recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Dated: March 4, 2015.

Jared Blumenfeld,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.

Part 52, Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for Part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*

Subpart F—California

■ 2. Section 52.220 is amended by adding paragraphs (c)(282)(i)(C)(*2*) and (*3*) and (c)(284)(i)(A)(*5*) and (c)(308)(i)(E) and (c)(453) to read as follows:

§ 52.220 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(282) * * *

(i) * * *

(C) * * *

(*2*) Rule 204, ''Cancellation of Applications,'' revised on March 21, 2001.

(*3*) Rule 206, ''Standards for Issuing Authorities to Construct and Permits to Operate,'' revised on March 21, 2001.

* * * * *

(284) * * *

(i) * * *

(A) * * *

(*5*) Rule 200, ''Permits Required,'' revised on December 13, 2000.

* * * * *

(308) * * *

(i) * * *

(E) Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rule 203, ''Application,'' revised October 16, 2002.

(2) Rule 212, ''Public Availability of Emission Data,'' revised on October 16, 2002.

* * * * *

(453) New and amended regulations for the following APCDs were submitted on May 12, 2011.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

(1) Rule 207, ''Review of New or Modified Sources,'' revised on April 20, 2011.

[FR Doc. 2015–06705 Filed 3–25–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[EPA–R06–OAR–2008–0636; FRL–9925–11–Region 6]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; Revisions to Emission Inventory Requirements, and General Provisions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Withdrawal of direct final rule.

SUMMARY: On February 2, 2015, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a direct final rule approving revisions to the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County, New Mexico State Implementation Plan. These revisions add definitions and clarifying changes to the general provisions and add a new emissions inventory regulation that establishes reporting requirements for stationary sources in Albuquerque/Bernalillo County. The direct final rule was published without prior proposal because EPA anticipated no adverse comments. EPA stated in the direct final rule that if we received relevant, adverse comments by March 4, 2015, EPA would publish a timely withdrawal in the **Federal Register**. EPA received a comment on February 20, 2015 from the Sierra Club stating in relevant part, that an Acting Regional Administrator cannot sign approvals, disapprovals, or any combination of approvals or disapproval, in whole or in part, due to the fact that the authority to act on agency actions on state implementation plans is delegated only to, and therefore can only be signed by, the Regional Administrator. EPA considers this a relevant, adverse comment and accordingly we are withdrawing our direct final rule approval, and in a separate subsequent final rulemaking we will address the comment received. The withdrawal is being taken pursuant to section 110 of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

DATES: The direct final rule published on February 2, 2015 (80 FR 5471), is withdrawn effective March 26, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John Walser (6PD–L), Air Planning Section, telephone (214) 665–7128, fax (214) 665–6762, email: *walser.john@epa.gov.*

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxides, Ozone, Particulate matter, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: March 13, 2015.

Ron Curry,

Regional Administrator, Region 6.

Accordingly, the amendments to 40 CFR 52.1620 published in the **Federal Register** on February 2, 2015 (80 FR 5471), which were to become effective on April 3, 2015, are withdrawn.

[FR Doc. 2015–06701 Filed 3–25–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 300

[EPA–HQ–SFUND–2014–0624, 0625; FRL 9924–32–OSWER]

National Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

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 (''the EPA'' or ''the agency'') in determining which sites warrant further investigation. These further investigations will allow the EPA to assess the nature and extent of public health and environmental risks associated with the site and to determine what CERCLA-financed remedial action(s), if any, may be appropriate. This rule adds two sites to the General Superfund section of the NPL.

DATES: The document is effective on April 27, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Contact information for the EPA Headquarters and EPA Region 5 dockets:

• Docket Coordinator, Headquarters; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; CERCLA Docket Office; 1301 Constitution Avenue NW.; William Jefferson Clinton Building West, Room

3334, Washington, DC 20004, 202/566–0276.

