

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST FINAL RULE—GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/County	Group
CT	Raymark Industries, Inc	Stratford	NA
WA	Boomsnub/Airco	Vancouver	NA
WA	Tulalip Landfill	Marysville	5/6

Number of Sites Listed: 3.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST FINAL RULE—FEDERAL FACILITIES SECTION

State	Site name	City/County	Group
OR	Fremont National Forest Uranium Mines (USDA)	Lake County	5/6

Number of Sites Listed: 1.

Public Comments

EPA reviewed all comments received on sites included in this notice. The formal comment period ended on September 27, 1991 for the site from Proposal #11; August 23, 1993 for the site from Proposal #15; February 17, 1994 for the sites from Proposal #16, and October 21, 1994 for the site from Proposal #17.

Based on comments received on the proposed sites, as well as investigation by EPA and the States (generally in response to comment), EPA recalculated the HRS scores for individual sites where appropriate. EPA's response to site-specific public comments and explanations of any score changes made as a result of such comments are addressed in the "Support Document for the Revised National Priorities List Final Rule—April 1995."

Economic Impacts

The costs of cleanup actions that may be taken at any site are not directly attributable to placement on the NPL. EPA has conducted a preliminary analysis of economic implications of today's amendment to the NPL. EPA believes that the kinds of economic effects associated with this revision generally are similar to those effects identified in the regulatory impact analysis (RIA) prepared in 1982 for the revisions to the NCP pursuant to section 105 of CERCLA and the economic analysis prepared when amendments to the NCP were proposed (50 FR 5882, February 12, 1985). The Agency believes the anticipated economic effects related to adding sites to the NPL can be characterized in terms of the conclusions of the earlier RIA and the most recent economic analysis.

Inclusion of a site on the NPL does not itself impose any costs. It does not establish that EPA necessarily will undertake remedial action, nor does it require any action by a private party or determine its liability for site response

costs. Costs that arise out of site responses result from site-by-site decisions about what actions to take, not directly from the act of listing itself. Nonetheless, it is useful to consider the costs associated with responding to the sites included in this rulemaking.

The major events that follow the proposed listing of a site on the NPL are a search for potentially responsible parties and a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) to determine if remedial actions will be undertaken at a site. Design and construction of the selected remedial alternative follow completion of the RI/FS, and operation and maintenance (O&M) activities may continue after construction has been completed.

EPA initially bears costs associated with responsible party searches. Responsible parties may bear some or all the costs of the RI/FS, remedial design and construction, and O&M, or EPA and the States may share costs.

The State cost share for site cleanup activities is controlled by Section 104(c) of CERCLA and the NCP. For privately operated sites, EPA will pay for 100% of the costs of the RI/FS and remedial planning, and 90% of the costs associated with remedial action. The State will be responsible for 10% of the remedial action. For publicly-operated sites, the State cost share is at least 50% of all response costs at the site, including the RI/FS and remedial design and construction of the remedial action selected. After the remedy is built, costs fall into two categories:

- For restoration of ground water and surface water, EPA will share in startup costs according to the criteria in the previous paragraph for 10 years or until a sufficient level of protectiveness is achieved before the end of 10 years.
- For other cleanups, EPA will share for up to 1 year the cost of that portion of response needed to assure that a remedy is operational and functional.

After that, the State assumes full responsibilities for O&M.

In previous NPL rulemakings, the Agency estimated the costs associated with these activities (RI/FS, remedial design, remedial action, and O&M) on an average per site and total cost basis. EPA will continue with this approach, using the most recent (1994) cost estimates available. The estimates are presented below. However, there is wide variation in costs for individual sites, depending on the amount, type, and extent of contamination. Additionally, EPA is unable to predict what portions of the total costs responsible parties will bear, since the distribution of costs depends on the extent of voluntary and negotiated response and the success of any cost-recovery actions.

Cost category	Average total cost per site ¹
RI/FS	1,350,000
Remedial Design	1,260,000
Remedial Action	³ 22,500,000
Present Discounted Value O&M ²	5,630,000

¹ 1994 U.S. Dollars.

² Assumes cost of O&M over 30 years, \$400,000 for the first year and 5.8% discount rate.

³ Includes State cost-share.

Source: Office of Program Management, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

Costs to the States associated with today's final rule arise from the required State cost-share of: (1) 10% of remedial actions and 10% of first-year O&M costs at privately-operated; and (2) at least 50% of the remedial planning (RI/FS and remedial design), remedial action, and first-year O&M costs at publicly-operated sites. States will assume the cost for O&M after EPA's period of participation. Using the budget projections presented above, the cost to the States of undertaking Federal remedial planning and actions, but excluding O&M costs, would be