

Dated: March 28, 2016.

**Jared Blumenfeld,**

*Regional Administrator, Region IX.*

For the reasons stated in the preamble, 40 CFR part 258, Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills, is proposed to be amended as follows:

**PART 258—CRITERIA FOR MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE LANDFILLS**

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

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1345(d) and (e); 42 U.S.C. 6902(a), 6907, 6912(a), 6944, 6945(c) and 6949a(c), 6981(a).

**Subpart F—Closure and Post-Closure Care**

■ 2. Section 258.62 is amended by adding paragraph (b) to read as follows:

**§ 258.62 Approval of site-specific flexibility requests in Indian Country.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) *Picacho Municipal Solid Waste Landfill—Alternative list of detection monitoring parameters and alternative final cover.* This paragraph (b) applies to the Picacho Landfill, a Municipal Solid Waste landfill operated by Imperial County on the Quechan Indian Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation in California.

(1) In accordance with 40 CFR 258.54(a), the owner and operator may modify the list of heavy metal detection monitoring parameters specified in 40 CFR 258, Appendix I, as required during Post-Closure Care by 40 CFR 258.61(a)(3), by replacing monitoring of the inorganic constituents with the exception of arsenic, with the inorganic indicator parameters chloride, nitrate as nitrogen, sulfate, and total dissolved solids.

(2) In accordance with 40 CFR 258.60(b), the owner and operator may replace the prescriptive final cover set forth in 40 CFR 258.60(a), with an alternative final cover as follows:

(i) The owner and operator may install an evapotranspiration cover system as an alternative final cover for the 12.5 acre site.

(ii) The alternative final cover system shall be constructed to achieve an equivalent reduction in infiltration as the infiltration layer specified in § 258.60(a)(1) and (2), and provide an equivalent protection from wind and

water erosion as the erosion layer specified in § 258.60(a)(3).

(iii) The final cover system shall consist of a minimum three-foot-thick multi-layer cover system comprised, from bottom to top, of:

(A) A minimum 30-inch thick infiltration layer consisting of:  
 (1) Existing intermediate cover; and  
 (2) additional cover soil which, prior to placement, shall be wetted to optimal moisture as determined by ASTM D 1557 and thoroughly mixed to near uniform condition, and the material shall then be placed in lifts with an uncompacted thickness of six to eight inches, spread evenly and compacted to 90 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by ASMT D 1557, and shall:

(i) Exhibit a grain size distribution that excludes particles in excess of three inches in diameter;

(ii) have a minimum fines content (percent by weight passing U.S. No. 200 Sieve) of seven percent for an individual test and eight percent for the average of ten consecutive tests;

(iii) have a grain size distribution with a minimum of five percent finer than five microns for an individual test and six percent for the average of ten consecutive tests; and

(iv) exhibit a maximum saturated hydraulic conductivity on the order of 1.0E-03 cm/sec.; and

(3) a minimum six-inch surface erosion layer comprised of a rock/soil admixture. The surface erosion layer admixture and gradations for 3% slopes and 3:1 slopes are detailed below:

(i) 3% slopes: For the 3% slopes the surface admixture shall be composed of pea gravel (3/8-inch to 1/2-inch diameter) mixed with cover soil at the ratio of 25% rock to soil by volume with a minimum six-inch erosion layer.

(ii) For the 3:1 side slopes the surface admixture shall be composed of either: gravel/rock (3/4-inch to one-inch diameter) mixed with additional cover soil as described in paragraph (b)(2)(iii)(A)(2) of this section at the ratio of 50% rock to soil by volume and result in a minimum six-inch erosion layer, or gravel/rock (3/4-inch to two-inch diameter) mixed with additional cover soil as described in paragraph (b)(2)(iii)(A)(2) of this section at the ratio of 50% rock to soil by volume and result in a minimum 12-inch erosion layer.

(iii) The owner and operator shall place documentation demonstrating compliance with the provisions of this Section in the operating record.

(iv) All other applicable provisions of 40 CFR part 258 remain in effect.

[FR Doc. 2016-07996 Filed 4-6-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 300**

[EPA-HQ-SFUND-1994-0002; EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0151, 0152, 0153, 0154, 0155, 0156, 0157 and 0158; FRL-9944-35-OLEM]

**National Priorities List**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (“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. These further investigations will allow the EPA 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 rulemaking proposes to add eight sites to the General Superfund section of the NPL. This proposed rule also withdraws a previous proposal to add a site to the NPL.

