

present the opportunity to exercise buyer market power.

3. Explain how the Commission's April 12 Order may impact long-term resource planning.

10:30 a.m.–10:45 a.m.—Break

10:45 a.m.–12:30 p.m.

4. Does the same incentive to exercise buyer market power exist for buyers who largely or totally self-supply as compared to buyers who self-supply only a small portion of their load?

5. Does the same incentive to exercise buyer market power exist for small load serving entities as compared to large load serving entities?

6. Would the market power concern about using self-supply be alleviated if the self-supplied resources are acquired through a procurement process that does not discriminate between new and existing resources? If yes, what factors should be analyzed to determine whether a procurement process is non-discriminatory?

7. Explain why the Fixed Resource Requirement (FRR) Alternative is or is not a viable alternative for those wishing to self-supply.

8. What other alternatives to the FRR option would allow parties to self-supply while deterring buyer market power?

Panelists

- Patrick McCullar, President & CEO, Delaware Municipal Electric Corporation, Inc., representing American Public Power Association
- Gregory J. Morgan, Managing Director of Regulated Operations, Dominion Virginia Power, representing Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
- Douglas R. M. Nazarian, Chairman, Maryland Public Service Commission
- Dr. Joseph E. Bowring, Market Monitor, Monitoring Analytics, L.L.C.
- David L. Mohre, Executive Director, Energy & Power Division, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association
- Lee A. Solomon, President, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities
- Andrew Ott, Senior Vice President-Markets, PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
- Mark Scott, Director, Structured Trading, Customized Energy Solutions, representing PJM Load Group
- Dr. Roy Shanker, Consultant, PJM Power Providers Group
- Dr. William Hogan, Professor, Harvard University, representing PSEG Companies

[FR Doc. 2011–19086 Filed 7–27–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 12715–003]

Fairlawn Hydroelectric Company, LLC; Notice of Public Meeting

On August 5, 2011, Office of Energy Projects staff may participate in a public meeting hosted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District (Corps) for the proposed Jennings Randolph Project No. 12715–003 (project). The purpose of the meeting is to discuss potential dam safety issues identified by the Maryland Department of the Environment related to the Corps' dam and any related effects on the project's licensing proceeding.

The meeting will begin at 10 a.m. EDT at the City Crescent Building, 10 S. Howard Street, Baltimore, MD 21201, Room 8510. Interested parties wishing to attend should contact Raymond Smith at (410) 962–4507 or by e-mail at Raymond.F.Smith@usace.army.mil.

Dated: July 22, 2011.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2011–19085 Filed 7–27–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER11–3322–000]

PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.; Supplemental Notice of Staff Technical Conference

On June 21, 2011, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) announced that a staff Technical Conference on Performance Measurement of Demand Response in the PJM Capacity Market will be held on July 29, 2011, beginning at 9 a.m. (EDT) in the Commission Meeting Room at the Commission's headquarters, located at 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. The technical conference will be led by Commission staff, and Commissioners may be in attendance. The conference will be open for the public to attend and advance registration is not required.

Attached to this supplemental notice is an agenda for the conference. If any changes are made, the revised agenda will be posted prior to the event on the Calendar of Events on the Commission's Web site, <http://www.ferc.gov>.

The conference will be transcribed. Transcripts will be available

immediately for a fee from Ace Reporting Company (202–347–3700 or 1–800–336–6646). A free webcast of this event is also available through <http://www.ferc.gov>. Anyone with Internet access who desires to view this event can do so by navigating to <http://www.ferc.gov>'s Calendar of Events and locating this event in the calendar. The event will contain a link to its webcast. The Capitol Connection provides technical support for the free webcasts. If you have any questions, visit <http://www.CapitolConnection.org> or call (703) 993–3100.

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

Parties seeking additional information regarding this conference should contact Tristan Cohen at Tristan.Cohen@ferc.gov or (202) 502–6598.

Dated: July 22, 2011.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,

Deputy Secretary.

Appendix

Performance Measurement of Demand Response in the PJM Capacity Market; ER11–3322–000

July 29, 2011

Agenda

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

9:15 a.m.–11:15 a.m. Discussion on Reliability Issues

1. Whether the customer baseline load (CBL) or peak load contribution (PLC) is a more accurate capacity market performance measure of what a demand response customer would have consumed in the absence of an instruction to reduce load.

2. Whether the current PJM add-back process under the guaranteed load drop (GLD) option, which is used to calculate peak load for capacity for the following delivery year, accurately reflects the fact that the load reduction of an over-performing demand response customer (*i.e.* a customer that provides a level of response greater than the MW nominated for it in the capacity auction) has been used to support an under-performing customer (*i.e.* a customer that provides a level of response less than the nominated MW) in a portfolio aggregated to meet the capacity commitment.

3. Whether PJM dispatchers account for PLCs during an emergency.

4. Whether any load in PJM can be at load levels in excess of PLC during an emergency.