

TABLE 1 TO § 36.2—CIVIL MONETARY PENALTY INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS—Continued

| Statute   | Description  | New maximum (and minimum, if applicable) penalty amount |
|---|--|---|
| 20 U.S.C. 1082(g) (section 432(g) of the HEA) ...                               | Provides for a civil penalty, as set by Congress in 1986, of up to \$25,000 for violations by lenders and guaranty agencies of title IV of the HEA, which authorizes the Federal Family Education Loan Program.  | \$71,545.   |
| 20 U.S.C. 1094(c)(3)(B) (section 487(c)(3)(B) of the HEA).                      | Provides for a civil penalty, as set by Congress in 1986, of up to \$25,000 for an IHE's violation of title IV of the HEA, which authorizes various programs of student financial assistance.  | \$71,545.   |
| 20 U.S.C. 1228c(c)(2)(E) (section 429 of the General Education Provisions Act). | Provides for a civil penalty, as set by Congress in 1994, of up to \$1,000 for an educational organization's failure to disclose certain information to minor students and their parents.  | \$2,111.  |
| 31 U.S.C. 1352(c)(1) and (c)(2)(A) .....  | Provides for a civil penalty, as set by Congress in 1989, of \$10,000 to \$100,000 for recipients of Government grants, contracts, etc. that improperly lobby Congress or the executive branch with respect to the award of Government grants and contracts. | \$25,132 to \$251,322.                                  |
| 31 U.S.C. 3802(a)(1) and (a)(2) .....   | Provides for a civil penalty, as set by Congress in 1986, of up to \$5,000 for false claims and statements made to the Government.   | \$14,308.   |

**PART 668—STUDENT ASSISTANCE GENERAL PROVISIONS**

■ 3. The authority citation for part 668 continues to read in part as follows:

**Authority:** 20 U.S.C. 1001–1003, 1070g, 1085, 1088, 1091, 1092, 1094, 1099c, 1099c–1, 1221e–3, and 1231a, unless otherwise noted.

\* \* \* \* \*

**§ 668.84 [Amended]**

- 4. Section 668.84 is amended by:
  - a. In paragraph (a)(1) introductory text, removing the number “\$69,733” and adding, in its place, the number “\$71,545”.
  - b. Removing the parenthetical authority citation at the end of the section.

[FR Doc. 2025–01419 Filed 1–16–25; 4:15 pm]

**BILLING CODE 4000–01–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 52**

**[EPA–R09–OAR–2024–0627; FRL–12536–02–R9]**

**Interim Final Determination To Defer Sanctions, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District**

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

**ACTION:** Interim final determination.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is making an interim final determination that the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has submitted a Clean Air Act (CAA or “Act”) state

implementation plan (SIP) revision on behalf of the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVUAPCD or “District”) that corrects deficiencies concerning the District’s new source review (NSR) stationary source permitting program. This determination is based on a proposed approval, published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**, of SJVUAPCD Rules 1020, 2020, and 2201. The effect of this interim final determination is to defer sanctions that were triggered by the EPA’s limited disapproval of SJVUAPCD Rule 2201 in 2023.

**DATES:** This interim final determination is effective January 21, 2025. However, comments will be accepted on or before February 20, 2025.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA–R09–OAR–2024–0620 at <https://www.regulations.gov>. For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [Regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov). The EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically 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 contents located outside of the primary

submission (*i.e.*, on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. For 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>. If you need assistance in a language other than English or if you are a person with a disability who needs a reasonable accommodation at no cost to you, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Doris Lo, EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne St., San Francisco, CA 94105; phone: (415) 972–3959; email: [lo.doris@epa.gov](mailto:lo.doris@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Throughout this document, “we,” “us,” and “our” refer to the EPA.

**Table of Contents**

- I. Background
- II. EPA Action
- III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

**I. Background**

On July 10, 2023, we published a limited approval and limited disapproval of SJVUAPCD Rule 2201 as adopted locally on August 15, 2019.<sup>1</sup> We based our limited disapproval action on deficiencies identified in the submitted rule. This limited approval and limited disapproval action started a sanctions clock for imposition of offset sanctions 18 months after August 9,

<sup>1</sup> 87 FR 45730 (July 29, 2022).

2023, and highway sanctions six months later, pursuant to section 179 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) and our regulations at 40 CFR 52.31. Under 40 CFR 52.31(d)(1), offset sanctions apply 18 months after the effective date of a disapproval and highway sanctions apply six months after the offset sanctions, unless we determine that the deficiencies forming the basis of the disapproval have been corrected.

On April 20, 2023, SJVUAPCD amended Rules 1020 and 2201 to address the deficiencies that were the basis for our limited disapproval of Rule 2201, as identified in our July 29, 2022, proposal. The State submitted these amended rules to the EPA on October 13, 2023, along with other revisions to Rule 2020 adopted on December 18, 2014. In the Proposed Rules section of this **Federal Register**, we are proposing a limited approval of these rules because we believe they correct the deficiencies identified in our July 10, 2023 disapproval action and meet other applicable CAA requirements. This approval is limited because the EPA is simultaneously proposing a limited disapproval of the rules based on other revisions that do not meet applicable CAA requirements. Based on this proposed action, we are taking this final rulemaking action, effective on publication, to defer the imposition of the offset and highway sanctions that were triggered by our July 10, 2023 limited disapproval.

The EPA is providing the public with an opportunity to comment on this deferral of sanctions. If comments are submitted that change our assessment described in this final determination and our proposed limited approval of SJVUAPCD Rules 1020, 2020, and 2201, we intend to take subsequent final action to reimpose sanctions pursuant to 40 CFR 52.31(d). If no comments are submitted that change our assessment, then all sanctions and sanction clocks associated with our July 10, 2023 final action will be permanently terminated on the effective date of a final rule approval.

## II. EPA Action

We are making an interim final determination to defer the imposition of the offset and highway sanctions associated with our limited disapproval of SJVUAPCD Rule 2201 (as adopted in 2023) based on our concurrent proposal finding that the State's SIP revision corrects the deficiencies that initiated the sanctions.

Because the EPA has preliminarily determined that the State has corrected the deficiencies identified in the EPA's July 10, 2023 limited disapproval

action, relief from sanctions should be provided as quickly as possible. Therefore, the EPA is invoking the good cause exception under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) in not providing an opportunity for comment before this action takes effect.<sup>2</sup> However, by this action, the EPA is providing the public with an opportunity to comment on the EPA's determination after the effective date, and the EPA will consider any comments received in determining whether to reverse such action.

The EPA believes that notice-and-comment rulemaking before the effective date of this action is impracticable and contrary to the public interest. The EPA has reviewed the State's submittal and, through its proposed action, is indicating that it is more likely than not that the State has corrected the deficiencies that were the basis for the limited disapproval that started the sanctions clocks. Therefore, it is not in the public interest to apply sanctions. The EPA believes that it is necessary to use the interim final rulemaking process to defer sanctions while the EPA completes its rulemaking process on the approvability of the State's submittal. Moreover, with respect to the effective date of this action, the EPA is invoking the good cause exception to the 30-day notice requirement of the APA because the purpose of this notice is to relieve a restriction.<sup>3</sup>

## III. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

This action defers Federal sanctions and imposes no additional requirements. For that reason, this action:

- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Orders 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and 14094 (88 FR 21879, April 11, 2023);
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*);
- Is certified as not having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*);
- Does not contain any unfunded mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-4);

- Does not have federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);

- Is not subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) because it proposes to approve a state program;

- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001); and

- Is not subject to requirements of Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) because application of those requirements would be inconsistent with the Clean Air Act.

In addition, the SIP is not approved to apply on any Indian reservation land or in any other area where the EPA or an Indian Tribe has demonstrated that a Tribe has jurisdiction. In those areas of Indian country, the rule does not have tribal implications and will not impose substantial direct costs on Tribal governments or preempt Tribal law as specified by Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000).

Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, 59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994) directs Federal agencies to identify and address "disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects" of their actions on communities with environmental justice (EJ) concerns to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law. Executive Order 14096 (Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All, 88 FR 25251, April 26, 2023) builds on and supplements Executive Order 12898 and defines EJ as, among other things, "the just treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, regardless of income, race, color, national origin, Tribal affiliation, or disability, in agency decision-making and other Federal activities that affect human health and the environment."

The State did not evaluate EJ considerations as part of its SIP submittal; the CAA and applicable implementing regulations neither prohibit nor require such an evaluation. The EPA did not perform an EJ analysis and did not consider EJ in this action. Consideration of EJ is not required as part of this action, and there is no information in the record inconsistent with the stated goal of Executive Orders 12898 and 14096 of achieving EJ for communities with EJ concerns.

This action is subject to the Congressional Review Act, and the EPA will submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller

<sup>2</sup> 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B).

<sup>3</sup> 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1).

General of the United States. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2). The CRA allows the issuing agency to make a rule effective sooner than otherwise provided by the CRA if the agency makes a good cause finding that notice and comment rulemaking procedures are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest (5 U.S.C. 808(2)). The EPA has made a good cause finding for this action as discussed in Section II of this preamble, including the basis for that finding.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by March 24, 2025. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this action for the purposes of judicial review nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and it shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements (see CAA section 307(b)(2)).

