



| SUPERFUND UNDERFUNDED

How taxpayers have been left with a toxic financial burden

SUPERFUND UNDERFUNDED

How taxpayers have been left with a toxic financial burden

NMPIRG | Education
Fund



WRITTEN BY JILLIAN GORDNER
U.S. PIRG EDUCATION FUND
FEBRUARY 2021

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Danielle Melgar, Elizabeth Ridlington, and Haley Clinton for their review of drafts of this document, as well as their insights and suggestions.

The author bears responsibility for any factual errors. Policy recommendations are those of U.S. PIRG Education Fund. The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of our funders or those who provided review.

© 2021 U.S. PIRG Education Fund. Some Rights Reserved. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license. To view the terms of this license, visit creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

With public debate around important issues often dominated by special interests pursuing their own narrow agendas, U.S. PIRG Education Fund offers an independent voice that works on behalf of the public interest. U.S. PIRG Education Fund, a 501(c)(3) organization, works to protect consumers and promote good government. We investigate problems, craft solutions, educate the public, and offer meaningful opportunities for civic participation. For more information about U.S. PIRG Education Fund or for additional copies of this report, please visit www.uspirgedfund.org.

Cover image: Oliver Hale, Unsplash.com

I CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | 1 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 3 |
| INTRODUCTION | 7 |
| Definitions | 8 |
| Superfund Cleanup Process | 10 |
| How the Superfund Toxic Waste Cleanup Program is Funded | 12 |
| IMPORTANCE OF CLEANING UP SUPERFUND SITES | 14 |
| Human Health and Safety | 14 |
| Environment | 14 |
| An Urgent Problem: The Threat of Worsening Natural Disasters to Superfund Sites | 14 |
| THE SUPERFUND PROGRAM'S DECLINING BUDGET AND SUCCESS | 16 |
| CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 25 |
| METHODOLOGY | 27 |
| Measuring Success of the Superfund Toxic Waste Cleanup Program | 27 |
| Potentially Responsible Parties and Orphan Sites | 28 |
| Calculating Yearly Federal Appropriations | 28 |
| APPENDIX: Superfund National Priorities List Toxic Waste Sites by State | 30 |
| Notes | 161 |

| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IN 1980, CONGRESS PASSED


the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), informally called Superfund. The Superfund program was given the authority and funds to hold polluters responsible for cleaning up contaminated waste sites or clean up the sites themselves if no responsible party can be found or afford the cleanup.¹ These toxic waste sites house some of the most “hazardous chemicals known to humankind.”² The Superfund toxic waste program protects people from these contaminants and the serious health problems associated with them.³

The program was originally funded by a tax on the chemical and petroleum industries, but that tax expired in 1995, and now the money for the Superfund program has come primarily through appropriations from the general revenue.⁴

As appropriations have decreased over the past two decades, cleanup has slowed, putting more people at risk for longer from hazardous contamination.⁵

- From 1999 to 2020, annual appropriations decreased by more than a billion dollars from \$2.3 billion to just under \$1.2 billion in constant 2020 dollars.^{6,7}
- From 1991 to 2000, when the Superfund Trust was at its highest balance, each year saw an average of 71 Construction Completions.⁸ From 2011 - 2020, that number fell to an average of 12 construction completions each year.⁹ In FY 2020, construction was completed at only ten sites.¹⁰
- The Superfund Trust reached its peak balance of \$4.7 billion at the start of FY 1997, and then began declining in FY 1998.¹¹ At the start of FY 2020, the Trust had a balance of \$225 million.¹²
- 34 construction projects did not begin in FY 2020 because of a lack of funding.¹³

FIGURE 1: CONSTRUCTION COMPLETIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS BY FISCAL YEAR¹⁴




In FY 2020, the EPA focused on Deletions and Partial Deletions, while the number of cleanup actions remained stagnant or decreased

- From 1997, when the first year Partial Deletions were used, until 2018, the average number of Partial Deletions each year was 4. In FY 2019, there were 15 and in FY 2020, there were 13.¹⁵
- FY 2019 and 2020 had the highest and second highest number of Partial Deletions in a single fiscal year, respectively.¹⁶

- Partial Deletions made up nearly half of the total number of combined Deletions and Partial Deletions in 2020. In previous years since the start of Partial Deletions, they have made up an average of less than one-third of the combined total each year.¹⁷
- 14 Superfund toxic waste sites were deleted from the National Priorities List (NPL) in FY 2020. Aside from 2018, this is the most Superfund National Priorities List deletions to occur in a single fiscal year since 2005.¹⁸


FIGURE 2: PARTIAL DELETIONS AND DELETIONS PER FISCAL YEAR¹⁹




The EPA did not start or complete many cleanup actions in FY 2020 compared to the history of the Superfund program, since the first site was put on the National Priorities List in 1983.²⁰

- The number of Construction Completions at National Priorities List sites in FY 2020 dropped two-thirds below the yearly averages since the first National Priorities List.²¹
- Less than half as many Remedy and Final Remedies were selected in FY 2020 compared to the 1983-2019 average of the Superfund program.²²
- Between 1983 and 2019, there was an average of 54 Superfund toxic waste site Remedial and Final Remedial Actions that began each fiscal year. In FY 2020, there were 24.²³

FIGURE 3: AVERAGE ANNUAL CONSTRUCTION COMPLETIONS BY 10-YEARS



One in six Americans lives within 3 miles of a proposed or approved Superfund toxic waste site



I INTRODUCTION

According to the most recent data available, one in six Americans lives within three miles of a toxic waste site that is so dangerous it has been proposed or approved for cleanup under the federal Superfund program.^{24,25} The majority of these sites are on the National Priorities List run by the EPA's toxic waste cleanup program, often referred to as Superfund.²⁶ Less than a quarter of the more than 1,700 sites that have been added to the list since it was created in 1980 have been deleted, which is the final step in confirming all cleanup goals have been achieved at the site.^{27,28}

The EPA Superfund program began in 1980 when Congress passed the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). The bill gave the EPA the authority and funds to identify

hazardous sites, which threaten public health; hold the polluting parties responsible for cleanup; and clean up the sites themselves if no Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs) could be determined. The program is referred to as Superfund, because of the Superfund Trust that was created to fund the program.

The Superfund program has been used to respond to natural disasters and emergencies including the attack on the World Trade Center, the BP Oil Spill, Hurricane Katrina, and the 2001 Anthrax attack.²⁹ Contaminants of concern at toxic waste sites on the National Priorities List include arsenic, lead, mercury, benzene, dioxin, and other hazardous chemicals³⁰ that may increase the risk of cancer, reproductive problems, birth defects, and other serious illnesses.³¹

Definitions

The EPA provides the definitions for a variety of cleanup actions. Each definition in the following section uses the exact definition provided by the EPA on the Superfund webpage. Definitions of cleanup actions are listed in the order they generally occur.

National Priorities List (NPL): The National Priorities List (NPL) is the list of sites of national priority among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States and its territories.³²

Contaminants of Concern (COCs): COCs are the chemical substances found at the site that EPA has determined pose an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment. These are the substances evaluated by EPA to be addressed by cleanup actions at the site.³³

Sediment: Sediment is materials found at the bottom of a water body. Sediments may include clay, silt, sand, gravel, decaying organic matter, and shells.³⁴

Preliminary Assessment: The preliminary assessment (PA) involves gathering historical and other available information about site conditions to evaluate whether the site poses a threat to human health and the environment and /or whether further investigation is needed. The preliminary assessment also helps identify sites that may need immediate or short-term response actions.³⁵

Site Inspection: The site investigation (SI) tests air, water, and soil at the site to determine what hazardous substances are present and whether they are being released to the environment and are a threat to human health.³⁶

Information about the site that is collected in the PA/SI phase helps EPA to evaluate the risks posed by the site using its Hazard Ranking System (HRS).³⁷

Hazardous Ranking Score: The Hazard Ranking System (HRS) is the principal mechanism that the EPA uses to place uncontrolled waste sites on the National Priorities List (NPL). It is a numerically based screening system that uses information from initial, limited investigations - the preliminary assessment (PA) and the site inspection (SI) - to assess the relative potential of sites to pose a threat to human health or the environment. Sites with HRS scores of 28.5 or greater are eligible for placement on the NPL.³⁸

Removal Action: Removal responses are common at Superfund Sites when the contamination poses an immediate threat to human health and the environment. Removals are classified as either emergency, time-critical, or non-time-critical depending on the extent and type of contamination.³⁹

Remedial Investigation: The remedial investigation (RI) serves as the mechanism for collecting data to characterize site conditions, determine the nature of the waste, assess risk to human health and the environment, and conduct treatability testing to evaluate the potential performance and cost of the treatment technologies that are being considered.⁴⁰

Feasibility Study: The feasibility study (FS) is the mechanism for the development, screening, and detailed evaluation of alternative remedial actions.⁴¹

Record of Decision: The ROD explains which cleanup alternatives will be used at NPL sites. It contains information on site history, site description, site characteristics, community participation, enforcement activities, past and present activities, contaminated media, the contaminants present, description of the response actions to be taken, and the remedy selected for cleanup. The development of the ROD also includes consideration of how the site could be used in the future.⁴²

Remedial Design: Remedial design (RD) is the phase in Superfund site cleanup where the technical specifications for cleanup remedies and technologies are designed.⁴³

Remedial Action: Remedial action (RA) follows the remedial design phase. It involves the actual construction or implementation phase of Superfund site cleanup. The RD/RA is based on the specifications described in the Record of Decision.⁴⁴


Construction Completion: This milestone indicates all physical construction required for the cleanup of the entire site has been completed (even though final cleanup levels may not have been achieved). For example, a groundwater treatment system has been constructed though it may need to operate for a number of years in order for all contaminants to be removed from the groundwater.⁴⁵

Partial Deletion: Sites, or portions of sites, that meet the standard provided in the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), i.e., no further response is appropriate, may be the subject of entire or partial deletion.⁴⁶ Such portion may be a defined geographic unit of the site, perhaps as small as a residential unit, or may be a specific medium at the site, e.g., groundwater, depending on the nature or extent of the release(s).⁴⁷

National Priorities List Deletion: EPA may delete a final NPL site if it determines that no further response is required to protect human health or the environment. Sites that have been deleted from the NPL remain eligible for further Superfund-financed remedial action in the unlikely event that conditions in the future warrant such action.⁴⁸

Superfund Cleanup Process

FIGURE 4: STEPS FOR A SUPERFUND NPL SITE FROM IDENTIFICATION TO DELETION



The cleanup of a Superfund site can take a decade or more.⁴⁹ Anyone -- citizens, state agencies, and EPA regional offices -- can bring the EPA's attention to a site.⁵⁰ Next, the EPA conducts a preliminary assessment and site inspection to evaluate the threat level of the site.⁵¹ During the preliminary assessment, the EPA investigates any available background information on the site, and if it continues to warrant further investigation, the EPA will do a site inspection to test the water, soil, and air for contamination.^{52,53} The sites that pose the most danger to human health are placed on the National Priorities List.⁵⁴

During the preliminary assessment and site inspection, the EPA also determines what type of cleanup action is necessary at the site or if no cleanup is necessary. The two types of cleanup at a Superfund toxic waste site are removal and remedial action.⁵⁵ Removal actions are usually short-term cleanup actions which involve the removal of contaminants that pose a present danger to human health.⁵⁶ Removal actions might include removing hazardous substances from a site, fencing the area to limit human access, providing an alternative water supply to local residents, or relocating residents.⁵⁷ Remedial actions are typically long-term cleanup actions aimed at permanently and significantly reducing contamination. The most hazardous sites that require long-term clean up action are referred to the National Priorities List.⁵⁸ The first step for a site on the National Priorities List is to

conduct a remedial investigation and feasibility study, which evaluates the type and extent of contamination, cost of cleanup, and technologies that may be used. All information collected about the site is then used to inform the Record of Decision (ROD).⁵⁹ The Record of Decision describes the history and characteristics of the site, details of the type and extent of the contamination, and the plan for cleaning it up.⁶⁰


Following the Record of Decision, the design of the cleanup and implementing the cleanup plan occur in the Remedial Design and Remedial Action stage.⁶¹ Once the physical work to complete the cleanup plan is complete, the site reaches the Construction Completed milestone.⁶² Once construction is complete, however, contaminants may still remain on-site, as the remedy continues to operate. For example, it may take many years after a groundwater treatment begins for all the contaminated groundwater to be treated, even though the construction of the treatment operation is complete. Or, the construction plan may need to be revised based on later investigations of the extent of the contamination and effectiveness of the remediation plan. Once construction is complete, additional monitoring may continue during the Post-Construction Completion phase in order to ensure that the remedy selected continues to be effective.⁶³ The final step is NPL Deletion, which occurs when the EPA is certain that all cleanup actions are complete and all cleanup goals have been achieved.⁶⁴

How the Superfund Toxic Waste Cleanup Program is Funded

There are two ways that the cleanup of a Superfund toxic waste site is funded. The first is when a Potentially Responsible Party (PRP) of a site is identified and can pay for the cleanup.⁶⁵ A Potentially Responsible Party can be any individual, organization, or company, which contributed in any way

to the contamination at the site.⁶⁶ The EPA aims to have PRPs pay for or conduct the cleanup of the site and will try to negotiate a cleanup agreement with the PRP to clean up the site.⁶⁷ Alternatively, the EPA may pay to clean up a site and then try to have the PRP pay back the cost.⁶⁸

FIGURE 5: SUPERFUND TOXIC WASTE PROGRAM FUNDING



At facilities that are owned or operated by a federal entity, such as a department or agency of the United States, the cleanup is paid for by the federal department or agency responsible, and not the Superfund Trust.⁶⁹ As of December 2020, federal Superfund sites make up approximately 12% of National Priorities List sites.⁷⁰

When a PRP cannot be identified or cannot afford the cleanup, the EPA pays for the cleanup from the Superfund Trust.⁷¹ When the Superfund program was established, the Trust was funded

by a tax on the chemical and oil industries. That tax expired in 1995, and shortly after the Trust reached its peak of \$4.7 billion at the start of FY 1997, it began declining.⁷² Now, the Trust is primarily funded through taxpayer dollars.⁷³

Since 1999, federal appropriations have decreased from approximately \$2.3 billion to less than \$1.2 billion.⁷⁴ In FY 2020, the federal government appropriated \$1,184,755,000 to the Superfund program.⁷⁵

I IMPORTANCE OF CLEANING UP SUPERFUND SITES

Human Health and Safety

Exposure to chemicals at Superfund toxic waste sites is linked to an increased risk of cancer; respiratory and heart disease; stunted development in children; and many other medical problems.⁷⁶ People living in areas with a higher number of Superfund sites have been found to have higher incidences of cancer than those not living near Superfund sites.⁷⁷

People can be exposed to contaminants from air emissions, eating fish that have absorbed toxic substances from the contaminated sediment and water, eating food grown in contaminated soil,⁷⁸ and drinking or swimming in contaminated water.⁷⁹

Children are particularly vulnerable to developing adverse health effects in early childhood or even before they're born if their mothers are exposed to harmful contaminants from a Superfund site.⁸⁰

Environment

Even once the danger to human health from a toxic waste site is under control, damage to the environment may be

irreversible. The hazardous substances at Superfund sites can kill and cause reproductive problems in organisms, and endanger the survival of ecosystems.⁸¹

At some sites, no action will be taken even if there are adverse ecological effects occurring or expected to occur because cleanup at the site is suspected to cause more long-term damage to the environment.⁸² For example, if an ecosystem is fragile, removing contaminated soil may physically destroy the habitat and cause more damage than leaving the contamination in place.^{83,84}

An Urgent Problem: The Threat of Worsening Natural Disasters to Superfund Sites

Hurricanes, floods, and sea-level rise threaten to sweep toxic chemicals from Superfund sites into nearby communities,⁸⁵ and more severe hurricanes are becoming more frequent.⁸⁶

Although the total number of tropical cyclones each year has remained steady, the average intensity of tropical

cyclones is increasing, meaning that we will see the average storm become more severe in the coming years.⁸⁷ Further, climate change has led to an increase in the proportion of tropical cyclones each year that are considered higher intensity (Category 4 and Category 5),⁸⁸ which are those responsible for the “great majority of [tropical cyclone]-related damage and mortality.”⁸⁹ Hurricane Floyd (1999), Hurricane Katrina (2005), Hurricane Irene (2011), Hurricane Sandy (2012), and Hurricane Harvey (2017) have all caused flooding at Superfund sites.⁹⁰ The record-breaking 2020 hurricane season only emphasized how this threat continues to grow, with the most named-storms to ever occur in the Atlantic hurricane season.⁹¹

As our climate changes, at least 800 Superfund toxic waste sites are at risk of extreme flooding in the next 20 years,⁹² which could spread the toxic pollution

into nearby communities.⁹³ In 2019, the U.S. Government Accountability Office found that almost 40 percent of National Priorities List (NPL) sites overlap with the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s list of top flood hazard regions.⁹⁴


In 2017, the Trump Administration reversed an executive order issued during the previous administration, requiring risks from flooding to be taken into account when building and rebuilding infrastructure,⁹⁵ including Superfund sites, which receive federal funds.⁹⁶ We can expect this to increase the chance that we will implement a cleanup plan that fails to keep people safe from contamination, and that it will require additional funding and time when it does.

I THE SUPERFUND PROGRAM'S DECLINING BUDGET AND SUCCESS

1. In FY 2020, construction was completed at less than a third as many sites than the yearly average in the history of the Superfund program, continuing the decades-long trend of decreasing numbers of yearly Construction Completions.⁹⁷

From 1991 to 2000, when the Superfund Trust was its highest balance, an average of 71 sites saw Construction Completion each year. In 2001 through 2010, the average dropped to 34. In 2011 through 2020, that number dropped further to 12. Construction was completed at 10 sites in FY 2020. This number increased from 6 sites in FY 2019, which was the lowest number of Construction Completions since 1987.

FIGURE 6: CONSTRUCTION COMPLETIONS PER FISCAL YEAR



While NPL Deletion and Partial Deletion can largely be a matter of waiting for the site to reach cleanup goals after construction is complete,⁹⁸ which may take decades,⁹⁹ the Construction Completed milestone reflects the culmination of physical cleanup work.¹⁰⁰

The 10 sites where Construction Completion was achieved in FY 2020 are:¹⁰¹

- Jet Propulsion Laboratory (NASA), Pasadena, CA
- Spectron, Inc., Elkton, MD
- MIDCO II, Gary, IN
- PJP Landfill, Jersey City, NJ

One of these sites, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, is a federal site,¹⁰² which means it is owned or operated by a federal government entity, and that entity pays for the cleanup.¹⁰³ Of the nine non-federal sites listed above, seven had Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs) involved in some aspect of the cleanup, which means at least some of the cost of cleanup was done or paid for by a Potentially Responsible Party.¹⁰⁴

The decades-long trend of declining Construction Completions correlates with the decreased amount of yearly appropriations to the program. From 1999 to 2020, annual appropriations decreased by more than a billion dollars from \$2.3 billion to just under \$1.2 billion in constant 2020 dollars.^{105,106} Accordingly, the average number of yearly Construction Completions fell by

- Ashland/Northern States Power Lakefront, Ashland, WI
- Corozal Well, Corozal, PR
- Fairfax St. Wood Treaters, Jacksonville, FL
- Blackburn and Union Privileges, Walpole, MA
- Red Panther Chemical Company, Clarksdale, MS
- Coast Wood Preserving, Ukiah, CA

approximately half each decade from 1999 through 2020.¹⁰⁷

2. The total number of Partial and full Deletions from the National Priorities List exceeds the historical average (1997-2019) by nearly 10.

