US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5
417827

1200; Dallas, Texas 75202–2733; telephone number: (214) 665–7437; e-mail: *casanova.rafael@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

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

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

Dated: September 6, 2011.

Al Armendariz,

Regional Administrator, Region 6.

Accordingly, the amendment to Table 1 of Appendix B to CFR part 300 to remove the entry "State Marine of Port Arthur Superfund Site," "Port Arthur, Texas," is withdrawn as of September 16, 2011.

[FR Doc. 2011–23823 Filed 9–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[EPA–HQ–SFUND–2000–0003; FRL–9465–5]

National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Withdrawal of direct final rule.

SUMMARY: On July 29, 2011, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a Notice of Intent to Delete and a Direct Notice of Deletion for the Palmer Barge Line (PBL) Superfund Site from the National Priorities List. The EPA is withdrawing the Final Direct Notice of Deletion because the deletion notices were published in the **Federal Register** without Headquarter's concurrence as required under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Delegation of Authority.

DATES: *Effective Date:* This withdrawal of the direct final action (76 FR 45432) is effective as of September 16, 2011.

ADDRESSES:

Information Repositories: Comprehensive information on the PBL Superfund Site, as well as the comments that we received during the comment period, are available in Docket EPA–HQ–SFUND–2000–0003, accessed through the *http://www.regulations.gov* Web site. Although listed in the docket index, some information is not publicly available (*e.g., CBI* or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute). Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, will be publicly available only in hard copy. Publicly available docket materials are available either electronically in *http://www.regulations.gov* or in hard copy at:

1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6; 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700; Dallas, Texas 75202–2733; *Hours of operation: Monday thru* Friday, 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. and 1 p.m. to 4 p.m.. Contact: Rafael A. Casanova (214) 665–7437.

2. Port Arthur Public Library; 4615 9th Avenue; Port Arthur, Texas 77642–5799; Hours of operation: Monday thru Thursday, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m.; Friday, 9 a.m. to 6 p.m.; Saturday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.; and Sunday, 2 p.m. to 5 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rafael A. Casanova, Remedial Project Manager; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6; Superfund Division (6SF–RA); 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200; Dallas, Texas 75202–2733; telephone number: (214) 665–7437; e-mail: *casanova.rafael@epa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

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

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

Dated: September 6, 2011.

Al Armendariz,

Regional Administrator, Region 6.

Accordingly, the amendment to Table 1 of Appendix B to CFR part 300 to remove the entry "Palmer Barge Line Superfund Site," "Port Arthur, Texas," is withdrawn as of September 16, 2011.

[FR Doc. 2011–23870 Filed 9–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[EPA–HQ–SFUND–2002–0001; EPA–HQ–SFUND–2010–0640 and 0641, EPA–HQ–SFUND–2011–0057, 0058, 0061, 0062, 0065, 0066, 0070, 0072, 0074, 0076, 0077, and 0078, FRL–9464–6]

RIN 2050–AD75

National Priorities List, Final Rule No. 52

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final Rule.

SUMMARY: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 ("CERCLA" or "the Act"), as amended, requires that the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan ("NCP") include a list of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States. The National Priorities List ("NPL") constitutes this list. The NPL is intended primarily to guide the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA" or "the Agency") in determining which sites warrant further investigation. These further investigations will allow 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 adds 15 sites to the NPL, all to the General Superfund Section.

DATES: *Effective Date:* The effective date for this amendment to the NCP is October 17, 2011.

