

**Note 1 to paragraph (k)(2)(i):** Although the document specified in paragraph (k)(2)(i) has the watermarked words “Uncontrolled for Reference Only” on the title page and each page of the table of contents, and the watermarked word “Uncontrolled” on each page of Part 1, this is a current version of that document.

(ii) Viking PSM 1–3–5, DHC–3 Otter Supplemental Inspection and Corrosion Control Manual, Revision IR, Part 1, dated December 21, 2017.

(iii) Viking Service Bulletin V3/0012, Revision NC, dated January 20, 2022.

(3) For Viking service information identified in this AD, contact Viking Air Limited Technical Support, 1959 de Havilland Way, Sidney, British Columbia, Canada, V8L 5V5; phone: (800) 663–8444; fax: (403) 295–8888; email: [dh\\_technical.support@vikingair.com](mailto:dh_technical.support@vikingair.com); website: [vikingair.com/support/service-bulletins](http://vikingair.com/support/service-bulletins).

(4) You may view this service information at the FAA, Airworthiness Products Section, Operational Safety Branch, 901 Locust, Kansas City, MO 64106. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (817) 222–5110.

(5) You may view this service information that is incorporated by reference at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, email: [fr.inspection@nara.gov](mailto:fr.inspection@nara.gov), or go to: [www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html](http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/ibr-locations.html).

Issued on August 31, 2023.  
**Victor Wicklund,**  
*Deputy Director, Compliance & Airworthiness Division, Aircraft Certification Service.*  
[FR Doc. 2023–19170 Filed 9–6–23; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Food and Drug Administration**

**21 CFR Part 161**

[Docket No. FDA–2016–P–0147]

**RIN 0910–AI74**

**Fish and Shellfish; Canned Tuna Standard of Identity and Standard of Fill of Container**

*Correction*

In rule document 2023–17916, appearing on pages 58157 through 58167 in the issue of Friday, August 25, 2023, make the following corrections:

**§ 161.190 Canned tuna. [Corrected]**

- 1. On page 58167, in the first column, on the third and second lines from the bottom, “1¼-inch” should read “1½-inch”.
- 2. On the same page, in the second column, on the eleventh and twelfth lines, “1¼-inch” should read “1½-inch”.

[FR Doc. C1–2023–17916 Filed 9–6–23; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 0099–10–D**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 300**

[EPA–HQ–OLEM–2023–0384, 0385, 0386 and 0387; FRL–11234–01–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 rule proposes to add four sites to the General Superfund section of the NPL.

**DATES:** Comments regarding any of these proposed listings must be submitted (postmarked) on or before November 6, 2023.

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

**DOCKET IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS BY SITE**

Site name	City/county, state	Docket ID No.
Lot 46 Valley Gardens TCE .....	Des Moines, IA .....	EPA–HQ–OLEM–2023–0384.
Acme Steel Coke Plant .....	Chicago, IL .....	EPA–HQ–OLEM–2023–0385.
Exide Baton Rouge .....	Baton Rouge, LA .....	EPA–HQ–OLEM–2023–0386.
Former Exide Technologies Laureldale .....	Laureldale, PA .....	EPA–HQ–OLEM–2023–0387.

You may send comments, identified by the appropriate docket number, by any of the following methods:

- **Federal eRulemaking Portal:** <https://www.regulations.gov/> (our preferred method). Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

- **Agency Website:** <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/current-npl-updates-new-proposed-npl-sites-and-new-npl-sites>; scroll down to the site for which you would like to submit comments and click the “Comment Now” link.

- **Mail:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA Docket Center, Superfund Docket, Mail Code 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20460.
- **Hand Delivery or Courier (by scheduled appointment only):** EPA

Docket Center, WJC West Building, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20004. The Docket Center's hours of operations are 8:30 a.m.–4:30 p.m., Monday–Friday (except Federal holidays).