There were more National Priorities List Deletions in 2020 compared to the annual average over the previous twenty years.¹⁰⁸

14 Superfund toxic waste sites were deleted from the National Priorities List in the fiscal year 2020.¹⁰⁹ Aside from 2018, this is the most Superfund National Priorities List deletions to occur in a single fiscal year since 2005.¹¹⁰

The sites deleted from the National Priorities List in FY 2020 are:¹¹¹

- American Crossarm & Conduit Co., Chehalis, WA
- Annapolis Lead Mine, Annapolis, MO
- Cimarron Mining Corp., Carrizozo, NM

- Fridley Commons Park Well Field, Fridley, MN
- JASCO Chemical Corp., Mountain View, CA
- Northside Landfill, Spokane, WA
- Red Panther Chemical Company, Clarksdale, MS
- Tulsa Fuel and Manufacturing, Collinsville, OK
- Scrap Processing Co., Inc., Medford, WI
- FMC Corp. (Dublin Road Landfill), Town of Shelby, NY
- Hormigas Ground Water Plume, Caguas, PR
- Dup. County Landfill/Blackwell Forest, Warrenville, IL
- First Piedmont Corp. Rock Quarry (Route 719), Pittsylvania County, VA
- Fairfax St. Wood Treaters, Jacksonville, FL

Eight of the above 14 sites had a PRP to pay for a part of the cleanup.¹¹² The other six were paid for out of the EPA Superfund budget.

There were more Partial Deletions in FY 2020 compared to the average annual number in the years since the first site had a Partial Deletion¹¹³

The main success of the Superfund program in FY 2020 compared to previous years was the number of sites that had Partial Deletions from the National Priorities List.

In 1995, the EPA introduced Partial Deletions as a new measure to evaluate the success of the Superfund program and the first Partial Deletion occurred in

1997.^{114,115} The Partial Deletion rule allows for part of a site, whether that be a geographic section or a medium of contamination, such as groundwater, to be deleted from the NPL before the rest of the site can be deleted.¹¹⁶ Those portions of the site deleted under the Partial Deletion rule must meet all deletion criteria, which means that no further response action is necessary to clean up the site.¹¹⁷

FY 2020 and FY 2019 both saw a marked increase in the number of Partial Deletions. From FY 1997, the first year a site had a Partial Deletion, until FY 2018, there was a yearly average of 4 Partial Deletions per year.¹¹⁸ In FY 2019 and FY 2020, there were 15 and 13 Partial Deletions, respectively.¹¹⁹

Nearly half the combined total of Partial and full Deletions in FY 2020 come from Partial Deletions, whereas in previous years, Partial Deletions have been, on average, a little more than a fifth of the combined total.¹²⁰

It is important to note that NPL Deletion and Partial Deletion is a step that comes after years, and often decades, of cleanup.¹²¹ However, it can be an important step in order to redevelop the land and indicate to the community or to investors that an area is ready for use.^{122,123}

4. The declining Superfund budget has slowed down the cleanup of toxic waste sites


In a 2013 report, the Government Accountability Office found that from

1999 through 2013, annual federal appropriations to Superfund declined from approximately \$2.3 billion to \$1.2 billion (adjusted to 2020 dollars).¹²⁴ In 2020, the Superfund program was appropriated nearly \$1.2 billion dollars.¹²⁵

and 2013, the program’s spending on new remedial cleanup projects also declined.¹²⁶ The EPA prioritizes ongoing cleanup work, and thus, approximately one-third of new remedial action projects were delayed at non-federal Superfund sites from 1999 through 2013 due to the decline in funding.¹²⁷

As annual Superfund federal appropriations decreased between 1999

FIGURE 7: ENACTED FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS TO THE SUPERFUND PROGRAM IN NOMINAL AND CONSTANT 2020 DOLLARS FROM 1999 THROUGH 2020*¹²⁸



*For 2020, the number is estimated enacted, because the enacted appropriation amount is not yet finalized as of this report release.


5. The federal budget proposed for FY 2020 by the President would have appropriated \$114 million less

to Superfund than in FY 2019,¹²⁹ but the enacted budget was approximately \$25 million more.¹³⁰

President Trump made Superfund a cornerstone of his Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) agenda,¹³¹ but the President's budget proposal in FY 2020 included a cut to the Environmental Protection Agency by nearly a third,¹³² which would include cutting Superfund appropriations by approximately \$114 million.¹³³ However, the estimated enacted appropriations in FY 2020 included \$207 million more to the EPA and \$25 million more to the Superfund program than in FY 2019.¹³⁴

The following graph shows the President's Budget for FY 2020 versus enacted appropriations. Under the FY 2020 President's Budget, the Superfund toxic waste program is not cut drastically compared to the entire EPA budget, but it does take up a larger percentage of the EPA's budget, which is in-line with President Trump's emphasis on revitalizing the Superfund toxic waste program.¹³⁵

FIGURE 8: PRESIDENT'S BUDGET VS ESTIMATED ENACTED SUPERFUND AND OTHER EPA APPROPRIATIONS¹³⁶



The President’s Budget for FY 2020 had Superfund receive approximately 20% of total EPA appropriations. However, the actual percentage of Superfund appropriations of the total EPA budget in FY 2020 was 13%, which is the same percent as in FY 2019.¹³⁷

6. In FY 2020, 34 construction projects did not begin because of a lack of funding¹³⁸


The budget shortfall has delayed construction at sites that would otherwise have been ready to be cleaned up at 34 sites,¹³⁹ which is the largest backlog of sites in 15 years.¹⁴⁰

Because the EPA prioritizes ongoing cleanup over beginning new cleanup projects,¹⁴¹ declining funds have slowed down the number of sites at which cleanup begins.¹⁴²

7. FY 2020 had less than half the number of combined Remedial and Final Remedial Actions Started than the average annual number from 1983, the first year a site was listed on the NPL, through 2019.¹⁴³

Between 1983 and 2019, there was an average of 54 Superfund toxic waste site Remedial and Final Remedial Actions that began each fiscal year. In FY 2020, there were 24.

FIGURE 9: REMEDIAL AND FINAL REMEDIAL ACTION STARTED BY FISCAL YEAR¹⁴⁴




8. Less than half as many Remedy and Final Remedies were selected in FY 2020 compared to the annual average history of the Superfund program since the first site was listed on the National Priorities List through 2019.¹⁴⁵

Response actions at a toxic waste site can include short-term removal actions and long term-remedial cleanup actions.¹⁴⁶ The remedial cleanup action

begins after the remedy is designed and selected.¹⁴⁷ Sometimes, due to new information, an additional remedy will be selected and is referred to as a Final Remedy. The Final Remedy Selected is issued in the last Record of Decision given for a site, which the EPA believes will best remediate the site.¹⁴⁸

From the fiscal years 1983 through 2019, an average of 59 Remedy and Final Remedies were selected. In FY 2020, there were 25.

FIGURE 10: REMEDY AND FINAL REMEDIES SELECTED BY FISCAL YEAR



9. Human exposure is not under control at 122 sites and the EPA has insufficient data to determine if human exposure is under control at another 130 sites.¹⁴⁹

Human exposure is considered not under control at a site when the possible pathways of exposure from the contamination to a person have not been sufficiently mitigated such that a person could become exposed to one or more of the contaminants at the site.¹⁵⁰

Some examples of efforts by the EPA to get human exposure under control are installing a fence around the site and warning signs around contaminated waterways to warn the public to avoid swimming or fishing in the affected areas.¹⁵¹ People should follow all EPA posted warnings and contact the Site Manager if they have further questions about possible exposure pathways from a specific Superfund toxic waste site.

10. The Administrator's Emphasis List has led to faster cleanup at the sites included on the list. The list has not led to faster cleanup overall across NPL sites.

In May 2017, the former EPA Administrator, Scott Pruitt, commissioned a Superfund Task Force to provide recommendations “for improving and expediting site cleanups and promoting redevelopment.”¹⁵² In July 2017, the task force produced a list of recommendations, including the creation of a Top Ten Administrator’s

Emphasis List of sites that need “immediate and intense attention.”¹⁵³

The first Administrator’s Emphasis List released in 2017 included 17 sites on the National Priorities List, one site under consideration to be proposed and three sites proposed to the National Priorities List.¹⁵⁴ The latest release of the Administrator’s Emphasis List in FY 2020 was August 2020, which has 14 sites listed, including proposed and listed NPL sites, as well as some sites that are not on the National Priorities List.¹⁵⁵ Nine sites on the current Administrator’s Emphasis List are sites that were on the original list.¹⁵⁶

In FY 2020, the EPA reported it would focus resources on the Administrator’s Emphasis List.¹⁵⁷ The following sites currently on the list have seen additional cleanup actions in FY 2020:

- Two sites on the Administrator’s List in 2020 and on the original Administrator’s Emphasis List received Partial Deletions: U.S.S. Smelter and Lead site and the Silver Bow Creek/Butte Area site.¹⁵⁸
- The Federal District Court of Montana approved a consent decree to secure more than \$150 million in cleanup actions for the Silver Bow Creek/Butte Area site from Atlantic Richfield Company.¹⁵⁹
- The Orange County North Basin site was finalized on the National Priorities List.¹⁶⁰

- The EPA approved Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs) to begin further investigation of the Olin Chemical site.¹⁶¹

None of the sites at which construction was completed in FY 2020 have been or are currently on the Administrator's Emphasis List.¹⁶² This may reflect the choice of sites to include on the

Emphasis List as those requiring dedicated, long-term action to reach the point of Construction Completed.

While the Administrator's Emphasis List is a useful tool for directing resources to specific sites, it does not address the larger lack of resources that slows down the cleanup of toxic waste sites.

I CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Superfund toxic waste cleanup program protects the health and safety of our communities.¹⁶³

The declining Superfund toxic waste program budget over the past 20 years has decreased the EPA's ability to clean up toxic waste sites, which is reflected in the budget and success of the program in 2020.

Recommendations for Congress

Congress needs to take action to support the Superfund toxic waste cleanup program, including the following:

A Polluter Pays Tax should be reinstated to fund the Superfund.

The EPA Superfund toxic waste program's limited financial resources slow down cleanup and make the process more costly as the EPA attempts to spread limited resources across more than 1,300 toxic waste sites.¹⁶⁴ In order to protect human health and safety, the Superfund toxic waste program needs additional funding, which should come from the polluting industries responsible for the contamination, not the public.

Recommendations for the EPA

The EPA needs to take action to better prepare for natural disasters hindering cleanup efforts:

The risk of toxic waste spreading from a Superfund site due to climate-induced natural disasters and sea-level rise should be taken into account when designing the cleanup plan for a site.

In October 2019, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) came out with a report urging the EPA, and specifically the Superfund program, to take additional actions to manage the risk from climate change.¹⁶⁵ They found that 945 Superfund toxic waste sites are in areas that may be impacted by climate change effects such as wildfires, flooding, hurricanes, and sea-level rise.¹⁶⁶ In the GAO report, they recommended that the EPA "clarify how its actions to manage risks at nonfederal NPL sites from potential impacts of climate change align with current goals and objectives." However, the 2018-2022 EPA Strategic Plan included no mention of climate change. The EPA's lack of clarification on the necessity to manage risks from climate change in accordance with its goals of a cleaner, healthier environment fails to

“ensure that officials consistently integrate climate change information into site-level risk assessments and risk response decisions.” The EPA’s Strategic Plan must be revised to include the importance of considering the threat of contamination spilling from a toxic waste site due to the effects of climate change.

Recommendations for local & state governments

Local and state governments need to take action to protect the health and safety of the communities they serve:

States and local governments should work closely with the EPA to ensure people are aware of the Superfund sites in their communities.

States and local governments have a responsibility to raise public awareness about the threats of toxic waste sites by utilizing state and local government resources.

Recommendations for individuals

Individuals need to take action to protect their own health and safety:

Individuals should find out if they live near a Superfund toxic waste site.

53 million Americans live within 3 miles of a toxic waste site proposed or designated for cleanup under the Superfund program and many don’t know it.¹⁶⁷ The chemicals at Superfund toxic waste sites can increase the risk of cancer, respiratory and heart problems, and other serious illnesses. The EPA may issue warnings to not swim or fish in areas near a Superfund toxic waste site due to possible contamination, and individuals should adhere to all warnings.

Find out if you live near a Superfund toxic waste site here:

<https://www.epa.gov/superfund/search-superfund-sites-where-you-live>

I METHODOLOGY

Definitions

See section 3: Introduction, subsection 1: Definitions, p. 8.

Measuring Success of the Superfund Toxic Waste Cleanup Program

The EPA Superfund toxic waste cleanup program utilizes a variety of different measurements to evaluate its success in a given year. The EPA reports on the number of National Priorities List (NPL) site Deletions, Partial Deletions, Construction Completions, sites Proposed to the NPL, and sites added to the NPL each fiscal year.¹⁶⁸

The EPA does not publish data for the annual number of Initial Assessment Completed, Remedy and Final Remedy Selected, or Remedial and Final Remedial Action Started actions. The EPA releases total "Remedial Action Project Completions" which includes multiple cleanup actions, but only up to fiscal year 2018 right now and not by Site Milestone.¹⁶⁹ The dates of each of the above Site Milestones are available on the webpage for each individual site under Cleanup Progress. This report used the Scrape Storm web scraper to extract that information for each individual site.

The sites scraped included Proposed, Listed, Deleted, and Superfund Alternative Approach sites in order to get the most complete picture of cleanup actions completed by the EPA toxic waste cleanup program each fiscal year. Superfund Alternative Approach sites are still managed under the Superfund program, though they are not included on the National Priorities List. Once the EPA determines that a site qualifies for inclusion on the NPL, a potentially responsible party may negotiate to clean up the site but not have it listed on the NPL.¹⁷⁰

The web scraper was not able to scrape seven of these sites.¹⁷¹ These sites did not have a Cleanup Progress section and are not included in the number of Remedy and Final Remedy Selected, or Remedial and Final Remedial Action Started in this report. These sites report a variety of different cleanup metrics that are not consistent with how cleanup is measured at other sites reviewed, and are therefore not included in order to maintain consistency in how the data is collected and reported.

Not every site reports on all of the same measures under the Cleanup Progress section of the site's webpage. For

example, some sites only have Final Remedy Selected and not a date included for Remedy Selected, which is why this report uses the combined number of Remedy and Final Remedy selected for each year and the same for Remedial and Final Remedial Action Started.

Potentially Responsible Parties and Orphan Sites

The funding to clean up a Superfund toxic waste site can come from a potentially responsible party (PRP), state and federal funds, or a combination of federal, state, and PRP funding.

Orphan sites are Superfund toxic waste sites where a PRP cannot be identified or cannot afford the cleanup.¹⁷² In these cases, funding for the cleanup comes from the EPA Superfund budget, which is primarily funded by appropriations from the general revenue fund.¹⁷³ In addition, states must pay 10% of the cost of cleanup at sites paid for by the federal Superfund program.¹⁷⁴

Orphan sites in this report adhere to the definition provided by the EPA, which are all those in which no PRP was able to fund the cleanup. The EPA does not aggregate the number of orphan sites and the number of sites with viable PRPs, nor does it uniformly state this information on the background webpage for each Superfund site. Therefore, we defined orphan sites as ones that had no PRP conduct any cleanup action.

Calculating Yearly Federal Appropriations

This report looks at the success of the EPA Superfund toxic waste cleanup program in the fiscal year 2020. We use the fiscal year, because it determines the program's budget, and the size of the budget has a significant impact on the success of the program year-to-year. The 2020 fiscal year ran from October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020.¹⁷⁵

To determine yearly federal appropriations, we relied on the EPA's annual Budget in Brief report. Each year, the President releases their budget proposal to Congress, which outlines how much they would like to appropriate to each agency.¹⁷⁶ The EPA's annual Budget in Brief report outlines how much the President has suggested to spend on each of the EPA's programs, including the Superfund program.¹⁷⁷ Ultimately, the amount the EPA is appropriated and the amount of those appropriations that go to the Superfund program depend on Congressional budget decisions for the fiscal year.¹⁷⁸ Then the following year, the EPA Budget in Brief includes the amount estimated to have been enacted in the previous fiscal year and the final amount enacted in the year before that.

In this report, we specifically used the Summary of Agency Resources by Appropriation section of the Budget in Brief report. A portion of the funds appropriated each year to the Superfund program are funds that are ultimately transferred to the Office of

the Inspector General and the Office of Science & Technology to do work for the Superfund program. The total amount appropriated to the Superfund program each year used in this report is the amount of money appropriated to the Superfund program before the transfers to the Office of Inspector General and the Office of Science and Technology. The Office of Inspector General provides audit, evaluation, and

investigative services for the Superfund program and the Office of Science and Technology conducts research and development activities for the Superfund program.¹⁷⁹ For years 1999 and 2000, there was no Summary of Agency Resources by Appropriation section in the Budget in Brief report. Instead the Trust Fund appendix was used for the number appropriated to the Superfund budget in those two years.

