

# Federal Register Notice

2492 - 2498 Federal Register / Vol. 52, No. 14 / Thursday, January 22, 1987 / Proposed Rules

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300  
[SW-FRL-3144-6]

### Amendment to National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan; the National Priorities List

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

#### SUMMARY:

The Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") is proposing the sixth update to the National Priorities List ("NPL"). This update contains 64 sites. The NPL is Appendix B to the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan ("NCP"), which EPA promulgated pursuant to section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 ("CERCLA") and Executive Order 12316. CERCLA requires that the NPL be revised at least annually. Today's notice proposes the sixth major revision to the NPL.

These sites are being proposed because they meet the eligibility requirements of the NPL. EPA has included on the NPL releases and threatened releases of designated hazardous substances, as well as "pollutants or contaminants" which may present an imminent and substantial danger to the public health or welfare. This notice provides the public with an opportunity to comment on placing these sites on the NPL.

#### DATES:

Comments must be submitted on or before March 23, 1987.

#### ADDRESSES:

Comments may be mailed to:

Russel H. Wyer  
Director, Hazardous Site Control Division (Attn: NPL Staff)  
Office of Superfund Remediation Technology Innovation (WH-548E)  
Environmental Protection Agency  
401M Street SW.  
Washington, DC 20460

Addresses for the Headquarters and Regional dockets are provided below. For further details on what these dockets contain, see the Public Comment Section, Section IV, of the "**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**" portion of this preamble.

Denise Sines  
Headquarters, U.S. EPA CERCLA Docket Office  
Waterside Mall Subbasement  
401 M Street SW.  
Washington, DC 20460  
202/382-3046

Peg Nelson  
Region 1  
U.S. EPA Library, Room E121  
John F. Kennedy Federal Bldg.  
Boston, MA 02203  
617/223-5791

Carole Petersen  
Region 2  
U.S. EPA, Site Investigation & Compliance Branch  
26 Federal Plaza, 7th Floor, Room 737  
New York, NY 10278  
212/264-8677

Diane McCreary  
Region 3  
U.S. EPA Library, 5th Floor  
841 Chestnut Bldg.  
9th & Chestnut Streets  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
215/597-0580

Gayle Alston  
Region 4  
U.S. EPA Library, Room G-6  
345 Courtland Street NE.  
Atlanta, GA 30365  
404/347-4216

Jeanne Griffin  
Region 5  
U.S. EPA  
230 South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, IL 60604  
312/886-3007

Barry Nash  
Region 6  
U.S. EPA  
InterFirst II Bldg.  
1201 Elm Street  
Dallas, TX 75270  
214/767-4075

Connie McKenzie  
Region 7  
U.S. EPA Library  
726 Minnesota Avenue  
Kansas City, KS 66101  
913/236-2828

Dolores Eddy  
Region 8  
U.S. EPA, Library  
999 18th Street, Suite 1300  
Denver, CO 80202-2413  
303/293-1444

Jean Circiello  
Region 9  
U.S. EPA Library, 6th Floor  
215 Fremont Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
415/974-8076

Joan Shafer  
Region 10  
U.S. EPA, 11th Floor  
1200 6th Avenue, Mail Stop 525  
Seattle, WA 98101  
206/442-4903

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Ann B. Sarno  
Hazardous Site Control Division  
Office of Superfund Remediation Technology Innovation (WH-548E)  
Environmental Protection Agency  
401 M Street SW.  
Washington, DC 20460  
Phone (800) 424-9346 (or 382-3000 in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Table of Contents**

- I. Introduction
- II. Purpose of the NPL
- III. NPL Update Process
- IV. Public Comment Period
- V. Eligibility
- VI. Contents of the Proposed Sixth NPL Update
- VII. Regulatory Impact Analysis
- VIII. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

## **I. Introduction**

In 1980, Congress enacted the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. section 9601, *et seq.* ("CERCLA" or "the Act") in response to the dangers of uncontrolled hazardous waste sites. To implement CERCLA, EPA promulgated the revised National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan, 40 CFR Part 300, on July 16, 1983 (47 FR 31180), pursuant to section 105 of CERCLA and Executive Order 12316 (46 FR 42237, August 20, 1981). The National Contingency Plan ("NCP"), further revised by EPA on September 16, 1985 (50 FR 37624) and November 20, 1985 (50 FR 47912), sets forth the guidelines and procedures needed to respond to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants under CERCLA.

