

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 300**

[FRL-5895-8]

National Priorities List for Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Sites

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 ("CERCLA" or "the Act"), as amended, requires that the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan ("NCP") include a list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States. The National Priorities List ("NPL") constitutes this list. The NPL is intended primarily to guide the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA" or "the Agency") in determining which sites warrant further investigation to assess the nature and extent of public health and environmental risks associated with the site and to determine what CERCLA-financed remedial action(s), if any, may be appropriate.

This rule adds 6 new sites to the NPL, all to the General Superfund Section.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date for this amendment to the NCP shall be October 27, 1997.

ADDRESSES: For addresses for the Headquarters and Regional dockets, as well as further details on what these dockets contain, see Section II, "Availability of Information to the Public" in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** portion of this preamble.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terry Keidan, State and Site Identification Center, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (mail code 5204G), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW, Washington, DC, 20460, (703) 603-8852, or the Superfund Hotline, phone (800) 424-9346 or (703) 412-9810 in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Contents**

- I. Background
 - What are CERCLA and SARA?
 - What is the NCP?
 - What is the National Priorities List (NPL)?
 - How are sites listed on the NPL?
 - What happens to sites on the NPL?
 - How are site boundaries defined?

- How are sites removed from the NPL?
- Can portions of sites be deleted from the NPL as they are cleaned up?
- What is the Construction Completion List (CCL)?
- II. Availability of Information to the Public
 - Can I review the documents relevant to this final rule?
 - What documents are available for review at the Headquarters docket?
 - What documents are available for review at the Regional Dockets?
 - How do I access the documents?
 - How can I obtain a current list of NPL sites?
- III. Contents of This Final Rule
 - Additions to the NPL
 - Status of NPL
 - What did EPA do with the public comments it received?
- IV. Regulatory Issues
 - A. Executive Order 12866
 - What is Executive Order 12866?
 - Is this final rule subject to Executive Order 12866 review?
 - B. Unfunded Mandates
 - What is the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)?
 - Does UMRA apply to this final rule?
 - C. Effects on Small Businesses
 - What is the Regulatory Flexibility Act?
 - Does the Regulatory Flexibility Act apply to this final rule?
 - Has this rule been submitted to Congress and the General Accounting Office?
- V. Possible Changes to the Effective Date of the Rule
 - Could the effective date of this final rule change?
 - What could cause the effective date of this rule to change?

I. Background*What Are CERCLA and SARA*

In 1980, Congress enacted the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601-9675 ("CERCLA" or "the Act"), in response to the dangers of uncontrolled releases of hazardous substances. CERCLA was amended on October 17, 1986, by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act ("SARA"), Pub. L. No. 99-499, 100, Stat. 1613 *et seq.*

What Is the NCP

To implement CERCLA, EPA promulgated the revised National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan ("NCP"), 40 CFR Part 300, on July 16, 1982 (47 FR 31180), pursuant to CERCLA section 105 and Executive Order 12316 (46 FR 42237, August 20, 1981). The NCP sets guidelines and procedures for responding to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants under CERCLA. EPA has revised the NCP on several occasions. The most recent comprehensive revision was on March 8, 1990 (55 FR 8666).

As required under Section 105(a)(8)(A) of CERCLA, the NCP also includes "criteria for determining priorities among releases or threatened releases throughout the United States for the purpose of taking remedial action and, to the extent practicable, taking into account the potential urgency of such action for the purpose of taking removal action." ("Removal" actions are defined broadly and include a wide range of actions taken to study, clean up, prevent or otherwise address releases and threatened releases 42 U.S.C 9601(23).)

