

Economy-wide effects of an amendment to the NPL are aggregations of efforts on firms and State and local governments. Although effects could be felt by some individual firms and States, the total impact of this amendment on output, prices, and employment is expected to be negligible at the national level, as was the case in the 1982 RIA.

Benefits

The real benefits associated with today's amendment are increased health and environmental protection as a result of increased public awareness of potential hazards. In addition to the potential for more Federally-financed remedial actions, expansion of the NPL could accelerate privately-financed, voluntary cleanup efforts. Listing sites as national priority targets also may give States increased support for funding responses at particular sites.

As a result of the additional CERCLA remedies, there will be lower human exposure to high-risk chemicals, and higher-quality surface water, ground water, soil, and air. These benefits are expected to be significant, although difficult to estimate in advance of completing the RI/FS at these sites.

IV. Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866 review.

V. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 requires EPA to review the impacts of this action on small entities, or certify that the action will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. By small entities, the Act refers to small businesses, small government jurisdictions, and nonprofit organizations.

While this rule proposes to revise the NPL, an NPL revision is not a typical regulatory change since it does not automatically impose costs. As stated above, adding sites to the NPL does not in itself require any action by any party, nor does it determine the liability of any party for the cost of cleanup at the site. Further, no identifiable groups are affected as a whole. As a consequence, impacts on any group are hard to predict. A site's inclusion on the NPL could increase the likelihood of adverse impacts on responsible parties (in the form of cleanup costs), but at this time EPA cannot identify the potentially

affected businesses or estimate the number of small businesses that might also be affected.

The Agency does expect that placing the sites in this proposed rule on the NPL could significantly affect certain industries, or firms within industries, that have caused a proportionately high percentage of waste site problems. However, EPA does not expect the listing of these sites to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses.

In any case, economic impacts would occur only through enforcement and cost-recovery actions, which EPA takes at its discretion on a site-by-site basis. EPA considers many factors when determining enforcement actions, including not only a firm's contribution to the problem, but also its ability to pay. The impacts (from cost recovery) on small governments and nonprofit organizations would be determined on a similar case-by-case basis.

For the foregoing reasons, I hereby certify that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Therefore, this proposed regulation does not require a regulatory flexibility analysis.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST PROPOSED RULE #18 GENERAL SUPERFUND SECTION

State	Site name	City/county	NPL Gr ¹
FL	Normandy Park Apartments	Temple Terrace	6
KS	Ace Services	Colby	5/6
LA	Gulf State Utilities-North Ryan Street	Lake Charles	5
LA	Old Citgo Refinery	Bossier City	5/6
LA	Southern Shipbuilding	Slidell	5/6
ME	West Site/Hows Corners	Plymouth	5/6
MI	Bay City Middlegrounds	Bay City	5/6

¹ Sites are placed in groups (Gr) corresponding to groups of 50 on the final NPL. Note: Number of Sites Proposed to General Superfund Section: 7.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST PROPOSED RULE #18 FEDERAL FACILITIES SECTION

State	Site name	City/county	NPL Gr ¹
KS	Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant	DeSoto	5/6
MD	Indian Head Naval Surface Warfare Center	Indian Head	5/6

¹ Sites are placed in groups (Gr) corresponding to groups of 50 on the final NPL. Note: Number of Sites Proposed to Federal Facilities Section: 2.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 300

Air pollution control, Chemicals, Hazardous materials, Intergovernmental relations, Natural resources, Oil pollution, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Superfund, Waste treatment and disposal, Water pollution control, Water supply.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 9605; 42 U.S.C. 9620; 33 U.S.C. 1321(c)(2); E.O. 11735, 3 CFR,

1971-1975 Comp., p. 793; E.O. 12580, 3 CFR, 1987 Comp., p. 193.

Dated: February 8, 1995.

Elliott P. Laws,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

[FR Doc. 95-3601 Filed 2-10-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 64

[CC Docket No. 94-158; FCC 94-352]

Operator Services Providers

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.