

Service Headquarters, 475 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, DC 20260-5360. Copies of all written comments will be available for inspection and photocopying between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, in Room 8430, U.S. Postal Service Headquarters, 475 L'Enfant Plaza W., SW., Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Ms. Cheryl Beller, (202) 268-5166.

Fred Eggleston,

Assistant General Counsel, Legislative Division.

[FR Doc. 86-18889 Filed 8-20-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-12-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[A-9-FRL-3065-8]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Nevada; Las Vegas Valley Post-82 Ozone Plan Revision

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rulemaking.

SUMMARY: EPA is approving the Nevada post 1982 State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision for the Las Vegas Valley ozone (O₃) nonattainment area. The revision has been evaluated against the Clean Air Act and EPA policy for areas with federally approved 1979 SIPs that did not attain the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) by December 1982 and thus were required to revise their SIPs. EPA has found that the SIP revision for the Las Vegas Valley successfully meet Clean Air Act and EPA requirements.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 22, 1986.

ADDRESSES: A copy of today's revision to the Nevada SIP is located at: Public Information Reference Unit, EPA Library, 401 M Street, Washington, DC
The Office of the Federal Register, 1100 "L" Street, NW., Room 8401, Washington DC

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
David P. Howekamp, Director, Air Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, CA 94105. At: Wallace Woo (415) 974-7634.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Clean Air Act (CAA) Amendments of 1977 required states to revise their SIPs by January 1979 for all areas that had not attained the NAAQS. These "1979 SIP revisions" were to provide for attainment of the NAAQS by December 31, 1982. However, EPA

determined at a later date that the Las Vegas Valley would not attain the O₃ NAAQS by December 1982 and on February 3, 1983 (48 FR 49721), EPA proposed to find the SIP inadequate and proposed to impose sanctions. On February 24, 1984 EPA notified the Governor of Nevada that the SIP for Clark County did not adequately provide for attainment of the O₃ standard and called for a revised SIP. On January 11, 1985, the Governor of Nevada submitted the post 1982 Ozone Update of the Las Vegas Valley Air Quality Implementation Plan.

Plan Evaluation

EPA has evaluated this plan submittal and has determined that it satisfied the requirements for a demonstration of the standard by December 31, 1987, and the adoption of all necessary control measures. To address the reasonable further progress requirements, the state has demonstrated that sufficient reductions have occurred to provide for attainment of the O₃ standard. In addition the plan satisfied the following requirements: (1) Adequate evidence of public and governmental involvement; (2) A contingency provision which describes the process for correcting failures to meet reasonable further progress; (3) Procedures to ensure conformance with the SIP for transportation plans, programs, and projects which are approved by the metropolitan planning organization; (4) A commitment to developing, expanding or improving public transportation needs; (5) Enforcement of the existing SIP. EPA has received the projected emissions inventories beyond 1987 submitted by the Clark County Health District, and it has determined that it is consistent with the attainment strategy of the plan. A complete discussion of EPA's evaluation of the plan can be found in the September 9, 1985 FR notice (50 FR 36635).

Public Comment

There were no comments received.

EPA Action

EPA is fully approving the post 1982 Nevada SIP update for the Las Vegas portion of Clark County. The Plan update satisfactorily meets all section 110 and Part D requirements of the Clean Air Act and EPA policy.

Regulatory Process

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

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 October 20, 1986. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements (See 307(b)(2)).

Incorporation by reference of the State Implementation Plan for the State of Nevada was approved by the Director of the Federal Register on July 1, 1982.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Carbon Monoxide.

Dated: August 8, 1986.

Lee M. Thomas,
Administrator.

PART 52—[AMENDED]

Part 52 of Chapter I, Title 40 (40 CFR Part 52) is amended as follows:

Subpart DD—Nevada

1. The authority citation for Part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7642.

2. Section 52.1470 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(33) as follows:

§ 52.1470 Identification of plan.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(33) On January 11, 1985, the following amendments to the plan were submitted by the State.

