

standards (NAAQS) for O<sub>3</sub> and TSP. A review of the air quality data (January 1981 through December 1982) gathered at the ozone monitors in the Columbia area (Lexington and Richland County) shows that the concentration of O<sub>3</sub> in the area has not exceeded the NAAQS for ozone of 0.12 parts per million during the last two calendar years. This improvement is due to the effects of the Federal Motor Vehicle Control Program.

The submittal also contained a request for the redesignation of the Georgetown and Charleston TSP nonattainment areas. EPA reviewed the air quality data collected in the Georgetown nonattainment area during calendar years 1981 and 1982 and determined that the concentrations of TSP in the area had not exceeded the national annual standard of 75 µg/m<sup>3</sup> or the 24-hour standard of 150 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. This improvement is due to the implementation of approved SLP strategies. The data support the redesignation of the Georgetown area.

EPA also reviewed the air quality data collected in the Charleston nonattainment area and determined that the concentrations of TSP in the area, had not exceeded the national standards. However, the Charleston data do not provide evidence that the decrease in the ambient concentration of TSP in the Charleston area is a result of the control strategy applied at Macalloy, the major facility in the area. In fact, the data indicate that the decrease in the ambient concentration of particulates may be a result of lower production rates. Macalloy operated at full capacity for approximately 25% of the period being used in the State's redesignation request (February 1981 through January 1983). Since the attainment request may not adequately and accurately reflect future operating rates, EPA has determined that the submitted air quality data may not be a true representation of the future ambient concentrations in the vicinity and thus do not demonstrate that the area will continue to maintain the NAAQS for TSP. Therefore no action will be taken on the redesignation request for Charleston at this time.

**Action.** EPA today announces the redesignation of that portion of Georgetown County within the southern section of Georgetown as attainment for the primary and secondary total suspended particulate standards and the Columbia area—Lexington and Richland Counties—as attainment for the ozone standard.

This action is being taken without prior proposal because the redesignations are noncontroversial and EPA anticipates no comments on them.

The public should be advised that this action will be effective 60 days from the date of this Federal Register notice. However, if notice is received within 30 days that someone wishes to submit adverse or critical comments, this action will be withdrawn and two subsequent notices will be published before the effective date. One notice will withdraw the final action and another will begin a new rulemaking by announcing a proposal of the action and establishing a comment period.

Under Section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by [60 days from today]. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See 307(b)(2)).

Under 5 U.S.C. 605(b), the Administrator has certified that redesignations do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. (See 46 FR 8709.)

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

**List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 81**

Air pollution control, National parks, Wilderness areas.

(Sec. 107 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7409))

Dated: October 24, 1983.

**William D. Ruckelshaus,**  
Administrator

**PART 81—[AMENDED]**

Part 81 of Chapter I, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, is amended as follows:

**Subpart C—Section 107 Attainment Status Designation**

1. In § 81.341, the attainment status designation table for TSP is amended by removing the first entry for Georgetown County (that portion of Georgetown County within southern section of Georgetown) and by revising the remaining entry for Georgetown County to read as follows:

**§ 81.341 South Carolina.**

**SOUTH CAROLINA—TSP**

Designated area	Does not meet primary standards	Does not meet secondary standards	Cannot be Classified	Better than national standards
Georgetown County				X

**SOUTH CAROLINA—TSP—Continued**

Designated area	Does not meet primary standards	Does not meet secondary standards	Cannot be Classified	Better than national standards

2. In § 81.341, the attainment status designation table for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) is amended by removing the entry for the Columbia area.

[FR Doc. 83-29450 Filed 10-31-83; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-M**

**40 CFR Part 180**

[PP 3E2849/R606; PH-FRL 2449-1]

**Tolerances and Exemptions From Tolerances for Pesticide Chemicals in or on Raw Agricultural Commodities; N, N-Diethyl-2-(1-Naphthalenyloxy) Propionamide**

*Correction*

In FR Doc. 83-27663 appearing on page 46310 in the issue of Wednesday, October 12, 1983, make the following correction: In column three, § 180.328, column two of the table "Parts per million", ".01" should read "0.1"

**BILLING CODE 1505-01-M**

**40 CFR Part 228**

[WH-FRL 2462-7]

**Ocean Dumping; Final Designation of Site**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA today designates an ocean disposal site offshore of Tampa Harbor for a period of three years for the disposal of dredged material. This action is necessary to provide an ocean dumping site for the disposal of dredged material from the Tampa Harbor Project which will permit unrestricted access for interstate and foreign commerce to the Port of Tampa.

