

## Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views, or arguments, as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic, environmental, and energy-related aspects of the proposal. Communications should identify both docket numbers and be submitted in triplicate to the address listed above. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this notice must submit with those comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket No. FAA-2017-0145/Airspace Docket No. 17-AGL-4." The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter.

All communications received on or before the specified closing date for comments will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will be filed in the docket.

## Availability of NPRMs

An electronic copy of this document may be downloaded through the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Recently published rulemaking documents can also be accessed through the FAA's Web page at [http://www.faa.gov/air\\_traffic/publications/airspace\\_amendments/](http://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/publications/airspace_amendments/).

You may review the public docket containing the proposal, any comments received, and any final disposition in person in the Dockets Office (see the **ADDRESSES** section for the address and phone number) between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except federal holidays. An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the Federal Aviation Administration, Air Traffic Organization, Central Service Center, Operations Support Group, 10101 Hillwood Parkway, Fort Worth, TX, 76177.

## Availability and Summary of Documents for Incorporation by Reference

This document proposes to amend FAA Order 7400.11A, Airspace

Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 3, 2016, and effective September 15, 2016. FAA Order 7400.11A is publicly available as listed in the **ADDRESSES** section of this document. FAA Order 7400.11A lists Class A, B, C, D, and E airspace areas, air traffic service routes, and reporting points.

## The Proposal

The FAA is proposing an amendment to Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 71 by modifying Class E airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 6.4-mile radius (reduced from a 7.4-mile radius) of Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, WI. Airspace redesign is necessary due to the decommissioning of the Burbun VOR, cancellation of the VOR approach and updating the geographic coordinates of the airport to coincide with the FAA's aeronautical database. This action would enhance the safety and management of the standard instrument approach procedures for (RNAV) IFR operations at the airport.

Class E airspace designations are published in paragraph 6005 of FAA Order 7400.11A, dated August 3, 2016, and effective September 15, 2016, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class E airspace designations listed in this document will be published subsequently in the Order.

## Regulatory Notices and Analyses

The FAA has determined that this proposed regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current, is non-controversial and unlikely to result in adverse or negative comments. It, therefore: (1) Is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this proposed rule, when promulgated, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

## Environmental Review

This proposal will be subject to an environmental analysis in accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, "Environmental Impacts: Policies and

Procedures" prior to any FAA final regulatory action.

## List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

## The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

## PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, B, C, D, AND E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS

■ 1. The authority citation for 14 CFR part 71 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(f), 106(g); 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

### § 71.1 [Amended]

■ 2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of FAA Order 7400.11A, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 3, 2016, and effective September 15, 2016, is amended as follows:

*Paragraph 6005 Class E Airspace Areas Extending Upward From 700 Feet or More Above the Surface of the Earth.*

\* \* \* \* \*

### AGL WI E5 Burlington, WI [Amended]

Burlington Municipal Airport, WI  
(Lat. 42°41'27" N., long. 88°18'17" W.)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 6.4-mile radius of Burlington Municipal Airport.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas on August 16, 2017.

**Walter Tweedy,**

*Acting Manager, Operations Support Group,  
ATO Central Service Center.*

[FR Doc. 2017-17755 Filed 8-23-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

### 18 CFR Part 35

[Docket No. RM16-6-000]

### Essential Reliability Services and the Evolving Bulk-Power System—Primary Frequency Response: Notice of Request for Supplemental Comments

**AGENCY:** Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Request for supplemental comments.

**SUMMARY:** On November 17, 2016, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NOPR) that, among other things, proposed to revise the Commission's regulations to require all newly interconnecting large and small generating facilities, both synchronous and non-synchronous, to install and enable primary frequency response capability as a condition of interconnection. In this document, the Commission seeks supplemental comments related to whether and when electric storage resources should be required to provide primary frequency response, and the costs associated with primary frequency response capabilities for small generating facilities.

**DATES:** Comments are due September 14, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by Docket No. RM16-6-000, by any of the following methods:

- Electronic filing through <http://www.ferc.gov>. Documents created electronically using word processing software should be filed in native applications or print-to-PDF format and not in a scanned format. Commenters filing electronically do not need to make a paper filing.

- *Mail/Hand Delivery:* Commenters 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:**

Jomo Richardson (Technical Information), Office of Electric Reliability, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502-6281, [Jomo.Richardson@ferc.gov](mailto:Jomo.Richardson@ferc.gov).

Mark Bennett (Legal Information), Office of the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, (202) 502-8524, [Mark.Bennett@ferc.gov](mailto:Mark.Bennett@ferc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

1. On November 17, 2016, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NOPR)<sup>1</sup> that proposed to modify the *pro forma* Large Generator Interconnection Agreement (LGIA) and the *pro forma* Small Generator Interconnection Agreement (SGIA), pursuant to its authority under section 206 of the Federal Power Act (FPA) to ensure that rates, terms and conditions of jurisdictional service

remain just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential.<sup>2</sup> As modified, the *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA would require all new large and small generating facilities, both synchronous and non-synchronous, to install, maintain, and operate equipment capable of providing primary frequency response as a condition of interconnection. The Commission also proposed certain operating requirements, including minimum requirements for droop and deadband parameters, and requirements to ensure the timely and sustained response to frequency deviations in the *pro forma* LGIA and *pro forma* SGIA. In this document, the Commission seeks supplemental comments related to whether and when electric storage resources should be required to provide primary frequency response, and the costs associated with primary frequency response capabilities for small generating facilities.

**I. Background**

2. Following a Notice of Inquiry (NOI) that explored a broad range of issues regarding primary frequency response and the evolving Bulk-Power System,<sup>3</sup> the Commission issued the NOPR at issue in this proceeding. In the NOPR, the Commission explained that its proposals address concerns that the existing *pro forma* LGIA contains only limited primary frequency response requirements, and those requirements only apply to large synchronous generating facilities, and do not reflect recent technological advancements enabling new large and small non-synchronous generating facilities to install the capability to provide primary frequency response.<sup>4</sup> Further, the Commission stated that to avoid establishing new requirements that could be unduly discriminatory or preferential, the proposed reforms would impose comparable primary frequency response requirements on both new large and small generating facilities.<sup>5</sup> In addition, the Commission did not propose to: (1) Apply these requirements to generating facilities regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; (2) impose a headroom requirement; or (3) mandate that new generating facilities receive compensation for complying with the proposed requirements, noting that a public utility is not prohibited from

filing a proposal for primary frequency response compensation under FPA section 205,<sup>6</sup> if it so chooses.<sup>7</sup>

3. In the NOPR, the Commission explained that the proposed requirements will help ensure adequate primary frequency response capability as the resource mix continues to evolve, with fair and consistent treatment for all types of generating facilities, and will help balancing authorities meet their frequency response obligations under NERC Reliability Standard BAL-003-1.1.<sup>8</sup>

**II. Request for Comments**

*A. Electric Storage Resources*

4. The NOPR proposals did not propose provisions specific to electric storage resources. Several commenters raise concerns that, by failing to address electric storage resources' unique technical attributes, the NOPR requirements could pose an unduly discriminatory burden on electric storage resources. The Energy Storage Association (ESA) asserts that the proposed requirements could result in unique, adverse impacts on electric storage resources. Particularly, ESA states that the proposed use of nameplate capacity as the basis for primary frequency response service and the fact that electric storage resources are capable of operating at the full range of their capacity (*i.e.*, they have no minimum set point) will require storage to provide a "greater magnitude of [primary frequency response] service than traditional generating facilities."<sup>9</sup> ESA also explains that while traditional generating facilities would have no primary frequency response obligations while offline, electric storage resources are always online, even when not charging or discharging, and under the requirements proposed in the NOPR, they would therefore be required to provide primary frequency response on a more frequent basis than generating facilities that can go offline.<sup>10</sup> Further, ESA explains that the optimal depth of discharge differs among various electric storage technologies, and exceeding the optimal depth of discharge accelerates the degradation of the facility and

<sup>6</sup> 16 U.S.C. 824d (2012).

