

market area expansion. Southern states that this expansion is an enhancement of its current facilities to enable Southern to transport an additional 140 MMcfd through its Toca Compressor Station, which is currently operated at or near full capacity. Southern contends that it has determined that the gas supply is available and has identified the facilities modifications required to relieve its system bottleneck at Toca. According to Southern, the major unresolved issue in the post-636 environment is which industry segment should initially pay the cost of this type of system enhancement. Southern states that the distribution segment of the industry believes that producers should contribute to the cost of expanding facilities in order to make their gas supplies available to the market. It is stated that producers have taken the lead in constructing facilities to attach gas supply to the existing pipeline infrastructure but do not believe that they should bear the additional cost of expanding jurisdictional pipeline capacity required to move new supplies downstream. At the same time, Southern argues that it would be unfair to expect interstate pipelines to make substantial investments in new facilities without an opportunity to earn a reasonable return on their investments.

To strike an appropriate balance, Southern states that its proposal is an effort to allocate among the stakeholders the cost of this expansion project that benefits the system as a whole. It is stated that the cost sharing proposal represents a reasonable sharing—between the producers for the first 10 years and the transportation customers thereafter—of the costs required to expand Southern's production area capacity. By adding additional compression at its Toca Compressor Station, Southern states that it will increase its capacity to transport gas supplies through Toca by 140 MMcfd. In addition, Southern submits that it will require, as part of the transportation agreement, a commitment from the producers to attach 150 Bcf of new reserves for every 50 MMcfd of Transportation Demand, or approximately 400 BCF of additional reserves to Southern's system. Based upon extensive discussions with producers that have prospects in the areas near Southern's supply system and with Southern's transportation customers, Southern believes that an expansion of its Toca Compressor Station as proposed would benefit the system as a whole and is in the public interest.

It is stated that producers would benefit from obtaining firm

transportation service in Southern's production area at a competitive rate. With firm service to the interconnections Southern has with other interstate pipelines in this area, Southern contends that the producers will have assured access to a substantial portion of the natural gas markets in the eastern United States. It is stated that they can elect to sell any of the new gas supplies they connect to the Southern system to markets served by the Southern system, and in such case, those gas supplies would likely be transported under the purchaser's firm and/or interruptible transportation service agreements.

Southern states that the requirement that producers commit to attach new reserves to the Southern system provides a substantial benefit to Southern's firm and interruptible transportation customers. It is stated that they will have the opportunity to compete for these new sources of supply without incurring, under Southern's proposed rate treatment, any increase in their transportation costs as a result of the construction of the facilities for an initial 10-year period. Whether these new supplies are transported in the production area under one of the new 10 year service agreements or to a market on the Southern system, Southern submits that the proposed expansion of the Toca Compressor Station will eliminate a capacity constraint and enable an additional 140 MMcfd to flow into the Southern system via the "east leg". It is stated that this increase in the "east leg", however, will not cause an increase in capacity on Southern's main line.

Southern requests that the Commission act on its request in two steps. First, Southern requests that the Commission issue an initial determination that the construction and operation of the proposed facilities to provide capacity necessary for the performance of firm production area transportation services on the terms and conditions described in the application are required by the present or future public convenience and necessity. Southern states that it is willing to accept an at-risk condition in the initial determination because its application does not include the requisite showing of market demand. Second, after it has submitted executed Firm Transportation Service Agreements for 100 percent of the additional capacity containing the terms and conditions described herein and after completion of the environmental review of the proposed facilities, Southern requests that the Commission issue an order adopting the initial decision as its final action in this

proceeding and removing the at-risk condition.

*Comment date:* June 13, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

## 2. ANR Storage Company

[Docket No. CP95-504-000]

Take notice that on May 18, 1995, ANR Storage Company (ANR), 500 Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan 48243, filed in Docket No. CP95-504-000, pursuant to Section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA), as amended, and §§ 157.7 and 157.18 of the Commission's Regulations thereunder, an application requesting permission and approval for abandonment of storage service performed for United Cities Gas Company (United Cities), all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission.

ANR states that it is requesting authorization for retroactive abandonment of storage service that it provides for United Cities under Rate Schedule X-6 and contained in Original Volume No. 2 of its FERC Gas Tariff. This service was authorized in Docket No. CP79-453-000. ANR requests the abandonment of Rate Schedule X-6 effective April 1, 1995, the date of the termination agreement between ANR and United Cities. ANR further states that at United Cities' request, commencing April 1, 1995, this service would be provided under ANR's FERC Gas Tariff, Original Volume No. 1.

ANR states that no facilities are proposed to be abandoned.

*Comment date:* June 13, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

## Standard Paragraphs

F. Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before the comment date, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) 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 to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein 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 Federal Energy Regulatory 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 a grant of the certificate and/or 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 a 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 applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

G. Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to § 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

**Lois D. Cashell,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-13228 Filed 5-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[FRL-5212-8]

**Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses; Approval of an Application for Certification of Equipment**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of Agency approval of an application for equipment certification.

**SUMMARY:** The Agency received an application dated August 2, 1994 from the Engelhard Corporation (Engelhard) with principal place of business at 101 Wood Avenue, Iselin, New Jersey for certification of urban bus retrofit/rebuild equipment pursuant to 40 CFR 85.1401-85.1415. On September 16, 1994 EPA published notification that the application had been received and made the application available for public review and comment for a period of 45 days (59 FR 47581). EPA has completed its review of this application and the Director of the Manufacturers Operations Division has determined that it meets all the requirements for certification. Accordingly, EPA approves the certification of this equipment effective May 31, 1995.

The candidate equipment provides a 25 percent or greater reduction in emissions of particulate matter (PM) for certain petroleum fueled diesel engines relative to the original engine configuration and on engines that have been retrofit/rebuilt with certified new rebuild kits that do not include aftertreatment devices. In addition, this equipment will be offered to all parties for \$2,151 or less (2,000 or less in 1992 dollars). The certification of this equipment triggers requirements for all operators utilizing Program 1 that have engines in their fleet that are covered by this certification.

**ADDRESSES:** The Engelhard application, as well as other materials specifically

relevant to it, are contained in Public Docket A-93-42, entitled "Certification of Urban Bus Retrofit/Rebuild Equipment". This docket is located in room M-1500, Waterside Mall (Ground Floor), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Docket items may be inspected from 8:00 a.m. until 4:00 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.

**DATES:** The date of this document May 31, 1995 is the official certification date for this application. The equipment is immediately available for installation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Anthony Erb, Technical Support Branch, Manufacturers Operations Division (6405J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St. SW., Washington, DC 20460. Telephone: (202) 233-9259.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Background**

On August 2, 1994 Engelhard submitted an application under EPA's Urban Bus/Retrofit program<sup>1</sup> for certification of a catalytic converter muffler (CCM) for use on 2-cycle and 4-cycle petroleum fueled diesel urban bus engines for 1993 and earlier model years. Engelhard has since withdrawn the 4-cycle engines from consideration pending development of additional test data.

The CCM functions as a catalytic converter and a muffler. It takes the place of the original muffler in the engine exhaust system. Engelhard documented that the candidate equipment provides a 25 percent or greater reduction in emissions of particulate matter (PM) for petroleum fueled diesel heavy-duty urban bus engines as listed in Table A.

TABLE A. CERTIFICATION LEVELS

Engine model	Model year	PM level with stand-ard rebuild and addition of CCM	Code	Family designation
DDC 6V92TA MUI .....	1979-1987	1.38	ALL .....	ALL
DDC 6V92TA MUI .....	1988-1989	.22	ALL .....	ALL
DDC 6V92TA MUI .....	1979-1989	2.18	ALL .....	ALL
DDC 6V92TA DDEC I .....	1986-1989	.23	ALL .....	ALL
DDC 6V92TA DDEC II .....	1988-1991	.23	ALL .....	ALL
	1992	.19	ALL .....	ALL

<sup>1</sup> EPA promulgated the Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses on April 23, 1993 (58 FR 21359). This final rule established the provisions for an urban

bus retrofit/rebuild program as required by section 219(d) of the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990.