**DATES:** Comments regarding any of these proposed listings must be submitted (postmarked) on or before June 6, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** Identify the appropriate docket number from the table below.

**DOCKET IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS BY SITE**

| Site name                                  | City/county, state        | Docket ID No.         |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Argonaut Mine .....                        | Jackson, CA .....         | EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0151 |
| Bonita Peak Mining District .....          | San Juan County, CO ..... | EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0152 |
| Riverside Ground Water Contamination ..... | Indianapolis, IN .....    | EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0153 |

DOCKET IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS BY SITE—Continued

| Site name                               | City/county, state        | Docket ID No.         |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Valley Pike VOCs .....                  | Riverside, OH .....       | EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0154 |
| Wappinger Creek .....                   | Dutchess County, NY ..... | EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0155 |
| Dorado Ground Water Contamination ..... | Dorado, PR .....          | EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0156 |
| Eldorado Chemical Co., Inc. ....        | Live Oak, TX .....        | EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0157 |
| North 25th Street Glass and Zinc .....  | Clarksburg, WV .....      | EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0158 |

Submit your comments, identified by the appropriate docket number, at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from Regulations.gov. The EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.* on the web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>. For 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 Jeng, phone: (703) 603-8852, email: [jeng.terry@epa.gov](mailto:jeng.terry@epa.gov), Site Assessment and Remedy Decisions Branch, Assessment and Remediation Division, Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (Mailcode 5204P), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., 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. Does the NPL define the boundaries of sites?
- G. How are sites removed from the NPL?
- H. May the EPA delete portions of sites from the NPL as they are cleaned up?
- I. What is the Construction Completion List (CCL)?
- J. What is the Sitewide Ready for Anticipated Use measure?
- K. What is state/tribal correspondence concerning NPL listing?
- II. Public Review/Public Comment
  - A. May 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 EPA Headquarters docket?
  - D. What documents are available for public review at the EPA 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. May I submit comments after the public comment period is over?
  - I. May I view public comments submitted by others?
  - J. May I submit comments regarding sites not currently proposed to the NPL?
- III. Contents of This Proposed Rule
  - A. Proposed Additions to the NPL
  - B. Withdrawal of Site From Proposal to the NPL
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews
  - A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review
  - B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)
  - C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)
  - D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)
  - E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
  - F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments
  - G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks
  - H. Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use
  - I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)
  - J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations

**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 or threatened releases of hazardous substances, and releases or substantial threats of releases into the environment of any pollutant or contaminant that may present an imminent or substantial danger to the public health or welfare. CERCLA was amended on October 17, 1986, by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (“SARA”), Public Law 99-499, 100 Stat. 1613 *et seq.*

*B. What is the NCP?*

To implement CERCLA, the 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 or releases or substantial threats of releases into the environment of any pollutant or contaminant that may present an imminent or substantial danger to the public health or welfare. The 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 of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants (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. 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 the 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, pollutants or contaminants. The NPL is only of limited significance, however, as it does not assign liability to any party or to the owner of any specific property. Also, placing a site on the NPL does not mean that any remedial or removal action necessarily need be taken.

For purposes of listing, the NPL includes two sections, one of sites that are generally evaluated and cleaned up by the EPA (the “General Superfund section”), and one of sites that are owned or operated by other federal agencies (the “Federal Facilities section”). With respect to sites in the Federal Facilities section, these sites are generally being addressed by other federal agencies. 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 the EPA is responsible for preparing a Hazard Ranking System (“HRS”) score and determining whether the facility is placed on the NPL.

#### 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 HRS, which the EPA promulgated as appendix A of the NCP (40 CFR part 300). The HRS serves as a screening tool to evaluate the relative potential of uncontrolled hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants to pose a threat to human health or the environment. On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), the 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) Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9605(a)(8)(B), each state may designate a single site as its top priority to be

listed on the NPL, without any HRS score. This provision of CERCLA requires that, to the extent practicable, the NPL include one facility designated by each state as the greatest danger to public health, welfare or the environment among known facilities in the state. This mechanism for listing is set out in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(2).