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* PP 1, 55.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* P 43. In January 2014, the Commission approved Reliability Standard BAL-003-1 requiring balancing authorities to meet a minimum required Frequency Response Obligation. While Reliability Standard BAL-003-1 establishes requirements for balancing authorities, it does not impose requirements on individual generating facilities. *Frequency Response and Frequency Bias Setting Reliability Standard*, Order No. 794, 146 FERC ¶ 61,024 (2014).

<sup>9</sup> ESA Comments at 4.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 3-4.

<sup>2</sup> 16 U.S.C. 824e (2012).

<sup>3</sup> *Essential Reliability Services and the Evolving Bulk-Power System—Primary Frequency Response*, 154 FERC ¶ 61,117 (2016).

<sup>4</sup> NOPR, 157 FERC ¶ 61,122 at PP 2, 11, 13.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* P. 2.

<sup>1</sup> *Essential Reliability Services and the Evolving Bulk-Power System—Primary Frequency Response*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 81 FR 85176 (November 25, 2016), 157 FERC ¶ 61,122 (2016) (NOPR).

increases operations and maintenance costs.<sup>11</sup>

5. To address its concerns, ESA requests that the Final Rule: (1) Allow electric storage resources to specify a minimum set point for the purposes of primary frequency response capability as a condition of interconnection; and (2) include inadequate state of charge as an operational constraint that would relieve electric storage resources from the sustained response requirement.<sup>12</sup> In the absence of these changes, ESA requests an exemption from the proposed primary frequency response requirements.<sup>13</sup> In its comments, AES Companies (AES) seeks a complete exemption from the proposed NOPR requirements for electric storage resources.<sup>14</sup> AES also asserts that a droop requirement of five percent would needlessly limit the contribution that electric storage resources that are specifically designed for primary frequency response can make to grid stability.<sup>15</sup>

6. In light of these concerns, the Commission seeks additional information to better understand the performance characteristics and limitations of electric storage resources, possible ramifications of the proposed primary frequency response requirements on electric storage resources, and what changes, if any, are needed to address the issues raised by ESA and others. Accordingly, the Commission seeks comment on the following questions:

1. Some commenters state that certain proposed requirements are not appropriate for electric storage resources, in particular, certain of the proposed settings related to droop (*e.g.*, basing the droop parameter on nameplate capacity) and the requirement for timely and sustained response to frequency deviations.

a. Are there challenges or operational implications (*e.g.*, unusual or excessive wear and tear) of requiring electric storage resources to implement the proposed operating settings for droop (including basing the droop parameter on nameplate capacity), deadband, and timely and sustained response? If so, please provide an explanation, and explain how these challenges are different than those faced by other synchronous and non-synchronous generating facilities.

b. Also, please explain whether and how possible impacts of the proposed

requirements on electric storage resources vary by their state of charge, and whether those possible impacts are the same or different for all electric storage technologies. If these impacts vary by the type of electric storage technology, please elaborate.

c. If the proposed operating settings for droop, deadband, and sustained response would cause any operational or other concerns unique to electric storage resources that would justify different operating settings than those proposed in the NOPR, what minimum requirements for droop, deadband, and timely and sustained response might be more appropriate for the effective provision of primary frequency response from electric storage resources? Or are there parameters other than those discussed in the NOPR (*e.g.*, droop, deadband) that are more applicable to electric storage resources that could be used to accomplish effective timely and sustained primary frequency response? If so, what would those parameters be?

2. Are there risks associated with requiring electric storage resources, which are energy-limited, to provide timely and sustained primary frequency response, such as possible adverse effects on an electric storage resource's ability to fulfill other obligations (*e.g.*, providing energy or other ancillary services)?

3. Please describe the relationship between electric storage resources being online and the provision of primary frequency response.

a. Are electric storage resources that are always online available on a more frequent basis to provide primary frequency response than generating facilities that start-up and shut-down (*i.e.*, go offline)? If so, please elaborate on possible operational or other impacts, if any, that the proposed requirements may have on generating facilities that are always online, as compared to generating facilities that go offline.

b. Please discuss whether it is possible to "turn off" an electric storage resource's primary frequency response capability (*i.e.*, disable the ability to respond to frequency deviations without physically disconnecting from the grid) when the electric storage resource is neither charging nor discharging and not providing other services (*e.g.*, energy or other ancillary services) to the power system. To the extent possible, please explain if this ability would vary by the type of electric storage technology.