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terry Jeng, phone: (703) 603–8852, email: *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 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?
II. Availability of Information to the Public
A. May 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 Dockets?
D. How Do I Access the Documents?
E. How May I Obtain a Current List of NPL Sites?
III. Contents of This Final Rule
A. Additions to the NPL
B. Site Name Change
C. What Did EPA Do with the Public Comments It Received?
IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews
A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review 13563
1. What Are Executive Order 12866 and Executive Order 13563?
2. Is This Final Rule Subject to Executive Order 12866 and Executive Order 13563 Review?
B. Paperwork Reduction Act
1. What is the Paperwork Reduction Act?
2. Does the Paperwork Reduction Act apply to this final rule?
C. Regulatory Flexibility Act
1. What is the Regulatory Flexibility Act?
2. How has EPA complied with the Regulatory Flexibility Act?
D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
1. What is the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)?
2. Does UMRA apply to this final rule?
E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
1. What is Executive Order 13132?
2. Does Executive Order 13132 apply to this final rule?
F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments
1. What is Executive Order 13175?
2. Does Executive Order 13175 apply to this final rule?
G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children from Environmental Health and Safety Risks
1. What is Executive Order 13045?
2. Does Executive Order 13045 apply to this final rule?
H. Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Usage
1. What is Executive Order 13211?
2. Does Executive Order 13211 apply to this final rule?
I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act
1. What is the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act?
2. Does the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act apply to this final rule?
J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
1. What is Executive Order 12898?
2. Does Executive Order 12898 apply to this final rule?
K. Congressional Review Act
1. Has EPA submitted this Rule to Congress and the Government Accountability Office?
2. Could the effective date of this Final Rule change?
3. What could Cause a Change in the effective date of this 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 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, 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. 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 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 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 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 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), 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.
- 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) 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." 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.

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 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, 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?

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.

H. May EPA delete portions of sites 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 made available for productive use.

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. For the most up-to-date information on the CCL, see EPA's Internet site at *http://www.epa.gov/superfund/cleanup/ccl.htm.*

J. What is the sitewide ready for anticipated use measure?

The Sitewide Ready for Anticipated Use measure represents important Superfund accomplishments and the measure reflects the high priority EPA places on considering anticipated future land use as part of our 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. 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 *http://www.epa.gov/superfund/programs/recycle/tools/index.html.*

II. Availability of Information to the Public

A. May 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.

An electronic version of the public docket is available through *http://www.regulations.gov* (see table below 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 identified below in section II D.

DOCKET IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS BY SITE

Site name	City/county, state	Docket ID No.
Blue Ledge Mine	Rogue River—Siskiyou National Forest, CA	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0057
New Idria Mercury Mine	Idria, CA	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0058
Armstrong World Industries	Macon, GA	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2010-0640
Sandoval Zinc Company	Sandoval, IL	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0061
Gary Development Landfill	Gary, IN	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0062
Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp—Columbus	Columbus, MS	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0065
Red Panther Chemical Company	Clarksdale, MS	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0066
Horton Iron and Metal	Wilmington, NC	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2010-0641
Garfield Ground Water Contamination	Garfield, NJ	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0070
Chevron Questa Mine	Questa, NM	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0072
New Cassel/Hicksville Ground Water Contamination	New Cassel/Hicksville, NY	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0074
North Ridge Estates	Klamath Falls, OR	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0076
US Finishing/Cone Mills	Greenville, SC	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0077
Alamo Contaminated Ground Water	Alamo, TN	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2011-0078
Falcon Refinery	Ingleside, TX	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2002-0001

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. For sites that received comments during the comment period, the Headquarters Docket also contains a Support Document that includes EPA's responses to comments.

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. For sites that received comments during the comment period, the Regional Docket also contains a Support Document that includes EPA's responses to comments.

D. How do I access the documents?

You may view the documents, by appointment only, after the publication of this 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.

Following is the contact information for the EPA Headquarters: Docket Coordinator, Headquarters; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; CERCLA Docket Office; 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW.; EPA West, Room 3334, Washington, DC 20004, 202/566-0276.

The contact information for the Regional Dockets is as follows:

Joan Berggren, 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 ; 617/918-1417.