**DATE:** This site designation shall become effective December 1, 1983.

**ADDRESSES:** The Environmental Impact statement (EIS) and other material considered in this rulemaking are available for public inspection at the following locations:

EPA Public Information on Reference Unit (PIRU), Room 2404 (rear), 401 M Street, Southwest, Washington, D.C. 20460; and

Tampa-Hillsborough County Public Library, Special Collections  
Department, 900 North Ashley Street,  
Tampa, Florida 33602.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Mr. Jonathan E. Amson, 202/245-3036,  
Criteria and Standards Division, U.S.  
Environmental Protection Agency,  
Washington, D.C. 20460.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Background**

Section 102(c) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, 33 U.S.C. 1401 et seq. (hereinafter "the Act"), gives the Administrator of EPA the authority to designate sites where ocean dumping may be permitted. On September 19, 1980, the Administrator delegated the authority to designate ocean dumping sites to the Assistant Administrator for Water and Waste Management, now the Assistant Administrator for Water. This site designation is made pursuant to that authority.

Under the Act, EPA is today designating a dredged material disposal site in the Tampa Bay area, known as Site 4. This site is approximately 18 nautical miles west of Egmont Key, positioned in a square with corner coordinates as follows:

27°32'27"N., 83°03'46"W.;  
27°30'27"N., 83°03'46"W.;  
27°30'27"N., 83°06'02"W.;  
27°32'27"N., 83°06'02"W.

The site occupies an area of four nautical square miles. Water depths within this area range from 21.8 to 24.1 meters.

In the selection process for dredged material disposal sites in the Tampa Bay area, one of the important factors considered is the absence or minimal presence of hard bottom areas. Hard bottom areas are unsuitable for dredged material disposal because they may contain productive sponge and coral habitats. These habitats may have valuable recreational or commercial uses.

On January 11, 1977, EPA designated two interim sites in the Tampa Bay area for the disposal of dredged material. 42 FR 2461 et seq. One site ("Site A") is located approximately 13 miles west of Egmont Key at the mouth of Tampa Bay; the other site ("Site B") is located approximately 9 miles from Egmont Key. Dredged material was disposed of at Site B from 1969 to 1973; no dredged material has been disposed there since 1973. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("the Corps") disposed of dredged material from a construction dredging project ("the Tampa Harbor Project") at

Site A from June, 1980, until December 24, 1982.

The sites were designated for a three-year period, or until final site designation studies could be completed. On December 9, 1980, the interim designations were renewed until February 1983, pending completion of final site designation studies. 45 FR 81042.

In April 1982, Manatee County sued EPA and the Corps with respect to the interim designation and continuing use of Site A for the disposal of dredged material ("Manatee County v. Gorsuch," 82-248-Civ.-T-GC (M.D. Fla)). On December 21, 1982, the Court enjoined the Corps from disposing of additional dredged material at Site A after December 24, 1982, pending completion of required studies.

The Tampa Harbor Project is a major channel deepening project undertaken by the Corps which will provide deep draft access to parts of the Tampa and Hillsborough Bay system. As of December 24, 1982, the Corps had disposed of approximately 4,936,600 cubic yards of material at Site A from construction phases of the Tampa Harbor Project and two other projects. As a result of the Florida court's decision, the Corps terminated a contract for the dredging and disposal of material from a section of the Tampa Harbor Project, known as "Section 2C (Portion)." Approximately 1,200,000 cubic yards remain to be dredged from Section 2C (Portion). An additional 2,570,000 cubic yards remaining to be dredged from funded portions of the Tampa Harbor Project are not yet under contract.

