

plicable implementation plan approved or promulgated under the Clean Air Act and in effect at the time of the issuance of the permit; and (3) result in a violation of any of the provisions of New York's Codes, Rules and Regulations.

The regulation submitted by New York State will allow EPA to revoke the indirect source regulations which EPA promulgated on February 25, 1974 (39 FR 7282) and amended July 9, 1974 (39 FR 25292). In addition, the EPA disapproval of § 201.4 of Part 201 of 6NYCRR will also be revoked. This occurs since Part 201 has been modified and Part 203 replaces Part 201 with regard to the preconstruction review of indirect sources of air pollution.

EPA has completed its review of the adequacy of the proposed revision request and has determined that the New York State regulation is either as stringent or more stringent than the EPA promulgations of February 25 and July 9, 1974. Specifically, the State regulation is more stringent than the EPA regulation in the following way: In New York County, preconstruction review of parking facilities will be required for all new or modified facilities, regardless of size. The EPA review is limited to new facilities having greater than 1,000 spaces and to modifications of facilities of 500 or more spaces.

Section 203.1(a) states that the City of New York has the authority to enforce the requirements of Part 203 in the New York City area. However, the information submitted with the proposed revision request did not contain documentation of the authority under which the City would be able to review indirect sources in accordance with the requirements of Part 203. In addition, the State failed to present a showing of resources which are considered necessary to enforce Part 203. To provide clarification on these points the State of New York, on May 8, 1975, sent to the Region II Office:

(1) A Copy of an order which delegates to the New York City Environmental Protection Administration the authority to enforce Part 203 of 6NYCRR. This order requires the City to report to the State on at least a quarterly basis all applications received and permits to construct, either issued or denied; and

(2) A State stipulation that, in addition to manpower currently assigned for National Environmental Policy Act review of highways, there are five additional people employed in the indirect source review program. Three of these are in the New York City Environmental Protection Administration and the other two are employed by the State.

The Administrator's review of this material has determined that it adequately responds to the issues raised.

On April 4, 1975 (40 FR 15094) EPA announced receipt of the proposed revision to the New York implementation plan and provided the opportunity for a 30-day public comment period on the proposed revision. The public comment period ended on May 4, 1975 with four comments being submitted to the Region II Office. In this notice, it was erroneously mentioned that Part 203 of 6NYCRR

was more stringent than the EPA promulgations with regard to highways and airports since the New York State review included a determination that the national standards for carbon monoxide, photochemical oxidants, and nitrogen oxides would not be contravened while the EPA review was limited to a determination that only the national standard for carbon monoxide and photochemical oxidants would not be contravened. It should be noted that the EPA regulation also provides for review of highways and airports to determine that national standards for nitrogen oxides will not be contravened.

Two of the four comments which were received objected to the proposed revision on the basis that nonstructural modifications of parking facilities are allowed without prior State approval. Changes in operating procedures, such as from self parking to attendant parking, which do not involve physical modifications, but do increase the number of parking spaces, are exempt from review under Part 203. The Administrator has considered this comment and determined that the only facilities which could benefit from this would be those whose operation was begun prior to the effective date of Part 203 which later change to attendant parking. However, the Administrator does not consider this to be a matter of great significance insofar as it does not contradict any of the provisions of the EPA promulgations of February 25 and July 9, 1974.

Another comment recommends a series of regulatory changes clarifying Part 203 easing the burden of complying with the regulation. The Administrator believes that these matters can best be handled through the State's administrative process and that specific regulatory changes should be addressed to New York State rather than EPA for consideration for inclusion in possible future revisions of Part 203. EPA believes that New York State's regulation is clear enough to be enforceable and to give fair notice to those affected by it of the permit requirements. It is not EPA's function under the Clean Air Act to second guess states on draftsmanship unless EPA finds that a regulation is so vague as to be unenforceable or contains fatal loopholes.

The last comment claims that to require that all parking facilities in New York County undergo preconstruction review would not be cost effective. It also suggested that since EPA has not required the review of any parking facility of less than 250 parking spaces (except in Fairbanks, Alaska) the scope of the State's review should be similarly limited. The State of New York believes that the review of all new or modified parking facilities in New York County is warranted in view of the magnitude of the carbon monoxide problem in the City. Moreover, by virtue of sections 110(a) and 116 of the Clean Air Act, EPA has no authority to disapprove state regulations on the ground that they are more stringent than necessary to meet Federal standards.

Effective Date. In view of the fact that New York is already conducting review under its regulation and that it will serve

no useful purpose to defer the effectiveness of this approval for 30 days, the Administrator hereby finds good cause for making this rulemaking effective immediately.

(42 U.S.C. 1857c-5 and 9)

Dated: September 8, 1975.

JOHN QUARLES,
Acting Administrator.

Part 52 of Chapter I, Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

Subpart HH—New York

1. In § 52.1670, paragraph (c) is amended by revising subparagraph (3) as follows:

§ 52.1670 Identification of Plan.

(c)

(3) October 26, 1973, November 27, 1973, January 17, 1974, August 29, 1974, October 11, 1974, December 6, 1974, January 27, 1975, February 25, 1975, May 8, 1975.

§ 52.1680 [Revoked]

2. Section 52.1680 is revoked.

[FR Doc. 75-24361 Filed 9-12-75; 8:45 am]

SUBCHAPTER N—EFFLUENT GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS

[FRL 430-7]

PART 435—OFFSHORE SEGMENT OF THE OIL AND GAS EXTRACTION POINT SOURCE CATEGORY

Notice of Interim Final Rule Making

Notice is hereby given that effluent limitations and guidelines for existing sources to be achieved by the application of best practicable control technology currently available as set forth in interim final form below are promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The regulation set forth below establishes Part 435—oil and gas extraction point source category and will be applicable to existing sources for the near-offshore subcategory (Subpart A), and the far-offshore subcategory (Subpart B) of the offshore segment of the oil and gas extraction point source category pursuant to sections 301, 304 (b) and (c), of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1251, 1311, 1314 (b) and (c), 86 Stat. 816 et seq.; Pub. L. 92-500) (the Act). Simultaneously, the Agency is publishing in proposed form effluent limitations and guidelines for existing sources to be achieved by the application of best available technology economically achievable, standards of performance for new point sources and pretreatment standards for existing sources and for new sources.

(a) Legal authority.

(1) Existing point sources.

Section 301(b) of the Act requires the achievement by not later than July 1, 1977, of effluent limitations for point sources, other than publicly owned treatment works, which require the application of the best practicable control technology currently available as defined by the Administrator pursuant to section

304(b) of the Act. Section 301(b) also requires the achievement by not later than July 1, 1983, of effluent limitations for point sources, other than publicly owned treatment works, which require the application of best available technology economically achievable which will result in reasonable further progress toward the national goal of eliminating the discharge of all pollutants, as determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Administrator pursuant to section 304(b) of the Act.