Ildefonso Acosta, Region 2 (NJ, NY, PR, VI), U.S. EPA, 290 Broadway, New York, NY 10007–1866; 212/637–4344.
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.
Debbie Jourdan, Region 4 (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN), U.S. EPA, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Mailcode 9T25, Atlanta, GA 30303; 404/562–8862.
Evette Jones, Region 5 (IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI), U.S. EPA, Records Center, Superfund Division SRC–7J, Metcalfe Federal Building, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604; 312/886–7572.
Brenda Cook, Region 6 (AR, LA, NM, OK, TX), U.S. EPA, 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200, Mailcode 6SF, Dallas, TX 75202–2733; 214/665–7436.
Michelle Quick, Region 7 (IA, KS, MO, NE), U.S. EPA, 901 North 5th Street, Mailcode SUPRERNB, Kansas City, KS 66101; 913/551–7335.
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.
Karen Jurist, Region 9 (AZ, CA, HI, NV, AS, GU, MP), U.S. EPA, 75 Hawthorne Street, Mailcode SFD–6–1, San Francisco, CA 94105; 415/972–3219.
Ken Marcy, Region 10 (AK, ID, OR, WA), U.S. EPA, 1200 6th Avenue, Mailcode ECL–112, Seattle, WA 98101; 206/463–1349.

E. How may 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/sites/npl/status.htm* or by contacting the Superfund Docket (see contact information above).

III. Contents of This Final Rule

A. Additions to the NPL

This final rule adds the following 15 sites to the NPL, all to the General Superfund Section. All of the sites included in this final rulemaking are being added to the NPL based on HRS scores of 28.50 or above with the exceptions of North Ridge Estates (Klamath Falls, OR), which is being added based on its designation as the state's top priority, and Garfield Ground Water Contamination (Garfield, NJ), which is being added based on ATSDR health advisory criteria (see further discussion in Section C below). The sites are presented in the table below:

State	Site name	City/county
CA	Blue Ledge Mine	Rogue River—Siskiyou National Forest.
CA	New Idria Mercury Mine	Idria.
GA	Armstrong World Industries	Macon.
IL	Sandoval Zinc Company	Sandoval.
IN	Gary Development Company	Gary.
MS	Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp—Columbus	Columbus.
MS	Red Panther Chemical Company	Clarksdale.
NC	Horton Iron and Metal	Wilmington.
NJ	Garfield Ground Water Contamination	Garfield.
NM	Chevron Questa Mine	Questa.
NY	New Cassel/Hicksville Ground Water Contamination	New Cassel/Hicksville.
OR	North Ridge Estates	Klamath Falls.
SC	US Finishing/Cone Mills	Greenville.
TN	Alamo Contaminated Ground Water	Alamo.
TX	Falcon Refinery	Ingleside.

B. Site Name Change

The Chevron Questa Mine site in Questa, New Mexico, was proposed to the NPL under a different name. The former name was MolyCorp Inc. (see Proposed Rule at 76 FR 13113, March 10, 2011). EPA believes the new name, Chevron Questa Mine, more accurately identifies the site (see further discussion in Section C below).

C. What did EPA do with the public comments it received?

EPA reviewed all comments received on the sites in this rule and responded to all relevant comments. This rule adds 15 sites to the NPL.

Six sites received no comments: Gary Development Landfill (IN) (three comments were received which were unrelated to Gary Development Landfill but erroneously were addressed to the Gary Development Landfill docket number); Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp-Columbus (MS); Red Panther Chemical Company (MS); US Finishing/Cone Mills (SC); Alamo Contaminated Ground Water (TN); and North Ridge Estates (OR).

Four sites being placed on the NPL received comments specifically related to the HRS score and these are being addressed in response to comment support documents available concurrent with this rule: Sandoval Zinc Company (IL); Armstrong World Industries (GA); Horton Iron and Metal (NC); and New Cassel/Hicksville Ground Water Contamination (NY).

The North Ridge Estates site was added to the NPL as a one-time state designation of highest priority pursuant to 40 CFR 300.425(c)(2). In accordance with the Oregon Governor's designation letter dated August 31, 2010, the site consists of areas affected by releases or threatened releases of asbestos or other materials within the approximately 422 acres of the North Ridge Estates site. These areas include the former Marine Recuperation Barracks location and the Kingsley Firing Range, identified respectively as Operable Units 1 and 2 (OU1 and OU2) in the Record of Decision (ROD) and other ongoing investigations between EPA and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), as referenced in the Governor's designation letter. As discussed in Section I.F. of this Final Rule, however, the North Ridge Estates site may not be limited to these areas or releases. As stated by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, "EPA may alter or expand the boundaries of a NPL site if subsequent study reveals a wider-than-expected scope of contamination." *Washington State DOT* v. *EPA*, 917 F.2d 1309, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (citing *Eagle-Picher Indus.* v. *EPA*, 822 F.2d 132, 144 (D.C. Cir. 1987)).