(3) The third mechanism for listing, included in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(3), allows certain sites to be listed without any 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.
- The EPA determines that the release poses a significant threat to public health.
- The 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.

The EPA promulgated an original NPL of 406 sites on September 8, 1983 (48 FR 40658) and generally has updated it at least annually.

#### 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.” The EPA may pursue other appropriate authorities to respond to the releases, including enforcement action under CERCLA and other laws.

#### F. Does the NPL define the boundaries of sites?

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. Indeed, the precise nature and extent of the site are typically not known at the time of listing.

Although a CERCLA “facility” is broadly defined to include any area where a hazardous substance 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. However, the NPL site is not necessarily coextensive with the boundaries of the installation or plant, and the boundaries of the installation or plant are not necessarily 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 where that contamination has come to be located, or from where 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. In addition, the site name is merely used to help identify the geographic location of the contamination, and is not meant to constitute any determination of liability at a site. For example, the name “Jones Co. Plant site,” does not imply that the Jones Company is responsible for the contamination located on the plant site.

The EPA regulations provide that the remedial investigation (“RI”) “is a process undertaken . . . to determine the nature and extent of the problem presented by the release” as more information is developed on site contamination, and which is generally performed in an interactive fashion with the feasibility Study (“FS”) (40 CFR 300.5). 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, the HRS inquiry focuses on an evaluation of the threat posed and

therefore 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 previously, 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, it can submit supporting information to the agency at any time after it 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?*

The 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 the 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.

#### *H. May the EPA delete portions of sites from the NPL as they are cleaned up?*

In November 1995, the EPA initiated a 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 made available for productive use.

#### *I. What is the Construction Completion List (CCL)?*

The 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) the 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. For the most up-to-date information on the CCL, see the EPA's Internet site at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-6>.

#### *J. What is the Sitewide Ready for Anticipated Use measure?*

The Sitewide Ready for Anticipated Use measure (formerly called Sitewide Ready-for-Reuse) represents important Superfund accomplishments and the measure reflects the high priority the EPA places on considering anticipated future land use as part of the remedy selection process. See Guidance for Implementing the Sitewide Ready-for-Reuse Measure, May 24, 2006, OSWER 9365.0-36. This measure applies to final and deleted sites where construction is complete, all cleanup goals have been achieved, and all institutional or other controls are in place. The EPA has been successful on many occasions in carrying out remedial actions that ensure protectiveness of human health and the environment for current and future land uses, in a manner that allows contaminated properties to be restored to environmental and economic vitality. For further information, please go to <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-9>.

#### *K. What is state/tribal correspondence concerning NPL listing?*

In order to maintain close coordination with states and tribes in the NPL listing decision process, the EPA's policy is to determine the position of the states and tribes regarding sites that the EPA is considering for listing. This consultation process is outlined in two memoranda that can be found at the following Web site: <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/statetribal-correspondence-concerning-npl-site-listing>.

The EPA is improving the transparency of the process by which state and tribal input is solicited. The EPA is using the Web and where appropriate more structured state and tribal correspondence that (1) explains the concerns at the site and the EPA's rationale for proceeding; (2) requests an explanation of how the state intends to

address the site if placement on the NPL is not favored; and (3) emphasizes the transparent nature of the process by informing states that information on their responses will be publicly available.

A model letter and correspondence from this point forward between the EPA and states and tribes where applicable, is available on the EPA's Web site at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/statetribal-correspondence-concerning-npl-site-listing>.

## **II. Public Review/Public Comment**

### *A. May I review the documents relevant to this proposed rule?*

Yes, documents that form the basis for the EPA's evaluation and scoring of the sites in this proposed rule are contained in public dockets located both at the EPA Headquarters in Washington, DC, and in the regional offices. These documents are also available by electronic access at <http://www.regulations.gov> (see instructions in the **ADDRESSES** section above).

### *B. How do I access the documents?*

You may view the documents, by appointment only, in the Headquarters or the regional dockets after the publication of this proposed rule. The hours of operation for the Headquarters docket are from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday excluding federal holidays. Please contact the regional dockets for hours.

The following is the contact information for the EPA Headquarters Docket: Docket Coordinator, Headquarters, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, CERCLA Docket Office, 1301 Constitution Avenue NW., William Jefferson Clinton Building West, Room 3334, Washington, DC 20004; 202/566-0276. (Please note this is a visiting address only. Mail comments to the EPA Headquarters as detailed at the beginning of this preamble.)

