

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 52**

[CA 211-0102b; FRL-6161-9]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Bay Area Air Quality Management District**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Proposed Rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving a revision to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) which concerns the general provisions and definitions that are applicable to all regulations in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

The intended effect of this action is to clarify the general provisions and definitions that apply to the regulation of emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), oxides of nitrogen (NOx), and other pollutants in accordance with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAA or the Act). In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the state's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for this approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting should do so at this time.

DATES: Written comments must be received by October 29, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to: Andrew Steckel, Rulemaking Office [AIR-4], Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901.

Copies of the rule revision are available for public inspection at EPA's Region IX office during normal business hours and at the following locations:

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.

California Air Resources Board, Stationary Source Division, Rule Evaluation Section, 2020 "L" Street, Sacramento, CA 95812.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yvonne Fong, Rulemaking Office [AIR-4], Air Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105-3901, Telephone: (415) 744-1199.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This document concerns Bay Area Air Quality Management District Regulation 1, General Provisions and Definitions, submitted to EPA on June 23, 1998 by the California Air Resources Board. For further information, please see the information provided in the direct final action that is located in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: September 4, 1998.

Felicia Marcus,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 98-25892 Filed 9-28-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Parts 144, 145 and 146**

[FRL-6170-2]

RIN 2040-AB83

Reopening of Comment Period on Revisions to the Underground Injection Control Regulations for Class V Injection Wells**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).**ACTION:** Proposed rule; notice of reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is reopening the comment period for the proposed rule revising the Class V Underground Injection Control (UIC) regulations which published in the **Federal Register** on July 29, 1998 at (63 FR 40585). The reopening of the comment period will allow all interested parties to submit written comments on the proposal.

DATES: The comment period for this proposal will be reopened on September 29, 1998 and will close on November 30, 1998. Comments will only be accepted on new sections of the proposed rule (see Table 1 of the preamble (63 FR 40587)).

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to the UIC Class V, W-98-05 Comment Clerk, Water Docket (MC-4101); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460. Comments may be hand-delivered to the Water Docket, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; 401 M Street, SW., East Tower Basement, Washington, DC

20460. Comments may be submitted electronically to owdocket@epamail.epa.gov.

Please submit all references cited in your comments. Facsimiles (faxes) cannot be accepted. EPA would appreciate one original and three copies of your comments and enclosures (including any references). Commenters who would like EPA to acknowledge receipt of their comments should include a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

The proposed rule and supporting documents, including public comments, are available for review in the Water Docket at the above address. For information on how to access Docket materials, please call (202) 260-3027 between 9 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For general information, contact the Safe Drinking Water Hotline, phone 800-426-4791. The Safe Drinking Water Hotline is open Monday through Friday, excluding federal holidays, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Eastern Time. For technical inquiries, contact Robyn Delehanty, Underground Injection Control Program, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (mailcode 4606), EPA, 401 M Street, SW, Washington DC, 20460. Phone: 202-260-1993. E-mail: delehanty.robyn@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The reopened comment period for the proposed rulemaking now ends November 30, 1998. All comments submitted in accordance with the instructions in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking will be incorporated into the Record and considered before promulgation of the final rule.

Dated: September 23, 1998.

J. Charles Fox,

Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Water.

[FR Doc. 98-26008 Filed 9-28-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**40 CFR Part 300**

[FRL-6169-2]

National Priorities List for Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Sites, Proposed Rule No. 26**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA" or "the Act"), 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 proposes to add 12 new sites to the NPL, all to the General Superfund section.

DATES: Comments regarding any of these proposed listings must be submitted (postmarked) on or before November 30, 1998.

ADDRESSES: *By Postal Mail:* Mail original and three copies of comments (no facsimiles or tapes) to Docket Coordinator, Headquarters; U.S. EPA; CERCLA Docket Office; (Mail Code 5201G); 401 M Street, SW; Washington, DC 20460; 703/603-9232.

By Express Mail: Send original and three copies of comments (no facsimiles or tapes) to Docket Coordinator, Headquarters; U.S. EPA; CERCLA Docket Office; 1235 Jefferson Davis Highway; Crystal Gateway #1, First Floor; Arlington, VA 22202.

By E-Mail: Comments in ASCII format only may be mailed directly to SUPERFUND.DOCKET@EPA.GOV. E-mailed comments must be followed up by an original and three copies sent by mail or express mail.