Section 304(b) of the Act requires the Administrator to publish regulations providing guidelines for effluent limitations setting forth the degree of effluent reduction attainable through the application of the best practicable control technology currently available and the degree of effluent reduction attainable through the application of the best control measures and practices achievable including treatment techniques, process and procedural innovations, operating methods and other alternatives. The regulation herein sets forth effluent limitations and guidelines, pursuant to sections 301 and 304(b) of the Act, for the near-offshore subcategory (Subpart A), and the far-offshore subcategory (Subpart B) of the offshore segment of the oil and gas extraction point source category.

Section 304(c) of the Act requires the Administrator to issue to the States and appropriate water pollution control agencies information on the processes, procedures or operating methods which result in the elimination or reduction of the discharge of pollutants to implement standards of performance under section 306 of the Act. The report or "Development Document" referred to below provides, pursuant to section 304(c) of the Act, information on such processes, procedures or operating methods.

(2) New sources.

Section 306 of the Act requires the achievement by new sources of a Federal standard of performance providing for the control of the discharge of pollutants which reflects the greatest degree of effluent reduction which the Administrator determines to be achievable through application of the best available demonstrated control technology, processes, operating methods, or other alternatives, including, where practicable, a standard permitting no discharge of pollutants.

Section 306 also requires the Administrator to propose regulations establishing Federal standards of performance for categories of new sources included in a list published pursuant to section 306 of the Act. The regulations proposed herein set forth the standards of performance applicable to new sources for the near-offshore subcategory (Subpart A), and the far-offshore subcategory (Subpart B) of the offshore segment of the oil and gas extraction point source category.

Section 307(b) of the Act requires the establishment of pretreatment standards for pollutants introduced into publicly owned treatment works and 40 CFR 128 establishes that the Agency will propose specific pretreatment standards at the

time effluent limitations are established for point source discharges.

Section 307(c) of the Act requires the Administrator to promulgate pretreatment standards for new sources at the same time that standards of performance for new sources are promulgated pursuant to section 306. In another section of the FEDERAL REGISTER regulations are proposed in fulfillment of these requirements.

(b) Summary and basis of interim final effluent limitations and guidelines for existing sources, proposed effluent limitations and guidelines for existing sources to be achieved by the application of the best available technology economically achievable, proposed standards of performance for new sources, and proposed pretreatment standards for both new and existing sources.

(1) General methodology.

The effluent limitations and guidelines set forth herein were developed in the following manner. The point source category was first studied for the purpose of determining whether separate limitations are appropriate for different segments within the category. This analysis included a determination of whether differences in raw material used, product produced, manufacturing process employed, age, size, waste water constituents and other factors require development of separate limitations for different segments of the point source category. The raw waste characteristics for each such segment were then identified. This included an analysis of the source, flow and volume of water used in the process employed, the sources of waste and waste waters in the operation and the constituents of all waste water. The constituents of the waste waters which should be subject to effluent limitations were identified.

The control and treatment technologies existing within each segment were identified. This included an identification of each distinct control and treatment technology, including both in-plant and end-of-process technologies, which is existent or capable of being designed for each segment. It also included an identification of, in terms of the amount of constituents and the chemical, physical, and biological characteristics of pollutants, the effluent level resulting from the application of each of the technologies. The problems, limitations and reliability of each treatment and control technology were also identified. In addition, the nonwater quality environmental impact, such as the effects of the application of such technologies upon other pollution problems, including air, solid waste, noise and radiation were identified. The energy requirements of each control and treatment technology were determined as well as the cost of the application of such technologies.

The information, as outlined above, was then evaluated in order to determine what levels of technology constitute the "best practicable control technology currently available." In identifying such technologies, various factors

were considered. These included the total cost of application of technology in relation to the effluent reduction benefits to be achieved from such application, the age of equipment and facilities involved, the process employed, the engineering aspects of the application of various types of control techniques, process changes, nonwater quality environmental impact (including energy requirements) and other factors.

The data upon which the above analysis was performed included EPA permit applications, EPA sampling and inspections, consultant reports, and industry submissions.

(2) Summary of conclusions with respect to the near-offshore subcategory (Subpart A), and the far-offshore subcategory (Subpart B), of the offshore segment of the oil and gas extraction point source category.

(i) Categorization.

For the purpose of studying waste treatment and effluent limitations, the offshore segment of the oil and gas extraction point source category was divided into two discrete subcategories. These subcategories were primarily based on considerations of (1) geographic location; (2) type of facility; and (3) waste water characteristics and treatability as outlined in the Development Document for the Offshore Segment of the Oil and Gas Extraction Industry Point Source Category. These subcategories are defined as:

(1) Subpart A—Near-Offshore Subcategory. This subcategory includes those offshore facilities within State waters engaged in the production, field exploration, drilling, well completions and well treatment of the oil and gas extraction industry.

(2) Subpart B—Far-Offshore Subcategory. This subcategory includes those offshore facilities within Federal waters engaged in the production, field exploration, drilling, well completions and well treatment of the oil and gas extraction industry.

A preliminary evaluation of the initial economic impact analysis, indicates that the draft recommendations for no discharge effluent limitations may not be justified for all onshore facilities. Therefore, a new level of best practicable control technology currently available must be defined, costed, and a subsequent economic impact analysis must be performed for onshore facilities. As a result of the stringent court ordered dates requiring promulgation of effluent limitations for this industry, sufficient time was not available to perform the above mentioned redefinition, costing and economic analysis. Consequently, the effluent limitations guidelines for the onshore segment of the oil and gas extraction point source category will be published by the Agency at a later date.

(ii) Waste characteristics.

The major pollutant parameters in the waste waters resulting from the oil and gas extraction industry are oil and grease, residual chlorine, and floating solids. The water insoluble hydrocarbons

and free floating emulsified oils in the waste water will effect the aquatic flora and fauna by interfering with oxygen transfer, coating bottom fauna and fish spawning grounds, damaging the plumage and coats of water fowl and animals, by adhering to the gills of fish, and by causing taste and toxicity problems. Thus, due to the significant impact of oil and grease upon aquatic systems and existence of technologically and economically viable treatment systems, effluent limitations have been developed to control this pollutant parameter. Residual chlorine concentrations are directly correlatable to fecal coliform bacteria counts in the sanitary wastes generated on offshore facilities. Fecal coliform bacteria concentrations serve as an indication of the pathogenetic potential of water resulting from the disposal of human wastes. Compliance with residual chlorine limitations is readily achieved through the proper control of waste water chlorinators. Floating solids are primarily the result of discharges from domestic and sanitary wastes from manned and intermittently manned offshore facilities. These pollutants may settle to form detrimental deposits or they may continue to float and produce objectionable odors. The technologies and "good-housekeeping" practices necessary to control floating solids are readily available.

