

considering a range of possible variations from Order No. 2003 with regard to future and early-stage existing interconnection requests, we believe that there are three types of variations that, individually or in combination, hold particular promise for speeding up queue processing while remaining faithful to the goals of Order No. 2003.

16. First, it may be appropriate to increase the requirements for getting and keeping a queue position. For example, it may be appropriate to increase the amount of the deposits required at the different stages of the process to more accurately reflect the cost of the necessary studies. Such a change would not only be consistent with traditional ratemaking principles, but would also increase the likelihood that only projects that are likely to be commercially viable (and hence willing to commit to the cost of such studies in advance) are in the queue. Such a change also would likely reduce the number of multiple interconnection requests made by the same customer for the purpose of speculating on the cost impacts of different locations. However, as discussed above, multiple requests for a single project can result from a legitimate desire to evaluate the merits of different interconnection points and configurations without having to go to the back of the queue. Therefore, the more stringent the requirements, the more important it is to ensure that customers have access to alternative sources of reliable information about available transmission capacity to help them tailor their interconnection requests more narrowly toward a single acceptable interconnection configuration. Further, the RTOs and ISOs should address the impact of any increases in the requirements on smaller customers or any other class of interconnection customers.

17. Second, elimination of the feasibility study as a separate step could reduce processing time without harming interconnection customers. Under Order No. 2003, the feasibility study is intended, in part, to provide preliminary information to assist developers in deciding whether it is even worth their while to pursue more detailed interconnection studies. Elimination of a separate feasibility study could streamline the study process and could reduce interconnection requests by screening out those customers who are not willing to pay the higher deposit required for a system impact study. However, elimination of a feasibility study phase, like increased requirements to obtain and retain a queue position, creates a greater need to develop alternative

mechanisms through which customers can gather the information necessary to more narrowly tailor their interconnection requests toward a final acceptable configuration.

18. Third, there may be approaches to prioritizing queue processing that provide protection against discrimination comparable to the first-come, first-served approach, but that are more efficient. For example, there may be merit in a first-ready, first-served approach, whereby customers who demonstrate the greatest ability to move forward with project development are processed first. Further, the Commission is open to considering methods of clustering other than that provided in Order No. 2003. Order No. 2003's approach to clustering is fundamentally based on a first-come, first-served paradigm, as clusters are limited to requests filed within the same time frame, not to exceed 180 days.<sup>12</sup> Clustering that takes into account factors other than proximity of filing date may allow for more efficient studies and we are open to reviewing such proposals.

19. We note that reforms that would affect existing interconnection requests that are in later stages of the process create special circumstances that require careful consideration. Unlike reforms applicable to future and early-stage existing interconnection requests, any such reforms could significantly disrupt the activities of customers who may have taken action in reliance upon the existing process. Reforms of this sort could take the form of a filing to make generic revisions to the tariff, filings to modify individual interconnection-related agreements, or a request for a one-time waiver of the tariff.<sup>13</sup> These reforms could change both the timing and the cost allocation for a customer. Some customers may experience an overall benefit from a particular reform, while others may be disadvantaged by a reform. In still other cases, perhaps the majority, the difference between continued processing under the existing tariff provisions and processing under a

<sup>12</sup> See *pro forma* LGIP § 4.2. But see *id.* § 4.1 (allowing allocation of cost of common upgrades for clustered interconnection requests without regard to queue position).

<sup>13</sup> See, e.g., *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 117 FERC ¶ 61,128 (2006), *order on reh'g*, 119 FERC ¶ 61,097 (2007) (rejecting as unsupported proposed tariff amendments applicable to existing interconnection agreements but without prejudice to future filings to revise individual interconnection agreements); and *Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp.*, 118 FERC ¶ 61,226, *order on clarification*, 120 FERC ¶ 61,180 (2007) (granting one-time waiver of procedures for conducting clustered system impact studies despite application to protestor who had already undergone a system impact study).

reformed process may be speculative, including as to ultimate timing and cost allocation. In those cases, we would expect proponents of reform to have an easier time justifying such reform.<sup>14</sup> Whether and how a particular reform should apply to a late-stage request will depend on the specific facts. The Commission is open to considering such reforms. Further, while such reforms do pose more difficult issues than reforms applicable to future and early-stage existing requests, the Commission recognizes that they may be necessary in order to resolve current backlogs.

#### *The Commission orders:*

The RTOs and ISOs are hereby directed to file reports as discussed in the body of this order within 30 days of the date of this order.

By the Commission.

**Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,**

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E8-6606 Filed 4-2-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6717-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER08-685-000]

#### TransCanada Maine Wind Development Inc.; Notice of Filing

March 27, 2008.

Take notice that on March 17, 2008, TransCanada Maine Wind Development Inc submitted for filing an application for authorization to make wholesale sales of energy and capacity at negotiated, market-based rates.

