

placement on the NPL (or even sites that have not been proposed for placement on the NPL) pursuant to the Agency's removal authority under CERCLA, as outlined in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.415. Although an RI/FS generally is conducted at a site after it has been placed on the NPL, in a number of circumstances the Agency elects to conduct an RI/FS at a site proposed for placement on the NPL in preparation for a possible Superfund-financed response action, such as when the Agency believes that a delay may create unnecessary risks to public health or the environment. In addition, the Agency may conduct an RI/FS to assist in determining whether to conduct a removal or enforcement action at a site.

Facility (Site) Boundaries

The Agency's position is that the NPL does not describe releases in precise geographical terms, and that it would be neither feasible nor consistent with the limited purpose of the NPL (as the mere identification of releases), for it to do so.

CERCLA section 105(a)(8)(B) directs EPA to list national priorities among the known "releases or threatened releases." Thus, the purpose of the NPL is merely to identify releases that are priorities for further evaluation. Although a CERCLA "facility" is broadly defined to include any area where a hazardous substance release 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 upon which the NPL placement was based will, to some extent, describe which release is at issue. That is, the NPL site would include all releases evaluated as part of that HRS analysis (including noncontiguous releases evaluated under the NPL aggregation policy, described at 48 FR 40663 (September 8, 1983)).

EPA regulations provide that the "nature and extent of the threat presented by a release" will be determined by an RI/FS as more information is developed on site contamination (40 CFR 300.68(d)). 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 and the migration of the contamination. However, this inquiry focuses on an evaluation of the threat posed. The boundaries of the release need not be 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 boundaries of the contamination can be expected to change over time. Thus, in most cases, it will be impossible to describe the boundaries of a release with certainty.

For these reasons, the NPL need not be amended if further research into the extent of the contamination expands the apparent boundaries of the release. Further, the NPL is only of limited significance, as it does not assign liability to any party or to the owner of any specific property. See Report of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senate Rep. No. 96-848, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 60 (1980), quoted above and at 48 FR 40659 (September 8, 1983). If a party contests liability for releases on discrete parcels of property, it may do so if and when the Agency brings an action against that party to recover costs or to compel a response action at that property.

At the same time, however, the RI/FS or the Record of Decision (which defines the remedy selected, 40 CFR 300.430(f)) may offer a useful indication to the public of the areas of contamination at which the Agency is considering taking a response action, based on information known at that time. For example, EPA may evaluate (and list) a release over a 400-acre area, but the Record of Decision may select a remedy over 100 acres only. This information may be useful to a landowner seeking to sell the other 300 acres, but it would result in no formal change in the fact that a release is included on the NPL. The landowner (and the public) also should note in such a case that if further study (or the remedial construction itself) reveals that the contamination is located on or has spread to other areas, the Agency may address those areas as well.

This view of the NPL as an initial identification of a release that is not subject to constant re-evaluation is consistent with the Agency's policy of not rescoring NPL sites:

EPA recognizes that the NPL process cannot be perfect, and it is possible that errors exist or that new data will alter previous assumptions. Once the initial scoring effort is complete, however, the focus of EPA activity must be on investigating sites in detail and determining the appropriate response. New data or errors can be considered in that process. . . . [T]he NPL serves as a guide to EPA and does not determine liability or the need for response. (49 FR 37081 (September 21, 1984).

See also *City of Stoughton, Wisc. v. U.S. EPA*, 858 F. 2d 747, 751 (D.C. Cir. 1988):

Certainly EPA could have permitted further comment or conducted further testing [on proposed NPL sites]. Either course would have consumed further assets of the Agency and would have delayed a determination of the risk priority associated with the site. Yet * * * "the NPL is simply a rough list of priorities, assembled quickly and inexpensively to comply with Congress' mandate for the Agency to take action straightaway." *Eagle-Picher [Industries v. EPA] II*, 759 F. 2d [921,] at 932 [(D.C. Cir. 1985)].

It is the Agency's policy that, in the exercise of its enforcement discretion, EPA will not take enforcement actions against an owner of residential property to require such owner to undertake response actions or pay response costs, unless the residential homeowner's activities lead to a release or threat of release of hazardous substances, resulting in the taking of a response action at the site (OSWER Directive #9834.6, July 3, 1991). This policy includes residential property owners whose property is located above a ground water plume that is proposed to or on the NPL, where the residential property owner did not contribute to the contamination of the site. EPA may, however, require access to that property during the course of implementing a clean up.

III. Contents of This Notice

This notice promulgates final rules to add 4 sites to the NPL, 3 to the General Superfund Section (Table 1) and 1 to the Federal Facilities Section (Table 2). Proposal #11 (56 FR 35840, July 29, 1991) provided 1 site, and Proposal #15 (58 FR 34018, June 23, 1993) provided 1 site, both of which are being added to the NPL based on HRS scores of 28.50 or greater. Proposal #16 (59 FR 2568, January 18, 1994) provided 2 sites, one of which is being added to the NPL based on ATSDR Health Advisory criteria and one of which is being added to the NPL consequent to being designated as the State's top priority.

As discussed more fully below, the following tables present the sites in this rule arranged alphabetically by State and identifies their rank by group number. Group numbers are determined by arranging the NPL by rank and dividing it into groups of 50 sites. For example, a site in Group 4 has a score that falls within the range of scores covered by the fourth group of 50 sites on the NPL.