

at the scoping meetings, or may be viewed on the web at <http://www.ferc.gov>, using the “eLibrary” link. Follow the directions for accessing information in paragraph m. Based on all oral and written comments, a Revised Scoping Document may be issued. A Revised Scoping Document may include additional issues, identified through the scoping process.

#### Environmental Site Review

The Applicant and FERC staff will conduct a project Environmental Site Review beginning at 9 a.m. on March 28, 2012. All interested individuals, organizations, and agencies are invited to attend. All participants should meet at the Robert C. Byrd Locks and Dam in Gallipolis, Ohio (Ohio side). All participants are responsible for their own transportation to the site. Anyone with questions about the Environmental Site Review should contact Philip E. Meier at 614-540-0913 or Gaylord Hoisington at 202-502-6032.

#### Objectives

At the scoping meetings, the staff will: (1) Summarize the environmental issues tentatively identified for analysis in the EA; (2) solicit from the meeting participants all available information, especially quantifiable data, on the resources at issue; (3) encourage statements from experts and the public on issues that should be analyzed in the EA, including viewpoints in opposition to, or in support of, the staff’s preliminary views; (4) determine the resource issues to be addressed in the EA; and (5) identify those issues that require a detailed analysis, as well as those issues that do not require a detailed analysis.

#### Procedures

The meetings are recorded by a stenographer and become part of the formal record of the Commission proceeding on the project.

Individuals, organizations, and agencies with environmental expertise and concerns are encouraged to attend the meetings and to assist the staff in defining and clarifying the issues to be addressed in the EA.

Dated: February 27, 2012.

**Kimberly D. Bose,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2012-5106 Filed 3-1-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. AD12-8-000]

#### Non-RTO/ISO Performance Metrics; Commission Staff Request Comments on Performance Metrics for Regions Outside of RTOs and ISOs

In September 2008, the United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report titled “Electricity Restructuring: FERC Could Take Additional Steps to Analyze Regional Transmission Organizations’ Benefits and Performance,” GAO-08-987. This report recommended that the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission or FERC), among other actions, work with regional transmission organizations (RTO), Independent System Operators (ISO), stakeholders and other experts to develop standardized measures that track the performance of RTO/ISO operations and markets and report the performance results to Congress and the public annually, while also providing interpretation of (1) what the measures and reported performance communicate about the benefits of RTOs and, where appropriate, (2) changes that need to be made to address any performance concerns. Consistent with the goals outlined in GAO’s report, the Commission’s Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2009–2014 outlined a multi-year process for developing and implementing a common set of performance measures for markets both within and outside of ISOs/RTOs.

As recommended by GAO, Commission staff worked with representatives from all the jurisdictional ISOs/RTOs to develop a set of performance metrics for ISOs and RTOs. Commission staff and ISO/RTO representatives met with interested stakeholders to solicit their perspectives and comments on the proposed performance metrics. Commission staff then released the proposed metrics for public comment in Docket No. AD10-5-000. In October 2010, Commission staff issued a staff report addressing the comments received and recommending a final list of metrics for ISOs and RTOs. In December 2010, the ISOs and RTOs submitted information for the 2005–2009 period addressing the final metrics developed by Commission staff. This information, along with a staff report and analysis of performance as measured by the metrics, was included in a report sent to Congress in April 2011. The ISOs and RTOs subsequently

submitted a report providing data for the 2006–2010 period.

Now, Commission staff has started the process of developing metrics to measure performance in regions outside of ISOs and RTOs. Consistent with the process used in developing metrics for ISO/RTO markets, Commission staff has worked with the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) and its members to develop a set of performance metrics for regions outside of ISOs and RTOs. Commission staff, along with EEI and its members, met with interested stakeholders to solicit their perspectives and comments on the proposed performance metrics. These metrics are based on the metrics previously selected in Docket No. AD10-5, but have been tailored to fit markets outside of ISOs and RTOs. We expect that those entities that decide to provide information in response to the final metrics developed in this proceeding will provide data and explain performance trends in a manner consistent with the responses provided by the ISOs and RTOs in Docket No. AD10-5.

