1997, tendered for filing a fully executed copy of Amendment No. 1 to Contract for Interchange Service between Florida Power and Western Power Services, Inc. (Amendment No. 1).

On December 31, 1996, Florida Power tendered for filing a partially executed copy of Amendment No. 1. The sole purpose of this filing is to provide the Commission with a fully executed copy.

Comment date: June 23, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

34. Florida Power Corporation

[Docket No. OA97–380–000]

Take notice that Florida Power Corporation (Florida Power), on May 8, 1997, tendered for filing a fully executed copy of Amendment No. 1 to Contract for Interchange Service between Florida Power and City of Starke (Amendment No. 1).

On December 31, 1996, Florida Power tendered for filing a partially executed copy of Amendment No. 1. The sole purpose of this filing is to provide the Commission with a fully executed copy.

Comment date: June 23, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

35. Florida Power Corporation

[Docket No. OA97–385–000]

Take notice that Florida Power Corporation (Florida Power), on May 8, 1997, tendered for filing a fully executed copy of Amendment No. 1 to Contract for Interchange Service between Florida Power and Louis Dreyfus Electric Power, Inc. n/k/a Duke/Louis Dreyfus Marketing, L.L.C. (Amendment No. 1).

On December 31, 1996, Florida Power tendered for filing a partially executed copy of Amendment No. 1. The sole purpose of this filing is to provide the Commission with a fully executed copy.

Comment date: June 23, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

36. Florida Power Corporation

[Docket No. OA97–388–000]

Take notice that Florida Power Corporation (Florida Power), on May 8, 1997, tendered for filing a fully executed copy of Amendment No. 2 to Contract for Interchange Service between Florida Power and Utility Board of the City of Key West (Amendment No. 2).

On December 31, 1996, Florida Power tendered for filing a partially executed copy of Amendment No. 2. The sole purpose of this filing is to provide the Commission with a fully executed copy.

Comment date: June 23, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

37. Florida Power Corporation

[Docket No. OA97–390–000]

Take notice that Florida Power Corporation (Florida Power), on May 8, 1997, tendered for filing a fully executed copy of Amendment No. 3 to Contract for Interchange Service between Florida Power and Florida Power & Light Company (Amendment No. 3).

On December 31, 1996, Florida Power tendered for filing a partially executed copy of Amendment No. 3. The sole purpose of this filing is to provide the Commission with a fully executed copy.

Comment date: June 23, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

38. Florida Power Corporation

[Docket No. OA97–393–000]

Take notice that Florida Power Corporation (Florida Power), on May 8, 1997, tendered for filing a fully executed copy of Amendment No. 1 to Contract for Interchange Service between Florida Power and Tampa Electric Company (Amendment No. 1).

On December 31, 1996, Florida Power tendered for filing a partially executed copy of Amendment No. 1. The sole purpose of this filing is to provide the Commission with a fully executed copy.

Comment date: June 23, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

39. Commonwealth Edison Company

[Docket No. OA97–569–000]

Take notice that on June 2, 1997 Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd) amended the March 26, 1997 filing and submits for filing a new form of service agreement, Short-Term Firm Service Agreement (Service Agreement), under Docket No. OA96–569–000.

ComEd continues to request an effective date of April 1, 1997, for the reasons set out in the original transmittal letter, dated March 26, 1997. Copies of this filing were served upon all OATT customers and the Illinois Commerce Commission.

Comment date: June 23, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraph

E. Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date. 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 proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–15653 Filed 6–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5842–4]

Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses; Public Review of a Notification of Intent To Certify Equipment

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of Agency receipt of a notification of intent to certify equipment and initiation of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Agency has received a notification of intent to certify urban bus retrofit/rebuild equipment pursuant to 40 CFR Part 85, Subpart O from the Engelhard Corporation (Engelhard). Pursuant to § 85.1407(a)(7), today's **Federal Register** notice summarizes the notification below, announces that the notification is available for public review and comment, and initiates a 45-day period during which comments can be submitted. The Agency will review this notification of intent to certify, as well as comments received, to determine whether the equipment described in the notification of intent to certify should be certified. If certified, the equipment can be used by urban bus operators to reduce the particulate matter of urban bus engines.

The Engelhard notification of intent to certify, as well as other materials specifically relevant to it, is contained in category XVII–A of Public Docket A–93–42, entitled ''Certification of Urban Bus Retrofit/Rebuild Equipment.'' This docket is at the address below.