(i) Incorporation by reference.

(A) Las Vegas Valley Air Quality Implementation Plan, Post 1982 Update for Ozone adopted on October 16, 1984.

(ii) Additional Material.

(A) Emissions Inventory for 1995, transmitted by a letter dated March 14, 1986.

[FR Doc 86-18452 Filed 8-20-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 228

[OW-10-FRL-3067-6]

Ocean Dumping; Final Designation of Sites

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA today designates four existing dredged material disposal sites located offshore of the mouth of the Columbia River, Oregon-Washington, as EPA approved ocean dumping sites for the dumping of dredged material removed from the entrance channel to the Columbia River and other small harbors and channels bordering the lower river. These final site designations are for an indefinite period of time but are subject to continued monitoring in order to insure that adverse environmental impacts do not occur. This action is necessary to provide

acceptable ocean dumping sites for the current and future disposal of this material.

EFFECTIVE DATE: These site designations shall become effective on September 22, 1986.

ADDRESSES: The file supporting this final designation is available for public inspection at the following locations:

EPA Public Information Reference Unit (PIRU), Room 2904 (rear), 401 M Street Southwest, Washington, DC

EPA Region X, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Library, Portland District, 319 Southwest Pine Street, Portland, Oregon

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Pan, 202/475-7131.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

Section 102(c) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended, 33 U.S.C. 1401 *et seq.* ("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 being made pursuant to that authority.

The EPA Ocean Dumping Regulations (40 CFR Chapter I, Subchapter H, section 228.4) state that ocean dumping sites will be designated by promulgation in Part 228. A list of "Approved Interim and Final Ocean Dumping Sites" was published on January 11, 1977 (42 FR 2461 *et seq.*) and was last extended on August 19, 1985 (50 FR 33338 *et seq.*). That list established these sites as interim sites.

B. EIS Development

Section 102(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.* ("NEPA") requires that Federal agencies prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The object of NEPA is to build into agency decision-making processes careful consideration of all environmental aspects of proposed actions. While NEPA does not apply to EPA activities of this type, EPA has voluntarily committed to prepare EISs in connection with ocean dumping site designations such as this. 39 FR 16186 (May 7, 1974).

EPA has prepared a draft and final EIS entitled "Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Mouth of Columbia River Dredged Material Disposal Site Designation." On October 15, 1982, a notice of availability of the draft EIS for public review and comment was published in the **Federal Register** (47 FR 46135). The public comment period on this draft EIS closed November 29, 1982. Twelve reviewers submitted comments on the draft EIS, which the Agency assessed and responded to in the final EIS. Editorial or factual corrections required by the comments were incorporated in the text and noted in the Agency's response. Comments which could not be appropriately treated as text changes were addressed point by point in the final EIS, following the letters of comment.

On April 29, 1983, a notice of availability of the final EIS for public review and comment was published in the **Federal Register** (48 FR 19465). The public comment period on the final EIS closed May 30, 1983. One comment was received on the final EIS which requested a consistency determination under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The states of Washington and Oregon have concurred with EPA's consistency determination. Anyone desiring a copy of the EIS may obtain one from the address given above.

The Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service have concurred with EPA's conclusion that the designation of these disposal areas will not affect the endangered species under their jurisdictions.

This final rulemaking notice fills the same role as the Record of Decision required under regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality for agencies subject to NEPA.

C. Site Designation

On October 2, 1985, EPA proposed designation of these sites for the continuing disposal of dredged materials from the entrance channel to the Columbia River and other small harbors bordering the lower river (50 FR 40274). The public comment period expired on November 18, 1985.