What Is the National Priorities List (NPL)

The NPL is a list of national priorities among the known or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States. The list, which is Appendix B of the NCP (40 CFR part 300), was required under section 105(a)(8)(B) of CERCLA, as amended by SARA. Section 105(a)(8)(B) defines the NPL as a list of "releases" and the highest priority "facilities" and requires that the NPL be revised at least annually. The NPL is intended primarily to guide EPA in determining which sites warrant further investigation to assess the nature and extent of public health and environmental risks associated with a release of hazardous substances. However, the NPL is only of limited significance, as it does not assign liability to any party or to the owner of any specific property. Neither does placing a site on the NPL mean that any remedial or removal action necessarily need be taken. See Report of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senate Rep. No. 96-848, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 60 (1980), 48 FR 40659 (September 8, 1983).

The NPL includes two sections, one of sites that are evaluated and cleaned up by EPA (the "General Superfund Section"), and one of sites being addressed generally by other Federal agencies (the "Federal Facilities Section"). Under Executive Order 12580 (52 FR 2923, January 29, 1987) and CERCLA section 120, each Federal agency is responsible for carrying out most response actions at facilities under its own jurisdiction, custody, or control, although EPA is responsible for preparing an HRS score and determining whether the facility is placed on the NPL. EPA generally is not the lead agency at Federal Facilities Section sites, and its role at such sites is accordingly less extensive than at other sites.

How Are Sites Listed on the NPL

There are three mechanisms for placing sites on the NPL for possible remedial action (see 40 CFR 300.425(c) of the NCP):

(1) A site may be included on the NPL if it scores sufficiently high on the Hazard Ranking System ("HRS"), which EPA promulgated as Appendix A of the NCP (40 CFR part 300). The HRS serves as a screening device to evaluate the relative potential of uncontrolled hazardous substances to pose a threat to human health or the environment. On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), EPA promulgated revisions to the HRS partly in response to CERCLA section 105(c), added by SARA. The revised HRS evaluates four pathways: ground water, surface water, soil exposure, and air. As a matter of Agency policy, those sites that score 28.50 or greater on the HRS are eligible for the NPL.

(2) Each State may designate a single site as its top priority to be listed on the NPL, regardless of the HRS score. This mechanism, provided by the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(2) requires that, to the extent practicable, the NPL include within the 100 highest priorities, one facility designated by each State representing the greatest danger to public health, welfare, or the environment among known facilities in the State (see 42 U.S.C. 9605(a)(8)(B)).

(3) The third mechanism for listing, included in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(3), allows certain sites to be listed regardless of their HRS score, if all of the following conditions are met:

- The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) of the U.S. Public Health Service has issued a health advisory that 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.

EPA promulgated an original NPL of 406 sites on September 8, 1983 (48 FR 40658). The NPL has been expanded since then, most recently on April 1, 1997 (62 FR 15572).

What Happens to Sites on the NPL

A site may undergo remedial action financed by the Trust Fund established under CERCLA (commonly referred to as the "Superfund") only after it is placed on the NPL, as provided in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(b)(1). ("Remedial actions" are those "consistent with permanent remedy,

taken instead of or in addition to removal actions. * * * 42 U.S.C. 9601(24).) However, under 40 CFR 300.425(b)(2) placing a site on the NPL "does not imply that monies will be expended." EPA may pursue other appropriate authorities to remedy the releases, including enforcement action under CERCLA and other laws.

How Are Site Boundaries Defined

The NPL does not describe releases in precise geographical terms; it would be neither feasible nor consistent with the limited purpose of the NPL (to identify releases that are priorities for further evaluation), for it to do so.

Although a CERCLA "facility" is broadly defined to include any area where a hazardous substance release has "come to be located" (CERCLA section 101(9)), the listing process itself is not intended to define or reflect the boundaries of such facilities or releases. Of course, HRS data (if the HRS is used to list a site) upon which the NPL placement was based will, to some extent, describe the release(s) at issue. That is, the NPL site would include all releases evaluated as part of that HRS analysis.

