

authorized NPDES program’s electronic reporting systems. However, if a state, territory, or tribe is already using EPA’s electronic reporting systems, the regulated entities would not need to register again as the NPDES-regulated entity will be using the same electronic reporting tool (*i.e.*, no change in the subscriber agreement that accompanies the electronic reporting tool).

**II. Listing of the Initial Recipients for NPDES Electronic Reporting**

The final rule requires EPA to publish in the **Federal Register** a listing of the initial recipients for electronic NPDES information from NPDES-regulated facilities by state, tribe, and territory and by NPDES data group [see 40 CFR 127.27(c)]. This listing must identify for NPDES-regulated facilities the initial

recipient of their NPDES electronic data submissions and the due date for these NPDES electronic data submissions. The final rule requires authorized NPDES programs to send EPA an opt-out notice by 19 April 2016. The following is a list of the six states that sent an opt-out notice to EPA. These notices are posted on EPA’s Web site that provides implementation information.

State	State elected for EPA to be initial recipient for general permit reports (NPDES Data Group No. 2)	State elected for EPA to be initial recipient for DMRs (NPDES Data Group No. 3)	State elected for EPA to be initial recipient for program reports (NPDES Data Group Nos. 4 through 10)
Georgia .....	Yes (All) .....	Yes .....	Yes (All).
Nebraska .....	Yes (All) .....	Yes .....	Yes (All).
New Jersey .....	No .....	No .....	Yes (only for CAFO Annual Program Report).
North Carolina .....	Yes (only for Low Erosivity Waivers and No Exposure Certifications).	No .....	No.
Oregon .....	Yes (All) .....	Yes .....	Yes (All).
Rhode Island .....	Yes (All) .....	Yes .....	Yes (All).

**Note:** Although not required as the initial recipient process is an ‘opt-out’ process, Tennessee sent notice to EPA that they intend to be the Initial Recipient for all NPDES data groups.

State that have elected for EPA to be the Initial Recipient for all of the NPDES data groups will be using EPA’s electronic reporting tools (*e.g.*, NetDMR, NeT) and NPDES data system (ICIS–NPDES). It should be noted that Georgia and Rhode Island elected to use EPA’s NetDMR and NPDES data system (ICIS–NPDES) prior to the effective date of the final rule. Consequently, NPDES-regulated entities in these two states that are already using NetDMR will not need to take any additional actions in response to Georgia and Rhode Island designating EPA as the Initial Recipient for DMRs (NPDES Data Group No. 3). In accordance with the final rule (see 40 CFR 127.16), NPDES-regulated entities in Nebraska and Oregon will need to register and start using NetDMR prior to the Phase 1 electronic reporting deadline (21 December 2016). New Jersey has elected for EPA to be the Initial Recipient for the Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) Annual Program Report [see 40 CFR 122.42(e)(4)]. In accordance with the final rule, CAFOs in New Jersey will need to register and start using NeT to submit their CAFO Annual Program Report prior to the Phase 2 electronic reporting deadline (21 December 2020). Finally, North Carolina has elected for EPA to be the Initial Recipient for Low Erosivity Waivers (LEWs) [see Exhibit 1 to 40 CFR 122.26(b)(15)] and No Exposure Certifications (NOEs) [see 122.26(g)]. In accordance with the final rule, facilities in North Carolina will need to register and start using NeT to submit their LEWs and NOEs prior to

the Phase 2 electronic reporting deadline (21 December 2020). For all other authorized NPDES programs not in the above table, the authorized state, tribe, or territorial NPDES program is the initial recipient for the NPDES programs and NPDES permits that it administers. For example, Arkansas will be the initial recipient for all NPDES Data Groups except for the Sewage Sludge/Biosolids Annual Program Reports [40 CFR part 503], as Arkansas is not authorized for the Federal Biosolids NPDES program. Likewise, Colorado will be the initial recipient for all NPDES Data Groups except for:

- Sewage Sludge/Biosolids Annual Program Reports [40 CFR part 503],
- Pretreatment Program Reports [40 CFR 403.12(i)],
- Significant Industrial User Compliance Reports in Municipalities Without Approved Pretreatment Programs [40 CFR 403.12(e) and (h)], and
- All NPDES reporting for Federal facilities.