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

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 the EPA delete portions of sites from the NPL as they are cleaned up?
I. What is the construction completion list (CCL)?
J. What is the Sitewide Ready for Anticipated Use Measure?
K. What is state/tribal correspondence concerning NPL listing?
II. 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 EPA Headquarters docket?
C. What documents are available for review at the EPA Region 5 docket?
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. What did the 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
B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)
C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)
D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)
E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
F. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments
G. Executive Order 13045: Protection of Children From Environmental Health and Safety Risks
H. Executive Order 13211: Actions That Significantly Affect Energy Supply, Distribution, or Use
I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)
J. Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
K. Congressional Review Act

I. Background

A. What are CERCLA and SARA?

In 1980, Congress enacted the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601–9675 ("CERCLA" or "the Act"), in response to the dangers of uncontrolled releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, and releases or substantial threats of releases into the environment of any pollutant or contaminant that may present an imminent or substantial danger to the public health or welfare. CERCLA was amended on October 17, 1986, by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act ("SARA"), Public Law 99–499, 100 Stat. 1613 *et seq.*

B. What is the NCP?

To implement CERCLA, the EPA promulgated the revised National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan ("NCP"), 40 CFR part 300, on July 16, 1982 (47 FR 31180), pursuant to CERCLA section 105 and Executive Order 12316 (46 FR 42237, August 20, 1981). The NCP sets guidelines and procedures for responding to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances, or releases or substantial threats of releases into the environment of any pollutant or contaminant that may present an imminent or substantial danger to the public health or welfare. The EPA has revised the NCP on several occasions. The most recent comprehensive revision was on March 8, 1990 (55 FR 8666).

As required under section 105(a)(8)(A) of CERCLA, the NCP also includes "criteria for determining priorities among releases or threatened releases throughout the United States for the purpose of taking remedial action and, to the extent practicable, taking into account the potential urgency of such action, for the purpose of taking removal action." "Removal" actions are defined broadly and include a wide range of actions taken to study, clean up, prevent or otherwise address releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants (42 U.S.C. 9601(23)).

C. What is the National Priorities List (NPL)?

The NPL is a list of national priorities among the known or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants throughout the United States. The list, which is appendix B of the NCP (40 CFR part 300), was required under section 105(a)(8)(B) of CERCLA, as amended. Section 105(a)(8)(B) defines the NPL as a list of "releases" and the highest priority "facilities" and requires that the NPL be revised at least annually. The NPL is intended primarily to guide the EPA in determining which sites warrant further investigation to assess the nature and extent of public health and environmental risks associated with a release of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants. The NPL is of only limited significance, however, as it does not assign liability to any party or to the owner of any specific property. Also, placing a site on the NPL does not mean that any remedial or removal action necessarily need be taken.

For purposes of listing, the NPL includes two sections, one of sites that are generally evaluated and cleaned up by the EPA (the "General Superfund section") and one of sites that are owned or operated by other federal agencies (the "Federal Facilities section"). With respect to sites in the Federal Facilities section, these sites are generally being addressed by other federal agencies. Under Executive Order 12580 (52 FR 2923, January 29, 1987) and CERCLA section 120, each federal agency is responsible for carrying out most response actions at facilities under its own jurisdiction, custody or control, although the EPA is responsible for preparing a Hazard Ranking System ("HRS") score and determining whether the facility is placed on the NPL.

D. How are sites listed on the NPL?

There are three mechanisms for placing sites on the NPL for possible remedial action (see 40 CFR 300.425(c) of the NCP): (1) A site may be included on the NPL if it scores sufficiently high on the HRS, which the EPA promulgated as appendix A of the NCP (40 CFR part 300). The HRS serves as a screening tool to evaluate the relative potential of uncontrolled hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants to pose a threat to human health or the environment. On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), the EPA promulgated revisions to the HRS partly in response to CERCLA section 105(c), added by SARA. The revised HRS evaluates four pathways: Ground water, surface water, soil exposure and air. As a matter of

agency policy, those sites that score 28.50 or greater on the HRS are eligible for the NPL. (2) 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:

(1) 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.

(2) The EPA determines that the release poses a significant threat to public health.

