

*care service recipient* means any individual who receives home care services, as defined in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, while enrolled, and for the remainder of the calendar year after ceasing to be enrolled, in a program administered by a Federal, state, or local government agency that provides Federal, state, or local government funds, to pay, in whole or in part, for home care services for that individual.

(c) *Effective/applicability dates.* An authorization under paragraph (a) in effect prior to December 12, 2013 continues to be in effect after that date. Paragraph (b) of this section applies to wages paid on or after January 1, 2014. However, pursuant to section 7805(b), taxpayers may rely on paragraph (b) of this section for all taxable years for which a valid designation is in effect under paragraph (a) of this section.

**Beth Tucker,**

*Deputy Commissioner for Services and Enforcement.*

Approved: September 27, 2013.

**Mark J. Mazur,**

*Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Tax Policy).*

[FR Doc. 2013-29664 Filed 12-11-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4830-01-P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 300**

[EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0574; EPA-HQ-SFUND-2012-0069; EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0196, 0197, 0198, 0201, 0202, 0203, 0204 and 0207; FRL-9903-89-OSWER]

**National Priorities List, Final Rule No. 57**

**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 nine sites to the General Superfund section of the NPL and changes the name of one NPL site.

**DATES:** The effective date for this amendment to the NCP is January 13, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Contact information for the EPA Headquarters:

- 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.

The contact information for the Regional Dockets is as follows:

- Holly Inglis, Region 1 (CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT), U.S. EPA, Superfund Records and Information Center, 5 Post Office Square, Suite 100, Boston, MA 02109-3912; 617-918-1413.

- Ildefonso Acosta, Region 2 (NJ, NY, PR, VI), U.S. EPA, 290 Broadway, New York, NY 10007-1866; 212-637-4344.

- Lorie Baker (ASRC), Region 3 (DE, DC, MD, PA, VA, WV), U.S. EPA, Library, 1650 Arch Street, Mailcode 3HS12, Philadelphia, PA 19103; 215-814-3355.

- Jennifer Wendel, Region 4 (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN), U.S. EPA, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Mailcode 9T25, Atlanta, GA 30303; 404-562-8799.

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

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

- Michelle Quick, Region 7 (IA, KS, MO, NE), U.S. EPA, 11201 Renner Blvd., Mailcode SUPRERNB, Lenexa, KS 66219; 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.

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

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Terry Jeng, phone: (703) 603-8852,

email: [jeng.terry@epa.gov](mailto:jeng.terry@epa.gov), Site Assessment and Remedy Decisions Branch, Assessment and Remediation Division, Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (Mailcode 5204P), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20460; or the Superfund Hotline, phone (800) 424-9346 or (703) 412-9810 in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Table of Contents**

- I. Background
  - A. What are CERCLA and SARA?
  - B. What is the NCP?
  - C. What is the National Priorities List (NPL)?
  - D. How are sites listed on the NPL?
  - E. What happens to sites on the NPL?
  - F. Does the NPL define the boundaries of sites?
  - G. How are sites removed from the NPL?
  - H. May the EPA delete portions of sites from the NPL as they are cleaned up?
  - I. What is the Construction Completion List (CCL)?
  - J. What is the sitewide ready for anticipated use measure?
  - K. What is state/tribal correspondence concerning NPL listing?
- II. 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. What did the EPA do with the public comments it received?
  - C. Site Name Change
- IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews
  - A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review
    1. What is Executive Order 12866?
    2. Is this final rule subject to Executive Order 12866 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 the 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 the 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, 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) Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9605(a)(8)(B), each state may designate a single site as its top priority to be listed on the NPL, without any HRS score. This provision of CERCLA requires that, to the extent practicable, the NPL include one facility designated by each state as the greatest danger to public health, welfare or the environment among known facilities in the state. This mechanism for listing is set out in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(2). (3) The third mechanism for listing, included in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(c)(3), allows certain sites to be listed without any HRS score, if all of the following conditions are met:

- The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) of the U.S. Public Health Service has issued a health advisory that recommends dissociation of individuals from the release.
- The EPA determines that the release poses a significant threat to public health.
- The EPA anticipates that it will be more cost-effective to use its remedial authority than to use its removal authority to respond to the release.

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

### E. What happens to sites on the NPL?

A site may undergo remedial action financed by the Trust Fund established under CERCLA (commonly referred to as the “Superfund”) only after it is placed on the NPL, as provided in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.425(b)(1). (“Remedial actions” are those “consistent with a permanent remedy, taken instead of or in addition to removal actions. . . .” 42 U.S.C.

9601(24).) However, under 40 CFR 300.425(b)(2), placing a site on the NPL “does not imply that monies will be expended.” The EPA may pursue other appropriate authorities to respond to the releases, including enforcement action under CERCLA and other laws.

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

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

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

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

In other words, while geographic terms are often used to designate the site (e.g., the “Jones Co. plant site”) in terms of the property owned by a particular party, the site, properly understood, is not limited to that property (e.g., it may extend beyond the property due to contaminant migration), and conversely may not occupy the full extent of the property (e.g., where there are uncontaminated parts of the identified property, they may not be, strictly speaking, part of the “site”). The “site” is thus neither equal to, nor confined by, the boundaries of any specific property that may give the site its name, and the name itself should not be read to imply that this site is coextensive with the entire area within the property boundary of the installation or plant. In

addition, the site name is merely used to help identify the geographic location of the contamination, and is not meant to constitute any determination of liability at a site. For example, the name “Jones Co. plant site,” does not imply that the Jones company is responsible for the contamination located on the plant site.

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](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 is improving the transparency of the process by which state and tribal input is solicited. The EPA will be using the Web and where appropriate more structured state and tribal correspondence that (1) explains

the concerns at the site and the EPA's rationale for proceeding; (2) requests an explanation of how the state intends to address the site if placement on the NPL is not favored; and (3) emphasizes the transparent nature of the process by informing states that information on their responses will be publicly available.

A model letter and correspondence from this point forward between the EPA and states and tribes where applicable, is available on the EPA's Web site at <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 Regional offices.

An electronic version of the public docket is available through [www.regulations.gov](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.
Rockets, Fireworks, and Flares (RFF) (formerly known as B.F. Goodrich).	Rialto, CA .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0574.
Beck's Lake .....	South Bend, IN .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0196.
Garden City Ground Water Plume .....	Garden City, IN .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0197.
Keystone Corridor Ground Water Contamination ...	Indianapolis, IN .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0198.
Cristex Drum .....	Oxford, NC .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0201.
Hemphill Road TCE .....	Gastonia, NC .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0202.
Collins & Aikman Plant (Former) .....	Farmington, NH .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0203.
Jackpile-Paguate Uranium Mine .....	Laguna Pueblo, NM .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2012-0069.
Wilcox Oil Company .....	Creek County, OK .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0204.
Makah Reservation Warmhouse Beach Dump .....	Neah Bay, WA .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0207.

**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 the 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 the 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 the 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 the 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. For addresses for the Headquarters and Regional 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 notice).

**III. Contents of This Final Rule**

**A. Additions to the NPL**

This final rule adds the following nine sites to the General Superfund Section of the NPL. All of the sites included in this final rulemaking are being added to the NPL based on HRS scores of 28.50 or above. The sites are presented in the table below:

General Superfund section:

State	Site name	City/county
IN .....	Beck's Lake .....	South Bend.
IN .....	Garden City Ground Water Plume .....	Garden City.
IN .....	Keystone Corridor Ground Water Contamination .....	Indianapolis.
NC .....	Cristex Drum .....	Oxford.
NC .....	Hemphill Road TCE .....	Gastonia.
NH .....	Collins & Aikman Plant (Former) .....	Farmington.

State	Site name	City/county
NM .....	Jackpile-Paguate Uranium Mine .....	Laguna Pueblo.
OK .....	Wilcox Oil Company .....	Creek County.
WA .....	Makah Reservation Warmhouse Beach Dump .....	Neah Bay.

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

The EPA reviewed all comments received on the sites in this rule and responded to all relevant comments. This rule adds nine sites to the NPL, all to the General Superfund Section.

Comments on two of the sites, Beck's Lake (South Bend, IN) and Jackpile-Paguate Uranium Mine (Laguna Pueblo, NM) are being addressed in response to comment support documents available in the public docket concurrently with this rule. Two generic comments, applicable to the Jackpile-Paguate Uranium Mine and all other sites proposed in March 2012, have been previously addressed in the September 2012 NPL final rule preamble (77 FR 57495, September 18, 2012).

None of the other seven sites being added to the NPL in this rule, which were proposed May 24, 2013 (78 FR 31464), received comments relating to the HRS score. Five sites received no comments and are, therefore, being added to the NPL. They are Collins & Aikman Plant (Former) (Farmington, NH), Cristex Drum (Oxford, NC), Hemphill Road TCE (Gastonia, NC), Keystone Corridor Ground Water Contamination (Indianapolis, IN) and Wilcox Oil Company (Creek County, OK). Although one comment was submitted to the Hemphill Road TCE docket, it was directed at the Smurfit-Stone Mill site, and will be addressed at the time a final decision is made on that site.