Any person desiring to intervene or to protest this filing must file in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). Protests will be 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 comment date. On or before the comment date, it is not necessary to serve motions to intervene or protests on persons other than the Applicant.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., *New York Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 114 FERC ¶ 61,207 (2006) (granting one-time waiver of interconnection procedure noting that protestor's claim that it would incur higher costs due to potential loss of its queue position was speculative).

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 on April 7, 2008.

**Kimberly D. Bose,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. E8-6863 Filed 4-2-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-8550-7]

### Meeting of the Mobile Sources Technical Review Subcommittee

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given that the Mobile Sources Technical Review Subcommittee (MSTRS) will meet in May 2008. The MSTRS is a subcommittee under the Clean Air Act Advisory Committee. This is an open meeting. The meeting will include discussion of current topics and presentations about activities being conducted by EPA's Office of Transportation and Air Quality. The preliminary agenda for the meeting and any notices about change in venue will be posted on the Subcommittee's Web site: [http://www.epa.gov/air/caaac/mobile\\_sources.html](http://www.epa.gov/air/caaac/mobile_sources.html). MSTRS listserver subscribers will receive notification when the agenda is available on the Subcommittee Web site. To subscribe to the MSTRS listserver, send a blank e-mail to [lists-mstrs@lists.epa.gov](mailto:lists-mstrs@lists.epa.gov).

**DATES:** Thursday, May 8, 2008 from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Registration begins at 8:30 a.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Doubletree Hotel Crystal City-National Airport, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, VA 22202-2891. Phone 703-416-4100. The hotel is located three blocks from the Pentagon City Metro station, and shuttle buses are available to and from both the Metro station and Washington Reagan National Airport.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

*For technical information:* John Guy, Designated Federal Officer, Transportation and Regional Programs Division, Mailcode 6405J, U.S. EPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; Ph: 202-343-9276; e-mail: [guy.john@epa.gov](mailto:guy.john@epa.gov).

*For logistical and administrative information:* Ms. Cheryl Jackson, U.S. EPA, Transportation and Regional Programs Division, Mailcode 6405J, U.S. EPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; 202-343-4653; e-mail: [jackson.cheryl@epa.gov](mailto:jackson.cheryl@epa.gov).

Background on the work of the Subcommittee is available at: [http://www.epa.gov/air/caaac/mobile\\_sources.html](http://www.epa.gov/air/caaac/mobile_sources.html). Individuals or organizations wishing to provide comments to the Subcommittee should submit them to Mr. Guy at the address above by April 24, 2008. The Subcommittee expects that public statements presented at its meetings will not be repetitive of previously submitted oral or written statements.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** During the meeting, the Subcommittee may also hear progress reports from some of its workgroups as well as updates and announcements on activities of general interest to attendees.

*For Individuals With Disabilities:* For information on access or services for individuals with disabilities, please contact Mr. Guy or Ms. Jackson (see above). To request accommodation of a disability, please contact Mr. Guy or Ms. Jackson, preferably at least 10 days prior to the meeting, to give EPA as much time as possible to process your request.

Dated: March 28, 2008.

**Margo Tsirigotis Oge,**

Director, Office of Transportation and Air Quality.

[FR Doc. E8-6916 Filed 4-2-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## FEDERAL ACCOUNTING STANDARDS ADVISORY BOARD

### Notice of Concepts Statement Exposure Draft Distinguishing Basic Information, Required Supplementary Information, and Other Accompanying Information and Scheduled Meeting Dates for 2009

*Board Action:* Pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3511(d), the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), as amended, and the FASAB Rules of Procedure, as amended in April, 2004, notice is hereby given that the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) has issued a Concepts Statement Exposure Draft, *Distinguishing Basic Information, Required Supplementary Information, and Other Accompanying Information*.

The Concepts Statement Exposure Draft proposes amendments to Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts 2, *Entity and Display*, to provide conceptual guidance for determining how information in financial reports should be categorized. The Concepts Statement Exposure Draft is available on the FASAB home page <http://www.fasab.gov/exposure.html>. Copies can be obtained by contacting FASAB at (202) 512-7350. Respondents are encouraged to comment on any part of the exposure draft. Written comments are requested by June 26th, 2008, and should be sent to: Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director, Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board, 441 G Street, NW., Suite 6814, Mail Stop 6K17V, Washington, DC 20548.

Notice is also given that the FASAB will meet on the following dates in room 7C13 of the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) Building (441 G Street, NW.) unless otherwise noted:

- Wednesday and Thursday, February 25 and 26, 2009.
- Wednesday and Thursday, April 22 and 23, 2009.
- Wednesday and Thursday, June 17 and 18, 2009.
- Wednesday and Thursday, August 26 and 27, 2009.
- Wednesday and Thursday, October 21 and 22, 2009.
- Wednesday and Thursday, December 16 and 17, 2009.

The purposes of the meetings are to discuss issues related to:

- FASAB's conceptual framework.
- Stewardship Reporting.
- Social Insurance.
- Natural Resources.
- Technical Agenda.
- Any other topics as needed.