Five sites received minimal comments: Falcon Refinery (TX); Blue Ledge Mine (CA); New Idria Mercury Mine (CA); Garfield Ground Water Contamination (NJ); and Chevron Questa Mine (NM). These sites are being added to the NPL in this rule and

comments are addressed below. Falcon Refinery was proposed September 5, 2002 and the other sites were proposed March 10, 2011.

EPA received no comments on the HRS score for the Falcon Refinery site but did receive one comment requesting that EPA suspend the final listing and allow the owner to perform the cleanup in accordance with EPA guidance for Superfund Alternative Sites. EPA agreed to this and entered into an agreement, leaving the site in proposed status since 2002. The owner has been approved by EPA to complete the RI/FS, but may not have the funds to carry out further cleanup work, should that be necessary (see information in docket for further information). Therefore, EPA is adding the site to the NPL in order for any potential cleanup activity to proceed in an expeditious manner. The work performed to this point has not resulted in any change to the HRS score at proposal.

The Blue Ledge Mine site received one potential comment (which may actually have been for the New Cassel/Hicksville site) supporting the listing. If the comment was regarding the Blue Ledge site proposal, EPA agrees the site should be listed so that it can be further investigated and the EPA can determine what, if any, response actions are necessary.

The Chevron Questa Mine site received 16 supporting comments and no comments opposing listing. An additional comment was received from an unrelated corporation named Molycorp, Inc., which was formed as a new Delaware corporation in 2010 and has no connection to the previous corporation named MolyCorp, Inc., or to the site being added to the NPL today. The commenter requested that the site name be changed to a name which does not include "Molycorp" to avoid confusion to the public and prevent harm to the recently formed corporation due to a false impression that it may have caused contamination of the site or be responsible for the cleanup and remediation of the site. EPA agrees with the commenter's concern, and has changed the name to Chevron Questa Mine to clarify and more accurately identify the site for the public.

The Garfield Ground Water Contamination site received one comment. The comment was related to another EPA **Federal Register** notice seeking public input regarding whether the HRS should be amended to add a vapor intrusion component. The comment said that EPA's ability to list the Garfield site showed that addition of a vapor intrusion component to the HRS was unnecessary. Since the comment was supportive of listing the site, EPA is proceeding with adding the site to the NPL.

The New Idria Mercury Mine site received five comments. Four supported listing, including one comment that said mercury at the site was bioavailable and a serious health concern, and cited several studies to support these assertions. One commenter opposed listing, claiming mercury at the site would not pose a problem and was not bioavailable, and that cleanup was a waste of money. The comment did not mention the HRS scoring. In response, the toxicity and bioaccumulation values assigned to mercury in the documentation record at proposal are consistent with the application of the HRS and no commenter suggested any other values. The site score based on these values makes the site eligible for listing. The HRS does not specifically consider bioavailability. Cost is not a factor considered when making a listing decision. Remedial costs, if any, will be determined once the risk decision is made. Placing the site on the NPL will enable EPA to evaluate whether the site poses a health risk, whether the mercury is bioavailable, and what cleanup, if any, is needed.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

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

1. What are Executive Order 12866 and Executive Order 13563?

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735 (October 4, 1993)), the Agency must determine whether a regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to Office of Management and Budget (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.

Executive Order 13563, entitled "Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review," was issued on January 18, 2011, and supplements Executive Order 12866 by outlining the President's regulatory strategy to support continued economic growth and job creation, while protecting the safety, health and rights of all Americans. The Executive Order requires considering costs, reducing burdens on businesses and consumers, expanding opportunities for public involvement, designing flexible approaches, ensuring sound science forms the basis of decisions, and retrospectively reviewing existing regulations.