The contact information for the regional dockets is as follows:

- Holly Inglis, Region 1 (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT), U.S. EPA, Superfund Records and Information Center, 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100, Boston, MA 02109-3912; 617/918-1413.
- Ildefonso Acosta, Region 2 (NJ, NY, PR, VI), U.S. EPA, 290 Broadway, New York, NY 10007-1866; 212/637-4344.
- Lorie Baker (ASRC), Region 3 (DE, DC, MD, PA, VA, WV), U.S. EPA, Library, 1650 Arch Street, Mailcode 3HS12, Philadelphia, PA 19103; 215/814-3355.
- Jennifer Wendel, Region 4 (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN), U.S. EPA, 61

Forsyth Street, SW., Mailcode 9T25, Atlanta, GA 30303; 404/562-8799.

- Todd Quesada, Region 5 (IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI), U.S. EPA Superfund Division Librarian/SFD Records Manager SRC-7J, Metcalfe Federal Building, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604; 312/886-4465.

- Brenda Cook, Region 6 (AR, LA, NM, OK, TX), U.S. EPA, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Mailcode 6SFTS, Dallas, TX 75202-2733; 214/665-7436.

- Preston Law, Region 7 (IA, KS, MO, NE), U.S. EPA, 11201 Renner Blvd., Mailcode SUPRERNB, Lenexa, KS 66219; 913/551-7097.

- Sabrina Forrest, Region 8 (CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY), U.S. EPA, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Mailcode 8EPR-B, Denver, CO 80202-1129; 303/312-6484.

- Sharon Murray, Region 9 (AZ, CA, HI, NV, AS, GU, MP), U.S. EPA, 75 Hawthorne Street, Mailcode SFD 6-1, San Francisco, CA 94105; 415/947-4250.

- Ken Marcy, Region 10 (AK, ID, OR, WA), U.S. EPA, 1200 6th Avenue, Mailcode ECL-112, Seattle, WA 98101; 206/463-1349.

You may also request copies from the EPA Headquarters or the regional dockets. 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. Please note that due to the difficulty of reproducing oversized maps, oversized maps may be viewed only in-person; since the EPA dockets are not equipped to both copy and mail out such maps or scan them and send them out electronically.

You may use the docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> to access documents in the Headquarters docket (see instructions included in the **ADDRESSES** section). Please note that there are differences between the Headquarters docket and the regional dockets and those differences are outlined in this preamble, Sections II.C and D.

*C. What documents are available for public review at the EPA Headquarters docket?*

The Headquarters docket for this proposed rule contains the following for the sites proposed in this rule: HRS score sheets; documentation records describing the information used to compute the score; information for any

sites affected by particular statutory requirements or the EPA listing policies; and a list of documents referenced in the documentation record.

*D. What documents are available for public review at the EPA regional dockets?*

The regional dockets for this proposed rule contain all of the information in the Headquarters docket plus the actual reference documents containing the data principally relied upon and cited by the EPA in calculating or evaluating the HRS score for the sites. These reference documents are available only in the regional dockets.

*E. How do I submit my comments?*

Comments must be submitted to the EPA Headquarters as detailed at the beginning of this preamble in the **ADDRESSES** section. Please note that the mailing addresses differ according to method of delivery. There are two different addresses that depend on whether comments are sent by express mail or by postal mail.

*F. What happens to my comments?*

The EPA considers all comments received during the comment period. Significant comments are typically addressed in a support document that the 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 the 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)). The EPA will not address voluminous comments that are not referenced to the HRS or other listing criteria. The EPA will not address comments unless they indicate which component of the HRS documentation record or what particular point in the EPA's stated eligibility criteria is at issue.

*H. May I submit comments after the public comment period is over?*

Generally, the EPA will not respond to late comments. The EPA can

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

*I. May 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 dockets approximately one week after the formal comment period closes.

All public comments, whether submitted electronically or in paper form, will be made available for public viewing in the electronic public docket at <http://www.regulations.gov> as the EPA receives them and without change, unless the comment contains copyrighted material, confidential business information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Once in the public dockets system, select "search," then key in the appropriate docket ID number.