For additional Docket addresses and further details on their contents, see section II, "Public Review/Public Comment," of the Supplementary Information portion of this preamble.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terry Keidan, phone (703) 603-8852, State, Tribal 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, or the Superfund Hotline, Phone (800) 424-9346 or (703) 412-9810 in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Background

- A. What are CERCLA and SARA?
- B. What is the NCP?
- C. What is the National Priorities List (NPL)?
- D. How are Sites Listed on the NPL?
- E. What Happens to Sites on the NPL?
- F. How Are Site Boundaries Defined?
- G. How Are Sites Removed From the NPL?
- H. Can Portions of Sites Be Deleted from the NPL as They Are Cleaned Up?
- I. What is the Construction Completion List (CCL)?
- II. Public Review/Public Comment
 - A. Can I Review the Documents Relevant to This Proposed Rule?
 - B. How do I Access the Documents?
 - C. What Documents Are Available for Public Review at the Headquarters Docket?
 - D. What Documents Are Available for Public Review at the Regional Dockets?
 - E. How Do I Submit My Comments?
 - F. What Happens to My Comments?
 - G. What Should I Consider When Preparing My Comments?
 - H. Can I Submit Comments After the Public Comment Period Is Over?
 - I. Can I View Public Comments Submitted by Others?
 - J. Can I Submit Comments Regarding Sites Not Currently Proposed to the NPL?
- III. Contents of This Proposed Rule
 - A. Proposed Additions to the NPL
 - B. Status of NPL
- IV. Executive Order 12866
 - A. What is Executive Order 12866?
 - B. Is This Proposed Rule Subject to Executive Order 12866 Review?
- V. Unfunded Mandates
 - A. What is the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)?
 - B. Does UMRA Apply to This Proposed Rule?
- VI. Effect on Small Businesses
 - A. What is the Regulatory Flexibility Act?
 - B. Does the Regulatory Flexibility Act Apply to This Proposed Rule?
- VII. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
 - A. What is the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act?
 - B. Does the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act Apply to This Proposed Rule?
- VIII. Executive Order 13045
 - A. What is Executive Order 13045?
 - B. Does Executive Order 13045 Apply to this Proposed Rule?
- IX. Paperwork Reduction Act
 - A. What is the Paperwork Reduction Act?
 - B. Does the Paperwork Reduction Act Apply to this Proposed Rule?
- X. Executive Order 12875
 - What is Executive Order 12875 and is it Applicable to this Proposed Rule?
- XI. Executive Order 13084
 - What is Executive Order 13084 and is it Applicable to this Proposed Rule?

I. Background

A. 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. 99-499, 100 Stat. 1613 *et seq.*

B. 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).)

C. 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.

D. 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 an 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 (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 September 18, 1998 (63 FR 49855).

E. 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.

F. 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, to describe the relevant release(s) the approach generally used 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 contamination from that area 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 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.

G. 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 176 sites from the NPL.

H. 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 1998, EPA has deleted portions of 11 sites.

I. 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 167 sites that have been deleted from the NPL because they have been cleaned up (9 additional sites have been deleted based on deferral to other authorities and are not considered cleaned up), an additional 368 sites are also on the NPL CCL. Thus, as of September 1998, the CCL consists of 535 sites.

II. Public Review/Public Comment

A. Can I Review the Documents Relevant to This Proposed Rule?

Yes, documents that form the basis for EPA's evaluation and scoring of sites in this rule are contained in dockets located both at EPA Headquarters in Washington, D.C. and in the appropriate Regional offices.

B. How Do I Access the Documents?

You may view the documents, by appointment only, in the Headquarters or the appropriate Regional docket after the appearance of this proposed rule. The hours of operation for the Headquarters docket are from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday excluding Federal holidays. Please contact individual Regional dockets for hours.

You may also request copies from EPA Headquarters or the 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 docket (see "How do I submit my comments?" section below for Regional contacts): Docket Coordinator, Headquarters, U.S. EPA CERCLA Docket Office, Crystal Gateway #1, 1st Floor, 1235 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202, 703/603-9232. (Please note this is a visiting address only. Mail comments to EPA Headquarters as detailed at the beginning of this preamble, or contact Regional offices as detailed in the "How do I submit my comments?" section below.)