Three letters of comment were received in response to the proposed rule. The Corps of Engineers made several comments correcting facts which have been incorporated into this final rulemaking. Two commentors expressed concern that the use of Site E might adversely affect potential black sand mining operations thus having the effect of curtailing future production of strategic metals. However, the Corps of Engineers in their comments stated that

dredged material disposed of at the site would not be likely to cause a significant increase in the sand overburden at the potential mining site due to the distance between Site E and the potential mining operation. The final EIS indicates that the black sand mining operation is four nautical miles north of Site E. Dredged sediments are typically transported in a northeastward direction onto Peacock Spit, parallel to the beach, although a portion may be transported into the embayments north of the entrance channel but seaward of the main part of the estuary. Based on these findings, it is unlikely that the dredged material disposal would cause a significant increase in sand overburden at the mining site.

All four sites are located between one and six nautical miles from shore near the Columbia River at water depths ranging from 14 to 42 meters. Currently approximately six million cubic yards is dredged annually to maintain the 17-meter channel depths. These ocean sites receive the material dredged from the channel.

Because of the severity of weather conditions in the region, dredging can be conducted only from mid-April to mid-October. The four sites available for dredged material disposal would allow full advantage of the short dredging season and enable greater flexibility for site selection and use when considering the weather conditions, sediment accumulation, vessel traffic and number of hopper dredges operating at the mouth of the river.

The sites are named A, B, E, and F for identification. Site A is located approximately four nautical miles from shore and occupies an area of about 0.27 square nautical miles. Corner coordinates are as follows:

46d 13' 03" N., 124d 06' 17" W.;
46d 12' 50" N., 124d 05' 55" W.;
46d 12' 13" N., 124d 06' 43" W.;
46d 12' 26" N., 124d 07' 05" W.

Site B is located approximately four nautical miles from shore and occupies an area of about 0.25 square nautical miles. Corner coordinates are as follows:

46d 14' 37" N., 124d 10' 34" W.;
46d 13' 53" N., 124d 10' 01" W.;
46d 13' 43" N., 124d 10' 26" W.;
46d 14' 28" N., 124d 10' 59" W.

Site E is located approximately one nautical mile from shore and occupies an area of about 0.08 square nautical miles. Corner coordinates are as follows:

46d 15' 43" N., 124d 05' 21" W.;
46d 15' 36" N., 124d 05' 11" W.;
46d 15' 11" N., 124d 05' 53" W.;
46d 15' 18" N., 124d 06' 03" W.

Site F is located approximately five nautical miles from shore and occupies an area of about 0.08 square nautical miles. Corner coordinates are as follows:

46d 12' 12" N., 124d 09' 00" W.;
46d 12' 00" N., 124d 08' 42" W.;
46d 11' 48" N., 124d 09' 00" W.;
46d 12' 00" N., 124d 09' 18" W.

D. Regulatory Requirements

Five general criteria are used in the selection and approval for continuing use of ocean disposal sites. Sites are selected so as to minimize interference with other marine activities, to keep any temporary perturbations from the dumping from causing impacts outside the disposal site, and to permit effective monitoring to detect any adverse impacts at an early stage. Where feasible, locations off the Continental Shelf are chosen. If at any time disposal operations at a site cause unacceptable adverse impacts, further use of the site will be restricted or terminated. These general criteria are given in Section 228.5 of the EPA Ocean Dumping Regulations, and Section 228.6 lists eleven specific factors used in evaluating a proposed disposal site to assure that the general criteria are met.

The existing sites, as discussed below under the eleven specific factors, are acceptable under these five general criteria except for the preference for sites located off the Continental Shelf. EPA has determined, based on the information presented in the EIS, that no environmental benefit would be obtained by selecting sites off the Continental Shelf instead of those sites in this action. In addition, the increased transit distance and time required for disposal farther offshore would further reduce the effective dredging season already restricted by weather conditions. Historical use of the existing sites has not resulted in substantial adverse effects to living resources of the ocean or to other uses of the marine environment.

The characteristics of the existing sites are reviewed below in terms of the eleven factors.