Section 105(8)(A) of CERCLA requires that the NCP include criteria for determining priorities among releases or threatened releases for the purpose of taking remedial or removal action. Removal action involves cleanup or other actions that are taken in response to emergency conditions or on a short-term or temporary basis (CERCLA section 101(23)). Remedial action tends to be long-term in nature and involves response actions which are consistent with a permanent remedy for a release (CERCLA section 101(24)). These criteria are included in Appendix A of the NCP, *Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Site Ranking System: A User's Manual* (the "Hazard Ranking System" or "HRS") (47 FR 31219, July 16, 1982).

Section 105(8)(B) of CERCLA requires that the statutory criteria described in the HRS be used to prepare a list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases throughout the United States. The list, which is Appendix B of the NCP, is the National Priorities List ("NPL").

Today, in this notice, EPA is proposing to add 64 sites to the NPL, bringing the number of proposed sites to a 248.<sup>1</sup> The final NPL contains 703 sites. EPA is proposing to include on the NPL sites at which there are or have been releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, or of "pollutants or contaminants." The discussion below may refer to "releases or threatened releases" simply as "releases," "facilities," or "sites".

---

<sup>1</sup> The total number of proposed sites reflects the removal of Silver Creek Tailings site from proposed status, as required by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (section 118(p)), effective October 17, 1986.

## II. Purpose of the NPL

The primary purpose of the NPL is stated in the legislative history of CERCLA (Report of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senate Report No. 96-848, 96th Cong., 2d. Sess. 60 (1980)):

The priority lists serve primarily informational purposes, identifying for the States and the public those facilities and sites or other releases which appear to warrant remedial actions. Inclusion of a facility or site on the list does not in itself reflect a judgment of the activities of its owner or operator, it does not require those persons to undertake any action, nor does it assign liability to any person. Subsequent government action in the form of remedial actions or enforcement actions will be necessary in order to do so, and these actions will be attended by all appropriate procedural safeguards.

The primary purpose of the NPL, therefore, is to serve as an informational tool for use by EPA in identifying sites that appear to present a significant risk to public health or the environment. The initial identification of a site for the NPL is intended primarily to guide EPA in determining which sites warrant further investigation, to assess the nature and extent of the public health and environmental risks associated with the site, and to determine what CERCLA-financed remedial action(s), if any, may be appropriate. Inclusion of a site on the NPL does not establish that EPA necessary will undertake remedial action. Moreover, listing does not require any action of any private party, nor does it determine the liability of any party for the cost of cleanup at the site. In addition, a site need not be on the NPL to be the subject of CERCLA financed removal actions, remedial investigations/feasibility studies, or actions brought pursuant to sections 106 or 107(a)(4)(B) of CERCLA.

In addition, although the HRS scores used to place sites on the NPL may be helpful to the Agency in determining priorities for cleanup and other response activities, EPA does not rely on the scores as the sole means of determining such priorities. The information collected to develop HRS scores is not sufficient in itself to determine the appropriate remedy for a particular site. EPA relies on further, more detailed studies to determine what response, if any, is appropriate. These studies will take into account the extent and magnitude of the contaminants in the environment, the risk to affected populations, the cost to correct problems at the site, and the response actions that have been taken by potentially responsible parties or others. Decisions on the type and extent of action to be taken at these sites are made in accordance with the criteria contained in Subpart F of the NCP. After conducting these additional studies, EPA may conclude that it is not desirable to conduct response action at some sites on the NPL because of more pressing needs at other sites, or because an enforcement action may instigate or force private-party cleanup. Given the limited resources available in the Hazardous Substance Response Trust Fund established under CERCLA, the Agency must carefully balance the relative needs for response at the numerous sites it has studied. It is also possible that EPA will conclude after further analysis that the site does not warrant response action.

