

EPA-APPROVED DELAWARE SOURCE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

Name of source	Permit number	State effective date	EPA approval date	Comments
*	*	*	*	*
SPI Polyols, Inc.	Secretary's Order No. 2000-A-0033	07/11/00	6/14/01, 66 FR 32235	Polyhydrate Alcohol's Catalyst Regenerative Process—Approved NO _x RACT Determination
Citisteel	Secretary's Order No. 2000-A-0033	07/11/00	6/14/01, 66 FR 32235	Electric Arc Furnace—Approved NO _x RACT Determination
General Chemical Corp.	Secretary's Order No. 2000-A-0033	07/11/00	6/14/01, 66 FR 32235	(1) Sulfuric Acid Process & Interstage Absorption System (2) Metallic Nitrite Process—Approved NO _x RACT Determinations

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 01-14898 Filed 6-13-01; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[FRL-6994-4]

National Priorities List for Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Sites

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (“CERCLA” or “the Act”), as amended, requires that the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (“NCP”) include a list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States. The National Priorities List (“NPL”) constitutes this list, and is intended primarily to guide the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA” or “the Agency”) in determining which sites warrant further investigation. This rule adds 10 new sites to the General Superfund Section of the NPL. These sites will be assessed to determine the nature and extent of public health and environmental risks associated with them, and to determine what CERCLA-financed remedial action(s), if any, may be appropriate.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date for this final rule shall be July 16, 2001.

ADDRESSES: For addresses for the Headquarters and Regional dockets, as well as further details on what these

dockets contain, see section II, “Availability of Information to the Public” in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** portion of this preamble.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yolanda Singer, phone (703) 603-8835, State, Tribal and Site Identification Center; Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (mail code 5204G); 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. 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. Availability of Information to the Public
 - A. Can I Review the Documents Relevant To this Final Rule?
 - B. What Documents Are Available for Review at the Headquarters Docket?
 - C. What Documents Are Available for Review at the Regional Docket?
 - D. How Do I Access the Documents?
 - E. How Can I Obtain a Current List of NPL Sites?
- III. Contents of This Final Rule
 - A. Additions to the NPL
 - B. Status of NPL
 - C. What Did EPA Do With the Public Comments It Received?
- IV. Executive Order 12866
 - A. What Is Executive Order 12866?
 - B. Is This Final 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 Final Rule?
- VI. Effects on Small Businesses
 - A. What Is the Regulatory Flexibility Act?
 - B. Does the Regulatory Flexibility Act Apply to This Final Rule?
- VII. Possible Changes to the Effective Date of the Rule
 - A. Has This Rule Been Submitted to Congress and the General Accounting Office?
 - B. Could the Effective Date of This Final Rule Change?
 - C. What Could Cause the Effective Date of This Rule To Change?
- VIII. 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 Final Rule?
- IX. Executive Order 12898
 - A. What Is Executive Order 12898?
 - B. Does Executive Order 12898 Apply to This Final Rule?
- X. Executive Order 13045
 - A. What Is Executive Order 13045?
 - B. Does Executive Order 13045 Apply to This Final Rule?
- XI. Paperwork Reduction Act
 - A. What Is the Paperwork Reduction Act?
 - B. Does the Paperwork Reduction Act Apply to This Final Rule?
- XII. Executive Orders on Federalism
 - What Are the Executive Orders on Federalism and Are They Applicable to This Final Rule?
- XIII. Executive Order 13175
 - What Is Executive Order 13175 and Is It Applicable to This Final 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"), Public Law 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. 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. Neither does placing a site on the NPL 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 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 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 appendix A of the NCP (40 CFR part 300). The HRS serves as a screening device to evaluate the relative potential of uncontrolled hazardous substances to pose a threat to human health or the environment. On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), EPA promulgated revisions to the HRS partly in response to CERCLA section 105(c), added by SARA. The revised HRS evaluates four pathways: ground water, surface water, soil exposure, and air. As a matter of Agency policy, those sites that score 28.50 or greater on the HRS are eligible for the NPL; (2) Each State may designate a single site as its top priority to be listed on the NPL, regardless of the HRS score. This mechanism, provided by the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(2) requires that, to the extent practicable, the NPL include within the 100 highest priorities, one facility designated by each State representing the greatest danger to public health, welfare, or the environment among known facilities in the State (see 42 U.S.C. 9605(a)(8)(B)); (3) The third mechanism for listing, included in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(3), allows certain sites to be listed regardless of their HRS score, if all of the following conditions are met:

- The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) of the U.S. Public Health Service has issued a health advisory that recommends dissociation of individuals from the release.
- EPA determines that the release poses a significant threat to public health.

