

15,000 pounds or more. The policy change covering FAK shipments (as described in MFTRP No. 1A, Items 112, 113, 115, and 116) standardizes carrier liability for all DOD FAK shipments by motor carriers, effective July 1, 1996, and will not apply to excluded commodities, such as engines, ammunition, and precious metals. Accordingly, the caption in Items 112 and 113 now providing a released value not exceeding \$1.75 per pound, also the caption in Items 115 and 166 providing a released value not exceeding \$2.50 per pound will be cancelled, effective July 1, 1996.

Gregory D. Showalter,
Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.
[FR Doc. 96-6047 Filed 3-13-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

Availability of Non-Exclusive, Exclusive, or Partially Exclusive Licensing of U.S. Patent Concerning a Microsphere Drug Application Device

AGENCY: U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, DOD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with 37 CFR 404.6, announcement is made of the availability for licensing of U.S. Patent No. 5,470,311 entitled "Microsphere Drug Application Device" and issued on November 28, 1995. This patent has been assigned to the United States Government as represented by the Secretary of the Army.

ADDRESSES: Commander, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, ATTN: Staff Judge Advocate, Fort Detrick, Frederick, Maryland 21702-5012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Werten F.W. Bellamy, U.S. Army Intellectual Property Law Division, 901 North Stuart Street, ATTN: JALS-IP, Arlington, Virginia 22203-1837, voice phone (703) 696-8119 or telefax (703) 696-8116.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The invention includes an apparatus and methods for dispensing medicinals encapsulated in a biodegradable polymer in surgical and other wounds. The apparatus, a microcapsule drug applicator, allows the caregiver to implant or spread measured and uniform quantities of microencapsulated medicinals in or on surgical or traumatic wounds to prevent and/or treat infections. Specific examples where microencapsulated antibiotics may prove useful include: soft-tissue wounds; following debridement and reduction or fixation

of open fractures; to osteomyelitic bone after surgical debridement; after surgical insertion of prostheses such as hip/knee replacements (arthroplasty); and following vascular surgery or grafting.

Gregory D. Showalter,
Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.
[FR Doc. 96-6044 Filed 3-13-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

Availability of Non-Exclusive, Exclusive, or Partially Exclusive Licensing of U.S. Patent Concerning a Test for Quantitative Thrombin Time

AGENCY: U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, DOD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with 37 CFR 404.6, announcement is made of the availability for licensing of U.S. Patent No. 5,476,771 entitled "Test for Quantitative Thrombin Time" and issued on December 19, 1995. This patent has been assigned to the United States Government as represented by the Secretary of the Army.

ADDRESSES: Commander, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, ATTN: Staff Judge Advocate, Fort Detrick, Frederick, Maryland 21702-5012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John F. Moran, Patent Attorney, (301) 619-2065 or telefax (301) 619-7714.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The invention is a quantitative method for determining the plasma levels of thrombin-specific inhibitors which is based on the quantitative thrombin time using plasma dilutions, excess fibrinogen and thrombin. The plasma dilutions and excess fibrinogen act in concert to eliminate the effect that coagulopathies have on standard coagulation tests. The method is relatively simple and provides superior results to standard conventional tests. The method is suitable for performance in clinical hematology laboratories on a routine basis using commercially availability instrumentation.

Gregory D. Showalter,
Army Federal Register, Liaison Officer.
[FR Doc. 96-6043 Filed 3-13-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Finding of No Significant Impact for the Alternative Fuel Transportation Program

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Finding of No Significant Impact

SUMMARY: The Department of Energy (the Department) has prepared an Environmental Assessment (Assessment) (DOE/EA-1151) to identify and evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the Alternative Fuel Transportation Program. The program implements statutorily-imposed alternative fueled vehicle acquisition requirements that apply to certain alternative fuel providers and some State government vehicle fleets.

Based on the analysis in DOE/EA-1151, the Department has determined that the proposed action is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended. Therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required, and the Department is issuing this Finding of No Significant Impact (Finding).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kenneth R. Katz, Program Manager, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EE-33), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585. (202) 586-6116.

For further information on the Department's general NEPA procedures, contact: Ms. Carol Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Oversight (EH-25), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20585. (202) 586-4600 or leave a message at (800) 472-2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Environmental Assessment addresses the effects of the Final Rule for the Alternative Fuel Transportation Program on the human environment. The Department proposed a rule for this program on February 28, 1995 (60 FR 10970), for the purpose of fulfilling its obligation under the Act to implement statutorily-imposed alternative fueled vehicle acquisition requirements in sections 501 and 507(o) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, which apply to certain alternative fuel providers and some State government vehicle fleets. In proposing this rule, the Department determined that preparation of an Environmental Assessment was appropriate to determine whether an Environmental Impact Statement was required.

