

April 23, 1997). This action does not contain any information collections subject to OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), nor does it require any special considerations under Executive Order 12898, entitled “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations” (59 FR 7629, February 16, 1994).

Since tolerances and exemptions that are established on the basis of a petition under FFDCA section 408(d), such as the tolerance in this final rule, do not require the issuance of a proposed rule, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), do not apply.

This action directly regulates growers, food processors, food handlers, and food retailers, not States or tribes, nor does this action alter the relationships or distribution of power and responsibilities established by Congress in the preemption provisions of FFDCA section 408(n)(4). As such, the Agency has determined that this action will not have a substantial direct effect on States or tribal governments, on the relationship between the national government and the States or tribal governments, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government or between the Federal Government and Indian tribes. Thus, the Agency has determined that Executive Order 13132, entitled “Federalism” (64 FR 43255, August 10, 1999) and Executive Order 13175, entitled “Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments” (65 FR 67249, November 9, 2000) do not apply to this action. In addition, this action does not impose any enforceable duty or contain any unfunded mandate as described under Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) (2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*).

This action does not involve any technical standards that would require Agency consideration of voluntary consensus standards pursuant to section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

## VII. Congressional Review Act

Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), EPA will submit 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**. This action is not a “major rule” as defined by 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

## List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: April 3, 2019.

**Donna Davis,**

*Acting Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.*

Therefore, 40 CFR chapter I is amended as follows:

## PART 180—[AMENDED]

■ 1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 21 U.S.C. 321(q), 346a and 371.

■ 2. In § 180.473, revise the entries “Fruit, stone, group 12–12”; “Nut, tree, group 14–12”; “Olive”; and “Soybean, hulls” in the table in paragraph (a) to read as follows:

### § 180.473 Glufosinate ammonium; tolerances for residues.

(a) \* \* \*

Commodity	Parts per million
* * * * *	*
Fruit, stone, group 12–12 .....	0.30
* * * * *	*
Nut, tree, group 14–12 .....	0.50
Olive .....	0.50
* * * * *	*
Soybean, hulls .....	10

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 2019–10054 Filed 5–14–19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 300

**[EPA–HQ–SFUND–1989–0007, EPA–HQ–OLEM–2018–0253, 0580, 0581, 0582, 0583, 0585, and 0586; FRL–9993–49–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 seven sites to the General Superfund section of the NPL and changes the name of an NPL site.

**DATES:** The document is effective on June 14, 2019.

**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.
- Kumud Pyakuryal, Region 7 (IA, KS, MO, NE), U.S. EPA, 11201 Renner Blvd., Mailcode SUPRSTAR, Lenexa, KS 66219; 913/551–7956.
- 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 Bowen, 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?
- C. Site Name Change

**IV. Statutory and Executive Order Reviews**

- A. Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review and Executive Order 13563: Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review
- B. Executive Order 13771: Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs
- C. Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)
- D. Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA)
- E. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA)
- F. Executive Order 13132: Federalism
- G. Executive Order 13175: Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

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

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

J. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)

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

L. 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. On January 9, 2017 (82 FR 2760), a subsurface intrusion component was added to the HRS to enable the EPA to

consider human exposure to hazardous substances or pollutants and contaminants that enter regularly occupied structures through subsurface intrusion when evaluating sites for the NPL. The current HRS evaluates four pathways: Ground water, surface water, soil exposure and subsurface intrusion, 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/construction-completions-national-priorities-list-npl-sites-number>.

*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 website: <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 website at <http://semspub.epa.gov/src/document/HQ/174024>.

**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 <https://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.
Copper Bluff Mine .....	Hoopa, CA .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2018-0580.
Cliff Drive Groundwater Contamination .....	Logansport, IN .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2018-0581.
McLouth Steel Corp .....	Trenton, MI .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2018-0582.
Sporlan Valve Plant #1 .....	Washington, MO .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2018-0583.
Magna Metals .....	Cortlandt Manor, NY .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2018-0585.
PROTECO .....	Peñuelas, PR .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2018-0253.
Shaffer Equipment/Arbuckle Creek Area .....	Minden, WV .....	EPA-HQ-OLEM-2018-0586.