Interim final effluent limitation guidelines achievable through the application of the best practicable control technology currently available are established below to control each of the above pollutants. No limitations have been established for several other existing waste water pollutants because: they occur in insignificant quantities; the technology is not presently available to control the pollutant discharge; the benefit derived from removal of the pollutants does not justify the high treatment costs; or available data indicates they are normally reduced incidentally with the removal or reduction of a limited pollutant parameter.

(iii) Origin of waste water pollutants in the offshore segment of the oil and gas extraction category (1) Subpart A—Near-Offshore Subcategory. The waste waters generated in this subcategory are the result of eight separate sources. These sources are: produced water; deck drainage; drilling muds; drill cuttings; well treatment; sanitary; domestic; and produced sands. Produced waters are those waste waters generated when the natural oil-water or gas-water interfaces within the oil-gas bearing formations are disrupted. Deck drainage includes all waste resulting from platform washings, deck washings, and run-off from curbs, gutters, and drains including drip pans and work areas. Drilling muds are those materials used to maintain hydrostatic pressure control in the well, lubricate the drilling bit, remove drill cuttings from the well, or stabilize the walls of the well during drilling or workover. Drill cuttings wastes contain metallic and mineral particles resulting from drilling into subsurface geologic formations. Drill

cuttings are brought to the surface of the well with the drilling muds and then separated from the muds. Well treatment wastes result from acidizing and hydraulic fracturing to improve oil recovery. Sanitary wastes includes human body wastes discharged from toilets and urinals on board the platforms. Domestic wastes are those wastes discharged from sinks, showers, laundries, and galleys. Produced sands wastes consist of the slurried particles used in hydraulic fracturing and of the accumulated formation sands generated during production.

The controlled pollutant for all waste water sources except sanitary and domestic wastes is oil and grease. For the sanitary wastes and domestic wastes sources only residual chlorine and floating solids will be limited respectively.

(2) Subpart B—Far-Offshore Subcategory. The waste water pollutant sources for this subcategory are the same as those outlined above for the near-offshore subcategory. The pollutants limited for this subcategory are, again, the same as those limited for the near-offshore facilities.

(iv) Treatment and control technology.

Waste water treatment and control technologies have been studied for each subcategory of the industry to determine what is the best practicable control technology currently available.

The major source of waste waters generated by offshore facilities are produced waters. These produced waters account for 0 to 99 percent of the total volume of fluids produced. This extreme fluctuation of flow volumes of produced waters is dependent on natural phenomena and is not subject to process controls. Consequently, the effluent limitations guidelines for the offshore segment of the oil and gas extraction industry are concentration based as opposed to a mass per unit production basis.

(1) Treatment in the Near-Offshore Subcategory. Several technologies have been identified as the best practicable control technology currently available. The determination of which technology is to be applied to meet these interim final limitations is dependent upon the source of the waste water within this subcategory. For those waste waters originating from produced water sources or deck drainage sources, any of the following treatment technologies may be employed to achieve these interim final limitations: gas flotation; parallel plate coalescers; loose or fibrous media filter systems; or gravity separation. The drilling muds and drill cuttings may be discharged if they are water based and their discharge does not result in free oil on the surface waters. Muds and cuttings that are oil based may not be discharged. Well treatment waste waters are typically combined with other waste streams entering the waste water treatment system. This waste may not be discharged without treatment. Sanitary wastes from platforms manned continuously by ten or more personnel will be required to maintain a residual chlorine concentration as close to 1 mg/l as possible. This is

easily achieved by the introduction of either dry or gaseous chlorine in flow dependent amounts. Sanitary wastes from platforms manned by 9 or less persons or from platforms that are intermittently manned must prevent the discharge of floating solids. This may be accomplished by the use of screening devices, shredders or similar devices. Produced sand wastes must be treated by solvent washes or other oil removal processes to prevent the discharge of free oil to surface waters or disposed of on-shore.

Oil and gas extraction facilities in the near-offshore subcategory have the option of piping their waste waters to on-shore treatment facilities. In many cases this method of treating wastes will be preferable to treatment on the near-offshore facility.

The 1983 best available technology economically achievable limitations and the new source performance standards will require no discharge of waste water pollutants to navigable waters for wastes generated by produced water sources of this subcategory. This will generally require subsurface disposal technologies. In those cases where the produced waters are needed for pressure maintenance the produced waters may be reinjected into the original formation. If the produced waters are either incompatible or are not needed they must be injected into formations other than their place of origin. When deep-well injection is chosen as the method of disposal adequate precautions must be taken to prevent the horizontal or vertical migration of pollutants. Alternative technologies include discharge to lined pits, ponds, or reservoirs for evaporation, and disposal by commercial waste collectors.

(2) Treatment in the Far-Offshore Subcategory. The waste water sources, characteristics, and treatment technologies associated with best practicable control technology currently available for this subcategory are identical, with one exception, to those described for the near offshore category. The exception to the above is that far-offshore facilities generally are not capable of piping their wastes to onshore treatment facilities.

To comply with the best available technology economically achievable limitations and with the new source performance standards no new or additional treatment technology should be necessary for this subcategory. It is expected that during the next eight years adequate experience and expertise will be acquired to allow higher, more efficient pollutant removals employing the same technologies. New sources can design and integrate waste treatment systems into the plant operation prior to construction. This reduces many problems inherent with "add-on-end-of-pipe" treatment systems and thus results in achievement of higher pollutant removal efficiencies.

Solid waste control must be considered. Best practicable control technology as known today, requires disposal of the pollutants removed from waste waters in this industry in the form of solid wastes and liquid concentrates. In most cases these are nonhazardous substances re-

quiring only minimal custodial care. However, some constituents may be hazardous and may require special consideration. In order to insure long-term protection of the environment from these hazardous or harmful constituents, special consideration of disposal sites must be made. All landfill sites where such hazardous wastes are disposed should be selected so as to prevent horizontal and vertical migration of these contaminants to ground or surface waters. In cases where geologic conditions may not reasonably ensure this, adequate legal and mechanical precautions (e.g. impervious liners) should be taken to ensure long term protection to the environment from hazardous materials. Where appropriate, the location of solid hazardous materials disposal sites should be permanently recorded in the appropriate office of legal jurisdiction.

The application of best practical control technology currently available results in no additional solid waste disposal problems. That may not be properly disposed by practices currently employed by the industry.

(v) Cost estimates for control of waste water pollutants.

The costs for providing in-plant controls are largely those associated with capital investment for process and equipment modifications. The capital investment costs for compliance with the 1977 limitations for the offshore segment of the oil and gas extraction industry range from approximately 68.0 to 148.9 million dollars. The operating and maintenance costs associated with these capital costs are estimated to vary from 6.0 to 12.3 million dollars.

The costs associated with end-of-pipe treatment to comply with 1983 limitations include amortization of capital investments over a 10 year period, debt servicing, and operation and maintenance. The 1983 limitations will require an estimated 61.8-68.5 million dollars of capital investment and an estimated 6.3 million dollars increase in annual operation and maintenance costs.

(vi) Energy requirements and non-water quality environmental impacts.

Energy requirements for this industrial category to comply with these interim final regulations by the application of best practicable control technology currently available are approximately 120,000 KWH/day. This is approximately equivalent to 391 barrels of crude per day or 0.03 percent of the total crude produced by offshore facilities.

These energy requirements are due primarily to the need for additional electrical power generation equipment and will generally be consumed in the form of diesel fuel.

The application of best practicable control technology will result in a net energy savings of 25 percent. This is a direct result of the 1.4 barrels of crude recovered by the treatment system for every one barrel of diesel fuel used.

The energy requirements for compliance with best available technology economically achievable limitations are estimated to be approximately 5400 barrels

of crude per day or 1,700,000 KWH per day. This represents 0.54 percent of the total estimated crude production from existing sources expected in 1983. These energy requirements assume that there will be a 20 percent reduction in crude production from 1977 levels and that all produced waters from near-offshore facilities will go to subsurface disposal. More probably some portion of the produced water wastes will be used in secondary recovery. A net recovery of approximately 1100 barrels per day of crude from the treatment systems has been assumed in the determination of these energy requirements.

It is estimated that compliance with the new source performance standards will require considerably less energy than that needed to achieve the 1983 best achievable technology limitations. This estimate is based on the assumption that much less raw waste water volume will be generated from new formations and the same treatment technologies will be employed.

A minimal impact is expected for solid waste disposal from offshore facilities. The collection, and subsequent transport to shore of oily sand, silt, and clays from the addition of desanding units, where appropriate, will generate a possible need for additional approved land disposal sites. There are no known radioactive substances used in the industry other than as integral components of certain instruments, such as well-logging instruments. Therefore, no radiation problems are expected. Noise levels will not be increased except in those cases where additional power generating equipment must be added to an offshore facility. The only possible source of air pollution would result from the above mentioned additional power generation equipment.

(vii) Economic impact analysis.

Estimated internal costs for existing sources in millions of dollars

Region	1977		1983	
	Investment	Operating	Investment	Operating
Gulfcoast.....	\$63.8-\$144.7	\$5.0-\$12.4	\$40.7-\$50.4	\$3.2
Alaska.....	4.2	.4	12.1	1.1
Total.....	68.0-148.9	6.0-12.8	61.8-68.5	6.3

The investment and operating costs for a new source should be similar to the cost for an existing source, though the investment cost may be somewhat lower since prior planning would alleviate the cost of acquiring additional space that some existing sources must cope with.

External costs are assessed in terms of the effect which the increase in internal costs will have on prices, employment, communities and regions, international trade, closures of existing facilities, and production.

Effect on Prices: A projection of the price effect, if any, that might be expected given the investment and operating costs of compliance is difficult since a major change in the regulation of oil, and possibly of gas, seems likely at this time. Nonetheless, prices of uncontrolled oil and gas output can be expected to be

This summary of the economic impact of the effluent limitation guidelines is based largely on the report entitled "Economic Analysis of Proposed and Interim Final Effluent Guidelines of the Offshore Oil and Gas Producing Industry." The internal and external costs of compliance with the guidelines are considered acceptable. (Data presented in this section is in 1974 dollars and, unless otherwise indicated, encompasses the industry's petroleum and gas operations in both Federal and State waters.)

Internal costs are defined as the increase in investment and annual operating costs for the industry as a whole that will occur as a result of the guidelines. For existing operations, the 1977 standards will require an estimated \$68.0-\$148.9 million of investment and an estimated \$6.0-\$12.8 million initial increase in annual operating costs; the 1983 guidelines will require an estimated \$61.8-\$68.5 million of investment and an estimated \$6.3 million initial increase in annual operating costs. The annual operating costs for existing sources should decline over time as producing units reach the end of their economic life and are shut-in.

Estimates of the total internal costs for existing sources were derived from an analysis of the industry's three producing regions. The estimated internal costs for two of these regions, the Gulf Coast and off-shore Alaska, are shown below in tabular form. A range of costs is shown for the Gulf Coast; the range indicates how the investment and initial annual operating costs can be expected to change in response to change in a critical parameter, i.e. price, decline rate, or cost of capital. Only a point estimate is available for Alaska at this time. The third region, off-shore California, is not shown since the guidelines will have virtually no impact on operations in this area.

unaffected by the costs of compliance with the proposed regulations; these prices will move with world oil and gas prices. Thus, in the event of total decontrol, no increase in prices would be expected to result from the added pollution control costs. In the event that some form of control is perpetuated, price increases on the proportion of output that is controlled might be allowed by the regulatory authorities.

Prices of interstate gas are currently regulated. Assuming continued regulation, the increased costs of producing interstate gas would probably be recovered; however, in terms of total U.S. gas production this would probably constitute a price increase of less than one-third of one percent. Similarly, if prices of old oil continue to be controlled and one assumes that the regulatory authorities

would allow full cost recovery, then in terms of total U.S. oil consumption the price of oil might increase by a few cents a barrel. However, because of the uncertain regulatory environment, a "worst case" assumption—that producers will have to absorb all costs of compliance—has been made in estimating the impact on production.

Effect on Well Abandonment and Foregone Production: In the Gulf, less than 0.2% of existing well completions could be abandoned in 1977 as a result of the increased costs of pollution abatement, while in 1983 an estimated 0.9%–1.5% of existing completions could be abandoned. However, the economic impact of the effluent limitation guidelines is best shown by data on the loss in potential production, not by the percentage of abandoned completions, for two reasons. First, any of the abandoned completions are already near the end of their producing life, and, second, Gulf production losses result almost entirely from a decrease in producing life due to increased operating costs rather than from shut-ins precipitated by 1977 or 1983 investment requirements. Since the losses in production occur at the end of producing life, most of the losses will be significantly deferred beyond 1983 and spread over many years. For existing sources in the Gulf of Mexico, the loss in potential production is estimated as 0.6%–1.2% (14.0–27.8 million BBL) for oil and 0.3%–1.0% (81.4–249.4 million MCF) for gas.

Assuming that the costs of operating off-shore Alaska are similar to the Gulf, no abandonments are projected for Alaska in either 1977 or 1983. The loss in potential production is estimated as .8% (2.26 million BBL) for oil and .8% (2.44 million MCF) for gas. However, the costs of operating in Alaska may be significantly higher than in the Gulf. Assuming that costs are three times as high, the estimated loss in potential production would increase to 2.4% (6.8 million BBL) for oil and 2.7% (7.0 million MCF) for gas. Due to uncertainties about the costs of operating off-shore Alaska, the Agency will be reviewing its Economic Impact Analysis for this area and would be particularly interested in receiving comments on this point, especially cost data.

The impact on new sources is difficult to estimate since energy needs and the returns associated with developing and operating a new source may change dramatically over the next several decades. Moreover, by 1985 only a small proportion of off-shore oil is expected to come from state waters; new off-shore production is expected to occur principally in federal waters. However, an indication of the likely impact on new sources might be obtained by examining the impact on existing Gulf sources in federal waters where the loss in potential production for oil is estimated at .5%–1.0% and the loss in potential production for gas is estimated at 0.3%–0.85%. For a new source these ranges would be expected to be even lower since new wells should, on average, have a larger potential production than existing wells that have been

worked for a number of years. Moreover, the deferral of production losses discussed in connection with existing sources in the Gulf should be even more pronounced for a new source that has yet to begin a longer expected production life.

Other Effects: The impact on the balance of payments will be adverse. Assuming a world price of \$11/BBL for oil and \$2/MCF for gas an outflow of less than \$30 MM is expected through 1985 however. No significant employment or community impacts are anticipated.

The report entitled "Development Document for Interim Final Effluent Limitations Guidelines and New Source Performance Standards for the Offshore Segment of the Oil and Gas Extraction Point Source Category" details the analysis undertaken in support of the interim final regulation set forth herein and is available for inspection in the EPA Freedom of Information Center, Room 204, West Tower, Waterside Mall, Washington, D.C., at all EPA regional offices, and at State water pollution control offices. A supplementary analysis prepared for EPA of the possible economic effects of the regulation is also available for inspection at these locations. Copies of both of these documents are being sent to persons or institutions affected by the proposed regulation or who have placed themselves on a mailing list for this purpose (see EPA's Advance Notice of Public Review Procedures, 38 FR 21202, August 6, 1973). An additional limited number of copies of both reports are available. Persons wishing to obtain a copy may write the EPA Office of Public Affairs, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460, Attention: Ms. Ruth Brown, A-107.

When this regulation is promulgated in final rather than interim form, revised copies of the Development Document will be available from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Copies of the economic analysis document will be available through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22151.

(c) Summary of public participation. Prior to this publication, the agencies and groups listed below were consulted and given an opportunity to participate in the development of effluent limitations, guidelines and standards proposed for the offshore segment of the oil and gas extraction category. All participating agencies have been informed of project developments. An initial draft of the Development Document was sent to all participants and comments were solicited on that report. The following are the principal agencies and groups consulted: (1) Effluent Standards and Water Quality Information Advisory Committee (established under section 515 of the Act); (2) all State and U.S. Territory Pollution Control Agencies; (3) Exxon Chemical Corporation; (4) Nalco Chemical Company; (5) Phillips Petroleum Company; (6) Oil Operators, Inc.; (7) Sun Oil Company; (8) Petrolite Corporation; (9) Enviro-tech Corporation; (10) Pollution Control Engineering,

Inc.; (11) Marathon Oil Company; (12) Mobil Oil Company; (13) Champlain Petroleum Company; (14) Brown & Root, Inc.; (15) Western Oil & Gas Association; (16) American Society of Mechanical Engineers; (17) The Conservation Foundation; (18) Businessmen for the Public Interest; (19) Environmental Defense Fund, Inc.; (20) Natural Resources Defense Council; (21) American Society for Civil Engineers; (22) Water Pollution Control Federation; (23) National Wildlife Federation; and (24) Kimberly Clark Corporation; (25) Offshore Operators Committee; (26) Exxon Company, U.S.A.; (27) American Petroleum Institute; (28) American Oil Company; (29) Atlantic Richfield Company; (30) Chevron Oil Company; (31) Continental Oil Company; (32) Gulf Oil Company; (33) Noble Drilling Company; (34) Rheem Superior; (35) Shell Oil Company; (36) Texaco, Inc.; (37) United States Filter; (38) Union Filter Company; (39) WEMCO.

The following responded with comments: Marathon Oil Company; Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association; American Petroleum Institute; South Texas Section, A.I. Ch. E.; Offshore Operators Committee; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Shell Oil; Getty Oil Company; Petrolite Corporation-Tretolite Division; Sun Oil Company; Atlantic Richfield Company; Exxon Company, U.S.A.; Colorado Department of Health; Western Oil & Gas Association; Illinois Environmental Protection Agency; North Carolina Department of Natural and Economic Resources; State of Michigan, Department of Natural Resources; Texaco; U.S. Department of the Interior; U.S. Department of Commerce; State of Alaska, Department of Environmental Conservation; Effluent Standards and Water Quality Information Advisory Committee; Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality; Wyoming Environmental Institute; Powder River Basin Resource Council—Buffalo, Wyoming; Wyoming Game and Fish Department; and Wyoming State League of Women Voters.

The primary issues raised in the development of the interim final effluent limitations and guidelines and the treatment of these issues herein are as follows:

(1) A common criticism was that in defining BPCT for continuously manned facilities with ten or more people, provisions be made for the use of other satisfactory methods of treatment, besides biological waste treatment systems, that may be available in the future.

The treatment systems used do not have to be biological. Any type of system may be used, as long as it meets the residual chlorine limits.

(2) One commenter suggested that the residual chlorine should be specified to be a minimum of 1 mg/l and maintained as close to this concentration as possible.

It is recognized that the disinfection technique used on offshore platforms is not as sophisticated and doesn't have the control capabilities of the units used in large municipal plants. For this reason,

the limitation has been changed to greater than 1 ppm and as close to this concentration as possible.

(3) One commenter recommended that chlorine residual monitoring frequency be changed from daily to monthly.

This regulation does not set monitoring requirements. Any requirements of this kind are set out in individual permits.

(4) One commenter recommended that the 204B colorimetric method, given on page 385 in Standards Method, be adopted for monitoring the chlorine residual for offshore operations.

The specification of analytical methods is not within the scope of this regulation.

(5) One commenter suggested that the EPA adopt a NPDES permit compliance monitoring frequency for produced water discharges no greater than four samples in a 24 hour period each month.

The daily maximum limit for oil and grease is based on composite sampling (e.g., 4 samples taken over a 24 hour period, analyzed separately and the 4 results averaged) and the maximum monthly average is based on weekly composite sampling. However, the monitoring requirements will be fixed in the individual permits.

(6) One commenter recommended that effluent limitations guidelines consistent with BPCTCA be promulgated for BAT and as a standard of performance for new sources.

Based on the evaluation of existing technologies, the cost of implementing these technologies, and other factors, the limitations have been changed to reflect improved operation and experience with continued discharge for the far-offshore subcategory and remains no discharge of produced water for near-offshore.

(7) One commenter recommends deletion of the 7 day performance test of each sanitary treatment system on initial installation, on major modification, or as an annual requirement. The commenter states that performance tests are run but may take greater than or less than 7 days.

This has been eliminated as part of the regulation, but it is recommended that some sort of performance testing be required in the NPDES permit. The determination of frequency and test interval should be on a case by case basis.

(8) One commenter wants a distinction to be made between the 2 possible types of deck drainage: one that becomes contaminated with oil and one that is kept essentially free from oil contamination. No treatment should be required for the latter.

There is no distinction made between types of deck drainage. If they are not contaminated they can meet the limitation without treatment. The contaminated deck drainage will require treatment to meet the limitation.

(9) One commenter suggested that elimination of detergents from deck washdowns could reduce water treatment system upsets. However, there is no other way to effectively clean decks. Clean

decks are necessary to eliminate fire and safety hazards.

The intent of the regulation was not the elimination of detergents but the discriminant use thereof. There exist alternate methods of deck cleaning (e.g. steam or solvent). EPA, in its field investigations, has seen exceptionally well maintained platforms where neither solvents nor detergents are used.

(10) One commenter stated that storm water runoff should be exempt from subsurface disposal provided that it is segregated from oily waste sources.

It is agreed that this should be the case and the regulation sets a separate limitation for the discharge of deck drainage in the cases where no discharge of produced water is required.

(11) One commenter states that "NONE" is not an achievable oil and grease limitation. It could literally be interpreted as "ZERO" which would effectively eliminate the discharge of the natural and fresh water based muds and the resultant cuttings.

The word "NONE" no longer appears in the regulation, "No discharge of free oil to surface waters" has been substituted.

(12) A comment was received that the size of the facility should be a consideration in setting the regulations.

Size was considered in determining, applicable technology and was found to be of minimal impact. Size was also considered in the economic impact analysis.

(13) A comment was stated that the document fails to mention background concentrations of hydrocarbons, the tolerance of marine ecosystems to oil, biodegradability, short term tolerances to higher concentrations, the nutrient value of hydrocarbon in certain ranges of concentration, etc.

The regulation is designed to define treatment technologies, their costs, and the economic impact of their implementation. The Development Document is a summary of the background materials used to arrive at the conclusions reached in the regulation. Section 6 of the Development Document defines some of the effects of the pollutant parameters. Additional information on pollutants and their effects is contained in Supplement B.

(14) One commenter suggested that a limit on monthly or yearly averages be included.

The regulation is designed to fix the levels at which a technology is capable of performing. The limitations are set on short term basis so that compliance with these limitations can be determined within a short period of time. A monthly maximum is set, therefore an annual average is unnecessary.

(15) One commenter stated that produced water treatment technology is subject to malfunction caused by fluid characteristics, variations in flow rate, equipment failure, biological action, start-up problems, and improper operations.

In determining limitations set out in this regulation, all of these factors were considered. In the analysis of the data, those points which represented preventable upsets were eliminated. The reason

for the daily maximum being higher than the annual average results from the above causes.

(16) Many commenters thought that the EPA did not adequately consider environmental impact of crude oil in the marine environment and the cost of treatment or elimination of discharge.

An economic impact analysis was done in terms of lost energy through the year 2000. Constituents other than oil and grease were also looked at. The result was elimination of the zero discharge requirement for the far-offshore subcategory. It is felt that the other constituents (BOD, heavy metals, TDS, chlorides, etc.) are potentially harmful in a near shore environment. The BAT and new source requirements in this area therefore remain unchanged.

(17) Some commenters stated that there should not be different guidelines for California, the Gulf of Mexico, and Alaska.

These guidelines have been changed to be the same for all areas.

(18) One commenter suggested that biological treatment for human sewage should not be required for offshore installations normally manned by less than 30 people.

Biological treatment is not required for removal of BOD or suspended solids but rather to allow disinfection (reduction of fecal coliform level). It was felt that portable sanitary facilities would be adequate for less than ten people. To lessen the load on biological systems, regulations have been changed to separate domestic from sanitary wastes (domestic wastes do not contain fecal coliform).

(19) Several comments were received that subsurface injection was developed for purpose of secondary recovery, before being required by any state.

There was apparently some confusion when the interpretation was made that "injection was required by states", as it was known that injection is also used for production stimulation.

(20) One commenter stated that oil and grease removals attained by offshore facilities cannot and should not be applied to onshore facilities. The commenter believes that the performance of onshore facilities is much better.

A statistical comparison was made between a total of 27 facilities (including both onshore and offshore). Eight of the 10 best facilities were offshore. Therefore, there is no reason why these facilities should not be considered comparable.

(21) One commenter questioned the use of a log-normal distribution assumption.

After first assuming that the data were distributed according to a normal or bell shaped distribution, it was found that the data more nearly approximated a log-normal distribution (where the logarithm of the data is normally distributed). The upper 70-80 percent of the data, in fact, fit almost perfectly to a lognormal distribution. The limits set in the regulation are the 99th percentile probability limits of the fitted data.

(22) Several commenters suggested the need for a special provision in the regulation for treatment bypass during upsets, start-ups, and maintenance.

Fluctuations in the effluent quality caused by unpreventable upsets and malfunctions were included as part of the data base. These fluctuations are in large part the reason for the daily maximum being set almost three times as high as the annual average (72 vs. 25). Provision is made for start-up of the treatment facilities as part of the implementation schedule in each permit. When major preventive maintenance becomes necessary, there will usually be options available other than discharge of the bypassed wastes. These options include but may not be limited to: 1) storage on the platform; 2) storage onshore; 3) storage on a barge. There may be rare cases when none of these options are technically possible and these will be considered on a case by case basis.

(23) Questions have been raised concerning the availability of standards or guidelines applicable to the disposal of solid wastes resulting from the operation of pollution control systems.

The principles set forth in "Land Disposal of Solid Wastes Guidelines" (40 CFR 241) may be used as guidance for acceptable land disposal techniques. Potentially hazardous wastes may require special considerations to ensure their proper disposal. Additionally, state and local guidelines and regulations should be considered wherever applicable.

The Agency is subject to an order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia entered in *Natural Resources Defense Council vs. Train et al.* (Cv. No. 1609-73) which requires the promulgation of regulations for this industry category no later than September 1, 1975. This order also requires that such regulations become effective immediately upon publication. In addition, it is necessary to promulgate regulations establishing limitations on the discharge of pollutants from point sources in this category so that the process of issuing permits to individual dischargers under section 402 of the Act is not delayed.

