

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.

ACTION: Notice of proposed information collection and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the requirements of Section 3506(c)(2)(a) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. No. 104-13), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) is soliciting public comment on the specific aspects of the information collection described below.

DATES: Consideration will be given to comments submitted within 60 days of the publication of this notice.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the proposed collection of information can be obtained from and written comments may be submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Attn: Michael P. Miller, Information Services Division, ED-12.4, 888 First Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael P. Miller may be reached by telephone at (202) 208-1415, by fax at (202) 273-0873, and by e-mail at mmiller@ferc.fed.us.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Abstract: The information collected under the requirements of FERC-510 "Application for the Surrender of a Hydropower License" (OMB No. 1902-0068) is used by the Commission to implement the statutory provisions of Part 1, Sections 4(e), 6 and 13 of the Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. 797(e), 799 and 806. Section 4(e) gives the Commission the authority to issue licenses for the purpose of constructing, operating and maintaining dams, water conduits, reservoirs, powerhouses, transmission lines or other project works necessary or convenient for developing and improving navigation, transmission and utilization of power

over which Congress has jurisdiction. Section 6 gives the Commission the authority to prescribe the conditions of the licenses including the revocation and/or surrender of the license. Section 13 defines the Commission's authority to delegate time periods for when a license must be terminated if project construction has not begun. Surrender of a license may be desired by a licensee when a licensed project is retired or not constructed. The commission implements these filing requirements in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) under 18 CFR Sections 6.1 through 6.4.

Action: The Commission is requesting a three-year extension of the current expiration date, with no changes to the existing collection of data.

Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this collection is estimated as:

No. of respondents annually (1)	No. of responses per respondent (2)	Average burden hours per re- sponse (3)	Total annual burden hours (1)×(2)×(3)
10	1	10	100

Estimated cost burden to respondents: 100 hours/2,087 hours per year × \$102,000 per year=\$4,887.

The reporting burden includes the total time, effort, or financial resources expended to generate, maintain, retain, disclose, or provide the information including: (1) reviewing instructions; (2) developing, acquiring, installing, and utilizing technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, verifying, processing, maintaining, disclosing and providing information; (3) adjusting the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; (4) training personnel to respond to a collection of information; (5) searching data sources; (6) completing and reviewing the collection of information; and (7) transmitting, or otherwise disclosing the information.

The estimate of cost for respondents is based upon salaries for professional and clerical support, as well as direct and indirect overhead costs. Direct costs include all costs directly attributable to providing this information, such as administrative costs and the cost for information technology. Indirect or overhead costs are costs incurred by an organization in support of its mission. These costs apply to activities which benefit the whole organization rather than any one particular function or activity.

Comments are invited on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information

is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology e.g. permitting electronic submission of responses.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-6117 Filed 3-13-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

[Docket Nos. RP95-310-001 and CP94-260-004]

Algonquin Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Amended Application

March 8, 1996.

Take notice that on March 1, 1996, Algonquin Gas Transmission Company (Algonquin) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Fourth Revised

Volume No. 1 the following tariff sheets, with an effective date of April 1, 1996:

Fifth Revised Sheet No. 20
Original Sheet Nos. 36-37
Alternate Original Sheet Nos. 36-37
Sheet Nos. 38-39
Second Revised Sheet No. 100
Sheet Nos. 238-240
Original Sheet Nos. 241-248
Sheet Nos. 249-599
Third Revised Sheet Nos. 678-680
Second Revised Sheet No. 680A
Second Revised Sheet No. 710
Third Revised Sheet No. 712
Second Revised Sheet No. 799
Sheet Nos. 936-939
Original Sheet Nos. 940-946
Sheet Nos. 947-1099

Algonquin states that the purpose of this filing is to comply with the Commission's order issued June 14, 1995, in Docket Nos. RP95-310-000 and CP94-260-001 and 002. Algonquin states that the June 14 order directed Algonquin to file, 30 days prior to the expected commencement of service under Rate Schedule AFT-CL, tariff sheets that are consistent with the proforma AFT-CL tariff sheets previously submitted in these dockets.

Algonquin also states that the rates reflected on Original Sheet Nos. 36-37 reflects the rates for which Algonquin has sought approval in an amendment filed February 20, 1996 in Docket No. CP94-260-003 and the rates on Alternate Original Sheet Nos. 36-37 reflect the initial rate approval in the April 19, 1995, and June 14, 1995 orders