

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 date as indicated below. Anyone filing an intervention or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant. Anyone filing an intervention or protest on or before the intervention or protest date need not 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 14 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 e-mail notification when a document is added to a subscribed docket(s). For assistance with any FERC Online service, please e-mail [FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov](mailto:FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov), or call (866) 208-3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502-8659.

*Comment Date:* 5 p.m. Eastern Time Wednesday, March 25, 2009.

**Kimberly D. Bose,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E9-5775 Filed 3-17-09; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. ER09-556-000; Docket Nos. ER09-556-000; and ER06-615-039; ER08-367-003]

#### California Independent System Operator Corporation; Notice Shortening Answer Period

March 11, 2009.

On March 6, 2009, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO) filed a Motion to Modify Effective Date of Certain Proposed Tariff Revisions and for Expedited Answer Period (March 6

Motion). In the filing, CAISO requests that the Commission establish an expedited time period to file answers to the motion in order to facilitate Commission consideration of the motion. By this notice, the date for filing answers to CAISO's March 6 Motion is shortened to and including March 13, 2009.

**Kimberly D. Bose,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E9-5777 Filed 3-17-09; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RM08-2-001]

#### Pipeline Posting Requirements Under Section 23 of the Natural Gas Act; Notice of Agenda for Technical Conference

March 11, 2009.

On February 24, 2009, the Commission issued a Notice of Technical Conference (February 24 Notice), to be held March 18, 2009, in the above referenced proceeding. The technical conference is being held by staff for the purpose of discussing certain issues raised in the requests for rehearing filed in response to Order No. 720.<sup>1</sup> As stated in the February 24 Notice, the technical conference will be held at the headquarters of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC, from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. (EDT).

Attached is an agenda for the March 18, 2009, technical conference. The February 24 Notice identified three topics for discussion: (1) The definition of major non-interstate pipelines; (2) what constitutes "scheduling" for a receipt or delivery point; and, (3) how the 15,000 MMBtu per day design capacity threshold should be applied. As reflected in the attached agenda, Panel 1 will address the first topic, with a focus on contiguous and non-contiguous networks, stub lines and other gathering issues; Panel 2 will address the second and third topics, with a focus on how pipeline systems account for high capacity receipt and delivery points (*i.e.*, greater than 15,000 MMBtu per day) where scheduling does not occur; and, Panel 3 will focus on estimating the cost of compliance with Order No. 720.

<sup>1</sup> Pipeline Posting Requirements under Section 23 of the Natural Gas Act, Order No. 720, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,281 (2008).

This conference will be transcribed. There is no registration required to attend and no registration fee. For additional information, please contact Saida Shaalan of FERC's Office of Enforcement at (202) 502-8278 or by e-mail at [Saida.Shaalan@ferc.gov](mailto:Saida.Shaalan@ferc.gov).

**Kimberly D. Bose,**  
*Secretary.*

#### Agenda for Technical Conference

Order No. 720 Rehearing Issues  
Technical Conference RM08-02-001

March 18, 2009

Commission Meeting Room

9-9:10 a.m.—Opening Remarks  
9:10-9:50 a.m.—Defining Major Non-Interstate Pipelines  
Assessing contiguous and non-contiguous networks

- What constitutes a contiguous pipeline system for the purpose of applying the annual 50 million MMBtu delivery threshold?
- What are the market differences between non-contiguous pipeline systems with the same owner and a single pipeline system?
- Stub lines and other gathering issues
- What role do stub lines play in the market? How are they operated?
- What gathering functions do not occur upstream of a processing plant? How widespread are those activities (*e.g.*, volumes)?

Panelists:

- Representative from TPA
- Representative from Southwest Gas
- Representative from AGA
- 9:50 a.m.-12 p.m.—Accounting for High Capacity Receipt and Delivery Points (*i.e.*, Greater than 15,000 MMBtu Per Day) Where Scheduling Does Not Occur
- Is there some rule of thumb to identify points at which advance notice of receipts/deliveries is required for operational purposes?
- How do companies without scheduling information address the risk of demand volatility from large scale consumers receiving unbundled service?
- How do pipelines reconcile nominations with actual flows at pooled points?

Panelists:

- Representative from TPA
- Representative from SoCal Gas
- Representative from Nicor
- Representative from AGA
- 12:10-12:50 p.m.—Estimating the Cost of Compliance
- What is the basis for cost estimates in the rehearing requests?
- Are there alternative approaches that