**Instructions:** All submissions received must include the appropriate Docket ID No. for site(s) for which you are submitting comments. Comments received may be posted without change to <https://www.regulations.gov/>, including any personal information provided. For detailed instructions on sending comments and additional information on the rulemaking process, see the “Public Review/Public Comment” heading of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Terry Jeng, Site Assessment and Remedy Decisions Branch, Assessment and Remediation Division, Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (Mail code 5204T), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; 1301 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20460, telephone number: (202) 566–1048, email address: [jeng.terry@epa.gov](mailto:jeng.terry@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Table of Contents

- I. Public Review/Public Comment
  - A. May I review the documents relevant to this proposed rule?
  - B. What documents are available for public review at the EPA Headquarters docket?
  - C. What documents are available for public review at the EPA regional dockets?
  - D. How do I access the documents?
  - 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?
- II. 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?
- III. Contents of This Proposed Rule
  - A. Proposed Additions 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. 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. An electronic version of the public docket is available through <https://www.regulations.gov> (see table above for docket identification numbers). Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the docket facilities.

##### B. What documents are available for public review at the EPA Headquarters docket?

The Headquarters docket for this proposed rule contains the following information for the sites proposed in this rule: Hazard Ranking System (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. These documents are also available online at <https://www.regulations.gov>.

##### C. 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.

##### D. How do I access the documents?

You may view the primary documents that support this proposed rule online at <https://www.regulations.gov> or by contacting the EPA HQ docket. You may view the primary documents plus the references by contacting the regional dockets. 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 individual regional dockets for hours. 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.
- James Desir, Region 2 (NJ, NY, PR, VI), U.S. EPA, 290 Broadway, New York, NY 10007–1866; (212) 637–4342.
- Lorie Baker, Region 3 (DE, DC, MD, PA, VA, WV), U.S. EPA, 4 Penn Center, 1600 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Mail code 3SD12, Philadelphia, PA 19103; (315) 814–3355.
- Sandra Bramble, Region 4 (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN), U.S. EPA, 61 Forsyth Street SW, Mail code 9T25, Atlanta, GA 30303; (404) 562–8926.
- 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.
- Michelle Delgado-Brown, Region 6 (AR, LA, NM, OK, TX), U.S. EPA, 1201 Elm Street, Suite 500, Mail code SED, Dallas, TX 75270; (214) 665–3154.
- Kumud Pyakuryal, Region 7 (IA, KS, MO, NE), U.S. EPA, 11201 Renner Blvd., Mail code SUPRSTAR, Lenexa, KS 66219; (913) 551–7956.
- David Fronczak, Region 8 (CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY), U.S. EPA, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Mail code 8SEM–EM–P, Denver, CO 80202–1129; (303) 312–6096.
- Matt Mitguard, Region 9 (AZ, CA, HI, NV, AS, GU, MP), U.S. EPA, 75 Hawthorne Street, Mail code SFD–6–1, San Francisco, CA 94105; (415) 972–3096.
- Brandon Perkins, Region 10 (AK, ID, OR, WA), U.S. EPA, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Mail code 13–J07, Seattle, WA 98101; (206) 553–6396.

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 them, oversized maps may be viewed only in-person. The EPA dockets are not equipped to copy and mail out such maps, nor are they equipped to scan them for electronic distribution.

You may use the docket at <https://www.regulations.gov> to access documents in the Headquarters docket. Please note that there are differences between the Headquarters docket and the regional dockets, and those differences are outlined in this preamble above.

#### *E. How do I submit my comments?*

Follow the online instructions detailed above in the **ADDRESSES** section for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from the docket. 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>.

#### *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 <https://www.regulations.gov> as the EPA receives them and without change, unless the comment contains copyrighted material, 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.

## **II. 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. On January 9, 2017 (82 FR 2760), a subsurface intrusion component was added to the HRS to enable the EPA to consider human exposure to hazardous substances or pollutants and contaminants that enter regularly occupied structures through subsurface intrusion when evaluating sites for the NPL. The current HRS evaluates four pathways: ground water, surface water, soil exposure and subsurface intrusion, 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 more information on the CCL, see the EPA’s internet site at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/construction-completions-national-priorities-list-npl-sites-number>.

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, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (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#reuse>.

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 website: <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/statetribal-correspondence-concerning-npl-site-listing>.

The EPA has improved 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 between the EPA and States and Tribes where applicable, is available on the EPA’s website at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/statetribal-correspondence-concerning-npl-site-listing>.