Today's notice initiates a 45-day period during which the Agency will accept written comments relevant to whether or not the equipment included in this notification of intent to certify

should be certified. Comments should be provided in writing to Public Docket A–93–42, Category XVII–A, at the address below. An identical copy should be submitted to Anthony Erb, also at the address below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before July 31, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit separate copies of comments to the two following addresses:

1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Public Docket A–93–42 (Category VIII–A), Room M–1500, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

2. Anthony Erb, Engine Compliance and Programs Group, Engine Programs & Compliance Division (6403J), 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Docket items may be inspected from 8:00 a.m. until 5:30 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anthony Erb, Engine Programs & Compliance Division (6403J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460. Telephone: (202) 233–9259.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On April 21, 1993, the Agency published final Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier model Year Urban Buses (58 FR 21359). The retrofit/rebuild program is intended to reduce the ambient levels of particulate matter (PM) in urban areas and is limited to 1993 and earlier model year (MY) urban buses operating in metropolitan areas with 1980 populations of 750,000 or more, whose engines are rebuilt or replaced after January 1, 1995. Operators of the affected buses are required to choose between two compliance programs: Program 1 sets particulate matter emissions requirements for each urban bus engine in an operator's fleet which is rebuilt or replaced; Program 2 is a fleet averaging program that establishes specific annual target levels for average PM emissions from urban buses in an operator's fleet.

Certification of retrofit/rebuild equipment is a key element of the retrofit/rebuild. To show compliance under either of the compliance programs, operators of the affected buses must use equipment that has been certified by the Agency. Emissions requirements under either of the two compliance programs depend on the availability of certified retrofit/rebuild equipment for each engine model. To be used for Program 1, equipment must be certified as meeting a 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM standard or as achieving a 25 percent reduction in PM. Equipment used for Program 2 must be certified as providing some level of PM reduction that would in turn be claimed by urban bus operators when calculating their average fleet PM levels attained under the program. For Program 1, information on life cycle costs must be submitted in the notification of intent to certify in order for certification of the equipment to initiate (or trigger) program requirements. To trigger program requirements, the certifier must guarantee that the equipment will be available to all affected operators for a life cycle cost of $7,940 or less at the 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM level, or for a life cycle cost of $2,000 or less for the 25 percent or greater reduction in PM. Both of these values are based on 1992 dollars.

II. Notification of Intent To Certify

By a notification of intent to certify signed November 18, 1996, Engelhard has applied for certification of equipment applicable to all Cummins L–10 engines that were originally manufactured prior to and including 1993.

The notification of intent to certify states that the candidate equipment will reduce PM emissions 25 percent or more on petroleum-fueled diesel engines that have been rebuilt to Cummins specifications. Pricing information has been submitted with the notification, along with a guarantee that the equipment will be offered to all affected operators for less than the incremental life cycle cost ceiling. Therefore, this equipment may trigger program requirements for the 25% reduction standard. If certified as a trigger of this standard, urban bus operators will be required to use this retrofit/rebuild equipment or other equipment certified to provide a PM reduction as discussed below.

The equipment being certified is a ''catalytic Converter Muffler'' or CMX™, that is a muffler containing an oxidation catalyst. The CMX is intended to replace the standard muffler previously installed in the engine eshaust system. The CMX is intended to be maintenance free, requiring no service for the full in-use compliance perior. The engine fuel to be used with this equipment is standard diesel fuel with a maximum sulfur content of 0.05 wt.% sulfur.

Engelhard has requested approval for all Cummins L–10 engines manufactured prior to and including 1993. Engelhard presents exhaust emission data from testing a 1992 280hp Cummins L–10 EC (electronic control) engine. Engelhard states that the engine selected can be considered worst case for an after treatment device because of the extremely low baseline emissions. Engelhard states that the low PM emissions provide less for the catalyst to work on, thus making it harder for the catalyst to achieve the 25% reduction. EPA notes that this interpretation of worst case in not in accordance with the regulation which states that EPA will allow results to be extrapolated to engine types and model years known to have engine out PM levels equal to or less than that of the test engine. In the case at hand, the test engine has a pre-rebuild PM emission level of 0.25 g/bhp-hr. The PM levels listed in the table at § 85.1403(c)(1)(iii)(A) for all Cummins models (other than the L–10 EC) are higher than the stated level for the test engine. Under the regulations, a test engine can serve only as a worst case for engines that have an original certification level that is equal to or less than the emission level of the test engine. Based on the regulations and worst case definition in the regulations, at this time EPA believes that this certification may only be applicable to the 1992–1993 L–10 EC model, as this is the only model that fulfills the worst-case criteria. EPA welcomes comments and supporting information relative to this issue.

Engelhard has stated that it may supply additional testing data on another engine that may meet the worst case criteria in the future which may alter the applicability of this application. EPA will consider such information and provide the opportunity for public comment at that time. However, pending receipt of that additional data, EPA welcomes comments based on the information presented herein.

The test engine was a new 1992 280 hp Cummins L–10 EC (electronic control) engine obtained from the National Institute for Petroleum and Energy Research. The engine had approximately 250 hours of break in time before testing. Two tests were conducted, one test was performed on the engine without the CMX and a second test was performed on the same engine after retrofit with the CMX. The test data show a PM level of 0.105 g/bhp-hr for the base engine without the CMX, and a PM level of 0.073 g/bhp-hr with the candidate equipment installed. This represents a PM reduction of 30% with candidate equipment installed. The test data also show that hydrocarbon (HC), carbon monoxide (CO), and oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) are

less than applicable standards. Fuel consumption is not affected when the candidate equipment is installed based on comparison to the test results. Engelhard presents smoke emission measurements for the engine demonstrating compliance with applicable standards.

TABLE A.—EXHAUST EMISSIONS SUMMARY

[G/BHP–HR]

Gaseous and particulate test	Standards	1992 Cummins L–10 EC baseline	1992 Cummins L–10 EC with CMX
HC	1.3	0.27	0.12
CO	15.5	1.46	0.74
NO_X	5.0	5.0	4.88
PM	0.25	0.105	[1] 0.073
BSFC[2]		0.373	0.368
Smoke Test.			
ACCEL	20 (percent)	3.1 (percent)	3.9 (percent)
LUG	15 (percent)	1.9 (percent)	1.2 (percent)
PEAK	50 (percent)	6.0 (percent)	6.6 (percent)

[1] The PM level listed in Table A differs from the level listed in the notification of intent to certify as the hot start test cited in the original notification was not valid. However, the PM level listed in Table B is based on a valid hot start test (H–2) which was conducted in conjunction with the cold start test.

[2] Brake Specific Fuel Consumption (BSFC) is measured in units of lb/bhp-hr.

Engelhard indicates that the CMX muffler kit equipment will have an incremental maximum cost (in 1992 dollars) to the bus operator of $1,790.00 and will require six hours of installation time @ $35.00 per hours. Thus, the total incremental cost according to Engelhard will be $2,000.00 (1992 dollars). Engelhard states that there will be no incremental fuel cost, or maintenance cost compared to the currently available standard rebuild. Therefore, the candidate equipment will be offered to all affected operators for a maximum life cycle cost of $2,000 (1992 dollars). Currently, no equipment is certified for the 1992 Cummins L–10 EC model engine, accordingly, if certified, this equipment would trigger the 25 percent reduction standard.

If the Agency certifies the candidate Engelhard equipment operators will be affected as follows. Under Program 1, this certification would trigger requirements for all rebuilds of applicable L–10 EC engines performed six months following the effective date of certification requiring the use of this equipment or other equipment certified in the meantime to provide at least a 25 percent reduction. With regard to the L–10 models included in this notification on intent to certify by Engelhard, equipment has already been certified demonstrating the 25% reduction.

The requirement to use certified equipment demonstrating at least a 25% reduction in PM will continue for the applicable engines until such time as equipment is certified to trigger the 0.10 g/bhp-hr emission standard for less than a life cycle cost of $7,940 (in 1992 dollars). If the Agency certifies the candidate Engelhard equipment, operators who choose to comply with Program 2 and install this equipment will use the PM emission level(s) established during the certification review process in their calculations for target or fleet level as specified in the program regulations. Emission levels proposed by Engelhard are provided in Table B. However, as noted above, EPA at this time believes that this certification would only apply to the 1992 and 1993 L–10 EC models.

TABLE B.—CERTIFICATION LEVELS

Cummins engine model	Model year	Baseline PM levels	PM emissions with CMX
L–10	1985–1987	0.65	0.50
L–10	1988–1989	0.55	0.41
L–10	1990–1991	0.46	0.34
L–10 EC	1992–1993	0.25	0.19

At a minimum, EPA expects to evaluate this notification of intent to certify, and other materials submitted as applicable, to determine whether there is adequate demonstration of compliance with: (1) the certification requirements of § 85.1406, including whether the testing accurately proves the claimed emission reduction or emission levels; and, (2) the requirements of § 85.1407 for a notification of intent to certify, including whether the data provided by Engelhard complies with the life cycle cost requirements.

The Agency requests that those commenting also consider these regulatory requirements, plus provide comments on any experience or knowledge concerning: (a) Problems with installing, maintaining, and/or using the candidate equipment on applicable engines; and, (b) Whether the equipment is compatible with affected vehicles.

The date of this notice initiates a 45-day period during which the Agency will accept written comments relevant to whether or not the equipment described in the Engelhard notification of intent to certify should be certified pursuant to the urban bus retrofit/rebuild regulations. Interested parties

are encouraged to review the notification of intent to certify and provide comment during the 45-day period. Please send separate copies of your comments to each of the above two addresses.