When a site is listed, the approach generally used to describe the relevant release(s) is to delineate a geographical area (usually the area within an installation or plant boundaries) and identify the site by reference to that area. As a legal matter, the site is not coextensive with that area, and the boundaries of the installation or plant are not the "boundaries" of the site. Rather, the site consists of all contaminated areas within the area used to identify the site, as well as any other location to which that contamination has come to be located, or from which that contamination came.

In other words, while geographic terms are often used to designate the site (e.g., the "Jones Co. plant site") in terms of the property owned by a particular party, the site properly understood is not limited to that property (e.g., it may extend beyond the property due to contaminant migration), and conversely may not occupy the full extent of the property (e.g., where there are uncontaminated parts of the identified property, they may not be, strictly speaking, part of the "site"). The "site" is thus neither equal to nor confined by the boundaries of any specific property that may give the site its name, and the name itself should not be read to imply that this site is coextensive with the entire area within the property boundary of the installation or plant. The precise nature and extent of the site are typically not known at the time of

listing. Also, the site name is merely used to help identify the geographic location of the contamination. For example, the "Jones Co. plant site," does not imply that the Jones company is responsible for the contamination located on the plant site.

EPA regulations provide that the "nature and extent of the threat presented by a release" will be determined by a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) as more information is developed on site contamination (40 CFR 300.430(d)). During the RI/FS process, the release may be found to be larger or smaller than was originally thought, as more is learned about the source(s) and the migration of the contamination. However, this inquiry focuses on an evaluation of the threat posed; the boundaries of the release need not be exactly defined. Moreover, it generally is impossible to discover the full extent of where the contamination "has come to be located" before all necessary studies and remedial work are completed at a site. Indeed, the known boundaries of the contamination can be expected to change over time. Thus, in most cases, it may be impossible to describe the boundaries of a release with absolute certainty.

Further, as noted above, NPL listing does not assign liability to any party or to the owner of any specific property. Thus, if a party does not believe it is liable for releases on discrete parcels of property, supporting information can be submitted to the Agency at any time after a party receives notice it is a potentially responsible party.

For these reasons, the NPL need not be amended as further research reveals more information about the location of the contamination or release.

How Are Sites Removed From the NPL

EPA may delete sites from the NPL where no further response is appropriate under Superfund, as explained in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(e). This section also provides that EPA shall consult with states on proposed deletions and shall consider whether any of the following criteria have been met:

- (i) Responsible parties or other persons have implemented all appropriate response actions required;
- (ii) All appropriate Superfund-financed response has been implemented and no further response action is required; or
- (iii) The remedial investigation has shown the release poses no significant threat to public health or the environment, and taking of remedial measures is not appropriate.

To date, the Agency has deleted 149 sites from the NPL.

Can Portions of Sites Be Deleted From the NPL as They Are Cleaned Up

In November 1995, EPA initiated a new policy to delete portions of NPL sites where cleanup is complete (60 FR 55465, November 1, 1995). Total site cleanup may take many years, while portions of the site may have been cleaned up and available for productive use. As of September 1997, EPA has deleted portions of 6 sites.

What Is the Construction Completion List (CCL)

EPA also has developed an NPL construction completion list ("CCL") to simplify its system of categorizing sites and to better communicate the successful completion of cleanup activities (58 FR 12142, March 2, 1993). Inclusion of a site on the CCL has no legal significance.

Sites qualify for the CCL when:

- (1) Any necessary physical construction is complete, whether or not final cleanup levels or other requirements have been achieved;
- (2) EPA has determined that the response action should be limited to measures that do not involve construction (e.g., institutional controls); or
- (3) The site qualifies for deletion from the NPL.

In addition to the 142 sites that have been deleted from the NPL because they have been cleaned up (7 sites have been deleted based on deferral to other authorities and are not considered cleaned up), an additional 305 sites are also on the NPL CCL. Thus, as of September 1997, the CCL consists of 447 sites.