C. What Documents Are Available for Public Review at the Headquarters Docket?

The Headquarters docket for this rule contains: HRS score sheets for each proposed site; a Documentation Record for each site describing the information used to compute the score; information for any site affected by particular statutory requirements or EPA listing policies; and a list of documents referenced in the Documentation Record. The Headquarters docket also contains an "Additional Information" document which provides a general discussion of the statutory requirements affecting NPL listing, the purpose and implementation of the NPL, and the economic impacts of NPL listing.

D. What Documents Are Available for Public Review at the Regional Dockets?

Each Regional docket for this rule contains all of the information in the Headquarters docket for sites in that Region, plus, the actual reference documents containing the data principally relied upon and cited by EPA in calculating or evaluating the HRS scores for sites in that Region. These reference documents are available only in the Regional dockets.

E. How Do I Submit My Comments?

Comments must be submitted to EPA Headquarters as detailed at the beginning of this preamble. Regional offices may be reached at the following: Jim Kyed, Region 1 (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT), 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 (NJ, NY, PR, VI), U.S. EPA, 290 Broadway, New York, NY 10007-1866, 212/637-4435

Kevin Wood, U.S. EPA Region 3, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103, Mail Code: 3HS33, 215/814-3303

Sherryl Decker, Region 4 (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN), U.S. EPA, 100 Alabama Street, SW, Atlanta, GA 30303, 404/562-8127 Region 5 (IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI), U.S. EPA, Records Center, Waste Management Division 7-J, Metcalfe Federal Building, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604, 312/886-7570

Brenda Cook, Region 6 (AR, LA, NM, OK, TX), U.S. EPA, 1445 Ross Avenue, Mail Code 6SF-RA, Dallas, TX 75202-2733, 214/655-7436

Carole Long, Region 7 (IA, KS, MO, NE), U.S. EPA, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, KS 66101, 913/551-7224

David Williams, Region 8 (CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY), U.S. EPA, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, CO 80202-2466, 303/312-6757

Carolyn Douglas, Region 9 (AZ, CA, HI, NV, AS, GU), U.S. EPA, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105, 415/744-2343

David Bennett, Region 10 (AK, ID, OR, WA), U.S. EPA, 11th Floor, 1200 6th Avenue, Mail Stop ECL-115, Seattle, WA 98101, 206/553-2103

F. What Happens to My Comments?

EPA considers all comments received during the comment period. Significant comments will be addressed in a support document that EPA will publish concurrently with the **Federal Register** document if, and when, the site is listed on the NPL.

G. What Should I Consider When Preparing My Comments?

Comments that include complex or voluminous reports, or materials prepared for purposes other than HRS scoring, should point out the specific information that EPA should consider and how it affects individual HRS factor values or other listing criteria (*Northside Sanitary Landfill v. Thomas*, 849 F.2d 1516 (D.C. Cir. 1988)). EPA will not address voluminous comments that are not specifically cited by page number and referenced to the HRS or other listing criteria. EPA will not address comments unless they indicate which component of the HRS documentation record or what particular point in EPA's stated eligibility criteria is at issue.

H. Can I Submit Comments After the Public Comment Period Is Over?

Generally, EPA will not respond to late comments. EPA can only guarantee that it will consider those comments postmarked by the close of the formal comment period. EPA has a policy of not delaying a final listing decision solely to accommodate consideration of late comments.

I. Can I View Public Comments Submitted by Others?

During the comment period, comments are placed in the Headquarters docket and are available to the public on an "as received" basis. A complete set of comments will be available for viewing in the Regional docket approximately one week after the formal comment period closes.

J. Can I Submit Comments Regarding Sites Not Currently Proposed to the NPL?

In certain instances, interested parties have written to EPA concerning sites which were not at that time proposed to the NPL. If those sites are later proposed to the NPL, parties should review their earlier concerns and, if still appropriate, resubmit those concerns for consideration during the formal comment period. Site-specific correspondence received prior to the period of formal proposal and comment will not generally be included in the docket.

III. Contents of This Proposed Rule

A. Proposed Additions to the NPL

Table 1 identifies the 12 sites in the General Superfund section being proposed to the NPL in this rule. This table follows this preamble. All sites are proposed based on HRS scores of 28.50 or above. The sites in Table 1 are listed

alphabetically by State, for ease of identification, with group number identified to provide an indication of relative ranking. To determine group number, sites on the NPL are placed in groups of 50; for example, a site in Group 4 of this proposal has an HRS score that falls within the range of scores covered by the fourth group of 50 sites on the NPL.

