

(e) Questions at the meeting may be asked only by members of the Advisory Panel.

(f) Seating for the public will be made available on a first-come first-served basis.

(g) Copies of minutes of public sessions will be made available for copying, following their certification by the Chairman, in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, at the U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration's Public Document Room, 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, upon payment of all charges required by law.

HARRY L. PEEBLES,
Deputy Advisory Committee
Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 76-16794 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL 557-4]

AMBIENT AIR MONITORING REFERENCE AND EQUIVALENT METHODS

Receipt of Application for Reference or Equivalent Method Determination

Notice is hereby given that on May 7, 1976, the Environmental Protection Agency received an application from ASARCO Incorporated to determine if its Model 500 Sulfur Dioxide analyzer should be designated by the Administrator of the EPA as an equivalent method under 40 CFR Part 53, promulgated February 18, 1975 (40 FR 7044). If, after appropriate technical study, the Administrator determines that this method should be so designated, notice thereof will be given in a subsequent issue of the *Federal Register*.

Dated: June 3, 1976.

WILSON K. TALLEY,
Assistant Administrator
for Research and Development.

[FR Doc. 76-16742 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am]

[FRL 557-8; OTS-01-75]

CHLORALKYLENE FLUIDS

Opinion Regarding Use as Dielectric Fluids

On May 14, 1976, the Environmental Protection Agency received a request from the Prodelec Company for the Agency's opinion regarding the environmental risk involved in using chloralkylene fluids as a substitute for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) as dielectric fluids. The Agency responded to this request with the following correspondence:

PRODELEC Specialites Rhone-Frogl, Uguine-Kuhlmann, Pour L'Industrie Electrique, 21, Rue Jean Goujon, 75008 Paris Tel.: 256-40-00; Telex: Rhone x 640100 P; Teleg.: Rhodia-Paris 066.

E.P.A., OFFICE OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES, 401 M Street, S.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. (U.S.A.)

Subject: Chloralkylene/substitute dielectric fluid.

Paris, 10th May 1976.

ATTENTION: Russell Train.

DEAR MR. TRAIN: We wish to thank Mr. Schweitzer and his group for the informal meeting at which we discussed the environmental impact study and the other aspects of our proposed replacement for the polychlorobiphenyls used in the American capacitor industry.

We would like to propose our product as the best temporary solution to this problem and we would very much appreciate learning the reaction of the EPA to our request for Chloralkylene to be accepted on a temporary basis until such time a more suitable product can be found completely acceptable for both the environment and for use in the capacitor industry.

Our Chloralkylene is based on mono- and dichloro biphenyl which have not been found in the environment (although dichlorobiphenyl amount to 20% in commercial PCB's). The tests carried out on Chloralkylene which could be completed by some additional studies as suggested during our meeting with Mr. Schweitzer, indicate in particular that this product is fairly easily metabolized in different biotas and does not offer the risks of persistence and accumulation which in the case of PCB's are of so much concern to the ecologist.

However, we do not think our product cannot be proved to be completely safe for the environment but at this time it is clear that it fulfills all the requirements of the capacitor industry and could be considered as a biodegradable replacement for PCB's and a comparatively non-toxic substitute.

Therefore, we would appreciate your information at this time concerning whether or not we should continue our studies and whether the EPA is willing to consider Chloralkylene as a suitable temporary replacement.

Yours faithfully,

G. PAINPADOINE,
B. RAY COQUAIS

MR. GERARD PAINPADOINE,
Director,

MR. BRUNO RAY-COQUAIS, Ingenieur I.C.P.I. Societe Prodelec, 21, rue Jean-Goujon, 75008 Paris, Cedex 08, France.

GENTLEMEN: We have received your letter of May 10, 1976, requesting our views on the environmental acceptability of Chloralkylene, a mixture containing polychlorinated biphenyl compounds and alkylchlorobiphenyl isomers, as electrical capacitors with a potential production level for such application of several tens of millions of pounds annually. Our preliminary conclusions concerning the environmental aspects of this proposed replacement fluid for Aroclor 1016, based on your technical briefing and your supporting documentation, are set forth below.

The data that have been developed on Chloralkylene are inadequate to assess the environmental acceptability of a product with a chemical structure so closely related to other polychlorinated biphenyls which have caused considerable environmental damage. For example, not a single lifetime animal feeding study has been conducted on Chloralkylene nor is one planned. Also, there are serious unresolved questions concerning the persistence of Chloralkylene. Its effects on aquatic organisms are not well understood. We also are concerned that your studies apparently show that metabolites of Chloralkylene may include the hydroxylated biphenyl, which could be of even greater concern than the starting material.

In the absence of more definitive data demonstrating the likelihood that Chloralkylene will not present environmental prob-

lems, we must recommend against the introduction of Chloralkylene for use in capacitors.

We are aware that some specialists believe that the less highly chlorinated biphenyls may present less of an environmental hazard than the more highly chlorinated ones. In the absence of more persuasive documentation than is currently available, however, we do not share the view that the degree of chlorination is the only determining factor in considering the environmental acceptability of this class of chemicals. Furthermore, even if some polychlorinated biphenyls are somewhat less toxic, less bioaccumulative, and less persistent than others, we consider that the properties of all members of the class are sufficiently undesirable to warrant major environmental concerns.

Sincerely,

GLENN E. SCHWEITZER,
Director,
Office of Toxic Substances.

The Agency would like to receive any additional information available on this issue. Members of the public or other Federal agencies are invited to submit written comments and other information relevant to this issue or to the correspondence contained in this notice to Dr. I. E. Wallen (WSMB 771), Office of Toxic Substances (WH-557), Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460. All written comments filed pursuant to this notice will be available for public inspection in the above office from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. during normal working days.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

A. W. BREIDENBACH,
Assistant Administrator
for Water and Hazardous Materials.

[FR Doc. 76-16744 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am]

[FRL 558-1; OTS-02-75]

POLYDIMETHYLSILOXANE

Opinion Regarding Use as Coolants for Use in Transformers

On May 5, 1976, the Environmental Protection Agency received a request from the Dow Corning Corporation for the Agency's opinion regarding the environmental risk involved in using polydimethylsiloxane fluids as a substitute for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) as coolants for electrical transformers. The Agency responded to this request with the following correspondence:

DOW CORNING

APRIL 30, 1976.

DR. I. E. WALLEN,
Office of Toxic Substances, United States
Environmental Protection Agency,
Washington, D.C. 20460.

DEAR DR. WALLEN: Enclosed is a copy of our answers to the questions that were raised during our informal technical meeting on March 23. We also have enclosed a number of supporting documents pertinent to these answers.

As you know, we are currently actively carrying out further research into environmental transport and decomposition routes of polydimethylsiloxane. As our information in this area grows, we are designing new experiments to investigate any potential toxicity of decomposition products. It is our in-

tention to keep you advised of our progress and to rapidly make you aware of significant results, particularly if they are contrary to the general trends we have reported to date.

We request your office to provide us with a statement stating your opinion as to the environmental risk involved in using polydimethylsiloxane fluids as coolants for electrical transformers.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. RYAN, Ph. D.,
Manager Fluids Research,
Dow Corning Corporation.

Dr. JOHN W. RYAN,
Manager, Fluids Research, Dow Corning
Corporation, Midland, Michigan 48640.

DEAR Dr. RYAN: We have received your letter of April 30, 1976, requesting our views on the environmental acceptability of polydimethylsiloxane fluids to be used in electrical transformers. The potential production level of this type of chemical for such application would be several tens of millions of pounds annually. Our preliminary conclusions concerning the environmental aspects of this fluid as a potential replacement for one of the major uses of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), based on your technical briefing and your supporting documentation, are set forth below. However, we have not attempted to assess the performance, flammability, or economic aspects of the use of these fluids in transformers.

We are unaware of any incidents of adverse health or ecological effects associated with the production, use, or disposal of polydimethylsiloxane fluids, which have been produced in the United States at an estimated level of about 240 million pounds for a variety of applications, including applications which result in substantial environmental discharges. Similarly, available laboratory test data do not suggest the likelihood of environmental problems. At the same time, however, we are unaware of any systematic epidemiological or other field efforts to search for adverse effects, and we would like to see more data on chronic health effects and effects in aquatic systems.

Despite the incompleteness of our knowledge concerning the environmental effects of polydimethylsiloxane fluids, we believe that the available information indicates that these fluids are far preferable to PCBs for use in transformers from the environmental viewpoint. Further, we have no basis for suspecting that this closed-system application will result in serious environmental problems.

Given the widespread use of polydimethylsiloxane fluids in open systems, as well as their potential use in transformers, we would encourage expanded efforts to acquire more definitive data as to the health and ecological aspects of these fluids, in addition to your current efforts directed to environmental transport and decomposition. Given the long history of usage of these fluids, epidemiological investigations of workers and users who have been exposed to them for long periods of time at relatively high concentrations should not be too difficult to organize and carry out. The single chronic toxicity animal study conducted in the 1940s was not performed at today's standards for control nor length of study. Additional animal studies of the chronic effects, particularly on the circulatory and respiratory systems, are in order. Finally, we would suggest further investigations of the likely impact of spills of polydimethylsiloxane fluids into confined aquatic areas on aquatic life, including surface dwelling insects. Since previous testing was all done with static bioassay, we would recommend, as a minimum, flow-through-bioassay with fathead

minnow, sheepshead minnow, and/or Daphnia.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN K. SCHWARTZMAN,
Director,
Office of Toxic Substances.

The Agency would like to receive any additional information available on this issue. Members of the public or other Federal agencies are invited to submit written comments and other information relevant to this issue or to the correspondence contained in this notice to Dr. I. E. Wallen (WSME 711), Office of Toxic Substances (WH-557), Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460. All written comments filed pursuant to this notice will be available for public inspection in the above office from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. during normal working days.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

A. W. BREIDENBACH,
Assistant Administrator for
Water and Hazardous Materials.
[FR Doc. 76-16745 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am]

VINYL CHLORIDE

Recommended Procedures for Disposal of Aerosol Cans

Background: On January 22, 1975, the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register canceled certain indoor aerosol pesticide products which contain vinyl chloride as a propellant (40 FR 3494). Following that action, the Office of Solid Waste Management Programs (OSWMP) of EPA developed internal guidance for the use of its Regional Offices should they be requested to provide disposal advice to affected parties.

On September 5, 1975, and again on February 6, 1976, the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) reaffirmed in the Federal Register its regulation declaring *any* self-pressurized products intended or suitable for household use that contain vinyl chloride monomer as an ingredient or in the propellant to be "banned hazardous substances". That action included certain repurchase requirements for manufacturers and had obvious disposal implications. In fact, CPSC in the September 5, 1975, Federal Register notice requested appropriate industry officials to conduct their repurchase and disposal actions in accordance with EPA guidelines (40 FR 41170). It was also noted "... that many States and municipalities have adopted codes for the disposal of hazardous wastes ... [which, in many instances] are in conformity with EPA guidelines and will insure the proper disposal of the products involved." No seizure actions have been initiated to date, but the CPSC, if necessary, "will recommend to the Courts disposal methods consistent with EPA guidelines."

Purpose: Pursuant to section 204(b) (1) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, the Administrator may issue guidance and recommendations to State

and local government, industry, organizations, and individuals, related to the disposal of waste materials.

The purpose of this publication is to provide guidance for the disposal of vinyl chloride-containing aerosol cans. This guidance is addressed primarily to holders of large quantities of vinyl chloride-containing aerosol cans, although the recommended procedures are appropriate to disposal of any such wastes. These recommended procedures represent the best information available on preferable disposal options for vinyl chloride-containing aerosol cans.

When the problem of disposal surfaced, little was known about the chemical interactions of vinyl chloride monomer (VCM) with the environment. While the chemical and physical properties of VCM as they generally relate to its manufacture and use are known, there is limited information on how VCM reacts in a land disposal site environment. However, comparison of the known properties of VCM to those of other gases has been attempted in order to provide a base for recommended procedures for the disposal of VCM-containing aerosols. The following recommendations acknowledge recommended procedures for pesticide disposal as well as procedures for disposal of heavy-metal containing materials.

Technical background. Vinyl chloride monomer (VCM) is a chlorinated alkene hydrocarbon with a density of twice that of air. Since VCM boils at -13.27 C, it is a gas at normal atmospheric temperature and pressure. Vinyl chloride is highly flammable having a flash point of -78 C. The explosive limits are from 4 to 22 percent VCM in air by volume.

VCM is soluble in organic solvents, but not very soluble in water. The quantity of VCM that dissolves in water depends on the partial pressure of the gas above the solution. If the partial pressure of the gas above the water is reduced, VCM will escape into the gas phase and be released to the ambient air. Chemical reactions, which can occur because of water impurities, might tend to inhibit escape of vinyl chloride. Certain salts have the ability to combine with VCM; for example, soluble silver and copper salts increase the solubility of VCM in water by forming complex dissolved salts.

VCM makes up about 20 percent by volume (equivalent to about 18 percent of the net weight) of the propellant in most of the canceled pesticide aerosols. The pesticides involved are mainly pyrethrins, lindane, and malathion. In hair sprays, deodorants, paints, etc., however, VCM may constitute as much as 40 to 45 percent by volume of the contents. Other propellants are chlorofluorocarbons 11

¹ The CPSC estimated in its September 5, 1975, Federal Register notice that an estimated 3.3 million cans of vinyl chloride aerosols were in existence. Of these, approximately one million were in the hands of manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. The remaining 2.3 million cans were in the possession of the consumer.

and 12 (e.g., Freon). Although EPA has no data on the ingredients of non-pesticide aerosols, hairsprays, for example, would be expected to consist mainly of organics, while paints may contain heavy metals such as cadmium, lead, chromium, or mercury.

Disposal of VCM-containing aerosol cans. Final disposal of VCM-containing aerosol cans should be undertaken using methods listed in order of preferred priority:

1. High temperature incineration (except for products containing heavy metals)
2. Burial in a State-approved chemical (or hazardous) waste landfill
3. Burial in a separate area of a State-approved sanitary landfill.

It should be noted that chemical treatment to recover the active materials may be technically feasible, but would require special handling techniques to remove the contents from the cans. Since this process is very costly, its feasibility depends largely upon the value of the recovered materials.

Incineration. Incineration should be used when possible for final destruction of the materials. This method is limited to heavy duty rotary-kiln or other incinerators that (1) can handle aerosol cans without damage, (2) operate at a temperature of 1000 C with two seconds dwell time, and (3) are equipped with appropriate pollution controls to meet State or local air pollution control requirements. Incineration should not be used where the product contains more than trace quantities of heavy metals such as lead, mercury, cadmium, and chromium.

High temperature incineration of pesticides, VCM, and the other propellants and solvents or carriers found in aerosol units can effectively be carried out at 1000 C with a dwell time in the combustion zone of two seconds. Although VCM probably is destroyed at a lower temperature (one source indicated 700 C was sufficient), preparations containing pesticides may not be completely combusted. Additionally, the hair sprays, deodorants, etc. contain unknown resins which may require higher temperatures for complete destruction.

Since the cans explode and produce shrapnel at high temperatures, only heavy duty rotary-kiln or equivalent units should be considered if more than about 12 cans are to be disposed of at one time. Incinerator feed mechanisms should be adjusted to prevent injury or damage from blow-back which may occur when several aerosol units (such as one case) are introduced simultaneously.

A pollution control system will be required to remove potential air contaminants. Most of these aerosols contain chlorofluorocarbon propellants as well as VCM, and therefore, generate both hydrogen chloride (HCl) and hydrogen fluoride (HF).

EPA publication, *Hazardous Waste Management Facilities* (EPA/530/SW-148.27),² provides information on some incineration facilities. Use of these facilities for incineration of VCM-containing aerosol cans should be checked with EPA Regional and State representatives to assure that the facility has adequate environmental controls to meet Federal/State/local regulations.

Chemical Waste Landfills. In some areas there are public or commercial landfills that have been approved by State agencies to accept industrial hazardous wastes. Such sites are located, engineered, or constructed to avoid hydraulic continuity with either surface or ground water. Disposal of VCM aerosols in these facilities does, however, require extraordinary care above that given to other toxic or hazardous wastes (such as sludges), because the gases that could be released upon rupture of the unit are highly volatile and flammable as well as toxic.

Further details on the recommended site criteria and operating procedures for landfilling are given in the following section. Specifically, however, in the case of VCM disposal in a chemical-waste landfill, special bottom liners would not be needed, although all other criteria and procedures should be followed.

State-approved Sanitary Landfills. Sanitary landfills for disposal of aerosols containing VC, should only be considered if an adequate incinerator or chemical waste landfill is not available. Even then, special conditions should be observed to assure proper disposal. Such a landfill should be located and operated in an appropriate manner and be inspected and approved by State and local agencies.

The following procedures discuss the landfilling aspects of disposal of aerosols containing VCM and are only concerned with the propellant. The active ingredients in the aerosol can could dictate more stringent disposal requirements due to their potential hazard to the environment. However, the quantities of active ingredients contained are usually small (1 percent of the net weight or less). Most of the pesticide chemicals involved are insoluble in water and biodegradable. Thus, they may not move from the burial site in ground water or percolating water, but would be biodegraded to their basic constituents in place. Other products, however, may contain soluble materials capable of polluting groundwaters. Procedures discussed in the next section will limit groundwater degradation potential.

Little is known of the soil degradation of VCM gas. However, the polar molecules suggest that the gas will be loosely held in place by soil organic matter, and

by the clay fraction of the soil. Soil moisture also hampers the dispersion of gases in soils; however, the best medium to contain gases would have a moisture content approaching 50 percent of field capacity. Such soils also normally contain a large, varied population of microorganisms including several species that might attack the organic compounds found in aerosols.

Recommended Procedures for Landfilling. State-approved sanitary landfills that are located, designed, and operated in accordance with EPA's "Guidelines for the Land Disposal of Solid Wastes" (40 CFR Part 241) published August 14, 1974, in the *Federal Register* (39 FR 29328) are acceptable, provided that the following special criteria and procedures are utilized:

- (1) Advance notice is given to the appropriate State agency;
- (2) A facility is chosen which has ground-water monitoring facilities or such facilities are provided prior to disposal of the cans. Quarterly monitoring for heavy metals or other potential pollutants should be carried out;
- (3) The burial site is specifically recorded in the property records;
- (4) A separate, clearly marked area is set aside so that the bottom of the trench (in which the aerosol cans are to be placed) is at least one foot above the 50-year high water table;
- (5) A trench with minimum depth of 10 feet is dug;
- (6) A high-density polyethylene film (30 to 30 mil, or equivalent material) is properly installed at the bottom of the trench;
- (7) One foot of topsoil covers the film (see note);
- (8) A single layer of cans, or randomly distributed cans do not exceed 12 inches in depth and 3 feet in width;
- (9) One foot of topsoil covers the cans (see note);
- (10) Six feet of cover material is compacted over the topsoil (see note);
- (11) A high-density polyethylene film liner (30 to 30 mil) is laid over the compacted cover;
- (12) One foot of final cover is compacted; and
- (13) The following safety precautions are observed during disposal:

No smoking or open flames, since VCM is a flammable gas.

No direct compaction of cans is undertaken since rupture will expose workers to hazardous or toxic vapors.

Each day's accumulation is covered with at least one foot of topsoil and 6 feet of cover and compacted.

NOTE.—Organic matter, clay, and moisture contents of soils will provide additional protection by interacting with the movement of chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides and VCM to the surface or to the water table. The topsoil and cover material should contain less than the optimum moisture content for compaction, in order to provide more pore space for the absorption of gases. The final cover should be mounded to approximately six inches above grade in the center to promote runoff and reduce infiltration.

Dated: June 4, 1976.

ROGER STEINLOW,
Assistant Administrator for
Air and Waste Management.

(EPA Doc.76-16747 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am)

² Referenced document may be obtained from Solid Waste Information, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, Ohio 45260.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

FARMERS BANK OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE, DOVER, DELAWARE

Suspension of Trading

It appearing to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation that an extension of the suspension of trading in the common stock of Farmers Bank of the State of Delaware being traded otherwise than on a national securities exchange, ordered by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation on March 8, 1976, is required in the public interest and for the protection of investors;

Therefore, pursuant to Sections 12(i) and 12(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the suspension of trading in such securities otherwise than on a national securities exchange is extended for the period beginning at 9:00 a.m. (d.s.t.) on June 6, 1976 through June 15, 1976.

By order of the Board of Directors, June 3, 1976.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION,
ALAN R. MILLER,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16639 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am]

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

[No. 76-81]

SOUTH AMERICAN SHOE CORP. V. THE ZIM ISRAEL NAVIGATION COMPANY, LTD.

Filing of Complaint

June 3, 1976.

Notice is hereby given that a complaint filed by South American Shoe Corp. against Zim Israel Navigation Company, Ltd. was served June 3, 1976. The complaint alleges that respondent has violated sections 16, 17, and 18(b)(5) by virtue of applying an outbound freight rate on shoes from New York to Greece significantly in excess of the rate applied inbound from Greece on the same commodity.

Hearing in this matter shall commence on or before December 3, 1976.

JOSEPH C. POLKING,
Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16724 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am]

[Docket No. 76-26]

TRANSCONEX INC.—PROPOSED GENERAL RATE INCREASE IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS DOMESTIC OFFSHORE TRADE

Order Vacating Suspension of Rates

By Order of Investigation and Suspension served on May 11, 1976, the Commission initiated this proceeding. At issue is a 12 percent general rate increase of Transconex, Inc., an NVOCC, in the Virgin Islands trade. The suspension of the rate increase was based on an analysis of the financial data submitted by Transconex to support the increase.

Subsequent to the Commission's Order, Transconex petitioned via telex for re-

consideration of the suspension and supplied additional financial data. The analysis of the additional data indicates that the suspension is no longer warranted.

Therefore, it is ordered, That the suspension of the subject tariff matter, identified in Appendix A, is hereby vacated, but that the investigation portion of the proceeding be continued;

It is further ordered, That pursuant to the provisions of the Commission's Tariff Circular No. 3 (46 CFR 531.20(f)), Transconex may file with the Commission the tariff matter necessary to vacate and set aside the suspension of said rates, such tariff matter to become effective on not less than one day's notice;

It is further ordered, That a copy of this Order shall be filed with Transconex's Tariff FMC-F No. 1, shall be served upon all parties to this proceeding and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Commission.

JOSEPH C. POLKING,
Assistant Secretary.

APPENDIX A
TRANSCONEX, INC.
FMC-F NO. 1

14th Revised Page 15
9th Revised Page 24
12th Revised Page 25
10th Revised Page 26
11th Revised Page 25
11th Revised Page 27
11th Revised Page 37
12th Revised Page 38
13th Revised Page 38
13th Revised Page 39
13th Revised Page 40

[FR Doc.76-16724 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am]

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Project No. 2376]

APPALACHIAN POWER CO.

Application for Approval of Revised Exhibits J and K and Exhibit R

June 2, 1976.

Public notice is hereby given that an application was filed on February 6, 1976, under the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 791a-823r) by Appalachian Power Company (Correspondence to: Mr. Herbert B. Cohn, Vice President, Appalachian Power Company, P.O. Box 18, Bowling Green Station, New York, New York 10004) for approval of revised Exhibits J and K and Exhibit R for the constructed Reusens Project No. 2376, located on the James River in Amherst, Bedford, and Campbell Counties, Virginia. Applicant also filed a revised Exhibit F to reflect current land ownership at the project. The proposed change in exhibits would only affect lands in Amherst County, Virginia.

Applicant seeks Commission approval of revised Exhibits J and K and Exhibit R that were filed in accordance with Article 30 of the license for the project. The Exhibit R describes existing recreation facilities for picnicking and boat launching on the 9.35-acre Monacan Recreation Area purchased by Applicant

in 1968. No further recreational development is planned. The proposed revision to the Exhibits J and K is to illustrate the inclusion of the above-mentioned tract of land within the project boundary.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before July 19, 1976, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 C.F.R. § 1.8 or § 1.10). 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 petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules. The application is on file with the Commission and is available for public inspection.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by Sections 308 and 309 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. § 821g, § 825h) and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, specifically Section 1.32(b) (18 C.F.R. § 1.32(b)), as amended by Order No. 518, a hearing may be held without further notice before the Commission on this application if no issue of substance is raised by any request to be heard, protest or petition filed subsequent to this notice within the time required herein and if Applicant requests that the shortened procedure of § 1.32(b) be used. If an issue of substance is so raised or Applicant fails to request the shortened procedure, further notice of hearing will be given.

Under the shortened procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing before the Commission.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.76-16662 Filed 6-8-76; 8:45 am]

[Docket No. ER76-718]

ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE CO.

Tender of Rate Supplement

June 3, 1976.

Take notice that, on May 28, 1976, Arizona Public Service Company (APS) tendered for filing Supplement No. 1 to Service Schedule E of the Power Coordination Agreement between APS and Tucson Gas and Electric Company, Rate Schedule FPC No. 32. APS states that this supplement establishes additional delivery and redelivery points and also provides for a change in the manner for computation of transmission lines.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a petition to intervene or protest with the Federal