I APPENDIX: Superfund National Priorities List Toxic Waste Sites by State

ALASKA

Number of sites: 6

Alaska has the 46th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 3

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 3

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Table of National Priorities List sites in Alaska:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Adak Naval Air Station | Adak | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Eielson Air Force Base | Fairbanks | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Elmendorf Air Force Base | Anchorage | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Fort Richardson (USArmy) | Anchorage | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | No |
| Fort Wainwright | Fort Wainwright | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Salt Chuck Mine | Thorne Bay | Yes | Yes | No | No |

ALABAMA

Number of sites: 12

Alabama has the 38th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of toxic waste sites as four other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 11

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 10

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 1

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Alabama:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Alabama Army Ammunition Plant | Childersburg | Insufficient Data | Yes | No | No |
| Alabama Plating Company, Inc. | Vincent | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| American Brass Inc. | Headland | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Anniston Army Depot (Southeast Industrial Area) | Anniston | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Ciba-Geigy Corp. (Mcintosh Plant) | Mcintosh | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Interstate Lead Co. (Ilco) | Leeds | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Olin Corp. (Mcintosh Plant) | Mcintosh | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Stauffer | Bucks | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----|------------------------------|-----|-----|
| Chemical Co. (Cold Creek Plant) | | | | | |
| Stauffer Chemical Co. (Lemoyne Plant) | Axis | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| T.H. Agriculture & Nutrition Co. (Montgomery Plant) | Montgomery | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Triana/Tenness ee River | Limestone/Mor gan | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | No |
| USArmy/NASA Redstone Arsenal | Huntsville | Yes | No | No | No |

AMERICAN SAMOA

Number of sites: 0

ARKANSAS

Number of sites: 9

Arkansas has the 42nd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 8

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 7

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Table of National Priorities List sites in Arkansas:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Arkwood, Inc. | Omaha | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cedar Chemical Corporation | West Helena | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Macmillan Ring Free Oil | Norphlet | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Mid-south Wood Products | Mena | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Midland Products | Ola/Birta | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mountain Pine Pressure Treating | Plainview | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ouachita Nevada Wood Treater | Reader | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Popile, Inc. | El Dorado | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vertac, Inc. | Jacksonville | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

ARIZONA

Number of sites: 9

Arizona has the 42nd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 7

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 5

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 4

Table of National Priorities List sites in Arizona:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Apache Powder Co. | Saint David | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hassayampa Landfill | Arlington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Indian Bend Wash Area | Scottsdale | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Iron King Mine - Humboldt Smelter | Dewey-humboldt | No | Yes | No | No |
| Motorola, Inc. (52nd Street Plant) | Phoenix | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |
| Phoenix-goodyear Airport Area | Goodyear | Yes | No | No | No |
| Tucson International Airport Area | Tucson | Yes | No | No | No |
| Williams Air Force Base | Chandler | Yes | No | No | No |
| Yuma Marine Corps Air Station | Yuma | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

CALIFORNIA

Number of sites: 97

California has the 2nd most Superfund toxic waste sites of any state, territory, or Washington D.C. in the country.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 69

Sites with insufficient data: 17

Sites with human exposure not under control: 11

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 54

Sites with insufficient data: 10

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 25

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 7

Sites that are not yet designated: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in California:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready Anticipated Use |
|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. | Sunnyvale | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. (Building 915) | Sunnyvale | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Aerojet General Corp. | Rancho Cordova | Yes | No | No | No |
| Alameda Naval Air Station | Alameda | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Alark Hard Chrome | Riverside | Yes | No | No | No |
| Amco Chemical | Oakland | Yes | No | No | No |
| Applied Materials | Santa Clara | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Argonaut Mine | Jackson | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Atlas Asbestos Mine | Coalinga | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |
| Barstow Marine Corps Logistics Base | Barstow | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Beckman Instruments (Porterville Plant) | Porterville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Blue Ledge Mine | Rogue River-siskiyou Nf | Insufficient Data | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Brown & Bryant, Inc. (Arvin Plant) | Arvin | Yes | No | No | No |
| Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base | Camp Pendleton | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Casmalia Resources | Casmalia | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Castle Air Force Base (6 Areas) | Merced | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Coast Wood Preserving | Ukiah | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Concord Naval Weapons Station | Concord | Yes | No | No | No |
| Cooper Drum Co. | South Gate | Yes | No | No | No |
| Copper Bluff Mine | Hoopa | No | Not yet designated | No | No |
| Crazy Horse Sanitary Landfill | Salinas | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Cts Printex, Inc. | Mountain View | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Del Amo | Los Angeles | Yes | No | No | No |
| Edwards Air Force Base | Edwards Afb | Insufficient Data | Yes | No | No |
| El Toro Marine Corps Air Station | El Toro | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Fairchild Semiconductor Corp. (Mountain View Plant) | Mountain View | Insufficient Data | No | Yes | No |
| Fairchild Semiconductor Corp. (South San Jose Plant) | San Jose | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Fort Ord | Marina | No | Yes | No | No |
| Fresno Municipal Sanitary Landfill | Fresno | Yes | No | No | No |
| Frontier Fertilizer | Davis | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| George Air Force Base | Victorville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Halaco Engineering Company | Oxnard | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Hewlett-packard (620-640 Page Mill Road) | Palo Alto | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Hunters Point Naval Shipyard | San Francisco | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Industrial Waste Processing | Fresno | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Intel Corp. (Mountain View Plant) | Mountain View | Insufficient Data | No | Yes | No |
| Intel Magnetics | Santa Clara | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Intersil Inc./Siemens Components | Cupertino | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Iron Mountain Mine | Redding | Yes | No | No | No |
| J.H. Baxter & Co. | Weed | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Jervis B. Webb Co. | South Gate | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Jet Propulsion Laboratory (Nasa) | Pasadena | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Klau/Buena Vista Mine | Paso Robles | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Koppers Co., Inc. (Oroville Plant) | Oroville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Laboratory For Energy-related Health Research/Old Campus Landfill (Usdoe) | Davis | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Lava Cap Mine | Nevada City | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Lawrence Livermore Natl Lab (Site 300) (Usdoe) | Tracy | Insufficient Data | Yes | No | No |
| Lawrence Livermore Natl Lab, Main Site (Usdoe) | Livermore | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Leviathan Mine | Markleeville | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Lorentz Barrel & Drum Co. | San Jose | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| March Air Force Base | Riverside | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Mather Air Force Base (Ac&W Disposal Site) | Mather | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mcclellan Air Force Base (Ground Water Contamination) | Mcclellan Afb | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Mccoll | Fullerton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mccormick & Baxter Creosoting Co. | Stockton | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Modesto Ground Water Contamination | Modesto | Yes | No | No | No |
| Moffett Field Naval Air Station | Moffett Field | Yes | No | No | No |
| Monolithic Memories | Sunnyvale | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Montrose Chemical Corp. | Torrance | No | No | No | No |
| National Semiconductor Corp. | Santa Clara | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | No |
| New Idria Mercury Mine | Idria | Insufficient Data | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Newmark Ground Water Contamination | San Bernardino | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Norton Air Force Base (Lndfil #2) | San Bernardino | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Omega Chemical Corporation | Whittier | Yes | No | No | No |
| Operating Industries, Inc., Landfill | Monterey Park | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Orange County North Basin | Orange County | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Pacific Coast Pipeline | Fillmore | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pemaco Maywood | Maywood | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Purity Oil Sales, Inc. | Malaga | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Raytheon Corp. | Mountain View | Insufficient Data | No | Yes | No |
| Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant | Riverbank | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rockets, Fireworks, And Flares Site | Rialto | Yes | No | No | No |
| Sacramento Army Depot | Sacramento | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| San Fernando Valley (Area 1) | North Hollywood | Yes | No | No | No |
| San Fernando Valley (Area 2) | Glendale | Yes | No | No | No |
| San Fernando Valley (Area 4) | Los Angeles | Insufficient Data | Yes | No | No |
| San Gabriel Valley (Area 1) | El Monte | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |
| San Gabriel Valley (Area 2) | Baldwin Park | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| San Gabriel Valley (Area 3) | Alhambra | Yes | No | No | No |
| San Gabriel Valley (Area 4) | La Puente | Yes | No | No | No |
| Selma Pressure Treating Company | Selma | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Sharpe Army Depot | Lathrop | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| South Bay Asbestos Area | Alviso | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |
| Southern Avenue Industrial Area | South Gate | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Spectra-physics, Inc. | Mountain View | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Stringfellow | Mira Loma | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Sulphur Bank Mercury Mine | Clearlake Oaks | No | No | No | No |
| Synertek, Inc. (Building 1) | Santa Clara | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Teledyne Semiconductor | Mountain View | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Tracy Defense Depot (USArmy) | Tracy | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Travis Air Force Base | Travis Afb | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Trw Microwave, Inc (Building 825) | Sunnyvale | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| United Heckathorn Co. | Richmond | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Valley Wood Preserving, Inc. | Turlock | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Waste Disposal, Inc. | Santa Fe Springs | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |
| Watkins-johnson Co. (Stewart Division Plant) | Scotts Valley | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Westinghouse Electric Corp. (Sunnyvale Plant) | Sunnyvale | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

COLORADO

Number of sites: 20

Colorado has the 21st most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as two other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 16

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 4

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 11

Sites with insufficient data: 6

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 3

Table of National Priorities List sites in Colorado:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Air Force Plant Pjks | Littleton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bonita Peak Mining District | Unincorporated | No | No | No | No |
| Broderick Wood Products | Denver | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| California Gulch | Leadville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Captain Jack Mill | Ward | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Central City, Clear Creek | Idaho Springs | No | No | No | No |
| Chemical Sales Co. | Denver | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colorado Smelter | Pueblo | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Denver Radium Site | Denver | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Eagle Mine | Minturn | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Lincoln Park | Canon City | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Lowry Landfill | Unincorporated Arapahoe County | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Marshall Landfill | Boulder | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Nelson Tunnel/Commodore Waste Rock | Creede | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Rocky Flats Plant (Usdoe) | Golden | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rocky Mountain Arsenal (USArmy) | Adams County | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Standard Mine | Gunnison National Forest | Yes | No | No | No |
| Summitville Mine | Rio Grande County | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Uravan Uranium Project (Union Carbide Corp.) | Uravan | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Vasquez Boulevard And I-70 | Denver | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |

CONNECTICUT

Number of sites: 13

Connecticut has the 33rd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as four other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 12

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 10

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Connecticut:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| BARKHAMSTE D-NEW HARTFORD LANDFILL | BARKHAMSTE D | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| BEACON HEIGHTS LANDFILL | BEACON FALLS | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| DURHAM MEADOWS | DURHAM | Yes | No | No | No |
| GALLUP'S QUARRY | PLAINFIELD | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| KELLOGG-DEERING WELL FIELD | NORWALK | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| LAUREL PARK, INC. | NAUGATUCK BOROUGH | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| LINEMASTER SWITCH CORP. | WOODSTOCK | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| NEW LONDON SUBMARINE BASE | NEW LONDON | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----|----------------------|-----|-----|
| PRECISION PLATING CORP. | VERNON | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| RAYMARK INDUSTRIES, INC. | STRATFORD | No | Yes | No | No |
| SCOVILL INDUSTRIAL LANDFILL | WATERBURY | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| SOLVENTS RECOVERY SERVICE OF NEW ENGLAND | SOUTHINGTON | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| YAWORSKI WASTE LAGOON | CANTERBURY | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

DELAWARE

Number of sites: 16

Delaware has the 27th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 13

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 10

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 4

Table of National Priorities List sites in Delaware:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Army Creek Landfill | New Castle | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Blades Groundwater | Blades | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Chem-solv, Inc. | Dover | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Delaware City Pvc Plant | New Castle | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Delaware Sand & Gravel Landfill | New Castle | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Dover Air Force Base | Dover | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dover Gas Light Co. | Dover | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| E.I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co., Inc. (Newport Pigment Plant Landfill) | Newport | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Halby Chemical Co. | New Castle | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Harvey & Knott Drum, Inc. | Kirkwood | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Hockessin Groundwater | Hockessin | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |
| Koppers Co., Inc. (Newport Plant) | Newport | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Ncr Corp. (Millsboro Plant) | Millsboro | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Newark South Ground Water Plume | Newark | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Standard Chlorine Of Delaware, Inc. | New Castle | Yes | No | No | No |
| Tybouts Corner Landfill | New Castle | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Number of sites: 1

Washington D.C. has the 53rd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as three other U.S. states and territories.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 1

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 1

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 0

Table of National Priorities List sites in Washington D.C.:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Washington Navy Yard | Washington D.C. | Yes | Yes | No | No |

FLORIDA

Number of sites: 52

Florida has the 7th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C..

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 51

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 39

Sites with insufficient data: 5

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 6

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 2

Table of National Priorities List sites in Florida:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Agrico Chemical Co. | Pensacola | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Airco Plating Co. | Miami | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Alaric Area GW Plume | Tampa | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| American Creosote Works, Inc. (Pensacola Plant) | Pensacola | No | Yes | No | No |
| Anodyne, Inc. | North Miami Beach | Yes | No | No | No |
| Arkla Terra Property | Thonotosassa | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Cabot/Koppers | Gainesville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Chevron Chemical Co. (Ortho Division) | Orlando | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| City Industries, Inc. | Orlando | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Continental Cleaners | Miami | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Escambia Wood - Pensacola | Pensacola | Yes | No | No | No |
| Flash Cleaners | Pompano Beach | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Florida Petroleum Reprocessors | Fort Lauderdale | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Florida Steel Corp. | Indiantown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| General Dynamics Longwood | Longwood | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Harris Corp. (Palm Bay Plant) | Palm Bay | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Helena Chemical Co. (Tampa Plant) | Tampa | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Hollingsworth Solderless Terminal | Fort Lauderdale | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Homestead Air Force Base | Homestead Air Force Base | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Jacksonville Naval Air Station | Jacksonville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Jj Seifert Machine | Ruskin | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp - Jacksonville | Jacksonville | Yes | No | No | No |
| Landia Chemical Company | Lakeland | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Madison County Sanitary Landfill | Madison | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Miami Drum Services | Miami | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mri Corp (Tampa) | Tampa | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Peak Oil Co./Bay Drum Co. | Tampa | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pensacola Naval Air Station | Pensacola | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Pepper Steel & Alloys, Inc. | Medley | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |
| Petroleum Products Corp. | Pembroke Park | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Pickettville Road Landfill | Jacksonville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Piper Aircraft Corp./Vero Beach Water & Sewer Department | Vero Beach | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Post And Lumber Preserving Co Inc | Quincy | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Raleigh Street Dump | Tampa | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Reeves Southeastern Galvanizing Corp. | Tampa | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Sanford Dry Cleaners | Sanford | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Sapp Battery Salvage | Cottondale | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Sherwood | Deland | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Medical Industries | | | | | |
| Solitron Microwave | Stuart | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Southern Solvents, Inc. | Tampa | Yes | No | No | No |
| Stauffer Chemical Co (Tampa) | Tampa | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Stauffer Chemical Co. (Tarpon Springs) | Tarpon Springs | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Sydney Mine Sludge Ponds | Brandon | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Taylor Road Landfill | Seffner | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tower Chemical Co. | Clermont | Yes | No | No | No |
| Trans Circuits, Inc. | Lake Park | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tyndall Air Force Base | Panama City | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| United Metals, Inc. | Marianna | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| USN Air Station Cecil Field | Jacksonville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Whiting Field Naval Air Station | Milton | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Wingate Road Municipal Incinerator Dump | Fort Lauderdale | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |
| Zellwood Ground Water Contamination | Zellwood | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

GEORGIA

Number of sites: 16

Georgia has the 27th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 13

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 2

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 9

Sites with insufficient data: 4

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 3

Table of National Priorities List sites in Georgia:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|-----------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Alternate Energy Resources Inc | Augusta | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Armstrong World Industries | Macon | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Brunswick Wood Preserving | Brunswick | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Camilla Wood Preserving Company | Camilla | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Diamond Shamrock Corp. Landfill | Cedartown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. (Albany Plant) | Albany | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hercules 009 Landfill | Brunswick | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lcp Chemicals Georgia | Brunswick | No | No | No | No |
| Macon Naval | Macon | Insufficient | Insufficient | No | No |

| Ordnance Plant | | Data | Data | | |
|---|----------------|------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Marine Corps Logistics Base | Albany | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Marzone Inc./Chevron Chemical Co. | Tifton | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Mathis Brothers Landfill (South Marble Top Road) | Kensington | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Peach Orchard Rd PCE Groundwater Plume Site | Augusta | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Robins Air Force Base (Landfill #4/Sludge Lagoon) | Houston County | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| T.H. Agriculture & Nutrition Co. (Albany Plant) | Albany | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Woolfolk Chemical Works, Inc. | Fort Valley | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |

GUAM

Number of sites: 2

Guam has the 49th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 2

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 2

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Table of National Priorities List sites in Guam:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|-------------------------|-------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Andersen Air Force Base | Yigo | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Ordot Landfill | Agana | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

HAWAII

Number of sites: 3

Hawaii has the 47th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 2

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 1

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Table of National Priorities List sites in Hawaii:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Del Monte Corp. (Oahu Plantation) | Kunia | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Naval Computer And Telecommunications Area Master Station Eastern Pacific | Wahiawa | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Pearl Harbor Naval Complex | Pearl Harbor | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |

IOWA

Number of sites: 11

Iowa has the 39th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 11

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 8

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 2

Table of National Priorities List sites in Iowa:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Des Moines TCE | Des Moines | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Fairfield Coal Gasification Plant | Fairfield | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Iowa Army Ammunition Plant | Middletown | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Lawrence Todtz Farm | Camanche | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Mason City Coal Gasification Plant | Mason City | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Midwest Manufacturing/ North Farm | Kellogg | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| PCE Former Dry Cleaner | Atlantic | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Peoples Natural Gas Co. | Dubuque | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Railroad Avenue Groundwater Contamination | West Des Moines | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Shaw Avenue Dump | Charles City | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vogel Paint & Wax Co. | Maurice | Yes | No | Yes | No |

IDAHO

Number of sites: 6

Idaho has the 46th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 5

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 1

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 3

Table of National Priorities List sites in Idaho:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Bunker Hill Mining & Metallurgical Complex | Smelterville | No | No | No | No |
| Eastern Michaud Flats Contamination | Pocatello | Yes | No | No | No |
| Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (Usdoe) | Idaho Falls | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp. (Soda Springs Plant) | Soda Springs | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Monsanto Chemical Co. (Soda Springs Plant) | Soda Springs | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Mountain Home Air Force Base | Mountain Home | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |

ILLINOIS

Number of sites: 45

Illinois has the 9th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 33

Sites with insufficient data: 5

Sites with human exposure not under control: 7

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 27

Sites with insufficient data: 13

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 3

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 2

Table of National Priorities List sites in Illinois:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Acme Solvent Reclaiming, Inc. (Morristown Plant) | Morristown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Adams County Quincy Landfills 2&3 | Quincy | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Amoco Chemicals (Joliet Landfill) | Joliet | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Asarco Taylor Springs | Taylor Springs | No | Yes | No | No |
| Bautsch-gray Mine | Galena | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Beloit Corp. | Rockton | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Byron Salvage Yard | Byron | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Central Illinois Public Service Co. | Taylorville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Chemetco | Hartford | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Cross Brothers Pail Recycling (Pembroke) | Pembroke Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Depue/New Jersey Zinc/Mobil Chemical Corp. | Depue | No | No | No | No |
| Eagle Zinc Co Div T L Diamond | Hillsboro | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Estech General Chemical Company | Calumet City | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Galesburg/Koppers Co. | Galesburg | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| H.O.D. Landfill | Antioch | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Hegeler Zinc | Danville | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Indian Refinery-texaco Lawrenceville | Lawrenceville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Interstate Pollution Control, Inc. | Rockford | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Jennison-Wright Corporation | Granite City | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Johns-Manville Corp. | Waukegan | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Joliet Army Ammunition Plant (Load-assembly-packing Area) | Joliet | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Joliet Army Ammunition Plant (Manufacturing Area) | Joliet | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kerr-Mcgee (Kress Creek/West | Dupage County | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Branch Of Dupage River) | | | | | |
| Kerr-Mcgee (Residential Areas) | West Chicago | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |
| Lake Calumet Cluster | Chicago | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Lasalle Electric Utilities | La Salle | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Lenz Oil Service, Inc. | Lemont | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Matthiessen And Hegeler Zinc Company | La Salle | No | Yes | No | No |
| Mig/Dewane Landfill | Belvidere | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| NI Industries/Tara corp Lead Smelter | Granite City | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Old American Zinc Plant | Fairmont City | No | Yes | No | No |
| Ottawa Radiation Areas | Ottawa | No | Yes | No | No |
| Outboard Marine Corp. | Waukegan | Insufficient Data | No | Yes | No |
| Pagel's Pit | Rockford | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Parsons Casket Hardware Co. | Belvidere | Yes | No | No | No |
| Sandoval Zinc Company | Sandoval | No | Yes | No | No |
| Sangamo Electric Dump/Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (Usdoi) | Carterville | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Savanna Army Depot Activity | Savanna | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Schroud Property | Chicago | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Southeast Rockford Ground Water Contamination | Rockford | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Tri-county Landfill Co./Waste Management Of Illinois, Inc. | Elgin | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Velsicol Chemical Corp. (Marshall Plant) | Marshall | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Wauconda Sand & Gravel | Wauconda | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Woodstock Municipal Landfill | Woodstock | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Yeoman Creek Landfill | Waukegan | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

