

Federal Register Notice

40674 - 40682 Federal Register / Vol. 48, No. 175 / Thursday, September 8, 1983 / Proposed Rules

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300
[S WER-FRL 2421-2]

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

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY:

The Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") is proposing the first update to the National Priorities List ("NPL") which is promulgated today as Appendix B of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan ("NCP"), 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, and today's notice proposes the first such revision.

DATES:

Comments may be submitted on or before November 7, 1983.

ADDRESSES:

Comments may be mailed to:

Russell H. Wyer
Director, Hazardous Site Control Division
Office of Superfund Remediation Technology Innovation (WH-548E)
Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

The public docket for the update to the NCP will contain Hazard Ranking System score sheets for all sites on the proposed update, as well as a "Documentation Record" for each site describing the information used to compute the scores. The main docket is located in Room S-325 of Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., and is available for viewing from 9:00 a.m. to p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. Requests for copies of these documents should be directed to EPA Headquarters, although the same documents will be available for viewing in the EPA Regional Offices. In addition, the background data relied upon by the Agency in calculating or evaluating HRS scores are retained in the Regional Offices. Any such data in EPA files may be obtained upon request. An informal written request, rather than a formal request under the Freedom of Information Act, should be the ordinary procedure for requesting these data sources. Addresses for the Regional Office dockets are:

Jenifer Arns
Region I
U.S. EPA Library
John F. Kennedy Federal Bldg.
Boston, MA 02203
617/223-5791

Audrey Thomas
Region II
U.S. EPA Library, 10th Floor
New York, NY 10278
212/264-2881

Diane McCreary
Region III
U.S. EPA Library
Curtis Building
6th & Walnut Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19106
215/ 597-0580

Carolyn Mitchell
Region IV
U.S. EPA Library
345 Courtland Street, NE.
404/257-4216

Lou Tilly
Region V
U.S. EPA Library
230 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, IL 60604
512/353-2022

Nita House
Region VI
U.S. EPA Library
First International Building
1201 Elm Street
Dallas, TX 75270
214/767-7341

Connier McKenzie
Region VII
U.S. EPA Library
Kansas City, MO 64106
816/ 374-3497

Delores Eddy
Region VIII
U.S. EPA Library
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, CO 80295
303/837-2560

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

Julie Sears
Region X
U.S. EPA Library
1200 6th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101
206/442-1289

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

C. Scott Parrish
Hazardous Site Control Division
Office of Superfund Remediation Technology Innovation (WH-548E)
Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone (800) 424-9346 (or 382-3000 in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

- I. NPL Update Process and Schedule
- II. Contents of the Proposed Update
- III. Additional Criteria for Listing
- IV. Regulatory Impact Analysis
- V. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

I. NPL Update Process and Schedule

Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601-9657, EPA is required to establish, as part of the National Contingency Plan (NCP) for responding to releases of hazardous substances, a National Priorities List (NPL) of sites of such releases. The NPL serves as guidance to EPA in setting priorities among sites for further investigation and possible response actions. After proposing over 400 sites for inclusion on the NPL on December 30, 1982 (47 FR 58476), EPA has established a final NPL, which is being published in today's **Federal Register** immediately preceding this update proposal. The preamble to that final list explains in more detail the purpose of the NPL, the criteria used to develop the list, and how it will be administered and revised. The purpose of this notice is to propose the addition of 133 new sites to the NPL.

CERCLA requires that the NPL be revised at least once per year, and today's notice proposes the first such revision. EPA believes, however, that it may be desirable to update the list on a more frequent basis. Thus, the Agency may revise the NPL more often than is specified in CERCLA. For each revision, EPA will inform the States of the closing dates for submission of candidate sites to EPA. In addition to these periodic updates, EPA believes it may be desirable in rare instances to propose separately the addition of individual sites on the NPL as the Agency did in the case of the Times Beach, Missouri, site.