The Agency will review this notification of intent to certify, along with comments received from interested parties, and attempt to resolve or clarify issues as necessary. During the review process, the Agency may add additional documents to the docket as a result of the review process. These documents will also be available for public review and comment within the 45-day period.

Mary D. Nichols,

Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 97–15729 Filed 6–13–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5842–5]

Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses; Public Review of a Notification of Intent To Certify Equipment and Public Review of a Request To Amend a Current Certification

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of agency receipt of a notification of intent to certify equipment and initiation of comment period. Notice of Agency receipt of a request to amend a current certification.

SUMMARY: The Agency has received a notification of intent to certify urban bus retrofit/rebuild equipment for 4-stroke petroleum fueled diesel engines pursuant to 40 CFR Part 85, Subpart O from Engine Control Systems Ltd. (ECS). Pursuant to § 85.1407(a)(7), today's **Federal Register** notice summarizes the notification below, announces that the notification is available for public review and comment, and initiates a 45-day period during which comments can be submitted. The Agency will review this notification of intent to certify, as well as comments received, to determine whether the equipment should be certified.

This action is also notifying the public that ECS proposes to amend its current two-stroke engine certification. On January 6, 1997 (62 FR 746) EPA approved certification of the ECS retrofit kit which demonstrated a 25% reduction in PM for 1979 to 1993 DDC 2-stroke engines. On February 11, 1997, ECS requested that this certification be modified to also include 8V71N engines for model years 1973 to 1984.

Today's notice initiates a 45-day period during which the Agency will accept written comments relevant to whether or not the equipment included in this notification of intent to certify for 4-stroke engines should be certified and whether the Agency should approve the ECS request to amend the previously approved 2-stroke application to include the 8V71N model. Comments relevant to the 4-stroke notification should be provided in writing to Public Docket A–93–42, Category XVI–A, at the address below. Comments relevant to the 2-stroke amendment should be provided in writing to Public Docket A–93–42, Category XIV–A, at the address below. An identical copy of each comment should be submitted to Anthony Erb, also at the address below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before July 31, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit separate copies of comments to the two following addresses:

1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Public Docket A–93–42 (Category XIV–A or XVI–A), Room M–1500, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

2. Anthony Erb, Engine Compliance and Programs Group, Engine Programs & Compliance Division (6403J), 401 ''M'' Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Docket items may be inspected from 8:00 a.m. until 5:30 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anthony Erb, Engine Programs & Compliance Division (6403J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460. Telephone: (202) 233–9259.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

On April 21, 1993, the Agency published final Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Year Urban Buses (58 FR 21359). The retrofit/rebuild program is intended to reduce the ambient levels of particulate matter (PM) in urban areas and is limited to 1993 and earlier year (MY) urban buses operating in metropolitan areas with 1980 populations of 750,000 or more, whose engines are rebuilt or replaced after January 1, 1995. Operators of the affected buses are required to choose between two compliance programs: Program 1 sets particulate matter emissions requirements for each urban bus engine in an operator's fleet which is rebuilt or replaced; Program 2 is a fleet averaging program that establishes specific annual target levels for average PM emissions from urban buses in an operator's fleet.

Certification of retrofit/rebuild equipment is a key element of the retrofit/rebuild program. To show compliance under either of the compliance programs, operators of the affected buses must use equipment that has been certified by the Agency. Emissions requirements under either of the two compliance programs depend on the availability of certified retrofit/rebuild equipment for each engine. To be used for Program 1, equipment must be certified as achieving at least a 25 percent reduction in PM. Equipment used for Program 2 must be certified as providing some level of PM reduction that would in turn be claimed by urban bus operators when calculating their average fleet PM levels attained under the program. For Program 1, information on life cycle costs must be submitted in the notification of intent to certify in order for certification of the equipment to initiate (or trigger) program requirements. To trigger program requirements, the certifier must guarantee that the equipment will be available to all affected operators for a life cycle cost of $7,940 or less at the 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM level, or for a life cycle cost of $2,000 or less for the 25 percent or greater reduction in PM. Both of these values are based on 1992 dollars.

The equipment for which certification is pending for the 4-stroke engine is a catalytic converter muffler which will take the place of the standard muffler in the exhaust system. ECS has requested that this equipment notification be considered for certification for use under Program 2 only. Equipment certified for Program 2 must provide some level of PM reduction that can in turn be claimed by urban bus operators when calculating their average fleet PM levels attained under the program. Certification of this equipment will not trigger or comply with any requirements under Program 1.

With regard to the request from ECS to amend the existing certification for 2-stroke engines, ECS is requesting that the certification be amended to include 8V71N model engines originally produced in model years 1973 through 1984. On August 8,1996 (61 FR 41409), EPA published a notice that it had received a notification of intent to certify equipment providing a 25% reduction in PM for specific DDC model engines. The equipment for which certification was requested was an oxidation converter muffler which was