1. Geographical position, depth of water, bottom topography and distance from coast. [40 CFR 228.6(a)(1)]

Geographical positions and distances from the coast for each existing site are given above. Water depths of sites range from 14 to 42 meters. The bottom topography of the nearshore mouth of the Columbia River region is characterized by a westward trending tidal delta and an elongation of the sand spit caused mainly by disposal at Site B, in the south half of Site B and just offshore from it.

2. Location in relation to breeding, spawning, nursery, feeding, or passage areas of living resources in adult or juvenile phases [40 CFR 228.6(a)(2)]

Breeding, spawning, nursery and/or passage activities of commercially important finfish and shellfish species all occur on a seasonal basis close to the mouth of the Columbia River. The spawning season of the dungeness crab is from December to April. With few crab larvae evident in the plankton after March, the probability that dredged material disposal at the mouth of the Columbia River will interfere with larval survival is small. Similarly, there is small likelihood of interference with the larval and juvenile crab populations on the ocean floor. Due to the mobility of finfish, it is unlikely that disposal operations will interfere with the migrations of commercially important anadromous species.

Twenty years of dumping at the sites has not caused significant or irreversible impacts on living resources. The effects of disposal on demersal fish are apparent temporary decreases in abundance, numbers of species, mean size, and a change in food preference; deposition at the sites in prior years revealed no apparent lasting effect on the diversity and number of finfish. The feeding, breeding, and migratory activities of marine mammals are not significantly affected by dredged material disposal in the area.

3. Location in relation to beaches and other amenity areas. [40 CFR 228.6(a)(3)]

All of the interim sites are close to shore, but only sediment dumped at Site E is likely to reach adjacent beaches. Sediments with median diameters of 0.18 millimeters (e.g., dredged sediments from the entrance channel) may be transported as bedload during winter storms. However, net sediment transport from Sites A, B, and F is northward and generally parallel to the isobaths, at rates of 0.25 nautical miles per year. Therefore, sediments dumped at Sites A, B, or F are not likely to be transported onto adjacent beaches. Dredged material released at Site E is dispersed, and no sediment accumulation has been detected. Previous studies have indicated a probable northeasterly transport of sediments onto Peacock Spit and adjacent beaches, although portions of the material dumped at Site E may move into the embayments north of the entrance channel but seaward of the main portion of the estuary. The material is predominantly clean sand which is suitable for beach nourishment; consequently, transport of dredged materials from Site E should have beneficial effects on local beaches. Furthermore, Washington State Parks Department has requested preferential

use of Site E to retard erosion of the coastal beaches.

4. Types and quantities of wastes proposed to be disposed of, and proposed methods of release, including methods of packing the waste, if any. [40 CFR 228.6(a)(4)]

Dredged sediments from the main entrance and from entrance channels to other small harbors west of Astoria Bridge are the only materials presently dumped at the sites. Dredged materials are 95 to 98 percent sand and comply with the requirements of § 227.13(b) of the Ocean Dumping Regulations. Sediments are transported by a hopper dredge equipped with a subsurface release mechanism and are not packaged in any manner. Disposal volumes average six million cubic yards during each six-month dredging season. The interim sites are close to the dredging sites, and their use will minimize transport time and facilitate a coordinated controlled dumping schedule.

In 1979 approximately 95 percent of the dredged material disposed was released at Site E. However, since deepening the channel to 17 meters in 1984, Site A has received 15–25 percent of the total material dredged; Site B has received 60–65 percent, and Site E has received 15–25 percent. Site F has not been used recently. Other sites can be used to control shoaling caused by eastward transport of sediment from Site E. The quantity of dredged material to be disposed at each site will be determined based upon the physical characteristics of the material and its potential for impact.

Future dredged material volumes may exceed present volumes if the navigational safety of the entrance channel necessitates expanded dredging efforts or if other dredged material is disposed at the site. Any dredged material disposed at the sites must comply with EPA's permit application evaluation criteria for dredged materials in § 227.13 of the Ocean Dumping Regulations (Ocean Dumping Criteria).