III. Contents of This Proposed Rule

A. Proposed Additions to the NPL

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

The sites are presented in the table below.

GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/county
IA .....	Lot 46 Valley Gardens TCE .....	Des Moines.
IL .....	Acme Steel Coke Plant .....	Chicago.
LA .....	Exide Baton Rouge .....	Baton Rouge.
PA .....	Former Exide Technologies Laureldale .....	Laureldale.

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 proposed 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 proposed rule listing sites on the NPL does not impose any obligations on any group, including small entities. This proposed 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 proposed rule 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.

**Barry N. Breen,**

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

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, EPA proposes to amend 40 CFR part 300 as follows:

### PART 300—NATIONAL OIL AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES POLLUTION CONTINGENCY PLAN

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

**Authority:** 33 U.S.C. 1251 *et seq.*; 42 U.S.C. 9601–9657; E.O. 13626, 77 FR 56749, 3 CFR, 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.

■ 2. Amend table 1 of appendix B to part 300 by adding the entries for “IA, Lot 46 Valley Gardens TCE”, “IL, Acme Steel Coke Plant”, “LA, Exide Baton Rouge”, and “PA, Former Exide Technologies Laureldale” in alphabetical order by State to read as follows:

### Appendix B to Part 300—National Priorities List

TABLE 1—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/county	Notes (a)
IA	Lot 46 Valley Gardens TCE	Des Moines.	
IL	Acme Steel Coke Plant	Chicago.	

TABLE 1—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION—Continued

State	Site name	City/county	Notes (a)
LA	Exide Baton Rouge	Baton Rouge.	
PA	Former Exide Technologies Laureldale	Laureldale.	

<sup>a</sup> A = Based on issuance of health advisory by Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (if scored, HRS score need not be greater than or equal to 28.50).

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2023–19005 Filed 9–6–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### 48 CFR Parts 3015, 3016 and 3052

[Docket No. DHS–2009–005]

RIN 1601–AA43

#### Homeland Security Acquisition Regulation; Limitations on Subcontracting in Emergency Acquisitions; Withdrawal

**AGENCY:** Office of the Chief Procurement Officer, Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** DHS is withdrawing a proposed rule titled *Limitations on Subcontracting in Emergency Acquisitions (HSAR Case 2009–005)* and providing notice of its cancellation. The notice of proposed rulemaking proposed

to amend the Homeland Security Acquisition Regulation (HSAR) to implement Limitations on Tiering of Subcontractors limiting the use of subcontractors on cost-reimbursement type contracts entered into by the Department to facilitate the response to or recovery from a natural disaster or act of terrorism or other man-made disaster.

**DATES:** The proposed rule published on June 9, 2010 (75 FR 32723) is withdrawn effective September 7, 2023.

**ADDRESSES:** *Mail:* Department of Homeland Security, Office of the Chief Procurement Officer, Acquisition Policy and Legislation, ATTN: Catherine Benavides, 245 Murray Drive, Bldg. 410 (RDS), Washington, DC 20528.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Catherine Benavides, Procurement Analyst, DHS, Office of the Chief Procurement Officer, Acquisition Policy and Legislation at (202) 897–8301 or email [HSAR@hq.dhs.gov](mailto:HSAR@hq.dhs.gov). When using email, include HSAR Case 2009–005 in the “Subject” line.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On June 9, 2010 the Department of Homeland

Security (DHS) proposed to amend the Department of Homeland Security Acquisition Regulation (HSAR), 48 CFR chapters 15, 16 and 52 to provide notice to implement Public Law 109–295 Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act (PKERMA), title VI, section 692, Limitations on Tiering of Subcontractors. Subsequently, title VIII, Section 866 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 resulted in government-wide changes to the Federal Acquisition Regulation to prevent excessive subcontracting, making Section 692 unnecessary.

DHS is withdrawing this proposed rule because Public Law 117–253, effective December 20, 2022, repealed Sec. 692 of the Post-Katrina Reform Act of 2006. Thus, DHS will not take any further action on this proposal.

**Paul Courtney,**

*Chief Procurement Officer, Department of Homeland Security.*

[FR Doc. 2023–19316 Filed 9–6–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–10–P