of Ratepayer Advocates;
- Steven Kelly representing the Independent Energy Producers Association;
- Mike Evans representing Shell Energy; and
- Michael Milligan representing National Renewable Energy Laboratory.

Questions for Panel Two: With respect to the concerns raised in the FLRR proceeding regarding a market-based means of addressing forward-looking system, local and flexible needs, including when resources are at risk of retirement but needed in future years for reliability, staff requests that panelists include in the presentations discussion of some of the questions below.

> What are the preferred market-based solutions that could be used to address the forward flexible and local reliability concerns raised in the FLRR proceeding?

> How would a forward procurement requirement, along with specific procurement targets for flexible and local resources, affect bilateral contract prices?

> Would the joint proposal's combination of multi-year ahead flexible capacity obligations procured through bi-lateral contracts, or via CAISO backstop procurement, provide sufficient revenues to resources?

> Will the joint proposal's limited forward procurement of flexible and local capacity pursuant to a three-year forward resource adequacy obligation backed by a market-based CAISO backstop procurement mechanism provide sufficient procurement tools and sufficient additional revenue to mitigate the risk of retirement and retain needed flexible and local resources?

> Will the joint proposal's voluntary backstop capacity market, along with market power mitigation measures, provide sufficient replacement for the capacity procurement mechanism when it sunsets in 2015? If a mechanism like the joint proposal were implemented, would CAISO still need an interim risk-of-retirement backstop mechanism and what would any such backstop mechanism look like?

> Is there a mechanism needed prior to the potential implementation of the joint proposal? For instance, is an interim mechanism necessary to procure resources at risk of retirement that are

needed for flexibility? If so, what kind of mechanism?

➤ With respect to the goal of retaining flexible and local resources for reliability purposes that may be at risk of retirement, what alternatives to the joint proposal should be considered?

2:30 p.m.–2:45 p.m. Break

2:45 p.m.–4:15 p.m. Open Discussion Time

This time will be reserved for follow-up discussion on any issues raised during the panel discussions, or to address miscellaneous concerns related to the Multi-Year Reliability Framework, including questions or comments from members of the audience.

4:15 p.m.–4:30 p.m. Closing Remarks

[FR Doc. 2013–17290 Filed 7–18–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–9010–2]

### Environmental Impacts Statements; Notice of Availability

*Responsible Agency:* Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–7146 or <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/>.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements

Filed 07/08/2013 Through 07/12/2013 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

### Notice

Section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act requires that EPA make public its comments on EISs issued by other Federal agencies. EPA's comment letters on EISs are available at: <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/eisdata.html>.

*EIS No. 20130208, Draft EIS, USFS, CO,* Gore Creek Restoration, Comment Period Ends: 09/03/2013, Contact: Jack Lewis 970–638–4176.

*EIS No. 20130209, Draft EIS, BLM, AZ,* Sonoran Valley Parkway Project, Comment Period Ends: 09/03/2013, Contact: Kathleen Depukat 623–580–5681.

*EIS No. 20130210, Draft EIS, DOE, CA,* Hydrogen Energy California Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle Project, Comment Period Ends: 09/03/2013, Contact: Fred Pozzuto 304–285–5219.

*EIS No. 20130211, Final EIS, USN, MD,* Medical Facilities Development and University Expansion at Naval Support Activity Bethesda, Review Period Ends: 08/19/2013, Contact: Joseph Macri 301–295–1803.

*EIS No. 20130212, Final EIS, BLM, AZ,* APS Sun Valley to Morgan 500/230kV

Transmission Line Project, Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment, Review Period Ends: 08/19/2013, Contact: Joe Incardine 801–560–7135.

### Amended Notices

*EIS No. 20130122, Final EIS, MARAD, AL, ADOPTION—Garrows Bend Intermodal Rail, Portion of the Choctaw Point Terminal Project,* Review Period Ends: 08/19/2013, Contact: Kris Gilson 202–492–0479. The U.S. Department of Transportation's Maritime Administration has adopted the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers FEIS #20040381, filed 08/10/2004. The Maritime Administration was not a cooperating agency, therefore recirculation is necessary under Section 1506.3(b) of the CEQ Regulation.

Revision to FR Notice Published 05/03/2013: CEQ Wait Period Ending 06/03/2013 has been reestablished to 08/19/2013.

*EIS No. 20130161, Draft EIS, USFS, MT,* East Reservoir Project, Comment Period Ends: 08/15/2013, Contact: Denise Beck 406–293–7773 Ext.7504

Revision to FR Notice Published 07/26/2013; Extending Comment Period from 07/29/2013 to 08/15/2013.

*EIS No. 20130200, Final EIS, FTA, CA,* Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Project, Review Period Ends: 08/12/2013, Contact: Alex Smith 415–744–3133.

Revision to FR Notice Published 07/12/2013; Correction to Agency Contact Name should be Alex Smith.

Dated: July 16, 2013.

**Cliff Rader,**

*Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.*

[FR Doc. 2013–17424 Filed 7–18–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–OGC–2013–0484; FRL–9835–6]

### Proposed Settlement Agreement, Clean Air Act Citizen Suit

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed settlement agreement; request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with section 113(g) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (“CAA” or the “Act”), notice is hereby given of a proposed settlement agreement to address a lawsuit filed by Communities for a Better Environment, California Communities Against Toxics,

Desert Citizens Against Pollution, Natural Resources Defense Council, and Physicians for Social Responsibility—Los Angeles (collectively “Petitioners”) in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit: *Communities for a Better Environment, et al. v. EPA*, No. 12–71340, (9th Cir.). On April 30, 2012, Petitioner filed a petition for review challenging EPA's final action to approve the state implementation plan (SIP) revisions submitted by California to provide for attainment of the 1997 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standard in the Los Angeles-South Coast area (“South Coast”). The proposed settlement agreement establishes a deadline for EPA to take action on subsequently submitted SIP revisions for the South Coast.

**DATES:** Written comments on the proposed settlement agreement must be received by *August 19, 2013*.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID number EPA–HQ–OGC–2013–0484, online at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) (EPA's preferred method); by email to [oei.docket@epa.gov](mailto:oei.docket@epa.gov); by mail to EPA Docket Center, Environmental Protection Agency, Mailcode: 2822T, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460–0001; or by hand delivery or courier to EPA Docket Center, EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC, between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. Comments on a disk or CD–ROM should be formatted in Word or ASCII file, avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption, and may be mailed to the mailing address above.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jan Tierney, Air and Radiation Law Office (2344A), Office of General Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone: (202) 564–5598; fax number (202) 564–5603; email address: [tierney.jan@epa.gov](mailto:tierney.jan@epa.gov).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### I. Additional Information About the Proposed Settlement Agreement

The proposed settlement agreement would resolve a lawsuit seeking to overturn EPA's final action to approve SIP revisions submitted by California to provide for attainment of the 1997 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standard in the South Coast. 77 FR 12674 (March 1, 2012). The proposed settlement agreement requires that no later than August 13, 2014, EPA shall sign a notice or notices of the Agency's final action or actions under Section