5. Feasibility of surveillance and monitoring. [40 CFR 228.6(a)(5)]

The U.S. Coast Guard is not currently carrying out surveillance at the interim sites. However, due to the proximity of the sites to shore, surveillance would not be difficult. Monitoring is not a problem because the sites are close to shore and in shallow water. Prior to and during annual dredging, the Corps of Engineers surveys the entrance channel and bottom topography within the site boundaries and identifies shoaling or mounding areas.

Monitoring by EPA, the Corps of Engineers, and permittees, as required, will continue for as long as the site is

used. Annual bathymetry surveys will be conducted with additional surveys scheduled as needed. If evidence of significant adverse environmental effects is found, EPA will take appropriate steps to limit or terminate dumping at the site. For example, if movement of material appears likely to impact a known resource, analysis of the benthic community or the specific resource will be undertaken.

6. *Dispersal, horizontal transport and vertical mixing characteristics of the area, including prevailing current direction and velocity, if any.* [40 CFR 228.6(a)(6)]

Dredged material is primarily medium to fine grained sand, thus rapid settling of the released sediments occurs with slight horizontal mixing or vertical stratification. Rapid settling precludes persistent changes in the postdisposal suspended sediment concentration. Large waves and tidal currents at Site E may result in a significantly greater horizontal dispersion of released sediments relative to Sites A, B, and F.

Previous studies have demonstrated the relative immobility of dredged sediments dumped at Sites A, B, and F. Large percentages of the dredged sediments released at these sites will remain within the boundaries of the sites; smaller proportions of dredged material move slowly northwards (0.25 nautical miles per year). Dredged materials dumped at Site E during summer are completely eroded during the following winter. Previous studies have indicated a probable northeasterly transport of sediments onto Peacock Spit and adjacent beaches, although portions of the material dumped at Site E may move into the embayments north of the entrance channel but seaward of the main portion of the estuary.

7. *Existence and effects of current and previous discharges and dumping in the area (including cumulative effects).* [40 CFR 228.6(a)(7)]

Studies indicate that disposal of dredged material at the interim sites causes only minor impacts: temporary localized mounding, slight changes in sediment texture, and temporary disturbance of benthic infauna and demersal finfish assemblages. Clean sands dredged from the high-energy entrance channel have not produced any changes in water or sediment quality at the disposal sites.

Although there has been no significant mounding at any site, sediment has accumulated within Site B at a shoaling rate of approximately 3 meters in 20 years. Present water depths range from 22 to 39 meters; therefore, shoaling does not currently present a problem to navigation. Mounds of accumulated

dredged sediments at Site B tend to spread laterally and flatten under the influence of bottom current and wave-induced turbulence.

Disturbances to infauna are caused by direct burial of sessile or slow-moving organisms. Substrate disturbances cause temporary (one to two months) changes in infaunal biomass and diversity. Other benthic species are motile or able to withstand temporary burial. Localized and temporary changes in finfish abundances may result from changes in fish food abundances. Effects on the biota are neither cumulative nor irreversible.

8. *Interference with shipping, fishing, recreation, mineral extraction, desalination, fish and shellfish culture, areas of special scientific importance and other legitimate uses of the ocean.* [40 CFR 228.6(a)(8)]

Extensive shipping, fishing, and recreational activities, in addition to scientific investigations, take place in the vicinity of the interim sites. Minor interferences with these activities may occur; however, dredging personnel can shift disposal operations to another site or temporarily suspend dredging during periods of conflict. Mineral extraction, desalination, and aquaculture activities do not presently occur in the vicinity of the mouth of the Columbia River. A black sand mining operation has been mentioned for a nearshore area four nautical miles north of the North Jetty. Because of the distance between the mining site and Site E, the fact that the dredged material previously released at Site E has not been shown to accumulate, it is unlikely that dredged material disposal would cause a significant increase in the sand overburden at the mining site.

