## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

**[Docket No. PR08–12–002]**

### ONEOK WesTex Transmission, LLC; Notice of Motion for Extension of Rate Case Filing Deadline

November 10, 2010.

Take notice that on November 2, 2010, ONEOK WesTex Transmission, LLC (OWT) filed a request to extend the date for filing its next rate case to January 3, 2013. OWT states that in Order No. 735 the Commission modified its policy concerning periodic reviews of rates charges by section 311 and Hinshaw pipelines to extend the cycle for such reviews from three to five years.[1] Therefore, OWT requests that the date for OWT's next rate filing be extended to January 3, 2013, which is five years from the date of OWT's most recent rate filing with this Commission.

Any person desiring to participate in this rate proceeding must file a motion 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 and 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 date as indicated below. Anyone filing an intervention or protest must serve a copy of that document on the Applicant. Anyone filing an intervention or protest on or before the intervention or protest date need not serve motions to intervene or protests on persons other than the Applicant.

The Commission encourages electronic submission of protests and interventions in lieu of paper using the "eFiling" link at *http://www.ferc.gov.* Persons unable to file electronically should submit an original and 7 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,* or call (866) 208–3676 (toll free). For TTY, call (202) 502–8659.

*Comment Date:* 5 p.m. Eastern Time on Monday, November 15, 2010.

**Kimberly D. Bose,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2010–29065 Filed 11–17–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6717–01–P**

[1] Contract Reporting Requirements of Intrastate Natural Gas Companies, Order No. 735, 131 FERC ¶ 61,150 (May 20, 2010).

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

**[Docket No. AD11–1–000]**

### Reliability Monitoring, Enforcement and Compliance Issues; Announcement of Panelists for Technical Conference

November 10, 2010.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) issued a notice on October 1, 2010 that it will hold a Commissioner-led Technical Conference on November 18, 2010 in the above-referenced proceeding to explore issues associated with reliability monitoring, enforcement and compliance. The Commission announced the conference in its September 16, 2010 order that accepted the North American Electric Reliability Corporation's initial assessment in Docket No. RR09–7–000 of its performance as the nation's Electric Reliability Organization (ERO), and performance by the Regional Entities, under their delegation agreements with the ERO.[1]

This Technical Conference will be held in the Commission Meeting Room (2C) at Commission Headquarters, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, from 1 p.m. until 5 p.m. EST. On November 2, 2010, the Commission issued a notice with the agenda for the conference. The Commission is now announcing the panelists for the conference.

The conference will be transcribed and Webcast. Transcripts of the conference will be immediately available for a fee from Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc. (202–347–3700 or 1–800–336–6646). A free webcast of the conference is also available through *http://www.ferc.gov.* Anyone with Internet access who desires to listen to 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 webcasts and offers the option of listening to the meeting via phone-bridge for a fee. If you have any questions, visit *http://www.CapitolConnection.org* or call 703–993–3100.

All those that are interested are invited and there is no registration list or registration fee to attend this technical conference.

For further information, contact Gregory Campbell by e-mail at *gregory.campbell@ferc.gov* or by phone at 202–502–6465 (after November 11, 2010).

**Kimberly D. Bose,**

*Secretary.*

[1] *North American Electric Reliability Corporation; Reliability Standards Development and NERC and Regional Entity Enforcement,* 132 FERC ¶ 61,217 at P 12 (2010).

### Attachment: Panelists and Agenda for the Technical Conference

November 18, 2010

**PANELISTS and AGENDA FOR THE TECHNICAL CONFERENCE**

I. Opening Statements (1–1:15 pm)

II. Panel 1: Reliability Standards Compliance and its Monitoring by Regional Entities and NERC (1:15–2:45)

*Panelists:*

**Thomas Galloway**, Senior Vice President and Chief Reliability Officer, NERC

**Daniel Skaar**, President, Midwest Reliability Organization

**Steven Goodwill**, General Counsel, Western Electricity Coordinating Council

**Douglas Curry**, General Counsel, Lincoln Electric System

**Chris Hajovsky**, Director, Regulatory Affairs and NERC Reliability Standards, RRI Energy, Inc.

*Topics*

- Status of compliance: what are the current trends in possible violations and levels of compliance, including the numbers of audits, possible violations, self-reports and penalties

Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) and non-CIP Violations

"Documentation" Violations and "Performance" Violations

- Are Regional Entities and NERC conducting compliance audits and other compliance processes consistently across the country? How does NERC test for consistency?

Are there inconsistencies in audit processes and audit results? If so, what kinds and why? What are current specific examples?
How do NERC and the Regional Entities set priorities of what to audit, and are they doing a good job setting priorities?
Do audits focus too much on documentation? Would alternative auditing methods also demonstrate compliance and improve reliability?
Possible improvements or solutions
• Event Analysis and Compliance
Focus on the potential tension between event analysis/lessons learned and NERC/RE compliance and enforcement activities
• How can the Commission, NERC and the Regional Entities help create a culture of compliance?
III. Break (2:45–3:00)
IV. Panel 2: Violation Processing and Penalties (3:00–4:30)

*Panelists:*

**Gerry W. Cauley**, President and Chief Executive Officer, NERC
**Stacy Dochoda**, General Manager, SPP Regional Entity
**Al Fohrer**, Chief Executive Officer, Southern California Edison Company
**David Mohre**, Executive Director, Energy and Power Division, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association
**John DiStasio**, Chief Executive Officer, Sacramento Municipal Utility District
**Stephen T. Naumann**, Vice President for Wholesale Market Development, Exelon Corporation

*Topics*

• Streamlining processes to reduce compliance violation backlogs and minimize future backlogs
Regional Entity and NERC levels of review
Appropriate Notice of Penalty records
Development of "traffic tickets," "parking tickets" and "warning tickets"
• How effective are the NERC Sanction Guidelines, and are they applied consistently? What changes may be warranted to improve effectiveness and/or consistency of the Sanction Guidelines?
• Do current enforcement and compliance processes provide proactive approaches and improve reliability by reducing future reliability standard violations and system disturbances?
What metrics are currently utilized for compliance-based reliability improvement?
What do these metrics show?
How can the Commission, NERC and the Regional Entities promote transparency of results and dissemination of lessons learned?
V. Questions from the Audience (4:30–4:50)
VI. Closing Statement

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2010–29068 Filed 11–17–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

## POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket No. MT2011–1; Order No. 584]**

## Market Test Involving Greeting Cards

**AGENCY:** Postal Regulatory Commission.
**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is noticing a recently-filed Postal Service proposal to conduct a market test involving greeting cards. A key feature of the market test is an alternative arrangement for payment of postage. Under this alternative, participating companies would be responsible for paying applicable postage, rather than having the sender of the card affix postage. This document describes the proposal, addresses procedural aspects of the filing, and invites public comment.

**DATES:** *Comment deadline:* December 8, 2010.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at *http://www.prc.gov.* Those who cannot submit comments electronically should contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section by telephone for advice on filing alternatives.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, 202–789–6820 or *stephen.sharfman@prc.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Table of Contents

I. Introduction
II. Background
III. Notice of Filing
IV. Ordering Paragraphs

### I. Introduction

On November 8, 2010, the Postal Service filed a notice, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3641(c)(1), announcing its intent to initiate a market test beginning on or about January 1, 2011, of an experimental market dominant product, Alternate Postage Payment Method for Greeting Cards.[1] The market research test will consist of providing a means for individuals to mail greeting cards without affixing postage. *Id.* at 1.

### II. Background

The Postal Service states that First-Class Mail single-piece correspondence has been a declining part of U.S. mail volume, and the communication alternatives, such as e-mail, use of the Internet, and cellular services, have had an impact on the mail volume of personal correspondence. *Id.* at 3–4. It proposes the instant market test as a convenient method for individuals to purchase a greeting card without the need to pay postage. *Id.* at 4. The Postal Service expects that the simplicity of the product design, which allows the customer to sign and address the card and place it in a collection box, will make greeting cards more likely to be purchased and mailed. *Id.*

The Postal Service explains that under the proposed market test participating businesses will produce and distribute pre-approved envelopes according to specific design requirements which will be packaged for sale with greeting cards. Individuals can mail the greeting cards in the pre-approved envelopes without affixing postage. *Id.* at 2. The Alternate Postage Payment Method has a two-stage process for businesses to pay postage. *Id.* at 1. First, at least 50 percent of the postage will be paid based on the company's reports on the number of cards sold to customers or third-party vendors. Generally, this payment would be retained by the Postal Service regardless of whether the cards are also mailed. Second, the balance of the postage due will be collected based on scans of the cards that are mailed. *Id.* at 1, 6.

*Statutory authority.* The Postal Service indicates that its proposal satisfies the criteria of section 3641, which imposes certain conditions on experimental products. 39 U.S.C. 3641. For example, the Postal Service asserts that the Alternate Postage Payment Method for Greeting Cards is significantly different from all products offered by the Postal Service within the meaning of section 3641(b)(1). Notice at 8–9. In addition, it contends that the market test will be limited to a small portion of the total greeting card volume and therefore does not create an unfair or inappropriate competitive advantage for the Postal Service or any mailer. *Id.* at 9; *see also* section 3641(b)(2). The Postal Service states that the Alternative Postage Payment Method for Greeting Cards is correctly classified as a market dominant product. *Id.* at 10–11; *see also* section 3641(b)(3). The Postal Service

[1] Notice of the United States Postal Service of Market Test of Experimental Product—Alternative Postage Payment Method for Greeting Cards, November 8, 2010 (Notice).