INDIANA

Number of sites: 41

Indiana has the 10th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 26

Sites with insufficient data: 9

Sites with human exposure not under control: 6

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 25

Sites with insufficient data: 13

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 2

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Indiana:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|-------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| American Chemical Service, Inc. | Griffith | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Beck's Lake | South Bend | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Bennett Stone Quarry | Bloomington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Broadway Street Corridor Groundwater Contamination | Anderson | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Cam-or Inc. | Westville | Yes | No | No | No |
| Cliff Drive Groundwater Contamination | Logansport | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Conrail Rail Yard (Elkhart) | Elkhart | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Continental Steel Corp. | Kokomo | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Douglass Road/Uniroyal, Inc., Landfill | Mishawaka | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Elm Street | Terre Haute | No | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Ground Water Contamination | | | | | |
| Envirochem Corp. | Zionsville | Insufficient Data | No | Yes | Yes |
| Fisher-calo | La Porte | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | No |
| Fort Wayne Reduction Dump | Fort Wayne | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Franklin Street Groundwater Contamination | Spencer | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Galen Myers Dump/Drum Salvage | Osceola | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Garden City Ground Water Plume | Garden City | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Gary Development Landfill | Gary | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Himco Dump | Elkhart | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Jacobsville Neighborhood Soil Contamination | Evansville | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Keystone Corridor Ground Water Contamination | Indianapolis | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Kokomo Contaminated Ground Water Plume | Kokomo | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Lake Sandy Jo (M&M Landfill) | Gary | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lakeland Disposal Service, Inc. | Claypool | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lane Street Ground Water Contamination | Elkhart | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Lemon Lane Landfill | Bloomington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lusher Street Ground Water Contamination | Elkhart | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Main Street Well Field | Elkhart | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Marion (Bragg) Dump | Marion | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Midco I | Gary | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Midco li | Gary | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Neal's Landfill (Bloomington) | Bloomington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ninth Avenue Dump | Gary | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| North Shore Drive | Elkhart | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Northside Sanitary Landfill, Inc | Zionsville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pike And Mulberry Streets Pce Plume | Martinsville | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Prestolite Battery Division | Vincennes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Reilly Tar & Chemical Corp. (Indianapolis Plant) | Indianapolis | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Seymour Recycling Corp. | Seymour | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tippecanoe Sanitary Landfill, Inc. | Lafayette | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| U.S. Smelter And Lead Refinery, Inc. | East Chicago | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Wayne Waste Oil | Columbia City | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

KANSAS

Number of sites: 13

Kansas has the 33rd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as four other U.S. states, territories, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 9

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 3

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 10

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 1

Sites that are not a groundwater site: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Kansas:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 57th And North Broadway Streets Site | Wichita | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ace Services | Colby | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Caney Residential Yards | Caney | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Chemical Commodities, Inc. | Olathe | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cherokee County | Galena | No | No | No | No |
| Doepke Disposal (Holliday) | Shawnee Mission | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Former United Zinc & Associated Smelters | Iola | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Fort Riley | Junction City | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Obee Road | Hutchinson | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pester Refinery Co. | El Dorado | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Plating, Inc. | Great Bend | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Strother Field Industrial Park | Winfield | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Wright Ground Water Contamination | Wright | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

KENTUCKY

Number of sites: 13

Kentucky has the 33rd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as four other U.S. states, territories, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 12

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 9

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 1

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 3

Table of National Priorities List sites in Kentucky:

| Site Name | City | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| Airco | Calvert City | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| B.F. Goodrich | Calvert City | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Brantley Landfill | Island | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Caldwell Lace Leather Co., Inc. | Auburn | Yes | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes |
| Distler Brickyard | West Point | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Distler Farm | West Point | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Fort Hartford Coal Co. Stone Quarry | Olaton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Green River Disposal, Inc. | Maceo | Yes | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes |
| Maxey Flats Nuclear Disposal | Hillsboro | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| National Electric Coil Co./Cooper | Dayhoit | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----|-------------------|------------------------|-----|
| Industries | | | | | |
| Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant (Usdoe) | Paducah | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Smith's Farm | Brooks | Yes | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes |
| Tri-city Disposal Co. | Shepherdsville | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |

LOUISIANA

Number of sites: 13

Louisiana has the 33rd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as four other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 8

Sites with insufficient data: 4

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 7

Sites with insufficient data: 5

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Louisiana:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Agriculture Street Landfill | New Orleans | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| American Creosote Deridder | Deridder | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| American Creosote Works, Inc. (Winnfield Plant) | Winnfield | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Bayou Bonfouca | Slidell | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Colonial Creosote | Bogalusa | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Combustion, Inc. | Denham Springs | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Delta Shipyard | Houma | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Evr-wood Treating/Evangeline Refining Company | Evangeline | No | Yes | No | No |
| Louisiana Army Ammunition | Doyline | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----|-----|
| Plant | | | | | |
| Madisonville Creosote Works | Madisonville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Marion Pressure Treating | Marion | Yes | No | No | No |
| Petro- processors Of Louisiana, Inc. | Scotlandville | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Sba Shipyard | Jennings | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |

MASSACHUSETTS

Number of sites: 31

Massachusetts has the 15th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 26

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with human exposure not under control: 3

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 21

Sites with insufficient data: 7

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 2

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Massachusetts:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Atlas Tack Corp. | Fairhaven | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Baird & Mcguire | Holbrook | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bjat Llc | Franklin | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Blackburn & Union Privileges | Walpole | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Charles George Reclamation Trust Landfill | Tyngsborough | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Creese & Cook Tannery (Former) | Danvers | No | Yes | No | No |
| Fort Devens | Fort Devens | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Groveland Wells | Groveland | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hanscom Field/Hanscom Air Force Base | Bedford | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Haverhill Municipal | Haverhill | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Landfill | | | | | |
| Hocomonco Pond | Westborough | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industri-plex | Woburn | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Iron Horse Park | Billerica | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Microfab Inc (Former) | Amesbury | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Natick Laboratory Army Research, Development, And Engineering Center | Natick | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant | Bedford | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| New Bedford | New Bedford | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Nuclear Metals, Inc. | Concord | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Nyanza Chemical Waste Dump | Ashland | Yes | No | No | No |
| Olin Chemical | Wilmington | No | No | No | No |
| Otis Air National Guard Base/Camp Edwards | Falmouth | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Psc Resources | Palmer | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Re-solve, Inc. | Dartmouth | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rose Disposal Pit | Lanesboro | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Silresim Chemical Corp. | Lowell | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| South Weymouth Naval Air Station | Weymouth | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Sullivan's | New Bedford | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Ledge | | | | | |
| Sutton Brook Disposal Area | Tewksbury | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| W.R. Grace & Co., Inc. (Acton Plant) | Acton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Walton & Lonsbury Inc. | Attleboro | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Wells G&H | Woburn | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |

MARYLAND

Number of sites: 20

Maryland has the 21st most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as two other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 14

Sites with insufficient data: 5

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 9

Sites with insufficient data: 10

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Maryland:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Aberdeen Proving Ground (Edgewood Area) | Edgewood | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Aberdeen Proving Ground (Michaelsville Landfill) | Aberdeen | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Andrews Air Force Base | Andrews Air Force Base | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (Usda) | Beltsville | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Brandywine Drmo | Brandywine | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Bush Valley Landfill | Abingdon | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Central Chemical (Hagerstown) | Hagerstown | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Curtis Bay Coast Guard Yard | Baltimore | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Dwyer Property Ground Water Plume | Elkton | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Fort Detrick Area B Ground Water | Fort Detrick | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |
| Fort George G. Meade | Odenton | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Indian Head Naval Surface Warfare Center | Indian Head | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Kane & Lombard Street Drums | Baltimore | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Limestone Road | Cumberland | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ordnance Products, Inc. | North East | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Patuxent River Naval Air Station | Patuxent River | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Sand, Gravel And Stone | Elkton | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Sauer Dump | Dundalk | No | Yes | No | No |
| Spectron, Inc. | Elkton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Woodlawn County Landfill | Colora | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

MAINE

Number of sites: 12

Maine has the 38th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of toxic waste sites as four other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 10

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 9

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Maine:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Brunswick Naval Air Station | Brunswick | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Callahan Mining Corp | Brooksville (Cape Rosier) | Yes | No | No | No |
| Eastern Surplus | Meddybemps | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Eastland Woolen Mill | Corinna | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Keddy Mill | Windham | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Leeds Metal | Leeds | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Loring Air Force Base | Limestone | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mckin Co. | Gray | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Portsmouth Naval Shipyard | Kittery | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Saco Municipal Landfill | Saco | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| West Site/Hows Corners | Plymouth | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Winthrop Landfill | Winthrop | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

MICHIGAN

Number of sites: 65

Michigan has the 5th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 55

Sites with insufficient data: 7

Sites with human exposure not under control: 3

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 42

Sites with insufficient data: 13

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 9

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Michigan:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Adam's Plating | Lansing | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Aircraft Components (D & L Sales) | Benton Harbor | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Albion-sheridan Township Landfill | Albion | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Allied Paper, Inc./Portage Creek/Kalamazoo River | Kalamazoo | No | Yes | No | No |
| American Anodco, Inc. | Ionia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Auto Ion Chemicals, Inc. | Kalamazoo | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Barrels, Inc. | Lansing | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bendix Corp./Allied Automotive | St. Joseph | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Bofors Nobel, Inc. | Muskegon | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Butterworth #2 | Grand Rapids | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Landfill | | | | | |
| Cannelton Industries, Inc. | Sault Ste Marie | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Chem Central | Wyoming Township | Insufficient Data | No | Yes | No |
| Clare Water Supply | Clare | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dsc Mclouth Steel Gibraltar Plant | Gibraltar | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Electrovoice | Buchanan | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Forest Waste Products | Otisville | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| G&H Landfill | Utica | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Grand Traverse Overall Supply Co. | Greilickville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Gratiot County Landfill | St. Louis | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| H. Brown Co., Inc. | Grand Rapids | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hedblum Industries | Oscoda | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hi-mill Manufacturing Co. | Highland | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Ionia City Landfill | Ionia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| J & L Landfill | Rochester Hills | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| K&L Avenue Landfill | Oshtemo Township | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Kaydon Corp. | Muskegon | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Kentwood Landfill | Kentwood | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kysor Industrial Corp. | Cadillac | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Liquid Disposal, Inc. | Utica | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mcgraw Edison | Albion | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Corp. | | | | | |
| Mclouth Steel Corp | Trenton | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Metamora Landfill | Metamora | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Michigan Disposal Service (Cork Street Landfill) | Kalamazoo | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Motor Wheel, Inc. | Lansing Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Muskegon Chemical Co. | Whitehall | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| North Bronson Industrial Area | Bronson | Yes | No | No | No |
| Northernair Plating | Cadillac | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Organic Chemicals, Inc. | Grandville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ott/Story/Cordova Chemical Co. | Dalton Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Packaging Corp. Of America | Filer City | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Parsons Chemical Works, Inc. | Grand Ledge | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Peerless Plating Co. | Muskegon | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Pmc Groundwater | Petoskey | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rasmussen's Dump | Brighton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rockwell International Corp. (Allegan Plant) | Allegan | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rose Township Dump | Rose Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Roto-finish Co., | Kalamazoo | Yes | Insufficient | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Inc. | | | Data | | |
| Sca Independent Landfill | Muskegon Heights | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Shiawassee River | Howell | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| South Macomb Disposal Authority (Landfills #9 And #9a) | Macomb Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Southwest Ottawa County Landfill | Park Township | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Sparta Landfill | Sparta Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Spartan Chemical Co. | Wyoming | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |
| Springfield Township Dump | Davisburg | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| State Disposal Landfill, Inc. | Grand Rapids | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Sturgis Municipal Wells | Sturgis | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | No |
| Tar Lake | Mancelona Township | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Ten-mile Drain | St. Clair Shores | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Thermo-chem, Inc. | Muskegon | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Torch Lake | Houghton County | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| U.S. Aviex | Howard Township | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Velsicol Burn Pit | St. Louis | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Velsicol Chemical Corp. (Michigan) | St. Louis | No | No | Yes | No |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|
| Verona Well Field | Battle Creek | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Wash King Laundry | Pleasant Plains Twp | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

MINNESOTA

Number of sites: 25

Minnesota has the 18th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 16

Sites with insufficient data: 5

Sites with human exposure not under control: 3

Sites that are not yet designated: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 17

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 4

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Sites that are not yet designated: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Minnesota:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Arrowhead Refinery Co. | Hermantown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Baytown Township Ground Water Plume | Baytown Township | Yes | No | No | No |
| Burlington Northern (Brainerd/Baxter Plant) | Brainerd/Baxter | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Fmc Corp. (Fridley Plant) | Fridley | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | No |
| Freeway Sanitary Landfill | Burnsville | Insufficient Data | Yes | No | No |
| General Mills/Henkel Corp. | Minneapolis | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Highway 100 And County Road 3 Groundwater | Edina, St. Louis Park | Not yet designated | Not yet designated | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Plume | | | | | |
| Joslyn Manufacturing & Supply Co. | Brooklyn Center | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Koppers Coke | St. Paul | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Kurt Manufacturing Co. | Fridley | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Lehillier/Mankato | Lehillier | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Long Prairie Ground Water Contamination | Long Prairie | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | No |
| Macgillis & Gibbs Co./Bell Lumber & Pole Co. | New Brighton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant | Fridley | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| New Brighton/Arden Hills/Tcaap (USArmy) | New Brighton | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Oakdale Dump | Oakdale | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Perham Arsenic Site | Perham | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Reilly Tar & Chemical Corp. (St. Louis Park Plant) | St. Louis Park | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Ritari Post & Pole | Sebeka | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| South Andover Site | Andover | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| South Minneapolis Residential Soil Contamination | Minneapolis | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |
| Spring Park Municipal Well Field | Spring Park | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|----|
| St. Louis River Site | St. Louis County | No | Yes | No | No |
| St. Regis Paper Co. | Cass Lake | Yes | No | No | No |
| Waite Park Wells | Waite Park | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |

MISSOURI

Number of sites: 33

Missouri has the 14th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 23

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 9

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 15

Sites with insufficient data: 11

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 5

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 2

Table of National Priorities List sites in Missouri:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Armour Road | North Kansas City | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Bee Cee Manufacturing Co. | Malden | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Big River Mine Tailings/St. Joe Minerals Corp. | Desloge | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Compass Plaza Well Tce | Rogersville | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Conservation Chemical Co. | Kansas City | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ellisville Site | Ellisville | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Fulbright Landfill | Springfield | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lake City Army Ammunition Plant (Northwest Lagoon) | Independence | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Lee Chemical | Liberty | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Madison | Fredericktown | No | Insufficient | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|-----|
| County Mines | | | Data | | |
| Minker/Stout/Romaine Creek | Imperial | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |
| Missouri Electric Works | Cape Girardeau | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Newton County Mine Tailings | Granby | No | No | No | No |
| Newton County Wells | Joplin | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Oak Grove Village Well | Sullivan | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Oronogoduenweg Mining Belt | Joplin | No | No | No | No |
| Pools Prairie | Neosho | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Quality Plating | Sikeston | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Riverfront | New Haven | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Solid State Circuits, Inc. | Republic | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Southwest Jefferson County Mining | Jefferson County | No | No | No | No |
| Sporlan Valve Plant #1 | Washington | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| St. Louis Airport/Hazelwood Interim Storage/Futura Coatings Co. | St. Louis | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Syntex Facility | Verona | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Valley Park Tce | Valley Park | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Vienna Wells | Vienna | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Washington County Lead District - Furnace Creek | Caledonia | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Washington County Lead District - Old | Old Mines | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Mines | | | | | |
| Washington County Lead District - Potosi | Potosi | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Washington County Lead District - Richwoods | Richwoods | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Weldon Spring Former Army Ordnance Works | St. Charles | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Weldon Spring Quarry/Plant/Pits (U.S. DOE/Army) | St. Charles | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Westlake Landfill | Bridgeton | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |

MISSISSIPPI

Number of sites: 8

Mississippi has the 44th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 5

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 2

Sites with insufficient data: 5

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Mississippi:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| American Creosote Works Inc (Louisville) | Louisville | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Chemfax, Inc. | Gulfport | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp - Columbus | Columbus | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Mississippi Phosphates Corporation | Pascagoula | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Picayune Wood Treating Site | Picayune | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Rockwell International Wheel & Trim | Grenada | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Sonford Products | Flowood | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Southeastern Wood Preserving | Canton | Yes | Yes | No | No |

MONTANA

Number of sites: 17

Montana has the 25th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 8

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 9

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 9

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 4

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Montana:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Acm Smelter And Refinery | Black Eagle | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Anaconda Aluminum Co Columbia Falls Reduction Plant | Columbia Falls | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Anaconda Co. Smelter | Anaconda | No | Yes | No | No |
| Barker Hughesville Mining District | Monarch | No | No | No | No |
| Basin Mining Area | Basin | Yes | No | No | No |
| Carpenter Snow Creek Mining District | Neihart | No | No | No | No |
| East Helena Site | East Helena | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Flat Creek IMM | Superior | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-----|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Idaho Pole Co. | Bozeman | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Libby Asbestos Site | Libby | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Libby Ground Water Contamination | Libby | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Lockwood Solvent Ground Water Plume | Billings | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Milltown Reservoir Sediments | Milltown | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Montana Pole And Treating | Butte | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Mouat Industries | Columbus | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Silver Bow Creek/Butte Area | Butte | No | Yes | No | No |
| Upper Tenmile Creek Mining Area | Helena | No | No | No | No |

NORTH CAROLINA

Number of sites: 38

North Carolina has the 12th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 37

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 29

Sites with insufficient data: 6

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 3

Table of National Priorities List sites in North Carolina:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Abc One Hour Cleaners | Jacksonville | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Aberdeen Contaminated Ground Water | Aberdeen | Yes | No | No | No |
| Aberdeen Pesticide Dumps | Aberdeen | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Barber Orchard | Waynesville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Benfield Industries, Inc. | Hazelwood | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Blue Ridge Plating Company | Arden | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bypass 601 Ground Water Contamination | Concord | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Camp Lejeune Military Res. (USNavy) | Onslow County | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Cape Fear Wood Preserving | Fayetteville | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Carolina | Fayetteville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Transformer Co. | | | | | |
| Celanese Corp. (Shelby Fiber Operations) | Shelby | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Charles Macon Lagoon And Drum Storage | Cordova | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Chemtronics, Inc. | Swannanoa | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station | Havelock | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Cristex Drum | Oxford | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| CTS Of Asheville, Inc. | Asheville | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Davis Park Road Tce | Gastonia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| FCX, Inc. (Statesville Plant) | Statesville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Fcx, Inc. (Washington Plant) | Washington | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Geigy Chemical Corp. (Aberdeen Plant) | Aberdeen | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| General Electric Co/Shepherd Farm | East Flat Rock | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Gmh Electronics | Roxboro | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Hemphill Road Tce | Gastonia | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Holcomb Creosote Co | Yadkinville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Horton Iron And Metal | Wilmington | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Jadco-hughes Facility | Belmont | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| JFD Electronics/Channel Master | Oxford | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Kerr-Mcgee Chemical Corp - Navassa | Navassa | Yes | No | No | No |
| Koppers Co., Inc. (Morrisville Plant) | Morrisville | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| National Starch & Chemical Corp. | Salisbury | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| North Belmont PCE | North Belmont | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| North Carolina State University (Lot 86, Farm Unit #1) | Raleigh | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ore Knob Mine | Ashe County | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Potter's Septic Tank Service Pits | Maco | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Ram Leather Care Site | Charlotte | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Sigmon's Septic Tank Service | Statesville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ward Transformer | Raleigh | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Wright Chemical Corporation | Riegelwood | Yes | Yes | No | No |

NORTH DAKOTA

Number of sites: 0

NORTHERN MARINA ISLANDS

Number of sites: 0

NEBRASKA

Number of sites: 17

Nebraska has the 25th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 15

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 10

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 5

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Nebraska:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 10th Street Site | Columbus | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bruno Co-op Association/Associated Properties | Bruno | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cleburn Street Well | Grand Island | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cornhusker Army Ammunition Plant | Grand Island | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Garvey Elevator | Hastings | Yes | No | No | No |
| Hastings Ground Water | Hastings | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Contamination | | | | | |
| Iowa-nebraska Light & Power Co | Norfolk | Yes | No | No | No |
| Lindsay Manufacturing Co. | Lindsay | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Nebraska Ordnance Plant (Former) | Mead | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Ogallala Ground Water Contamination | Ogallala | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Old Hwy 275 And N 288th Street | Valley | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Omaha Lead | Omaha | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Parkview Well | Grand Island | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pce Southeast Contamination | York | Yes | No | No | No |
| Pce/Tce Northeast Contamination | York | Yes | No | No | No |
| Sherwood Medical Co. | Norfolk | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| West Highway 6 & Highway 281 | Hastings | Yes | No | No | No |

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Number of sites: 20

New Hampshire has the 21st most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as two other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 19

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 15

Sites with insufficient data: 5

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Table of National Priorities List sites in New Hampshire:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Auburn Road Landfill | Londonderry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Beede Waste Oil | Plaistow | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Chlor-alkali Facility (Former) | Berlin | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Coakley Landfill | North Hampton | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Collins & Aikman Plant (Former) | Farmington | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Dover Municipal Landfill | Dover | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Fletcher's Paint Works & Storage | Milford | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kearsarge Metallurgical Corp. | Conway | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Keefe Environmental Services (Kes) | Epping | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Mottolo Pig Farm | Raymond | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| New Hampshire Plating Co. | Merrimack | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Ottati & Goss/Kingston Steel Drum | Kingston | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pease Air Force Base | Portsmouth/Ne wington | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Savage Municipal Water Supply | Milford | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Somersworth Sanitary Landfill | Somersworth | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| South Municipal Water Supply Well | Peterborough | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Sylvester | Nashua | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tibbetts Road | Barrington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tinkham Garage | Londonderry | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Troy Mills Landfill | Troy | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

NEW JERSEY

Number of sites: 114

New Jersey has the most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 90

Sites with insufficient data: 13

Sites with human exposure not under control: 11

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 77

Sites with insufficient data: 20

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 15

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 2

Table of National Priorities List sites in New Jersey:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. O. Polymer | Sparta Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| American Cyanamid Co | Bridgewater | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Atlantic Resources | Sayreville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Bog Creek Farm | Howell Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Brick Township Landfill | Brick Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bridgeport Rental & Oil Services | Bridgeport | Yes | No | No | No |
| Brook Industrial Park | Bound Brook | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Burnt Fly Bog | Marlboro Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Caldwell Trucking Co. | Fairfield | No | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Chemical Control | Elizabeth | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |
| Chemical Insecticide Corp. | Edison Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Chemical Leaman Tank Lines, Inc. | Bridgeport | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Chemsol, Inc. | Piscataway | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Ciba-geigy Corp. | Toms River | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Cinnaminson Township (Block 702) Ground Water Contamination | Cinnaminson Township | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Combe Fill South Landfill | Chester Township | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Cornell Dubilier Electronics Inc. | South Plainfield | No | No | No | No |
| Cosden Chemical Coatings Corp. | Beverly | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Cps/Madison Industries | Old Bridge Township | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |
| Curcio Scrap Metal, Inc. | Saddle Brook Twp | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Curtis Specialty Papers, Inc | Milford | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| D'imperio Property | Hamilton Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Dayco Corp./L.E Carpenter Co. | Wharton Borough | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| De Rewal Chemical Co. | Kingwood Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Diamond Alkali Co. | Newark | No | Yes | No | No |
| Diamond Head Oil Refinery Div. | Kearny | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Dover Municipal Well 4 | Dover | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Ellis Property | Evesham Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Emmell's Septic Landfill | Galloway Township | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Evor Phillips Leasing | Old Bridge Township | Yes | No | No | No |
| Ewan Property | Shamong Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Fair Lawn Well Field | Fair Lawn | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Federal Aviation Administration Technical Center (Usdot) | Atlantic County | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Former Kil-tone Company | Vineland | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Franklin Burn | Franklin Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Fried Industries | East Brunswick Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Garden State Cleaners Co. | Minotola | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Garfield Ground Water Contamination | Garfield | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Gems Landfill | Gloucester Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Global Sanitary Landfill | Old Bridge Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Goose Farm | Plumstead Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Helen Kramer Landfill | Mantua Township | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Hercules, Inc. (Gibbstown Plant) | Gibbstown | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Higgins Disposal | Kingston | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Higgins Farm | Franklin Township | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Horseshoe Road | Sayreville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Iceland Coin Laundry Area Gw Plume | Vineland | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Imperial Oil Co., Inc./Champion Chemicals | Morganville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Jis Landfill | South Brunswick | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kauffman & Minter, Inc. | Springfield Twp(Jobstown) | Yes | No | No | No |
| Kin-buc Landfill | Edison Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| King Of Prussia | Winslow Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Landfill & Development Co. | Mount Holly | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lang Property | Pemberton Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lcp Chemicals Inc. | Linden | Yes | No | No | No |
| Lightman Drum Company | Winslow Township | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Lipari Landfill | Pitman | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Lone Pine Landfill | Freehold Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mansfield Trail Dump | Byram | No | No | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Martin Aaron, Inc. | Camden | Yes | No | No | No |
| Matlack, Inc. | Woolwich Township | Yes | No | No | No |
| Matteo & Sons Inc. | Thorofare | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Maywood Chemical Co. | Maywood/Rochelle Park | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Mcguire Air Force Base #1 | Wrightstown | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Metaltec/Aerosystems | Franklin Borough | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Middlesex Sampling Plant (Usdoe) | Middlesex | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Monitor Devices, Inc./Intercircuits, Inc. | Wall Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Montgomery Township Housing Development | Montgomery Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Myers Property | Franklin Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Nascolite Corp. | Millville | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Naval Air Engineering Center | Lakehurst | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Naval Weapons Station Earle (Site A) | Colts Neck | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| NI Industries | Pedricktown (Oldmans Town | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Orange Valley Regional Ground Water Contamination | West Orange/Orange | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Picatinny Arsenal (USArmy) | Rockaway Township | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Pierson's Creek | Newark | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Pjp Landfill | Jersey City | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Pohatcong Valley Ground Water Contamination | Warren County | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Price Landfill | Pleasantville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Puchack Well Field | Pennsauken Township | Yes | No | No | No |
| Quanta Resources | Edgewater | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Radiation Technology, Inc. | Rockaway Township | Yes | No | No | No |
| Raritan Bay Slag | Old Bridge Twp/Sayreville | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Reich Farms | Pleasant Plains | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ringwood Mines/Landfill | Ringwood Borough | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Riverside Industrial Park | Newark | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Rockaway Borough Well Field | Rockaway Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Rockaway Township Wells | Rockaway Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rocky Hill Municipal Well | Rocky Hill Borough | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Roebing Steel Co. | Florence | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Rolling Knolls Lf | Green Village | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Scientific Chemical Processing | Carlstadt | Yes | No | No | No |
| Sharkey Landfill | Parsippany, Troy Hls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Sherwin-williams/Hilliards Creek | Gibbsboro | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Shieldalloy Corp. | Newfield Borough | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |
| South Jersey Clothing Co. | Minotola | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Standard Chlorine | Kearny | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Swope Oil & Chemical Co. | Pennsauken Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Syncon Resins | South Kearny | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| U.S. Radium Corp. | Orange | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Unimatic Manufacturing Corporation | Fairfield | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| United States Avenue Burn | Gibbsboro | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Universal Oil Products (Chemical Division) | East Rutherford | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Ventron/Velsicol | Wood Ridge Borough | No | Yes | No | No |
| Vineland Chemical Co., Inc. | Vineland | No | Yes | No | No |
| Waldick Aerospace Devices, Inc. | Wall Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Welsbach & General Gas Mantle (Camden Radiation) | Camden And Gloucester Cit | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| White Chemical Corp. | Newark | Yes | No | No | No |
| White Swan Laundry And Cleaner Inc. | Wall Twp | Yes | No | No | No |
| Williams Property | Swainton Middle | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Woodbrook Road Dump | South Plainfield | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Woodland Route 532 Dump | Woodland Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Woodland Route 72 Dump | Woodland Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Zschiegner Refining | Howell Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

NEW MEXICO

Number of sites: 15

New Mexico has the 28th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 13

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 9

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 4

Table of National Priorities List sites in New Mexico:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| AT&SF (Albuquerque) | Albuquerque | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Chevron Questa Mine | Questa | Yes | No | No | No |
| Eagle Picher Carefree Battery | Socorro | Yes | No | No | No |
| Fruit Avenue Plume | Albuquerque | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Grants Chlorinated Solvents | Grants | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Griggs & Walnut Ground Water Plume | Las Cruces | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Homestake Mining Co. | Milan | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Jackpile-paguante Uranium Mine | Laguna Pueblo | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----|-----|
| Lea And West Second Street | Roswell | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Lee Acres Landfill (Usdoi) | Farmington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mcgaffey And Main Groundwater Plume | Roswell | Yes | No | No | No |
| North Railroad Avenue Plume | Espanola | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Prewitt Abandoned Refinery | Prewitt | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| South Valley | Albuquerque | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| United Nuclear Corp. | Church Rock | Yes | No | Yes | No |

NEVADA

Number of sites: 1

Nevada has the 53rd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as three other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 0

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 0

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Nevada:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Carson River Mercury Site | Dayton | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |

NEW YORK

Number of sites: 84

New York has the 4th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 70

Sites with insufficient data: 8

Sites with human exposure not under control: 6

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 62

Sites with insufficient data: 12

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 5

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 5

Table of National Priorities List sites in New York:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| American Thermostat Co. | South Cairo | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Applied Environmental Services | Glenwood Landing | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Arsenic Mine | Kent | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Black River Pcb's | Town Of Champion | Insufficient Data | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Brewster Well Field | Putnam County | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Brookhaven National Laboratory (Usdoe) | Upton | Yes | No | No | No |
| Byron Barrel & Drum | Byron Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Carroll & Dubies Sewage Disposal | Port Jervis | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Cayuga Groundwater Contamination Site | Union Springs | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Circuitron Corp. | East Farmingdale | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Claremont Polychemical | Old Bethpage | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colesville Municipal Landfill | Town Of Colesville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Computer Circuits | Hauppauge | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Cortese Landfill | Vil Of Narrowsburg | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Crown Cleaners Of Watertown Inc. | Carthage | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Dewey Loeffel Landfill | Nassau | Insufficient Data | Yes | No | No |
| Diaz Chemical | Holley | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Eighteenmile Creek | Lockport | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Endicott Village Well Field | Village Of Endicott | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Facet Enterprises, Inc. | Elmira | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | No |
| Forest Glen Mobile Home Subdivision | Niagara Falls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Fulton Avenue | Garden City Park | Yes | No | No | No |
| Gcl Tie And Treating Inc. | Village Of Sidney | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Ge Moreau | South Glens Falls | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| General Motors (Central | Massena | Yes | No | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Foundry Division) | | | | | |
| Genzale Plating Co. | Franklin Square | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Goldisc Recordings, Inc. | Holbrook | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Gowanus Canal | Brooklyn | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Griffiss Air Force Base (11 Areas) | Rome | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Haviland Complex | Town Of Hyde Park | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hertel Landfill | Plattekill | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hooker (S Area) | Niagara Falls | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Hooker Chemical & Plastics Corp./Ruco Polymer Corp. | Hicksville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hopewell Precision | Hopewell Junction | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Hudson River Pcb's | Hudson River | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Islip Municipal Sanitary Landfill | Islip | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Johnstown City Landfill | Town Of Johnstown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Jones Chemicals, Inc. | Caledonia | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Kentucky Avenue Well Field | Horseheads | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Lawrence Aviation Industries, Inc. | Port Jefferson Station | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lehigh Valley Railroad | Le Roy | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Li Tungsten Corp. | Glen Cove | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Liberty Industrial Finishing | Farmingdale | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Little Valley | Little Valley | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mackenzie Chemical Works | Central Islip | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Magna Metals | Cortlandt Manor | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Malta Rocket Fuel Area | Malta | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Mattiace Petrochemical Co., Inc. | Glen Cove | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Mercury Refining, Inc. | Colonie | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mohonk Road Industrial Plant | High Falls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Nepera Chemical Co., Inc. | Maybrook | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| New Cassel/Hicksville Ground Water Contamination | New Cassel/Hicksville | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Newtown Creek | Brooklyn, Queens | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Niagara Mohawk Power | Saratoga Springs | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Corp. (Saratoga Springs Plant) | | | | | |
| Old Bethpage Landfill | Oyster Bay | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Old Roosevelt Field Contaminated Gw Area | Garden City | Yes | No | No | No |
| Olean Well Field | Olean | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Onondaga Lake | Syracuse | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Peninsula Boulevard Groundwater Plume | Hewlett | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Plattsburgh Air Force Base | Plattsburgh | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Pollution Abatement Services | Oswego | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Port Washington Landfill | Port Washington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Preferred Plating Corp. | Farmingdale | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ramapo Landfill | Ramapo | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Richardson Hill Road Landfill/Pond | Sidney Center | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Robintech, Inc./National Pipe Co. | Town Of Vestal | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Rosen Brothers Scrap Yard/Dump | Cortland | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rowe Industries Ground Water Contamination | Noyack/Sag Harbor | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics | Village Of Hoosick Falls | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Sarney Farm | Amenia | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Sealand Restoration, Inc. | Lisbon | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Seneca Army Depot | Romulus | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Shenandoah Road Groundwater Contamination | East Fishkill | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Sidney Landfill | Sidney | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Sinclair Refinery | Wellsville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Smithtown Ground Water Contamination | Smithtown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Solvent Savers | Lincklaen | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Stanton Cleaners Area Ground Water Contamination | Great Neck | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tri-cities Barrel Co., Inc. | Port Crane | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vestal Water Supply Well 1-1 | Vestal | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Volney Municipal Landfill | Town Of Volney | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Wappinger Creek | Wappinger Falls, Town Of Wappinger, Town Of Poughkeepsie | Insufficient Data | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Wolff-alport Chemical Company | Ridgewood | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| York Oil Co. | Moira | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|--------------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|

OHIO

Number of sites: 38

Ohio has the 12th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 32

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with human exposure not under control: 3

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 27

Sites with insufficient data: 6

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 5

Table of National Priorities List sites in Ohio:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Allied Chemical & Ironton Coke | Ironton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Behr Dayton Thermal System Voc Plume | Dayton | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Big D Campground | Kingsville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Chem-dyne | Hamilton | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Copley Square Plaza | Copley | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Donnelsville Contaminated Aquifer | Donnelsville | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| E.H. Schilling Landfill | Hamilton Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| East Troy Contaminated Aquifer | Troy | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Feed Materials Production Center (Usdoe) | Fernald | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Fields Brook | Ashtabula | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Fultz Landfill | Jackson Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industrial Excess Landfill | Uniontown | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lammers Barrel Factory | Beavercreek | Yes | No | No | No |
| Little Scioto River | Marion County | No | No | No | No |
| Miami County Incinerator | Troy | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Milford Contaminated Aquifer | Milford | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Mound Plant (Usdoe) | Miamisburg | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Nease Chemical | Salem | Yes | No | No | No |
| New Carlisle Landfill | New Carlisle | Yes | No | No | No |
| New Lyme Landfill | New Lyme | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| North Sanitary Landfill | Dayton | Yes | No | No | No |
| Old Mill | Rock Creek | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ormet Corp. | Hannibal | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Peters Cartridge Factory | Kings Mills | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Powell Road Landfill | Dayton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pristine, Inc. | Reading | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Reilly Tar & Chemical Corp. (Dover Plant) | Dover | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Sanitary Landfill Co. (Industrial Waste Disposal Co., Inc.) | Moraine | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Skinner Landfill | West Chester | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| South Point Plant | South Point | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Summit National | Deerfield Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Trw, Inc. (Minerva Plant) | Minerva | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| United Scrap Lead Co., Inc. | Troy | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Valley Pike Vocs | Riverside | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Van Dale Junkyard | Marietta | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| West Troy Contaminated Aquifer | Troy | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Wright-patterson Air Force Base | Dayton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Zanesville Well Field | Zanesville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

OKLAHOMA

Number of sites: 8

Oklahoma has the 44th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 4

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Sites that are not yet designated: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 3

Sites with insufficient data: 4

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Sites that are not yet designated: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Oklahoma:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Eagle Industries | Midwest City | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Hardage/Criner | Criner | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Henryetta Iron And Metal | Henryetta | Not yet designated | Not yet designated | No | No |
| Hudson Refinery | Cushing | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Oklahoma Refining Co. | Cyril | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Tar Creek (Ottawa County) | Ottawa County | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Tinker Air Force Base (Soldier Creek/Building 3001) | Oklahoma City | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Wilcox Oil Company | Creek County | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |

OREGON

Number of sites: 13

Oregon has the 33rd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as four other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 9

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with human exposure not under control: 2

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 4

Sites with insufficient data: 5

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 3

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Oregon:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Black Butte Mine | Cottage Grove | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Formosa Mine | Riddle | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Fremont National Forest/White King And Lucky Lass Uranium Mines (Usda) | Lakeview | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Mccormick & Baxter Creosoting Co. (Portland Plant) | Portland | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| North Ridge Estates | Klamath Falls | Insufficient Data | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Northwest Pipe & Casing/Hall Process Company | Clackamas | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Portland Harbor | Portland | No | No | No | No |
| Reynolds | Troutdale | Yes | Insufficient | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Metals Company | | | Data | | |
| Taylor Lumber And Treating | Sheridan | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Teledyne Wah Chang | Albany | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Umatilla Army Depot (Lagoons) | Hermiston | Insufficient Data | Yes | No | No |
| Union Pacific Railroad Co. Tie-treating Plant | The Dalles | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| United Chrome Products, Inc. | Corvallis | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |

PENNSYLVANIA

Number of sites: 91

Pennsylvania has the 3rd most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C..

