

(v) Duress, coercion, or desperation.
(vi) Family obligations or comparable obligations to third-parties.

(vii) Age, education, cultural background, and judgmental maturity.

(3) Whether a valid legal defense would have precluded a conviction for AWOL or misconduct under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. For purposes of this paragraph, the defense must go directly to the substantive issue of absence or misconduct rather than to procedures, technicalities, or formalities.

(f) *Board of corrections upgrade.* An honorable discharge or discharge under honorable conditions issued through a board for correction of records established under authority of 10 U.S.C. 1552 is final and conclusive on the Department of Veterans Affairs. The action of the board sets aside any prior bar to benefits imposed under paragraph (c) or (d) of this section.

(g) *Discharge review board upgrades prior to October 8, 1977.* An honorable or general discharge issued prior to October 8, 1977, under authority other than that listed in paragraphs (i)(1), (2), and (3) of this section by a discharge review board established under 10 U.S.C. 1553, sets aside any bar to benefits imposed under paragraph (c) or (d) of this section except the bar contained in paragraph (c)(2) of this section.

(h) *Discharge review board upgrades on or after October 8, 1977.* An honorable or general discharge issued on or after October 8, 1977, by a discharge review board established under 10 U.S.C. 1553, sets aside a bar to benefits imposed under paragraph (d), but not under paragraph (c) of this section provided that:

* * * * *

(i) *Special review board upgrades.* Unless a discharge review board established under 10 U.S.C. 1553 determines on an individual case basis that the discharge would be upgraded under uniform standards meeting the requirements set forth in paragraph (h) of this section, an honorable or general discharge awarded under one of the following programs does not remove any bar to benefits imposed under this section:

* * * * *

(j) *Overpayments after October 8, 1977, due to discharge review board upgrades.* No overpayments shall be created as a result of payments made after October 8, 1977, based on an upgraded honorable or general discharge issued under one of the programs listed in paragraph (i) of this section which would not be awarded

under the standards set forth in paragraph (h) of this section. Accounts in payment status on or after October 8, 1977, shall be terminated the end of the month in which it is determined that the original other than honorable discharge was not issued under conditions other than dishonorable following notice from the appropriate discharge review board that the discharge would not have been upgraded under the standards set forth in paragraph (h) of this section, or April 7, 1978, whichever is the earliest. Accounts in suspense (either before or after October 8, 1977) shall be terminated on the date of last payment or April 7, 1978, whichever is the earliest.

(k) *Overpayments after October 8, 1977, based on application of AWOL statutory bar.*

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2020-14559 Filed 7-9-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320-01-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R07-OAR-2020-0339; FRL-10011-79-Region 7]

Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Control of Emissions From Industrial Surface Coating Operations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve revisions to the Missouri State Implementation Plan (SIP) received on March 7, 2019. The submission revises Missouri's regulation that restricts the emissions of volatile organic compounds from industrial surface coating operations in St. Louis City and Jefferson, St. Charles, Franklin, and St. Louis Counties. Specifically, the revisions to the rule adds a new surface coating category for the decorative coating of foam products, establishes an appropriate emission limit for this type of surface coating operation, removes obsolete provisions that were applicable prior to March 1, 2012, removes a reference to a rule that is being rescinded, removes the unnecessary use of restrictive words, adds definitions specific to this rule, changes rule language to be consistent with defined terms, and updates incorporations by reference.

The new emission limit for decorative coating of foam products is a SIP

strengthening and will not adversely impact the air quality in the St. Louis area. The remaining revisions are administrative in nature and do not impact the stringency of the SIP or air quality. Approval of these revisions will ensure consistency between state and federally-approved rules.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 10, 2020.

ADDRESSES: You may send comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2020-0339 to <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the Docket ID No. for this rulemaking. Comments received will be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov/>, including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on sending comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the "Written Comments" heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Stone, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7 Office, Air Quality Planning Branch, 11201 Renner Boulevard, Lenexa, Kansas 66219; telephone number: (913) 551-7714; email address: stone.william@epa.gov.

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

Table of Contents

- I. Written Comments
- II. What is being addressed in this document?
- III. Have the requirements for approval of a SIP revision been met?
- IV. What action is EPA taking?
- V. Incorporation by Reference
- VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Written Comments

Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R07-OAR-2020-0339, at <https://www.regulations.gov>. 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, 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>.

II. What is being addressed in this document?

The EPA is proposing to approve revisions to the Missouri SIP received on March 7, 2019. The revisions are to Title 10, Division 10 of the Code of State Regulations, 10 CSR 10–5.330 “Control of Emissions From Industrial Surface Coating Operations”, which restricts the emissions of volatile organic compounds from industrial surface coating operations in St. Louis City and Jefferson, St. Charles, Franklin, and St. Louis Counties. These revisions are described in detail in the technical support document (TSD) included in the docket for this action.

Missouri received three comments from EPA during the comment period. Missouri responded to all three comments, as noted in the State submission included in the docket for this action. Therefore, the EPA is proposing to approve the revisions to this rule because it will not have a negative impact on air quality.

III. Have the requirements for approval of a SIP revision been met?

The state submission has met the public notice requirements for SIP submissions in accordance with 40 CFR 51.102. The submission also satisfied the completeness criteria of 40 CFR part 51, appendix V. The state provided public notice of the revisions from August 1, 2018, to October 4, 2018, and held a public hearing on September 27, 2018. The state received and addressed three comments. As explained in more detail in the TSD which is part of this docket, the SIP revision submission meets the substantive requirements of the CAA, including section 110 and implementing regulations.

IV. What action is EPA taking?

The EPA is proposing to amend the Missouri SIP by approving the State’s request to revise 10 CSR 10–5.330 “Control of Emissions From Industrial Surface Coating Operations.” Approval of these revisions will ensure consistency between state and federally-approved rules. The EPA has determined that these changes will not adversely impact air quality.

The EPA is processing this as a proposed action because we are soliciting comments on the action. Final rulemaking will occur after consideration of any comments.

V. Incorporation by Reference

In this document, the EPA is proposing to include regulatory text in a final rule that includes incorporation by reference. In accordance with requirements of 1 CFR 51.5, the EPA is proposing to incorporate by reference the Missouri Regulations described in the proposed amendments to 40 CFR part 52 set forth below. EPA has made, and will continue to make, these materials generally available through www.regulations.gov and at the EPA Region 7 Office (please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this preamble for more information).

VI. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Under the Clean Air Act (CAA), the Administrator is required to approve a SIP submission that complies with the provisions of the Act and applicable Federal regulations. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k); 40 CFR 52.02(a). Thus, in reviewing SIP submissions, the EPA’s role is to approve state choices, provided that they meet the criteria of the CAA. Accordingly, this action merely approves state law as meeting Federal requirements and does not impose additional requirements beyond those imposed by state law. 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 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011);
- Is not an Executive Order 13771 (82 FR 9339, February 2, 2017) regulatory action because SIP approvals are exempted under Executive Order 12866.
- 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 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 the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTA) because this rulemaking does not involve technical standards; and

- Does not provide EPA with the discretionary authority to address, as appropriate, disproportionate human health or environmental effects, using practicable and legally permissible methods, under Executive Order 12898 (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

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).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Incorporation by reference, Particulate matter, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: June 29, 2020.

James Gulliford,

Regional Administrator, Region 7.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the EPA proposes to amend 40 CFR part 52 as set forth below:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart—AA Missouri

■ 2. In § 52.1320, the table in paragraph (c) is amended by revising the entry “10–5.330” to read as follows:

§ 52.1320 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

EPA-APPROVED MISSOURI REGULATIONS

Missouri citation	Title	State effective date	EPA approval date	Explanation
Missouri Department of Natural Resources				
* * * * *				
Chapter 5-Air Quality Standards and Air Pollution Control Regulations for the St. Louis Metropolitan Area				
* * * * *				
10-5.330	Control of Emissions From Industrial Surface Coating Operations.	3/30/2019	[Date of publication of the final rule in the Federal Register], [Federal Register citation of the final rule].	
* * * * *				

* * * * *
 [FR Doc. 2020-14444 Filed 7-9-20; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0309; FRL-10011-43-Region 9]

Finding of Failure To Attain the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards; California; Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to determine that the Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin nonattainment area failed to attain the 2006 24-hour fine particulate matter (“PM_{2.5}”) national ambient air quality standards by the December 31, 2019 “Serious” area attainment date. This proposed determination is based on ambient air quality monitoring data from 2017 through 2019. If the EPA finalizes this determination as proposed, the State of California will be required to submit a revision to the California State Implementation Plan that, among other elements, provides for expeditious attainment within the time limits prescribed by regulation and provides for a five percent annual reduction in the emissions of direct PM_{2.5} or a PM_{2.5} plan precursor pollutant. We are also proposing to correct an error in the table of California area designations for the 2006 PM_{2.5} national ambient air quality standards.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 10, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0309 at <https://www.regulations.gov>. For comments submitted at *Regulations.gov*, follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *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>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ginger Vagenas, Air Planning Office (AIR-2), EPA Region IX, (415) 972-3964, vagenas.ginger@epa.gov.

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

Table of Contents

- I. Background
 - A. PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards

- B. South Coast Designations, Classifications, and Attainment Dates for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS
- II. Proposed Determination and Consequences
 - A. Applicable Statutory and Regulatory Provisions
 - B. Monitoring Network Considerations
 - C. Data Considerations and Proposed Determination
 - D. Consequences for a Serious PM_{2.5} Nonattainment Area Failing To Attain the Standards by the Attainment Date
- III. Proposed Error Correction
- IV. Proposed Actions and Request for Public Comment
- V. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

I. Background

A. PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards

Under section 109 of the Clean Air Act (CAA or “Act”), the EPA has established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS or “standards”) for certain pervasive air pollutants (referred to as “criteria pollutants”) and conducts periodic reviews of the NAAQS to determine whether they should be revised or whether new NAAQS should be established.

In October 2006, the EPA revised the 24-hour NAAQS for fine particulate matter (particles with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less or PM_{2.5})¹ (“2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS”) to provide increased protection of public health by lowering

¹ The EPA established both primary and secondary standards for the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Primary standards provide public health protection, including protecting the health of “sensitive” populations such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly. Secondary standards provide public welfare protection, including protection against decreased visibility and damage to animals, crops, vegetation, and buildings. Since the primary and secondary standards for 24-hour PM_{2.5} are set at the same level, we refer to them herein using the singular “2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS” or “2006 PM_{2.5} standard.”