2. Is this rule subject to Executive Order 12866 and Executive Order 13563 review?

No. The listing of sites on the NPL does not impose any obligations on any entities. The listing does not set standards or a regulatory regime and imposes no liability or costs. Any liability under CERCLA exists irrespective of whether a site is listed. It has been determined that this action is not a "significant regulatory action" under the terms of Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, October 4, 1993) and is therefore not subject to review under Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 (76 FR 3821, January 21, 2011).

B. Paperwork Reduction Act

1. 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.

2. Does the Paperwork Reduction Act apply to this final rule?

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* 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.

Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a

Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations in 40 CFR are listed in 40 CFR part 9.

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act

1. 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.

2. How has EPA complied with the Regulatory Flexibility Act?

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. Thus, this rule does not impose any requirements on any small entities. For the foregoing reasons, I certify that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

1. 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 where 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.

2. Does UMRA apply to this final rule?

This final 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 the private sector in any one year. 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 placing a site on the NPL. Thus, this rule is not subject to the requirements of section 202 and 205 of UMRA.

This rule is also not subject to the requirements of section 203 of UMRA because it contains no regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect small governments. As is mentioned above, site listing does not impose any costs and would not require any action of a small government.

E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

1. What is Executive Order 13132?

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" are 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."

2. Does Executive Order 13132 apply to this final rule?

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, because it does not contain any requirements applicable to States or other levels of government. Thus, the requirements of the Executive Order do not apply to this final rule.

EPA believes, however, that this final rule may be of significant interest to State governments. In the spirit of Executive Order 13132, and consistent with EPA policy to promote communications between EPA and State and local governments, EPA therefore consulted with State officials and/or representatives of State governments early in the process of developing the rule to permit them to have meaningful and timely input into its development. All sites included in this final rule were referred to EPA by States for listing. For all sites in this rule, EPA received letters

of support either from the Governor or a State official who was delegated the authority by the Governor to speak on their behalf regarding NPL listing decisions.

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

1. What is Executive Order 13175?

Executive Order 13175, entitled "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments" (65 FR 67249, November 6, 2000), requires EPA to develop an accountable process to ensure "meaningful and timely input by tribal officials in the development of regulatory policies that have tribal implications." "Policies that have tribal implications" are defined in the Executive Order to include regulations that have "substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal government and the Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal government and Indian tribes."

2. Does Executive Order 13175 apply to this final rule?

This final rule does not have tribal implications, as specified in Executive Order 13175 (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000). 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 final rule.

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

1. 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.

2. 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 rule present a disproportionate risk to children.

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

1. What Is Executive Order 13211?

Executive Order 13211, "Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use" (66 FR 28355 (May 22, 2001)), requires federal agencies to prepare a "Statement of Energy Effects" when undertaking certain regulatory actions. A Statement of Energy Effects describes the adverse effects of a "significant energy action" on energy supply, distribution and use, reasonable alternatives to the action, and the expected effects of the alternatives on energy supply, distribution and use.

2. Does Executive Order 13211 apply to this final rule?

This action is not a "significant energy action" as defined in Executive Order 13211, because it is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. Further, we have concluded that this final rule is not likely to have any adverse energy impacts because adding a site to the NPL does not require an entity to conduct any action that would require energy use, let alone that which would significantly affect energy supply, distribution, or usage. Thus, Executive Order 13175 does not apply to this action.

I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act

1. 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.

2. 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.

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

1. What is Executive Order 12898?

Executive Order (EO) 12898 (59 FR 7629 (Feb. 16, 1994)) establishes federal executive policy on environmental justice. Its main provision directs federal agencies, to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, to make environmental justice part of their mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States.

2. Does Executive Order 12898 apply to this rule?

EPA has determined that this final rule will not have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations because it does not affect the level of protection provided to human health or the environment. As this rule does not impose any enforceable duty upon State, tribal, or local governments, this rule will neither increase nor decrease environmental protection.

K. Congressional Review Act

1. Has EPA submitted this rule to Congress and the Government Accountability 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, that 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).

2. 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 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.

3. What could cause a change in the effective date of this rule?

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.**

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: September 8, 2011.