Colorado is not authorized for the Federal Biosolids or Pretreatment NPDES programs and Colorado is not the NPDES permitting authority for Federal facilities in Colorado. It should be noted that EPA will be the initial recipient for all NPDES-regulated entities where EPA is the permitting authority or authorized NPDES program. A full listing of NPDES program authorization for each state is available on EPA’s Web site ([https://](https://www.epa.gov/npdes/npdes-state-program-information)

[www.epa.gov/npdes/npdes-state-program-information](https://www.epa.gov/npdes/npdes-state-program-information)).  
 Dated: August 24, 2016.  
**David Hindin**,  
*Director, Office of Compliance, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance.*  
 [FR Doc. 2016–21204 Filed 9–8–16; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**40 CFR Part 300**

**[EPA–HQ–OLEM–2016–0151, 0152, 0154, 0155, 0156, 0157 and 0158; EPA–HQ–SFUND–2015–0139, 0575 and 0576; FRL–9952–06–OLEM]**

**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 ten sites to the General Superfund section of the NPL.

**DATES:** The document is effective on October 11, 2016.

**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.
- Cathy Amoroso, Region 4 (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN), U.S. EPA, 61 Forsyth Street SW., Mailcode 9T25, Atlanta, GA 30303; 404/562-8637.
- 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.
- Brian Mitchell, Region 7 (IA, KS, MO, NE), U.S. EPA, 11201 Renner Blvd., Mailcode SUPR/SPEB, Lenexa, KS 66219; 913/551-7633.
- Victor Ketellapper, Region 8 (CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY), U.S. EPA, 1595 Wynkoop Street, Mailcode 8EPR-B, Denver, CO 80202-1129; 303/312-6578.
- 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 EPA headquarters docket?
  - C. What documents are available for review at the EPA 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?
- 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:

- 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” (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 previously, NPL listing does not assign liability to any party or to the owner of any specific property. Thus, if a party does not believe it is liable for releases on discrete parcels of property, it can submit supporting information to the agency at any time after it receives notice it is a potentially responsible party.

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

*G. How are sites removed from the NPL?*

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

- (i) Responsible parties or other persons have implemented all appropriate response actions required;
- (ii) All appropriate Superfund-financed response has been implemented and no further response action is required; or
- (iii) The remedial investigation has shown the release poses no significant threat to public health or the environment, and taking of remedial measures is not appropriate.

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

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

*I. What is the Construction Completion List (CCL)?*

The EPA also has developed an NPL construction completion list (“CCL”) to

simplify its system of categorizing sites and to better communicate the successful completion of cleanup activities (58 FR 12142, March 2, 1993). Inclusion of a site on the CCL has no legal significance.

Sites qualify for the CCL when: (1) Any necessary physical construction is complete, whether or not final cleanup levels or other requirements have been achieved; (2) the EPA has determined that the response action should be limited to measures that do not involve construction (e.g., institutional controls); or (3) the site qualifies for deletion from the NPL. For more information on the CCL, see the EPA’s Internet site at [https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-remedial-performance-measures#cc\\_anchor](https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-remedial-performance-measures#cc_anchor).

*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 <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-9>.

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

The EPA has improved the transparency of the process by which state and tribal input is solicited. The EPA is using the Web and where appropriate more structured state and tribal correspondence that (1) explains the concerns at the site and the EPA’s rationale for proceeding; (2) requests an explanation of how the state intends to address the site if placement on the NPL is not favored; and (3) emphasizes the transparent nature of the process by informing states that information on their responses will be publicly available.

A model letter and correspondence between the EPA and states and tribes where applicable, is available on the EPA’s Web site at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/statetribal-correspondence-concerning-npl-site-listing.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 regional offices.

An electronic version of the public docket is available through <http://www.regulations.gov> (see table below for docket identification numbers). Although not all docket materials may be available electronically, you may still access any of the publicly available docket materials through the docket facilities identified in section II.D.