*J. May I submit comments regarding sites not currently proposed to the NPL?*

In certain instances, interested parties have written to the EPA concerning sites that 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*

In this proposed rule, the EPA is proposing to add eight sites to the NPL, all to the General Superfund section. All of the sites in this proposed rulemaking are being proposed based on HRS scores of 28.50 or above.

The sites are presented in the table below.

GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

| State | Site name     | City/County |
|-------|---------------|-------------|
| CA    | Argonaut Mine | Jackson.    |

GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION—Continued

| State    | Site name                                  | City/County      |
|----------|--|------------------|
| CO ..... | Bonita Peak Mining District .....          | San Juan County. |
| IN ..... | Riverside Ground Water Contamination ..... | Indianapolis.    |
| OH ..... | Valley Pike VOCs .....                     | Riverside.       |
| NY ..... | Wappinger Creek .....                      | Dutchess County. |
| PR ..... | Dorado Ground Water Contamination .....    | Dorado.          |
| TX ..... | Eldorado Chemical Co., Inc. ....           | Live Oak.        |
| WV ..... | North 25th Street Glass and Zinc .....     | Clarksburg.      |

*B. Withdrawal of Site From Proposal to the NPL*

The EPA is withdrawing its previous proposal to add the Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base site in Lockbourne, Ohio to the NPL because all appropriate cleanup actions have been taken at the site in accordance with its reuse as an airport. The U.S. Air Force will continue to provide funding to the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency under its Defense-State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) to provide cleanup oversight and stewardship of institutional controls in accordance with state law. The proposed rule can be found at 59 FR 2568 (January 18, 1994). Refer to the Docket ID Number EPA-HQ-SFUND-1994-0002 for supporting documentation regarding this action.

**IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

Additional information about these statutes and Executive Orders can be found at <https://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/laws-and-executive-orders>.

*A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review*

This action is not a significant regulatory action and was therefore not submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review.

*B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)*

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the PRA. This rule does not contain any information collection requirements that require approval of the OMB.

*C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)*

I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA. This action will not impose any requirements on small entities. This rule listing sites on the NPL does not impose any obligations on any group, including small entities. This rule also does not establish standards or requirements that any small entity must meet, and imposes no direct costs on

any small entity. Whether an entity, small or otherwise, is liable for response costs for a release of hazardous substances depends on whether that entity is liable under CERCLA 107(a). Any such liability exists regardless of whether the site is listed on the NPL through this rulemaking.

*D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)*

This action does not contain any unfunded mandate as described in UMRA, 2 U.S.C. 1531-1538, and does not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. This action imposes no enforceable duty on any state, local or tribal governments or the private sector. Listing a site on the NPL does not itself impose any costs. Listing does not mean that the EPA necessarily will undertake remedial action. Nor does listing require any action by a private party, state, local or tribal governments or determine liability for response costs. Costs that arise out of site responses result from future site-specific decisions regarding what actions to take, not directly from the act of placing a site on the NPL.

*E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism*

This action does not have federalism implications. It will not have substantial direct effects on the states, on the relationship between the national government and the states, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

*F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments*

This action does not have tribal implications as specified in Executive Order 13175. Listing a site on the NPL does not impose any costs on a tribe or require a tribe to take remedial action. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this action.

*G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks*

The EPA interprets Executive Order 13045 as applying only to those regulatory actions that concern

environmental health or safety risks that the EPA has reason to believe may disproportionately affect children, per the definition of “covered regulatory action” in section 2-202 of the Executive Order. This action is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because this action itself is procedural in nature (adds sites to a list) and does not, in and of itself, provide protection from environmental health and safety risks. Separate future regulatory actions are required for mitigation of environmental health and safety risks.

*H. Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use*

This action is not subject to Executive Order 13211, because it is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866.

*I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)*

This rulemaking does not involve technical standards.

*J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*

The EPA believes the human health or environmental risk addressed by this action will not have potential disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority, low-income or indigenous populations because it does not affect the level of protection provided to human health or the environment. As discussed in Section I.C. of the preamble to this action, the NPL is a list of national priorities. The NPL is intended primarily to guide the 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, pollutants or contaminants. The NPL is of only limited significance as it does not assign liability to any party. Also, placing a site on the NPL does not mean that any remedial or removal action necessarily need be taken.