Mathy Stanislaus,

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	Blue Ledge Mine	Rogue River—Siskiyou National Forest	
*	*	*	*
CA	New Idria Mercury Mine	Idria	
*	*	*	*
GA	Armstrong World Industries	Macon	
*	*	*	*
IL	Sandoval Zinc Company	Sandoval	
*	*	*	*
IN	Gary Development Company	Gary	
*	*	*	*
MS	Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp—Columbus	Columbus	
*	*	*	*
MS	Red Panther Chemical Company	Clarksdale	
*	*	*	*
NC	Horton Iron and Metal	Wilmington	

TABLE 1—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION—Continued

State	Site name	City/county	Notes [a]
*	*	*	*
NJ	Garfield Ground Water Contamination	Garfield	
*	*	*	*
NM	Chevron Questa Mine	Questa	
*	*	*	*
NY	New Cassel/Hicksville Ground Water Contamination	New Cassel/Hicksville	
*	*	*	*
OR	North Ridge Estates	Klamath Falls	
*	*	*	*
SC	US Finishing/Cone Mills	Greenville	
*	*	*	*
TN	Alamo Contaminated Ground Water	Alamo	
*	*	*	*
TX	Falcon Refinery	Ingleside	
*	*	*	*

[a] A = Based on issuance of health advisory by Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry (HRS score need not be greater than or equal to 28.50).
C = Sites on Construction Completion list.
S = State top priority (HRS score need not be greater than or equal to 28.50).
P = Sites with partial deletion(s).

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2011–23652 Filed 9–15–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Defense Acquisition Regulations System

48 CFR Parts 203 and 252

[DFARS Case 2010–D026]

RIN 0750–AG98

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Display of DoD Inspector General Fraud Hotline Posters

AGENCY: Defense Acquisition Regulations System, Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: DoD is issuing a final rule amending the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) to require contractors to display the DoD fraud hotline poster in common work areas.

DATES: *Effective Date:* September 16, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Meredith Murphy, 703–602–1302.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

This final rule implements the recommendations of the DoD Inspector General (IG) by providing a DFARS clause to use in lieu of the FAR clause at 52.203–14, Display of Hotline Poster(s).

Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report GAO–09–591, entitled "Defense Contracting Integrity: Opportunities Exist to Improve DoD's Oversight of Contractor Ethics Programs," recommended that the DoD IG determine the need for defense contractors to display the DoD IG's fraud hotline poster.

The DoD IG determined that DoD contractors, including contractors that have an ethics and compliance program that includes a reporting mechanism such as a hotline poster, need to display DoD fraud hotline posters in a common work area within business segments performing work under the contract and at contract work sites.

FAR 52.203–14(c) states that "(i)f the Contractor has implemented a business ethics and conduct awareness program, including a reporting mechanism, such as a hotline poster, then the Contractor need not display any agency fraud hotline posters, other than any required DHS posters." The DoD IG determined that this exemption has the potential to make the DoD hotline program less effective by ultimately reducing contractor exposure to DoD IG fraud hotline posters and diminishing the means by which fraud, waste, and abuse can be reported under the protection of Federal whistleblower protection laws. According to the DoD IG, some contractors' posters may not be as effective as the DoD poster in advertising the hotline number, which is integral to the fraud program. The DoD IG is also revising the DoD IG fraud hotline poster to inform contractor employees of their Federal whistleblower protections.

Therefore, the prescription for use of the new DFARS clause provides no exception to the use of the DoD hotline poster for contractors that have implemented a business ethics and conduct awareness program, even those that include a reporting mechanism such as a hotline poster.

II. Discussion and Analysis

DoD published a proposed rule at 76 FR 13327 on March 11, 2011, to implement the DoD IG's policy. Nine respondents submitted 25 public comments on the proposed rule. The comments are summarized and discussed in the following paragraphs.

A. Supportive Comments

Comments: Four respondents supported the DFARS rule, stating that it would assist employees in reporting fraud, waste, and abuse and might promote *qui tam* suits. Two respondents recommended expanding the rule's applicability by (1) Lowering the