*Applications Delivered by Hand:* An application that is hand-delivered must be taken to Mr. Fred Sellers, U.S. Department of Education, Student Financial Assistance Programs, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Room 3045, General Service Administration Regional Office Building #3, Washington, D.C. Hand-delivered applications will be accepted between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. daily (Eastern time), except Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays.

An application that is hand-delivered will not be accepted after 4:30 p.m. on the closing date.

*Program Information:* Section 415C(a) of the HEA requires that an annual application be submitted for a State to receive SSIG funds. In preparing the application, each State agency should be guided by the table of allotments provided in the application package.

State allotments are determined according to the statutorily mandated formula under section 415B of the HEA and are not negotiable. A State may also request its share of reallotment, in addition to its basic allotment, which is contingent upon the availability of such additional funds.

In fiscal year 1995, 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Island (Palau), and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands received funds under the SSIG Program.

*Applicable Regulations:* The following regulations are applicable to the SSIG Program:

(1) The SSIG Program regulations in 34 CFR part 692.

(2) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR part 75.60 through 75.62 (Ineligibility of Certain Individuals to Receive Assistance), part 76 (State-Administered Programs), part 77 (Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations), part 79 (Intergovernmental Review of Department of Education Programs and Activities), part 80 (Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments), part 82 (New Restrictions on Lobbying), part 85 (Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement), and Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)), and part 86 (Drug-Free Schools and Campuses).

(3) The regulations in 34 CFR part 604 that implement section 1203 of the HEA (Federal-State Relationship Agreements).

(4) The Student Assistance General Provisions in 34 CFR part 668.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** For further information contact Mr. Greg Gerrans, Pell and State Grant Section, U.S. Department of Education, Student Financial Assistance Programs, Washington, D.C. 20202–5447; telephone (202) 708–4607. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday. (20 U.S.C. 1070c–1070c–4)

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 84.069, State Student Incentive Grant Program)

Dated: May 1, 1996.

David A. Longanecker,

*Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education.*

[FR Doc. 96–11222 Filed 5–03–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[FRL–5468–6]**

## Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses; Public Review of a Notification of Intent to Certify Equipment

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency

**ACTION:** Notice of agency receipt of a notification of intent to certify equipment and initiation of 45 day public review and comment period.

**SUMMARY:** Engelhard Corporation (Engelhard) has submitted to the Agency a notification of intent to certify urban bus retrofit/rebuild equipment pursuant to 40 CFR part 85, subpart O. The notification describes equipment consisting of an engine rebuild kit (fuel injectors, cylinder kits, camshafts, blower, turbocharger, cylinder heads, by-pass valve, exhaust manifold and associated gaskets) along with a catalytic converter muffler that replaces the existing muffler in the exhaust stream. Several of the engine rebuild components will have a proprietary coating applied to the surface. Engelhard has proposed a three-tiered supply approach, discussed in more detail below, intended to provide flexibility to transit operators using this equipment. Engelhard intends that this equipment be certified to the 0.1 grams per brake-horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr) particulate matter standard for 1979–1990 model year Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) 6V92TA engines having mechanical unit injectors (MUI). Pursuant to § 85.1407(a)(7), today's Federal Register notice summarizes the notification, announces that the notification is available for public review and comment, and initiates a 45 day period during which comments can be submitted. The Agency will review this notification of intent to certify, as well any comments it receives, to determine whether the equipment described in the notification of intent to certify should be certified. If certified, the equipment can be used by urban bus operators to reduce the particulate matter of urban bus engines.

The notification of intent to certify, as well as other materials specifically relevant to it, are contained in Category XIII of Public Docket A–93–42, entitled ''Certification of Urban Bus Retrofit/Rebuild Equipment''. This docket is located at the address listed below.

Today's notice initiates a 45-day period during which the Agency will accept written comments relevant to whether or not the equipment included in this notification of intent to certify should be certified. Comments should be provided in writing to the addresses below.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before June 20, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit separate copies of comments to each of the two following addresses:

1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Public Docket A–93–42 (Category XIII-A), Room M–1500, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460.

2. Tom Stricker, Engine Compliance Programs Group, Engine Programs and Compliance Division (6403J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 ''M'' Street SW, Washington, DC 20460.

The Engelhard notification of intent to certify, as well as other materials specifically relevant to it, are contained in the public docket indicated above. Docket items may be inspected from 8 a.m. until 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. As provided in 40 CFR part 2, a reasonable fee may be charged by the Agency for copying docket materials.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tom Stricker, Engine Programs and Compliance Division (6403J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St. SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. Telephone: (202) 233–9322.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### I. Background

On April 21, 1993, EPA published final Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses (58 FR 21359). The retrofit/rebuild program is intended to reduce the ambient levels of particulate matter

(PM) in urban areas and is limited to 1993 and earlier model year (MY) urban buses operating in metropolitan areas with 1980 populations of 750,000 or more, whose engines are rebuilt or replaced after January 1, 1995. Operators of the affected buses are required to choose between two compliance options: Option 1 sets particulate matter emissions requirements for each urban bus engine in an operator's fleet which is rebuilt or replaced; Option 2 is a fleet averaging program that sets out a specific annual target level for average PM emissions from urban buses in an operator's fleet.

A key aspect of the program is the certification of retrofit/rebuild equipment. To meet either of the two compliance options, operators of the affected buses must use equipment which has been certified by EPA. Emissions requirements under either of the two options depend on the availability of retrofit/rebuild equipment certified for each engine model. To be used for Option 1, equipment must be certified as meeting a 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM standard or as achieving a 25 percent reduction in PM. Equipment used for Option 2 must be certified as providing some level of PM reduction that would in turn be claimed by urban bus operators when calculating their average fleet PM levels attained under the program.

Under Option 1, additional information regarding cost must be submitted in the application for certification, in order for certification of that equipment to initiate (or trigger) program requirements for a particular engine model. In order for the equipment to serve as a trigger, the certifier must guarantee that the equipment will be offered to affected operators for $7,940 or less at the 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM level, or for $2,000 or less for the 25 percent or greater reduction in PM. Both of the above amounts are based on 1992 dollars and include life cycle costs incremental to the cost of a standard rebuild.

## II. Application for Certification

Engelhard Corporation has applied for certification of equipment applicable to 1979–1990 model year Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) 6V92TA diesel engines with mechanical unit injectors (MUI). The application states that the candidate equipment achieves a particulate matter (PM) level of 0.1 g/bhp-hr. Life cycle costs for operators are stated to be less than $7,940 (in 1992 dollars) for all affected operators. The use of the equipment by transit operators to meet program requirements is discussed further below.

The equipment being certified consists of an engine rebuild kit in conjunction with a catalytic converter muffler that takes the place of the original muffler installed in the engine exhaust system. The engine rebuild kit consists of two separate parts kits. One kit contains new components including cylinder kits, blower by-pass valve, air inlet hose, and gaskets. The other parts kit contains remanufactured components including fuel injectors, camshafts, blower assembly, turbocharger, exhaust manifold(s), turbocharger Y-inlet pipe, and cylinder head assemblies. (The cylinder head(s), valve faces, piston crowns, and exhaust manifold(s), and turbo Y-inlet have a proprietary coating applied to the surface). One of each type of kit is required, depending on the horsepower rating of the engine, direction of engine rotation, and camshaft mounting gear type. A total of twelve combinations of these two kits are available. The specific catalytic converter part to be used depends on the type of coach as well as the type of engine.

Engelhard provides a table listing the various catalytic converter kits available for different engine/coach combinations. The Engelhard catalytic converter used in this equipment package is not the same as the Engelhard catalytic converter previously certified by EPA (60 FR 28402, May 31, 1995), therefore, transit operators cannot use the previously certified converter in place of the new converter in this kit.

Engelhard states its intention that certification of this equipment trigger program requirements for the 0.1 g/bhp-hr PM standard for applicable engines, and provides life cycle cost information. The life cycle cost of the Engelhard kit, in 1992 dollars, is stated as $13,502, which includes $10,686 for the engine rebuild kit, $2,600 for the catalytic converter muffler, and $216 for installation of the catalytic converter muffler. Engelhard indicates that the life cycle cost ($13,502) is $7,940 incremental to the cost of a ''standard'' rebuild, which is listed as $5,562, and therefore meets the life cycle cost requirements. Engelhard uses $5,562 as the cost a ''standard'' rebuild because this figure is the purchase price (in 1992 dollars) quoted by Detroit Diesel Corporation for its upgrade rebuild kit (see 61 FR 8275, March 4, 1996). The labor to rebuild an engine will be the same for a ''standard'' rebuild and the candidate kit, with the exception of the additional labor required for installation of the catalytic converter muffler. Engelhard states in its notification that there is no fuel economy penalty associated with the candidate equipment. EPA's preliminary review of the test data of the notification, however, suggests a fuel economy penalty of roughly four (4) percent with the candidate equipment, and, if a 4 percent fuel economy penalty exists, it would increase life cycle costs about $1,140 (in 1992 dollars). At this point, EPA has not determined whether a fuel economy penalty exists, and requests comments concerning this issue. EPA will use information gathered through public comment and from the certifier to resolve this issue. If Engelhard cannot show that its equipment will be offered to all operators for less than $7,940 (in 1992 dollars), incremental to the cost of a standard rebuild, then certification may proceed but it would not trigger the 0.1 g/bhp-hr PM standard.

Engelhard presents data from testing a 1987 model year configuration Detroit Diesel 6V92TA MUI engine with the Engelhard upgrade kit and converter kit installed, documenting a PM emissions level of 0.08 g/bhp-hr. This test also showed that emissions of hydrocarbon (HC), carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen ($NO_X$), and smoke were within the applicable standards. Engelhard also presents comparative baseline test data from a standard 1979 rebuilt engine configuration. These data document PM emissions of 0.33 g/bhp-hr in the standard rebuild configuration. Although the PM level of the standard 1979 engine rebuild is somewhat low (0.33 g/bhp-hr), EPA believes that engines emitting in the 0.50 g/bhp-hr range would still meet the 0.1 g/bhp-hr PM standard with the Engelhard kit installed because installation of the kit results in the replacement of all emissions related parts with a specific set of parts, the combination of which results in a documented PM level of 0.08 g/bhp-hr. In other words, the emission level of the original engine, prior to installation of the Engelhard kit, may be irrelevant since all emission related parts are replaced upon installation of the kit. EPA requests comments on whether or not all engines for which certification is intended will meet the 0.1 g/bhp-hr PM standard.

In a March 25, 1996 addendum to its notification of intent to certify, Engelhard requested approval of this kit under three different supply scenarios described below. The purpose of this proposal was to provide increased flexibility to operators and to allow transits to make use of existing transit personnel to the maximum extent possible.

Under supply option 1, Engelhard would provide the coated engine components, the catalytic converter muffler, and the cylinder kits. The

remaining parts (fuel injectors, camshafts, blower and turbocharger) could be purchased or supplied separately as long as such parts were Engelhard specified OEM components or their equivalent.

Under supply option 2, Engelhard would supply all components in the kit as described in the notification of intent to certify.

Under supply option 3, Engelhard would supply the coated engine components, the catalytic converter muffler, and the new engine components (cylinder kits, blower by-pass valve, air inlet hose, and gaskets). The remanufactured components (fuel injectors, camshafts, blower assembly and turbocharger) would be required to be remanufactured by Engelhard Certified Remanufacturers. Such ''certified remanufacturers'' would consist of transits or other third parties designated by Engelhard as capable of remanufacturing these components within the tolerances prescribed by Engelhard with proper quality control. Engelhard proposed to provide training to those interested in becoming a certified Engelhard remanufacturer.

EPA expects to evaluate each of these supply options and their impact on life cycle costs. Also, EPA will evaluate whether any of these options will compromise the ability of the Engelhard kit to achieve 0.1 g/bhp-hr PM standard in the field.

If EPA approves the request for certification of this equipment, urban bus operators who choose to comply with compliance Option 1 of this regulation will be required to use this equipment or other equipment certified to the 0.1 g/bhp-hr standard beginning six months after certification approval, when applicable engines are rebuilt or replaced.

If EPA approves Engelhard's certification request, urban bus operators who chose to comply under compliance Option 2 of this regulation may also use the Engelhard equipment. If certification is approved by EPA, the emission levels of the Engelhard rebuild kit will be used to modify the Option 2 post-rebuild levels in July 1996.

The date of this notice initiates a 45 day period during which EPA will accept written comments relevant to whether or not the equipment described in this application should be certified. Interested parties are encouraged to review this application, and provide comments related to whether or not the equipment described in it should be certified pursuant to the urban bus retrofit/rebuild program. Comments should be provided in writing to the address listed under the Addresses section of this notice.

The Agency will review this notification of intent to certify, along with comments received from the interested parties, and attempt to resolve or clarify issues as necessary. During the review process, EPA may add additional documents to the docket as a result of the review process. These documents will also be available for public review and comment within the 45 day period.

Dated: April 26, 1996.

Richard Wilson,

*Acting Assistant Administrator for Office of Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 96–11077 Filed 5–3–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

**[Report No. 2129]**

### Petitions for Reconsideration and Clarification of Actions in Rulemaking Proceedings

May 1, 1996.

Petitions for reconsideration and clarification have been filed in the Commission's rulemaking proceedings listed in this Public Notice and published pursuant to 47 CFR Section 1.429(e). The full text of these documents are available for viewing and copying in Room 239, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor ITS, Inc. (202) 857–3800. Opposition to this petition must be filed May 21, 1996. See Section 1.4(b)(1) of the Commission's rules (47 CFR 1.4(b)(1)). Replies to an opposition must be filed within 10 days after the time for filing oppositions has expired.

Subject: Amendment of the Commission's Regulatory Policies Governing Domestic Fixed Satellites and Separate International Satellite Systems. (IB Docket No. 95–41)

Number of Petitions Filed: 4

Subject: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulation of Satellite Earth Stations (IB Docket No. 95–59)

Number of Petitions Filed: 8

Subject: Streamlining Broadcast EEO Rules and Policies, Vacating the EEO Forfeiture Policy Statement and Amending Section 1.80 of the Commission's Rules to Include EEO Forfeiture Guidelines (MM Docket No. 96–16)

Number of Petitions Filed: 1

Subject: Implementation of Section 302 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Open Video Systems (CS Docket No. 96–46)

Telephone Company-Cable; Television Cross-Ownership Rules, Sections 63–54—63–58 (CC Docket No. 87–266 (Terminated))

Number of Petitions Filed: 1

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

*Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96–11176 Filed 5–3–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712–01–M**

## FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

### Sunshine Act Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the ''Government in the Sunshine Act'' (5 U.S.C. 552b), notice is hereby given that at 3:33 p.m. on Tuesday, April 30, 1996, the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation met in closed session to consider matters relating to the Corporation's supervisory activities.

In calling the meeting, the Board determined, on motion of Vice Chairman Andrew C. Hove, Jr., seconded by Director Joseph H. Neely (Appointive), concurred in by Director Eugene A. Ludwig (Comptroller of the Currency), Director Jonathan L. Fiechter (Acting Director, Office of Thrift Supervision), and Chairman Ricki Helfer, that Corporation business required its consideration of the matters on less than seven days' notice to the public; that no earlier notice of the meeting was practicable; that the public interest did not require consideration of the matters in a meeting open to public observation; and that the matters could be considered in a closed meeting by authority of subsections (c)(4), (c)(6), (c)(8), (c)(9)(A)(ii) of the ''Government in the Sunshine Act'' (5 U.S.C. 552b (c)(4), (c)(6), (c)(8), and (c)(9)(A)(ii)).

The meeting was held in the Board Room of the FDIC Building located at 550—17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Dated: May 1, 1996.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

Valerie J. Best,

*Assistant Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96–11296 Filed 5–2–96; 2:09 pm]

**BILLING CODE 6714–01–M**

## FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

### Notice of Agreement(s) Filed

The Federal Maritime Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the