## III. NPL Update Process

There are three mechanisms for placing sites on the NPL. The principal mechanism is the application of the HRS. The HRS serves as a screening device to evaluate the relative potential of uncontrolled hazardous substances to cause human health and safety problems, or ecological or environmental damage. The HRS takes into account "pathways" to human or environmental exposure in terms of numerical scores. Those sites that score 28.50 or greater on the HRS, and which are otherwise eligible, are proposed for listing.

The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), enacted on October 17, 1986, directs EPA to revise the HRS. The Agency will continue to use the existing HRS until the revised HRS becomes effective. Sites proposed for, or included on, the NPL prior to the effective date of the revised HRS will not be reevaluated.

In addition, States may designate a single site as the State top priority. In rare instances, EPA may utilize the listing provision promulgated as § 300.66(b)(4) of the NCP (50 FR 37624, September 16, 1985).

Section 300.66(b)(4) of the NCP allows certain sites with HRS scores below 28.50 to be eligible for the NPL. These sites may qualify for the NPL if all of the following occur:

- The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has issued a health advisory which recommends dissociation of individuals from the release.
- EPA determines that the release poses a significant threat to public health.
- EPA anticipates that it will be more cost-effective to use its remedial authority than to use its removal authority to respond to the release.

States have the primary responsibility for identifying sites, computing HRS scores, and submitting candidate sites to the EPA Regional Offices. EPA Regional Offices conduct a quality control review of the States' candidate sites, and may assist in investigating, monitoring, and scoring sites. Regional Offices may consider candidate sites in addition to those submitted by States. EPA Headquarters conducts further quality assurance audits to ensure accuracy and consistency among the various EPA and State offices participating in the scoring. The Agency then proposes the new sites that meet the criteria for listing and solicits public comments on the proposal. Based on these comments and further EPA review, the Agency determines final scores and promulgates those sites that still qualify for listing.

An original NPL of 406 sites was promulgated on September 8, 1983 (48 FR 40658). The NPL has since been expanded (see 49 FR 19480, May 8, 1984; 49 FR 37070, September 21, 1984; 50 FR 6320, February 14, 1985; 50 FR 37630, September 16, 1985; and 51 FR 21054, June 10, 1986). On March 7, 1986 (51 FR 7935), EPA published a notice to delete eight sites from the NPL. As of June 10, 1986, the number of final NPL sites was 703. Another 184 sites from previous updates remain proposed for the NPL (see 49 FR 40320, October 15, 1984; 50 FR 14115, April 10, 1985; 50 FR 37950, September 18, 1985; and 51 FR 21099, June 10, 1986). With the 64 sites in proposed Update #6, 248 sites are now proposed for the NPL.

## IV. Public Comment Period

This **Federal Register** notice proposing sites for NPL Update #6 opens the formal 60-day comment period. Comments may be mailed to:

Russel H. Wyer  
Director, Hazardous Site Control Division (Attn: NPL staff)  
Office of Superfund Remediation Technology Innovation (WH-548E)  
Environmental Protection Agency  
401 M Street, SW.  
Washington, DC 20460

The Addresses portion of this notice contains information on where to obtain documents relating to the scoring of these proposed sites. Documents providing EPA's justification for proposing these sites are available to the public in both the Headquarters public docket and in the appropriate Regional Office's public docket.

The Headquarters public docket for NPL Update #6 contains: HRS score sheets for each proposed site; a Documentation Record for each site describing the technical rationale for the HRS scores; and a list of reference documents. The Headquarters public docket is located in EPA Headquarters, Waterside Mall Subbasement, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460, and is available for viewing by appointment only from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday excluding holidays. Requests for copies of the HRS documents may be directed to the EPA Headquarters docket office.

The Regional public dockets contain HRS score sheets, Documentation Records, and a list of reference documents for each site in that Region. These Regional dockets also contain documents referenced in the Documentation Record which contain the data EPA relied upon in calculating or evaluating the HRS scores. The reference documents are available only in the Regional public dockets. These reference documents may be viewed in the appropriate Regional Office, and requests for copies of them may be directed to the appropriate Regional Superfund Branch Office. Documents with some relevance to the scoring of each site, but which were not used as references, are also available only in the appropriate EPA Regional office, and may be viewed and copied by arrangement with that office. An informal written request, rather than a formal request, should be the ordinary procedure for obtaining copies of any of these documents.

EPA considers all comments received during this formal comment period. Comments received are placed into the Headquarters docket and, during the comment period, are available to the public only in the Headquarters docket. A complete set of comments pertaining to sites in a particular EPA Region will be available for viewing in the Regional Office docket approximately one week following the close of the formal comment period. Comments received after the close of the comment period will be available in the Headquarters docket and in the appropriate Regional Office docket on an "as received" basis. An informal written request, rather than a formal request, should be the ordinary procedure for obtaining copies of these comments. After considering the relevant comments received during the comment period, EPA will add to the NPL all proposed sites that meet EPA's criteria for listing. In past NPL rulemakings, EPA has considered comments received after the close of the comment period. However, with the increased frequency of NPL rulemakings, EPA may no longer be able to consider late comments.

## V. Eligibility

CERCLA restricts EPA's authority to respond to certain categories of releases and expressly excludes some substances from the definition of release. In addition, as a matter of policy, EPA may choose not to use CERCLA to respond to certain types of releases because other authorities can be used to achieve cleanup of these releases. Preambles to previous NPL rulemakings have discussed examples of these policies. (See, e.g., 48 FR 40658 (September 8, 1983); 49 FR 37070 (September 21, 1984); 49 FR 40320 (October 15, 1984); and 51 FR 21056 (June 10, 1986).) Sites proposed for the NPL in this update meet these past eligibility policies. The policies regarding Federal facilities and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) sites are relevant to this update and are discussed below.

### ***Federal Facility Releases***

CERCLA as amended by section 120(a) of SARA, requires that Federal facilities be subject to, and comply with, the Act in the same manner as any non-governmental entity. In addition, listing Federal facilities is consistent with the NPL's purpose of providing information to the public with respect to sites that present potential hazards. CERCLA section 111(e)(3), however, prohibits use of the Trust Fund for remedial actions at Federally-owned facilities.

For Update #6, the Agency is proposing one Federal facility (listed in Table 2) and requests comments on the scoring of this site. As of today, EPA has proposed 48 Federal facilities for the NPL.

### ***Releases from Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Sites***

On June 10, 1986 (51 FR 21057), EPA announced components of a final policy for placing sites on the NPL that are subject to the corrective action requirements of Subtitle C of RCRA. At the same time, the Agency requested comment on several proposed components of the RCRA/NPL policy (51 FR 21109). Under the final policy, sites not subject to RCRA Subtitle C corrective action requirements will remain eligible for the NPL. Examples of NPL-eligible sites include:

- Facilities that ceased treating, storing, or disposing of hazardous wastes prior to November 19, 1980 (the effective date of Phase I of the Subtitle C regulations).
- Sites at which only materials exempted from the statutory or regulatory definition of solid waste or hazardous waste are managed.
- Hazardous waste generators or transporters not required to have Interim Status or a final RCRA permit.

Sites with releases that can be addressed under the RCRA Subtitle C corrective action authorities generally will not be placed on the NPL. However, RCRA sites may be listed if they meet all of the other criteria for listing (e.g., an HRS score of 28.50 or greater), and if they fall within one of the following categories:

1. Facilities owned by persons who are bankrupt.
2. Facilities that have lost authorization to operate, and for which there are additional indications that the owner or operator will be unwilling to undertake corrective action.
3. Sites, analyzed on a case-by-case basis, whose owners or operators have shown an unwillingness to undertake corrective action.

EPA is reviewing comments submitted in response to the proposed components of the RCRA policy and is in the process of developing a complete final RCRA policy. However, based on the application of the final components of the RCRA/NPL policy announced on June 10, 1986 (51 FR 21057), EPA is proposing four RCRA sites for the NPL. Three of these sites are bankrupt:

- Parsons Casket Hardware Co., Belvidere, Illinois
- Allied Plating, Inc., Portland, Oregon
- Palmetto Recycling, Inc., Columbia, South Carolina

EPA has determined that a fourth RCRA facility is eligible for the NPL because it has lost its RCRA authorization to operate and appears unwilling to undertake corrective action. This site is:

- Chem-Solv, Inc., Cheswold, Delaware

Chem-Solv lost authorization to operate in August 1985 when the State of Delaware denied its RCRA storage permit. In 1984 and 1985 the State issued two orders requiring Chem-Solv to begin remedial action at the site in order to address imminent hazards. Chem-Solv has refused to comply with these orders; the company has stated that it is financially unable to perform remedial action.

Documents supporting the decisions for these RCRA-related sites are contained in the appropriate Regional dockets and are available for public review.

## **VI. Contents of the Proposed Sixth NPL Update**

All sites in today's proposed addition to the NPL received HRS scores of 28.50 or above.

Following this preamble is a list of the 64 sites proposed for addition to the NPL (Table 1 and 2). Each entry on the list contains the name of the facility, the State and city or county in which it is located, and the corresponding EPA Region. Each proposed site is placed by score in a group corresponding to groups of 50 sites presented within the final NPL. For example, sites in Group 8 of the proposed update have scores that fall within the range of scores covered by the eighth group of 50 sites on the final NPL. Each entry is accompanied by one or more notations reflecting the status of response and cleanup activities at the site at the time this list was prepared. Because this information may change periodically, these notations may become outdated.

Five response categories are used to designate the type of response underway. One or more categories may apply to each site. The categories are:

Federal and/or State response (R), Federal enforcement (F), State enforcement (S), Voluntary or negotiated response (V), and Category to be determined (D).

EPA also indicates the status of significant Fund-financed or private-party cleanup activities underway or completed at proposed and final NPL sites. There are three cleanup status codes; only one code is necessary to designate the status of cleanup activities at each site since the codes are mutually exclusive. The codes are:

Implementation activities are underway for one or more operable units (I), Implementation activities are completed for one or more (but not all) operable units, but additional site cleanup actions are necessary (O), and Implementation activities are completed for all operable units (C).

These categories and codes are explained in detail in earlier rulemakings, the most recent on June 10, 1986 (51 FR 21075).

## VII. Regulatory Impact Analysis

The costs of cleanup actions that may be taken at sites are not directly attributable to listing on the NPL, as explained below. Therefore, the Agency determined that this rulemaking is not a "major" regulation under Executive Order 12291. EPA has conducted a preliminary analysis of the implications of today's proposal to add new sites. EPA believes that the kinds of economic effects associated with this revision are generally similar to those identified in the regulatory impact analysis (RIA) prepared in 1982 for the revisions to the NCP pursuant to section 105 of CERCLA (47 FR 31180, July 16, 1982) and the economic analysis prepared when the amendments to the NCP were proposed (50 FR 5882, February 12, 1985). The Agency believes the anticipated economic effects related to proposing the addition of these sites to the NPL can be characterized in terms of the conclusions of the earlier RIA and the most recent economic analysis.

### **Costs**

EPA has determined that this proposed rulemaking is not a "major" regulation under Executive Order 12291 because inclusion of a site on the NPL does not itself impose any costs. It does not establish that EPA will necessarily undertake remedial action, nor does it require any action by a private party or determine its liability for site response costs. Costs that arise out of site responses result from site-by-site decisions about what actions to take, not directly from the act of listing itself. Nonetheless, it is useful to consider the costs associated with responding to all sites included in a proposed rulemaking. This action was submitted to the Office Of Management and Budget for review.

The major events that generally follow the proposed listing of a site on the NPL are a search for responsible parties and a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) to determine if remedial actions will be undertaken at a site. Design and construction of the selected remedial alternative follow completion of the RI/FS, and operation and maintenance (O&M) activities may continue after construction has been completed.

Costs associated with responsible party searches are initially borne by EPA. Responsible parties may bear some or all the costs of the RI/FS, design and construction, and O&M, or the costs may be shared by EPA and the States.

The State cost share for cleanup activities has been amended by section 104 of SARA. For privately-owned sites, EPA will pay for 100% of the costs of the RI/FS and remedial planning, and 90% of the costs associated with remedial action. The State will be responsible for 10% of the remedial action. Similarly, at publicly-owned but not publicly operated sites, the cost share for remedial action is 90%:10%. At publicly operated sites, however, the State cost share is at least 50% of all response costs. This includes the RI/FS, remedial design and construction, and O&M.

With regard to O&M for cleanup activities other than ground water or surface water, EPA will share, for up to 1 year, in the cost of that portion of O&M that is necessary to assure that a remedy is operational and functional. After that time, the State assumes full responsibility for O&M. SARA provides that EPA will share in the operational cost associated with ground water/surface water restoration for up to 10 years.

In previous NPL rulemakings, the Agency has provided estimates of the costs associated with these activities (RI/FS, remedial design, remedial action, and O&M) on an average per-site and total cost basis. At this time, however, there is insufficient information to determine what these costs will be as a result of the new requirements under SARA. Until such information is available, the Agency will provide cost estimates based on CERCLA prior to enactment of SARA; these estimates are presented below. EPA is unable to predict what portions of the total costs will be borne by responsible parties, since the distribution of costs depends on the extent of voluntary and negotiated response and



the success of any cost-recovery actions.

<b>Cost category</b>	<b>Average total cost per site <sup>1</sup></b>
RI/FS	\$875,000
Remedial design	850,000
Remedial action	8,600,000 <sup>2</sup>
Net present value of O&M <sup>3</sup>	3,770,000 <sup>2</sup>

Source: "Extent of the Hazardous Release Problem and Future Funding Needs-CERCLA section 301(a)(1)(c) Study", December 1984, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, U.S. EPA.

<sup>1</sup> 1986 U.S. Dollars.

<sup>2</sup> Includes State cost-share.

<sup>3</sup> Assumes cost of O&M over 30 years, \$400,000 for the first year and 10% discount rate.

Costs to States associated with today's proposed amendment arise from the required State cost-share of: (1) 10% of remedial action and 10% of first-year O&M costs at privately-owned sites and sites which are publicly-owned but not publicly-operated; and (2) at least 50% of the remedial planning (RI/FS and remedial design), remedial action and first-year O&M costs at publicly operated sites. States will assume the cost for O&M after the first year. Using the assumptions developed in the 1982 RIA for the NCP, EPA has assumed that 90% of the 63 non-Federal sites proposed to be added to the NPL in this amendment will be privately-owned and 10% will be State- or locally-operated. Therefore, using the budget projections presented above, the cost to States of undertaking Federal remedial actions at all 63 non-Federal sites would be approximately \$294 million, of which approximately \$205 million is attributable to the State O&M cost. As a result of the changes to State cost share under SARA, however, the Agency believes that State O&M costs may actually decrease. When new cost information is available, it will be presented in future rulemakings.

Listing a hazardous waste site on the final NPL does not itself cause firms responsible for the site to bear costs. Nonetheless, a listing may induce firms to clean up the site voluntarily, or it may act as a potential trigger for subsequent enforcement or cost-recovery actions. Such actions may impose costs on firms, but the decisions to take such actions are discretionary and made on a case-by-case basis. Consequently, precise estimates of these effects cannot be made. EPA does not believe that every site will be cleaned up by a responsible party. EPA cannot project at this time which firms or industry sectors will bear specific portions of response costs, but the Agency considers: the volume and nature of the wastes at the site, the parties' ability to pay, and other factors when deciding whether and how to proceed against potentially responsible parties.

Economy-wide effects of this proposed amendment are aggregations of effects on firms and State and local governments. Although effects could be felt by some individual firms and States, the total impact of this revision on output, prices, and employment is expected to be negligible at the national level, as was the case in the 1982 RIA.

### **Benefits**

The Benefits associated with today's proposed amendment to list additional sites are increased health and environmental protection as a result of increased public awareness of potential hazards. In addition to the potential for more Federally-financed remedial actions, this proposed expansion of the NPL could accelerate privately-financed, voluntary cleanup efforts to avoid potential adverse publicity, private lawsuits, and/or Federal or State enforcement actions.

As a result of additional NPL remedies, there will be lower human exposure to high-risk chemicals, and higher-quality surface water, ground water, soil, and air. These benefits are expected to be significant, although difficult to estimate in advance of completing the RI/FS at these particular sites.

Associated with the costs or remedial actions are significant potential benefits and cost offsets. The distributional costs to firms of financing NPL remedies have corresponding "benefits" in that funds expended for a response generate employment, directly or indirectly (through purchased materials).