II. Availability of Information to the Public

Can I Review the Documents Relevant to This Final Rule

Yes, the documents relating to the evaluation and scoring of the sites in this final rule are contained in dockets located both at EPA Headquarters and in the appropriate Regional offices.

What Documents Are Available for Review at the Headquarters Docket

The Headquarters docket for this rule contains HRS score sheets for five of the final sites that were added to the NPL

based on HRS scores, Documentation Records for those sites describing the information used to compute the scores, pertinent information regarding statutory requirements or EPA listing policies that affect those sites, and a list of documents referenced in each of the Documentation Records. For the site added to the NPL based on ATSDR Health Advisory criteria, the Headquarters docket contains the nomination package which includes the ATSDR Health Advisory for the site. For all sites, the Headquarters docket also contains comments received, and the Agency's responses to those comments. The Agency's responses are contained in the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List Final Rule—September 1997."

A general discussion of the statutory requirements affecting NPL listing, the purpose and implementation of the NPL, the economic impacts of NPL listing, and the analysis required under the Regulatory Flexibility Act is included as part of the Headquarters rulemaking docket in the **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION** document.

What Documents Are Available for Review at the Regional Dockets

The Regional dockets contain all the information in the Headquarters docket, plus, for sites added to the NPL based on HRS scores, the actual reference documents containing the data principally relied upon by EPA in calculating or evaluating the HRS scores for the sites. These reference documents are available only in the Regional dockets.

How Do I Access the Documents

You may view the documents, by appointment only, after the appearance of this document. The hours of operation for the Headquarters docket are from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. Please contact the Regional Docket for hours.

You may also request copies from the Headquarters or appropriate Regional docket. An informal request, rather than a formal written request under the Freedom of Information Act, should be the ordinary procedure for obtaining copies of any of these documents.

Following is the contact information for the EPA Headquarters and Regional dockets:

- Docket Coordinator, Headquarters, U.S. EPA CERCLA Docket Office, Crystal Gateway #1, 1st Floor, 1235 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, 703/603-8917
- Jim Kyed, Region 1, U.S. EPA Waste Management Records Center, HRC-CAN-7, J.F. Kennedy Federal Building, Boston, MA 02203-2211, 617/573-9656
- Ben Conetta, Region 2, U.S. EPA, 290 Broadway, New York, NY 10007-1866, 212/637-4435
- Diane McCreary, Region 3, U.S. EPA Library, 3rd Floor, 841 Chestnut Building, 9th & Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, PA 19107, 215/566-5250
- Kathy Piselli, Region 4, U.S. EPA, 100 Alabama Street, SW, Atlanta, GA 30303, 404/562-8190
- Cathy Freeman, Region 5, U.S. EPA, Records Center, Waste Management Division, 7-J Metcalfe Federal Building, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604 312/886-6214
- Bart Canellas, Region 6, U.S. EPA, 1445 Ross Avenue, Mail Code 6H-MA, Dallas, TX 75202-2733, 214/655-6740
- Carole Long, Region 7, U.S. EPA, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, KS 66101, 913/551-7224
- Pat Smith, Region 8, U.S. EPA, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, CO 80202-2466, 303/312-6082
- Carolyn Douglas, Region 9 U.S. EPA, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, 415/744-2343
- David Bennett, Region 10, U.S. EPA, 11th Floor, 1200 6th Avenue, Mail Stop HW-114, Seattle, WA 98101, 206/553-2103

How Can I Obtain a Current List of NPL Sites

You may obtain a current list of NPL sites via the internet at WWW.EPA.GOV/SUPERFUND and look under site information category or by contacting the Superfund Docket (see contact information above).

III. Contents of This Final Rule

Additions to the NPL

This final rule adds 6 sites to the NPL, all to the General Superfund Section. The following table presents the sites in this rule arranged alphabetically by State and identifies their rank by group number. Group numbers are determined by arranging the NPL by rank and dividing it into groups of 50 sites. For example, a site in Group 4 has an HRS score that falls within the range of scores covered by the fourth group of 50 sites on the NPL.