To avoid delay to, and cost escalation of, the Tampa Harbor Project, EPA proposed to extend the interim designation of Site A for disposal of dredged material from Section 2C (Portion) of the Tampa Harbor Project. 47 FR 44122 (October 6, 1982.) EPA also proposed to designate Site 4 on an interim basis. Following public comment and the decision of the court in the Manatee County case, the Agency has decided not to proceed with the extension of the interim designation of Site A or the interim designation of Site 4. On October 29, 1982, EPA issued a Draft EIS (DEIS) on a proposed dredged material disposal site (Site 4) in the Tampa Bay area (47 FR 49074). On November 8, 1982, the Agency proposed the designation of Site 4 for the continuing disposal of dredged material (47 FR 50524). On September 9, 1983, EPA published a notice of the availability of the Final EIS (48 FR 40780). Today EPA takes final action to designate Site 4.

**II. Site Designation Studies**

Extensive studies have been made regarding the designation of an ocean disposal site for dredged material in the Tampa Bay area. The sites examined and their distances from Egmont Key at the mouth of Tampa Bay, are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

[Nautical miles from Egmont Key]

Site	Location
A (previously designated).....	13
B (previously designated).....	9
SWAS 1 .....	16.5
SWAS 2 .....	13
SWAS 2A .....	14
SWAS 3 .....	24
SWAS 4 .....	18
Control Site .....	19
State Site X .....	27
State Site Y .....	28
State Site Z .....	30

<sup>1</sup> Shallow-water alternative site.

EPA entered into a contract with Interstate Electronics Corporation (IEC) in 1977 for the evaluation of interim-designated sites and the preparation of EIS's. The Corps joined this effort in 1978 by providing financial support, reviews, and consultation. The Tampa Bay interim-designated sites were included in the contractual effort along with a number of other interim-designated ocean dredged material disposal sites (ODMDS).

IEC initiated its studies of the Gulf of Mexico near Tampa Bay in 1979. Initial screening of historical data and information indicated that three general areas should be considered for the location of a permanently-designated ODMDS: Shallow-Water, Mid-Shelf, and Deepwater. The previously designated sites are located in the Shallow-Water area. Based on the initial screening, areas within three miles immediately north and west of the previously designated sites were eliminated from further consideration because of the presence of hard bottom areas and artificial reefs. Waters less than 10m deep also were eliminated because of potential shoaling.

IEC implemented surveys in September-October 1979 and January 1980 on Sites A and B and the immediately surrounding areas, and concluded that those sites might not be the most environmentally acceptable locations for dredged material disposal. IEC recommended that further studies be conducted on potential alternative sites.

In April 1981, Monte Marine Laboratory (MML) of Sarasota, Florida at the request of the Manatee County Board of County Commissioners, began

a study to evaluate the effects of offshore disposal of sediments dredged from Bayboro Harbor, St. Petersburg, Florida. The study was conducted at Site A. The study concluded that partially buried hard bottom habitats were present at the boundaries of the disposal site. Living hard bottom communities, including hard corals, soft corals, and sponges were observed beyond the limit of the disposal site. One of the recommendations of the MML report was that dredged material disposal at Site A be discontinued and efforts be directed toward locating an alternative site(s).

Subsequently, using the Ocean Survey Vessel *Antelope*, EPA performed a reconnaissance survey of potential alternative sites in the Tampa Bay area in October 1981. Using side scan sonar and fathometer tracings provided by IEC, EPA divers observed and photographed the bottoms of Alternative Shallow-Water Sites 1, 2, and 3. Evaluation of the divers' observations and photographs indicated that Alternative Site 1 contained hard bottom outcrops and numerous animal and plant communities. For this reason, Alternative Site 1 was eliminated from further detailed evaluation. Alternative Site 2 was determined to be only marginally acceptable, due to a finger of hard bottom communities extending into the site from the eastern boundary of the site. The western and southern portions of the site consisted of sandy bottoms. Alternative Site 3 appeared to be sandy-bottomed over its entire area.