9. *The existing water quality and ecology of the site as determined by available data or by trend assessment or baseline surveys.* 40 CFR 228.6(a)(9)]

Investigations suggest that the disposal of clean sands, dredged from the entrance channel, will have minimal adverse impacts on the water quality or ecology at the sites.

The mouth of the Columbia River is a dynamic, high-energy environment; and water quality parameters (concentrations of dissolved nutrients, trace metals, dissolved oxygen, pH, or turbidity) are influenced by river discharge volumes, tidal cycles, wave conditions, and biological activity.

The distribution of nearshore planktonic communities is both temporally and spatially variable. Phytoplankton communities consist of a diverse assemblage of diatoms and dinoflagellates, with seasonally variable productivities and standing crop.

Zooplankton are dominated by calanoid copepods, gammarid amphipods, cumaceans, and mysids. Smelt, anchovy, right eye flounder, and codfish, which are part of the ichthyoplankton community at certain stages of their life cycle, are dominant.

Releases of dredged material do not produce a persistent turbidity plume, thus decreased light transmission with a concomitant decrease in phytoplankton primary productivity is not expected to occur. In addition, no detectable changes in dissolved nutrients or trace metal concentrations accompany disposal; therefore, no significant adverse impacts on phytoplankton productivity are expected.

Benthic assemblages at the mouth of the Columbia River are abundant, diverse and adapted by sediment type and depth. Polychaetes, crustaceans, and molluscs are the dominant benthic organisms. These benthic organisms could be affected by dredged material disposal, by temporary burial and slight changes in sediment texture. Disposal-related turbidity impacts are improbable because post-disposal, suspended particulate concentrations are not significantly different from pre-disposal concentrations. Subsequent to disposal activities, the sites are repopulated by benthic organisms which either burrow up through the substrate or migrate into the site from adjacent areas. Therefore, effects of dredged material disposal are temporary and do not extend beyond the boundaries of the disposal sites.

10. *Potentiality for the development or recruitment of nuisance species in the disposal site.* [40 CFR 228.6(a)(10)]

Previous surveys at the interim sites did not detect the development or recruitment of nuisance species.

11. *Existence at or in close proximity to the site of any significant natural or cultural features of historical importance.* [40 CFR 228.6(a)(11)]

The Washington State Department of Archaeology is compiling an inventory of cultural and historic resources for the mouth of the Columbia River. Although density of known shipwrecks is high, information about the exact location, historical value, and accessibility of individual wrecks must be compiled. Previous dredged material disposal has reduced the potential for locating or recovering cultural features of historical importance at the interim sites.

By letter of December 15, 1982, the State Office of Archaeology acknowledged that the EIS adequately considered any potential impact on cultural resources, and the precautions to be taken to avoid or mitigate anticipated impacts to identified or

unidentified cultural resources are adequate.

E. Action.

The EIS concludes that the existing sites may appropriately be designated for continuing use. The existing sites are compatible with the criteria used for site selection; designating sites other than the existing sites offers no clear economic advantage or environmental benefit; the existing sites have been historically used without apparent significant adverse environmental effects.

Based on the information reported in the EIS, EPA is designating the four existing mouth of the Columbia River dredged material disposal sites as EPA approved ocean dumping sites for continuing use for the ocean disposal of dredged material where the applicant has demonstrated compliance with EPA's ocean dumping criteria. The EIS is available for inspection at the addresses given above.

The designation of the four existing mouth of the Columbia River dredged material disposal sites as EPA Approved Ocean Dumping Sites is being published as final rulemaking. Management authority of these sites will be delegated to the Regional Administrator of EPA Region X.

One previously interim-designated ocean site, Site G, is not included in this final site designation. Site G was an experimental site where material was dumped in 1974 as part of the Corps of Engineers Dredged Material Research Program study conducted at the mouth of the Columbia River. No material has been deposited there since, and there are no plans to use the site in the future.

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 also evaluate the proposed dumping in accordance with EPA's ocean dumping 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.