Commission staff requests comments on whether the proposed performance metrics (attached) will effectively track the performance of markets outside of ISOs and RTOs. Comments must be filed on or before May 1, 2012. Reply comments must be filed on or before May 16, 2012.

*Addresses:* Parties may submit comments, identified by Docket No. AD12-08-000, by one of the following methods.

*Agency Web site:* <http://www.ferc.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments via the eFiling link found under the “Documents and Filing” tab.

*Mail:* Those unable to file comments electronically may mail or hand-deliver comments to: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Secretary of the Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

*For Further Information Contact:* Jeffrey Hitchings, Office of Energy Market Regulation, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, Telephone: (202) 502-6042, Email: [jeffrey.hitchings@ferc.gov](mailto:jeffrey.hitchings@ferc.gov) or Stephen J. Hug, Office of the General Counsel—Energy Markets, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, Telephone: (202) 502-8009, Email: [stephen.hug@ferc.gov](mailto:stephen.hug@ferc.gov).

#### Information Collection Statement

The following collection of information contained in these proposed metrics is subject to review by

the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.<sup>1</sup> OMB's regulations require approval of certain information collection requirements imposed by agency actions.<sup>2</sup> The Commission solicits comments on the Commission's need for this information, whether the information will have practical utility, the accuracy of the burden estimates, ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected

or retained, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondents' burden, including the use of automated information techniques.

The proposed collection of information requires those public utilities outside of ISOs and RTOs that choose to participate to provide information responding to the attached metrics on a periodic basis. This includes the submission of price data and information relating to reliability, transmission planning, requests for

service, and system capacity. The information submitted by participating utilities would be used to help develop a common set of metrics for both ISO/RTO markets and non-RTO/ISO markets, and for evaluating market performance thereafter.

*Burden Estimate:* The additional estimated public reporting burdens for the proposed reporting requirements in this rule are as follows.

FERC-922 requirements	Number of respondents annually (1)	Number of responses per respondent (2)	Average burden hours per response (3)	Total annual burden hours (1) × (2) × (3)
Metrics Data Collection .....	11	1	80	880
Write Performance Analysis .....	11	1	60	660
<b>Total .....</b>				<b>1,540</b>

We estimate that it will take, on average, one technical analyst two weeks to collect the data to respond to the metrics. We also estimate that it will take one technical analyst one week to write a report responding to the metrics and it will take one manager approximately 20 hours to review the report.

*Cost to Comply:* The Commission has projected the cost of compliance to be \$106,920.

*Technical Expertise* = \$89,760 (880 hours data collection + 440 hours report completion @ \$68 per hour).

*Management Review* = \$17,160 (220 hours report review @ \$78 per hour).

Cost per hour figures are calculated using Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data.<sup>3</sup> The technical expertise category factors in the median wage for an engineer, analyst, attorney and economist. The management category factors in the median wage for general and operations managers. Based on BLS

data,<sup>4</sup> both cost figures have been adjusted to include benefits (benefits represent 29.5% of the total hourly figure).

*Title:* FERC-922, Non-RTO/ISO Performance Metrics.

*Action:* Proposed Collection.  
*OMB Control No.* TBD.

*Internal Review:* The Commission has reviewed the proposed metrics and has determined that the metrics and data gathered thereunder are necessary.

These requirements conform to the Commission's need for efficient information collection, communication, and management within the energy industry. The Commission has assured itself, by means of internal review, that there is specific, objective support for the burden estimates associated with the information collection requirements.

Interested persons may obtain information on the reporting requirements by contacting the following: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE.,

Washington, DC 20426 [Attention: Ellen Brown, Office of the Executive Director], email: [DataClearance@ferc.gov](mailto:DataClearance@ferc.gov), Phone: (202) 502-8663, fax: (202) 273-0873.