DOCKET IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS BY SITE

Site name	City/county, State	Docket ID No.
Argonaut Mine .....	Jackson, CA .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0151
Bonita Peak Mining District .....	San Juan County, CO .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0152
West Vermont Drinking Water Contamination .....	Indianapolis, IN .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2015-0575
SBA Shipyard .....	Jennings, LA .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2015-0576
Anaconda Aluminum Co Columbia Falls Reduction Plant .....	Columbia Falls, MT .....	EPA-HQ-SFUND-2015-0139
Wappinger Creek .....	Dutchess County, NY .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0155
Valley Pike VOCs .....	Riverside, OH .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0154
Dorado Ground Water Contamination .....	Dorado, PR .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0156
Eldorado Chemical Co., Inc. ....	Live Oak, TX .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0157

DOCKET IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS BY SITE—Continued

Site name	City/county, State	Docket ID No.
North 25th Street Glass and Zinc .....	Clarksburg, WV .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0158

*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 regional dockets?*

The EPA 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.

These reference documents are available only in the regional dockets.

*D. How do I access the documents?*

You may view the documents, by appointment only, after the publication of this 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 <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/national-priorities-list-npl-sites-site-name> 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 ten 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
CA .....	Argonaut Mine .....	Jackson.
CO .....	Bonita Peak Mining District .....	San Juan County.
IN .....	West Vermont Drinking Water Contamination .....	Indianapolis.
LA .....	SBA Shipyard .....	Jennings.
MT .....	Anaconda Aluminum Co Columbia Falls Reduction Plant .....	Columbia Falls.
NY .....	Wappinger Creek .....	Dutchess County.
OH .....	Valley Pike VOCs .....	Riverside.
PR .....	Dorado Ground Water Contamination .....	Dorado.
TX .....	Eldorado Chemical Co., Inc .....	Live Oak.
WV .....	North 25th Street Glass and Zinc .....	Clarksburg.

*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. The EPA is adding ten sites to the NPL in this final rule, all to the General Superfund section. Comments on the Bonita Peak Mining District (San Juan County, CO), West Vermont Drinking Water Contamination (Indianapolis, IN), SBA Shipyard (Jennings, LA) and Anaconda Aluminum Co Columbia Falls Reduction Plant (Columbia Falls, MT) sites are addressed in a response to comment support document available in the public docket concurrently with this rule.

The remaining six sites being added to the NPL in this rule did not receive any comments urging specific changes to the HRS score. The Valley Pike VOCs (Riverside, OH) site received no comments. The Dorado Ground Water Contamination (Dorado, PR) and Eldorado Chemical Co., Inc. (Live Oak, TX) sites both received only erroneous comments that were meant for other

sites but were directed to incorrect docket numbers.

The Argonaut Mine (Jackson, CA) site received two comments urging EPA to list, one from a citizen and one from the Mayor of the City of Jackson. In response, EPA is placing the Argonaut Mine site on the NPL.

The Wappinger Creek (Dutchess County, NY) site received three comments, all urging EPA to list the site, one from a citizen, one anonymous and one from Senator Gillibrand. In response, EPA is placing the Wappinger Creek site on the NPL.

The North 25th Street Glass and Zinc (Clarksburg, WV) site received nine comments. Three of those comments were erroneous comments directed toward the incorrect docket. Three of the comments urged EPA to list the site and two urged EPA to clean up the site. One comment raised objections to tax payer money being wasted on hazardous waste lawsuits. In response, nothing raised in this comment impacted the HRS score or the decision to list the site on the NPL. Therefore, EPA is adding

the North 25th Street Glass and Zinc site to the NPL.

**IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

Additional information about these statutes and Executive Orders can be found at <https://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/laws-and-executive-orders>.

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

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

*B. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)*

This action does not impose an information collection burden under the PRA. This 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: September 1, 2016.

#### **Mathy Stanislaus,**

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

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(d); 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 “Argonaut Mine”, “Bonita Peak Mining District”, “West Vermont Drinking Water Contamination”, “SBA Shipyard”, “Anaconda Aluminum Co Columbia Falls Reduction Plant”, “Wappinger Creek”, “Valley Pike VOCs”, “Dorado Ground Water Contamination”, “Eldorado Chemical Co., Inc.”, and “North 25th Street Glass and Zinc” 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 <sup>a</sup>
CA	Argonaut Mine	Jackson.	*
CO	Bonita Peak Mining District	San Juan County.	*
IN	West Vermont Drinking Water Contamination	Indianapolis.	*
LA	SBA Shipyard	Jennings.	*
MT	Anaconda Aluminum Co Columbia Falls Reduction Plant	Columbia Falls.	*
NY	Wappinger Creek	Dutchess County.	*
OH	Valley Pike VOCs	Riverside.	*
PR	Dorado Ground Water Contamination	Dorado.	*
TX	Eldorado Chemical Co., Inc.	Live Oak.	*
WV	North 25th Street Glass and Zinc	Clarksburg.	*

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

\* \* \* \* \*  
 [FR Doc. 2016–21615 Filed 9–8–16; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**42 CFR Part 8**

[Docket No. 2016–0001]

RIN–0930–AA22

**Medication Assisted Treatment for Opioid Use Disorders; Correction**

**AGENCY:** Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Correcting amendment.

**SUMMARY:** The Health and Human Services Department (HHS) is correcting a final rule that appeared in the **Federal Register** on July 8, 2016. The final rule increased the maximum number of patients to whom an individual practitioner may dispense or prescribe certain medications, including buprenorphine, from 100 to 275. Practitioners are eligible for the increased patient limit if they have prescribed covered medications to up to 100 patients for at least one year pursuant to secretarial approval, provided that they meet certain criteria and adhere to several additional requirements aimed at ensuring that patients receive the full array of services that comprise evidence-based medication-assisted treatment (MAT)

and minimize the risks that medications provided for treatment are misused or diverted. One pathway through which practitioners may become eligible to increase their patient limit is by obtaining additional credentialing from one of several credentialing bodies. In the final rule, the name of one of the credentialing bodies listed was incorrect. This action provides the correct name.

**DATES:** Effective on September 9, 2016.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jinhee Lee, Division of Pharmacologic Therapies, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, SAMHSA, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, (240) 276–2700, email: *Jinhee.Lee@samhsa.hhs.gov*.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On July 8, 2016 (81 FR 44711), HHS published a final rule in the **Federal Register**, which increased the maximum number of patients to whom an individual practitioner may dispense or prescribe certain medications, including buprenorphine, from 100 to 275. One of the pathways through which practitioners can become eligible to increase their patient limit is by receiving additional credentialing.

In the final rule, the American Osteopathic Academy of Addiction Medicine (AOAAM), which provides training but not certification, was mistakenly included in the definition for “additional credentialing.” HHS intended to include the American

Osteopathic Association (AOA) in this definition, not AOAAM. This intention was evident in HHS’s Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), published on March 30, 2016, which proposed defining “board certification” so as to include “subspecialty board certification in addiction medicine from the American Osteopathic Association (AOA) . . . .” AOAAM, on the other hand, was not referenced within the NPRM. Accordingly, HHS gave the public notice and an opportunity to comment on its proposal to include AOA board certification as one of the credentials that would make practitioners eligible to practice at the higher patient cap. No public comments were received that related to AOA’s role in the proposed rule.

HHS’s intention to reference AOA (not AOAAM) was also reflected in the preamble of the final rule; AOA board certification was referenced in Section B of the Regulatory Impact Analysis, which stated that “[t]he training requirement may be satisfied in several ways: One may hold board certification in . . . addiction medicine from the American Osteopathic Association . . . .” HHS also explained in the preamble of the final rule that, “HHS removed the term ‘board certification’ and added ‘additional credentialing’ to clarify that all practitioners who currently qualify to treat up to 100 patients are eligible for the higher patient limit if they are included as specialists as described in 21 U.S.C. 823