## VIII. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 requires EPA to review the impacts of this action on small entities, or certify that the action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. By small entities, the Act refers to small businesses, small governmental jurisdictions, and nonprofit organizations.

While proposed modifications to the NPL are considered revisions to the NCP, they are not typical regulatory changes since the revisions do not automatically impose costs. Proposing sites for the NPL does not in itself require any action by any private party, nor does it determine the liability of any party for the cost of cleanup at the site. Further, no identifiable groups are affected as a whole. As a consequence, it is hard to predict impacts on any group. A site's proposed inclusion on the NPL could increase the likelihood that adverse impacts to responsible parties (in the form of cleanup costs) will occur, but EPA cannot identify the potentially affected businesses at this time nor estimate the number of small businesses that might be affected.

The Agency does expect that certain industries and firms within industries that have caused a proportionately high percentage of waste site problems could be significantly affected by CERCLA actions. However, EPA does not expect the impacts from the proposed listing of these sites to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses.

In any case, economic impacts would only occur through enforcement and cost-recovery actions, which are taken at EPA's discretion on a site-by-site basis. EPA considers many factors when determining what enforcement actions to take, including the firm's contribution to the problem and the firm's ability to pay. The impacts from cost recovery on small governments and nonprofit organizations would be determined on a similar case-by-case basis.

### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous materials, Intergovernmental relations, Natural resources, Oil pollution, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Waste treatment and disposal, Water pollution control, Water supply.

Dated: January 15, 1987.

**Jack W. McGraw,**  
*Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.*

### PART 300--[AMENDED]

It is proposed to amend 40 CFR Part 300 as follows:

1. The authority citation for Part 300 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 9605(8)(B)/CERCLA105(8)(B).

2. It is proposed to add the following sites by Group, to Appendix B of Part 300:

**Note.**--In proposed rules, the number in the left column corresponds to the Group number in Appendix B.

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-M**

**Table 1  
National Priorities List - Proposed Update 6 Sites (by Group)  
January 1987**

<b>NPL Gr<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>St</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>City/county</b>	<b>Response category<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Cleanup status<sup>3</sup></b>
1	UT	Wasatch Chemical Co. (Lot 6)	Salt Lake City	V, R, F, S	O
2	IL	Parsons Casket Hardware Co.	Belvidere	D	
2	PA	Salford Quarry	Salford Township	D	
2	VA	Saunders Supply Co.	Chuckatuck	D	
3	CA	S. CA Edison (Visalia Poleyard)	Visalia	D	
3	DE	E.I. Du Pont (Newport Plant Lf)	Newport	D	
3	NC	Aberdeen Pesticide Dumps	Aberdeen	V, R	O
3	NY	Jones Sanitation	Hyde Park	D	
3	PA	Hellertown Manufacturing Co.	Hellertown	D	
3	VA	Greenwood Chemical Co.	Newtown	D	
4	MD	Woodlawn County Landfill	Woodlawn	D	
5	NC	Charles Macon Lagoon & Drum Stor	Cordova	R	O
5	VA	C & R Battery Co., Inc.	Chesterfield County	R	I
6	CA	Watkins-Johnson Co. (Stewart Div)	Scotts Valley	S	I
6	CT	Nutmeg Valley Road	Wolcott	D	
6	PA	River Road Lf (Waste Mngmnt, Inc)	Hermitage	D	
6	WI	Spickler Landfill	Spencer	D	
7	DE	Dover Gas Light Co.	Dover	D	
7	MI	Barrels, Inc.	Lansing	R	I
7	PA	Avco Lycoming (Williamsport Div)	Williamsport	V, S	I
7	PA	Commodore Semiconductor Group	Lower Providence Twp	D	I
7	PA	Novak Sanitary Landfill	South Whitehall Twp	D	
8	OR	Allied Plating, Inc.	Portland	D	
8	SC	Golden Strip Septic Tank Service	Simpsonville	D	
8	TN	Arlington Blending & Packaging	Arlington	R	O
8	VA	H & H Inc., Burn Pit	Farrington	D	
9	DE	Chem-Solv, Inc.	Cheswold	R	O
9	DE	Pigeon Point Landfill	New Castle	D	