Comments on the collections of information and the associated burden estimates in this proceeding should be sent to the Commission in this docket and may also be sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503 [Attention: Desk Officer for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission]. For security reasons, comments to OMB should be submitted by email to: [oir\\_submission@omb.eop.gov](mailto:oir_submission@omb.eop.gov). Comments submitted to OMB should include Docket Number AD12-08-000 and FERC-922.

Dated: February 23, 2012.

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

**Attachment**

**PROPOSED PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR NON-ISO/RTO REGIONS**

[Based on ISO/RTO metrics from Docket No. AD10-5-000]

Performance metric	Specific metric(s)
<b>Reliability</b>	
A. National or Regional Reliability Standards Compliance.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>References to which Electricity Reliability Organization (ERO) and Regional Reliability Organization (RRO) standards are applicable.</li> <li>Number of violations self-reported and made public by NERC/FERC.</li> <li>Number of violations identified and made public as RRO or ERO audit findings.</li> <li>Total number of violations made public by NERC/FERC.</li> <li>Severity level of each violation made public by NERC/FERC.</li> </ol>

<sup>1</sup> 44 U.S.C. 3507 (2006). The Paperwork Reduction Act requires OMB approval of certain information collection activities when these activities apply to 10 or more persons. Because it

is estimated that 11 entities will respond to this collection the Commission is requesting approval from OMB.

<sup>2</sup> 5 CFR part 1320 (2011).

<sup>3</sup> See [http://bls.gov/oes/current/naics4\\_221100.htm#\(3\)](http://bls.gov/oes/current/naics4_221100.htm#(3)).

<sup>4</sup> See <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/ceec.nr0.htm>.

PROPOSED PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR NON-ISO/RTO REGIONS—Continued

[Based on ISO/RTO metrics from Docket No. AD10–5–000]

Performance metric	Specific metric(s)
<p>B. Dispatch Reliability .....</p> <p>C. Operational Planning—Load Forecast Accuracy.</p> <p>D. Wind Forecasting Accuracy .....</p> <p>E. Unscheduled Flows .....</p> <p>F. Transmission Outage Coordination.</p> <p>G. Long-Term Reliability Planning—Transmission.</p> <p>H. Long-Term Reliability Planning—Resources.</p> <p>I. Infrastructure Investment—Interconnection and Transmission Process Metrics.</p> <p>J. Special Protection Systems .....</p>	<p>6. Compliance with operating reserve standards.</p> <p>7. Unserved energy (or load shedding) caused by violations. Additional detail will be provided on (1) number of events; (2) duration of the events; (3) whether the events occurred during on/off-peak hours; and (4) additional information on equipment types affected and kV of lines affected.</p> <p>Items 2–7: Track the ISO/RTO definition: “This metric is a quantification of all NERC and RRO Reliability Standards violations that have been identified during an audit or as a result of an ISO/RTO self-report and have been published as part of that process.”</p> <p>Non-ISO/RTO utilities should limit reporting to the same eight functional areas used by the ISO/RTOs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Balancing Authority.</li> <li>2. Interchange Authority.</li> <li>3. Planning Authority.</li> <li>4. Reliability Coordinator.</li> <li>5. Resource Planner.</li> <li>6. Transmission Operator.</li> <li>7. Transmission Planner.</li> <li>8. Transmission Service Provider.</li> </ol> <p>1. Balance Authority Ace Limit (BAAL) OR// CPS1 and CPS2.</p> <p>2. Number of events of transmission load reliefs (of severity level 3 or higher) called by the incumbent transmission provider or unscheduled flows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WECC entities will report events under the WECC Unscheduled Flow Mitigation Procedure (equivalent to the NERC TLR Level three).</li> </ul> <p>3. Energy Management System (EMS) availability.</p> <p>Actual peak load as a percentage variance from forecasted peak load as reported in OASIS.</p> <p>Actual wind availability compared to forecasted wind availability.</p> <p>Difference between net actual interchange (actual measured power flow in real time) and the net scheduled interchange in megawatt hours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reported in Form 714.</li> </ul> <p>Report information posted on OASIS (percentage of outages, planned and unplanned, with less than 2 days notice).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dollar amount of facilities approved to be constructed for reliability purposes.</li> <li>2. Percentage of approved construction completed.</li> <li>3. Performance of planning process related to:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Requests for and number of completed reliability studies.</li> <li>b. Narrative detailing economic studies process.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Discussion of stakeholder process and identification of stakeholder groups participating.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Processing time for generation interconnection requests.</li> <li>2. Planned reserve margins.</li> <li>3. Explanation of the nature and characteristics of demand response programs and how they are used in system planning.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of requests.</li> <li>2. Number of studies completed.</li> <li>3–5. Total cost and types of studies completed (e.g., feasibility study, system impact study and facility study).</li> </ol> <p>6. Number of transmission access denials/transmission service requests (TSRs) denied.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of special protection systems.</li> <li>2. Percentage of special protection systems that responded as designed when activated.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicable pool of special protection systems should be based on how the reporting entity’s Regional Entity defines “special protection systems.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Number of unintended activations.</li> </ol>
<b>System Operations Measures</b>	
<p>A. Demand Response .....</p> <p>B. System Lambda .....</p> <p>C. Congestion Management .....</p> <p>D. Resource Availability .....</p> <p>E. Transmission System Availability</p> <p>F. Fuel Diversity .....</p> <p>G. Clean Energy .....</p>	<p>Comprehensive explanation of the nature of utility demand response programs implemented for load management as well as in compliance with state requirements.</p> <p>System Lambda (on marginal unit).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed System Lambda metric would not apply to utilities where the marginal price is typically set by hydro units.</li> <li>• System lambda data will be based on Form 714 information.</li> </ul> <p>Congestion analysis per Order No. 890.</p> <p>System forced outage rate as measured over 12 months.</p> <p>Interrupted load megawatt hours as a percentage of load served.</p> <p>Fuel diversity in terms of energy, installed capacity and actual production.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clean Energy megawatt hours, by resource type, as a percentage of total energy.</li> <li>2. Clean Energy megawatts, by resource type, as a percentage of total capacity.</li> </ol>
<b>Organizational Effectiveness</b>	
<p>Not applicable to non-RTO entities</p>	

[FR Doc. 2012-5004 Filed 3-1-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory  
Commission

[Docket No. RM01-5-000]

Electronic Tariff Filings; Notice of  
Procedures for Public Utilities Seeking  
To Extend the Date for Commission  
Action on Statutory Filings

This is to provide notice that Commission staff has posted (at <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/etariff/comment-order/extend-date.pdf>) procedures that public utilities filing under Part 35 must follow if they seek to extend the date by which the Commission must act on a rate case or other statutory filing.

Dated: February 23, 2012.

Kimberly D. Bose,  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2012-5003 Filed 3-1-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory  
Commission

[Project No. 3287-006]

American Land Company, LLC,  
Burnshire Hydroelectric, LLC; Notice  
of Transfer of Exemption

1. By letter filed February 14, 2012, American Land Company, LLC informed the Commission that its exemption from licensing for the Burnshire Dam Project No. 3287, originally issued September 22, 1982,<sup>1</sup> has been transferred to Burnshire Hydroelectric, LLC. The project is located on the North Fork, Shenandoah River in Shenandoah County, Virginia. The transfer of an exemption does not require Commission approval.

2. Burnshire Hydroelectric, LLC, located at 480 N Pifer Road, Star Tannery, Virginia 22654 is now the exemptee of the Burnshire Dam Project No. 3287.

Dated: February 27, 2012.

