permit no. 0060–OP24, issued by Allegheny County Health Department to Neville Chemical Company in Neville Township, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. On September 16, 2025, the EPA Administrator issued an order granting in part and denying in part the petition. The order itself explains the basis for the EPA's decision.

Sections 307(b) and 505(b)(2) of the CAA provide that a petitioner may request judicial review of those portions of an order that deny issues in a petition. Any petition for review shall be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit no later than January 20, 2026.

Michael Dunn,

Acting Director, Air & Radiation Division, Region III.

[FR Doc. 2025–20412 Filed 11–19–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–13048–01–OAR]

Notice of November 2025 Decisions on Petitions for Small Refinery Exemptions Under the Renewable Fuel Standard Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Decision on petitions.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is providing notification of its final action entitled November 2025 Decision on Petitions for RFS Small Refinery Exemptions (''November 2025 SRE Decisions Action'') in which EPA issued decisions on 16 small refinery exemption (SRE) petitions under the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) program. EPA is providing this notification for public awareness of, and the basis for, EPA's decision announced on November 7, 2025.

DATES: November 20, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Campbell Martin, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20004; telephone number: (202) 564–5209; email address: *SRE-Petitions@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background and Final Action

The Clean Air Act (CAA) provides that a small refinery [1] may at any time petition EPA for an extension of the exemption from the obligations of the RFS program for the reason of disproportionate economic hardship (DEH).[2] In evaluating such petitions, the EPA Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, will consider the findings of a Department of Energy (DOE) study and other economic factors.[3]

In the November 2025 SRE Decisions Action,[4] EPA is acting on 16 individual SRE petitions from 8 refineries seeking an exemption from their RFS obligations for the 2021–2024 compliance years. In consultation with DOE, EPA reviewed all the information submitted by each individual refinery in support of its petition. After careful consideration of all statutory factors and the information submitted by the refineries, EPA is granting full (100 percent) exemptions to 2 petitions, granting partial (50 percent) exemptions to 12 petitions, and denying 2 petitions.

The November 2025 SRE Decisions Action articulates EPA's interpretation of section 211(o)(9) of the CAA and EPA's authority with respect to SRE petitions. As required by CAA section 211(o)(9), EPA's final actions on the pending SRE petitions are based on the legal and factual analysis presented herein, after consulting with DOE, and considering the DOE Small Refinery Study and ''other economic factors.''

The November 2025 SRE Decisions Action also explains how EPA will implement SRE decisions when an exemption is granted. In addition, the November 2025 SRE Decisions Action provides a correction to an error in one of the SRE decisions issued in the August 2025 SRE Decisions Action.[5]

II. Judicial Review

Section 307(b)(1) of the CAA governs judicial review of final actions by EPA. This section generally provides that petitions for judicial review of final actions that are nationally applicable must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and petitions for judicial review of actions that are locally or regionally applicable must be filed in the appropriate regional circuit.[6] However, petitions for judicial review of a final action that is locally or regionally applicable must be filed in the D.C. Circuit when ''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.'' [7]

As the Supreme Court recently articulated in *Calumet,* the first step in determining the appropriate venue for judicial review of an EPA final action is to ascertain whether the action at issue is nationally applicable or locally or regionally applicable.[8] If the action is nationally applicable, judicial review belongs in the D.C. Circuit. If the action is locally or regionally applicable, then the second step is to determine whether EPA has appropriately invoked the ''nationwide scope or effect'' exception to ''override the default rule'' that judicial review of a locally or regionally applicable action belongs in the appropriate regional circuit.[9] The exception applies, and judicial review of EPA's action belongs in the D.C. Circuit, if EPA invokes the exception for a final action that is ''based on a determination of nationwide scope or effect'' and accompanied by an EPA finding of this basis.[10] A determination is ''the justification [EPA] gives for it[s] action, which can be found in its explanation of its action.'' [11] A determination has a nationwide scope when it applies throughout the country as a legal matter, and it has a nationwide effect when it applies throughout the country as a practical matter.[12] Finally, an action is ''based on'' a determination of nationwide scope or effect when the determination ''lie[s] at the core of the agency action,'' so as to form the most important part of the agency's reasoning.[13] Put another way, an EPA action is based on a determination of nationwide scope or effect ''only if a justification of nationwide breadth is the primary explanation for and driver of EPA's action.'' [14]

In the November 2025 SRE Decisions Action, EPA is adjudicating SRE petitions pursuant to the authority granted to the Agency by CAA section 211(o)(9)(B). Each adjudication is a separate ''action'' for the purposes of determining venue under CAA section 307(b)(1), and because each adjudication only applies to a single refinery, each action is locally or

[1] The CAA defines a small refinery as ''a refinery for which the average aggregate daily crude oil throughput for a calendar year . . . does not exceed 75,000 barrels.'' CAA section 211(*o*)(1)(K).

[2] CAA section 211(o)(9)(B)(i).

[3] CAA section 211(o)(9)(B)(ii).

[4] EPA, ''November 2025 Decision on Petitions for RFS Small Refinery Exemptions,'' EPA–420–R–25–013, November 2025.

[5] EPA, ''August 2025 Decision on Petitions for RFS Small Refinery Exemptions,'' EPA–420–R–25–010, August 2025.

[6] CAA section 307(b)(1).

[7] *Id.*

[8] *Calumet,* 145 S. Ct. at 1746.

[9] *Id.* at 1746.

[10] *Id.* at 1749–50.

[11] *Id.* at 1750 (internal quotations omitted).

[12] *Id.*

[13] *Id.* at 1751.

[14] *Id.*

regionally applicable.[15] However, EPA's adjudication of the relevant petitions is based on several determinations of nationwide scope or effect that formed the core basis for the Agency's decision.

First, these adjudications are based on EPA's determination that CAA section 211(o)(9) provides EPA with the authority to find that a small refinery would experience partial DEH if required to comply with its RFS obligations and to extend a partial exemption. As detailed in Section III.H, CAA section 211(o)(9)(B) grants EPA authority to temporarily extend the exemption from RFS obligations to a small refinery that demonstrates ''disproportionate economic hardship,'' but the statute does not define that phrase or its components, suggesting Congress left it to the Agency's discretion to ''fill up the details'' when determining how to implement this provision.[16] EPA interprets CAA section 211(o)(9)(B), based on the plain language, structure, and objective of the statute, to provide the Agency with the authority to find that a small refinery would experience partial DEH and to extend a partial exemption. This determination has nationwide scope because it is an interpretation of a federal statute and CAA section 211(o)(9)(B)(i) by its terms applies nationwide.[17] Additionally, this determination has nationwide effect because it applies generically to all refineries nationwide, regardless of their geographic location.[18]

Second, these adjudications are based on EPA's determination that the DOE matrix is a reasonable proxy for DEH, and EPA will defer to DOE's findings unless EPA's consideration of other economic factors compels a different result. As detailed in Section III.E, CAA section 211(o)(9)(B) permits a small refinery to petition for an extension of the exemption from its RFS obligations for the reason of DEH. The statute directs EPA to ''consider the findings of the [2011 DOE study] and other economic factors'' in evaluating a petition but provides no further instruction as to how to effectuate these obligations.[19] As the author of the study and through its work assessing SRE petitions in conjunction with EPA, DOE has developed extensive expertise in evaluating economic conditions at U.S. refineries that is fundamental to the process both DOE and EPA use to identify whether DEH exists for each petitioner. With limited exceptions, EPA has consistently relied upon DOE's expertise in the Agency's adjudication of SRE petitions over the life of the RFS program. Thus, EPA has determined that the best way to fulfill its obligation to ''consider the findings of the [2011 DOE study]'' under CAA section 211(o)(9)(B) is to defer to DOE's application of its matrix and resulting findings in evaluating whether a small refinery would experience DEH. EPA has further determined that the best way to fulfill its obligation to consider ''other economic factors'' is to independently assess all available information and weigh whether this information compels EPA to depart from DOE's findings. This determination has nationwide scope because it is both an interpretation of a federal statute and CAA section 211(o)(9)(B)(i) by its terms applies nationwide, and it is a rebuttable presumption that DOE's finding as to whether a given small refinery would experience DEH, based on application of the DOE matrix, is correct, unless EPA's consideration of other economic factors compels it to depart from DOE's findings. Additionally, this determination has nationwide effect because it applies generically to all refineries nationwide, regardless of their geographic location.

Third, these adjudications are based on EPA's determination that, when extending the exemption, either wholly or partially, to a small refinery that has already retired RINs to comply with its RFS obligations, CAA section 211(o) restricts EPA to returning some or all of those retired RINs, commensurate with the degree of the exemption. As detailed in Section IV.B, returning RINs in this manner effectuates the best reading of the statute. CAA section 211(o)(5) requires that every instance of RIN generation be associated with the refining, blending, or importation of renewable fuel. Section 211(o)(5) also requires that RINs expire after a certain amount of time, while section 211(o)(9)(B) permits small refineries to petition for an extension of the exemption ''at any time.'' EPA interprets these provisions of CAA section 211(o) to limit EPA to returning RINs retired for compliance, if any, when it grants an extension of the exemption. This determination has nationwide scope because it is an interpretation of a federal statute and CAA sections 211(o)(5) and 211(o)(9)(B) by their terms apply nationwide. Additionally, this determination has nationwide effect because it applies generically to all refineries nationwide, regardless of their geographic location.

This third determination also minimizes disruptions to the RIN market and RFS program, akin to the Fifth Circuit's review of the April 2022 Alternative Compliance Action[20] in *Wynnewood Refining Co., LLC* v. *EPA,* 86 F.4th 1114 (5th Cir. 2023). In *Wynnewood,* the Fifth Circuit concluded that the ACA was based on a determination of nationwide scope or effect because the ACA was designed to mitigate the impact of the collective denials from the April 2022 SRE Denial Action on the RIN market.[21] After denying 36 SRE petitions for the 2018 compliance year, EPA estimated that the small refineries would need to retire an additional 1.4 billion RINs to satisfy their 2018 compliance obligations.[22] Concerned that such a drastic spike in need for RINs would threaten the viability of the RIN market, EPA issued the ACA, which required that the small refineries file a revised compliance report but did not require them to retire additional RINs.[23] The Fifth Circuit reasoned that, because the purpose of the ACA was to address the continuing viability of the RFS program as a whole, it was based on a determination of nationwide scope or effect.[24] Similarly here, EPA's determination that the only permissible means of implementing the extension of the exemption is by returning retired RINs is based on concerns about the integrity of the RFS program as a whole. As explained in Section IV.B, EPA estimates that, were the Agency to replace the retired RINs with current vintage RINs, it would introduce approximately 3 billion new RINs into the market. The sudden mass influx of new RINs would result in decreased RIN prices, leading to decreased future investments in renewable fuel production and threatening the stabilty of the RIN market nationwide. EPA's approach of returning retired RINs is designed to avoid these negative impacts to the RFS program. Following the reasoning from the *Wynnewood* decision, because the purpose of this determination is to address the continuing viability of the RFS program as a whole, it is a determination of nationwide scope or effect.

[15] *Id.* at 1748.

[16] *Loper Bright Enters.* v. *Raimondo,* 603 U.S. 369, 394–95.

[17] *Calumet,* 145 S. Ct. at 1752.

[18] *Id.*

[19] CAA section 211(o)(9)(B).

[20] ''April 2022 Alternative RFS Compliance Demonstration Approach for Certain Small Refineries,'' EPA–420–R–22–006, April 2022 (''ACA'').

[21] *Wynnewood Refining Co., LLC* v. *EPA,* 86 F.4th 1114, 1119 (5th Cir. 2023).

[22] *Id.* at 1119–20.

[23] *Id.* at 1117, 1120.

[24] *Id.* at 1120.

The actions discussed within the November 2025 SRE Decisions Action are based on the three determinations outlined above, as these determinations lie ''at the core of the agency action[s]'' so as to form the most important part of EPA's reasoning.[25] The first and second determinations together form the core basis for EPA's adjudications because the Agency has used both of them to create a rebuttable presumption that application of the DOE matrix produces 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.'' [26] 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.[27] 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 November 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 January 20, 2026.

Aaron Szabo,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 2025–20440 Filed 11–19–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[25] *Calumet,* 145 S. Ct. at 1751.

[26] *Id.*

[27] *Id.* at 1752.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–11423–02–OAR]

Acid Rain Program: Excess Emissions Penalty Inflation Adjustments

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of annual adjustment factors.

SUMMARY: The Acid Rain Program requires sources that do not meet their annual Acid Rain emissions limitations for sulfur dioxide (SO_2) or nitrogen oxides (NO_X) to pay inflation-adjusted excess emissions penalties. This document provides notice of the annual adjustment factors used to calculate excess emissions penalties for compliance years 2025 and 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bryan Ramirez at (202) 564–7591 or *ramirez.bryan@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Acid Rain Program limits SO_2 and NO_X emissions from fossil fuel-fired electricity generating units. All affected sources must hold allowances sufficient to cover their annual SO_2 mass emissions, and certain coal-fired units must meet annual average NO_X emission rate limits. Under 40 CFR 77.6, any source that does not meet these requirements must pay an excess emissions penalty without demand to the EPA Administrator. The automatic