As with the establishment of the initial NPL, States have the primary responsibility for selecting and scoring sites that are candidates for inclusion on the NPL using the Hazard Ranking System (HRS) and submitting the candidates to the EPA Regional Offices. The regional Offices then conduct a quality control review of the States' candidate sites. After conducting this review, the EPA Regional Offices submit candidate sites to EPA Headquarters. The Regions may include candidate sites in addition to those submitted by States. In reviewing these submissions, EPA Headquarters conducts further quality assurance audits to ensure accuracy and consistency among the various EPA and State offices participating in the scoring.

EPA anticipates that each update publication will list sites in three categories: the "Current List;" "Proposed Additions;" and "Proposed Deletions". Sites on the "Current List" are those which have previously been proposed for listing, either in the initial NPL process or in any subsequent update proposal, and for which final scores have been established based on public comment and further investigation by EPA. In today's proposal, the "Current List" consists

of the final NPL published immediately preceding this proposed update notice. As explained more fully in the preamble to the final NPL published today, once a site appears on the final "Current List," EPA does not expect to recalculate its HRS score. Although EPA does not plan to consider additional information on such sites for purposes of rescoring, the Agency always welcomes information on a site that may be useful in determining more precisely the nature of the release and what response actions may be appropriate.

"Proposed Additions" consist of sites not currently on the NPL that the Agency is proposing to add to the NPL. The "Proposed Additions" for this update are those contained in the list immediately following this preamble discussion. The Agency is requesting public comment on whether it is appropriate to add these sites to the final NPL, and may recalculate site scores based on comments received during the comment period.

"Proposed Deletions" will consist of sites on the current NPL that EPA proposes to delete because listing of the site no longer is appropriate. EPA is not today proposing to delete any sites from the NPL. The Agency will consider deleting sites on a case by case basis, according to internal EPA guidance currently being developed. Deletions may be based on such circumstances as the fact that the site has been cleaned up by EPA or the responsible party, or a determination that no fund-financed cleanup is appropriate. EPA does not anticipate, however, that deletions will be based on recalculations of a site's HRS score. The criteria for deletion under consideration by EPA are discussed more fully in the preamble to the final NPL.

II. Contents of the Proposed Update

Each entry on the final NPL, as well as proposed additions and deletions, contains the name of the facility, the State and city or county in which it is located, and the corresponding EPA Region. Each site EPA is proposing to add is placed by score in a group corresponding to the groups of 50 sites presented on the final NPL. Thus, the sites in group 1 of the proposed update have scores that fall within the range of scores covered by the first 50 sites on the final NPL. Each entry on the proposed update, as well as those on the final NPL, is accompanied by one or more notations on the status of response and enforcement activities at the site at the time the list was prepared or updated. These status categories are described briefly below.

Voluntary or Negotiated Response (V). Sites are included in this category if private parties are taking response actions pursuant to a consent order or agreement to which EPA is a party. Voluntary or negotiated cleanup may include actions taken pursuant to agreements reached after enforcement action had commenced. This category of response may include remedial investigations, feasibility studies, and other preliminary work, as well as actual cleanup.

Even though response actions qualify for notation in this category only if sanctioned by a formal agreement, this is not intended to preclude responsible parties from taking voluntary response actions outside of such an agreement. However, in order for the site to be deleted, or to be noted in the Voluntary or Negotiated Response category, EPA must still sanction the complete cleanup. If the remedial action is not fully implemented or is not consistent with the NCP, the responsible party may be subject to an enforcement action. Therefore, most responsible parties may find it in their best interest to negotiate a consent agreement.

Federal and State Response (R). The Federal and State Response category includes sites at which EPA or State agencies have commenced or completed removal or remedial actions under CERCLA, including remedial investigations and feasibility studies (see NCP section 300.68(f)(i)). For purposes of this categorization, EPA considers the response action to have begun when LPA has obligated funds. For some of the sites in this category, remedial investigations and feasibility studies may be followed by EPA enforcement actions, at which time the site status will change to "Federal or State Enforcement".