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

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

E. What happens to sites on the NPL?

A site may undergo remedial action financed by the Trust Fund established under CERCLA (commonly referred to as the "Superfund") only after it is placed on the NPL, as provided in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(b)(1). ("Remedial actions" are those "consistent with a permanent remedy, taken instead of or in addition to removal actions" (40 CFR 300.5). However, under 40 CFR 300.425(b)(2), placing a site on the NPL "does not imply that monies will be expended." The EPA may pursue other appropriate authorities to respond to the releases, including enforcement action under CERCLA and other laws.

F. Does the NPL define the boundaries of sites?

The NPL does not describe releases in precise geographical terms; it would be neither feasible nor consistent with the limited purpose of the NPL (to identify releases that are priorities for further evaluation), for it to do so. Indeed, the precise nature and extent of the site are typically not known at the time of listing.

Although a CERCLA "facility" is broadly defined to include any area where a hazardous substance has "come to be located" (CERCLA section 101(9)), the listing process itself is not intended to define or reflect the boundaries of such facilities or releases. Of course, HRS data (if the HRS is used to list a site) upon which the NPL placement was based will, to some extent, describe the release(s) at issue. That is, the NPL site would include all releases evaluated as part of that HRS analysis.

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

In other words, while geographic terms are often used to designate the site (*e.g.,* the "Jones Co. Plant site") in terms of the property owned by a particular party, the site, properly understood, is not limited to that property (*e.g.,* it may extend beyond the property due to contaminant migration), and conversely may not occupy the full extent of the property (*e.g.,* where there are uncontaminated parts of the identified property, they may not be, strictly speaking, part of the "site"). The "site" is thus neither equal to, nor confined by, the boundaries of any specific property that may give the site its name, and the name itself should not be read to imply that this site is coextensive with the entire area within the property boundary of the installation or plant. In addition, the site name is merely used to help identify the geographic location of the contamination, and is not meant to constitute any determination of liability at a site. For example, the name "Jones Co. plant site," does not imply that the Jones Company is responsible for the contamination located on the plant site.

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?

The EPA may delete sites from the NPL where no further response is appropriate under Superfund, as explained in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(e). This section also provides that the EPA shall consult with states on proposed deletions and shall consider whether any of the following criteria have been met:

(i) Responsible parties or other persons have implemented all appropriate response actions required;

(ii) All appropriate Superfund-financed response has been implemented and no further response action is required; or

(iii) The remedial investigation has shown the release poses no significant threat to public health or the environment, and taking of remedial measures is not appropriate.

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

In November 1995, the EPA initiated a policy to delete portions of NPL sites where cleanup is complete (60 FR 55465, November 1, 1995). Total site cleanup may take many years, while portions of the site may have been cleaned up and made available for productive use.

I. What is the construction completion list (CCL)?

The EPA also has developed an NPL construction completion list ("CCL") to simplify its system of categorizing sites and to better communicate the

successful completion of cleanup activities (58 FR 12142, March 2, 1993). Inclusion of a site on the CCL has no legal significance.

Sites qualify for the CCL when: (1) Any necessary physical construction is complete, whether or not final cleanup levels or other requirements have been achieved; (2) the EPA has determined that the response action should be limited to measures that do not involve construction (*e.g.*, institutional controls); or (3) the site qualifies for deletion from the NPL. For the most up-to-date information on the CCL, see the EPA's Internet site at *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 the EPA places on considering anticipated future land use as part of the remedy selection process. See Guidance for Implementing the Sitewide Ready-for-Reuse Measure, May 24, 2006, OSWER 9365.0–36. This measure applies to final and deleted sites where construction is complete, all cleanup goals have been achieved, and all institutional or other controls are in place. The EPA has been successful on many occasions in carrying out remedial actions that ensure protectiveness of human health and the environment for current and future land uses, in a manner that allows contaminated properties to be restored to environmental and economic vitality. For further information, please go to *http://www.epa.gov/superfund/programs/recycle/pdf/sitewide_a.pdf.*

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

In order to maintain close coordination with states and tribes in the NPL listing decision process, the EPA's policy is to determine the position of the states and tribes regarding sites that the EPA is considering for listing. This consultation process is outlined in two memoranda that can be found at the following Web site: *http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/npl/hrsres/policy/govlet.pdf* The EPA has improved the transparency of the process by which state and tribal input is solicited. The EPA is using the Web and where appropriate more structured state and tribal correspondence that (1) explains the concerns at the site and the EPA's rationale for proceeding; (2) requests an explanation of how the state intends to address the site if placement on the NPL is not favored; and (3) emphasizes the transparent nature of the process by informing states that information on their responses will be publicly available.