Based on the results of the reconnaissance survey, more in-depth surveys were planned. In April 1982, the Corps planned and implemented a survey of the area southwest of Alternative Site 2, known as Site 2A. In May 1982, EPA planned and implemented surveys of the two previously designated sites, Alternative Site 3, and an area southwest of Site 2A identified as Alternative Site 4.

The Corps initiated its study in April 1982, and issued a report in May 1982. The report found that Alternative Site 2A was environmentally unacceptable due to the presence of extensive areas of hard-bottom. Based on this finding by the Corps, and on EPA's finding during its reconnaissance survey, Site 2 and 2A were eliminated from further detailed consideration.

The in-depth survey implemented by EPA in May 1982 included videotaping of the bottom of Site A, a transect of the ocean floor between Site A and Shallow-Water Alternative Site 3, and a transect of the ocean floor in a southwest direction from Alternative Site 2A. During the course of the

videotaping, an extensive sandy-bottomed area southwest of Alternative Site 2 was discovered. This area, designated Alternative Site 4, was surveyed in addition to Alternative Site 3, and the two previously designated sites. Site 4 was found to be virtually barren of hard bottom areas or coralline growths over the area examined, which was a videocamera track 2.3 nautical miles in length from the northeast boundary of Site 4, through approximately the center of the site, to the southwest boundary of the site.

Examination of the videotape of Alternative Site 3 revealed many more hard bottom areas than had been found in the reconnaissance survey of October 1981. These new results led to the elimination of Alternative Site 3 from further detailed consideration.

Due in part to the public comments received in response to the Tampa Bay DEIS, EPA planned and implemented another survey in February, March, and April, 1983. This survey examined in intense detail Alternative Site 4, and a Control Site approximately five miles southeast of Alternative Site 4; Sites A and B were examined in lesser detail. The Survey consisted of extensive videotaping of the bottom of Alternative Site 4 and the Control Site, as well as side scan sonar mapping of both sites. Three other sites suggested by the State of Florida, and identified as State Sites X, Y, and Z, at approximate distances of 27, 28, and 30 nmi, respectively, west of Egmont Key, were also examined in briefer detail, with videotape recordings.

The February, March, and April 1983 EPA surveys collected over 35 nautical miles of videotape data within and immediately surrounding Site 4. Twenty-two transects, at approximately one-quarter mile intervals, were run within Site 4, providing an extraordinarily detailed view of the substratum of the site, as well as a full transect around the periphery of the site. In addition, approximately eight nautical miles of transects were run within the Control Site, and approximately two nautical miles of transects were run at each of the State Sites X, Y, and Z.

The videocamera transects revealed that the vast majority of Site 4 has a minimum of hard bottom areas, and is characterized by flat, barren, sandy areas occasionally interspersed with one- to six-inch high sand waves interdigitated with shell hash. No significant hard bottom areas were seen in Site 4; a limited and sparsely populated area of hard bottom was noted in the northwest quadrant of Site 4, running in a roughly northwest-southeast direction. Analysis of the videotape of all of Site 4 demonstrated

that over 83 percent of the area viewed was virtually devoid of any form of coralline or sponge communities; approximately 17 percent of the site had sparsely covered hard bottom areas, and less than one percent of the site could be characterized as densely populated hard bottoms.

State Site Z was found to contain quite dense growths of hard bottom and associated coralline communities; denser coralline growth were seen at State Site Z than any other site surveyed previously in the Tampa Bay area, including the richly diverse and dense patches of coralline growth seen at Shallow-Water Alternative Site 3. Consequently, State Site Z was eliminated from further detailed consideration. State Site Y was characterized by the presence of immense quantities of the invertebrate *Melitta quinquesperforata*, commonly known as sand dollars. At no time during the survey of State Site Y were the sand dollars not seen; the average density was estimated to be over four animals per square meter. This site is apparently a rare and unique biological area, for this phenomenon has not been seen at any other site surveyed previously in the Tampa Bay area. Consequently, State Site Y was eliminated from further detailed consideration. State Site X was also characterized by the presence of sand dollars, although they were not as dense at Site X as at Site Y. Site X had flat uninterrupted sandy bottoms over the entire area examined, and minimal algal patches were seen in the videocamera transects. Although State Site X may be environmentally acceptable for the disposal of dredged material, more site-specific information would have to be obtained on the site to propose a designation for this purpose.

The February, March, and April 1983 surveys also collected data from a towed side scan sonar fish, geochemical and infaunal sediment analyses, and biochemical invertebrate and teleost tissue analyses.

### III. Environmental Impact Statements

A draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) was filed with the EPA Office of Federal Activities on October 22, 1982, and a notice of availability for public review and comment was published in the **Federal Register** on October 29, 1982 (47 FR 49074).

EPA has prepared a "Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Tampa Harbor, Florida Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site Designation." The notice of availability of the FEIS was published in the **Federal Register** on September 9, 1983 (48 FR

40780). This FEIS evaluates the suitability for disposal of material dredged from the Tampa Harbor Project at the two previously designated sites (Sites A and B), as well as at four shallow-water alternative sites (Sites 1, 2, 3, and 4).

The FEIS includes the Agency's assessment of the comments received during the comment period on the DEIS. Comments presenting facts which corrected those in the DEIS were incorporated in the text; those comments which did not require text changes were responded to point by point, in Appendix G of the FEIS.

The FEIS analyzes all pertinent information gathered by EPA from all of its surveys as well as other pertinent information on these sites. Based on the information available to the Agency, Site 4 is an acceptable site from an environmental viewpoint because of its paucity of significant hard bottom areas which may be adversely affected by dredged material disposal.

The FEIS also contains an evaluation of the statutory factors contained in Section 102(a) of the Act, and Section 228.6 of the EPA Ocean Dumping Regulations (40 CFR Part 228). A discussion of the most important of the criteria as applied to Site 4 follows below.

*Location in relation to beaches and other amenity areas.* The nearest developed beaches are 18 nautical miles away; there is little or no recreational diving, sport or commercial fishing, and very limited hard bottom areas which might support sport or commercial fishing.

*Dispersion, horizontal transport, and vertical mixing characteristics of the area, prevailing current direction and velocity, if any.* Dispersion and horizontal transport will occur primarily to the north and south, resulting from wind-induced seasonal currents. Vertical mixing is inhibited only during strong late-summer stratification. Influence from waters flowing out of Tampa Bay is less than at Site A, with sediments less likely than those at Site A to be transported back into the entrance channel.

*Existence and effects of current and previous discharges and dumping in the area.* No disposal has occurred at this site.

*Interference with shipping, fishing, recreation, mineral extraction, desalination, fish and shellfish culture, areas of special scientific importance, and other legitimate uses of the ocean.* No interference is expected with recreational or commercial interests, nor with shipping, mineral extraction,

desalination, fish and shellfish culture, or areas of special scientific importance.

Based on the analysis of these and other factors specified in EPA's regulations, the Agency has decided to designate Site 4 for the disposal of dredged material, for a period of three years. For a more complete discussion of the factors used to evaluate Site 4 and other sites in the area, please refer to Chapter 2 of the FEIS.

#### IV. Public Comment

On November 8, 1982, EPA proposed designation of this site for the continuing disposal of dredged material (47 FR 50524). The public comment period expired on January 3, 1983. Two comments were received in response to the proposed rule.

The first comment was from the Miami law firm representing the Manatee County Board of County Commissioners. The letter stated that Manatee County was opposed to the designation of Site 4 due to the inadequate information available on Site 4. The letter recommended three actions be taken:

- (a) A site-specific survey of Site 4 be performed;
- (b) A public hearing be scheduled to allow for public comment;
- (c) Pending completion of the recommended environmental studies, no ocean disposal be allowed, and no further "interim" designation of ocean disposal sites be made.

