(Northwest), 295 Chipeta Way, Salt Lake City, Utah 84108–0900, filed in Docket No. CP96–573–000 an application pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act and Section 157.18 of the Commission's regulations for an order permitting and approving an abandonment by removal the following five inactive receipt point meter stations.

- Klondike Receipt Meter Station located in Grand County, Utah
- Amoco Wheeler Receipt Meter Station located in La Plata County, Colorado
- C. C. Company Receipt Meter Station located in Grand County, Utah
- Papoose Canyon Receipt Meter Station located in Dolores County, Colorado
- Unicon Producing Company (UPC) Durango Receipt Meter Station located in La Plata County, Colorado

Northwest states that at each meter station it plans to remove all above ground facilities except for the valve taps; that the removed facilities will be scrapped, except for a 70 barrel tank at the Amoco Wheeler Receipt Meter Station and the meters which will be used at other locations; that the accounting treatment for the abandonments will be as proposed in its Exhibit Y to the application; and that the sites will be restored to original conditions; all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open for public inspection.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before July 16, 1996, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE. Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 385.214) and the regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party in any proceeding herein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Commission by Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application, if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that permission and approval for the proposed abandonment are required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Northwest to appear or to be represented at the hearing.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–16626 Filed 6–28–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. RP96–281–000]

Williams Natural Gas Company; Notice of Proposed Changes in FERC Gas Tariff

June 25, 1996.

Take notice that on June 19, 1995, Williams Natural Gas Company (WNG), tendered for filing to become part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Second Revised Volume No. 1, the following tariff sheets, to be effective on July 1, 1996:

Thirteenth Revised Sheet No. 6A
Second Revised Sheet No. 6B
Third Revised Sheet No. 204
Fifth Revised Sheet No. 205

WNG states that this filing is being made pursuant to part 154 of the Commission's regulations and as contemplated in WNG's abandonment of facilities filing in Docket No. CP94–196. In that filing WNG stated that tariff sheets reflecting the abandonment would be filed upon the Commission's issuance of an order approving the abandonment.

WNG states that a copy of its filing was served on all participants listed on the service list maintained by the Commission in Docket No. CP94–196 and on all jurisdictional customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest this 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 sections 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed as provided in section 154.210 of the Commission's Regulations. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. 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 proceedings. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–16630 Filed 6–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5530–1]

Sustainable Development Challenge Grant Program

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Solicitation of Proposals for FY 1996; Request for Comments on Program Design for Full Implementation in FY 1997.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announces and solicits applications for a new competitive grant program, the Sustainable Development Challenge Grant (SDCG) program, one of President Clinton's ''high priority'' actions described in the March 16, 1995 report, ''Reinventing Environmental Regulation.'' The EPA expects to fund a limited number of pilot projects in FY 1996 through the new SDCG program. EPA is also asking for comments on the program design to help develop a full scale program for FY 1997. The Sustainable Development Challenge Grant program is intended to ''encourage community, business, and government to work cooperatively to develop flexible, locally-oriented approaches that link place-based environmental management with sustainable development and revitalization.'' The SDCG program will challenge communities to invest in a sustainable future that links environmental protection and economic prosperity to provide equitable opportunities for health, safety and well-being. These grants are intended to: catalyze community-based and regional projects to promote sustainable development; build partnerships to increase community long-term capacity to protect the environment; and leverage public and private investments to enhance environmental quality by enabling sustainable community efforts to continue beyond EPA funding.

This document includes: background information on the Sustainable Development Challenge Grant program; a description of the program; the

criteria; the process for selection of projects; and the program's relationship to other related EPA activities.

DATES: The period for submission of proposals for FY 1996 will begin upon publication of this Federal Register notice pursuant to the Information Collection Request (ICR No. 1755.01) approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB Approval No. 2010–0026) under the Paperwork Reduction Act. Project pre-applications must be postmarked by August 1, 1996. Comments on this Federal Register notice concerning program design for full implementation in FY 1997 are due August 30, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the FY 1997 program may be provided in writing. Please send your comments by mail *or* fax to: Pamela A. Hurt, U.S. EPA, Office of Regional Operations and State/Local Relations (1501), 401 M St., S. W., Washington, D.C. 20460. The fax number for the office is 202–260–9365.

Applications. Pre-application kits for FY 1996 project proposals are available upon request from EPA Headquarters. These kits will include more detailed guidance and may be requested in writing from the address above, *or* by fax addressed to Pamela A. Hurt at 202–260–9365, *or* by voice mail at 202–260–0422. EPA will notify successful applicants in writing and provide technical assistance in preparation of formal applications.

The original plus one copy of the pre-application, should be sent to: Pamela A. Hurt, U.S. EPA, Office of Regional Operations and State/Local Relations, (1501), 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460. Pre-applications should include a one page cover sheet that summarizes: the amount of assistance requested from EPA; the various entities or organizations that will be partners in the project; and the project's anticipated results. The cover sheet should also include the applicant's name, address, and phone number. The project proposal narrative should be limited to five (5) double-sided pages and explain the relationship of the proposal to the criteria for project selection described in this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pamela A. Hurt, U.S. EPA, Office of Regional Operations and State/Local Relations (1501), 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, or by voice mail at (202) 260–0422.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose

EPA intends these competitive grants to be catalysts that challenge communities to invest in a sustainable future, recognizing that sustainable environmental quality and economic prosperity are inextricably linked. The Sustainable Development Challenge Grant program is an important opportunity for EPA to award competitive grants for seed funding to leverage private and other public sector investment in communities (and larger geographic areas such as watersheds) to build partnerships that increase a community's long-term capacity to protect the environment through sustainable development. This grant program challenges local communities to invest in their own sustainable futures.

Overview of the Sustainable Development Challenge Grant Approach

The grant program encourages communities to recognize and build the fundamental connection between environmental protection and economic development. Accomplishing this linkage requires integrating environmental protection in policy and decision-making at all levels of government and throughout the economy. The SDCG program recognizes the significant role that communities have and should play in environmental protection. The program acknowledges that sustainable development is often best designed and implemented at a community level. This program also requires a stakeholder process that will identify measurable milestones as steps in an iterative process that integrates environmental and economic goals. The EPA will implement this program consistent with the principles of Executive Order 12898, ''Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations'' (February 11, 1994). Projects funded must ensure that no one is subjected to unjust or disproportionate environmental impacts.

Achieving sustainability is a responsibility shared by environmental, community and economic interests at all levels of government and the private sector. This emphasis on strong community involvement requires a commitment to ensuring that all Americans, of varying economic and social groups, are afforded opportunities to participate in decision-making. Only through the combined efforts, and collaboration of governments, private organizations, and individuals can our communities, regions, states, and nation achieve the benefits of sustainable development.

Linkages to Other Initiatives

The Sustainable Development Challenge Grant (SDCG) program is a new competitive grant program, one of 25 major environmental reforms announced by President Clinton in March 1995, as part of EPA's Reinventing Environmental Regulation.

EPA and its state and local partners are reinventing the way environmental protection is accomplished in the United States. The Agency recognizes that environmental progress will not be achieved solely by regulation, but also requires individual, institutional, and corporate responsibility, commitment and stewardship. The Sustainable Development Challenge Grant program is consistent with other community-based efforts EPA has introduced, such as Brownfields, Project XL, and the Community-Based Environmental Protection Approach, which stimulate broad community participation. The Sustainable Development Challenge Grant program is also a step in implementing Agenda 21, the Global Plan of Action on Sustainable Development, agreed to by the United States at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.

Through the Sustainable Development Challenge Grant Program, EPA intends to further the vision and goals of the President's Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD), created in 1993 by President Clinton. The Council, composed of corporate, government, and non-profit representatives, was charged to find ways to ''bring people together to meet the needs of the present without jeopardizing the future.'' The Council has declared this vision:

> ''Our vision is of a life-sustaining Earth. We are committed to the achievement of a dignified, peaceful and equitable existence. We believe a sustainable United States will have a growing economy that equitably provides opportunities for satisfying livelihoods and a safe, healthy, high quality of life for current and future generations. Our nation will protect its environment, its natural resource base, and the functions and viability of natural systems on which all life depends.'' (February 1996)

The Sustainable Development Challenge Grant program furthers this vision by encouraging community initiatives that achieve environmental quality with economic prosperity through public and private involvement and investment.

Examples of Potential Projects

EPA welcomes proposals for many types of projects. The following examples of the types of projects EPA envisions funding. These examples are

only illustrative and are not intended to limit proposals in any way.

• Demonstrate environmental and economic benefits in a rural community through the development of community-based agricultural pollution prevention practices. Reduced use of fertilizers and pesticides by area farmers should result in economic benefits in lower drinking water treatment and monitoring costs, and reduced water treatment costs for local businesses. It is also expected to lower human exposure to agricultural chemicals and minimize adverse impacts to habitat with associated quality of life benefits.

• Demonstrate the design and establishment of an eco-industrial park. Enlist the participation of local officials, environmental groups, and business interests in designing and establishing an eco-industrial park that will attract industries that can use each other's wastes as raw materials, and that pioneer environmentally sound technologies, thereby promoting new and existing locally based companies that are ''zero dischargers''. The goal would be to reduce costs for the businesses involved for water treatment, waste incineration, and landfilling. These improvements would be intended to have positive long-term water and air quality benefits.

• Demonstrate a cooperative effort among business interests, environmental groups, and government agencies to design and implement a plan for managing timber lands in such a way that they continue to provide jobs and bring money into the local economy, but also protect critical habitats and sensitive species. As part of the plan development, wildlife agencies and organizations commit to conducting or funding the scientific research needed. The project will also explore opportunities for using extracted timber in local manufacturing and finished goods.

• Demonstrate the interrelationship between federal environmental mandates and sound urban redevelopment as an alternative to suburban sprawl. The project will demonstrate the benefits of development that uses existing urban infrastructure close to the urban core and also protects drinking water sources, air quality, and wildlife habitat. By providing open spaces for natural sumps for the treatment of stormwater runoff, green spaces can be provided to increase aesthetic value and recreational opportunities. The project will increase residential spaces with good access to public transportation, and will assess improvements in air quality, as well as the impact on use of other infrastructure, sewers, sidewalks and roads. The project will assess the environmental quality benefits gained from urban redevelopment.

Selection Criteria

After determining that the proposed project meets the two statutory threshold determinations described below in the **STATUTORY AUTHORITY** section, EPA will also consider the following criteria, weighting each as indicated:

(1) Sustainability: 40 points

• How well does the proposal integrate environmental protection and economic prosperity?

• Does the proposal define the community it will benefit, either by geographic or political boundaries? Does the proposal define how it relates to regional sustainability?

• Does the proposal take a comprehensive multi-media approach (e.g. air, water, land) to assess environmental quality and set priorities for action?

• Does the proposal use a proactive environmental approach, for example, pollution prevention or watershed protection?

• Will the proposal result in sustainable economic development benefits, such as more appropriate, efficient use of resources so that jobs created will be sustained, or the amount of money retained in the local economy will be maximized?

• Does the proposal represent new solutions for the community, given their previous history and current circumstances?

(2) Community Commitment and Contribution: 30 points

• Do the partners fully represent those in the community who have an interest in or will be affected by the project?

• Will the proposal's outcomes and results benefit all affected groups in the community?

• Does the proposal describe effective methods for community involvement to assure that all affected by the project are provided an opportunity to participate?

• Does the proposal describe the depth and breadth of the community's support (financial and in-kind) for the proposal? Does it provide evidence of long-term commitment to the proposal?

(3) Measurable Results: 30 points

• Does the proposal describe the specific environmental and economic benefits to be gained by the community? What non-sustainable behaviors will be addressed by the proposal?

• Does the proposal include achievable short-term (within three years) and long-term targets or benchmarks to measure the proposal's contribution to the community's sustainability? (These may be quantitative and/or qualitative.)

• Does the proposal set goals for the proactive environmental approaches it employs?