TABLE 1.—NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST FINAL RULE, GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/county	Group
CA	Del Amo	Los Angeles	22
MD	Central Chemical	Hagerstown	5/6

TABLE 1.—NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST FINAL RULE, GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION—Continued

State	Site name	City/county	Group
MD	Ordnance Products, Inc	Cecil County	21
NJ	Grand Street Mercury	Hoboken	NA
TX	Sprague Road Ground Water Plume	Odessa	10
WA	Oeser Co	Bellingham	1

Number of Sites Added to the General Superfund Section: 6

Status of NPL

With the new sites added in today's rule, the NPL now contains 1,204 sites, 1,053 in the General Superfund Section and 151 in the Federal Facilities Section. With a proposed NPL rule published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**, there are now 52 sites proposed and awaiting final agency action, 46 in the General Superfund Section and 6 in the Federal Facilities Section. Final and proposed sites now total 1,256.

What Did EPA Do With the Public Comments It Received

EPA reviewed all comments received on sites included in this rule. Based on comments received on the proposed sites, as well as investigation by EPA and the States (generally in response to comment), EPA recalculated the HRS scores for individual sites where appropriate. EPA's response to site-specific public comments and explanations of any score changes made as a result of such comments are addressed in the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List Final Rule—September 1997."

IV. Regulatory Issues

A. Executive Order 12866

What Is Executive Order 12866

Executive Order 12866 requires certain regulatory assessments for any "economically significant regulatory action," defined as one which would result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more, or have other substantial impacts.

Is This Final Rule Subject to Executive Order 12866 Review

No, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866 review.

B. Unfunded Mandates

What Is the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), P.L. 104-4, establishes requirements for Federal agencies to assess the effects of their regulatory actions on State, local, and tribal governments and the private

sector. Under section 202 of the UMRA, EPA generally must prepare a written statement, including a cost-benefit analysis, for proposed and final rules with "Federal mandates" that may result in expenditures by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any one year. When a written statement is needed for an EPA rule, section 205 of the UMRA generally requires EPA to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives and adopt the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule. The provisions of section 205 do not apply when they are inconsistent with applicable law. Moreover, section 205 allows EPA to adopt an alternative other than the least costly, most cost-effective or least burdensome alternative if the Administrator publishes with the final rule an explanation why that alternative was not adopted. Before EPA establishes any regulatory requirements that may significantly or uniquely affect small governments, including tribal governments, it must have developed under section 203 of the UMRA a small government agency plan. The plan must provide for notifying potentially affected small governments, giving them meaningful and timely opportunity to participate in the development of EPA regulatory proposals with significant Federal intergovernmental mandates, and informing, educating, and advising them on compliance with the regulatory requirements.

Does UMRA Apply to This Final Rule

No, today's rule contains no Federal mandates (within the meaning of Title II of the UMRA) for State, local, or tribal governments or the private sector. Nor does it contain any regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments. This is because today's listing decision does not impose any enforceable duties upon any of these governmental entities or the private sector. Inclusion of a site on the NPL does not itself impose any costs. It does not establish that EPA necessarily will undertake response 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. Therefore, today's rulemaking is not subject to the requirements of sections 202, 203 or 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Act.

C. Effect on Small Businesses

What is the Regulatory Flexibility Act

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 government jurisdictions, and nonprofit organizations.

Does the Regulatory Flexibility Act Apply to This Final Rule

While this rule revises the NPL, an NPL revision is not a typical regulatory change since it does not automatically impose costs. As stated above, adding sites to the NPL does not in itself require any action by any 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 consequence, impacts on any group are hard to predict. A site's inclusion on the NPL could increase the likelihood of adverse impacts on responsible parties (in the form of cleanup costs), but at this time EPA cannot identify the potentially affected businesses or estimate the number of small businesses that might also be affected.

The Agency does expect that placing the sites in this rule on the NPL could significantly affect certain industries, or firms within industries, that have caused a proportionately high percentage of waste site problems. However, EPA does not expect the listing of these sites to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses.

In any case, economic impacts would occur only through enforcement and cost-recovery actions, which EPA takes at its discretion on a site-by-site basis.

EPA considers many factors when determining enforcement actions, including not only a firm's contribution to the problem, but also its ability to pay. The impacts (from cost recovery) on small governments and nonprofit organizations would be determined on a similar case-by-case basis.

For the foregoing reasons, I hereby certify that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Therefore, this regulation does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

Has This Rule Been Submitted to Congress and the General Accounting Office

Under 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A) as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, EPA submitted a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives and the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office prior to publication of the rule in today's **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

V. Possible Changes to the Effective Date of the Rule

Could the Effective Date of This Final Rule Change

Provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) or section 305 of CERCLA may alter the effective date of this regulation.

Under 5 U.S.C. 801(a), before a rule can take effect the federal agency promulgating the rule must submit a report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General. This report must contain a copy of the rule, a concise general statement relating to the rule (including whether it is a major rule), a copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule (if any), the agency's actions relevant to provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (affecting small businesses) and the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (describing

unfunded federal requirements imposed on state and local governments and the private sector), and any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive Orders.

Section 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(3) provides for a delay in the effective date of major rules after this report is submitted. Section 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(4) provides that all other rules shall take effect after submission to Congress, as otherwise provided by law.

EPA has submitted a report under the APA for this rule. The rule will take effect, as provided by law, within 30 days of publication of this document, since it is not a major rule. Section 5 U.S.C. 804(2) defines a major rule as any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) finds has resulted in or is likely to result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more; a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets. NPL listing is not a major rule because, as explained above, the listing, itself, imposes no monetary costs on any person. It establishes no enforceable duties, does not establish that EPA necessarily will undertake remedial action, nor does it require any action by any 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.

What Could Cause the Effective Date of This Rule to Change

Under 5 U.S.C. 801(b)(1) a rule shall not take effect, or continue in effect, if Congress enacts (and the President

signs) a joint resolution of disapproval, described under section 5 U.S.C. 802.

Another statutory provision that may affect this rule is CERCLA section 305, which provides for a legislative veto of regulations promulgated under CERCLA. Although *INS v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919, 103 S. Ct. 2764 (1983) and *Bd. of Regents of the University of Washington v. EPA*, 86 F.3d 1214, 1222 (D.C. Cir. 1996) cast the validity of the legislative veto into question, EPA has transmitted a copy of this regulation to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

If action by Congress under the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act calls the effective date of this regulation into question, EPA will publish a notice of clarification in the **Federal Register**.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Environmental protection, 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: September 12, 1997.

Timothy Fields, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

40 CFR part 300 is amended as follows:

PART 300—[AMENDED]

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

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1321(c)(2); 42 U.S.C. 9601-9657; E.O. 12777, 56 FR 54757, 3 CFR, 1991 Comp., p. 351; E.O. 12580, 52 FR 2923, 3 CFR, 1987 Comp., p. 193.

2. In appendix B to part 300, table 1 is amended by adding the following sites in alphabetical order to read as follows:

Appendix B to Part 300—National Priorities List

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/county	Notes (a)
CA	Del Amo	Los Angeles.	*
MD	Central Chemical	Hagerstown.	*
MD	Ordnance Products, Inc.	Cecil County.	*

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION—Continued

State	Site name	City/county	Notes (a)
NJ	Grand Street Mercury	Hoboken	A
TX	Sprague Road Ground Water Plume	Odessa.	
WA	Oeser Co.	Bellingham.	

(a) A = Based on issuance of health advisory by Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (if scored, HRS score need not be ≤ 28.50).

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 97-25095 Filed 9-24-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P