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

$1,320,885 which represented approximately 5% of the BAAQMD's budget.

Section 105(c)(1) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7405(c)(1), provides that ''[n]o agency shall receive any grant under this section during any fiscal year when its expenditures of non-Federal funds for recurrent expenditures for air pollution control programs will be less than its expenditures were for such programs during the preceding fiscal year. In order for [EPA] to award grants under this section in a timely manner each fiscal year, [EPA] shall compare an agency's prospective expenditure level to that of its second preceding year.'' EPA may still award financial assistance to an agency not meeting this requirement, however, if EPA, ''after notice and opportunity for public hearing, determines that a reduction in expenditures is attributable to a non-selective reduction in the expenditures in the programs of all Executive branch agencies of the applicable unit of Government.'' CAA section 105(c)(2). These statutory requirements are repeated in EPA's implementing regulations at 40 CFR 35.210(a).

In its FY–95 section 105 application, which EPA reviewed in July 1994, the BAAQMD projected expenditures of non-Federal funds for recurrent expenditures (or its maintenance of effort (MOE)) of $26,757,937. This MOE would have been sufficient to meet the MOE requirements of the CAA. In January of 1996, however, the BAAQMD submitted to EPA documentation which shows that its actual FY–95 MOE was $26,471,610. This amount represents a shortfall of $286,327 from the MOE of the preceding fiscal year. In addition, the projected FY–96 MOE of $24,778,132 represents a shortfall of $1,693,478 from the FY–95 MOE of $26,471,610. In order for the BAAQMD to be eligible to keep its FY–95 grant and to be awarded an FY–96 grant, EPA must make a determination under section 105(c)(2).

In FY–95, the BAAQMD determined that its MOE would decrease because revenues from property taxes and permit fees decreased. For FY–96 the BAAQMD once again determined that there would be continued reductions in these revenue sources. The reductions resulted in the loss of two permanent positions and the furlough of fifteen long-term temporary staff. In addition to the reduction in revenues, a general reserve and fund balance account were no longer available (because they had been depleted) to make up for shortages as they had in previous years. These were the contributing factors to a reduction in BAAQMD's FY–95 and FY–96 MOE level.

The BAAQMD's MOE reductions resulted from a loss of revenue from property taxes and permit fees. This loss of revenue and MOE reduction resulted from circumstances beyond the District's control. EPA proposes to determine that the BAAQMD's lower FY–95 and FY–96 MOE level meets the section 105(c)(2) criteria as resulting from a non-selective reduction of expenditures. Pursuant to 40 CFR 35.210, this determination will allow the BAAQMD to keep the funds received from EPA for FY–95 and to be eligible for an FY–96 award.

This notice constitutes a request for public comment and an opportunity for public hearing as required by the Clean Air Act. All written comments received by March 18, 1996 on this proposal will be considered. EPA will conduct a public hearing on this proposal only if a written request for such is received by EPA at the address above by March 18, 1996. If no written request for a hearing is received, EPA will proceed to a final determination.

Dated: February 6, 1996.

David P. Howekamp,

Director, Air and Toxics Division.

[FR Doc. 96–3585 Filed 2–15–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[FRL–5422–3]

Air Pollution Control; Proposed Action on Clean Air Act Grant to the Pima County, Arizona, Department of Environmental Quality

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

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

SUMMARY: The U.S. EPA has made a proposed determination that a reduction in expenditures of non-Federal funds for the Pima County, Arizona, Department of Environmental Quality (PDEQ) in Tucson, Arizona is a result of a non-selective reduction in expenditures. This determination, when final, will permit the PDEQ 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: Douglas K. McDaniel, 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)744–1076.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Douglas K. McDaniel, 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) 744–1246.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the authority of Section 105 of the CAA, EPA provides financial assistance to the PDEQ to aid in the operation of its air pollution control programs. In FY–95, EPA awarded the PDEQ $331,207, which represented approximately 25.4% of the PDEQ's air pollution control program budget.

Section 105(c)(1) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. 7405(c)(1), provides that ''[n]o agency shall receive any grant under this section during any fiscal year when its expenditures of non-Federal funds for recurrent expenditures for air pollution control programs will be less than its expenditures were for such programs during the preceding fiscal year.'' EPA may still award financial assistance to an agency not meeting this requirement, however, if EPA, ''after notice and opportunity for public hearing, determines that a reduction in expenditures is attributable to a non-selective reduction in the expenditures in the programs of all Executive branch agencies of the applicable unit of Government.'' CAA section 105(c)(2). These statutory requirements are repeated in EPA's implementing regulations at 40 CFR 35.210(a).

In January of 1996, the PDEQ submitted to EPA final documentation which shows that its actual FY–95 expenditures of non-Federal funds for recurrent expenditures (or its maintenance of effort (MOE)) were $973,959. In its FY–96 § 105 grant application the PDEQ projected MOE of $537,821. This amount represents a shortfall of $436,138 from the MOE for the preceding fiscal year (FY–95). In order for the PDEQ to be eligible to be awarded its FY–96 grant, EPA must make a determination under section 105(c)(2).

In December 1995, the PDEQ submitted documentation to EPA establishing that its reduced expenditures for FY–96 result from a loss of permit revenue, due to changes to Pima County's air quality rules mandated by new Arizona state law which required Arizona localities to amend their air quality rules that were more stringent than state rules. Rule changes adopted on November 14, 1995