F. Regulatory Assessments

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 since the site designation will only have the effect of providing a disposal option 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 rule does not necessitate preparation of a Regulatory Impact Analysis.

This rule does not contain any information collection requirements subject to Office of Management and Budget 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.

Dated: August 7, 1986.

Rebecca W. Hanmer,
Acting Assistant Administrator for Water.

In consideration of the foregoing, Subchapter H of Chapter I of Title 40 is amended as set forth below.

PART 228—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 228 continues to read as follows:

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

2. Section 228.12 is amended by removing paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(E), and adding paragraphs (b) {23}, {24}, {25}, and {26} to read as follows:

§ 228.12 Delegation of management authority for ocean dumping sites.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(23) Mouth of Columbia River Dredged Material Site A—Region X. Location: 46d 13' 03" N., 124d 06' 17" W.; 46d 12' 50" N., 124d 05' 55" W.; 46d 12' 13" N., 124d 06' 43" W.; 46d 12' 26" N., 124d 07' 05" W.

Size: 0.27 square nautical miles.
Depth: Ranges from 14–25 meters.
Primary Use: Dredged material.
Period of Use: Continuing use.

Restriction: Disposal shall be limited to dredged material from the Columbia River entrance channel and adjacent areas.

(24) Mouth of Columbia River Dredged Material Site B—Region X. Location: 46d 14' 37" N., 124d 10' 34" W.; 46d 13' 53" N., 124d 10' 01" W.; 46d 13' 43" N., 124d 10' 26" W.; 46d 14' 28" N., 124d 10' 59" W.

Size: 0.25 square nautical miles.
Depth: Ranges from 24–39 meters.
Primary Use: Dredged material.
Period of Use: Continuing use.

Restriction: Disposal shall be limited to dredged material from the Columbia River entrance channel and adjacent areas.

(25) Mouth of Columbia River Dredged Material Site E—Region X. Location: 46d 15' 43" N., 124d 05' 21" W.; 46d 15' 36" N., 124d 05' 11" W.; 46d 15' 11" N., 124d 05' 53" W.; 46d 15' 18" N., 124d 06' 03" W.

Size: 0.08 square nautical miles.
Depth: Ranges from 16–21 meters.
Primary Use: Dredged material.
Period of Use: Continuing use.

Restriction: Disposal shall be limited to dredged material from the Columbia River entrance channel and adjacent areas.

(26) Mouth of Columbia River Dredged Material Site F—Region X. Location: 46d 12' 12" N., 124d 09' 00" W.; 46d 12' 00" N., 124d 08' 42" W.; 46d 11' 48" N., 124d 09' 00" W.; 46d 12' 00" N., 124d 09' 18" W.

Size: 0.08 square nautical miles.
Depth: Ranges from 38–42 meters.
Primary Use: Dredged material.
Period of Use: Continuing use.

Restriction: Disposal shall be limited to dredged material from the Columbia River entrance channel and adjacent areas.

[FR Doc 86-18753 Filed 8-19-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6580-50-M

40 CFR Part 228

[OW-10-FRL-3067-5]

Ocean Dumping; Final Designation of Sites

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA today designates two existing dredged material disposal sites and one new dredged material disposal site located in the Pacific Ocean offshore of Coos Bay, Oregon, as EPA approved ocean dumping sites for the dumping of material dredged from the bay to maintain navigation channels. These final site designations are for an indefinite period of time but are subject to continued monitoring in order to insure that adverse environmental impact do not occur. The two existing sites (Sites E and F) will be used for disposal of larger grained dredged material, while the new site (Site H) farther offshore will be used for disposal of finer sediments more compatible with sediments of that area. This action is necessary to provide acceptable ocean dumping sites for the current and future disposal of this material.

EFFECTIVE DATE: These site designations shall become effective on September 22, 1986.

ADDRESSES: The file supporting this designation is available for public inspection at the following locations: