ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 81


Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; South Coast Moderate Area Plan and Reclassification as Serious Nonattainment for the 2012 PM\(_{2.5}\) NAAQS; Correcting Amendment

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Correcting amendment.

SUMMARY: On November 9, 2020, the EPA issued a final rule titled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; South Coast Moderate Area Plan and Reclassification as Serious Nonattainment for the 2012 PM\(_{2.5}\) NAAQS.” That publication inadvertently omitted from the description of the Riverside County portion of the designated area, language indicating that the lands of the Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians and Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation are excluded from that portion of the Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin nonattainment area for the 2012 PM\(_{2.5}\) NAAQS.” That publication inadvertently omitted from the description of the Riverside County portion of the designated area, language indicating that the lands of the Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians and Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation are excluded from that portion of the Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin nonattainment area for the 2012 PM\(_{2.5}\) NAAQS. This action corrects the omission and revises the entry as intended in the November 9, 2020 final rule.

The EPA has determined that this action falls under the “good cause” exemption in section 553(b)(3)(B) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) which, upon finding “good cause,” authorizes agencies to dispense with public participation where public notice and comment procedures are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest. Public notice and comment for this action are unnecessary because the underlying rule for which this correcting amendment has been prepared was already subject to a 30-day comment period, and this action merely corrects an error in the rule text. Further, this action is consistent with the purpose and rationale of the final rule, which is corrected herein. Because this action does not change the EPA’s analyses or overall actions, no purpose would be served by additional public notice and comment. Consequently, additional public notice and comment are unnecessary.

The EPA also finds that there is good cause under APA section 553(d)(3) for this correction to become effective on the date of publication of this action. Section 553(d)(3) of the APA allows an effective date of less than 30 days after publication “as otherwise provided by the agency for good cause found and published with the rule.” 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3). The purpose of the 30-day waiting period prescribed in APA section 553(d)(3) is to give affected parties a reasonable time to adjust their behavior and prepare before the final rule takes effect. This rule does not create any new regulatory requirements such that affected parties would need time to prepare before the rule takes effect. This action merely corrects an error in a previous rulemaking. For these reasons, the EPA finds good cause under APA section 553(d)(3) for this correction to become effective on the date of publication of this action.

Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

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 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.);
- Is not subject to the regulatory flexibility provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.);
- Is not subject to sections 202 and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) (Pub. L. 104–4); and
- Does not impose a significant intergovernmental mandate or significantly or uniquely affect small governments, as described in sections 203 and 204 of the UMRA;

- Does not have federalism implications as specified in Executive Order 13132 (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999);
- Is not an economically significant regulatory action based on health or safety risks subject to Executive Order 13045 (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997);
- Is not a significant regulatory action subject to Executive Order 13211 (66 FR 28355, May 22, 2001);
- 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 this error correction action does not involve technical standards; and
- Does not involve special consideration of environmental justice related issues as required by Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

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).

In issuing this rule, the EPA has taken the necessary steps to eliminate drafting errors and ambiguity, minimize potential litigation, and provide a clear legal standard for affected conduct, as required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (61 FR 4729, February 7, 1996).

The EPA has complied with Executive Order 12630 (53 FR 8859, March 15, 1998) by examining the takings implications of the rule in accordance with the “Attorney General’s Supplemental Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings” issued under the executive order.

The Congressional Review Act (CRA) (5 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. Section 808 allows the issuing agency to make a rule effective sooner than otherwise provided if the Agency makes a good cause finding that notice and public procedure is impracticable, unnecessary or contrary to the public interest. This determination must be supported by a brief statement. 5 U.S.C. 808(2). As stated previously, the EPA has made such a good cause finding, including the reasons therefore, and established an effective date of March 19, 2021. The EPA will submit a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the Federal Register. This correction to 40 CFR part 81 for California is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

### CALIFORNIA—2012 ANNUAL PM$_{2.5}$ NAAQS (Primary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated area $^1$</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Date $^2$</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County (part): That portion of Riverside County which lies to the west of a line described as follows: Beginning at the Riverside-San Diego County boundary and running north along the range line common to Range 4 East and Range 3 East, San Bernardino Base and Meridian; then east along the Township line common to Township 8 South and Township 7 South; then north along the range line common to Range 5 East and Range 4 East; then west along the Township line common to Township 6 South and Township 7 South to the southwest corner of Section 34, Township 6 South, Range 4 East; then north along the west boundaries of Sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, Township 5 South, Range 3 East; then north along the range line common to Range 2 East and Range 3 East; to the Riverside-San Bernardino County line (excluding the lands of the Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians, and excluding the lands of the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation).</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>December 9, 2020</td>
<td>Serious.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^1$ Includes areas of Indian country located in each county or area, except as otherwise specified.

$^2$ This date is April 15, 2015, unless otherwise noted.
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 131
[40 CFR § 131.4040]

Federal Aluminum Aquatic Life Criteria Applicable to Oregon

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or Agency) is promulgating Federal criteria for fresh waters in the State of Oregon that are jurisdictional under the Clean Water Act (CWA) to protect aquatic life from the effects of exposure to harmful levels of aluminum. EPA disapproved of Oregon’s freshwater acute and chronic aluminum criteria in 2013. The CWA directs EPA to promptly propose water quality standards (WQS) addressing the Agency’s disapproval and to promulgate those WQS unless, prior to such promulgation, the state adopts WQS addressing EPA’s disapproval that the Agency determines meet the requirements of the CWA and EPA approves. Since Oregon has not adopted and submitted revised freshwater acute and chronic aluminum criteria to address EPA’s 2013 disapproval, EPA is promulgating Federal freshwater acute and chronic aluminum criteria to address EPA’s 2013 disapproval, EPA would withdraw this regulation.

DATES: This rule is effective on April 19, 2021. The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the rule is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of April 19, 2021.

ADDRESSES: EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA–HQ–OW–2016–0694. All documents in the docket are listed on the http://www.regulations.gov website. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., confidential business information (CBI) 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 electronically through http://www.regulations.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mimi Soo-Hoo, Office of Water, Standards and Health Protection Division (4305T), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (202) 566–1192; email address: soo-hoo.mimi@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This final rule is organized as follows:

I. General Information
   A. Does this action apply to me?
   B. How did EPA develop this final rule?
   C. General Recommended Approach for Deriving Aquatic Life Criteria
   D. Incorporation by Reference
   E. Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review) and Executive Order 13771 (Reducing Regulatory Costs)
   F. Executive Order 13132 (Federalism)
   G. Executive Order 13175 (Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments)
   H. Executive Order 13045 (Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks)
   I. Executive Order 13211 (Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use)
   J. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995
   K. Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations)
   L. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

II. Background
   A. Statutory and Regulatory Authority
   B. EPA’s Disapproval of Oregon’s Freshwater Aluminum Criteria
   C. General Recommended Approach for Deriving Aquatic Life Criteria
   D. Incorporation by Reference
   E. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
   F. Implementation of Final Freshwater Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria in Oregon
   G. Under what conditions would Federal standards be withdrawn?
   H. Alternative Regulatory Approaches and Implementation Mechanisms

III. Freshwater Aluminum Aquatic Life Criteria
   A. EPA’s National CWA Section 304(a) Recommended Freshwater Aluminum Criteria
   B. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
   C. Implementation of Final Freshwater Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria in Oregon
   D. Incorporation by Reference

IV. Critical Low Flows and Mixing Zones

V. Endangered Populations

VI. Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

VII. Alternative Regulatory Approaches and Implementation Mechanisms

VIII. Economic Analysis

IX. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

A. Designating Uses
B. WQS Variances
C. NPDES Permit Compliance Schedules
D. Permit Compliance Schedules
E. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
F. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
G. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
H. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
I. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
J. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
K. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
L. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
M. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
N. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
O. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
P. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
Q. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
R. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
S. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
T. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
U. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
V. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
W. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
X. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
Y. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters
Z. Final Acute and Chronic Aluminum Criteria for Oregon’s Fresh Waters

IX. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

A. Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review) and Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review)
B. Executive Order 13371 (Reducing Regulations and Controlling Regulatory Costs)
C. Paperwork Reduction Act
D. Regulatory Flexibility Act
E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
F. Executive Order 13132 (Federalism)
G. Executive Order 13175 (Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments)
H. Executive Order 13045 (Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks)
I. Executive Order 13211 (Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use)
J. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995
K. Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations)
L. Congressional Review Act (CRA)

A. Does this action apply to me?

Entities such as industrial facilities, stormwater management districts, or publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) that discharge pollutants to fresh waters of the United States under the State of Oregon’s jurisdiction could be affected by this rule because Federal WQS promulgated by EPA in this rule will be the applicable WQS for fresh waters in Oregon for CWA purposes after the effective date of this rule. These WQS are the minimum standards which must be used in such CWA regulatory programs as National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting 1 and identifying impaired waters under CWA Section 303(d). Categories and entities that could potentially be affected by this rule include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples of potentially affected entities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Industrial point sources discharging pollutants to fresh waters of the United States in Oregon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>Publicly owned treatment works or similar facilities discharging pollutants to fresh waters of the United States in Oregon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management Districts</td>
<td>Entities responsible for managing stormwater in the State of Oregon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities that could ultimately be affected by this action.

1 Before any water quality based effluent limit is included in an NPDES permit, the permitting authority (here, the State of Oregon), will first determine whether a discharge “will cause or has the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any WQS.” 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i) and (ii).