The Agency has completed the site-specific studies of Site 4, which have provided an extraordinary amount of information about Site 4, and have shown it to be environmentally acceptable for the disposal of dredged material. The Agency has met with local, State, and Federal officials on January 26, 1983, in Jacksonville; on April 7, 1983, in Bradenton; on April 8, 1983, in Tampa; and on June 27, 1983, in Tampa. The discussions at these meetings allowed for full comment on the issues at hand. Finally, no ocean disposal of dredged material has occurred in the Tampa area since December 24, 1982; there is no intent on the part of the Agency to make any further interim designations of sites for ocean disposal of dredged material.

The second comment was from the Tampa Port Authority (TPA). The letter stated that the TPA supported the proposed designation of Site 4. The letter recommended that additional investigations of Site 4 be made, using either divers or underwater television to confirm the absence or limited presence of hard bottom communities.

As noted previously, the Agency has completed the additional investigations

recommended by the TPA, and these studies have fully confirmed the virtual absence of hard bottom communities throughout the majority of Site 4, and the limited presence of hard bottom areas only in the northwest quadrant of the site.

Based on the above information, EPA is today designating Site 4 for the disposal of dredged material from the Tampa Harbor-Project for a period of three years. Management authority of this site is delegated to the Regional Administrator of EPA Region IV.

The Agency fully intends to carefully monitor the effects of disposal operations at Site 4 to assure that no significant adverse environmental effects occur beyond the boundaries of the site. A monitoring plan, including the necessary parameters and their limits, is presently being developed by representatives of the Agency, the Corps, the TPA, and State and local Florida officials and scientists. This plan will be fully in place prior to the initiation of disposal operations, presently scheduled to begin in January 1984. Should the Agency, through its monitoring of disposal operations at Site 4, find that the dredged material is spreading beyond the limits of Site 4 causing significant adverse environmental effects, it will rapidly move to halt disposal operations until methods can be used to assure that the material remains within the site. Should such containment prove impossible, the EPA will terminate the designation or use of Site 4 and rapidly move toward designation of an environmentally acceptable site.

Further, the Agency has agreed to initiate survey operations with OSV *Antelope* in Fall 1983 to locate another ocean dredged material disposal site approximately 30 miles west of Egmont Key. It is the Agency's intention that complete site-specific studies, an EIS, and completion of rulemaking on a final site designation for this alternative 30-mile site be completed prior to the end of the three-year designation of Site 4.

The Agency expects that the Corps will use the diked disposal areas presently existing in Tampa Bay for the disposal of operational and maintenance dredging. It should be emphasized that, if an ocean dumping site is designated, such a site designation does not constitute or imply EPA's approval of actual disposal of materials at sea. Before ocean dumping of dredged material at the site may commence, the Corps of Engineers must evaluate a permit application according to EPA's ocean dumping criteria. If a Federal project is involved, the Corps must

evaluate the proposed dumping in accordance with those criteria. In either case, EPA has the right to disapprove the actual dumping, if it determines that environmental concerns under the Act have not been met.

The State of Florida has determined that this site designation is consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the State's coastal zone management plan. For any comments by the State of Florida on the DEIS, interested persons should consult the public record, which may be found at the two locations identified in the beginning of this rulemaking.

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, EPA is required to perform a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis for all rules which may have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. EPA has determined that this action will not have a significant impact on small entities. The site designation will only have the effect of providing a disposal site for dredged material. Consequently, this action does not necessitate preparation of a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis.

Under Executive Order 12291, EPA must judge whether a regulation is "major" and therefore subject to the requirement of a Regulatory Impact Analysis. This action will not result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more, or cause any of the other effects which would result in its being classified by the Executive Order as a "major" rule. Consequently, this action does not necessitate preparation of a Regulatory Impact Analysis.

This rule was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for review as required by Executive Order 12291. This rule does not contain any information collection requirements subject to OMB review under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980. 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.

#### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 228

Water pollution control.

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1412 and 1418.

Dated: October 27, 1983.

Rebecca W. Hanmer,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Water

#### PART 228--[AMENDED]

In consideration of the foregoing, Subchapter H of Chapter I of Title 40 is amended by adding paragraph (b)(14) to § 228.12 as follows:

#### § 228.12 Delegation of management authority for ocean disposal sites.

(b) \* \* \*

(14) Tampa Harbor Site 4—Region IV.