B. Status of NPL

A final rule published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**, results in an NPL of 1,194 sites, 1,041 in the General Superfund section and 153 in the Federal Facilities section. With this proposal of 12 new sites, there are now 66 sites proposed and awaiting final agency action, 57 in the General Superfund section and 9 in the Federal Facilities section. Final and proposed sites now total 1,260.

IV. Executive Order 12866

A. What Is Executive Order 12866?

Under Executive Order 12866, (58 FR 51735 (October 4, 1993)) the Agency must determine whether a regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to OMB review and the requirements of the Executive Order. The Order defines "significant regulatory action" as one that is likely to result in a rule that may: (1) have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order.

B. Is This Proposed 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.

V. Unfunded Mandates

A. What Is the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)?

Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), Public Law 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. Before EPA promulgates a rule for which a written statement is needed, 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, enabling officials of affected small governments to have meaningful and timely input in the development of EPA regulatory proposals with significant Federal intergovernmental mandates, and informing, educating, and advising small governments on compliance with the regulatory requirements.

B. Does UMRA Apply to This Proposed Rule?

No, EPA has determined that this rule does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate. This rule will not impose any federal intergovernmental mandate because it imposes no enforceable duty upon State, tribal or local governments. Listing a site on the NPL does not itself impose any costs. Listing does not mean that EPA necessarily will undertake remedial action. Nor does listing require any action by a private party or determine liability for response costs. Costs that arise out of site responses result from site-specific decisions regarding what actions to take, not directly from the act of listing a site on the NPL.

For the same reasons, EPA also has determined that this rule contains no regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments. In addition, as discussed above, the private sector is not expected to incur costs exceeding \$100 million. EPA has fulfilled the requirement for analysis under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

VI. Effect on Small Businesses

A. 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.

B. Does the Regulatory Flexibility Act Apply to This Proposed Rule?

While this rule proposes to revise 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 whole. 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 proposed 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 proposed rule, if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Therefore, this proposed regulation does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

VII. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

A. What Is the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act?

Section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (NTTAA), Public Law 104-113, section 12(d) (15 U.S.C. 272 note), directs EPA to use voluntary consensus standards in its regulatory activities unless to do so would be inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. Voluntary consensus standards are technical standards (e.g., materials specifications, test methods, sampling procedures, and business practices) that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies. The NTTAA requires EPA to provide Congress, through OMB explanations when the Agency decides not to use available and applicable voluntary consensus standards.

B. Does the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act Apply to This Proposed Rule?

No. This proposed rulemaking does not involve technical standards. Therefore, the Agency did not consider the use of any voluntary consensus standards.

VIII. Executive Order 13045

A. What Is Executive Order 13045?

Executive Order 13045: "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (62 FR 19885, April 23, 1997) applies to any rule that: (1) is determined to be "economically significant" as defined under E.O. 12866, and (2) concerns an environmental health or safety risk that EPA has reason to believe may have a disproportionate effect on children. If the regulatory action meets both criteria, the Agency must evaluate the environmental health or safety effects of the planned rule on children, and explain why the planned regulation is preferable to other potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives considered by the Agency.

B. Does Executive Order 13045 Apply to This Proposed Rule?

This rule is not subject to E.O. 13045 because it is not an economically significant rule as defined by E.O. 12866, and because it does not involve

decisions based on environmental health or safety risks.

IX. Paperwork Reduction Act

A. What Is the Paperwork Reduction Act?

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information that requires OMB approval under the PRA, unless it has been approved by OMB and displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations, after initial display in the preamble of the final rules, are listed in 40 CFR part 9. The information collection requirements related to this action have already been approved by OMB pursuant to the PRA under OMB control number 2070-0012 (EPA ICR No. 574).

B. Does the Paperwork Reduction Act Apply to This Proposed Rule?

This action does not impose any burden requiring OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

XI. Executive Order 12875

What Is Executive Order 12875 and Is It Applicable to This Proposed Rule?

Under Executive Order 12875, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute and that creates a mandate upon a State, local or tribal government, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by those governments. If the mandate is unfunded, EPA must provide to the Office of Management and Budget a description of the extent of EPA's prior consultation with representatives of affected State, local and tribal governments, the nature of their concerns, copies of any written communications from the governments, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, Executive Order 12875 requires EPA to develop an effective process permitting elected officials and other representatives of State, local and tribal governments "to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory proposals containing significant unfunded mandates."