Kimberly D. Bose,  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2012-5107 Filed 3-1-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

<sup>1</sup> 20 FERC ¶ 62,512, Order Granting Exemption From Licensing of a Small Hydroelectric Project of 5 Megawatts or Less.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
AGENCY

[ER-FRL-9001-8]

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 02/20/2012 Through 02/24/2012 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. 20120043, Draft EIS, USFS, CA, On Top Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project, To Disclose the Environmental Effects of a Federal Proposal on National Forest System (NFS) Land, Plumas National Forest, Feather River Ranger District, Plumas, Butte Counties, CA, Comment Period Ends: 04/16/2012, Contact: Carol Spinos, 530-534-6500;*

*EIS No. 20120044, Final EIS, BR, WA, PROGRAMMATIC—Yakima River Basin Integrated Water Resource Management Plan, To Meet the Water Supply and Ecosystem Restoration Needs, Benton, Kittitas, Klickitat and Yakima Counties, WA, Review Period Ends: 04/02/2012, Contact: Candace McKinley, 509-575-5848 ext. 613;*

*EIS No. 20120045, Final EIS, USACE, FL, St. Lucie County South Beach and Dune Restoration Project, To Restore Recreational Beach, Restore Beach and Habitat, and Reduce Storm Damage Due to Beach Erosion, St. Lucie County, FL, Review Period Ends: 04/02/2012, Contact: Garrett Lipps, 561-472-3519;*

*EIS No. 20120046, Draft EIS, NPS, VI, Buck Island Reef National Monument General Management Plan, Implementation, St. Croix, Virgin Islands, Comment Period Ends: 05/01/2012, Contact: Joel A. Tutein, 340-773-1460;*

*EIS No. 20120047, Draft EIS, BIA, WA, West Plains Casino and Mixed-Use Development Project, Approval of Gaming Development and Management, Spokane Tribe of Indians, Spokane County, WA, Comment Period Ends: 04/16/2012, Contact: Dr. B.J. Howerton, 503-231-6749;*

*EIS No. 20120048, Draft EIS, NPS, WI, Ice Age Complex at Cross Plains*

General Management Plan, Implementation, Ice Age National Scenic Trail, Dane County, WI, *Comment Period Ends: 04/30/2012, Contact: Pam Shuler, 608-441-5610;*

*EIS No. 20120049, Final EIS, GSA, DC, Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation at St. Elizabeth's Master Plan Amendment—East Campus North Parcel, St. Elizabeth's Campus in Southeast Washington, DC, Review Period Ends: 04/02/2012, Contact: Denise Decker, 202-538-5643;*

*EIS No. 20120050, Final Supplement, USFS, MT, Grizzly Vegetation and Transportation Management Project, Updated and Additional Information, Proposes Timber Harvest, Prescribed Burning, Road Maintenance, and Transportation Management Actions, Three Rivers Ranger District, Kootenai National Forest, Lincoln County, MT, Review Period Ends: 04/02/2012, Contact: Leslie McDougall, 406-295-4693;*

*EIS No. 20120051, Draft EIS, BLM, AK, Eastern Interior Resource Management Plan, To Provide Comprehensive Framework to Guide Management of Public Lands, AK, Comment Period Ends: 07/30/2012, Contact: Jeanie Cole, 907-474-2200;*

*EIS No. 20120052, Final EIS, USFS, ID, Little Slate Project, Proposes Watershed Improvement, Timber Harvest, Fuel Treatments, Soil Restoration and Access Changes in the Little Slate Creek, Salmon River Ranger District, Nez Perce National Forest, Idaho County, ID, Review Period Ends: 04/02/2012, Contact: Tammy Harding, 208-935-4263.*

## Amended Notices

*EIS No. 20120005, Draft EIS, NRCS, HI, WITHDRAWN—South Kona Watershed Irrigation System, To Provide Supplemental Irrigation Water to Farms in the Honomalo/Kapu'a Area, Funding, County of Hawaii, HI, Comment Period Ends: 03/05/2012, Contact: Sharon Sawdey, 808-541-2600, ext. 125.*

*Revision to FR Notice Published 1/20/2012: Officially Withdrawn by the Preparing Agency.*

Dated: February 28, 2012.

Cliff Rader,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 2012-5131 Filed 3-1-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P