*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 seven 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 .....	Copper Bluff Mine .....	Hoopla.
IN .....	Cliff Drive Groundwater Contamination .....	Logansport.
MI .....	McLouth Steel Corp .....	Trenton.
MO .....	Sporlan Valve Plant #1 .....	Washington.
NY .....	Magna Metals .....	Cortlandt Manor.
PR .....	PROTECO .....	Peñuelas.
WV .....	Shaffer Equipment/Arbuckle Creek Area .....	Minden.

*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 seven sites to the NPL in this final rule. The PROTECO site in Peñuelas, PR was proposed for addition to the NPL on May 17, 2018 (83 FR 22918). The remaining six sites were proposed for addition to the NPL on September 13, 2018 (83 FR 46460).

Comments on the PROTECO site are being addressed in a response to comment support document available in the public docket concurrently with this rule. To view public comments on this site, as well as EPA's response, please refer to the support document available at <https://www.regulations.gov>.

The EPA received no comments on the Cliff Drive Groundwater Contamination site.

EPA received comments supporting the listing of McLouth Steel Corp, Sporlan Valve Plant #1 and Copper Bluff Mine.

For Magna Metals, in addition to several comments in support of the listing, the EPA received one comment from a community member raising concerns about the adequacy of previous site investigations and urging that a comprehensive off-site investigation be conducted as part of the RI/FS process. In response, the commenter's suggestions for further study have been noted and will be considered during further site related activities. The RI/FS study phase involves on-site and off-site testing to assess the nature and extent of the public health and environmental risks associated with the site and to determine what CERCLA-funded remedial actions, if any, may be appropriate.

For the Shaffer Equipment/Arbuckle Creek Area, the EPA received overwhelming community support for placing the site on the NPL, including mass mailers from community members. A law firm representing the community provided an independent technical review that raised concerns about previous cleanup work by EPA under the removal program but supported NPL listing as a means to address site risks

under Superfund's remedial program. Several commenters requested permanent relocation either for themselves or on behalf of other community members. A few commenters raised concerns about the possibility of contamination spreading. Several comments from community members opposed listing because of the perceived stigma of Superfund which they believe could result in negative community impacts.

In response, EPA is adding the Shaffer Equipment/Arbuckle Creek Area to the NPL. Economic factors are generally not considered in the assessment of whether a site belongs on the NPL. However, the EPA notes that there are both costs and benefits that can be associated with including a site on the NPL. Among the benefits are increased environmental protection resulting from the cleanup. Therefore, it is possible that any perceived or actual negative fluctuations in property values that may result from contamination may also be countered by positive fluctuations when a CERCLA investigation and any necessary cleanup are completed.

For several sites included in this final rule, the EPA received comments unrelated to listing which were not relevant. In addition, there were several sites for which comments were submitted erroneously to incorrect docket numbers. All listing-related comments that were submitted to incorrect dockets were duplicated into the correct dockets for the site for which they were intended.

*C. NPL Site Name Change*

On September 13, 2018 (83 FR 46460), EPA proposed to change the name of an NPL site in San Francisco, California which was formally known as the Treasure Island Naval Station-Hunters Point Annex site. EPA received no comments on the name change. Therefore, the name has been changed and the site is now known as Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. The name Hunters Point Naval Shipyard is more representative of the area to the local community and local government. Refer to docket number EPA-HQ-SFUND-1989-0007 for information regarding this site.

**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. Executive Order 13771: Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs*

This action is not an Executive Order 13771 regulatory action because this action is not significant under Executive Order 12866.

*C. 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.

*D. 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.

*E. 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.

#### *F. 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.

#### *G. 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.

#### *H. 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.

#### *I. 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.

#### *J. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)*

This rulemaking does not involve technical standards.

