

authorization request for its 2020 At-Berth Amendments. Based on CARB's submissions, relevant adverse comment, and other comments in the record, EPA is granting an authorization under section 209(e)(2)(A) of the CAA for CARB's 2020 At-Berth Amendments. The opponents of the authorization request have not met their burden of proof to demonstrate or to adequately support an EPA finding that CARB and its 2020 At-Berth Amendments fail to meet the three authorization criteria in section 202(e)(2)(A)(i)–(iii) of the CAA.

A. Judicial Review

Section 307(b)(1) of the CAA governs judicial review of final actions by the EPA. This section provides, in part, that petitions for review must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit: (i) when the agency action consists of “nationally applicable regulations promulgated, or final actions taken, by the Administrator,” or (ii) when such action is locally or regionally applicable, but “such action is based on a determination of nationwide scope or effect and if in taking such action the Administrator finds and publishes that such action is based on such a determination.” For locally or regionally applicable final actions, the CAA reserves to the EPA complete discretion whether to invoke the exception in (ii).

To the extent a court finds this final action to be locally or regionally applicable, the Administrator is exercising the complete discretion afforded to him under the CAA to make and publish a finding that this action is based on a determination of “nationwide scope or effect” within the meaning of CAA section 307(b)(1) for several reasons.¹⁴² This final action grants an authorization for amendments to California's At-Berth Regulations that were previously authorized by EPA. As such, this final action will affect any person who owns, operates, charters, or leases any United States or foreign-flag OGV that visits a California port, terminal, or berth; any person who owns, operates, or leases a port, terminal, or berth located where OGVs visit, or any person who owns, operates, or leases a CARB approved CAECS for OGV auxiliary engines or tanker auxiliary boilers. Furthermore, the At-

Berth Regulations, and the amendments to those regulations that are the subject of today's action, the 2020 At-Berth Amendments, are part of California's nonroad emissions program that, together with its on-highway emissions program, are regulatory programs that EPA may waive under CAA section 209. As required by statute, in evaluating the authorization criteria in this action, EPA considers not only the 2020 At-Berth Amendments in isolation, but in the context of the entire California nonroad emission program. See CAA section 209(e)(2)(A) (requiring that the protectiveness finding be made for California's standards “in the aggregate”). Moreover, EPA generally applies a consistent statutory interpretation and analytical framework in evaluating and deciding various authorization and waiver requests under CAA section 209. EPA also relies on the extensive body of D.C. Circuit case law developed by that Court since 1979 as it has reviewed and decided judicial challenges to these actions. As such, judicial review of any challenge to this action in the D.C. Circuit will centralize review of national issues in that Court and advance other Congressional principles underlying this CAA provision of avoiding piecemeal litigation, furthering judicial economy, and eliminating the risk of inconsistent judgments. For these reasons, the Administrator is exercising the complete discretion afforded to him by the CAA and hereby finds that this final action is based on a determination of nationwide scope or effect for purposes of CAA section 307(b)(1) and is hereby publishing that finding in the **Federal Register**. Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by June 20, 2023.

B. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

As with past authorization and waiver decisions, this action is not a rule as defined by Executive Order 12866. Therefore, it is exempt from review by the Office of Management and Budget as required for rules and regulations by Executive Order 12866.

In addition, this action is not a rule as defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601(2). Therefore, EPA has not prepared a supporting regulatory flexibility analysis addressing the impact of this action on small business entities.

Further, the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801, *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, does

not apply because this action is not a rule for purposes of 5 U.S.C. 804(3).

Michael S. Regan,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2023–23261 Filed 10–19–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–OGC–2023–0510; FRL–11458–01–OGC]

Proposed Consent Decree, Clean Water Act Claim

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

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

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator's March 18, 2022, memorandum regarding “Consent Decrees and Settlement Agreements to resolve Environmental Claims Against the Agency,” notice is hereby given of a proposed consent decree in *Arizona Mining Reform Coalition et al. v. Guzman et al.* (D. Ariz. 2023). On September 27, 2023, the Arizona Mining Reform Coalition, the Center for Biological Diversity, Earthworks, the Concerned Citizens and Retired Miners Coalition, and the Grand Canyon Chapter of the Sierra Club (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) filed a complaint against EPA in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona alleging that the Agency failed to perform a mandatory duty under the Clean Water Act (CWA) to establish Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for copper and lead impairments for Queen Creek, Arizona. This complaint followed submission of a Notice of Intent to Sue on August 9, 2022. EPA seeks public input on a proposed consent decree prior to its final decision-making with regard to potential settlement of the litigation.