4. Please explain what is meant by "minimum set point" and elaborate on how and by whom it would be defined and determined.

a. Could possible adverse impacts of the proposed primary frequency response requirements on electric storage resources be minimized or eliminated, if owners/operators of such resources or another entity were allowed to establish a minimum set point for the provision of primary frequency response service? If so, please elaborate.

b. Would the primary frequency response requirements proposed in the NOPR result in electric storage resources that have no such minimum set point providing a greater magnitude of primary frequency response for a given frequency deviation than other generating facilities of equal nameplate capacity that have a minimum set point? Please provide an explanation as to why this is or is not the case.

c. How and in what ways would the implementation of such a minimum set point change an electric storage resource's response to frequency deviations, as compared to other generating facilities that do not implement a minimum set point? As part of this explanation, please explain whether the implementation of a minimum set point would: (1) Limit the provision of primary frequency response for electric storage resources to a megawatt (MW) range (*i.e.*, between a minimum value and the nameplate capacity of the electric storage resource); (2) be used in lieu of nameplate capacity as the basis of the droop curve (*i.e.*, reduce the expected proportional MW response to frequency deviations below that of other generating facilities of equivalent nameplate capacity for a given percentage droop (*e.g.*, a 5 percent droop)); or (3) be used in some other way.

d. If owners/operators of electric storage resources or another entity were allowed to establish a minimum set point for the purposes of primary frequency response:

i. How would they determine the appropriate value of the minimum set point for a given electric storage resource? What technical characteristics or economic factors should be considered in establishing a minimum set point for the various types of electric storage resources?

ii. Should the minimum set point be static, or dynamic and subject to change based on technical or other factors? If it is subject to change, please explain the factors that would warrant such changes.

iii. Should owners/operators of electric storage resources be required to specify in their interconnection agreements the value of the minimum set point and indicate whether it is

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 4–5.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 5.

<sup>14</sup> AES Comments at 17 and 19 (specifying changes to the proposed *pro forma* language).

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at 6–7.

static or dynamic? In what manner should this information be provided to the relevant balancing authority?

5. Please explain what is meant by “inadequate state of charge” and elaborate on how and by whom it would be defined and determined.

a. Could possible adverse impacts of the proposed primary frequency response requirements on electric storage resources be minimized or eliminated if owners/operators of such resources or another entity were allowed to define inadequate state of charge as an explicit operational constraint relieving electric storage resources from providing sustained response when in that “inadequate” state? If so, please elaborate.

b. If owners/operators of electric storage resources or another entity were allowed to define inadequate state of charge as an operational constraint for electric storage resources:

i. How would they determine what level of charge is “inadequate” thus preventing electric storage resources from providing sustained primary frequency response output?

ii. Should the inadequate state of charge parameter be static, or dynamic and subject to change based on technical or other factors? If it is subject to change, please explain the factors that would warrant such changes.

iii. Should owners/operators of electric storage resources be required to specify in their interconnection agreements a parameter for “inadequate state of charge” and indicate whether it is static or dynamic? In what manner should this information be provided to the relevant balancing authority?

6. What impacts, if any, would owners/operators of electric storage resources experience if their resources are not allowed to maintain a specified range of state of charge?

a. Is there a certain range of state of charge (expressed as a percentage of total charge) that would enable an electric storage resource to provide primary frequency response without possible adverse impacts?

b. Would this range be the same for all electric storage resources, or would it depend on the particular technology of a given electric storage resource and/or the duration that the resource could sustain its output?

c. Are there differences in terms of adverse impacts on an electric storage resource depending on whether its state of charge is low (e.g., five percent remaining charge) or high (e.g., 98 percent remaining charge)? If so, please elaborate.

d. To the extent there are adverse impacts, would they differ for different

electric storage technologies? If so, please elaborate.