<b>NPL Gr<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>St</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>City/county</b>	<b>Response category<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Cleanup status<sup>3</sup></b>
9	SC	Sangamo/Twelve-Mile/Hartwell PCB	Pickens	V, F	
10	GA	Diamond Shamrock Corp. Landfill	Cedartown	D	
10	IN	McCarty's Bald Knob Landfill	Mt. Vernon	D	
10	LA	Dutchtown Treatment Plant	Ascension Parish	D	
10	PA	Aladdin Plating	Scott Township	D	
10	PA	American Electronics Laboratories	Montgomeryville	D	
10	PA	Ametek, Inc. (Hunter Spring Div)	Hatfield	D	
10	PA	Gentle Cleaners/Granite Knitting	Souderton	D	
10	PA	J. W. Rex/Allied Paint/Keystone	Lansdale	D	
10	PA	Spra-Fin, Inc.	North Wales	D	
10	PA	William Dick Lagoons	West Caln Township	D	
11	MO	Kem-Pest Laboratories	Cape Girardeau	D	
11	NJ	Cosden Chemical Coatings Corp.	Beverly	D	
11	NJ	Curcio Scrap Metal, Inc.	Saddle Brook Twp	D	
11	VA	Dixie Caverns County Landfill	Salem	D	
12	KS	Obee Road	Hutchinson	D	
12	NC	Carolina Transformer Co.	Fayetteville	R, F	O
12	NY	Islip Municipal Sanitary Landfill	Islip	D	
12	WI	Tomah Fairgrounds	Tomah	D	
13	GA	Mathis Bros Lf (S Marble Top Rd)	Kensington	D	
13	IL	Stauffer Chem (Chic Heights Plnt)	Chicago Heights	D	
13	MI	Ford Motor Co. (Sludge Lagoon)	Ypsilanti	D	
13	OK	Tenth Street Dump/Junkyard	Oklahoma City	R, F	O
13	PA	Paoli Rail Yards	Paoli	V, F	
13	VA	Rentokil, Inc. (VA Wood Pres Div)	Richmond	D	
13	WI	Tomah Armory	Tomah	D	
14	AR	Jacksonville Municipal Landfill	Jacksonville	D	

<b>NPL Gr<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>St</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>City/county</b>	<b>Response category<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Cleanup status<sup>3</sup></b>
14	AR	Rogers Road Municipal Landfill	Jacksonville	D	
14	MI	Metal Working Shop	Lake Ann	D	
14	MN	Ritari Post & Pole	Sebeka	D	
14	MO	Wheeling Disposal Service Co. Lf	Amazonia	D	
14	NJ	Horstmann's Dump	East Hanover	D	
14	PA	Transicoil, Inc.	Worcester	D	
14	SC	Palmetto Recycling, Inc.	Columbia	S	O
14	TN	Mallory Capacitor Co.	Waynesboro	D	

Number of sites proposed for listing: 63. <sup>1</sup> Sites are placed in groups (Gr) corresponding to groups of 50 on the final NPL

<sup>2</sup> V=Voluntary or negotiated response; R=Federal and State response; F=Federal enforcement; S=State enforcement; D=Category to be determined

<sup>3</sup> I=Implementation activity underway, one or more operable units; O=One or more operable units completed (others may be underway); C=Implementation activity completed for all operable units

**Table 2**  
**National Priorities List - Federal Proposed Update 6 Sites (by Group)**  
**January 1987**

<b>NPL Gr<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>St</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>City/county</b>	<b>Response category<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Cleanup status<sup>3</sup></b>
12	MN	Twin Cities Air Force (SAR Landfl)	Minneapolis	R	

Number of Federal sites proposed for listing: 1. <sup>1</sup> Sites are placed in groups (Gr) corresponding to groups of 50 on the final NPL

<sup>2</sup> V=Voluntary or negotiated response; R=Federal and State response; F=Federal enforcement; S=State enforcement; D=Category to be determined

<sup>3</sup> I=Implementation activity underway, one or more operable units; O=One or more operable units completed (others may be underway); C=Implementation activity completed for all operable units

[FR Doc. 87-1353 Filed 1-21-87; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-C**