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 86

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with human exposure not under control: 2

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 77

Sites with insufficient data: 6

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 8

Table of National Priorities List sites in Pennsylvania:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A.I.W. Frank/Mid-county Mustang | Exton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Avco Lycoming (Williamsport Division) | Williamsport | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Baghurst Drive | Harleysville | Insufficient Data | Yes | No | No |
| Bally Ground Water Contamination | Bally | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bell Landfill | Terry Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bendix Flight Systems Division | South Montrose | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Berks Sand Pit | Longswamp Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Blosenski Landfill | West Caln Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Boarhead Farms | Bridgeton Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Borit Asbestos | Ambler | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Breslube-penn, Inc. | Coraopolis | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Brown's Battery Breaking | Hamburg | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Butler Mine Tunnel | Pittston Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Butz Landfill | Stroudsburg | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Centre County Kepone | State College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Chem-fab | Doylestown | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Commodore Semiconductor Group | Lower Providence Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Crater Resources, Inc./Keystone Coke Co./Alan Wood Steel Co. | Upper Merion Township | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Crossley Farm | Hereford Township | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Croydon Tce | Croydon Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cryochem, Inc. | Worman Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Delta Quarries & Disposal, Inc./Stotler Landfill | Antis/Logan Twps | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Douglasville Disposal | Douglasville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Drake Chemical | Lock Haven | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dublin Tce Site | Dublin Borough | Yes | No | No | No |
| East Mount Zion | Springettsbury Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Eastern Diversified Metals | Hometown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Elizabethtown Landfill | Elizabethtown | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Fischer & Porter Co. | Warminster | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Foote Mineral Co. | East Whiteland Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Franklin Slag Pile (Mdc) | Philadelphia | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Havertown Pcp | Haverford | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Heleva Landfill | North Whitehall Twp | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hellertown Manufacturing Co. | Hellertown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Henderson Road | Upper Merion Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hunterstown Road | Straban Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industrial Lane | Williams Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Jacks Creek/Sitkin Smelting & Refining, Inc. | Maitland | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Jackson Ceramix, Inc | Falls Creek | No | Yes | No | No |
| Keystone Sanitation Landfill | Union Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kimberton | East Pikeland Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Letterkenny Army Depot (Pdo Area) | Franklin County | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Letterkenny Army Depot (Se Area) | Chambersburg | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Lindane Dump | Harrison Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lord-shope Landfill | Girard Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lower Darby Creek Area | Darby Twp | No | Yes | No | No |
| Malvern Tce | Malvern | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Metal Bank | Philadelphia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Metro Container Corporation | Trainer | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Mill Creek Dump | Erie | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Modern Sanitation Landfill | Lower Windsor Twp | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mw Manufacturing | Valley Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Naval Air Development Center (8 Waste Areas) | Warminster Township | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Navy Ships Parts Control Center | Mechanicsburg | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| North Penn - Area 1 | Souderton | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| North Penn - Area 12 | Worcester | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| North Penn - Area 2 | Hatfield | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| North Penn - Area 5 | Montgomery Township | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |
| North Penn - Area 6 | Lansdale | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| North Penn - Area 7 | North Wales | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Novak Sanitary Landfill | South Whitehall Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Occidental Chemical Corp./Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. | Lower Pottsgrove Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ohio River Park | Neville Island | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Old City Of York Landfill | Seven Valleys | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Old Wilmington Road Gw Contamination | Sadsburyville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Osborne Landfill | Grove City | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Palmerton Zinc Pile | Palmerton | Yes | No | No | No |
| Paoli Rail Yard | Paoli | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Price Battery Lead Smelter | Hamburg | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Raymark | Hatboro | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Revere Chemical Co. | Nockamixon Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rodale Manufacturing Co., Inc. | Emmaus Borough | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ryeland Road Arsenic Site | Heidelberg Twp | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Saegertown Industrial Area | Saegertown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Safety Light Corporation | Bloomsburg | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Salford Quarry | Lower Salford Township | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Sharon Steel Corp (Farrell Works Disposal Area) | Hermitage | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Shriver's Corner | Straban Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Stanley Kessler | King Of Prussia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tobyhanna Army Depot | Tobyhanna | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tonolli Corp. | Nesquehoning | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tysons Dump | Upper Merion Twp | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ugi Columbia Gas Plant | Columbia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Valmont Tce Site (Former - Valmont Industrial Park) | West Hazleton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Walsh Landfill | Honeybrook Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Watson Johnson Landfill | Richland Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Westinghouse Electric Corp. (Sharon Plant) | Sharon | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Westinghouse Elevator Co. Plant | Gettysburg | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Whitmoyer Laboratories | Jackson Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| William Dick Lagoons | West Caln Township | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Willow Grove Naval Air And Air Reserve Station | Horsham | Yes | No | No | No |

PUERTO RICO

Number of sites: 18

Puerto Rico has the 23rd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 14

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 7

Sites with insufficient data: 6

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 5

Table of National Priorities List sites in Puerto Rico:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Area | Vieques | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Cabo Rojo Ground Water Contamination | Cabo Rojo | Yes | No | No | No |
| Cidra Groundwater Contamination | Cidra | Yes | No | No | No |
| Corozal Well | Corozal | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dorado Ground Water Contamination | Dorado | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Fibers Public Supply Wells | Jobos | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Juncos Landfill | Juncos | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Maunabo Urbano Public Wells | Maunabo | Yes | No | No | No |
| Papelera Puertorriquena, Inc. | Utuado | Yes | No | No | No |
| Pesticide Warehouse I | Arecibo | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Pesticide Warehouse Iii | Manati | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Proteco | Penuelas | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| San German Ground Water Contamination | San German | Yes | No | No | No |
| Scorpio Recycling, Inc. | Candeleria Ward | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| The Battery Recycling Company | Arecibo | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Upjohn Facility | Barceloneta | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vega Alta Public Supply Wells | Vega Alta | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vega Baja Solid Waste Disposal | Rio Abajo Ward | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

RHODE ISLAND

Number of sites: 12

Rhode Island has the 38th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as four other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 11

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 10

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Table of National Priorities List sites in Rhode Island:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Central Landfill | Johnston | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Centredale Manor Restoration Project | North Providence | No | Yes | No | No |
| Davis Liquid Waste | Smithfield | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Davisville Naval Construction Battalion Center | North Kingstown | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Landfill & Resource Recovery, Inc. (L&Rr) | North Smithfield | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Newport Naval Education & Training Center | Newport | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Peterson/Puritan, Inc. | Lincoln/Cumberland | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Picillo Farm | Coventry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rose Hill Regional Landfill | South Kingstown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Stamina Mills | North Smithfield (Forestdale) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| West Kingston Town Dump/Uri Disposal Area | South Kingstown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Western Sand & Gravel | Burrillville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

SOUTH CAROLINA

Number of sites: 27

South Carolina has the 17th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 23

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Sites that are not yet designated: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 18

Sites with insufficient data: 4

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 3

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Sites that are not yet designated: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in South Carolina:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Aqua-Tech Environmental Inc (Groce Labs) | Greer | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Barite Hill/Nevada Goldfields | Mccormick | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Beaunit Corp. (Circular Knit & Dyeing Plant) | Fountain Inn | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |
| Brewer Gold Mine | Jefferson | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Burlington Industries Cheraw | Cheraw | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Carolawn, Inc. | Fort Lawn | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Clearwater Finishing | Clearwater | Not yet designated | Not yet designated | No | No |
| Elmore Waste Disposal | Greer | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Helena | Fairfax | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Chemical Co. Landfill | | | | | |
| Kalama Specialty Chemicals | Beaufort | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Koppers Co., Inc. (Charleston Plant) | Charleston | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Leonard Chemical Co., Inc. | Rock Hill | Yes | No | No | No |
| Lexington County Landfill Area | Cayce | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Macalloy Corporation | North Charleston | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Medley Farm Drum Dump | Gaffney | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Palmetto Wood Preserving | Dixiana | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Para-chem Southern, Inc. | Simpsonville | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Parris Island Marine Corps Recruit Depot | Parris Island | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |
| Rock Hill Chemical Co. | Rock Hill | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Sangamo Weston, Inc./Twelve-mile Creek/Lake Hartwell Pcb Contamination | Pickens | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Savannah River Site (Usdoe) | Aiken | Yes | No | No | No |
| Scrudi Bluff Road | Columbia | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Scrudi Dixiana | Cayce | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Shuron Inc. | Barnwell | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Townsend Saw Chain Co. | Pontiac | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----|
| Us Finishing/Cone Mills | Greenville | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Wamchem, Inc. | Burton | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

SOUTH DAKOTA

Number of sites: 2

South Dakota has the 49th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 1

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 1

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in South Dakota:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Ellsworth Air Force Base | Ellsworth Afb | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Gilt Edge Mine | Lead | Yes | Yes | No | No |

TENNESSEE

Number of sites: 18

Tennessee has the 23rd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as one other U.S. state, territory, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 17

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 1

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 11

Sites with insufficient data: 5

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 2

Table of National Priorities List sites in Tennessee:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Alamo Contaminated Ground Water | Alamo | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| American Creosote Works, Inc. (Jackson Plant) | Jackson | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Arlington Blending & Packaging | Arlington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Carrier Air Conditioning Co. | Collierville | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Clinch River Corporation | Harriman | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Former Custom Cleaners | Memphis | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Mallory Capacitor Co. | Waynesboro | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Memphis Defense Depot (Dla) | Memphis | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Milan Army Ammunition Plant | Milan | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Murray-ohio Dump | Lawrenceburg | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Oak Ridge Reservation (Usdoe) | Oak Ridge | Yes | No | No | No |
| Ross Metals Inc. | Rossville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Smalley-piper | Collierville | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Smokey Mountain Smelters | Knoxville | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Southside Chattanooga Lead | Chattanooga | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Velsicol Chemical Corp. (Hardeman County) | Toone | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Walker Machine Products, Inc. | Collierville | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Wrigley Charcoal Plant | Wrigley | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |

TEXAS

Number of sites: 55

Texas has the 6th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 43

Sites with insufficient data: 7

Sites with human exposure not under control: 5

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 37

Sites with insufficient data: 6

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 10

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 2

Table of National Priorities List sites in Texas:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Air Force Plant #4 (General Dynamics) | Fort Worth | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Alcoa (Point Comfort)/Lavaca Bay | Point Comfort | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bandera Road Ground Water Plume | San Antonio | No | Yes | No | No |
| Brine Service Company | Corpus Christi | Yes | No | No | No |
| Circle Court Ground Water Plume | Willow Park | Yes | No | No | No |
| City Of Perryton Well No. 2 | Perryton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Conroe Creosoting Co. | Conroe | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Crystal Chemical Co. | Houston | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Delfasco Forge | Grand Prairie | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |
| Donna | Donna | No | Not a | No | No |

| Reservoir And Canal System | | | Groundwater Site | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| East 67th Street Ground Water Plume | Odessa | Yes | No | No | No |
| Eldorado Chemical Co., Inc. | Live Oak | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Falcon Refinery | Ingleside | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| French, Ltd. | Crosby | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Garland Creosoting | Longview | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Geneva Industries/Fuhrmann Energy | Houston | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Gulfc0 Marine Maintenance | Freeport | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hart Creosoting Company | Jasper | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Highlands Acid Pit | Highlands | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Highway 18 Ground Water | Kermit | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Jasper Creosoting Company Inc. | Jasper | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Jones Road Ground Water Plume | Houston | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Koppers Co., Inc. (Texarkana Plant) | Texarkana | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Lane Plating Works, Inc | Dallas | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant | Texarkana | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant | Karnack | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Main Street | Burnet | Insufficient | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Ground Water Plume | | Data | | | |
| Malone Service Co - Swan Lake Plant | Texas City | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Many Diversified Interests, Inc. | Houston | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Midessa Ground Water Plume | Midland | Yes | No | No | No |
| Motco, Inc. | La Marque | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| North Cavalcade Street | Houston | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| North East 2nd Street Site | Happy | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Odessa Chromium #1 | Odessa | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Pantex Plant (Usdoe) | Pantex Village | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Patrick Bayou | Deer Park | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Petro-chemical Systems, Inc. (Turtle Bayou) | Liberty | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| River City Metal Finishing | San Antonio | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Rockwool Industries Inc. | Bell County | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Rsr Corporation | Dallas | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| San Jacinto River Waste Pits | Channelview | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Sandy Beach Road Ground Water Plume | Pelican Bay | Yes | No | No | No |
| Sheridan Disposal Services | Hempstead | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Sikes Disposal Pits | Crosby | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Sol Lynn/Industrial Transformers | Houston | Insufficient Data | No | Yes | Yes |
| South Cavalcade Street | Houston | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Sprague Road Ground Water Plume | Odessa | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Star Lake Canal | Port Neches | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| State Road 114 Groundwater Plume | Levelland | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Tex-tin Corp. | Texas City | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Texarkana Wood Preserving Co. | Texarkana | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| United Creosoting Co. | Conroe | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Us Oil Recovery | Pasadena | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Van Der Horst Usa Corporation | Terrell | Yes | No | No | No |
| West County Road 112 Ground Water | Midland | No | No | No | No |

U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

Number of sites: 1

The U.S. Virgin Islands have the 53rd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as three other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 1

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 0

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in the U.S. Virgin Islands:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|----------------|------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Tutu Wellfield | Tutu | Yes | No | Yes | No |

UTAH

Number of sites: 12

Utah has the 38th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as four other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 8

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 4

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 6

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 3

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Utah:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 700 South 1600 East PCE Plume | Salt Lake City | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Bountiful/Woods Cross 5th S. Pce Plume | Bountiful | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Five Points PCE Plume | Woods Cross/Bountiful | Yes | No | No | No |
| Hill Air Force Base | Hill Afb | No | Yes | No | No |
| Jacobs Smelter | Stockton | No | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Monticello Mill Tailings (Usdoe) | Monticello | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ogden Defense Depot (Dla) | Ogden | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Portland Cement (Kiln Dust 2 & 3) | Salt Lake City | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Tooele Army Depot (North Area) | Tooele | Yes | No | No | No |
| Us Magnesium | Tooele County | No | No | No | No |
| Utah Power & Light/American Barrel Co. | Salt Lake City | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Wasatch Chemical Co. (Lot 6) | Salt Lake City | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

VERMONT

Number of sites: 12

Vermont has the 38th most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as four other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 10

Sites with insufficient data: 2

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 9

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Table of National Priorities List sites in Vermont:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|-------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Bennington Municipal Sanitary Landfill | Bennington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bfi Sanitary Landfill (Rockingham) | Rockingham | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Burgess Brothers Landfill | Woodford | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Commerce Street Plume | Williston | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Elizabeth Mine | Strafford | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Ely Copper Mine | Vershire | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Jard Company, Inc. | Bennington | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Old Springfield Landfill | Springfield | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Parker Sanitary Landfill | Lyndon | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pike Hill Copper Mine | Corinth | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Pine Street Canal | Burlington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pownal Tannery | Pownal | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

VIRGINIA

Number of sites: 30

Virginia has the 16th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 26

Sites with insufficient data: 1

Sites with human exposure not under control: 3

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 16

Sites with insufficient data: 11

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 3

Table of National Priorities List sites in Virginia:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Abex Corp. | Portsmouth | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Arrowhead Associates, Inc./Scovill Corp. | Montross | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Atlantic Wood Industries, Inc. | Portsmouth | No | Yes | No | No |
| Avtex Fibers, Inc. | Front Royal | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Buckingham County Landfill | Buckingham | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| C & R Battery Co., Inc. | Chesterfield County | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Chisman Creek | York County | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Culpeper Wood Preservers, Inc. | Culpeper | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Defense General Supply Center (Dla) | Chesterfield County | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Former Nansemond Ordnance Depot | Suffolk | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Fort Eustis (Us Army) | Newport News | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Greenwood Chemical Co. | Newtown | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| H & H Inc., Burn Pit | Farrington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hidden Lane Landfill | Sterling | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Kim-stan Landfill | Selma | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| L.A. Clarke & Son | Spotsylvania | Yes | No | No | No |
| Langley Air Force Base/Nasa Langley Research Center | Hampton | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Marine Corps Combat Development Command | Quantico | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek | Virginia Beach | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Naval Surface Warfare Center - Dahlgren | Dahlgren | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Naval Weapons Station - Yorktown | Yorktown | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Norfolk Naval Base (Sewells Point Naval Complex) | Norfolk | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| Norfolk Naval Shipyard | Portsmouth | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Nws Yorktown - Cheatham Annex | Yorktown | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Peck Iron And | Portsmouth | No | No | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----|----------------------|-----|-----|
| Metal | | | | | |
| Rentokil, Inc. (Virginia Wood Preserving Division) | Richmond | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Saltville Waste Disposal Ponds | Saltville | Yes | No | No | No |
| Saunders Supply Co. | Chuckatuck | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| St. Juliens Creek Annex (U.S. Navy) | Chesapeake | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | Yes |
| U.S. Titanium | Piney River | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

WASHINGTON

Number of sites: 46

Washington has the 8th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 33

Sites with insufficient data: 4

Sites with human exposure not under control: 9

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 28

Sites with insufficient data: 6

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 11

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Washington:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| American Lake Gardens/Mcchord AFB | Tacoma | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bangor Naval Submarine Base | Silverdale | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Bangor Ordnance Disposal (USNavy) | Bremerton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Boomsnub/Airco | Vancouver | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Bremerton Gasworks | Bremerton | No | No | No | No |
| Centralia Municipal Landfill | Centralia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colbert Landfill | Spokane | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Commencement Bay, Near Shore/Tide Flats | Tacoma | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Commencement | Tacoma | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| t Bay, South Tacoma Channel | | | | | |
| Fairchild Air Force Base (4 Waste Areas) | Spokane | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Fmc Corp. (Yakima) | Yakima | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Fort Lewis Logistics Center | Tillicum | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| General Electric Co. (Spokane Apparatus Service Shop) | Spokane | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Grain Handling Facility At Freeman | Freeman | Yes | No | No | No |
| Greenacres Landfill | Spokane County | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hamilton/Labre Roads Gw Contamination | Chehalis | No | No | No | No |
| Hanford 100-area (USDOE) | Benton County | Yes | No | No | No |
| Hanford 200-area (Usdoe) | Benton County | Yes | No | No | No |
| Hanford 300-area (Usdoe) | Benton County | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Harbor Island (Lead) | Seattle | No | Yes | No | No |
| Hidden Valley Landfill (Thun Field) | Pierce County | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Jackson Park Housing Complex (USNavy) | Kitsap County | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Kaiser Aluminum (Mead Works) | Mead | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Lakewood | Lakewood | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Lockheed West Seattle | Seattle | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | No | No |
| Lower Duwamish Waterway | Seattle | No | No | No | No |
| Makah Reservation Warmhouse Beach Dump | Neah Bay | Insufficient Data | Yes | No | No |
| Mica Landfill | Mica | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Midnite Mine | Wellpinit | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Midway Landfill | Kent | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Moses Lake Wellfield Contamination | Moses Lake | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island (Ault Field) | Whidbey Island | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station (4 Waste Areas) | Keyport | Insufficient Data | No | Yes | No |
| North Market Street | Spokane | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Oeser Co. | Bellingham | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Old Navy Dump/Manchester Laboratory (Usepa/Noaa) | Manchester | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Pacific Car & Foundry Co. | Renton | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Pacific Sound Resources | Seattle | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Palermo Well Field Ground Water Contamination | Tumwater | No | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Pasco Sanitary | Pasco | Yes | Yes | No | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Landfill | | | | | |
| Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Complex | Bremerton | No | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Queen City Farms | Maple Valley | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Quendall Terminals | Renton | No | No | No | No |
| Seattle Municipal Landfill (Kent Highlands) | Kent | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Western Processing Co., Inc. | Kent | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Wyckoff Co./Eagle Harbor | Bainbridge Island | No | No | No | No |

WEST VIRGINIA

Number of sites: 10

West Virginia has the 40th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 7

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 5

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 2

Table of National Priorities List sites in West Virginia:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|---|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Allegany Ballistics Laboratory (USNavy) | Mineral County | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Big John Salvage - Hoult Road | Fairmont | Yes | No | No | No |
| Fike Chemical, Inc. | Nitro | Yes | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Hanlin-Allied-olin | Moundsville | Insufficient Data | No | No | No |
| North 25th Street Glass And Zinc | Clarksburg | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Ravenswood Pce | Ravenswood | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Shaffer Equipment/Arbuckle Creek Area | Minden | Insufficient Data | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Sharon Steel Corp (Fairmont Coke Works) | Fairmont | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Vienna | Vienna | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-----|-----|----|----|
| Tetrachloroethene | | | | | |
| West Virginia Ordnance (USArmy) | Point Pleasant | Yes | Yes | No | No |

WISCONSIN

Number of sites: 35

Wisconsin has the 13th most Superfund toxic waste sites of any U.S. state, territory, or Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 33

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 2

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 31

Sites with insufficient data: 3

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Sites that are not groundwater sites: 1

Table of National Priorities List sites in Wisconsin:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|--|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Algoma Municipal Landfill | Algoma | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Amcast Industrial Corporation | Cedarburg | No | Insufficient Data | No | No |
| Ashland/Northern States Power Lakefront | Ashland | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Better Brite Plating Co. Chrome And Zinc Shops | De Pere | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| City Disposal Corp. Landfill | Dunn | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Delavan Municipal Well #4 | Delavan | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hagen Farm | Stoughton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Hechimovich Sanitary Landfill | Williamstown | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Hunts Disposal | Caledonia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Landfill | | | | | |
| Janesville Ash Beds | Janesville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Janesville Old Landfill | Janesville | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kohler Co. Landfill | Kohler | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lauer I Sanitary Landfill | Menomonee Falls | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lemberger Landfill, Inc. | Whitelaw | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lemberger Transport & Recycling | Franklin Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District Lagoons | Bloomington Grove | Yes | Not a Groundwater Site | Yes | Yes |
| Master Disposal Service Landfill | Brookfield | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mid-state Disposal, Inc. Landfill | Cleveland Township | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Moss-american Co., Inc. (Kerr-Mcgee Oil Co.) | Milwaukee | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Muskego Sanitary Landfill | Muskego | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| N.W. Mauthe Co., Inc. | Appleton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| National Presto Industries, Inc. | Eau Claire | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Oconomowoc Electroplating Co., Inc. | Ashippun | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Onalaska Municipal Landfill | Onalaska | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Penta Wood | Daniels | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|
| Products | | | | | |
| Refuse Hideaway Landfill | Middleton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ripon City Landfill | Fond Du Lac County | Yes | Insufficient Data | Yes | No |
| Sauk County Landfill | Excelsior | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Schmalz Dump | Harrison | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Sheboygan Harbor & River | Sheboygan | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| Spickler Landfill | Spencer | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Stoughton City Landfill | Stoughton | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Tomah Municipal Sanitary Landfill | Tomah | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Waste Management Of Wisconsin, Inc. (Brookfield Sanitary Landfill) | Brookfield | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Wausau Ground Water Contamination | Wausau | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |

WYOMING

Number of sites: 1

Wyoming has the 53rd most Superfund toxic waste sites in the country and the same number of Superfund toxic waste sites as three other U.S. states, territories, and Washington D.C.