Proposed Action

The Final Rule for the Alternative Fuel Transportation Program implements the statutorily-imposed

alternative fueled vehicle acquisition requirements in sections 501 and 507(o) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, which apply to certain alternative fuel providers and some State government vehicle fleets. The final rule principally covers: (1) interpretations necessary for affected entities to determine whether and to what extent the statutory requirements apply; (2) required procedures for exemptions and administrative remedies; and (3) a program of marketable credits to reward those who voluntarily acquire vehicles in excess of mandated requirements or before the requirements take effect. The purpose of DOE action is to reduce the use of imported petroleum by promoting alternative fuel use, infrastructure development and alternative fueled vehicle availability. The rationale for requiring fleets to acquire alternative fueled vehicles is that fleet demand for alternative fuels and alternative fueled vehicles should improve their availability to the public, increase public demand and cause a larger shift to alternative fuels than would be achieved in absence of the program.

Environmental Impacts

An analysis (DOE/EA-1151) was performed to determine the effect on air quality due to implementation of the final rule. Emissions were computed for five pollutants: nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), non-methane hydrocarbons (NMHC), particulate matter (PM-10), and carbon dioxide (CO₂). Five scenarios were considered based upon differing assumptions of fuel-type market penetrations over a 25-year period for both the alternative fuel provider and State fleets.

The air emissions analysis shows that, in 2020, the proposed action could reduce state and alternative fuel provider fleet emissions for all five pollutants. The Alternative Fuel Transportation Program is estimated to cause a less than 3% decrease in cumulative emissions from all highway vehicles in the United States by the end of the 25-year study period in 2020. However, the vehicles acquired due to this program, and thus the associated emissions improvements, would be concentrated in metropolitan areas. Because these vehicles represent only 0.5% of all light duty vehicles and air emissions are expected to be the principal environmental effect, other environmental effects are not quantified.

For each of the pollutant-scenario combinations, the results show a reduction in the emission levels. When the projected emissions in 2020 are compared with 1993 National Mobile Source Emissions, the reductions range

from 0.001% for NO_x in the Gaseous Fuel Dominant Scenario to 0.15% for CO in the Gaseous Fuel Dominant with EVs Scenario and the New Technology Dominant Scenario. When the emissions from the entire 25-year study period are compared with 1993 National Mobile Source Emissions, the reductions range from 0.02% for NO_x in the Gaseous Fuel Dominant Scenario to 2.53% for CO in the Gaseous Fuel Dominant with EVs Scenario.

Although vehicle manufacturing, conversion and delivery affect the environment, the Environmental Assessment assumes that the effects of these activities for alternative fueled vehicles are virtually the same as for conventional vehicles. Therefore, the assessment assumes that there will not be incremental environmental effects from manufacturing or converting and delivering AFVs.

The program is projected to displace 50 trillion Btu (0.34%) of gasoline use in light duty vehicles in 2010. Similarly, petroleum extraction, gasoline production, and gasoline delivery infrastructure and delivery activities would be reduced not more than 0.34%. Because this is below the level of significance, the assessment does not quantify the incremental environmental effects of raw materials acquisition, production, or fuel transportation for alternative fuels or petroleum.

The program includes the resale and ultimate disposal of fleet vehicles. Air emissions of AFVs and conventional vehicles are quantified for the entire useful life of the vehicle, irrespective of vehicle ownership, so resale does not affect the analysis. Disposal of AFVs would be similar to disposal of conventional vehicles, with the exception of electric vehicle battery disposal. Batteries from electric vehicles are the principal waste that is different under the proposed action, compared to conventional vehicle waste under the no action alternative. At most, it is estimated that the electric vehicles acquired under the program will only represent 2.2% of the total number of electric vehicles on the road in 2010. Currently the infrastructure for the disposal of lead-acid batteries results in 98% recycling. Other battery materials may be used in the future, but the new battery technologies are also expected to be recycled.

For further information on other environmental effects of the alternative fueled vehicles that will be acquired in this program, DOE refers interested stakeholders to the Environmental Assessment (DOE/EA-1151), which can be obtained from Docket Number EE-RM-95-110. For further information

concerning the docket: Andi Kasarsky, (202) 586-3012.

Alternatives Considered

Actions other than the proposed action could fulfill the goals of the Alternative Fuel Transportation Program, but DOE is required by the Energy Policy Act to proceed with the proposed action, and therefore no alternative actions other than the No Action alternative were considered in the assessment.

A No Action alternative was considered and was found not to meet the mandate of the Energy Policy Act. However, the no action alternative serves as a baseline for evaluating the environmental effects of the program. If no action were taken, fleets would be expected to acquire fewer alternative fueled vehicles than if the proposed action were taken. The incremental effects of additional alternative fueled vehicle acquisitions, not the total effects, were considered in the Environmental Assessment. The analysis defines a reference, or no action, case and five different scenarios that are used to represent possible outcomes of the proposed action. The difference between the reference case and any of the alternative scenarios analytically defines the incremental effects.

Determination

Based on the analysis in the Environmental Assessment, the Department has determined that the implementation of the Alternative Transportation Program does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, within the meaning of the NEPA. Therefore, the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required and the Department is issuing this Finding of No Significant Impact.

Issued at Washington, D.C., this 5th day of March, 1996.

Brian T. Castelli,

Chief-of-Staff, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

[FR Doc. 96-5701 Filed 3-13-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Proposed Information Collection and Request for Comments (FERC-510)

March 8, 1996.

AGENCY: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.