TABLE A. CERTIFICATION LEVELS—Continued

Engine model	Model year	PM level with standard rebuild and addition of CCM	Code	Family designation
DDC 6V71N .....	1993	.19	ALL .....	ALL
DDC 6V71T .....	1973–1989	.38	ALL .....	ALL
DDC 8V71N .....	1985–1986	.38	ALL .....	ALL
DDC 6L71TA .....	1973–1984	.38	ALL .....	ALL
DDC 6L71TA DDEC .....	1990	.44	ALL .....	ALL
DDC-8V-92TA .....	1988–1989	.23	ALL .....	ALL
DDC-8V-92TA-DD .....	1990–1991	.23	ALL .....	ALL
DDC-8V-92TA .....	1979–1987	.40	ALL .....	8V-92TA
DDC-8V-92TA .....	1988	.29	ALL .....	ALL
DDC-8V-92TA .....	1988	.31	ALL .....	8V-92TA-DDEC II
DDC-8V-92TA .....	1989	.35	9E70 .....	KDD0736FW8 9
DDC-8V-92TA .....	1989	.29	9A90 .....	KDD0736FW8 9
DDC-8V-92TA .....	1989	.26	9G85 .....	KDD0736FW8 9
DDC-8V-92TA-DDEC .....	1989	.31	1A .....	KDD0736FZH 4
DDC-8V-92TA .....	1990	.35	9E70 .....	LDD0736FAH 9
DDC-8V-92TA-DDEC .....	1990	.37	1A .....	LDD0736FZH 3
DDC-8V-92TA-DDEC .....	1991	.19	1A OR 5A .....	MDD0736FZH 2
DDC-8V-92TA .....	1992–1993	.16	1D .....	NDD0736FZH 1 & PDD0736FZH X
DDC-8V-92TA-DDEC .....	1992–1993	.22	6A .....	NDD0736FZH 1 & PDD0736FZH X
DDC-8V-92TA-DDEC .....	1992–1993	.15	5A .....	NDD0736FZH 1 & PDD0736FZH X
DDC-8V-92TA-DDEC .....	1992–1993	.19	1A .....	NDD0736FZH 1 & PDD0736FZH X

<sup>1</sup> To attain these levels of PM reduction engines must be rebuilt to original manufacturers specifications, or in cases where the operator finds the engines meet certain performance specifications as stated by Engelhard in the instructions to purchasers of the CCM kit, rebuild of the engine in order to claim the listed PM reduction would not be required. This applies to all engines listed in the table with the exception of those covered by footnote 2.

<sup>2</sup> If the CCM is installed on these engines after rebuild using the “Engelhard Emission Rebuild/Retrofit Kit” in conjunction with the CCM, the emission level certified to by Engelhard is 0.18 g/bhp-hr PM.

Emission test results supplied by Engelhard in the application are shown in Table B. The test data show a greater than 25% reduction in PM. Hydrocarbon (HC), carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) and smoke emissions were within the applicable emission standards with the CCM installed.

TABLE B.—CERTIFICATION EMISSION TEST RESULTS (GM/BHP-HR)

	Baseline engine before rebuild	Baseline engine before rebuild with catalyst	Baseline rebuilt engine	Rebuilt engine with catalyst
HC .....	1.19	0.64	0.48	0.24
CO .....	2.53	1.32	1.53	1.00
NO <sub>x</sub> .....	9.55	9.70	10.31	10.46
PM .....	0.87	0.51	0.21	0.15
Smoke Test .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Accel .....	.....	.....	.....	6.0%
Lug .....	.....	.....	.....	3.4%
Peak .....	.....	.....	.....	7.6%

Urban bus operators who choose to comply with Program 1 will be required to use this equipment (or other equipment certified in the meantime) beginning six months after the date of this certification approval. Urban bus operators who choose to comply with Program 2 and use the Engelhard equipment will use the PM emissions values from Table A when calculating their average fleet PM level.

The emission levels of the Engelhard rebuild kit will be used to modify the

Program 2 post rebuild levels in July 1996.

**II. Summary and Analysis of Comments**

EPA received a variety of comments on the Engelhard application during the comment period. The comments generally fall into the areas of equipment effects and design, durability and cost. Copies of the original comments are to be found in EPA Docket A-93-42.

An abbreviated summary of the major comments is provided below.

Additional discussion of comments for this decision can be found in the Final Decision Document for the Engelhard Application #1 (FDDEA1) which has been placed in Docket A-93-42. A limited number of copies of the FDDEA1 are also available from the contact person listed above (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

The most frequently raised concern among commenters was the effect of the

CCM on engine backpressure and the effect the backpressure could have on the remaining life of the engine.

Backpressure with the CCM installed will generally be higher than the backpressure with the original muffler. However, Engelhard has designed the CCM to ensure that the engine manufacturer's maximum allowable backpressure will not be exceeded for any engine/exhaust combination. Since backpressure will remain below the manufacturer's allowable limit, EPA does not believe that engine life will be diminished as a result of installing a CCM. Furthermore, Engelhard has recently reconfigured the catalyst that will be marketed under this program to provide a lower backpressure as compared to the catalyst used in the certification test.