**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(d); 42 U.S.C. 9601–9657; E.O. 13626, 77 FR 56749, 3CFR, 2013 Comp., p. 306; 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: March 28, 2016.

**Mathy Stanislaus,**

*Assistant Administrator, Office of Land and Emergency Management.*

[FR Doc. 2016–07671 Filed 4–6–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES****Administration for Children and Families****45 CFR Part 1355**

**RIN 0970–AC47**

**Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System**

**AGENCY:** Administration on Children, Youth and Families (ACYF), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

**ACTION:** Supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** On February 9, 2015, the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) to amend the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) regulations to modify the requirements for title IV–E agencies to collect and report data to ACF on children in out-of-home care and who were adopted or in a legal guardianship with a title IV–E subsidized adoption or guardianship agreement. In this supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking (SNPRM), ACF proposes to require that state title IV–E agencies collect and report additional data elements related to the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (ICWA) in the AFCARS. ACF will consider the public comments on this SNPRM as well as comments already received on the February 9, 2015 NPRM and issue one final AFCARS rule.

**DATES:** Submit written or electronic comments on this Supplemental Notice

of Proposed Rulemaking on or before May 9, 2016.

**ADDRESSES:** We encourage the public to submit comments electronically to ensure they are received in a timely manner. Please be sure to include identifying information on any correspondence. To download an electronic version of the proposed rule, please go to <http://www.regulations.gov/>. You may submit comments, identified by docket number, by any of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** <http://www.regulations.gov/>. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

**Mail:** Written comments may be submitted to Kathleen McHugh, United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Director, Policy Division, 330 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20024.

- Please be aware that mail sent in response to this SNPRM may take an additional 3 to 4 days to process due to security screening of mail.

- **Hand Delivery/Courier:** If you choose to use an express, overnight, or other special delivery method, please ensure that the carrier will deliver to the above address Monday through Friday during the hours of 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., excluding holidays.

**Instructions:** All submissions received must include the agency name and docket number or Regulatory Information Number (RIN) for this rulemaking. All comments received will be posted without change to [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov/), including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on submitting comments, see the “Public Participation” heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

Comments that concern information collection requirements must be sent to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) at the address listed in the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) section of this preamble. A copy of these comments also may be sent to the Department representative listed above.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kathleen McHugh, United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Director, Policy Division. To contact Kathleen McHugh, please use the following email address: [cbcomments@acf.hhs.gov](mailto:cbcomments@acf.hhs.gov). Deaf and hearing impaired individuals may call the Federal Dual Party Relay Service at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 7 p.m. Eastern Time.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Contents**

- I. Background
- II. Statutory Authority
- III. Public Participation
- IV. Consultation and Regulation Development
- V. Section-by-Section Discussion of the SNPRM
- VI. Regulatory Impact Analysis
- VII. Tribal Consultation Statement

**I. Background***Adoption and Foster Care Automated Reporting System (AFCARS)*

Section 479 of the Social Security Act (the Act) requires that ACF regulate a national data collection system that provides comprehensive demographic and case-specific information on all children who are in foster care or adopted with title IV–E agency involvement (42 U.S.C. 679).

Historically, the broad underlying legislative directive has always been the establishment and administration of a system for “the collection of data with respect to adoption and foster care in the United States.” Such data collection system is the Adoption and Foster Care Automated Reporting System (AFCARS).

The AFCARS statute with regard to data collection systems requires the following: (1) The data collection system developed and implemented shall avoid unnecessary diversion of resources from adoption and foster care agencies; (2) the data collection system shall assure that any data that is collected is reliable and consistent over time and among jurisdictions through the use of uniform definitions and methodologies; (3) the data collection system shall provide: Comprehensive national information with respect to the demographic characteristics of adoptive and foster children and their biological and adoptive foster parents; the status of the foster care population, the number and characteristics of children placed in and removed from foster care; children adopted or for whom adoptions have been terminated; children placed in foster care outside the state which has placement and care responsibility; the extent and nature of assistance provided by federal, state, and local adoption and foster care programs; the characteristics of the children with respect to whom such assistance is provided; and the annual number of children in foster care who are identified as sex trafficking victims including those who were victims before entering foster care; and those who were victims while in foster care; and (4) the data collection system will utilize appropriate requirements and incentives to ensure that the system