7. In lieu of (1) establishing a minimum set point for electric storage resources and (2) including an inadequate state of charge as an operational constraint, could owners/operators of all or certain types of electric storage resources or another entity specify an operating range<sup>16</sup> outside of which electric storage resources would not be required to provide and/or sustain primary frequency response to prevent adverse impacts on the electric storage resources?

a. Would it be possible to base such an operating range on manufacturer specifications and, if so, would establishing such an operating range potentially address concerns about the harm to the resource, degradation of its useful life, or other potential adverse impacts?

b. Would it be possible to specify such an operating range at the time of interconnection and include the operating range in the interconnection agreement? By what means should the operating range be communicated to the relevant balancing authority?

8. Are there other mechanisms or ways to address the concerns raised by ESA and others on the proposed primary frequency response requirements instead of: (1) Establishing a minimum set point and including an inadequate state of charge as an operational constraint; or (2) establishing an operating range as described above.

#### B. Small Generating Facilities

7. In the NOPR, the Commission proposed that small generating facilities be subject to new primary frequency response requirements in the *pro forma* SGIA. The Commission stated that the record indicates that small generating facilities are capable of installing and enabling governors at low cost in a manner comparable to large generating facilities.<sup>17</sup>

8. Some commenters raise concerns that small generating facilities could face disproportionate costs to install primary frequency response capability.<sup>18</sup> For example, the Public Interest Organizations state that the Commission’s discussion of the economic impact on small generating

<sup>16</sup>For the purposes of this document, “operating range” is defined as minimum state of charge, maximum state of charge, maximum rate of charge, and maximum rate of discharge.

<sup>17</sup>NOPR, 157 FERC ¶ 61,122 at P 41 (citing IEEE–P1547 Working Group Comments at 1, 5, and 7).

<sup>18</sup>Public Interest Organizations Comments at 3; NRECA Comments at 8.

facilities of installing primary frequency response capability is limited, and claims the information in the NOPR does not directly support the Commission’s conclusion that “small generating facilities are capable of installing and enabling governors at low cost in a manner comparable to large generating facilities.”<sup>19</sup> Public Interest Organizations encourage the Commission to further investigate the cost for small renewable energy generating facilities to install frequency response capability before making the proposed revisions to the *pro forma* SGIA.<sup>20</sup> National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA) asserts that the record is insufficient to conclude that the proposed primary frequency response capability requirement will not pose an undue burden on smaller generating facilities.<sup>21</sup>

9. Other commenters request that the Commission consider a size limitation. In particular, Idaho Power Company (Idaho Power), NRECA, and Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) request the Commission adopt a size limitation for applying the NOPR requirements.<sup>22</sup>

10. To augment the record regarding the ability of small generating facilities to comply with the proposed primary frequency response requirements, and their potential economic impact, the Commission seeks comment on the following questions:

1. Are the costs for small generating facilities to install, maintain, and operate governors or equivalent controls proportionally comparable to the costs for large generating facilities? If costs are proportionally higher for small generating facilities to install, maintain, and operate governors or equivalent controls, what accounts for these higher costs? Quantify, to the extent possible, any general differences in these costs between small and large generating facilities.

2. If small generating facilities were required to comply with the proposed primary frequency response requirements, do recent technological advances in primary frequency response capability minimize or eliminate possible barriers to entry of small generating facilities? If not, in what specific ways could the proposed requirements be a barrier to entry? Should such negative impacts occur, please discuss means by which the

<sup>19</sup>Public Interest Organizations Comments at 3 (citing NOPR, 157 FERC ¶ 61,122 at P 42).

<sup>20</sup>*Id.* at 3–4.

<sup>21</sup>NRECA Comments at 8.

<sup>22</sup>Idaho Power Comments at 2; NRECA Comments at 8; TVA Comments at 3–4.

Commission could potentially mitigate or eliminate them?

3. Is an exemption appropriate for all or a subset of small generating facilities based on possible disproportionate cost impacts of installing the capability to provide primary frequency response? If so, please provide specific cost data demonstrating that is the case.

4. Given their increasing market penetration and operational role in the Bulk-Power System, please discuss the extent to which small generating facilities are necessary to ensure adequate primary frequency response.

5. Please discuss whether PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.'s (PJM's) recent changes to its interconnection agreements, which require new large and small non-synchronous generating facilities to install enhanced inverters that include primary frequency response capability,<sup>23</sup> address concerns regarding possible disproportionate costs or barriers resulting from applying the NOPR proposals to the entire set of small generating facilities. If yes, please discuss the viability of applying PJM's approach in other regions.

### III. Comment Procedures

11. The Commission invites interested persons to submit comments on the matters and issues proposed in this document to be adopted, including any related matters or alternative proposals that commenters may wish to discuss. Comments are due September 14, 2017. Comments must refer to Docket No. RM16-6-000, and must include the commenter's name, the organization they represent, if applicable, and their address in their comments.

12. The Commission encourages comments to be filed electronically via the eFiling link on the Commission's Web site at <http://www.ferc.gov>. The Commission accepts most standard word processing formats. Documents created electronically using word processing software should be filed in native applications or print-to-PDF format and not in a scanned format. Commenters filing electronically do not need to make a paper filing.

13. Commenters that are not able to file comments electronically must send an original of their comments to: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Secretary of the Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426.

14. All comments will be placed in the Commission's public files and may be viewed, printed, or downloaded remotely as described in the Document

Availability section below. Commenters on this proposal are not required to serve copies of their comments on other commenters.

### IV. Document Availability

15. In addition to publishing the full text of this document in the **Federal Register**, the Commission provides all interested persons an opportunity to view and/or print the contents of this document via the Internet through FERC's Home Page (<http://www.ferc.gov>) and in FERC's Public Reference Room during normal business hours (8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Eastern time) at 888 First Street NE., Room 2A, Washington, DC 20426.

16. From FERC's Home Page on the Internet, this information is available on eLibrary. The full text of this document is available on eLibrary in PDF and Microsoft Word format for viewing, printing, and/or downloading. To access this document in eLibrary, type the docket number excluding the last three digits of this document in the docket number field.

17. User assistance is available for eLibrary and the FERC's Web site during normal business hours from FERC Online Support at 202-502-6652 (toll free at 1-866-208-3676) or email at [ferconlinesupport@ferc.gov](mailto:ferconlinesupport@ferc.gov), or the Public Reference Room at (202) 502-8371, TTY (202) 502-8659. Email the Public Reference Room at [public.referenceroom@ferc.gov](mailto:public.referenceroom@ferc.gov).

By direction of the Commission.

Issued: August 18, 2017.

**Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.**,  
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2017-17952 Filed 8-23-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

#### 33 CFR Part 209

[COE-2016-0016]

RIN 0710-AA72

#### Use of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Reservoir Projects for Domestic, Municipal & Industrial Water Supply

**AGENCY:** Army Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking; reopening of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is reopening the public comment period for the notice of

proposed rulemaking that appeared in the **Federal Register** of December 16, 2016.

**DATES:** The comment period for the proposed rule published December 16, 2016 at 81 FR 91556 and extended to August 18, 2017 at 82 FR 22452 is reopened until November 16, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, identified by docket number and/or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) and title, by any of the following methods:

*Federal eRulemaking Portal:* <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

*Email:* [WSRULE2016@usace.army.mil](mailto:WSRULE2016@usace.army.mil). Include the docket number, COE-2016-0016, in the subject line of the message.

*Mail:* U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, ATTN: CECC-L, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 441 G St NW., Washington, DC 20314.

*Hand Delivery/Courier:* Due to security requirements, we cannot receive comments by hand delivery or courier.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

*Technical information:* Jim Fredericks, 503-808-3856. *Legal information:* Daniel Inkelas, 202-761-0345.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In response to requests from multiple parties, USACE is extending the time for public comments to November 16, 2017. The date listed in the **DATES** section by which comments must be received is changed from August 18, 2017 to November 16, 2017.

Dated: August 17, 2017.

**David R. Cooper,**

Chief Counsel, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

[FR Doc. 2017-17779 Filed 8-23-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3720-58-P**

---

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0371; FRL-9966-46-Region 4]

#### Air Plan Approval; Alabama: PSD Replacement Units

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

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a portion of Alabama's State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Alabama, through the Alabama Department of

<sup>23</sup> See NOPR, 157 FERC ¶ 61,122 at P 42 (citing *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 151 FERC ¶ 61,097, at P 28 (2015)).