

megawatts, (3) a proposed 34.5 kilovolt underground transmission line, and (4) appurtenant facilities. The Gibson Dam Hydroelectric Company, LLC project would have an average annual generation of 50 gigawatt-hours.

The project proposed by Gibson Dam Hydro, LLC using the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Gibson Dam and operated in a run-of-river mode and would consist of: (1) A proposed 100-foot-long, 120-inch-diameter steel penstock, (2) a proposed powerhouse containing two generating units with a total installed capacity of 16 megawatts, (3) a proposed 1-mile-long, 14.7 kilovolt transmission line, and (4) appurtenant facilities. The Gibson Dam Hydro, LLC project would have an average annual generation of 45 gigawatt-hours.

i. *Locations of Applications*: A copy of the application is available for inspection and reproduction at the Commission in the Public Reference Room, located at 888 First Street, NE., Room 2A, Washington DC 20426, or by calling (202) 502-8371. This filing may also be viewed on the Commission's Web site at <http://www.ferc.gov> using the "eLibrary" link. Enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the docket number field to access the document. For assistance, call toll-free 1-866-208-3676 or e-mail [FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov](mailto:FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov). For TTY, call (202) 502-8659. A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction at the address in item h. above.

j. Individuals desiring to be included on the Commission's mailing list should so indicate by writing to the Secretary of the Commission.

k. *Competing Preliminary Permit*—Anyone desiring to file a competing application for preliminary permit for a proposed project must submit the competing application itself, or a notice of intent to file such an application, to the Commission on or before the specified comment date for the particular application (see 18 CFR 4.36). Submission of a timely notice of intent allows an interested person to file the competing preliminary permit application no later than 30 days after the specified comment date for the particular application. A competing preliminary permit application must conform with 18 CFR 4.30(b) and 4.36.

l. *Competing Development Application*—Any qualified development applicant desiring to file a competing development application must submit to the Commission, on or before a specified comment date for the particular application, either a competing development application or a notice of intent to file such an

application. Submission of a timely notice of intent to file a development application allows an interested person to file the competing application no later than 120 days after the specified comment date for the particular application. A competing license application must conform with 18 CFR 4.30(b) and 4.36.

m. *Notice of Intent*—A notice of intent must specify the exact name, business address, and telephone number of the prospective applicant, and must include an unequivocal statement of intent to submit, if such an application may be filed, either a preliminary permit application or a development application (specify which type of application). A notice of intent must be served on the applicant(s) named in this public notice.

n. *Proposed Scope of Studies under Permit*—A preliminary permit, if issued, does not authorize construction. The term of the proposed preliminary permit would be 36 months. The work proposed under the preliminary permit would include economic analysis, preparation of preliminary engineering plans, and a study of environmental impacts. Based on the results of these studies, the Applicant would decide whether to proceed with the preparation of a development application to construct and operate the project.

o. *Comments, Protests, or Motions to Intervene*—Anyone may submit comments, a protest, or a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of rules of practice and procedure, 18 CFR 385.210, .211, .214. In determining the appropriate action to take, the Commission will consider all protests or other comments filed, but only those who file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's rules may become a party to the proceeding. Any comments, protests, or motions to intervene must be received on or before the specified comment date for the particular application.

Comments, protests and interventions may be filed electronically via the Internet in lieu of paper; see 18 CFR 385.2001 (a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Web site under "e-filing" link. The Commission strongly encourages electronic filing.

p. *Filing and Service of Responsive Documents*—Any filings must bear in all capital letters the title "COMMENTS", "RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS", "PROTEST", OR "MOTION TO INTERVENE", as applicable, and the Project Number of the particular application to which the filing refers. Any of the above-named

documents must be filed by providing the original and the number of copies provided by the Commission's regulations to: The Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. A copy of any motion to intervene must also be served upon each representative of the Applicant specified in the particular application.

q. *Agency Comments*—Federal, State, and local agencies are invited to file comments on the described application. A copy of the application may be obtained by agencies directly from the Applicant. If an agency does not file comments within the time specified for filing comments, it will be presumed to have no comments. One copy of an agency's comments must also be sent to the Applicant's representatives.

Magalie R. Salas,  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. E4-74 Filed 01-15-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project No. 1390-005]

#### Southern California Edison; Notice of Meeting To Discuss Settlement Negotiations

January 9, 2004.

a. *Date and Time of Meeting*: January 21, 2004, 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. P.s.t.

b. *Place*: U.S. Forest Service, Mono Basin Scenic Area Visitor Center, Lee Vining, California, 1/2 mile north of the Town of Lee Vining on Highway 395.

c. *Teleconference*: To participate by teleconference please call 760-647-3043 or contact Jim Canaday, California State Water Resources Control Board, at 916-341-5308.

d. *FERC Contact*: John Smith at (202) 502-8972; [John.Smith@FERC.gov](mailto:John.Smith@FERC.gov).

e. *Purpose of the Meeting*: The U.S. Forest Service on behalf of itself and other stakeholders have requested a meeting with Commission staff to discuss the progress of ongoing settlement negotiations regarding minimum flows at the Lundy Hydroelectric Project No. 1390.

f. *Proposed Agenda*: (1) Introduction of participants, (2) settlement group presentation to Commission staff on status of negotiations, (3) discussion, and (5) close of meeting.

g. All local, State, and Federal agencies, Indian Tribes, and interested

parties, are hereby invited to attend this meeting as participants.

**Magalie R. Salas,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E4-75 Filed 01-15-04; 8:45 am

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. PL02-8-000, ER96-2495-016, ER97-4143-004, ER97-1238-011, ER98-2075-010, ER98-542-006 (Not Consolidated), ER91-569-018, and ER97-4166-010]

#### Before Commissioners: Conference on Supply Margin Assessment, AEP Power Marketing, Inc., AEP Service, Corporation, CSW Power Marketing, Inc., CSW Energy Services, Inc., Central and South West Services, Inc., Entergy Services, Inc., Southern Company Energy Marketing L.P.; Supplemental Notice of Technical Conference on Supply Margin Assessment Screen and Alternatives

January 9, 2004.

The December 19, 2003, Notice of Technical Conference in this proceeding indicated that a technical conference will be held on January 13-14, 2004 from 9:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. in the Commission Meeting Room of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC. The agenda for the technical conference is set forth in the Attachment to this notice.

The December 19, 2003, Notice of Technical Conference indicated that transcripts of the proceeding will be available for the public on the Commission's e-Library two weeks after the conference. Please note, however, that the transcripts will be available one week after the conference. In addition, Capitol Connection offers the opportunity for remote listening as well as viewing of the conference for a fee. Persons interested in this service should contact David Reininger or Julia Morelli at the Capitol Connection (703-993-3100) as soon as possible or visit the Capitol Connection Web site at <http://www.capitolconnection.gmu.edu> and click on "FERC."

**Magalie R. Salas,**  
*Secretary.*

#### Supply Margin Assessment Technical Conference Agenda

January 13, 2004—Morning Session

9:30 a.m.—12 p.m.—Panel 1:  
Discussion on Defining the Relevant

Geographic Markets, Including Transmission Considerations.

Opening comments and introduction by staff.

Presentations and reactions by panelists: Joe Pace, Director, LECG, LLC; John Apperson, Director of Trading, PacifiCorp; Jesse Tilton, CEO of Electricities of NC; Ricky Biddle, Vice President of Planning, Rates and Dispatching, Arkansas Electric Cooperative; Ron McNamara, Vice President of Regulatory Affairs and Chief Economist, MISO; Steven Corneli, Director of Regulatory Affairs, NRG Energy, Inc.

Open microphone.

This session will include a discussion of how transmission should be accounted for in the context of the interim generation dominance analysis and statutory deadlines. Transmission affects which generators are in the market, and how they should be accounted for in a screen. There is some overlap between this session and the afternoon session.

Specific topics to be discussed in this session include the following:

Should the relevant geographic market be defined as the control area? More broadly? More narrowly? Where can reliable data be found for markets that are not defined using control areas?

How to account for load pockets inside and outside of RTOs/ISOs;

How to account for transmission limitations;

—TTC, ATC, Historical;

—What is the public source of the information used;

How to account for competing supplies;

How much transmission capacity should be included in the analysis where transmission providers (whose control over transmission has not been transferred to an RTO or ISO) calculate the capacity and also participate in generation markets?

Where transmission or other operating constraints exist within a control area (such that some generators are not able to run to their maximum rated capacity), what percent of these generators' capacity should be included as participating in the market?

12 p.m.—1 p.m.—Lunch.

January 13, 2004—Afternoon Session

1 p.m.—4 p.m.—Panel 2: Discussion of the Appropriate Interim Generation Dominance Screen.

Opening comments and introduction by staff.

Presentations and reactions by panelists: Bill Marshall, Vice President of Fleet Operations and Trading, Southern Company; Steve Henderson,

Vice President, Charles River Associates; Michael Wroblewski, Assistant General Counsel for Policy Studies, Federal Trade Commission; Bob Stibolt, Senior Vice President of Risk Management, Tractebel Corporation; Gary Ackerman, Executive Director, Western Power Trading Forum; Denise Goulet, Senior Assistant Consumer Advocate, Pennsylvania Office of the Consumer Advocate.

Open microphone.

This session will include a discussion of staff's proposed interim generation dominance screens and alternative proposals offered by others.

Specific topics to be discussed in this session include the following:

Which approach is preferable for the interim screen: pivotal supplier? market share? other?

—Should the analysis be applied on a monthly or annual basis;

—Whether and how to capture generators' ability to withhold on non-peak days or over a sustained period of time;

How to determine capacity (installed and/or uncommitted);

How to determine "opportunity" demand under the Wholesale Market Share screen;

Whether and under what circumstances to adopt an ISO/RTO exemption.

January 14, 2004—Morning Session

9:30 a.m.—12 p.m.—Panel 3:

Discussion of the Appropriate Mitigation Measures for Those That Fail the Applicable Screen.

Opening comments and introduction by staff.

Presentations and reactions by panelists: Bill Hieronymus, Vice President, Charles River Associates; Bill Dudley, Assistant General Counsel of Xcel Energy Services Inc.; Pat Alexander, Energy Industry Advisor, Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky; Don Sipe, Counsel with Preti Flaherty; Robert O'Neil, General Counsel, Golden Spread Electric Cooperative; Craig Roach, Partner, Boston Pacific Company.

Open microphone.

This session will include a discussion of staff's Proposed Price Mitigation Measures (Cost-Based Rates and Single Market Clearing Price) as well as alternatives proposed by others. Specific topics to be discussed in this session include the following: Which approach is preferable (cost-based rate, single market clearing price, or other), and to what products should the price mitigation apply;

Over what time period should price mitigation be applied (monthly, seasonally, daily);