• After seed funds from EPA are exhausted, does the proposal demonstrate how the work will continue, or how it will evolve into or generate other sustainability efforts, either locally or regionally?

• Will the experiences gained during the project be transferable to other communities?

Statutory Authority

EPA expects to award Sustainable Development Challenge Grants program under the following eight grant authorities: Clean Air Act section 103(b)(3); Clean Water Act section 104 (b)(3); Resource Conservation and Recovery Act section 8001; Toxics Substances Control Act section 10; Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act section 20; Safe Drinking Water Act sections 1442(a) and (b); National Environmental Education Act, section 6; and Pollution Prevention Act, section 6605.

As a threshold determination, to be selected for funding, a project must consist of activities within the statutory terms of these EPA grant authorities. Most of the statutes authorize grants for the following activities: ''research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys and studies.'' These activities relate generally to the gathering or transferring of information or advancing the state of knowledge. Grant proposals should emphasize this ''learning'' concept, as opposed to ''fixing'' an environmental problem via a well-established method. For example, a proposal to plant some trees in an economically depressed area, in order to prevent erosion, would probably not, in itself, fall within the statutory terms ''research, studies'' etc., nor would a proposal to start a routine recycling program.

On the other hand, the statutory term ''demonstration'' can encompass the first instance of the application of a pollution control technique, or an innovative application of a previously used method. Similarly, the application of established practices may qualify when they are part of a broader project which qualifies under the term ''research.''

As a second threshold determination, in order to be funded, a project's subject generally must be one that is specified in the statutes listed above. For most of

the statutes, a project must address the causes, effects, extent, prevention, reduction, and elimination of air, water, or solid/hazardous waste pollution, or, in the case of grants under the Toxic Substances Control Act or the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, to ''carrying out the purposes of the Act.'' While the purpose of this program's grants will include the other two aspects of sustainable development and economic prosperity, the overarching concern or principal focus must be on the statutory purpose of the applicable grant authority, in most cases ''to control pollution.'' Note that proposals relating to other topics which are sometimes included within the term ''environment'' such as recreation, conservation, restoration, protection of wildlife habitats, etc., should describe the relationship of these topics to the statutorily required purpose of pollution control.

Definitions

Sustainable Development: Sustainable development means integrating environmental protection, and community and economic goals. Sustainable development meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The sustainable development approach seeks to encourage broad-based community participation and public and private investment in decisions and activities that define a community's environmental and economic future.

Community: The scale used to define ''community'' under this challenge grant program will vary with the issues, problems, or opportunities that an applicant intends to address. The SDCG program recognizes the significant role that communities have and should play in environmental protection. ''Community'' means a geographic area within which different groups and individuals share common interests related to their homes and businesses, their personal and professional lives, the surrounding natural landscape and environment, and the local or regional economy. A community can be one or more local governments, a neighborhood within a small or large city, a large metropolitan area, a small or large watershed, an airshed, tribal lands, ecosystems of various scales, or some other specific geographic area with which people identify.

Who Should Apply

Eligible applicants include: (1) Incorporated non-profit (or not-for-profit) private agencies, institutions and organizations; and (2) public (state, county, regional or local) agencies, institutions and organizations, including those of federally-recognized Indian tribes. While state agencies are eligible they are encouraged to work in partnership with community groups to strengthen their proposals.

Applicants are not required to have a formal Internal Revenue Service (IRS) non-profit designation, such as 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(4), however they should present their letter of incorporation or other documentation demonstrating their nonprofit or not-for-profit status. Applicants who do have an IRS 501(c)(4) designation are not eligible for grants if they engage in lobbying, no matter what the source of funding for the lobbying activity. (No recipient may use grant funds for lobbying.) Further, profit-makers are not eligible to receive sub-grants from eligible recipients, although they may receive contracts, subject to EPA's regulations on procurement under assistance agreements, 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 30.40 (for non-governmental recipients) and 40 CFR 31.36 (for governments).

Funding Ranges and Match

Applicants may compete for funding in two ranges for FY 1996: (1) $50,000 or less, and (2) between $50,001 and $100,000. [Please note that for FY 1997 these levels may be changed based on EPA's assessment of FY 1996 experience.] Proposals will be compared to other proposals in the same range (i.e. a proposal for $50,000 will not compete against a proposal for $100,000.)

In FY 1996, EPA expects to fund a limited number of projects in the two funding ranges. Applicants may submit multiple proposals, but each specific proposal can only be submitted in one funding range and must be for a separate and distinct project. A separate solicitation will be issued for FY 1997. No organization may receive funding for more than one proposal each year. In addition, projects awarded will be ineligible for future competition. The number of grants awarded in FY 1997 for each range will depend on the total amount of funds available for the Sustainable Development Challenge Grantsprogram.

This program is intended to provide seed money to leverage a broader public and private investment in sustainability activities. As a result, the program requires a minimum non-Federal match of at least 20 percent of the total project budget. EPA strongly encourages applicants to leverage as much investment in community sustainability as possible. EPA funds can be used for no more than 80 percent of the total cost of the project. The match can come from a variety of public and private sources and can include in-kind goods and services. No Federal funds, however, can be used as matching funds without specific statutory authority.

Selection Process

In order to ensure a fair selection process, an evaluation panel consisting of EPA Regional and Headquarters staff will evaluate the pre-applications. The evaluation panel will assess how well the proposals meet the selection criteria outlined above. The panel's recommendations will be presented to EPA Senior Management for final selection.

What Costs Can Be Paid

Even though a proposal may involve an eligible applicant, eligible activity, and eligible purpose, grant funds cannot necessarily pay for all of the costs which the recipient might incur in the course of carrying out the project. Allowable costs are determined by reference to the EPA regulations cited below and to OMB Circulars A–122, ''Cost Principles for Non-profit Organizations'', A–21 ''Cost Principles for Education Institutions'' and A–87, ''Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments.'' Generally, costs which are allowable include salaries, equipment, supplies, training, rental of office space, etc., as long as these are ''necessary and reasonable.'' Entertainment costs are an example of unallowable costs.

Applicable Grant Regulations

40 CFR Part 30 (for other than State/local governments e.g. non-profit organizations) (recently revised, see 61 FR 6065 (Feb. 15, 1996)), and Part 31 (for State and local governments and Indian tribes).

Paperwork Reduction Act

The information collection provisions in this Notice, for solicitation of proposals, have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq. (ICR No. 1755.01 and OMB Approval No. 2010–0026). The approved Information Collection Request (ICR No. 1755.01) is in effect and will cover all burdens associated with Sustainable Development Challenge Grants. Copies of the ICRs (ICR Nos. 1755.01 and 1755.02) may be obtained from the Information Policy Branch, EPA, 401 M Street, SW., (Mail Code 2136), Washington, DC 20460 or by calling (202) 260–2740.

Dated: June 25, 1996.

Fred Hansen,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96–16696 Filed 6–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[FRL–5530–2]

Science Advisory Board Amendment To Previously Published Federal Register Notice and Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meeting; Open Meeting

On June 25, 1996, notice of several meetings of the EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) was published in the Federal Register 61 FR 32796. This notice amends section 4 of that notice concerning the July 16–18 meeting of the Drinking Water Committee (DWC). This notice also announces the meeting of the Valuation Subcommittee of the Integrated Risk Project Committee which will meet on July 19, 1996.

1. Drinking Water Committee—Amended Notice of Meeting

This notice amends the statement of purpose and background from section 4 of the Federal Register notice of June 25, 1996 concerning the July 16–18 meeting of the Drinking Water Committee (DWC) at the Holiday Inn Georgetown, 2101 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20007, telephone (202) 338–4600.

As amended, the main purpose of the meeting is to: (a) Evaluate EPA's basis for concluding that protozoan monitoring, required under the Information Collection Rule (ICR), will provide data adequate for supporting a national impact analysis for the Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (ESWTR); (b) discuss the proposals submitted for DWC review in Fiscal Year 1997; (c) discuss emerging requirements regarding testing and evaluation of endocrine disruptors; (d) consider the impacts revisions to the Cancer Guidelines may have on the assessment of waterborne cancer hazards; and, (e) finish drafting the DWC's report on the Agency's Five Year Research Plan for Microbes and Disinfectant By-Products.

Background on the Statistical Evaluation of Pathogenic Parasites: The Agency has promulgated an Information Collection Rule (ICR) which among other things will provide data about the occurrence of the pathogenic parasites *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in the source waters of several hundred water supplies. Information about pathogen occurrence is needed for a Regulatory Impact Analysis of the ESWTR. The Office of Water (OW) does not believe that current protozoan methods are appropriate for evaluating occurrence at individual sites for the purpose of complying with a regulation. However, OW does think the method is adequate for obtaining data to support a National Impact Analysis.

2. Integrated Risk Project Committee

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that the Valuation Subcommittee (Committee) of the Integrated Risk Project Committee (IRP) of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) will meet on July 19, 1996, from 8:30 am to no later than 5:00 pm (Eastern Daylight Time) in Room 17 of the Washington Information Center (WIC) of the US EPA, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460. This meeting is open to the public, however, due to limited space, seating will be on a first-come basis. The purpose of the meeting is to refine the charge to the Committee and to plan the Committee's efforts as part of the larger IRP effort of the SAB.

Background: In a letter dated October 25, 1995, Deputy Administrator Fred Hansen requested the SAB to update the assessment of environmental risks, priorities, and risk reduction opportunities contained in the 1990 SAB report, Reducing Risk: Setting Priorities and Strategies for Environmental Protection (EPA–SAB–EC–90–021). In subsequent discussions with the Deputy Administrator, the SAB has also agreed to provide insights on economic analysis of risk reduction options and ecosystem valuation. In summary, the current charge to the Valuation Subcommittee is to propose a new framework for assessing the value of ecosystems to humans, including ecological services and environmentally mediated health and quality of life values.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Single copies of the information provided to the Committee can be obtained by contacting Ms. Diana Pozun, Staff Secretary, Committee Operations Staff, Science Advisory Board (1400), US EPA, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460, telephone (202) 260–8414, fax (202) 260–7118, or Internet at: pozun.diana@epamail.epa.gov. Single copies of Reducing Risk, the report of the previous relative risk ranking effort of the SAB, can be obtained by contacting the SAB's Committee Evaluation and Support Staff (1400), 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, telephone (202) 260–8414, or fax (202) 260–1889. Anyone wishing to make an oral presentation at the meeting must contact Mr. Thomas Miller, Designated Federal Official for the Valuation Subcommittee IRP, *in writing* no later than 4:00 pm (Eastern Daylight Time) July 12 1996, at the above address, via fax (202) 260–7118, or via the Internet at: Miller.Tom@epamail.epa.gov. The request should identify the name of the individual who will make the presentation and an outline of the issues to be addressed. At least 35 copies of any written comments to the Committee are to be given to Mr. Miller no later than the time of the presentation for distribution to the Committee and the interested public. To discuss technical aspects of the meeting, please contact Mr. Miller by telephone at (202) 260–8414.

Providing Oral or Written Comments at SAB Meetings

The Science Advisory Board expects that public statements presented at its meetings will not be repetitive of previously submitted oral or written statements. In general, each individual or group making an oral presentation will be limited to a total time of ten minutes. Written comments (at least 35 copies) received in the SAB Staff Office sufficiently prior to a meeting date, may be mailed to the relevant SAB committee or subcommittee prior to its meeting; comments received too close to the meeting date will normally be provided to the committee at its meeting. Written comments may be provided to the relevant committee or subcommittee up until the time of the meeting.

Dated: June 21, 1996.

John R. Fowle III,

Acting Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.

[FR Doc. 96–16667 Filed 6–28–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[DA 96–962]

Telecommunications Services Between the United States and Cuba

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On June 17, 1996, the Commission approved the application of AT&T Corp. to acquire and operate additional facilities to provide telecommunications services between the United States and Cuba. The services authorized include both switched voice and private line services.