

the correct DEH finding, and EPA defers to that finding unless the Agency's consideration of other economic factors, including refinery-specific information, compels the Agency to depart from that rebuttable presumption. EPA's first determination is the first element of EPA's rebuttable presumption: because the DOE matrix can result in a finding of full DEH, partial DEH, or no DEH, EPA must first determine that the CAA provides the Agency with authority for finding partial DEH before the Agency can consider deferring to those findings. EPA's second determination is the second element of EPA's rebuttable presumption: the DOE matrix is a reasonable proxy for determining whether a small refinery would experience DEH, and deferring to that finding is the best way of fulfilling the Agency's statutory obligation to "consider the [2011 DOE Study]" and will result in the correct DEH finding for that small refinery. Taken together, these two determinations—that EPA has the authority to find that a small refinery is experiencing partial DEH and that the DOE matrix is a reasonable proxy for determining whether a small refinery would experience DEH—form the rebuttable presumption that is "the primary explanation for and driver of EPA's action."²⁵ Under this rebuttable presumption, EPA will defer to DOE's findings unless the Agency's consideration of other economic factors compels a different result.

To fulfill its statutory obligation to consider "other economic factors," EPA did consider refinery-specific information in its adjudications. However, these confirmatory reviews were not the primary drivers of EPA's actions on these petitions. EPA considered refinery-specific facts only to determine whether to depart from its rebuttable presumption that application of DOE's matrix results in the correct DEH finding, and these considerations, for each small refinery, confirmed that none of the refinery-specific facts rebutted the presumptive disposition. For example, EPA considered information presented by small refineries regarding their financial circumstances and found that the information was already considered in the DOE matrix or did not otherwise justify departing from the finding reached by application of the DOE matrix. Thus, EPA's consideration of refinery-specific facts was peripheral in comparison to EPA's rebuttable presumption that application of the DOE matrix is the best means of

determining whether DEH exists.²⁶ Notably, EPA's confirmatory review of refinery-specific facts did not change the final decision for any of the SRE petitions.

Additionally, EPA's third determination—that the only permissible way to implement the extension of the exemption from RFS obligations when a small refinery has retired RINs for compliance is to return those retired RINs—is a core driver of EPA's actions because EPA's adjudication of SRE petitions necessarily includes extending the exemption to meritorious petitioners. But how EPA effectuates that extension of the exemption can look different depending on whether the relevant small refinery has already demonstrated compliance with its relevant RFS obligations by retiring RINs. Generally, the RFS statutory and regulatory provisions require all obligated parties to comply with their RFS obligations. However, CAA section 211(o)(9)(B) provides an exception when a small refinery demonstrates that it would experience DEH. In other words, when EPA grants an exemption to a small refinery, that small refinery is not required to retire any RINs to demonstrate compliance if it is a full exemption, and only the number of RINs necessary to meet half of its RFS obligation if it is a partial exemption. However, simply granting a petition does not necessarily effectuate the exemption in all cases. If the exemption is granted prior to a compliance demonstration by the small refinery, then the exemption is self-implementing. But if the small refinery has already demonstrated compliance by retiring RINs, EPA needs to take an additional step to effectuate the exemption. For the reasons outlined in Section IV.B and in this Section V, EPA has determined, consistent with its interpretation of the Agency's authority under CAA section 211(o) and its policy interest in treating all refineries that receive an exemption equally, that returning the retired RINs is the only permissible way of implementing the exemption where a small refinery has previously demonstrated compliance with its RFS obligations by retiring RINs. EPA's adjudications are based on this determination because extending the exemption to meritorious petitioners is necessarily a part of EPA's action on the SRE petitions and EPA's statutory interpretation and policy considerations inform its implementation of the exemption for all petitioners.

For the reasons discussed above, EPA finds that the final actions discussed within the August 2025 SRE Decisions Action are based on determinations of nationwide scope or effect for purposes of CAA section 307(b)(1) and is publishing that finding in the **Federal Register**. Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of these actions must be filed in the D.C. Circuit by October 27, 2025.

Aaron Szabo,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 2025–16390 Filed 8–26–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[EPA–HQ–OPP–2025–0295; FRL–12946–01–OCSPP]

Pesticide Experimental Use Permit; Receipt of Application; Comment Request (May 2025)

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces EPA's receipt of an application 102306–EUP–R from Synvect, Inc. 505 Coast Blvd., Suite 210, La Jolla, CA 92037, requesting an experimental use permit (EUP) for the *Streptococcus pyogenes* Cas9 (SpCas9) protein. The Agency has determined that the permit may be of regional and national significance. Therefore, because of the potential significance, EPA is seeking comments on this application.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before September 26, 2025.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by docket identification (ID) number EPA–HQ–OPP–2025–0295, through the *Federal eRulemaking Portal* at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Additional instructions on commenting and visiting the docket, along with more information about dockets generally, is available at <https://www.epa.gov/dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Each application summary in Unit II. specifies a contact division. The appropriate division contacts are identified as follows:

- BPPD (Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division) (Mail Code 7511M); Shannon Borges; main

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.* at 1752.

telephone number: (202) 566-1400;
email address: BPPDFRNotices@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this action apply to me?

This action is directed to the public in general. Although this action may be of particular interest to those persons who conduct or sponsor research on pesticides, the Agency has not attempted to describe all the specific entities that may be affected by this action.

B. What should I consider as I prepare my comments for EPA?

1. *Submitting CBI.* Do not submit this information to EPA through [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or email. Clearly mark the part or all of the information that you claim to be CBI. For CBI information in a disk or CD-ROM that you mail to EPA, mark the outside of the disk or CD-ROM as CBI and then identify electronically within the disk or CD-ROM the specific information that is claimed as CBI. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public docket. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2.

2. *Tips for preparing your comments.* When preparing and submitting your comments, see the commenting tips at <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

3. *Environmental justice.* EPA seeks to achieve environmental justice, the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of any group, including minority and/or low-income populations, in the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. To help address potential environmental justice issues, the Agency seeks information on any groups or segments of the population who, as a result of their location, cultural practices, or other factors, may have atypical or disproportionately high and adverse human health impacts or environmental effects from exposure to the pesticide(s) discussed in this document, compared to the general population.

II. What action is the Agency taking?

Under section 5 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), 7 U.S.C. 136c, EPA can allow manufacturers to field test

pesticides under development. Manufacturers are required to obtain an EUP before testing new pesticides or new uses of pesticides if they conduct experimental field tests on 10 acres or more of land or one acre or more of water.

Pursuant to 40 CFR 172.11(a), the Agency has determined that the following EUP application may be of regional and national significance, and therefore is seeking public comment on the EUP application:

- *Experimental Use Permit Number:* 102306-EUP-R. *Docket ID Number:* EPA-HQ-OPP-2025-0295. *Submitter:* Synvect, Inc., 505 Coast Blvd., Suite 210, La Jolla, CA 92037. *Pesticide Chemical:* *Streptococcus pyogenes* Cas9 (SpCas9) protein. *Summary of Request:* Synvect, Inc. is proposing to use 14.9142 oz of the active ingredient *Streptococcus pyogenes* Cas9 (SpCas9) protein in a total release number of 3,585,200,000 *Aedes aegypti* eggs over 15,100 total acres for two years beginning at the issuance of the Experimental Use Permit. Proposed testing will include the states and territories of Florida, Texas, and Puerto Rico to generate data to fulfill the requirements for Section 3 product registration under FIFRA. *Contact:* BPPD.

Following the review of the application and any comments and data received in response to this solicitation, EPA will decide whether to issue or deny the EUP request, and if issued, the conditions under which it is to be conducted. Any issuance of an EUP will be announced in the **Federal Register**.

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a.

Dated: August 22, 2025.

Kimberly Smith,

Acting Director, Information Technology and Resources Management Division, Office of Program Support.

[FR Doc. 2025-16383 Filed 8-26-25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

[Public Notice: EIB-2025-0016]

Application for Final Commitment for a Long-Term Loan or Financial Guarantee in Excess of \$100 Million: AP099993XX

AGENCY: Export-Import Bank.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This Notice is to inform the public the Export-Import Bank of the United States (“EXIM”) has received an application for final commitment for long-term loans or financial guarantees

in excess of \$100 million. Comments received within the comment period specified below will be presented to the EXIM Board of Directors prior to final action on these Transactions.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before September 22, 2025 to be assured of consideration before final consideration of the transactions by the Board of Directors of EXIM.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted through [Regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) at www.regulations.gov. To submit a comment, enter EIB-2025-0016 under the heading “Enter Keyword or ID” and select Search. Follow the instructions provided at the Submit a Comment screen. Please include your name, company name (if any) and EIB-2025-0016 on any attached document.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Reference: AP099993XX.

Purpose and Use: Brief description of the purpose of the transactions: to develop an open pit copper-gold mine as well as a processing plant, storage facilities, power generation, transportation infrastructure, and other related facilities needed to support the project.

Brief non-proprietary description of the anticipated use of the items being exported: to support the development of an open-pit copper gold mine and related facilities.

Parties:

Principal Supplier: Fluor, Irving, TX; Komatsu, Chicago, IL; Caterpillar, Irving, TX; Metso USA, Brookfield, WI; First Solar, Tempe, AZ; Wabtec, Pittsburgh, PA; International Trade & Transportation, Pinehurst, TX.

Obligor: Reko Diq Mining Company, Balochistan province, Pakistan.

Guarantor(s): n/a.

Description of Items Being Exported: Engineering, Procurement, and Construction Management services; mining trucks, feeders, grinders, and related equipment; trucks, crushers, graders, and other related machinery; solar panels, rail transportation equipment; and consultancy services.

Information on Decision: Information on the final decision for these transactions will be available in the “Summary Minutes of Meetings of Board of Directors” on <http://exim.gov/newsandevents/boardmeetings/board/ConfidentialInformation>: Please note that this notice does not include confidential or proprietary business information; information which, if disclosed, would violate the Trade Secrets Act; or information which would jeopardize jobs in the United States by supplying information that competitors could use to compete with companies in the United States.