#### *K. 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.

#### *L. 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: May 6, 2019.

**Barry N. Breen,**

*Acting 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, 3CFR, 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 as follows:

■ a. Under California:

■ i. Adding entries for “Copper Bluff Mine” and “Hunters Point Naval Shipyard” in alphabetical order; and

■ ii. Removing the entry for “Treasure Island Naval Station-Hun Pt An”; and

■ b. Adding entries for “Cliff Drive Groundwater Contamination”, “McLouth Steel Corp”, “Sporlan Valve Plant #1”, “Magna Metals”, “PROTECO”, and “Shaffer Equipment/Arbuckle Creek Area” in alphabetical order by state.

The 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	Copper Bluff Mine	Hoopla.	*
CA	Hunters Point Naval Shipyard	San Francisco	P
IN	Cliff Drive Groundwater Contamination	Logansport.	*
MI	McLouth Steel Corp	Trenton.	*
MO	Sporlan Valve Plant #1	Washington.	*
NY	Magna Metals	Cortlandt Manor.	*
PR	PROTECO	Peñuelas.	*
WV	Shaffer Equipment/Arbuckle Creek Area	Minden.	*

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

\* \* \* \* \*

P = Sites with partial deletion(s).

[FR Doc. 2019-09924 Filed 5-14-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Part 1552

[EPA-HQ-OMS-2018-0742; FRL 9992-99-OMS]

#### Environmental Protection Agency Acquisition Regulation (EPAAR) Clause Update for Submission of Invoices

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is revising its *Submission of Invoices* clause to add electronic invoicing requirements. In 2019 the EPA will begin using the Invoice Processing Platform (IPP), which is a secure web-based service provided by the U.S. Treasury that efficiently manages government invoicing.

**DATES:** This final rule is effective on May 15, 2019.

**ADDRESSES:** The EPA has established a docket for this action under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OARM-2018-0742. All documents in the docket are listed on

the <https://www.regulations.gov> website. Although listed in the index, some information is not publicly available, e.g., CBI or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Certain other material, such as copyrighted material, is not placed on the internet and will be publicly available only in hard copy form. Publicly available docket materials are available electronically through <http://www.regulations.gov>.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Thomas Valentino, Policy, Training, and Oversight Division, Office of Acquisition Solutions (3802R), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: 202-564-4522; email address: [valentino.thomas@epa.gov](mailto:valentino.thomas@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

The EPA is revising clause 1552.232-70, *Submission of Invoices*, to add electronic invoicing requirements. In 2019 the EPA will begin using the Invoice Processing Platform (IPP), which is a secure web-based service provided by the U.S. Treasury that efficiently manages government invoicing. Currently the EPA requires contractors and vendors to submit paper invoices, which are inefficient and costly. The EPA will also begin using IPP to satisfy the requirements of Office

of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum M-15-19, *Improving Government Efficiency and Saving Taxpayer Dollars Through Electronic Invoicing*. By changing the subject clause to require electronic invoicing, the EPA will reap benefits of efficiency and cost that have become ubiquitous in modern commerce, and be in compliance with Memorandum M-15-19. On December 20, 2018 (83 FR 65328) EPA sought comments on the proposed rule and received no comments.

##### II. Final Rule

The final rule amends EPAAR Part 1552, *Solicitation Provisions and Contract Clauses*, by revising EPAAR § 1552.232-70, *Submission of Invoices*.

1. EPAAR § 1552.232-70, *Submission of Invoices* clause is revised to provide new electronic invoicing requirements as the EPA begins using the IPP electronic-invoicing program in 2019. The clause is revised by replacing the preamble and paragraphs (a) and (b), with new paragraphs (a) and (b), that update the old paper invoicing instructions to electronic invoicing. Paragraph (g)(5) is revised to remove references to suspended costs, which are not authorized under IPP. The “Note to paragraph (i)” and “Note to paragraph (j)” are also being revised to remove references to suspended costs. Finally, paragraph (k) and “Note to paragraph