This final rule does not create a mandate on State, local or tribal governments. The rule does not impose any enforceable duties on these entities. Accordingly, the requirements of section 1(a) of Executive Order 12875 do not apply to this rule.

XII. Executive Order 13084

What Is Executive Order 13084 and Is It Applicable to This Proposed Rule?

Under Executive Order 13084, EPA may not issue a regulation that is not required by statute, that significantly or uniquely affects the communities of Indian tribal governments, and that imposes substantial direct compliance costs on those communities, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by the tribal

governments. If the mandate is unfunded, EPA must provide to the Office of Management and Budget, in a separately identified section of the preamble to the rule, a description of the extent of EPA's prior consultation with representatives of affected tribal governments, a summary of the nature of their concerns, and a statement supporting the need to issue the regulation. In addition, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to develop an effective process permitting elected and other representatives of Indian tribal

governments "to provide meaningful and timely input in the development of regulatory policies on matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities."

Today's rule does not significantly or uniquely affect the communities of Indian tribal governments because it does not significantly or uniquely affect their communities. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of Executive Order 13084 do not apply to this rule.

TABLE 1.—NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST PROPOSED RULE NO. 26, GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/county	Group
CA	Lava Cap Mine	Nevada City	21
CA	Omega Chemical Corporation	Whittier	22
MN	Fridley Commons Park Well Field	Fridley	4/5
NJ	Middlesex Sampling Plant	Middlesex	4/5
NJ	United States Avenue Burn	Gibbsboro	4/5
NY	Hiteman Leather	West Winfield	4/5
NY	Mohonk Road Industrial Plant	High Falls	4/5
NY	Smithtown Ground Water Contamination	Smithtown	4/5
OK	Tulsa Fuel and Manufacturing	Collinsville	4/5
TX	City of Perryton Well No. 2	Perryton	4/5
TX	Many Diversified Interests, Inc	Houston	19
VT	Pownal Tannery	Pownal	4/5

Number of Sites Proposed to General Superfund Section: 12.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous substances, Hazardous waste, Intergovernmental relations, Natural resources, Oil pollution, Penalties, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Water pollution control, Water supply.

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.

Dated: September 22, 1998.

Timothy Fields, Jr.,

Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.
[FR Doc. 98–25890 Filed 9–28–98; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–U

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 68

[CC Docket No. 98–163; FCC 98–221]

1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Modifications to Signal Power Limitations

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This NPRM proposes increasing the signal power limitations in order to improve the transmission rates experienced by persons using high speed digital information products, such as 56 kilobits per second (kbps) modems, to download data from the Internet. Current rules limiting the signal power that can be transmitted over telephone lines can prohibit such products from operating at their full potential. We believe that these signal power limitations may be increased without causing interference or other technical problems. We propose increasing the signal power limitations and request comment on the benefits and harms, if any, that may result from this change. Specifically, this change will allow Pulse Code Modulation (PCM) modems, used by Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and other online information service providers to utilize higher signal power levels to transmit data at moderately higher speeds.

DATES: Comments are due on or before October 29, 1998, and reply comments are due on or before November 13, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Room 222, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554. In addition to filing comments with the Secretary, an electronic and a paper copy of any comments, reply comments,

and supporting documents should be submitted to Vincent M. Paladini, Federal Communications Commission, Common Carrier Bureau, Network Services Division, Room 235, 2000 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554 or via the Internet to vpaladin@fcc.gov. Electronic submissions must be in WordPerfect 5.1 for Windows format.

Comments may be filed using the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) or by filing paper copies. See *Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings*, 63 FR 24121 (May 1, 1998). Comments filed through the ECFS can be sent as an electronic file via the Internet to <http://www.fcc.gov/e-file/ecfs.html>. Generally, only one copy of an electronic submission must be filed. If multiple docket or rulemaking numbers appear in the caption of this proceeding, however, commenters must transmit one electronic copy of the comments to each docket or rulemaking number referenced in the caption. In completing the transmittal screen, commenters should include their full name, Postal Service mailing address, and the applicable docket or rulemaking number. Parties may also submit an electronic comment by Internet e-mail. To get filing instructions for e-mail comments, commenters should send an e-mail to ecfs@fcc.gov, and should include the following words in the body of the message, "get form <your e-mail