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Ammonia, Nitrogen oxides, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Sulfur oxides, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: January 13, 2025.

**Martha Guzman Aceves,**  
Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 2025–01215 Filed 1–17–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R05–OAR–2020–0055; FRL–11687–02–R5]

#### Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Withdrawal of Technical Amendment

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is taking final action to correct a November 19, 2020, rulemaking removing the Air Nuisance Rule (ANR) from the Ohio State Implementation Plan (SIP). This action is in response to a February 10, 2023, decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (Sixth

Circuit or Court) to remand without vacatur EPA’s removal of the ANR from the Ohio SIP. Because the Court did not vacate EPA’s removal of the ANR, the ANR is currently not in Ohio’s SIP. After reevaluating EPA’s November 19, 2020, rulemaking, upon remand, EPA proposed to determine that its November 2020 final action was in error, and to correct that action by reinstating the ANR as part of the Ohio SIP. EPA proposed to take this action on February 22, 2024 and received both supportive and adverse comments. EPA is finalizing this action as proposed, and upon the effective date of this action, the ANR will be reinstated into the Ohio SIP.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective on February 20, 2025.

**ADDRESSES:** EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–R05–OAR–2020–0055. All documents in the docket are listed on the <https://www.regulations.gov> website. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, *i.e.*, Confidential Business Information (CBI), Proprietary Business Information (PBI), or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available either through <https://www.regulations.gov> or at the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, Air and Radiation Division, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604. This facility is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. We recommend that you telephone Christos Panos, at (312) 353–8328 before visiting the Region 5 office.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Christos Panos, Air and Radiation Division (AR–18J), Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353–8328, [panos.christos@epa.gov](mailto:panos.christos@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Throughout this document, whenever “we,” “us” or “our” is used, we mean EPA.

### I. Background

A detailed history of this matter is provided in EPA’s February 22, 2024, 89 FR 13304, notice of proposed rulemaking (February 2024 Proposed Rule). It includes a discussion of EPA’s previous rulemaking action to remove the ANR, OAC 3745–15–07, from the Ohio SIP, which EPA proposed on

March 23, 2020, 85 FR 16309 (March 2020 Proposed Rule) and finalized on November 19, 2020, 85 FR 73636 (November 2020 Final Rule). That action relied on EPA’s error-correction authority under Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) section 110(k)(6). In that action, EPA concluded that we had erred by approving the ANR into Ohio’s SIP because we determined that the ANR was not relied upon by Ohio to demonstrate the implementation, maintenance, attainment, or enforcement of any National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS).

During the public comment period for the March 2020 Proposed Rule to remove the ANR from the Ohio SIP, EPA received comments from the Sierra Club and other environmental groups,<sup>1</sup> referred to in this action collectively as “Environmental Commenters,” asserting that EPA’s approval of the ANR as part of the SIP was not an error and that EPA’s use of its error correction authority to remove the ANR from Ohio’s SIP was unlawful. These comments stated that the ANR was an “important regulatory tool in achieving and maintaining the NAAQS,” and that its removal from the SIP “ignored the role of citizen suits in CAA enforcement.” Further, these comments identified procedural concerns with EPA’s error correction, and stated that EPA was required to adhere to the SIP revision process to remove the ANR from Ohio’s SIP, which would include addressing the requirements of section 193 of the CAA to demonstrate that no backsliding would result from this change. Additionally, these comments addressed the use of the ANR in enforcement actions.<sup>2</sup> These comments asserted that EPA had failed to consider the impact of eliminating the only available pathway for Ohio residents to enforce the ANR. Therefore, the commenters maintained, removing the ANR from the SIP prevents local governments and non-governmental organizations, as well as affected Ohio communities, from directly enforcing

<sup>1</sup> EPA received comments opposing the removal of the ANR from the Sierra Club, the Ohio Environmental Council, Ohio Citizen Action, Altman Newman Co. LPA, the National Resources Defense Council, and more than 1800 individual commenters who submitted their comments as part of a letter-writing campaign. See Docket ID No. EPA–R05–OAR–2020–0055. All documents in the docket are listed on the [www.regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) website.

<sup>2</sup> See “Sierra Club, Ohio Environmental Council, Ohio Citizen Action, Altman Newman Co. LPA, and Natural Resources Defense Council Comments Regarding EPA Proposed Removal of the Air Pollution Nuisance Rule from the Ohio State Implementation Plan (SIP),” Docket ID No. EPA–R05–OAR–2020–0055. All documents in the docket are listed on the [www.regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) website.