The Makah Reservation Warmhouse Beach Dump (Neah Bay, WA) received one comment which supported placing the site on the NPL. In response, the Makah Reservation Warmhouse Beach Dump has been added to the NPL. Listing makes a site eligible for remedial action funding under CERCLA. The site will be further investigated during the remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) phase of the Superfund process to determine what response, if any, is appropriate to ensure protection of public health and the environment.

The Garden City Ground Water Plume (Garden City, IN) received one comment. The comment stated that tribal governments should be required to allow access to all records to any American taxpayer who requested it. The comment must have been directed to the wrong docket, since the Garden

City Ground Water Plume has no tribal involvement. If the comment was directed to the Makah Reservation Warmhouse Beach Dump, as opposed to some other regulatory docket, EPA's response is that this issue is unrelated to listing and thus has no bearing on EPA's decision to list the site.

*C. Site Name Change*

The EPA is changing the name of the B.F. Goodrich site in Rialto, California to Rockets, Fireworks, and Flares (RFF). This site was added to the NPL on September 23, 2009 (74 FR 48412). This name change was proposed on May 24, 2013 (78 FR 31464) (docket number EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0574). In response to a request by a Settling Work Party to change the site name, EPA had proposed changing the name to Locust Ave. The City of Rialto submitted comments in opposition to the new proposed name. The comments stated that the proposed name would stigmatize the local community and confuse the general public about the nature of the contamination. The comments included a unanimous resolution passed by the City Council and signed by the Mayor reflecting the community's unequivocal disapproval of the new proposed site name.

In response, the new site name has been revised to Rockets, Fireworks, and Flares (RFF). Since the primary purpose of an NPL listing is to inform the public that the EPA has determined that the site warrants further investigation, the EPA attempts to select the name that clearly informs the public but, when possible, does not offend local sensitivities. With the limited purpose of the NPL, as stated in *RSR Corp. v. EPA*, 102 F.3d 1266 (D.C. Cir. 1997), when naming a site, EPA may choose a name that reflects "the location or nature of the problems at a site and that are readily and easily associated with the site by the general public." The new name informs the public of activities that are believed to have contributed to contamination at the site.

**IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

*A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review*

1. What is Executive Order 12866?

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735 (October 4, 1993)), the agency

must determine whether a regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to 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.

2. Is this final rule subject to Executive Order 12866 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 and is therefore not subject to OMB review.

*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 the 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.* the 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 the 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 the 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, the 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 the EPA promulgates a rule where a written statement is needed, section 205 of the UMRA generally requires the 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 the 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 the 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 the 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 the 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 the 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.

The 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 the EPA policy to promote communications between the EPA and state and local governments, the 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 the EPA by states for listing. For all sites in this rule, the 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 the 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 the 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 section present a disproportionate risk to children.

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

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, the agency has 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 13211 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 the 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 the 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, the 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 final rule?

The 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 the 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, which includes a copy of the rule, to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. The 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.

The 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. NPL listing is not a major rule because, by itself, imposes no monetary costs on any person. It establishes no enforceable duties, does not establish that the 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, 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: November 27, 2013.

**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. 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:

- a. Revising the site name entry located in Rialto, California that currently reads “Rockets, Fireworks, and Flares (RFF).”; and
- b. Adding entries for “Beck’s Lake, Garden City Ground Water Plume, Keystone Corridor Ground Water Contamination, Cristex Drum, Hemphill Road TCE, Collins & Aikman Plant (Former), Jackpile-Paguete Uranium Mine, Wilcox Oil Company, and Makah Reservation Warmhouse Beach Dump” in alphabetical order by state;

The revisions and additions read as follows:

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

TABLE 1—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/county	Notes (a)
CA	Rockets, Fireworks, and Flares (RFF)	Rialto	*
IN	Beck’s Lake	South Bend	*
IN	Garden City Ground Water Plume	Garden City	*
IN	Keystone Corridor Ground Water Contamination	Indianapolis	*
NC	Cristex Drum	Oxford	*
NC	Hemphill Road TCE	Gastonia	*
NH	Collins & Aikman Plant (Former)	Farmington	*
NM	Jackpile-Paguete Uranium Mine	Laguna Pueblo	*
OK	Wilcox Oil Company	Creek County	*



TABLE 1—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION—Continued

State	Site name	City/county	Notes (a)
WA	Makah Reservation Warmhouse Beach Dump	Neah Bay	

(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).  
 S = State top priority (included among the 100 top priority sites regardless of score).  
 P = Sites with partial deletion(s).