Location: 27°32'27"N., 83°03'46"W.;  
27°30'27"N., 83°03'46"W.; 27°30'27"N.,  
83°06'02"W.; 27°32'27"N., 83°06'02"W.

Size: 4 nautical square miles.

Depth: Ranges from 21.8 to 24.1 meters.

Primary Use: Dredged material.

Period of Use: Three years.

Restrictions: Disposal shall be limited to dredged material from the Tampa Harbor Project.

[FR Doc. 83-29719 Filed 11-1-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

#### 40 CFR Part 434

[WH-FRL 2461-5]

#### Coal Mining Point Source Category; Effluent Limitations Guidelines and New Source Performance Standards

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Corrections to the final rule.

**SUMMARY:** On October 13, 1982 EPA promulgated effluent limitations guidelines and standards under the Clean Water Act for the Coal Mining Industrial Category (47 FR 45382). This notice makes various corrections to that final rulemaking which involve typographical, spelling, and wording errors.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Allison Phillips at the Environmental Protection Agency at (202) 382-7167.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Corrections to the October 13, 1982 Rulemaking

Corrections are as follows:

1. On page 45382, column 1, second line of summary; "navigable" is deleted.
2. On page 45382, column 2, line 9 from the bottom; "Regulations" is replaced by "Discharges".
3. On page 45382, column 3, line 3 from the bottom; "to" is replaced by "is".
4. On page 45382, column 2, 16th line from the top; "487-6000" is replaced by "487-4600".
5. On page 45383, column 1, line 29 from the bottom; "(BMOs)" is replaced by "(BMPs)".
6. On page 45384, column 2, line 9 from the top; ")" is added after the word "required".

7. On page 45384, column 2, line 15 from the bottom; "This" is replaced by "These".

8. On page 45385, column 1, line 18 from the bottom; "metal" is replaced by "metals".

9. On page 45385, column 3, line 29 from the top; the comma after "system" is replaced by a period.

10. On page 45836, column 3, line 29 from the bottom; "May 29, 1982" is replaced by "May 29, 1981".

11. On page 45388, column 1, line 30 from the top; "for discharges" is added between "events" and "from".

12. On page 45388, column 2, line 8 from the top; "and" is deleted.

13. On page 45388, column 2, line 10 from the top of footnote 11.; "and" is deleted.

14. On page 45388, column 3, line 28 from the top; "this" is replaced by "these".

15. On page 45388, column 3, line 18 from the bottom; "suggests" is added between "surveyed" and "that".

16. On page 45389, column 1, line 19 from the bottom (not including footnote); "has" is replaced by "have".

17. On page 45389, column 2, line 21 from the bottom; "wordshops" is replaced by "workshops".

18. On page 45389, column 2, line 19 from the top; a comma is inserted after "event" and the words "and three others" is deleted. Lines 20 and 21 from the top are also deleted.

19. On page 45389, column 3, line 7 from the top; "of" is replaced by "or".

20. Page 45390, column 1, line 13 from the bottom; "EPA 440 2-82/006" is replaced by "EPA 440/2-82/006".

21. Page 45390, column 2, line 5 from the top; "were" is replaced by "was".

22. Page 45390, column 3, line 31 from the bottom; "analysis" is replaced by "analyses".

23. Page 45391, column 3, line 8 from the top; "540 R." is replaced by "540 F."

24. Page 45393, column 1, line 29 from the bottom; "Standard" is replaced by "Standards" in the entry for § 434.25 in the table of contents for Part 434.

25. Page 45393, column 2, line 9 from the top; "43.44" is replaced by "434.44" in the table of contents for Part 434.

26. Page 45394, column 1, line 4 from the top; "stope" is replaced by "slope" in § 434.11(j)(1)(ii)(D).

27. Page 45394, column 2, line 16 from the top; "S" is added to the beginning of the line in § 434.22(a).

28. Page 45395, column 1, line 10 from the bottom (not including table);