Catalyst sizing, packaging and installation applicability were raised as issues by several commenters.

Specifically, commenters questioned whether the catalyst would be adequately packaged to fit the wide range of engines and bus models, and whether proper installation and mounting hardware would be available for each combination of bus/engine.

Clear instructions and proper installation for each bus/engine combination will be required to ensure proper operation of the CCM. Engelhard has designed specific installation instructions and hardware for most applications already. The CCM takes the place of the muffler in the exhaust system and each kit will contain all components necessary to complete the installation. Engelhard continues to work with operators to develop appropriate hardware and packaging for specific applications.

The last major group of comments centered around life cycle cost of the CCM. One commenter proposed that field data be collected to support fuel economy impact claims contained in the application for certification. Another commenter noted that operators might use the equipment beyond the 150,000 mile useful life, and questioned how the costs associated with use beyond 150,000 miles are accounted for in the life cycle cost.

Regarding field data to demonstrate fuel economy claims, the regulations do not require that life cycle fuel cost be calculated using field data. At the time of application for certification, a certifier that is applying for certification within life cycle cost limitations must provide information on the fuel economy impact of rebuild/retrofit equipment. Engelhard provided brake-specific fuel consumption (BSFC) data from transient tests performed on a

baseline engine and on an engine equipped with a CCM. This data shows the BSFC difference between these tests to be within normal test to test variability, and EPA does not find that this equipment will have an impact on fuel economy.

Regarding the second comment, operators may indeed continue to use certified equipment beyond the statutory useful-life of 150,000 miles. However, for the purpose of calculating life cycle costs, only those costs incurred within the useful-life are relevant. Operators who operate equipment beyond the useful-life are responsible for costs to maintain the equipment in proper operating condition, and assume in-use emissions performance liability.

### III. Certification Approval

The Agency has reviewed this application, along with comments received from the interested parties, and finds that this application meets the requirements for certification under the Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses (40 CFR 85.1401 and 85.1415). Thus, the Agency hereby approves the certification of this equipment.

### IV. Operator Requirements and Responsibilities

Operators who have chosen to comply with Program 1 will be required to utilize this equipment for any engines that are listed in Table A that undergo rebuild on or after December 1, 1995. Under Program 2, this equipment is immediately available to operators for use and those who use this certified kit may claim the PM emissions reduction as stated in Table A when calculating their Fleet Level Attained.

As stated in the regulations, operators should maintain records for each engine in their fleet to demonstrate that they are in compliance with either program 1 or program 2 beginning in January 1, 1995. These records include purchase records, receipts, and part numbers for the parts and components used in the rebuilding of urban bus engines.

Dated: May 10, 1995.

**Mary D. Nichols,**

*Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 95-13246 Filed 5-30-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[OPPTS-62145; FRL-4947-6]

### Instruction Manual on Interim Controls and the Operation and Maintenance of Lead-Based Paint for Abatement Workers and Maintenance Personnel; Notice of Availability

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Request for preproposals.

**SUMMARY:** EPA issued a proposed rule *Lead: Requirements for Lead-Based Paint Activities* on September 2, 1994. The objective of the proposed rule is to provide standards for the training of a workforce qualified to assist in the evaluation and reduction of hazards associated with lead-based paint. To further the goal of improved training for the workforce engaged in lead-based paint activities, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has provided funds for the development of a training curriculum and an accompanying video on interim controls and operations and maintenance for lead-based paint. HUD has transferred these funds to EPA for the management of this project. EPA is requesting the submission of preproposals from qualified organizations that are interested in developing a training course and a video on these subjects. This notice describes the eligibility and criteria for the selection of preproposals.

**DATES:** All preproposals must be submitted to EPA by June 30, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Preproposals should be sent to the following address: Betty Weiner, Chemical Management Division (7404), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Betty Weiner at (202) 260-2924 or write to the address listed under the ADDRESSES unit.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In the **Federal Register** of September 2, 1994 (59 FR 45872), EPA issued a proposed rule regarding regulations governing lead-based paint activities. The purpose of this document is to announce the availability of funds to be administered by EPA in the form of a cooperative agreement with an organization with demonstrated experience in lead-based paint training activities. Any nonprofit organization with such experience is eligible to apply. These funds are to be used for the development of a 1-day course in interim controls for lead-based paint and routine maintenance activities. The basic elements of interim controls are: paint stabilization, dust