A model letter and correspondence between the EPA and states and tribes where applicable, is available on the EPA's Web site at *http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/query/queryhtm/nplstcor.htm.*

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 the EPA Headquarters and in the EPA Region 5 office.

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.
Kokomo Contaminated Ground Water Plume	Kokomo, IN	EPA–HQ–SFUND–2014–0624
DSC McLouth Steel Gibraltar Plant	Gibraltar, MI	EPA–HQ–SFUND–2014–0625

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

The Headquarters docket for this rule contains the HRS score sheets, the documentation record describing the information used to compute the score and a list of documents referenced in the documentation record for each site.

C. What documents are available for review at the EPA Region 5 docket?

The EPA Region 5 docket contains all the information in the Headquarters docket, plus the actual reference documents containing the data principally relied upon by the EPA in calculating or evaluating the HRS score. These reference documents are available only in the Region 5 docket.

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 Region 5 docket for hours. For addresses for the Headquarters and Region 5 dockets, see "Addresses" section in the beginning portion of this preamble.

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/index.htm* or by contacting the Superfund docket (see contact information in the beginning portion of this document).

III. Contents of This Final Rule

A. Additions to the NPL

This final rule adds the following sites to the General Superfund section of the NPL. These sites are being added to the NPL based on HRS score.

General Superfund section:

State	Site name	City/County
IN	Kokomo Contaminated Ground Water Plume.	Kokomo.
MI	DSC McLouth Steel Gibraltar Plant	Gibraltar.

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

The EPA is adding two sites to the NPL in this final rule, both of which were proposed for NPL addition on September 22, 2014 (79 FR 56538). The sites are the Kokomo Contaminated Ground Water Plume in Kokomo, Indiana, and the DSC McLouth Steel Gibraltar Plant in Gibraltar, Michigan. The EPA received no comments in connection with the Kokomo Contaminated Ground Water Plume. It received one comment in connection with the DSC McLouth Steel Gibraltar Plant.

On October 30, 2014, counsel for Detroit Steel Company and Gibraltar Land Company, the respective owners of the DSC McLouth Steel Gibraltar Plant and the Countywide Landfill, commented on the proposed listing. Counsel described the comments as "not technical in nature" and stated that the comments were "submitted in order to supplement the record. And provide needed background." The comments did not challenge the HRS score but did provide a substantial site history, which includes litigation between Gibraltar Land Company (GLC) and the State of Michigan arising out of Michigan's denial of GLC's application for a construction permit to expand the Countywide Landfill. The commenter closed with the following statements, "The designation of the properties on the National Priorities List would make the financing of future landfill operations and/or the sale of the property to another landfill developer difficult. However, recognizing the continued areas of environmental concern, even if USEPA would elect to designate these sites on the NPL at this time, we would believe that USEPA could play a constructive role in attempting to mediate a resolution of this matter. Such a resolution would provide for the vertical expansion of the [Countywide Landfill], which would in turn provide a source of revenue that would minimize the use of federal monies."

In response, the EPA notes that the commenter raised no issue with the HRS score. EPA is placing the DSC McLouth Steel Gibraltar Plant site on the NPL. EPA will coordinate with GLC, Michigan, and Wayne County to efficiently address the contamination. EPA, however, has no authority to require Michigan to approve a permit for landfill expansion at the Countywide Landfill facility.

IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews

Additional information about these statutes and Executive Orders can be found at *http://www2.epa.gov/laws-regulations/laws-and-executive orders.*

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

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

B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)

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

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)

I certify that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA. This action will not impose any requirements on small entities. This rule listing sites on the NPL does not impose any obligations on any group, including small entities. This rule also does not establish standards or requirements that any small entity must meet, and imposes no direct costs on any small entity. Whether an entity, small or otherwise, is liable for response costs for a release of hazardous substances depends on whether that entity is liable under CERCLA 107(a). Any such liability exists regardless of whether the site is listed on the NPL through this rulemaking.

D. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)

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

E. Executive Order 13132: Federalism

This 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)

This rulemaking does not involve technical standards.

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

The EPA believes the human health or environmental risk addressed by this action will not have potential disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority, low-income or indigenous populations because it does not affect the level of protection provided to human health or the environment. As discussed in Section I.C. of the preamble to this action, the NPL is a list of national priorities. The NPL is intended primarily to guide the EPA in determining which sites warrant further

investigation to assess the nature and extent of public health and environmental risks associated with a release of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants. The NPL is of only limited significance as it does not assign liability to any party. Also, placing a site on the NPL does not mean that any remedial or removal action necessarily need be taken.

K. Congressional Review Act

This action is subject to the CRA, and the EPA will submit a rule report to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. This action is not a ''major rule'' as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

Provisions of the Congressional Review Act (CRA) or section 305 of CERCLA may alter the effective date of this regulation. 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, the 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, the 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: March 16, 2015.

Mathy Stanislaus,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

40 CFR part 300 is amended as follows:

PART 300—NATIONAL OIL AND HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES POLLUTION CONTINGENCY PLAN

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

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1321(c)(2); 42 U.S.C. 9601–9657; E.O. 13626, 77 FR 56749, 3 CFR, 2013 Comp., p.306; E.O. 12777, 56 FR 54757, 3 CFR, 1991 Comp., p.351; E.O. 12580, 52 FR 2923, 3 CFR, 1987 Comp., p.193.

■ 2. Table 1 of Appendix B to Part 300 is amended by adding entries for ''Kokomo Contaminated Ground Water Plume'' and ''DSC McLouth Steel Gibraltar Plant'' in alphabetical order by state to read as follows:

Appendix B to Part 300—National Priorities List

TABLE 1—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/county	Notes [a]
*	*	*	*
IN	Kokomo Contaminated Ground Water Plume	Kokomo	
*	*	*	*
MI	DSC McLouth Steel Gibraltar Plant	Gibraltar	
*	*	*	*

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

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 2015–06696 Filed 3–25–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 51

[WC Docket No. 10–90, CC Docket No. 01–92; DA 15–249]

Connect America Fund; Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Federal Communications Commission's Wireline Competition Bureau clarifies certain rules related to the implementation of the intercarrier compensation transition for rate-of-return local exchange carriers adopted in the *USF/ICC Transformation Order.* Specifically, the Bureau clarifies the Commission's rules governing Eligible Recovery calculations to address limited unanticipated results of the application of the true-up process evidenced by the rate-of-return carriers' 2014 annual access tariff filings.

DATES: Effective April 27, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pamela Arluk, Wireline Competition Bureau, Pricing Policy Division, (202) 418–1520 or (202) 418–0484 (TTY); or Robin Cohn, Wireline Competition Bureau, Pricing Policy Division, (202) 418–1520 or (202) 418–0484 (TTY).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Order in WC Docket No. 10–90 and CC Docket No. 01–92, adopted and released on February 24, 2015. The full text of this document can be viewed at the following Internet address: *https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-15-249A1.docx.* The full text of this document is also available for public inspection during regular business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 445 12th Street SW., Room CY–A257, Washington, DC 20554. To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (*e.g.* braille, large print, electronic files, audio format, etc.) or to request reasonable accommodations (*e.g.* accessible format documents, sign language interpreters, CART, etc.), send an email to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice) or (202) 418–0432 (TTY).

I. Introduction

1. In the *USF/ICC Transformation Order,* the Commission delegated to the Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau) the authority to make any rule revisions