Federal or State Enforcement (E). This category includes sites where the United States or the State has filed a civil complaint or issued an administrative order. It also includes sites at which a Federal or State court has mandated some form of non-consensual response action following a judicial proceeding. It may not, however, include all sites at which preliminary enforcement activities are underway. A number of sites that EPA is proposing to add to the NPL are the subject of enforcement investigation or have been formally referred to the Department of Justice for enforcement action. EPA's policy is not to release information concerning a possible enforcement action until a lawsuit has been filed. Accordingly, these sites have not been included in the enforcement category.

Actions to be Determined (D). This category includes all sites not listed in any other category. A wide range of activities may be in progress for sites in this category. The Agency may be considering a response action, or may be conducting an enforcement investigation. EPA may have referred a case involving a site to the Department of Justice, but no lawsuit has yet been filed. Investigations may be underway or needed to determine the source of a release in areas adjacent to or near a Federal facility. Responsible parties may be undertaking cleanup operations that are unknown to the Federal or State government, or corrective action may not be occurring yet.

EPA requests public comment on each of the sites it is proposing to add to the NPL, and will accept such comments for 60 days following the date of this notice. A "Documentation Record" and HRS scoring sheets for all proposed sites are available for inspection and copying in the NPL docket located in Washington, D.C. These documents are also available in the EPA Regional Offices, as are background data referred to in the Documentation Records and relied on for scoring. In some instances, where States calculated site scores and EPA review and quality control checking did not require direct inspection of background data, these data may be available only from the State that conducted the original scoring. After considering the relevant comments received during the comment period and determining the final score for each proposed site, the Agency will add to the current NPL at the time of the next update all sites that meet EPA's criteria for listing.

III. Additional Criteria for Listing

The preamble to the proposed NPL (47 FR 58476, December 30, 1982) stated that the more than 400 sites on the proposed list were included based primarily on total scores ("migration" or "S_m" scores) calculated according to the HRS. For the proposed NPL, all sites (with the exception of some sites designated by States as "top priority" sites) scored 28.50 or higher according to the HRS.

EPA has found that the HRS scoring factors provide a good estimate of the relative hazards at sites for purpose of establishing a list of national priorities for further investigation and possible remedial action. As explained in the preamble to the proposed NPL (47 FR 58479, December 30, 1982) and the preamble to the NCP which discusses the HRS (47 FR 31187-88, July 16, 1982), the HRS total score used for the NPL is designed to take into account a standard set of factors related to risks from migration of substances through ground water, surface water, and the air. Although the HRS also does provide an approximation of risk from direct contact with substances and from the possibility of fire and explosion, these pathway scores are not considered in computing the HRS "total score" of a site for purposes of listing. Rather, scores from the direct contact and fire and explosion pathways are used as guidance in determining the need for immediate removal action at a site.

EPA has found, however, that in certain instances EPA's authority to conduct an immediate removal action may not be sufficient to address completely the direct contact risks at a site, and that remedial action may therefore be warranted. For example, where relocation of residents is the appropriate remedy, the Agency's removal authority extends only to evacuation of threatened residents, whereas its remedial authority may include permanent relocation of those residents. Although EPA can take removal actions, including temporary relocation of residents, irrespective of whether a site appears on the NPL, the NCP (40 CFR 300.68(a)) provides that remedial actions may be taken only at sites on the NPL.

Since the "direct contact" scores are not included in calculating the HRS total score for purposes of listing sites on the NPL, some of the sites involving direct contact to residents where remedial action, rather than immediate removal action, appears necessary to address the problem completely may not receive a sufficiently high HRS total score to be listed on the NPL. This situation has led EPA to believe that in limited circumstances it may be appropriate to consider other criteria than simply a sufficiently high HRS total score for purposes of listing sites on the NPL to make them eligible for remedial action.

Quail Run Mobile Manor, Gray Summit, Missouri, is an example of a site that presents a significant risk to the public that may warrant remedial action, although its HRS total score is too low for the site to be included on the NPL. During the winter of 1982-1983, the EPA conducted environmental sampling at Quail Run as part of its investigation of a number of sites in the State of Missouri that were potentially contaminated with dioxin. The investigation of the Quail Run site revealed widespread dioxin contamination of yards, roadsides, and garden areas, as well as high concentrations under the road pavement and presence in at least one residence.

In the case of Quail Run, EPA believes that a number of factors suggest that it may be appropriate to consider including the site on the NPL even though its HRS total score is less than 28.50. First, based on EPA's sampling, the

Centers for Disease Control (CDC) on May 11, 1983 issued a public health advisory for the trailer park. This advisory was based on the risk to residents posed by direct contact with the contaminated areas. Second the Federal Emergency Management Agency determined that temporary relocation of the residents was necessary to protect public health, based on the CDC advisory and its determination that the possible human exposure would continue unless the residents left their homes. Finally, EPA's current assessment is that some type of remedial action - as opposed to an immediate removal action - may be the most health-protective and cost-effective response.

Therefore, EPA is proposing to add the Quail Run site to the NPL. Including the Quail Run site on the NPL will permit EPA to consider the broadest possible range of response actions, including remedial actions, that will protect the public health and environment and provide the most cost-effective response.

EPA recognizes, however, that the sole criterion in the NCP for listing sites on the NPL is a sufficiently high HRS total score (or designation by a State as its top priority site). Before EPA includes the Quail Run site on the NPL, therefore, the Agency intends to amend the NCP to authorize consideration of limited criteria other than the HRS total score for purposes of including sites on the NPL. These alternative criteria would take into account circumstances such as those existing at the Quail Run site.

In preparing a proposed amendment to the NCP, EPA will consider the advisability of relying in part on health assessments or advisories such as those issued by the newly formed Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) or special information from the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Such information could serve as the technical basis for an EPA advisory committee review and subsequent administrative decision on the relative risk of the site. A related approach, for situations where persons at different locations are affected by the risks of direct contact from common substances (such as dioxin), might be to group such sites by geography or political subdivision on the NPL. For example, EPA might develop some process whereby many of the locations in Missouri involving direct contact risks from dioxin could be grouped into a single listing on the NPL if a suitable health assessment or advisory had been issued by an agency such as ATSDR with respect to those locations. Of course, this approach could also apply to similar dioxin risks in other States or territories.

EPA anticipates, however, that any alternative criteria it may develop will apply only to a limited number and type of sites. With rare exception, the HRS has proven to be an effective tool for approximating the risk posed by sites, and will remain the principal criterion for listing. EPA invites comments on the general issue of considering alternative criteria for listing on the NPL and on approaches such as those discussed above, as well as on the inclusion of the Quail Run site.

IV. Regulatory Impact Analysis

The EPA has conducted a preliminary analysis of the economic implications of today's amendment to the NCP. The EPA believes that the direction of the economic effects of this revision is generally similar to those effects identified in the regulatory impact analysis (RIA) prepared in 1982 for the revisions to the NCP pursuant to section 105 of CERCLA. ¹Nevertheless, the Agency intends to go beyond this earlier characterization of possible effects with a more extensive analysis of the combined economic impact of this update proposal and other amendments to the NCP that EPA may propose in the near future. The analysis will accompany publication of future major amendments to the NCP. A more comprehensive examination, together with more than 2 years of experience with the Superfund program, will allow better estimates of the economic impact of this and other proposed amendments. In the meantime, the Agency believes the anticipated economic effects of adding 133 sites to the NPL can be characterized in terms of the conclusions of the earlier regulatory impact analysis.

Costs

The costs associated with revising the NCP that were estimated in the 1982 RIA included costs to States of meeting cost-share requirements; costs to industries and individual firms of financing remedies at NPL sites as a result either of enforcement or cost recovery action or of voluntary response; and macroeconomic costs resulting from effects on industries and State governments. Each of these types of costs is discussed below.

Costs to States associated with today's amendment arise from the statutory State cost-share requirement of 10 percent of remedial action costs at privately-owned sites. Using the assumptions developed in the 1982 RIA, we can assume that 90 percent of the 133 sites proposed for listing in this amendment will involve a 10 percent State cost

share, and 10 percent will involve a 50 percent cost share at publicly-owned sites. Estimating the average costs of a remedial action at \$6.5 million, the cost to all States of undertaking Federal remedial actions at all 133 sites would be \$121 million.

Cost to industry could result from required financing of remedies at sites on the NPL under enforcement or cost recovery action. Firms could also be induced to respond to sites for which they are responsible as a prudent business action to avoid possible enforcement actions and to prevent adverse publicity if they are linked to hazardous waste sites that are now national priority targets. Precise estimates must await the full analysis to be conducted; however, the range of costs would extend from zero (if none of the 133 sites is addressed) to a maximum of \$865 million (if the 133 sites are privately-owned and each remedial action costs an average of \$6.5 million). The EPA cannot identify at this time which firms may be threatened with specific portions of response costs. The act of adding a hazardous waste site to the NPL does not itself cause firms responsible for that site to bear these costs. Instead, listing acts only as a potential trigger for subsequent enforcement, cost recovery, or voluntary remedial efforts. Moreover, it remains at EPA's discretion whether or not to proceed with enforcement actions against firms which may be adversely affected by such actions.

Economy-wide effects of this 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

Associated with the costs are significant potential benefits and cost offsets. The distributional costs to firms of financing NPL remedies have corresponding "benefits" in that each dollar expended for a response puts someone to work directly or indirectly (through purchased materials).

The real benefits associated with today's amendment come in the form of increased health and environmental protection as a result of additional response actions at hazardous waste sites. In addition to the potential for more Federally-financed remedial actions, expansion of the NPL could accelerate privately-financed, voluntary cleanup efforts to avoid potential adverse publicity, torts, and/or enforcement action. Listing sites as national priority targets may also give States increased support for funding responses at particular sites.

As a result of the additional NPL remedies, there will be lower human exposure to high-risk chemicals, and higher quality surface water, ground water, soil, and air. The magnitude of these benefits is expected to be significant, although difficult to estimate. As an example of a rough calculation, the 1982 RIA estimated that the population potentially at risk from contamination of ground water, soil, and air would be reduced by approximately 1.8 million, 600,000, and 97,000 respectively, if remedial actions were taken at 170 NPL sites. Assuming an average estimate per NPL site of 10,000 people at risk of exposure to contaminated ground water, response actions at the 133 sites to be listed by this revision could result in a reduced risk of exposure to ground water contamination for up to 1.3 million people.

¹ TCF Incorporated, Regulatory Impact Analysis of the Revisions to the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan, February 16, 1982. The analysis is available for inspection at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460.

V. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, the Agency has reviewed the impact of this revision to the NCP on small entities. The EPA certifies that the revision will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

While modifications to the NPL are considered revisions to the NCP, they are not typical regulation changes since the change does not automatically impose across-the-board costs. As a consequence, it is hard to predict effects. The Agency does expect that certain industries and firms within industries that have caused a proportionally high percentage of waste site problems will possibly be significantly affected by CERCLA actions. Being included on the NPL will increase the likelihood that these effects will occur. The costs, when imposed to these affected firms and

industries, are justified because of the public health and environmental problems they have caused. Adverse effects are not expected to affect a substantial number of small businesses, as a class.

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.

PART 300 - [AMENDED]

It is proposed to amend Appendix B of 40 CFR Part 300 by adding the following sites to the National Priorities List:

Appendix B - National Priorities List

Group 1

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
03	PA	TYSONS DUMP	UPPER MERION TWP	R
08	MT	EAST HELENA SMELTER	EAST HELENA	D
06	TX	GENEVA INDUSTRIES (FUHRMANN)	HOUSTON	R E
02	NJ	VINELAND CHEMICAL CO.	VINELAND	V E
02	NJ	FLORENCE LAND RECONTOURING LF	FLORENCE TOWNSHIP	V E
02	NJ	SHIELDALLOY CORP.	NEWFIELD BOROUGH	E
05	WI	OMEGA HILLS NORTH LANDFILL	GERMANTOWN	V E
05	OH	UNITED SCRAP LEAD CO., INC.	TROY	D

Group 2

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
05	WI	JANESVILLE OLD LANDFILL	JANESVILLE	D
04	SC	INDEPENDENT NAIL CO.	BEAUFORT	D
04	SC	KALAMA SPECIALTY CHEMICALS	BEAUFORT	E
05	WI	JANESVILLE ASH BEDS	JANESVILLE	D
05	OH	MIAMI COUNTY INCINERATOR	TROY	D
05	WI	WHEELER PIT	LA PRAIRIE TOWNSHIP	D
02	NY	HUDSON RIVER PCBS	HUDSON RIVER	D
01	CT	OLD SOUTHTON LANDFILL	SOUTHTON	V E
04	MS	FLOWOOD*	FLOWOOD	D

Group 3

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
10	ID	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.	POCATELLO	E
04	AL	CIBA-GEIGY CORP. (MCINTOSH PLANT)	MCINTOSH	D
05	MN	ST. REGIS PAPER CO.	CASS LAKE	V
04	GA	HERCULES 009 LANDFILL	BRUNSWICK	D
05	MN	MACGILLIS & GIBBS/BELL & POLE	NEW BRIGHTON	D
05	WI	MUSKEGO SANITARY LANDFILL	MUSKEGO	D
02	NJ	VENTRON/VELSICOL	WOODRIDGE BOROUGH	E
04	SC	KOPPERS CO., INC. (FLORENCE PLANT)	FLORENCE	E
02	NJ	NASCOLITE CORP.	MILLVILLE	E
05	MN	BOISE CASCADE/ONAN/MEDTRONICS	FRIDLEY	D
02	NJ	DELILAH ROAD	EGG HARBOR TOWNSHIP	E
03	PA	MILL CREEK DUMP	ERIE	R
05	WI	SCHMALZ DUMP	HARRISON	D
08	CO	LOWRY LANDFILL	ARAPAHOE COUNTY	E

Group 4

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
04	SC	WAMCHEM, INC.	BURTON	D
02	NJ	CHEMICAL LEAMAN TANK LINERS, INC.	BRIDGEPORT	E
05	WI	MASTER DISPOSAL SERVICE LANDFILL	BROOKFIELD	E
02	NJ	W. R. GRACE CO. (WAYNE PLANT)	WAYNE TOWNSHIP	D
04	SC	LEONARD CHEMICAL CO., INC.	ROCK HILL	V
04	AL	STAUFFER CHEM. (COLD CREEK PLANT)	BUCKS	D
04	GA	OLIN CORP. (AREAS 1, 2 & 4)	AUGUSTA	V
05	OH	SOUTH POINT PLANT	SOUTH POINT	D
03	PA	DORNEY ROAD LANDFILL	UPPER MACUNGIE TWP	D
05	IN	NORTHSIDE SANITARY LANDFILL	ZIONSVILLE	E
09	CA	ATLAS ASBESTOS MINE	FRESNO COUNTY	E
09	CA	COALINGA ASBESTOS MINE	COALINGA	D
02	NJ	EWAN PROPERTY	SHAMONG TOWNSHIP	D
10	ID	PACIFIC HIDE & FUR RECYCLING CO.	POCATELLO	RE
05	MN	JOSLYN MFG. & SUPPLY CO.	BROOKLYN CENTER	D

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
05	MN	ARROWHEAD REFINERY CO.	HERMANTOWN	D
05	WI	MOSS-AMERICAN (KERR-MCGEE OIL CO.)	MILWAUKEE	D

Group 5

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
01	MA	IRON HORSE PARK	BILLERICA	D
05	WI	KOHLER CO. LANDFILL	SHEBOYGAN	D
05	IN	REILLY TAR & CHEMICAL CORP.	INDIANAPOLIS	D
05	WI	LAUER I SANITARY LANDFILL	MENOMONEE FALLS	E
05	MN	UNION SCRAP	MINNEAPOLIS	D
02	NJ	RADIATION TECHNOLOGY, INC.	ROCKAWAY TOWNSHIP	E
05	WI	ONALASKA MUNICIPAL LANDFILL	ONALASKA	D
05	MN	NUTTING TRUCK & CASTER CO.	FARIBAULT	D
02	PR	VEGA ALTA PUBLIC SUPPLY WELLS	VEGA ALTA	D
05	MI	STURGIS MUNICIPAL WELLS	STURGIS	D
05	MN	WASHINGTON COUNTY LANDFILL	LAKE ELMO	R
09	CA	SAN GABRIEL AREA 1	EL MONTE	D
09	CA	SAN GABRIEL AREA 2	BALDWIN PARK AREA	D
06	TX	PIG ROAD	NEW WAVERLY	D
02	PR	UPJOHN FACILITY	BARCELONETA	V
03	PA	HENDERSON ROAD	UPPER MERION TWP	D
06	LA	PETRO-PROCESSORS	SCOTLANDVILLE	E
03	PA	INDUSTRIAL LANE LANDFILL	WILLIAMS TOWNSHIP	D
03	PA	EAST MOUNT ZION	SPRINGGETTSBURY TWP	D
02	NY	GENERAL MOTORS-CENT. FOUNDRY DIV.	MASSENA	D
03	DE	OLD BRINE SLUDGE LANDFILL	DELAWARE CITY	D
05	MN	WHITTAKER CORP.	MINNEAPOLIS	D

Group 6

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
01	CT	KELLOGG-DEERING WELL FIELD	NORWALK	V E
04	AL	OLIN CORP. (MCINTOSH PLANT)	MCINTOSH	V
04	FL	TRI-CITY CONSERVATIONIST, INC.	TEMPLE TERRACE	D

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
05	WI	NORTHERN ENGRAVING CO.	SPARTA	D
01	NH	KEARSAGE METALLURGICAL CORP.	CONWAY	V E
04	SC	PALMETTO WOOD PRESERVING	DIXIANNA	E
05	MN	MORRIS ARSENIC DUMP	MORRIS	D
05	MN	PERHAM ARSENIC	PERHAM	D
01	NH	SAVAGE MUNICIPAL WATER SUPPLY	MILFORD	D
05	IN	POER FARM	HANCOCK COUNTY	R
06	TX	UNITED CREOSOTING CO.	CONROE	D
05	WI	CITY DISPOSAL CORP. LANDFILL	DUNN	D
02	NJ	TABERNACLE DRUM DUMP	TABERNACLE TWP	D
02	NJ	COOPER ROAD	VOORHEES TOWNSHIP	D
04	FL	CABOT-KOPPERS	GAINESVILLE	D

Group 7

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
05	MN	GENERAL MILLS/HENKEL CORP.	MINNEAPOLIS	R
09	CA	DEL NORTE PESTICIDE STORAGE	CRESCENT CITY	D
02	NJ	DE REWAL CHEMICAL CO.	KINGWOOD TOWNSHIP	D
04	GA	MONSANTO CORP. (AUGUSTA PLANT)	AUGUSTA	D
01	NH	SOUTH MUNICIPAL WATER SUPPLY WELL	PETERSBOROUGH	D
05	WI	EAU CLAIRE MUNICIPAL WELL FIELD	EAU CLAIRE CITY	D
04	GA	POWERSVILLE	PEACH COUNTY	D
05	MI	METAMORA LANDFILL	METAMORA	D
02	NJ	DIAMOND ALKALI CO.	NEWARK	R
02	PR	FIBERS PUBLIC SUPPLY WELLS	JOBOS	D
05	WI	MID-STATE DISPOSAL, INC., LANDFILL	CLEVELAND TOWNSHIP	E
08	CO	BRODERICK WOOD PRODUCTS	DENVER	D
02	NJ	WOODLAND ROUTE 532 DUMP	WOODLAND TOWNSHIP	D
05	IN	AMERICAN CHEMICAL SERVICE	GRIFFITH	D
05	WI	LEMBERGER TRANSPORT & RECYCLING	FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP	E
10	WA	QUEEN CITY FARMS	MAPLE VALLEY	D
05	WI	SCRAP PROCESSING CO., INC.	MEDFORD	D
02	NJ	HOPKINS FARM	PLUMSTEAD TOWNSHIP	D

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
02	NJ	WILSON FARM	PLUMSTEAD TOWNSHIP	R
06	OK	COMPASS INDUSTRIES	TULSA	R
09	CA	KOPPERS CO., INC. (OROVILLE PLANT)	OROVILLE	E
03	PA	WALSH LANDFILL	HONEYBROOK TWP	D
02	NJ	UPPER DEERFIELD TOWNSHIP SLF	UPPER DEERFIELD TWP	E

Group 8

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
01	MA	SULLIVAN'S LEDGE	NEW BEDFORD	D
05	IN	BENNETT STONE QUARRY	BLOOMINGTON	R
04	AL	STAUFFER CHEM. (LE MOYNE PLANT)	AXIS	D
04	SC	GEIGER (C&M OIL)	RANTOULES	D
05	WI	WASTE RESEARCH & RECLAMATION CO.	EAU CLAIRE	V E
04	FL	PEPPER STEEL & ALLOYS, INC.	MEDLEY	V R E
05	MN	ST. LOUIS RIVER	ST. LOUIS COUNTY	D
03	PA	BERKS SAND PIT	LONGSWAMP TOWNSHIP	D
04	FL	HIPPS ROAD LANDFILL	DUVAL COUNTY	R
05	WI	OCONOMOWOC ELECTROPLATING CO.	ASHIPPIN	E
08	CO	LINCOLN PARK	CANON CITY	D
02	NJ	WOODLAND ROUTE 72 DUMP	WOODLAND TOWNSHIP	D
10	OR	UNITED CHROME PRODUCTS, INC.	CORVALLIS	D
02	NJ	LANDFILL & DEVELOPMENT CO.	MOUNT HOLLY	V E
03	PA	TAYLOR BOROUGH DUMP	TAYLOR BOROUGH	D
05	OH	POWELL ROAD LANDFILL	DAYTON	D
05	MI	BURROWS SANITATION	HARTFORD	R
10	WA	ROSCH PROPERTY	ROY	D

Group 9

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
05	WI	DELAVAN MUNICIPAL WELL #4	DELAVAN	D
09	CA	SAN GABRIEL AREA 3	ALHAMBRA	D
09	CA	SAN GABRIEL AREA 4	LA PUENTE	D
10	WA	AMERICAN LAKE GARDENS	TACOMA	R

EPA REG	ST	SITE NAME *	CITY/COUNTY	RESPONSE STATUS #
10	WA	GREENACRES LANDFILL	SPOKANE COUNTY	D
06	OK	SAND SPRINGS PETROCHEMICAL	SAND SPRINGS	R
07	MO	QUAIL RUN MOBILE MANOR	GRAY SUMMIT	R

Note: Group refers to the NPL Group with similar HRS scores.

#:.

V = Voluntary or Negotiated Response;

R = Federal and State Response;

E = Federal and State Enforcement;

D = Actions to be Determined.

* = States' Designated Top Priority Sites.

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M