- EPA anticipates that it will be more cost-effective to use its remedial authority than to use its removal authority to respond to the release.

EPA promulgated an original NPL of 406 sites on September 8, 1983 (48 FR 40658). The NPL has been expanded since then, most recently on December 1, 2000 (65 FR 75179).

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

In other words, while geographic terms are often used to designate the site (e.g., the "Jones Co. plant site") in terms

of the property owned by a particular party, the site properly understood is not limited to that property (e.g., it may extend beyond the property due to contaminant migration), and conversely may not occupy the full extent of the property (e.g., where there are uncontaminated parts of the identified property, they may not be, strictly speaking, part of the "site"). The "site" is thus neither equal to nor confined by the boundaries of any specific property that may give the site its name, and the name itself should not be read to imply that this site is coextensive with the entire area within the property boundary of the installation or plant. The precise nature and extent of the site are typically not known at the time of listing. Also, the site name is merely used to help identify the geographic location of the contamination. For example, the name "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 problem presented by the release" will be determined by a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) as more information is developed on site contamination (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, this inquiry focuses on an evaluation of the threat posed; the boundaries of the release need not be exactly defined. Moreover, it generally is impossible to discover the full extent of where the contamination "has come to be located" before all necessary studies and remedial work are completed at a site. Indeed, the known boundaries of the contamination can be expected to change over time. Thus, in most cases, it may be impossible to describe the boundaries of a release with absolute certainty.

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

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

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.

As of May 21, 2001, the Agency has deleted 232 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 May 21, 2001, EPA has deleted portions of 23 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.

As of May 21, 2001, there are a total of 766 sites on the CCL. For the most up-to-date information on the CCL, see EPA's Internet site at <http://www.epa.gov/superfund>.

II. Availability of Information to the Public

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

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

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

The Headquarters docket for this rule contains, for each site, the HRS score sheets, the Documentation Record describing the information used to compute the score, pertinent information regarding statutory requirements or EPA listing policies that affect the site, and a list of documents referenced in the Documentation Record. The Headquarters docket also contains comments received, and the Agency's responses to those comments. The Agency's responses are contained in the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List Final Rule—June 2001."

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

The Regional dockets contain all the information in the Headquarters docket, plus the actual reference documents containing the data principally relied upon by EPA in calculating or evaluating the HRS score for the sites located in their Region. These reference documents are available only in the Regional dockets.

D. How Do I Access the Documents?

You may view the documents, by appointment only, after the publication of this document. 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 the Regional dockets for hours.

Following is the contact information for the EPA Headquarters: Docket Coordinator, Headquarters, U.S. EPA CERCLA Docket Office, Crystal Gateway #1, 1st Floor, 1235 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, 703/603-8917.

The contact information for the Regional dockets is as follows:

Ellen Culhane, Region 1 (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT), U.S. EPA, Superfund Records Center, Mailcode HSC, One Congress Street, Suite 1100, Boston, MA 02114-2023; 617/918-1225.
Ben Conetta, Region 2 (NJ, NY, PR, VI), U.S. EPA, 290 Broadway, New York, NY 10007-1866; 212/637-4435
Dawn Shellenberger (ASRC), Region 3 (DE, DC, MD, PA, VA, WV), U.S. EPA,

Library, 1650 Arch Street, Mailcode 3PM52, Philadelphia, PA 19103; 215/814-5364.

Joellen O'Neill, Region 4 (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN), U.S. EPA, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, 9th floor, 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, Mailcode 6SF-RA, Dallas, TX 75202-2733; 214/665-7436.

Michelle Quick, Region 7 (IA, KS, MO, NE), U.S. EPA, 901 North 5th Street, Kansas City, KS 66101; 913/551-7335.

David Williams, Region 8 (CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY), U.S. EPA, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Mailcode 8EPR-SA, 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.

Robert Phillips, Region 10 (AK, ID, OR, WA), U.S. EPA, 11th Floor, 1200 6th Avenue, Mail Stop ECL-115, Seattle, WA 98101; 206/553-6699.

E. How Can I Obtain a Current List of NPL Sites?

You may obtain a current list of NPL sites via the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/> (look under the Superfund sites category) or by contacting the Superfund Docket (see contact information above).

III. Contents of This Final Rule

A. Addition to the NPL

This final rule adds 10 sites to the NPL; all to the General Superfund Section of the NPL. Table 1 presents the 10 sites in the General Superfund Section. Sites in the tables are arranged alphabetically by State.

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

State and site name	City/county
CA—Cooper Drum Company.	South Gate.
MA—Nuclear Metals, Inc.	Concord.
MA—Sutton Brook Disposal Area.	Tewksbury.
NM—Griggs & Walnut Ground Water Plume.	Las Cruces.
NY—Consolidated Iron and Metal.	Newburgh.

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

State and site name	City/county
NY—Shenandoah Road Ground Water Contamination.	East Fishkill.
OR—Taylor Lumber and Treating.	Sheridan.
PA—Lower Darby Creek Area.	Delaware/Philadelphia Counties.
TX—Malone Service Company, Inc..	Texas City.
VT—Elizabeth Mine	Strafford.

Number of Sites Added to the General Superfund Section: 10.

B. Status of NPL

With the 10 new sites added to the NPL in today's final rule; the NPL now contains 1,236 final sites; 1,076 in the General Superfund Section and 160 in the Federal Facilities Section. With a separate rule (published elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**) proposing to add 10 new sites to the NPL, there are now 67 sites proposed and awaiting final agency action, 61 in the General Superfund Section and 6 in the Federal Facilities Section. Final and proposed sites now total 1,303. (These numbers reflect the status of sites as of May 21, 2001. Site deletions occurring after this date may affect these numbers at time of publication in the **Federal Register**.)

C. What Did EPA Do With the Public Comments It Received?

EPA reviewed all comments received on the sites in this rule. The Lower Darby Creek site was proposed May 11, 2000 (63 FR 30489). The Nuclear Metals, Inc. and Sutton Brook Disposal Area sites were proposed on July 27, 2000 (65 FR 46131). The Malone Service Company, Inc. site was proposed on Aug 24, 2000 (65 FR 51567). The Consolidated Iron and Metals, Taylor Lumber and Treating, and Elizabeth Mine sites were proposed on December 1, 2000 (65 FR 75215). The Copper Drum Company, Griggs & Walnut Ground Water Plume, and Shenandoah Road Ground Water Contamination sites were proposed on January 11, 2001 (65 FR 2380).

For the Copper Drum Company and the Griggs & Walnut Ground Water Plume sites, EPA received no comments and therefore, EPA is placing them on the final NPL at this time.

For Shenandoah Road Ground Water Contamination site, EPA received only comments supporting the listing of the sites to the NPL and therefore, EPA is placing them on the final NPL at this time.

EPA responded to all relevant comments received on the other sites. EPA's responses to site-specific public comments are addressed in the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List Final Rule—June 2001."

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 Final Rule Subject to Executive Order 12866 Review?

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

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 Final Rule?

No, EPA has determined that this rule does not contain a Federal mandate that may result in expenditures of \$100 million or more for State, local, and tribal governments in the aggregate, or by the private sector in any one year. 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?

Pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA) of 1996) whenever an agency is required to publish a notice of rulemaking for any proposed or final rule, it must prepare and make available for public comment a regulatory flexibility analysis that describes the effect of the rule on small entities (*i.e.*, small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions). However, no regulatory flexibility analysis is required if the head of an agency certifies the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. SBREFA amended the Regulatory Flexibility Act to require Federal agencies to provide a statement of the factual basis for certifying that a rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

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

No. The RFA does not apply to NPL listings (See 65 FR 46135 (July 27, 2000)). The RFA generally requires an agency to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis of any rule for which an agency must publish a notice of general rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act or any other statute. Under RFA section 601(2), however, the term "rule" means any rule for which the agency publishes a general notice of rulemaking but does not include a rule of "particular applicability relating * * * to facilities * * *." 5 U.S.C. 601(2). Here, while EPA published a notice of rulemaking for these listings, each listing is based on determinations unique to individual sites and the listing applies only to one facility or site. Consequently, each listing is a rule of particular applicability and thus, the RFA does not apply to the listing of these individual sites on the NPL.

Moreover, the listing of these individual sites on the NPL does not impose any obligations on small entities or any other identifiable group. The rule sets no standards or a regulatory regime that any small entity must meet. The listing imposes no liability or costs on any small entity (65 FR 46135 (July 27, 2000)). 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 irrespective of whether the site is listed on the NPL.

A commenter questioned whether we had adequately assessed the impact on small businesses located near one of the sites included in today's final rule (the Nuclear Metals, Inc. site). However, even if the RFA did apply to the listing of the Nuclear Metals Inc. site (or any of the other sites added to the NPL in today's rule), the statute does not require EPA to assess the impact on small entities which are not subject to a rule. *Motor & Equipment Mfrs. Ass'n v. N. Nichols*, 142 F.3d 449, 467 (D.C. Cir. 1998). As discussed above, the listing of a site on the NPL does not apply to any small entity because it imposes no obligations. Certainly, no regulatory obligations are imposed on small businesses which may be located near a site listed in today's final.

VII. Possible Changes to the Effective Date of the Rule

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

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*, as added by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996, generally provides that before a rule may take effect, the agency promulgating the rule must submit a rule report, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. EPA has submitted a report containing this rule and other required information to the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States prior to publication of the rule in the **Federal Register**. A "major rule" cannot take effect until 60 days after it is published in the **Federal Register**. This rule is not a "major rule" as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2). This rule will be effective on July 16, 2001.

B. Could the Effective Date of This Final Rule Change?

Provisions of the Congressional Review Act (CRA) or section 305 of CERCLA may alter the effective date of this regulation.

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

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

EPA has submitted a report under the CRA for this rule. The rule will take effect, as provided by law, within 30 days of publication of this document, since it is not a major rule. Section 804(2) defines a major rule as any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) finds has resulted in or is likely to result in: an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more; a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets. NPL listing is not a major rule because, as explained above, the listing, itself, imposes no monetary costs on any person. It establishes no enforceable duties, does not establish that EPA necessarily will undertake remedial action, nor does it require any action by any party or determine its liability for site response costs. Costs that arise out of site responses result from site-by-site decisions about what actions to take, not directly from the act of listing itself. Section 801(a)(3) provides for a delay in the effective date of major rules after this report is submitted.

C. What Could Cause the Effective Date of This Rule to Change?

Under 5 U.S.C. 801(b)(1) a rule shall not take effect, or continue in effect, if Congress enacts (and the President signs) a joint resolution of disapproval, described under section 802.

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

If action by Congress under either the CRA or CERCLA section 305 calls the effective date of this regulation into

question, EPA will publish a document of clarification in the **Federal Register**.

VIII. 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 directs 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 Final Rule?

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

IX. Executive Order 12898

A. What Is Executive Order 12898?

Under Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations," as well as through EPA's April 1995, "Environmental Justice Strategy, OSWER Environmental Justice Task Force Action Agenda Report," and National Environmental Justice Advisory Council, EPA has undertaken to incorporate environmental justice into its policies and programs. EPA is committed to addressing environmental justice concerns, and is assuming a leadership role in environmental justice initiatives to enhance environmental quality for all residents of the United States. The Agency's goals are to ensure that no segment of the population, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, bears disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects as a result of EPA's policies, programs, and activities, and all people live in clean and sustainable communities.

B. Does Executive Order 12898 Apply to This Final Rule?

No. While this rule revises the NPL, no action will result from this rule that

will have disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects on any segment of the population.

X. 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 Executive Order 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 Final Rule?

This rule is not subject to Executive Order 13045 because it is not an economically significant rule as defined by Executive Order 12866, and because the Agency does not have reason to believe the environmental health or safety risks addressed by this section present a disproportionate risk to children.

XI. 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 Final Rule?

No. EPA has determined that the PRA does not apply because this rule does not contain any information collection requirements that require approval of the OMB.

XII. Executive Orders on Federalism*What Are the Executive Orders on Federalism and Are They Applicable to This Final Rule?*

Executive Order 13132, entitled "Federalism" (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have federalism implications." "Policies that have federalism implications" is defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that 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."

Under section 6 of Executive Order 13132, EPA may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications, that imposes substantial direct compliance costs, and that is not required by statute, unless the Federal government provides the funds necessary to pay the direct compliance costs incurred by State and local governments, or EPA consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation. EPA also may not issue a regulation that has federalism implications and that preempts State law, unless the Agency consults with State and local officials early in the process of developing the proposed regulation.

This final 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, as specified in Executive Order 13132. Thus, the requirements of section 6 of the Executive Order do not apply to this rule.

XIII. Executive Order 13175*What Is Executive Order 13175 and Is It Applicable to This Final Rule?*

On November 6, 2000, the President issued Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249) entitled, "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments." Executive Order 13175 took effect on January 6, 2001, and revokes Executive Order 13084 (Tribal Consultation) as of that date. EPA developed this final rule, however, during the period when Executive Order 13084 was in effect; thus, EPA addressed tribal considerations under Executive Order 13084.

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, or EPA consults with those governments. If EPA complies by consulting, Executive Order 13084 requires EPA to 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 officials 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."

Under section 3(b) of 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, or EPA consults with those governments. The addition of sites to the NPL will not impose any substantial direct compliance costs on Tribes. While Tribes may incur costs from participating in the investigations and cleanup decisions, those costs are not compliance costs. Accordingly, the requirements of section 3(b) of Executive Order 13084 do not apply to this final rule.

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.

Dated: June 1, 2001.

Michael H. Shapiro,

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

40 CFR part 300 is amended as follows:

PART 300—[AMENDED]

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

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

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

Appendix B to Part 300—National Priorities List

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/County	Notes ^(a)
*	*	*	*
CA	Cooper Drum Company	South Gate.	*
MA	Nuclear Metals, Inc.	Concord.	*
MA	Sutton Brook Disposal Area	Tewksbury.	*
NM	Griggs & Walnut Ground Water Plume	Las Cruces.	

TABLE 1.—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION—Continued

State	Site name	City/County	Notes (a)
*	*	*	*
NY	Consolidated Iron and Metal	Newburgh.	*
NY	Shenandoah Road Ground Water Contamination	East Fishkill.	*
OR	Taylor Lumber and Treating	Sheridan.	*
PA	Lower Darby Creek Area	Delaware/Philadelphia Counties.	*
TX	Malone Service Company, Inc	Texas City.	*
VT	Elizabeth Mine	Strafford.	*

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 01-14616 Filed 6-13-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**47 CFR Part 73**

[MM Docket No. 00-108; FCC 01-133]

RIN 4211

Broadcast Services; Radio Stations, Television Stations**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.**ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document amends the Commission's "dual network" rule. That rule effectively prevented mergers among the four major television broadcast networks (ABC, CBS, Fox and NBC) or between one of the four major networks and the UPN and/or the WB television networks. The action taken eliminates that portion of the rule that effectively prevents mergers between a major television network and the UPN and/or WB television networks.

DATES: Effective August 13, 2001.**ADDRESSES:** Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC 20554.**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Roger Holberg or Danny Bring, Mass Media Bureau, Policy and Rules Division, (202) 418-2120.**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the *Report and Order (R&O)* in MM Docket No. 00-108, FCC 01-133, adopted April 19, 2001, and released

May 15, 2001. The complete text of this document is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center, Room CY-A257, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC and may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service (202) 857-3800, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC. This *R&O* is also available on the Internet at the Commission's website: <http://www.fcc.gov>.

Synopsis of Report and Order**I. Introduction**

1. In this *R&O* we amend § 73.658(g), the "dual network" rule, to permit one of the four major television networks—ABC, CBS, Fox and NBC—to own, operate, maintain or control the UPN and/or the WB television network. The rule already permits any of the four major television networks to own any television network created subsequent to the date that the Telecommunications Act of 1996 was enacted. By this action, we recognize that the economics of the broadcast television network industry have changed to the point that retention of the rule in its current form is no longer in the public interest.

II. Background

2. The dual network rule goes back some sixty years. The Commission first adopted a dual network rule in 1941, following its investigation of "chain" broadcasting. The rule adopted then mandated a flat prohibition on an entity maintaining more than a single radio network. As we noted in the *Notice of Proposed Rule Making ("NPRM")* in this proceeding (65 FR 41393 (July 5, 2000)),

when the Commission extended the rule to television networks in 1946, it determined that permitting an entity to operate more than one network might preclude new networks from developing and affiliating with desirable stations.

3. Title 47 CFR 73.658(g) sets forth the current version of the dual network rule. It reflects the provisions of section 202(e) of the 1996 Act. That section directed the Commission to modify its dual network rule to prohibit a television station from affiliating with any entity that owns more than one of the four major networks (ABC, CBS, Fox, or NBC) or one of the four major networks and an emerging English-language network which, on the date of the 1996 Act's enactment, "provides 4 or more hours of programming per week on a national basis pursuant to network affiliation arrangements with local television broadcast stations in markets reaching more than 75 percent of television homes. * * *" The legislative history of this provision indicated that it was intended to apply to only the UPN and WB television networks. Moreover, these two networks were the only two entities other than the four major networks that met this definition of a network on the relevant date. (Both UPN and WB argue that they did not meet the legislative definition of a network for these purposes. We rejected UPN's argument in this regard in considering the Viacom/CBS merger. We need not reach the merits of The WB Network's argument in this regard given our resolution herein, which renders its argument moot.)

4. The current dual network rule differs markedly from the dual network rule that existed from 1946 to 1996. The