DATES: Written comments on the proposed consent decree must be received by November 20, 2023.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OGC–2023–0510 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

¹⁴²In deciding whether to invoke the exception by making and publishing a finding that this final action is based on a determination of nationwide scope or effect, the Administrator has also taken into account a number of policy considerations, including his judgment balancing the benefit of obtaining the D.C. Circuit's authoritative centralized review versus allowing development of the issue in other contexts and the best use of Agency resources.

comments, see the “Additional Information About Commenting on the Proposed Consent Decree” heading under the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alec Mullee, Water Law Office, Office of General Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; telephone: (202) 564-9616; email address: mullee.alec@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Additional Information About the Proposed Consent Decree

On September 27, 2023, Plaintiffs filed a complaint in Federal district court asserting that the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) constructively submitted to EPA no TMDLs for copper and lead impairments in Queen Creek. Plaintiffs allege that for this reason EPA has a mandatory duty under the CWA to approve or disapprove the constructive submission and, upon disapproval, establish these TMDLs. Plaintiffs further allege that EPA has failed to meet this duty. Following submission of a Notice of Intent to Sue containing these assertions on August 9, 2022, the parties initiated settlement discussions, which produced the proposed consent decree. Under the consent decree, EPA would be obligated to establish copper and lead TMDLs for Queen Creek by July 31, 2028, unless ADEQ first establishes and submits them to EPA by January 31, 2027. If ADEQ submits the TMDLs to EPA, the proposed consent decree provides that Plaintiffs would not object to EPA taking up to an additional 60 days beyond the 30-day statutory deadline to act on the submittal. If EPA disapproves the TMDLs submitted by ADEQ, Plaintiffs would not object to EPA taking up to 12 additional months beyond the 30-day statutory deadline to establish replacement TMDLs.

For a period of thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, EPA will accept written comments relating to the proposed consent decree from persons who are not parties to the litigation. EPA or the Department of Justice may withdraw or withhold consent to the proposed consent decree if the comments received disclose facts or considerations that indicate that such consent is inappropriate, improper, inadequate, or inconsistent with the requirements of the CWA.

II. Additional Information About Commenting on the Proposed Consent Decree

A. How can I get a copy of the proposed consent decree?

The official public docket for this action (identified by Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OGC-2023-0510) 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.”

B. How and to whom do I submit comments?

Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OGC-2023-0510 via <https://www.regulations.gov>. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from this docket. 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. EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa->

dockets. For additional information about submitting information identified as CBI, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document.

If you submit an electronic comment, EPA recommends that you include your name, mailing address, and an email address or other contact information in the body of your comment. This ensures that you can be identified as the submitter of the comment and allows EPA to contact you in case EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties or needs further information on the substance of your comment. Any identifying or contact information provided in the body of a comment will be included as part of the comment that is placed in the official public docket and made available in EPA’s electronic public docket. If EPA cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, EPA may not be able to consider your comment.

Use of the <https://www.regulations.gov> website to submit comments to EPA electronically is EPA’s preferred method for receiving comments. The electronic public docket system is an “anonymous access” system, which means EPA will not know your identity, email address, or other contact information unless you provide it in the body of your comment. Please ensure that your comments are submitted within the specified comment period. Comments received after the close of the comment period will be marked “late.” EPA does not plan to consider these late comments.

Steven M. Neugeboren,
Associate General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2023-23239 Filed 10-19-23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-11454-01-OMS]

Good Neighbor Environmental Board

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) gives notice of a public meeting of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB). The purpose of this meeting is for the board to discuss and approve the final integrated draft of its 20th comprehensive report on water and wastewater infrastructure issues and