\* \* \* \* \*  
 [FR Doc. 2013–29350 Filed 12–11–13; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

**GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**

**41 CFR Part 302–7**

[FTR Amendment 2013–03; FTR Case 2013–301; Docket No. 2013–0011, Sequence No. 1]

RIN 3090–AJ40

**Federal Travel Regulation (FTR); Relocation Allowances; Commuted Rate**

**AGENCY:** Office of Governmentwide Policy (OGP), U.S. General Services Administration (GSA).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The GSA, OGP, is providing a workable commuted rate to be used by agencies in determining a benchmark for payment on the transportation of household goods and temporary storage under a “do it yourself” move cost scenario. This final rule will meet the requirements set forth in the U.S. Code for Relocation Expenses.

**DATES:** *Effective:* This final rule is effective December 12, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Contact the U.S. General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat Division (MVCB), 1800 F Street NW., 2nd Floor Washington, DC 20405–0001, 202–501–4755, for information pertaining to status or publication schedules. For clarification of content, contact Mr. Ed Davis, Office of Governmentwide Policy (MA), at 202–208–7639 or email at *ed.davis@gsa.gov*. Please cite FTR Amendment 2013–03, FTR case 2013–301.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**A. Background**

5 U.S.C. 5724(c) requires that GSA maintain a commuted rate incorporating all aspects of household goods shipping that is based on a per 100 pound rate

fixed by zones. The GSA OGP is issuing a new commuted rate chart to meet the requirements of this law.

The U.S. Department of Transportation’s Surface Transportation Board (STB) ruled that the American Moving and Storage Association (AMSA) could no longer provide a standard tariff for Household Goods (HHG) shipments. The effective date for this ruling was January 1, 2008. Prior to January 1, 2008, the AMSA 415–G tariff was treated by Federal agencies as the commuted rate; that is, when a Federal employee moved his/her own household goods or hired his/her own mover, the AMSA tariff was used by the agency as a benchmark, to help determine whether the agency should reimburse the full amount the employee vouchered for. Agencies are still required to do this in accordance with the regulations at Federal Management Regulation (FMR) section 102–117.225 and Federal Travel Regulation (FTR) section 302–7, subpart B. Both of these regulations were made obsolete by the STB ruling.

Since both the FMR and FTR address the commuted rate, GSA is concurrently publishing an FMR Bulletin and an FTR Bulletin on this issue.

**B. Changes to the Current FTR**

- This final rule—
- Revises section 302–7.101 to direct the reader to the GSA Web site to calculate commuted rate shipments.
  - Revises section 302–7.102 to direct the reader to use the tariffs filed with GSA travel management centers.
  - Adds new section 302–7.110 to direct the reader to the GSA Web site to calculate commuted rate shipments.

**C. Executive Orders 12866 and 13563**

Executive Orders (E.O.s) 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety effects, distributive impacts, and

equity). E.O. 13563 emphasizes the importance of quantifying both costs and benefits, of reducing costs, of harmonizing rules, and of promoting flexibility. This is not a significant regulatory action and, therefore, was not subject to review under Section 6(b) of E.O. 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, dated September 30, 1993. This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804.

**D. Regulatory Flexibility Act**

This final rule is not required to be published in the **Federal Register** for notice and comment as per the exemption specified in 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2); therefore, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*, does not apply. However, this final rule is being published to provide transparency in the promulgation of Federal policies.

**E. Paperwork Reduction Act**

The Paperwork Reduction Act does not apply because the changes to the Federal Travel Regulation do not impose recordkeeping or information collection requirements, or the collection of information from offerors, contractors, or members of the public that require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget under 44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*

**F. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act**

This final rule is also exempt from congressional review prescribed under 5 U.S.C. 801 since it relates solely to agency management and personnel.

**List of Subjects in 41 CFR Part 302–7**

Government employees, Transportation and storage of property, Travel and transportation expenses.

Dated: November 25, 2013.

**Dan Tangherlini,**  
*Administrator of General Services.*

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, under 5 U.S.C. 5738, 5 U.S.C. 5724(c) and 20 U.S.C. 905(a), GSA is amending 41 CFR part 302–7 as follows: