

and study of interconnection requests by automating different steps in the process and using advanced computing technologies, such as artificial intelligence, to shorten the timeline from interconnection request to generator interconnection agreement.⁵

Questions

1. Please describe the different steps in the generator interconnection process that may be automated and your experience automating these steps, including data entry, base case model building, running power flow studies, and identifying solutions. How can automation reduce errors, improve study repeatability and transparency, or address workforce needs?

2. Are you using AI tools in your generator interconnection processes? Are these AI tools part of or separate from your work on automation? What have been the advantages and disadvantages of adopting these AI tools? Looking across the electric power industry, how common is the use of AI tools?

3. Looking across the electric power industry, how common is automation in the different steps of the generator interconnection process (e.g., model building) today? What do you think are the main challenges to broader adoption of automation? Do the Commission's existing regulatory frameworks and/or utility processes present any impediments in these areas? If so, what are the impediments? What role can the Commission play in supporting the adoption of automation in the generator interconnection process? What reforms, if any, would you recommend that the Commission consider pursuing to facilitate greater automation in the processing and study of interconnection requests?

4. Recognizing that a lack of standardized data inputs and outputs can create challenges, how can automation reduce variability between studies done by a given transmission provider or reduce variability of studies between transmission providers?

5. In developing the base case model, what role can automation play to address rapidly changing load forecasts or to improve the coordination of generator interconnection and transmission planning?

Panelists

- Clayton Barrows—*Senior Researcher and Manager of the Grid Operations*

⁵ Artificial intelligence (AI) is a broad term for a spectrum of tools ranging from simple data validation to more sophisticated machine learning and statistical modeling, to advanced deep learning and generative AI.

Planning Group, National Renewable Energy Laboratory

- David Bromberg—*Co-Founder and CEO*, Pearl Street Technologies
- Cody Doll—*Sr. Manager of Transmission Business Management*, at NextEra Energy Resources
- Andrew Martin—*Co-Founder and Transmission Lead*, Nira Energy
- Anton Ptak—*Director of Transmission and Interconnection*, EDF Renewables
- Jennifer Swierczek—*Manager Generator Interconnection*, Southwest Power Pool

2:30 p.m.–2:45 p.m.: Break

2:45 p.m.–4:30 p.m.: Efficiencies Panel

3: Post-Generator Interconnection Agreement Construction Phase

This panel will focus on the time period after execution of a generator interconnection agreement (GIA), or its filing unexecuted, through the commercial operation date (COD).

Topics include opportunities for greater efficiency, transparency, and accountability in cost and time estimates for interconnection facilities and network upgrades, as well as identifying other problems that contribute to delays, such as supply chain issues, which may benefit from organized cooperation among stakeholders.

Questions

1. What are the primary cost and timing concerns arising during the period between execution, or unexecuted filing, of a GIA and the COD? To the extent that cost increases and delays for interconnection facilities and network upgrades are becoming more frequent, what are the primary drivers of those issues?

2. Are there productive ways to increase transparency around construction plans and progress of interconnection facilities and network upgrades, such as CAISO's quarterly forum to track the status of network upgrades, SPP's quarterly transmission project tracking report, or California's newly instated metrics for tracking distribution-level interconnection timeframes? What construction metrics for interconnection facilities and network upgrades would be most informative? How much documentation is reasonable and not unduly burdensome?

3. Are there new approaches to sourcing equipment for interconnection facilities and network upgrades that could be more efficient? What safeguards would need to be in place for engineering, procurement, and construction work for such facilities to begin earlier? Is there a way to pool equipment purchasing or risk? Are there

efficiencies that may be achieved by standardizing engineering, procurement, or construction of interconnection facilities and network upgrades? Would pooling procurement of equipment provide manufacturers with the certainty needed to increase their manufacturing capacity thereby reducing lead times?

4. Are there efficiencies that may be gained by enhancing internal transmission owner or RTO/ISO procedure, increasing staffing, or by opening up interconnection facility studies and/or interconnection facility construction work to contractors? How can the interconnection study process be better aligned with interconnection customer-initiated processes, such as permitting for the generating facility and generator equipment procurement?

Panelists

- Lionel Chailleux—*Senior VP, Market Development North America*, Hitachi Energy
 - Matthew Crosby—*Senior Director, Grid Integration*, Cypress Creek Renewables
 - Neil Millar—*Vice President of Infrastructure and Operations Planning*, California ISO
 - Jing Shi—*Managing Director of Renewable Integration*, Duke Energy
 - Carrie Zalewski—*Vice President of Transmission and Electricity Markets*, American Clean Power Association
- 4:30 p.m.–4:45 p.m.: Closing Remarks

[FR Doc. 2024–20306 Filed 9–9–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. IN23–14–000]

Ketchup Caddy, LLC, Philip Mango; Notice of Service of Order To Show Cause

On July 26, 2024, the Commission issued an Order Amending Answer Deadline¹ directing the Secretary of the Commission (Secretary) to serve on Ketchup Caddy, LLC (Ketchup Caddy) and Philip Mango (Mango) (collectively, Respondents) the Order to Show and Notice of Proposed Penalty previously issued in the above-referenced proceeding.²

Notice is hereby given that on July 26, 2024, the Secretary served the Order to Show Cause on Respondents.

¹ *Ketchup Caddy, LLC & Philip Mango*, 188 FERC ¶ 61,081 (2024).

² *Ketchup Caddy, LLC & Philip Mango*, 186 FERC ¶ 61,132 (2024) (Order to Show Cause).

Dated: September 4, 2024.

Debbie-Anne A. Reese,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2024–20410 Filed 9–9–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–OGC–2024–0394; FRL–12196–01–OGC]

Proposed Consent Decree, Clean Air Act Citizen Suit

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of proposed consent decree; request for public comment.

SUMMARY: In accordance with section 113(g) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (“CAA” or “the Act”), the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA” or “the Agency”) is providing notice of a proposed consent decree in *Louisiana Environmental Action Network, et al. v. Regan*, No. 1:23–cv–2714–DLF (D.D.C.). On December 7, 2023, Plaintiffs Louisiana Environmental Action Network, People Concerned About Chemical Safety, and Sierra Club (collectively Plaintiffs) filed an amended complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Plaintiffs alleged that: EPA failed to perform certain non-discretionary duties in accordance with the Act to “review, and revise as necessary” the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (“NESHAP”) for the Polyether Polyols Production source category, at least every eight years; and EPA’s failure to timely issue a new final rule or other final action on the 2014 petition for reconsideration (the Reconsideration Petition) submitted by Louisiana Environmental Action Network and Sierra Club for the NESHAP as promulgated in 2014. The proposed consent decree would establish deadlines for EPA to take actions.

DATES: Written comments on the proposed consent decree must be received by October 10, 2024.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OGC–2024–0394, online at <https://www.regulations.gov> (EPA’s preferred method). Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket ID number for this action. Comments received may be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided. For

detailed instructions on sending comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the “Additional Information about Commenting on the Proposed Consent Decree” heading under the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Thrift, Air and Radiation Law Office, Office of General Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; telephone: (202) 564–8852; email address: thrift.mike@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Obtaining a Copy of the Proposed Consent Decree

The official public docket for this action (identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OGC–2024–0394) contains a copy of the proposed consent decree. The official public docket is available for public viewing at the Office of Environmental Information (OEI) Docket in the EPA Docket Center, EPA West, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Public Reading Room is (202) 566–1744, and the telephone number for the OEI Docket is (202) 566–1752.

The electronic version of the public docket for this action contains a copy of the proposed consent decree, and is available through <https://www.regulations.gov>. You may use <https://www.regulations.gov> to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the official public docket, and access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, key in the appropriate docket identification number then select “search.”

II. Additional Information About the Proposed Consent Decree

Plaintiffs filed a complaint in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia alleging (i) that EPA failed to perform certain non-discretionary duties in accordance with the Clean Air Act under section 112(d)(6) to the NESHAP for the Polyether Polyols Production source category, 40 CFR part 63, subpart PPP, at least every eight years; and (ii) that EPA’s failure to issue a new final rule or other final action on the 2014 petition for reconsideration (the Reconsideration Petition) submitted by Louisiana Environmental Action Network and Sierra Club for the NESHAP as

promulgated in 2014, 79 FR 17340 (March 27, 2014), constitutes “agency action unreasonably delayed” under Clean Air Act section 304(a).

The EPA solicits public comments on a proposed consent decree that would establish deadlines for EPA to take proposed and final actions pursuant to Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) section 112(d)(6). Specifically, the consent decree would require by December 10, 2024, that EPA sign a final rule taking action on reconsideration of the affirmative defense provisions related to the 2014 national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAP) for the Polyether Polyols Production source category, 40 CFR part 63, subpart PPP. In addition, the consent decree would require by December 10, 2024, that EPA sign a notice of proposed rulemaking on its review of the NESHAP for the Polyether Polyols Production source category, 40 CFR part 63, subpart PPP, including all “necessary” revisions (taking into account developments in practices, processes, and control technologies) to subpart PPP and to reconsider other aspects of the 2014 NESHAP subpart PPP. Finally, the consent decree would require by December 10, 2025, that EPA sign a final rule for these proposed actions. For a period of thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will accept written comments relating to the proposed consent decree. The EPA or the Department of Justice may withdraw or withhold consent to the proposed consent decree if the comments disclose facts or considerations that indicate that such consent is inappropriate, improper, inadequate, or inconsistent with the requirements of the Act.

III. Additional Information About Commenting on the Proposed Consent Decree

Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OGC–2024–0394, via <https://www.regulations.gov>. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from this docket. The EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit to EPA’s docket at <https://www.regulations.gov> any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment