optimize the economic advantages to both DPL and PSE&G, DPL requests the Commission to waive its customary notice period and allow this Agreement to become effective on January 31, 1996.

DPL states that a copy of this filing has been sent to PSE&G and will be furnished to the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, the Delaware Public Service Commission, the Maryland Public Service commission, and the Virginia State Corporation Commission.

Comment date: February 23, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

20. Commonwealth Electric Company Cambridge Electric Light Company

[Docket No. ER96–969–000]

Take notice that on January 30, 1996, Commonwealth Electric Company (Commonwealth) on behalf of itself and Cambridge Electric Light Company (Cambridge), collectively referred to as the ''Companies,'' tendered for filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission executed Service Agreements between the Companies and the following Customers: Cenergy, Inc., Global Petroleum Corporation, Sonat Power Marketing, Inc.

These Service Agreements specify that the Customers have signed on to and have agreed to the terms and conditions of the Companies' Power Sales and Exchanges Tariffs designated as Commonwealth's Power Sales and Exchanges Tariff (FERC Electric Tariff Original Volume No. 3) and Cambridge's Power Sales and Exchanges Tariff (FERC Electric Tariff Original Volume No. 5). These Tariffs, approved by FERC on April 13, 1995, and which have an effective date of March 20, 1995, will allow the Companies and the Customers to enter into separately scheduled transactions under which the Companies will sell to the Customers capacity and/or energy as the parties may mutually agree.

The Companies request an effective date as specified on each Service Agreement.

Comment date: February 23, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

21. Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.

[Docket No. ER96–977–000]

Take notice that on January 30, 1996, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Con Edison), tendered for filing proposed supplements to its Rate Schedules FERC No. 92 and FERC No. 96.

The proposed supplement No. 7 to Rate Schedule FERC No. 96 decreases the rates and charges for electric delivery service furnished to public customers of the New York Power Authority (NYPA) by $2,462,000 annually based on the 12-month period ending March 31, 1997.

The proposed supplement No. 6 to Rate Schedule FERC No. 96, applicable to electric delivery service to NYPA's non-public, economic development customers, and the proposed supplement No. 4 to Rate Schedule FERC No. 92, applicable to electric delivery service to commercial and industrial economic development customers of the County of Westchester Public Service Agency (COWPUSA) or the New York City Public Utility Service (NYCPUS), decrease the rates and charges for the service by $146,000 annually based on the 12-month period ending March 31, 1997.

The proposed decreases are a part of a Company-wide general electric rate change application which Con Edison filed to implement rates for the second year of a multi-year rate plan previously approved by the New York Public Service Commission (NYPSC) and which is pending before the NYPSC.

Although the proposed supplements bear a nominal effective date of April 1, 1996, Con Edison will not seek permission to make these effective until the effective date, estimated to be April 1, 1996, of the rate changes, if any, authorized by the NYPSC.

A copy of this filing has been served on NYPA, COWPUSA, NYCPUS, and the New York Public Service Commission.

Comment date: February 23, 1996, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraph

E. Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–3529 Filed 2–15–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3717–01–P

[Project No. 2232–303; North Carolina and South Carolina]

Duke Power Company; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

February 12, 1996.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Regulations, 18 CFR Part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 FR 47910), the Office of Hydropower Licensing (OHL) reviewed Duke Power Company's Revised Shoreline Management Plan for the Catawba-Wateree Hydroelectric Project located on the Catawba-Wateree River in North and South Carolina. The Plan addresses 1,635 miles of shoreline area for 11 reservoirs, focusing primarily on land use classification, recreational shoreline uses, boating access, and shoreline aesthetics. The 11 reservoirs, in order from north to south, are:

North Carolina	South Carolina
1. Lake James	7. Lake Wylie.
2. Lake Rhodhiss	8. Fishing Creek Lake.
3. Lake Hickory	9. Great Falls Lake.
4. Lookout Shoals Lake.	10. Rocky Creek Lake.
5. Lake Norman	11. Lake Wateree.
6. Mountain Island Lake..	

In the Plan, the licensee proposes certain land uses at the 11 project reservoirs: commercial/non-residential; commercial/residential; residential; recreational; project operations; natural areas; and environmental areas.

In developing the Plan, the licensee evaluated and classified existing and future shoreline and lake use at the 11 reservoirs. The projected use levels are based on the classification of existing shoreline development and the results of a boating and lake use study.

The staff prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed plan and concluded that the effects on environmental resources would be nonsignificant if our recommendations are implemented, and the recreational opportunities at the project would be enhanced with additional facilities. On the basis of the independent environmental assessment, approval of the Plan would not constitute a major

federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the environment.

Copies of the EA are available for review in the Reference and Information Center, Room 2A, of the Commission's offices at 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–3534 Filed 2–15–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Project No. 8679–004 California]

Sequoia Land and Power, Inc.; Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment

February 12, 1996.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Regulations, 18 CFR Part 380 (Order 486, 52 F.R. 47897), the Commission's Office of Hydropower Licensing has reviewed an exemption surrender application for the Sequoia Ranch Project, No. 8679–004. The Sequoia Ranch Project is located on the Middle Fork of the Tule River in Tulare County, California. The exemptee is applying for a surrender of the exemption because the project is not economically viable. An Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared for the application. The EA finds that approving the application would not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Copies of the EA are available for review in the Commission's Reference and Information Center, Room 1C–1, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

Please submit any comments within 20 days from the date of this notice. Any comment, conclusions, or recommendations that draw upon studies, reports or other working papers of substance should be supported by appropriate documentation.

Comments should be addressed to Lois D. Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. Please affix Project No. 8679–004 to all comments. For further information, please contact the project manager, Ms. Hillary Berlin, at (202) 219–0038.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–3535 Filed 2–15–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Project No. 11359–001 New Hampshire]

Northrop Engineering Corp.; Notice of Surrender of Preliminary Permit

February 12, 1996.

Take notice that the Northrop Engineering Corporation, permittee for the Murphy Project No. 11359, located on the Connecticut River in Coos County, New Hampshire, has requested that its preliminary permit be terminated. The preliminary permit was issued on May 30, 1995, and would have expired on April 30, 1998. The permittee states that the project would be economically infeasible.

The permittee filed the request January 25, 1996, and the preliminary permit for Project No. 11359 shall remain in effect through the thirtieth day after issuance of this notice unless that day is a Saturday, Sunday or holiday as described in 18 CFR 385.2007, in which case the permit shall remain in effect through the first business day following that day. New applications involving this project site, to the extent provided for under 18 CFR Part 4, may be filed on the next business day.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–3536 Filed 2–15–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Project No. 11479–001 New York]

Trenton Falls Hydroelectric Co.; Notice of Surrender of Preliminary Permit

February 12, 1996.

Take notice that the Trenton Falls Hydroelectric Company, permittee for the Hawkinsville Project No. 11479, located on the Black River in Oneida County, New York, has requested that its preliminary permit be terminated. The preliminary permit was issued on November 30, 1994, and would have expired on October 31, 1997. The permittee states that the project would be economically infeasible.

The permittee filed the request on January 24, 1996, and the preliminary permit for Project No. 11479 shall remain in effect through the thirtieth day after issuance of this notice unless that day is a Saturday, Sunday or holiday as described in 18 CFR 385.2007, in which case the permit shall remain in effect through the first business day following that day. New applications involving this project site, to the extent provided for under 18 CFR Part 4, may be filed on the next business day.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–3534 Filed 2–15–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5423–7]

Air Pollution Control; Proposed Action on Clean Air Act Grant to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed determination with request for comments and notice of opportunity for public hearing.

SUMMARY: The EPA has made two proposed determinations that reductions in expenditures of non-Federal funds for the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) in San Francisco, California are a result of non-selective reductions in expenditures. These determinations, when final, will permit the BAAQMD to keep the financial assistance awarded to it by EPA for FY–95 and to be awarded financial assistance for FY–96 by EPA under section 105(c) of the Clean Air Act (CAA).

DATES: Comments and/or requests for a public hearing must be received by EPA at the address stated below by March 18, 1996.

ADDRESSES: All comments and/or requests for a public hearing should be mailed to: Valerie Cooper, Air Grants Section (A–2–3), Air and Toxics Division, U.S. EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105–3901; FAX (415)744–1072.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Valerie Cooper, Air Grants Section (A–2–3), Air and Toxics Division, U.S. EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105–3901 at (415) 744–1294.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the authority of Section 105 of the CAA, EPA provides financial assistance to the BAAQMD, whose jurisdiction includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and part of Solano and Sonoma Counties in California, to aid in the operation of its air pollution control programs. In FY'94, EPA awarded the BAAQMD $1,608,900 which represented approximately 5% of the BAAQMD's budget, and in FY'95