potential advantages or disadvantages compared to those of the conventional interconnection, merchant transmission and/or transmission planning? Is one approach more likely to lead to integrated offshore wind generation development?

3. Are there any challenges associated with using the merchant transmission model where subscribing generation has not yet been identified? What types of injection rights may be appropriate for merchant transmission projects that have not yet identified all interconnecting offshore wind generation?

4. If RTO/ISO merchant transmission frameworks were to be used, what milestones currently exist or should be established if such a framework were to apply to transmission facilities for offshore wind generation? At what point in the merchant transmission interconnection process should an offshore transmission project be required to demonstrate that it has contracted with offshore wind generation?

5. What steps must an offshore or onshore merchant transmission developer complete to meet site control requirements? Does a merchant transmission developer need full site control of onshore connections as well as the offshore lease area? Are the existing merchant transmission rules pertaining to partial vs. full site control creating any impediments for offshore wind generation? If so, what are the impediments? Do the requirements for site control in RTO/ISO processes for generator interconnection and merchant transmission interconnection differ? If so, how? If so, does that difference create impediments for offshore wind generation?

6. Should the current criteria for granting negotiated rate authority to merchant transmission developers be adjusted to consider potential market power concerns that may emerge from unique attributes of offshore wind generation (e.g., a limited number of points of interconnection)?

7. When merchant transmission developers select and interconnect offshore wind generation, what factors do they consider, and which are most important (e.g., available landing points, existing interconnection infrastructure, existing system capacity for injections, etc.)? What are the benefits of being a first mover with regards to merchant transmission interconnection? Are there any impediments under the merchant transmission framework to the development of offshore wind generation? If so, what are the impediments? What are the best ways to reduce or eliminate the impediments?

8. Are existing dynamic modeling data requirements adequate for increased penetration of inverter-based wind generation and offshore transmission projects, under either conventional transmission planning processes or merchant transmission frameworks? Are there specific improvements that would have to be made to data requirements or transmission planning assumptions regarding dynamic modeling to accommodate a “transmission first” approach?

3:30 p.m.–3:45 p.m.: Panel 4: Alternative Models for Offshore Wind Transmission

Jeff Billington, Director, Transmission Infrastructure Planning, California ISO

James Cotter, General Manager, American Offshore Wind, Shell New Energies

Beth Garza, Senior Fellow, Electricity Policy, R Street Institute

Michael Goggin, Business Network for Offshore Wind and Vice President, Grid Strategies, LLC

Kim Hanemann, EVP & Chief Operating Officer, Public Service Electric & Gas Company

Jan Papsch: Team Lead Electricity, European Commission, Directorate General for Energy

This panel will explore potential alternative models for building transmission that may be needed to accommodate anticipated growth in offshore wind generation. The panel will include a discussion of the following topics and questions:

1. In an ideal world, what would a model for transmission development that could accommodate anticipated growth in offshore wind generation look like? Could this be achieved under existing RTO/ISO approaches? If not, what are the impediments?

2. Are there examples of existing interconnection, merchant transmission, and/or transmission planning processes for accessing remote onshore generation resources that could be adapted to the offshore wind context? If so, how?

3. What reforms would you recommend that the Commission consider pursuing to facilitate the efficient or cost-effective integration of anticipated offshore wind generation in RTOs/ISOs, including potential modifications of the existing interconnection, merchant transmission, and/or transmission planning processes, or other potential changes?

4. Are there existing or anticipated state legislative efforts related to transmission development for offshore wind generation? Are these efforts consistent with existing RTO/ISO tariffs and the Commission’s existing regulatory frameworks?

5. Which aspects of the interconnection, merchant transmission, and/or transmission planning and cost allocation processes related to offshore wind generation used in European markets could be adapted to or inform the U.S. framework?

4:45 p.m.–5:00 p.m.: Closing Remarks

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 13417–008]

Western Technical College; ReNew Hydro Power, LLC; Notice of Application for Transfer of License and Soliciting Comments, Motions To Intervene, and Protests

On September 14, 2020, Western Technical College (transferor) and ReNew Hydro Power, LLC (transferee) filed jointly an application for the transfer of license of the Angelo Dam Hydroelectric Project No. 13417. The project is located on the La Crosse River, Monroe County, Wisconsin.

The applicants seek Commission approval to transfer the license for the Angelo Dam Hydroelectric Project from the transferor to the transferee.

Applicants Contact: For transferor: Roger Stanford, President, Western Technical College, 400 7th St. N, La Crosse, WI 54601, Phone: (608) 785–9123.

For transferee: Christopher or Beth Cutts, Manager, ReNew Hydro Power, LLC, W7547 County Road P., Wild Rose, WI 54984, Phone: (920) 765–2193.

FERC Contact: Anumzziatta Purchiaroni, (202) 502–6191, Anumzziatta.purchiaroni@ferc.gov

Deadline for filing comments, motions to intervene, and protests: 30 days from the date that the Commission issues this notice. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filing. Please file comments, motions to intervene, and protests using the Commission’s eFiling system at http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/eFiling.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; (866) 208–3676 (toll free), or (202) 502–8659 (TTY).

In lieu of electronic filing, you may submit a paper copy. Submissions sent via U.S. Postal Service must be addressed to, Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE, Room 1A, Washington, DC 20542. Submissions sent via any other carrier must be addressed to, Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 12225 Wilkins Avenue, Rockville, Maryland 20852. The first page of any filing should include docket number P–13417–008. Comments emailed to Commission staff are not considered part of the Commission record.

In addition to publishing the full text of this document in the Federal Register, the Commission provides all interested persons an opportunity to view and/or print the contents of this document via the internet through the Commission’s Home Page (http://ferc.gov) using the “eLibrary” link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. At this time, the Commission has suspended access to the Commission’s Public Reference Room, due to the proclamation declaring a National Emergency concerning the Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID–19), issued by the President on March 13, 2020. For assistance, contact the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission at FERCONlineSupport@ferc.gov or call toll-free, (866) 208–3676 or TTY, (202) 502–8659.


Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary.

For further information contact: Ozone Transport Commission, 89 South St., Suite 602, Boston, MA 02111; (617) 259–2005; email: ozone@otcair.org; website: http://www.otcair.org.

For registration: To register for the virtual meeting, please use the online registration form available at http://www.otcair.org, or contact the OTC at (617) 259–2005 or by email at ozone@otcair.org.

Supplementary Information: The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 contain Section 184 provisions for the Control of Interstate Ozone Air Pollution. Section 184(a) establishes an Ozone Transport Region (OTR) comprised of the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, parts of Virginia and the District of Columbia. The purpose of the OTC is to address ground-level ozone formation, transport, and control within the OTR. Type of Meeting: Open. Agenda: Copies of the final agenda will be available from the OTC office (617) 259–2005; or by email: ozone@otcair.org or via the OTC website at http://www.otcair.org.


Dennis Deziel,
Regional Administrator, EPA Region 1.

For registration: To register for the virtual meeting, please use the online registration form available at http://www.otcair.org, or contact the OTC at (617) 259–2005 or by email at ozone@otcair.org.

Summary: The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is announcing the 2020 Annual Meeting of the Ozone Transport Commission (OTC). The meeting agenda will include topics regarding reducing ground-level ozone precursors.

Dates: The meeting will be held on November 18, 2020 starting at 9 a.m. and ending at noon.

Addresses: Virtual meeting. Further information on the details for the virtual public meeting will be available at http://www.otcair.org.