It has not been practicable to develop and publish regulations for this category in proposed form, to provide a 30 day comment period, and to make any necessary revisions in light of the comments received within the time constraints imposed by the court order referred to above. Accordingly, the Agency has determined pursuant to 5 USC § 553(b) that notice and comment on the interim final regulations would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest. Good cause is also found for these regulations to become effective immediately upon publication.

Interested persons are encouraged to submit written comments. Comments should be submitted in triplicate to the EPA Office of Public Affairs, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460, Attention: Ms. Ruth Brown, A-107. Comments on all aspects of the regulation are solicited. In the event comments are in the nature of criticisms as to the adequacy of data which are

available, or which may be relied upon by the Agency, comments should identify and, if possible, provide any additional data which may be available and should indicate why such data are essential to the amendment or modification of the regulation. In the event comments address the approach taken by the Agency in establishing an effluent limitation or guideline EPA solicits suggestions as to what alternative approach should be taken and why and how this alternative better satisfies the detailed requirements of sections 301 and 304(b) of the Act.

A copy of all public comments will be available for inspection and copying at the EPA Freedom of Information Center, Room 204, West Tower, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington D.C. A copy of preliminary draft contractor reports, the Development Document and economic study referred to above, and certain supplementary materials supporting the study of the industry concerned will also be maintained at this location for public review and copying. The EPA information regulation, 40 CFR Part 2, provides that a reasonable fee may be charged for copying.

All comments received on or before October 15, 1975, will be considered. Steps previously taken by the Environmental Protection Agency to facilitate public response within this time period are outlined in the advance notice concerning public review procedures published on August 6, 1973 (38 FR 21202). In the event that the final regulation differs substantially from the interim final regulation set forth herein the Agency will consider petitions for reconsideration of any permits issued in accordance with these interim final regulation.

In consideration of the foregoing, 40 CFR Part 435 is hereby established as set forth below.

Dated: August 29, 1975.

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Administrator.

Subpart A—Near Offshore Subcategory

- Sec. 435.10 Applicability; description of the near-offshore subcategory.
- 435.11 Specialized definitions.
- 435.12 Effluent limitations guidelines representing the degree of effluent reduction attainable by the application of the best practicable control technology currently available.

Subpart B—Far-Offshore Subcategory

- 435.20 Applicability; description of the far-offshore subcategory.
- 435.21 Specialized definitions.
- 435.22 Effluent limitations guidelines representing the degree of effluent reduction attainable by the application of the best practicable control technology currently available.

AUTHORITY: Secs. 301, 304 (b) and (c), 306 (b) and (c), 307(c), Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (the Act); 33 U.S.C. 1251, 1311, 1314 (b) and (c), 1316 (b) and (c), 1317(c); 86 Stat. 816 et seq.; Pub. L. 92-500.

Subpart A—Near-Offshore Subcategory

§ 435.10 Applicability; description of the near-offshore subcategory.

The provisions of this subpart are applicable to discharges resulting from those near-offshore facilities within States waters engaged in the production, field exploration, drilling, well completions and well treatment of the oil and gas extraction industry.

§ 435.11 Specialized definitions.

For the purpose of this subpart:

(a) Except as provided below, the general definitions, abbreviations and methods of analysis set forth in 40 CFR 401 shall apply to this subpart.

(b) The term "State waters" shall mean the territorial seas as defined in 40 CFR 125.1(gg)—(excluding the Great Lakes).

(c) The term "M10" shall mean those offshore facilities continuously manned by ten (10) or more persons.

(d) The term "M9FM" shall mean those offshore facilities continuously manned by nine (9) or less persons or intermittently manned by any number of persons.

§ 435.12 Effluent limitations guidelines representing the degree of effluent reduction attainable by the application of the best practicable control technology currently available.

(a) In establishing the limitations set forth in this section, EPA took into account all information it was able to collect, develop and solicit with respect to factors (such as age and size of facility, raw materials, manufacturing processes, products produced, treatment technology available, energy requirements and costs) which can affect the industry sub-categorization and effluent levels established. It is, however, possible that data which would affect these limitations have not been available and, as a result, these limitations should be adjusted for certain facilities in this industry. An individual discharger or other interested person may submit evidence to the Regional Administrator (or to the State, if the State has the authority to issue NPDES permits) that factors relating to the equipment or facilities involved, the process applied, or other such factors related to such discharger are fundamentally different from the factors considered in the establishment of the guidelines. On the basis of such evidence or other available information, the Regional Administrator (or the State) will make a written finding that such factors are or are not fundamentally different for that facility compared to those specified in the Development Document. If such fundamentally different factors are found to exist, the Regional Administrator or the State shall establish for the discharger effluent limitations in the NPDES permit either more or less stringent than the limitations established herein, to the extent dictated by such fundamentally different factors. Such limitations must be approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protec-

RULES AND REGULATIONS

tion Agency. The Administrator may approve or disapprove such limitations, specify other limitations, or initiate proceedings to revise these regulations.

(b) The following limitations establish the quantity or quality of pollutants or

pollutant properties, controlled by this section, which may be discharged by a point source subject to the provisions of this subpart after application of the best practicable control technology currently available:

Effluent limitations

Pollutant parameter waste source	Oil and grease		Residual chlorine minimum for any 1 d, milligram per liter
	Maximum for any 1 d, milligram per liter	Average of daily values for 30 consecutive days shall not exceed milligram per liter	
Produced water	72	43	NA
Deck drainage	72	43	NA
Drilling muds	(1)	(1)	NA
Drill cuttings	(1)	(1)	NA
Well treatment	(1)	(1)	NA
Sanitary:			
M10	NA	NA	*1
M9IM*	NA	NA	NA
Domestic*	NA	NA	NA
Produced sand	(1)	(1)	NA

*1 No discharge of free oil.

* Minimum of 1 mg/l and maintained as close to this concentration as possible.

* There shall be no floating solids as a result of the discharge of these wastes.

Subpart B—Far-Offshore Subcategory**§ 435.20 Applicability; description of the far-offshore subcategory.**

The provisions of this subpart are applicable to discharges resulting from those far-offshore facilities within Federal waters engaged in the production, field exploration, drilling, well completions and well treatment of the oil and gas extraction industry.

§ 435.21 Specialized definitions.

For the purpose of this subpart:

(a) Except as provided below, the general definitions, abbreviations and methods of analysis set forth in 40 CFR 401 shall apply to this subpart.

(b) The term "Federal waters" shall mean all waters seaward from the territorial seas as defined in 40 CFR 125.1 (gg)—(excluding the Great Lakes).

(c) The term "M10" shall mean those offshore facilities continuously manned by ten (10) or more persons.

(d) The term "M9IM" shall mean those offshore facilities continuously manned by nine (9) or less persons or intermittently manned by any number of persons.

§ 435.22 Effluent limitations guidelines representing the degree of effluent reduction attainable by the application of the best practicable control technology currently available.

(a) In establishing the limitations set forth in this section, EPA took into account all information it was able to collect, develop and solicit with respect to factors (such as age and size of facility, raw materials, manufacturing processes, products produced, treatment technology available, energy requirements and costs) which can affect the industry sub-

categorization and effluent levels established. It is, however, possible that data which would affect these limitations have not been available and, as a result, these limitations should be adjusted for certain facilities in this industry. An individual discharger or other interested person may submit evidence to the Regional Administrator (or to the State, if the State has the authority to issue NPDES permits) that factors relating to the equipment or facilities involved, the process applied, or other such factors related to such discharger are fundamentally different from the factors considered in the establishment of the guidelines. On the basis of such evidence or other available information, the Regional Administrator (or the State) will make a written finding that such factors are or are not fundamentally different for that facility compared to those specified in the Development Document. If such fundamentally different factors are found to exist, the Regional Administrator or the State shall establish for the discharger effluent limitations in the NPDES permit either more or less stringent than the limitations established herein, to the extent dictated by such fundamentally different factors. Such limitations must be approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. The Administrator may approve or disapprove such limitations, specify other limitations, or initiate proceedings to revise these regulations.

(b) The following limitations establish the quantity or quality of pollutants or pollutant properties, controlled by this section, which may be discharged by a point source subject to the provisions of this subpart after application of the best practicable control technology currently available:

Effluent limitations

Pollutant parameter waste source	Oil and grease		Residual chlorine, minimum for any 1 d, milligram per liter
	Maximum for any 1 d, milligram per liter	Average of daily values for 30 consecutive days (shall not exceed, milligram per liter)	
Produced water	72	48	NA
Deck drainage	72	48	NA
Drilling muds	(1)	(1)	NA
Drill cuttings	(1)	(1)	NA
Well treatment	(1)	(1)	NA
Sanitary:			
MIO	NA	NA	11
MIRM*	NA	NA	NA
Domestic*	NA	NA	NA
Produced sand	(1)	(1)	NA

1 No discharge of free oil.
 * Minimum of 1 mg/l and maintained as close to this concentration as possible.
 * There shall be no floating solids as a result of the discharge of these wastes.

[FR Doc.75-24363 Filed 9-12-75;8:45 am]

Title 43—Public Lands: Interior
 CHAPTER II—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

APPENDIX—PUBLIC LAND ORDERS
 [Public Land Order 5529; J-012096]

ALASKA

Withdrawal for National Forest Administrative Site

By virtue of the authority vested in the President and pursuant to Executive Order No. 10355 of May 26, 1952 (17 FR 4831), it is ordered as follows:

Subject to valid existing rights, the minerals in the following described national forest lands are hereby withdrawn from prospecting, location, entry and purchase under the mining laws, 30 U.S.C., Ch. 2, in aid of programs of the Forest Service for utilization of the surface as an administrative site:

TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST

HOONAH ADMINISTRATIVE SITE

U.S. Survey No. 2414,
 Lots 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8.
 Containing 10.93 acres.

JACK O. HORTON,
 Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1975.

[FR Doc.75-24463 Filed 9-12-75;8:45 am]

[Public Land Order 5535; Riverside 1664]

CALIFORNIA

Withdrawal for Addition to National Forest Administrative Site

By virtue of the authority vested in the President and pursuant to Executive Order No. 10355 of May 26, 1952 (17 FR 4831), it is ordered as follows:

1. Subject to valid existing rights, the following described national forest lands are hereby withdrawn from appropriation under the mining laws, 30 U.S.C., Ch. 2, but not from leasing under the mineral leasing laws, in aid of programs of the Department of Agriculture:

LOS PADRES NATIONAL FOREST

SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN

Chuchupate Administrative Site

T. 8 N., R. 20 W.,
 Sec. 8, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$;
 Sec. 9, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$.

The areas described contain 50 acres in Ventura County.

2. The withdrawal made by this order does not alter the applicability of the public land laws governing the use of the national forest lands under lease, license, or permit, or governing the disposal of their mineral or vegetative resources other than under the mining laws.

JACK O. HORTON,
 Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1975.

[FR Doc.75-24464 Filed 9-12-75;8:45 am]

[Public Land Order 5533; Riverside 1151]

CALIFORNIA

Withdrawal of Lands for Water Resource Development

By virtue of the authority vested in the President and pursuant to Executive Order No. 10355 of May 26, 1952 (17 FR 4831), it is ordered as follows:

Subject to valid existing rights, the following described public land, which is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, 30 U.S.C., Ch. 2, and the mineral leasing laws, in aid of programs of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, for construction, operation and maintenance of the Mojave River Forks Reservoir flood control project, authorized by the Act of July 14, 1960, 74 Stat. 480, 497:

SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN

T. 3 N., R. 4 W.,
 Sec. 22, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$.

The area contains 40 acres in San Bernardino County.

JACK O. HORTON,
 Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1975.

[FR Doc.75-24465 Filed 9-12-75;8:45 am]

[Public Land Order 5530; Colorado 17547]

COLORADO

Withdrawal for Recreation Sites

By virtue of the authority vested in the President and pursuant to Executive Order No. 10355 of May 26, 1952 (17 FR 4831), it is ordered as follows:

1. Subject to valid existing rights, the following described public lands which are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, 30 U.S.C., Ch. 2, but not from leasing under the mineral leasing laws, for protection of their public recreation values:

SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

WOLCOTT RECREATION SITE

T. 4 S., R. 83 W.,

Sec. 9, Lots 4, 5, 6, those portions south of the centerline of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad, as constructed (right-of-way, Colorado 093762) and north of the centerline of U.S. Highway 6-24, as constructed (now within right-of-way, Colorado 4370 for Interstate Highway 70).

STATE BRIDGE RECREATION SITE

T. 2 S., R. 83 W.,

Sec. 26, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$;
 Sec. 27, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$.

The areas described aggregate approximately 170 acres.

2. The withdrawal made by this order does not alter the applicability of the public land laws governing the use of the lands under lease, license, or permit, or governing the disposal of their mineral or vegetative resources other than under the mining laws. However, leases, licenses, or permits will be issued only if the proposed use of the lands will not interfere with the primary use for which they are withdrawn.

JACK O. HORTON,
 Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1975.

[FR Doc.75-24466 Filed 9-12-75;8:45 am]

[Public Land Order 5532; Idaho 6775]

IDAHO

Reservation for Constructed Forest Service Road

By virtue of the authority vested in the President and pursuant to Executive Order No. 10355 of May 26, 1952 (17 FR 4831), it is ordered as follows:

1. Subject to valid existing rights and to the provisions of existing with-