Number of sites with human exposure under control: 1

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with human exposure not under control: 0

Number of sites with groundwater migration under control: 1

Sites with insufficient data: 0

Sites with groundwater migration not under control: 0

Table of National Priorities List sites in Wyoming:

| Site Name | City | Human Exposure Under Control | Groundwater Migration Under Control | Cleanup Complete | Site-wide Ready for Anticipated Use |
|----------------------------|----------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| F.E. Warren Air Force Base | Cheyenne | Yes | Yes | No | No |

Notes

¹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *What Is Superfund?*, November 30, 2018. Archived on January 31, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131230147/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/what-superfund>.

² Hazardous chemicals known to humankind: Carter, Jacob, and Casey Kalman, *A Toxic Relationship Extreme Coastal Flooding and Superfund Sites*, Ucsusa.org, p. 3, July 28, 2020, archived on December 8, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131223700/https://www.ucsus.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/a-toxic-relationship.pdf>.

³ "Superfund's role in cleaning up these sites: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund History*, July 20, 2020, archived January 31, 2021, at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131231619/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-history#:~:text=Since%201980,%20EPA's%20Superfund%20program,and%20nationally%20significant%20environmental%20emergencies>.

⁴ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, p. 7, September 2015, archived January 31, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131231817/https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673051.pdf>.

⁵ Grinapol, Corinne, and Pam McFarland, "Superfund Still Struggling at 40," *Engineering NewsRecord* RSS, December 11, 2020, archived January 31, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131232239/https://www.enr.com/articles/50850-superfund-still-struggling-at-40>.

⁶ 2020 appropriations: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, *FY 2021 EPA Budget in Brief*, February 2020, "Summary of Agency Resources by Appropriation," p. 85, accessed December 3, 2020 at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2020-02/documents/fy-2021-epa-bib.pdf>.

⁷ Appropriations in 1999: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Summary of the 2000 Budget, January 1999, accessed December 3, 2020 at <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/P100BJVF.PDF?Dockey=P100BJVF.PDF>
Used inflation calculator to calculate \$1,500,000,000 in 2020 dollars = \$2,330,231,092.44: "Inflation Calculator: Find US Dollar's Value from 1913-2020." US Inflation Calculator, January 13, 2021, accessed January 15, 2021 at <https://www.usinflationcalculator.com/>.

⁸ Calculated average = 70.8. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year, June 04, 2018, archived November 27, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201127202021/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/number-npl-site-actions-and-milestones-fiscal-year>.

⁹ Calculated average = 34.1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year, June 04, 2018, archived January 26, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201127202021/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/number-npl-site-actions-and-milestones-fiscal-year>.

¹⁰ Calculated average = 23.2. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year, June 04, 2018, archived January 26, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201127202021/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/number-npl-site-actions-and-milestones-fiscal-year>.

¹¹ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Superfund: Funding and Reported Costs of Enforcement and Administration Activities*, GAO 08-841R, Washington D.C. July 18, 2008, <https://web.archive.org/web/20201026232652/https://www.gao.gov/assets/100/95632.pdf>.

¹² U.S. Office of Management and Budget, *Appendix, Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2021*, February 10, 2020, "Environmental Protection Agency," <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131234108/https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/BUDGET-2021-APP/pdf/BUDGET-2021-APP-1-23.pdf>.

¹³U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Sites with New Construction Projects Awaiting Funding*, July 02, 2020, archived January 31, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131234256/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-sites-new-construction-projects-awaiting-funding>.

¹⁴U.S. PIRG analysis of EPA data.

¹⁵Averaged 1997 through 2018 Partial Deletion sites, and averaged 2019 and 2020 Partial Deletion sites. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*, June 04, 2018, archived November 27, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201127202021/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/number-npl-site-actions-and-milestones-fiscal-year>.

¹⁶Averaged 1997 through 2018 Partial Deletion sites, and averaged 2019 and 2020 Partial Deletion sites. U.S. EPA, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*.

¹⁷ Sum of Partial Deletions 1997 - 2018 / Sum of total Partial and full Deletions = 90 / 329 = 23.75. U.S. EPA, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ The EPA reports annual fiscal site milestones beginning in 1983, the first year a site was put on the National Priorities List. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Comprehensive Environmental Response, PACE Law, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA): Overview*, PACE Law School Library Research Guides, October 29, 2020, archived January 28, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201128232636/https://libraryguides.law.pace.edu/CERCLA>.

²¹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*, June 04, 2018, archived November 27, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201127202021/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/number-npl-site-actions-and-milestones-fiscal-year>.

²² U.S. PIRG analysis of EPA data.

²³ U.S. PIRG analysis of EPA data.

²⁴ Divided 320,635,163 people (2015 U.S. population) by the 53 million people that live within 3 miles of a Superfund site listed or proposed to the National Priorities List, or a Superfund Alternate Agreement site = 6.05. 53 million Americans live within 3 miles of a proposed or listed Superfund site: "Population Surrounding 1,388 Superfund Remedial Sites. September 2015. Accessed December 8, 2020. Archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20170226163012/https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/webpopulationrsuperfundsites9.28.15.pdf>.

2015 population: "Population, total - United States" World Bank. Accessed 1/5/21.

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=US>

²⁵ Superfund Alternate Approach sites are Superfund sites: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, archived January 31, 2021 at

<https://web.archive.org/web/20210131235937/https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/superfund-alternative-approach>

²⁶ 1,327 toxic waste sites on the National Priorities List: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund: National Priorities List (NPL)*, October 07, 2020, archived January 30, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210130215726/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl>.

Total proposed, listed, deleted, and SAA sites: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *National Priorities List and Superfund Alternative Approach Sites*, June 03, 2020, archived January 30, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210130222621/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/search-superfund-sites-where-you-live>.

²⁷ Added total NPL Sites to total deleted. 1,327 + 438 = 1,765. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund: National Priorities List (NPL)*, October 07, 2020, archived January 30, 2021 at [https://web.archive.org/web/20210130215726/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl#:~:text=The%20National%20Priorities%20List%20\(NPL,United%20States%20and%20its%20territories](https://web.archive.org/web/20210130215726/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl#:~:text=The%20National%20Priorities%20List%20(NPL,United%20States%20and%20its%20territories).

²⁸U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund: NPL Deletion Guidance and Policy*, January 12, 2021, archived January 26, 2021, <https://web.archive.org/web/20210126002300/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-npl-deletion-guidance-and-policy#:~:text=Deletion%20of%20sites%20from%20the,with%20concurrence%20from%20the%20State.&text=EPA%20can%20also%20delete%20portions%20of%20sites%20that%20meet%20deletion%20criteri>

²⁹U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund History - Printable Version*, July 20, 2020, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201001429/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-history-printable-version>.

³⁰ Lead and dioxin: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Contaminants at Superfund Sites, June 4, 2018, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201002145/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/contaminants-superfund-sites>.

Mercury and benzene: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, DAVISVILLE NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTALION CENTER, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201101065111/https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/SiteProfiles/index.cfm?fuseaction=second.contams&id=0101430>.

³¹ The common chemicals at Superfund sites: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Contaminants at Superfund Sites*, accessed January 5, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/contaminants-superfund-sites>

Danger of asbestos: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Learn About Asbestos*, accessed January 5, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/asbestos/learn-about-asbestos#effects>

Danger of lead: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Learn About Lead*, accessed January 5, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/lead/learn-about-lead>

Danger of dioxin: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Learn About Dioxin*, accessed January 5, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/dioxin/learn-about-dioxin>

³² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund: National Priorities List (NPL)*, October 07, 2020, archived February 1, 2021 at [https://web.archive.org/web/20210201000301/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl#:~:text=The%20National%20Priorities%20List%20\(NPL,United%20States%20and%20its%20territorie](https://web.archive.org/web/20210201000301/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl#:~:text=The%20National%20Priorities%20List%20(NPL,United%20States%20and%20its%20territorie)

³³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *ADAK NAVAL AIR STATION Site Profile*, October 20, 2017, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/SiteProfiles/index.cfm?fuseaction=second.contams&id=1000128>.

³⁴ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund: Contaminated Sediments*, June 04, 2018, accessed January 27, 2021. <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-contaminated-sediments#:~:text=Sediments%20are%20materials%20found%20at,decaying%20organic%20matter,%20and%20shells.&text=Sediments%20can%20become%20contaminated%20in,metals%20and%20other%20harmful%20substance>.

³⁵U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*, November 11, 2020, archived January 22, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210122095850/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process>.

³⁶ *ibid.*

³⁷ *ibid.*

³⁸ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Site Assessment Process*, June 19, 2018. archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201003057/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-site-assessment-process>.

³⁹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Non-Time-Critical Removal Actions*, June 04, 2018, archived October 17, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201017182451/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/non-time-critical-removal-actions>.

⁴⁰ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (Site Characterization)*, March 06, 2019, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-remedial-investigationfeasibility-study-site-characterization>.

⁴¹ *ibid.*

⁴² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*, November 11, 2020, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-4>.

⁴³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund: Remedial Design / Remedial Action*, November 11, 2020, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-remedial-design-remedial-action>.

⁴⁴ *ibid.*

⁴⁵ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*, November 11, 2020, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-6>.

⁴⁶ "Notice of Policy Change for Partial Deletion from the NPL." EPA. June 04, 2018. Accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/notice-policy-change-partial-deletion-npl>.

⁴⁷ United States. Rules and Regulations. 211th ed. Vol. 60. 1995. Accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-1995-11-01/pdf/95-27069.pdf>.

⁴⁸ "Superfund: National Priorities List Deletion." EPA. January 12, 2021. Accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-deletion#:~:text=EPA%20may%20delete%20a%20final,human%20health%20or%20the%20environment.&text=EPA,%20in%20conjunction%20with%20the.all%20appropriate%20response%20action%20require>.

⁴⁹ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Superfund: Litigation Has Decreased and EPA Needs Better Information on Site Cleanup and Cost Issues to Estimate Future Program Funding Requirements*, GAO-09-656, "Table 15, Construction Complete Nonfederal NPL by Site Type and Megasite Designation through Fiscal Year 2007," p. 70, Accessed January 26, 2021.

<https://web.archive.org/web/20201120193053/https://www.gao.gov/assets/300/292299.pdf>.

⁵⁰ U.S. EPA, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Site Assessment Process*, November 11, 2020. Accessed January 30, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-site-assessment-process>.

⁵⁴ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *The Superfund Cleanup Program*, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201011725/https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/documents/the-superfund-cleanup-program.pdf>.

⁵⁵ U.S. EPA, *Superfund Site Assessment Process*.

⁵⁶ U.S. Government Accountability Agency, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, September 2015, p. 2, archived January 31, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131231817/https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673051.pdf>.

⁵⁷ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Cleanup Alternatives*, June 04, 201, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201012904/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-cleanup-alternatives#er>.

⁵⁸ Sites move from removal to long-term cleanup plans if necessary: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Site Assessment Process*, June 19, 2018. archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201003057/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-site-assessment-process>.

The NPL is the cleanup plan for sites with the most serious long-term cleanup: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*, November 11, 2020, archived January 22, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210122095850/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-1>.

The next step is Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study and Record of Decision, which outlines the plan for remedial cleanup: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*, EPA. November 11, 2020, accessed January 26, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process>.

⁵⁹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*,. November 11, 2020, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201011444/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-1>.

⁶⁰ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*,. November 11, 2020, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201011444/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-1>.

⁶¹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*,. November 11, 2020, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201011444/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-1>.

⁶² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund: Remedial Action Project Completion and Construction Completions*, April 30, 2020, archived November 16, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201016201439/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-remedial-action-project-completion-and-construction-completions>.

⁶³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*,. November 11, 2020, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201011444/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-1>.

⁶⁴ U.S. EPA, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*.

⁶⁵ "Frequently Asked Questions," Center for Public Integrity. May 10, 2007, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201014840/https://publicintegrity.org/environment/frequently-asked-questions-4/>.

⁶⁶ "Frequently Asked Questions"

⁶⁷ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Negotiating Superfund Settlements*, July 15, 2019, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201014828/https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/negotiating-superfund-settlements#:~:text=EPA%20prefers%20to%20reach%20an,recovering%20the%20cleanup%20costs%20later.>

⁶⁸ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Superfund: Funding and Reported Costs of Enforcement and Administration Activities*, GAO 08-841R, Washington D.C. July 18, 2008, <https://web.archive.org/web/20201026232652/https://www.gao.gov/assets/100/95632.pdf>.

⁶⁹ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, September 2015, p. 1, archived December 9, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201209104847/https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673051.pdf>.

⁷⁰ Calculated: Out of 1,327, there are 157 federal NPL sites. $157/1,327 = .118$ or 11.8%
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund: National Priorities List (NPL)*, November 19, 2020, archived December 1, 2020, at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201201232724/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl>.

⁷¹ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, September 2015, p. 7, archived December 9, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201209104847/https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673051.pdf>.

⁷² U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Superfund: Funding and Reported Costs of Enforcement and Administration Activities*, GAO 08-841R, Washington D.C. July 18, 2008, <https://web.archive.org/web/20201026232652/https://www.gao.gov/assets/100/95632.pdf>.

⁷³ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, September 2015, p. 7, archived December 9, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201209104847/https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673051.pdf>.

⁷⁴ See notes 6 and 7.

⁷⁵ See notes 6.

⁷⁶ "Frequently Asked Questions," Center for Public Integrity. May 10, 2007, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201014840/https://publicintegrity.org/environment/frequently-asked-questions-4/>.

The common chemicals at Superfund sites: "Contaminants at Superfund Sites." EPA. Accessed January 5, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/contaminants-superfund-sites>

Danger of asbestos: "Learn About Asbestos." EPA. September 17, 2018. Accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/asbestos/learn-about-asbestos#effects>.

Danger of lead: "Learn about Lead." EPA. December 22, 2020. Accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/lead/learn-about-lead>.

Danger of dioxin: "Learn about Dioxin." EPA. September 08, 2020. Accessed January 27, 2021. <https://www.epa.gov/dioxin/learn-about-dioxin>.

⁷⁷ Raid Amin, Arlene Nelson & Shannon McDougall (2018), "A Spatial Study of the Location of Superfund Sites and Associated Cancer Risk," *Statistics and Public Policy*, 5:1, 1-9, DOI: 10.1080/2330443X.2017.1408439 Accessed December 5, 2020 at <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/2330443X.2017.1408439>

⁷⁸ Center for Environmental Policy and Management, *Urban Agriculture and Soil Contamination: An Introduction to Urban Gardening*, University of Louisville, Winter 2009, accessed February 4, 2021, at <https://louisville.edu/cepm/pdf-files/pg-25-1>.

⁷⁹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Presenter's Manual For: "Superfund Risk Assessment and How You Can Help" A 40-Minute Videotape. 2000. p. 19. EPA/540/R-99/013. OSWER 9285.7-29. Accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-11/documents/vdmanual.pdf>.

⁸⁰ "The Cognitive Consequences of Superfund Sites." May 2, 2017. Accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.ipr.northwestern.edu/news/2017/figlio-persico-superfund-sites.html>.

⁸¹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Health and Ecological Hazards Caused by Hazardous Substances*, January 26, 2017, archived October 28, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201028122625/https://www.epa.gov/emergency-response/health-and-ecological-hazards-caused-hazardous-substances>.

⁸² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. Issuance of Final Guidance: Ecological Risk Assessment and Risk Management Principles for Superfund Sites. By Stephen D. Luftig. Washington D.C, 1999. p. 6. OSWER Directive 9285.7-28 P Accessed December 15, 2020 at <https://clu-in.org/download/contaminantfocus/sediments/eco-risk-principles-1999.pdf>.

⁸³ *ibid*.

⁸⁴ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. Reusing Cleaned Up Superfund Sites: Ecological Use Where Waste is Left on Site. July 2006. p. 9. Accessed January 30, 2021 at https://19january2017snapshot.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-07/documents/reusing_cleaned_up_superfund_sites_2006.pdf.

⁸⁵ Increase in flooding from sea-level rise and spread to communities: Carter, Jacob, and Casey Kalman. "Carter, Jacob, and Casey Kalman. "A Toxic Relationship Extreme Coastal Flooding and Superfund Sites." Ucsusa.org. July 28, 2020. Accessed December 8, 2020 at <https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/a-toxic-relationship.pdf>.

David Hasemyer, Insideclimate News. "Battered, Flooded and Submerged: Many Superfund Sites Are Dangerously Threatened by Climate Change." Inside Climate News. December 18, 2020, accessed January 30, 2021 at <https://insideclimatenews.org/news/24092020/climate-change-epa-superfund-sites-hurricanes-floods-fires-sea-level-rise/>.

⁸⁶ Worsening storms (specifically hurricanes): Emanuel, Kerry. "Evidence that hurricanes are getting stronger" Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences Jun 2020, 117 (24) 13194-13195; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2007742117, accessed December 8, 2020 at <https://www.pnas.org/content/117/24/13194>.

⁸⁷ *ibid*.

⁸⁸ Increase in Category 4 and Category 5: "Global Warming and Hurricanes." GFDL.NOAA.gov, September 23, 2020, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.gfdl.noaa.gov/global-warming-and-hurricanes/>.

⁸⁹ James P. Kossin et al., "Global Increase in Major Tropical Cyclone Exceedance Probability over the past Four Decades," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117, no. 22 (2020), doi:10.1073/pnas.1920849117) accessed December 8, 2020 at <https://www.pnas.org/content/117/22/11975>.

⁹⁰"Superfund and Climate Change: Lessons from Hurricane Sandy," American Bar Association, Accessed November 04, 2020 at https://www.americanbar.org/groups/environment_energy_resources/publications/natural_resources_environment/2013-14/winter-2014/superfund_and_climate_change_lessons_hurricane_sandy/.

Hurricane Harvey: Valdmanis, Richard, and Timothy Gardner. "Harvey Floods or Damages 13 Texas Superfund Sites - EPA." Reuters. September 03, 2017. Accessed January 31, 2021 at <https://www.reuters.com/article/storm-harvey-superfund/harvey-floods-or-damages-13-texas-superfund-sites-epa-idINKCN1BE03P>.

⁹¹"Record-breaking Atlantic Hurricane Season Draws to an End." Record-breaking Atlantic Hurricane Season Draws to an End | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. November 24, 2020. Accessed January 30, 2021 at <https://www.noaa.gov/media-release/record-breaking-atlantic-hurricane-season-draws-to-end>.

⁹²Carter, Jacob, and Casey Kalman. "A Toxic Relationship Extreme Coastal Flooding and Superfund Sites." Ucsusa.org. July 28, 2020. Accessed December 8, 2020 at <https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/a-toxic-relationship.pdf>.

⁹³ See note 70.

⁹⁴ 45% of all non-federal sites are located in areas with FEMA's highest flood hazard category: U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND: EPA Should Take Additional Actions to Manage Risks from Climate Change*, October 2019, p. 20, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/710/702158.pdf>

As of September 2019, when the G.A.O. report listed above cites the number of Superfund sites, there were 1,179 non-federal sites.

Environmental Protection Agency, Superfund: National Priorities List (NPL), archived September 18, 2019 <https://web.archive.org/web/20190918222115/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl>

45% of 1,179 sites is $45\% \times 1,179 = 530.55$.

The total number of National Priorities List sites as of September, 2019 is 1,336. The number of non-federal sites in FEMA's highest flood hazard category $530.55 / \text{the total number of National Priorities List sites } 1,336 = .3967$ or 39.57%

⁹⁵Darryl Fears, Steven Mufson, "Trump to Reverse Obama-era Order Aimed at Planning for Climate Change," *The Washington Post*, April 29, 2019, archived January 29, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210129054642if/https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/08/15/trump-to-reverse-obama-era-order-aimed-at-planning-for-climate-change/>.

⁹⁶ David Hasemyer, Insideclimate News. "Battered, Flooded and Submerged: Many Superfund Sites Are Dangerously Threatened by Climate Change," *Inside Climate News*, December 18, 2020, accessed January 27, 2021. <https://insideclimatenews.org/news/24092020/climate-change-epa-superfund-sites-hurricanes-floods-fires-sea-level-rise/>.

⁹⁷ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*, June 04, 2018, archived November 27, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201127202021/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/number-npl-site-actions-and-milestones-fiscal-year>.

⁹⁸U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*, November 11, 2020, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-6>.

⁹⁹ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Superfund: Litigation Has Decreased and EPA Needs Better Information on Site Cleanup and Cost Issues to Estimate Future Program Funding Requirements*, GAO-09-656, "Table 15, Construction Complete Nonfederal NPL by Site Type and Megasite Designation through Fiscal Year 2007," p. 70, accessed January 26, 2021 at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/300/292299.pdf>.

¹⁰⁰U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *About the Superfund Cleanup Process*, November 11, 2020, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/about-superfund-cleanup-process#tab-6>.

-
- ¹⁰¹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Construction Completions at National Priorities List (NPL) Sites - by Number*, March 02, 2020, "Site Location," accessed December 03, 2020 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/construction-completions-national-priorities-list-npl-sites-number>.
- ¹⁰² U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *JET PROPULSION LABORATORY (NASA) Site Profile*, October 20, 2017, "What is the Current Site Status?" archived October 24, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201024234232/https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/SiteProfiles/index.cfm?fuseaction=second.cleanup&id=0903438>.
- ¹⁰³ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, p. 7, September 2015, archived January 31, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131231817/https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673051.pdf>.
- ¹⁰⁴ U.S. PIRG analysis of EPA data.
- ¹⁰⁵ 2020 appropriations: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Office of the Chief Financial Officer, *FY 2021 EPA Budget in Brief*, "Summary of Agency Resources by Appropriation," p. 85, February 2020, accessed December 3, 2020 at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2020-02/documents/fy-2021-epa-bib.pdf>.
- ¹⁰⁶ See notes 6 and 7.
- ¹⁰⁷ U.S. EPA, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*.
- ¹⁰⁸ "Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year." EPA. June 04, 2018. Accessed January 26, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/number-npl-site-actions-and-milestones-fiscal-year>.
- ¹⁰⁹ "EPA Deletes All or Part of 27 Superfund Sites from the National Priorities List, Continuing Recent Trend of Historic High Deletions." EPA. October 05, 2020. Accessed January 30, 2021 at [https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-deletes-all-or-part-27-superfund-sites-national-priorities-list-continuing-recent#:~:text=WASHINGTON \(October 5, 2020\),National Priorities List \(NPL\)](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-deletes-all-or-part-27-superfund-sites-national-priorities-list-continuing-recent#:~:text=WASHINGTON (October 5, 2020),National Priorities List (NPL)).
- ¹¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹¹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Deleted National Priorities List (NPL) Sites - by Deletion Date*, EPA. September 24, 2020. Accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/deleted-national-priorities-list-npl-sites-deletion-date>.
- ¹¹² U.S. PIRG analysis of EPA data.
- ¹¹³ U.S. EPA, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*.
- ¹¹⁴ Partial Deletion policy enacted in 1995: "Procedures for Partial Deletions at NPL Sites." EPA. April 08, 2019. Accessed December 03, 2020 at <https://www.epa.gov/fedfac/procedures-partial-deletions-npl-sites>.
- ¹¹⁵ First Partial Deletion in 1997: U.S. EPA, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*.
- ¹¹⁶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Glossary*, October 02, 2018, accessed January 26, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-glossary>.
- ¹¹⁷ "Procedures for Partial Deletions at NPL Sites." EPA. April 08, 2019. Accessed December 03, 2020. <https://www.epa.gov/fedfac/procedures-partial-deletions-npl-sites>.
- ¹¹⁸ Averaged 1997 through 2018 Partial Deletion sites. U.S. EPA, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*.
- ¹¹⁹ U.S. EPA, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*.
- ¹²⁰ Sum of Partial Deletions 1997 - 2018 / Sum of total Partial and full Deletions = 90 / 329 = 23.75%. Averaged % Partial Deletions of Sum Partial Deletions and Deletions for years 1997 through 2018 = 27.18%: U.S. EPA, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*.
- ¹²¹ Knickmeyer, Ellen, "Toxic Superfund Cleanups Decline to More than 30-year Low," AP NEWS, February 20, 2020, accessed January 30, 2021 at <https://apnews.com/article/c1d827364ac630d53848ac3ec489788d>.
- ¹²² Partial Deletion policy enacted in 1995: "Procedures for Partial Deletions at NPL Sites." EPA. April 08, 2019. Accessed December 03, 2020 at <https://www.epa.gov/fedfac/procedures-partial-deletions-npl-sites>.
- ¹²³ Schillaci, William C, "Exploring EPA's Superfund Partial Deletion Policy," EHS Daily Advisor, November 06, 2019, archived September 18, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20200918163334/https://ehsdailyadvisor.blr.com/2019/11/exploring-epas-superfund-partial-deletion-policy/>.

¹²⁴ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, September 2015, p. 11, archived January 31, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131231817/https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673051.pdf>.

¹²⁵ Ibid..

¹²⁶ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, September 2015, p. 11, archived January 31, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131231817/https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673051.pdf>.

¹²⁷ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, September 2015, p. 11, archived January 31, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131231817/https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673051.pdf>

¹²⁸ U.S. PIRG analysis of annual EPA Budget in Brief.

¹²⁹ FY 2020 President's budget for Superfund \$1,045,351,000 - FY 2019 enacted appropriations for Superfund \$1,159,947,000 = -\$114,596,000.

FY 2020 President's budget for Superfund is \$1,045,351,000: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Office of the Chief Financial Officer. *FY 2020 EPA Budget in Brief*, March 2019, p. 67, "Summary of Agency Resources by Appropriation," accessed December 3, 2020 at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-03/documents/fy-2020-epa-bib.pdf>.

FY 2019 enacted appropriations for Superfund is \$1,159,947,000: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Office of the Chief Financial Officer, *FY 2021 EPA Budget in Brief*, February 2020, p. 103, "Summary of Agency Resources by Appropriation," accessed December 3, 2020 at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2020-02/documents/fy-2021-epa-bib.pdf>.

¹³⁰ FY 2020 estimated enacted appropriations for Superfund is \$1,184,755,000 - FY 2019 enacted appropriations for Superfund \$1,159,947,000 = \$24,808,000
U.S. EPA, *FY 2021 EPA Budget in Brief*. p. 103.

¹³¹ Trump focuses on Superfund: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *EPA Administrator Wheeler Highlights Superfund Redevelopment, Clean Air Progress in Visit Southeast Virginia*, August 24, 2020. Accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-administrator-wheeler-highlights-superfund-redevelopment-clean-air-progress-visit>.

¹³² Calculated FY 2020 President Budget agency total \$6,068,490,000 - FY 2019 enacted appropriations agency total \$8,849,488,000 = - \$2,780,998,000;

Delta FY 2020 President's Budget agency total and FY 2019 enacted appropriations agency total \$2,780,998,000/ FY 2019 enacted appropriations agency total \$8,849,488,000 = .3142 = 31.42%
President's Budget for FY 2020 agency total was \$6,068,490,000: U.S. EPA, *FY 2020 Budget in Brief*, p. 67.

FY 2019 enacted appropriations agency total is \$8,849,488,000. U.S. EPA, *FY 2021 EPA Budget in Brief*, p. 103.

¹³³ FY 2020 President's Budget for Superfund \$1,045,351,000 - FY 2019 enacted appropriations for Superfund \$1,159,947,000 = -\$114,596,000.

FY 2020 President's Budget: U.S. EPA, *FY 2020 EPA Budget in Brief*, p. 67.

FY 2019 enacted appropriations: U.S. EPA, *FY 2021 EPA Budget in Brief*, p. 103.

¹³⁴ FY 2020 estimated enacted appropriations agency total \$9,057,401,000 - FY 2019 enacted appropriations agency total \$8,849,488 = \$207,913,000. U.S. EPA, *FY 2021 EPA Budget in Brief*, p. 103.

¹³⁵ D'Angelo, Chris, "EPAs Superfund Program, a Trump Priority, Is in Shambles," *Grist*, January 11, 2020, archived January 14, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210114070504/https://grist.org/politics/epas-superfund-program-a-trump-priority-is-in-shambles/>.

¹³⁶ U.S. PIRG analysis of annual EPA Budget in Brief reports.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Sites with New Construction Projects Awaiting Funding*, July 02, 2020, archived January 31, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131234256/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-sites-new-construction-projects-awaiting-funding>.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰Hasemyer, David, Inside Climate News, Lise Olsen, and Texas Observer, "Biden Will Inherit Hundreds of Toxic Waste Superfund Sites, with Climate Threats Looming," NBCNews.com, December 29, 2020, archived January 29, 2021 at

https://web.archive.org/web/20210129141057if_/https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/biden-will-inherit-hundreds-toxic-waste-superfund-sites-climate-threats-n1252276.

¹⁴¹U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, p. 7, September 2015, archived January 31, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210131231817/https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673051.pdf>.

¹⁴²U.S. EPA, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*.

¹⁴³U.S. PIRG analysis of EPA data. Includes proposed, listed, and deleted NPL sites, as well as Superfund Alternate Approach sites.

¹⁴⁴Ibid.

¹⁴⁵U.S. PIRG analysis of EPA data.

¹⁴⁶U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Superfund: Funding and Reported Costs of Enforcement and Administration Activities*, GAO 08-841R, Washington D.C. July 18, 2008, <https://web.archive.org/web/20201026232652/https://www.gao.gov/assets/100/95632.pdf>.

¹⁴⁷U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund: Remedial Design / Remedial Action*, November 11, 2020, accessed January 31, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-remedial-design-remedial-action>.

¹⁴⁸U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Glossary*, October 02, 2018, accessed January 26, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-glossary>

¹⁴⁹U.S. PIRG Analysis of EPA data.

¹⁵⁰U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Human Exposure Dashboard*, March 12, 2020, archived November 11, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201111232954/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-human-exposure-dashboard>.

¹⁵¹U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Human Exposure Dashboard*, March 12, 2020, archived November 11, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201111232954/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-human-exposure-dashboard>.

¹⁵²U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Task Force*, April 28, 2020, accessed January 28, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-task-force>.

¹⁵³U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Task Force Recommendations*, July 25, 2017, accessed January 27, 2021 at https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-07/documents/superfund_task_force_report.pdf.

¹⁵⁴U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Previous Versions of Administrators Emphasis List*, January 27, 2021, accessed January 28, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/previous-versions-administrators-emphasis-list>.

¹⁵⁵U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Administrator's Emphasis List*, October 21, 2020, archived December 09, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201209191945/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/administrators-emphasis-list>

¹⁵⁶U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Previous Versions of Administrators Emphasis List*, January 27, 2021, archived January 16, 2021. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210116180859/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/previous-versions-administrators-emphasis-list>.

¹⁵⁷U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *FY 2020 EPA Budget in Brief*, March 2019, accessed December 9, 2020 at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-03/documents/fy-2020-epa-bib.pdf>.

¹⁵⁸U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *EPA Deletes All or Part of 27 Superfund Sites from the National Priorities List, Continuing Recent Trend of Historic High Deletions*, October 5, 2020, accessed February 4, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-deletes-all-or-part-27-superfund-sites-national-priorities-list-continuing-recent>.

-
- ¹⁵⁹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *SILVER BOW CREEK/BUTTE AREA*, archived October 17, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201017154518/https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/SiteProfiles/index.cfm?fuseaction=second.Stayup&id=0800416#Stayup>.
- ¹⁶⁰ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *ORANGE COUNTY NORTH BASIN Site Profile*, October 20, 2017, accessed January 28, 2021 at <https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/SiteProfiles/index.cfm?fuseaction=second.schedule&id=0900251>.
- ¹⁶¹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *OLIN CHEMICAL Site Profile*, October 20, 2017, accessed January 31, 2021 at <https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/SiteProfiles/index.cfm?fuseaction=second.Cleanup&id=0100438#bkground>.
- ¹⁶² Cross-listed FY 2020 Construction Completions with sites that are on or have been on the Administrator's Emphasis List. Construction Completion: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Construction Completions at National Priorities List (NPL) Sites - by Number, March 02, 2020, "Site Location," accessed December 03, 2020 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/construction-completions-national-priorities-list-npl-sites-number>.
Administrator's Emphasis list: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Previous Versions of Administrators Emphasis List*, January 27, 2021, archived January 16, 2021. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210116180859/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/previous-versions-administrators-emphasis-list>.
- ¹⁶³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund's role in cleaning up these sites: Superfund History*, July 20, 2020, accessed January 05, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-history#:~:text=Since%201980,%20EPA's%20Superfund%20program,and%20nationally%20significant%20environmental%20emergencies>.
- ¹⁶⁴ OVERSIGHT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY'S SUPERFUND PROGRAM, 111th Cong. (2010).S. Hrg. 111-1242, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-111shrg23570/html/CHRG-111shrg23570.htm#>.
- ¹⁶⁵ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND: EPA Should Take Additional Actions to Manage Risks from Climate Change*, October 2019, p. 20, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/710/702158.pdf>
- ¹⁶⁶ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND: EPA Should Take Additional Actions to Manage Risks from Climate Change*, October 2019, p. 20, accessed January 27, 2021 at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/710/702158.pdf>. 2020 data: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund: National Priorities List (NPL)*, archived February 1, 2021 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20210201000301/https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-national-priorities-list-npl>.
- ¹⁶⁷ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Population Surrounding 1,388 Superfund Remedial Sites*, September 2015, accessed December 8, 2020, archived at <https://web.archive.org/web/20170226163012/https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/webpopulationrsuperfundsites9.28.15.pdf>
- ¹⁶⁸ U.S. EPA, *Number of NPL Site Actions and Milestones by Fiscal Year*.
- ¹⁶⁹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Remedial Performance Measures*, November 11, 2020, accessed January 28, 2021 at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-remedial-performance-measures>.
- ¹⁷⁰ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Superfund Alternative Approach*, October 10, 2017, accessed January 28, 2021 at [https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/superfund-alternative-approach#:~:text=The%20Superfund%20alternative%20\(SA\)%20approach,sites%20listed%20on%20the%20NPL.&text=The%20SA%20approach%20can%20potentially,a%20site%20on%20the%20NPL](https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/superfund-alternative-approach#:~:text=The%20Superfund%20alternative%20(SA)%20approach,sites%20listed%20on%20the%20NPL.&text=The%20SA%20approach%20can%20potentially,a%20site%20on%20the%20NPL).
- ¹⁷¹ U.S. PIRG analysis of EPA data.
- ¹⁷² "Superfund: Implementation and Selected Issues." EveryCRSReport.com. November 26, 2007. Accessed January 28, 2021. <https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/RL33426.html#fn42>.
- ¹⁷³ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, September 2015, p. 7, archived December 9, 2020 at <https://web.archive.org/web/20201209104847/https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/673051.pdf>.

¹⁷⁴ U.S. Government Accountability Office, *SUPERFUND Trends in Federal Funding and Cleanup of EPA's Nonfederal National Priorities List Sites*, p. 8.

¹⁷⁵ Amadeo, Kimberly, "Fiscal Year Versus Calendar Year," *The Balance*, accessed January 28, 2021. <https://www.thebalance.com/fiscal-year-definition-federal-budget-examples-3305794>.

¹⁷⁶ Louise D. Yinug and Casey Burgat, *The President's Budget: Overview and Timing of the Mid-Session Review*, Congressional Research Service, p. 2, "Summary," August 2, 2016, accessed January 28, 2021 at <https://www.senate.gov/CRSpubs/f33abcb0-9dfa-45a9-aa02-0b6a06f07023.pdf>.

¹⁷⁷ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, *FY 2021 EPA Budget in Brief*, February 2020, p. 103, accessed December 3, 2020 at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2020-02/documents/fy-2021-epa-bib.pdf>.

¹⁷⁸ "Budget." U.S. Senate: Budget. December 21, 2020. Accessed January 28, 2021 at https://www.senate.gov/reference/reference_index_subjects/Budget_vrd.htm.

¹⁷⁹ "Budget FY 2021 - Appendix, Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2021." Govinfo.gov. February 10, 2020. Accessed January 27, 2021. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/BUDGET-2021-APP/pdf/BUDGET-2021-APP-1-23.pdf>.