

n-16-01
III-A-39

Name	Location	Project	Agency	Final action	Date
Indeck Kirkwood	Kirkwood, New York	55 MW combined cycle gas turbine cogeneration project firing natural gas with #2 oil as backup fuel.	NYSDEC	Non-applicability	June 17, 1992.
Saranac Cogeneration	Saranac, New York	239.7 MW combined cycle gas turbine cogeneration project firing natural gas with liquid petroleum fuel.	NYSDEC	PSD Permit	July 22, 1992.

This notice lists only the sources that have received final PSD determinations. Anyone who wishes to review these determinations and related materials should contact the following offices:

EPA Actions

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region II Office, Permits Administration Branch—room 505, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, New York 10270.

NYSDEC Actions

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Division of Air Resources, Source Review and Regional Support Section, 50 Wolf Road, Albany, New York 12253-0001.

NJDEPE Actions

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and Energy, Division of Environmental Quality, Bureau of Engineering and Technology, 401 East State Street, Trenton, New Jersey 08625.

If available pursuant to the Consolidated Permit Regulations (40 CFR 124), judicial review of these determinations under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act (the Act) may be sought only by the filing of a petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days from the date on which these determinations are published in the Federal Register. Under section 307(b)(2) of the Act, these determinations shall not be subject to later judicial review in civil or criminal proceedings for enforcement.

Dated: September 2, 1992.
Constantine Sldamon-Eristoff,
Regional Administrator.
[FR Doc. 92-23250 Filed 9-23-92; 9:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6960-50-M

[ER-FRL-4500-6]

Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON): Report and Recommendations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of availability of FICON report and recommendations.

SUMMARY: At the direction of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Federal Aviation Administration, the FICON was formed in December 1990 with a basic charter to review specific elements of the assessment of airport noise impacts contained in documents prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); to review the relationship of Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 150 to NEPA; and to make recommendations regarding potential improvements. The FICON is composed of representatives of Departments of Transportation (Office of the Secretary and the Federal Aviation Administration), Defense, Justice, Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development; the Environmental Protection Agency; and the Council on Environmental Quality. The FICON has completed its charter and has issued its report, which contains technical findings and conclusions, and policy recommendations. This notice of the availability of the FICON Report is being published separately by all FICON member agencies.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ken Mittelholz, Office of Federal Activities (A-104), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone, 202-260-0788.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Availability of FICON Report

Any person may obtain a copy of the FICON Report by submitting a written request to the point of contact: Spectrum Sciences and Software, Inc., Attn: Mr. Larry McGlothlin (Code EPA), 242 Vicki Leigh Road, Fort Walton Beach, Florida 32548-1314, telephone (909) 862-3330/3332.

Background

The FICON was formed to review federal policies which are used in the assessment of airport noise impacts. The FICON review focused primarily on:

- The manner in which noise impacts are determined, including whether aircraft noise impacts are fundamentally different from other transportation noise impacts;
- The manner in which noise impacts are described;

- The extent of impacts outside of Day-Night Average A-Weighted Sound Level (DNL) 65 decibels (db) that should be reviewed in a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document;

- The range of FAA-controlled mitigation options (e.g., noise abatement and flight track procedures) analyzed; and

- The relationship of the Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 150 process to the NEPA process, including ramifications to the NEPA process if they are separate, and exploration of the means by which the two processes can be handled to maximize benefits.

The FICON was organized into three subgroups to appropriately focus on the technical, legal and policy issues associated with the assessment of airport noise impacts. The Technical Subgroup was tasked to review the body of science associated with methodologies and metrics for assessing airport noise impacts which have evolved since the 1980 meetings of the Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise (FICUN). The Policy Subgroup was tasked to review federal policies which are used in the assessment of airport noise impacts. The Legal Subgroup reviewed the legal aspects of current and proposed federal policies for assessing airport noise impacts. The Technical Subgroup's products were used as a basis for the policy findings, conclusions and recommendations in the Report.

FICON Report Conclusions

General

- There are no new descriptors or metrics of sufficient scientific standing to substitute for the present DNL cumulative noise exposure metric.
- The methodology employing DNL as the noise exposure metric and appropriate dose-relationships (primarily the Schultz curve for Percent Highly Annoyed) to determine noise impact on populations is considered the proper one for civil and military aviation scenarios in the general vicinity of airports.
- Federal agencies generally conduct noise assessments at DNL levels of 65 dB and higher. For a variety of reasons,

noise predictions and interpretations are frequently less reliable below DNL 65 dB. DNL prediction models tend to degrade in accuracy at large distances from the airport. Therefore, predictions of noise exposure and impact below DNL 65 dB should take the possibility of such inaccuracy into account.

- DNL is sometimes supplemented by other metrics on a case-by-case basis.
- Noise analyses should address impacts in the following areas: (1) health and welfare, (2) environmental degradation/impact, and (3) land use planning.
- Complaints are an inadequate indicator of the full extent of noise effects on a population.

Health and Welfare

- The dose-effect relationship, as represented by DNL and "Percent Highly Annoyed" (%HA), remains the best available approach for analyzing overall health and welfare impacts for the vast majority of transportation noise analysis situations.

- The 10 dB nighttime penalty levied against noise during the 10 PM to 7 AM period is specifically designed to account for the intrusiveness of noise during this period, and its potential impact on sleep. There are no new hard data which would justify a change in this penalty.

- If supplemental analysis for sleep disturbance is desired, use may be made of an interim dose-response model developed by the AF Armstrong Laboratories. Although this relationship is described in terms of Sound Exposure Level (SEL), single event metrics are of limited use in predicting and interpreting cumulative noise exposure impacts.

- Annoyance is a summary measure of the general adverse reaction of people to living in noisy environments that cause speech interference, sleep disturbance, desire for a tranquil environment, and the inability to use the telephone, radio or television satisfactorily.

- No definitive evidence of nonauditory health effects from aircraft noise exists, particularly below DNL 70 Db.

- For supplemental analysis Long-Term Equivalent Sound Level $L_{eq}(X)$ (where X represents the time period of concern) or Time Above (TA) may be used for analysis of school and communications requirements indoors during specific hours.

- Public health and welfare effects below DNL 60 dB have not been established, but are assumed to decrease according to the decrease in percent of people highly annoyed.

Environmental Degradation/Impact

- Under NEPA, environmental degradation might have to be assessed around airports even if there is no clear effect on public health and welfare. Other criteria might be appropriate.

- A 3 dB increase in the DNL environment represents a doubling of sound energy, and clearly is an indicator of the need for further analysis, although smaller increases may indicate similar need. In other words, the impact of a given incremental amount of change in noise levels depends, in part, upon the existing level of the noise environment.

- Recent technology and software advances in geographic information systems (GIS), noise methodology and Census data present an enhanced potential for detailed analysis of sound impacts on population and noise-sensitive areas. These technologies should be considered for use to determine noise impacts of present and proposed actions.

Land-Use Planning

- DNL represents the accepted noise metric for input to compatible land use planning.

- For cumulative speech interference, Table 3-2 "Effects of Noise on People" contained in FICON Volume II: Technical Report, provides a rough approximation of both outdoor and indoor predicted speech interference parameters for various levels of noise exposure as measured in DNL for residential land use only.

- There is a need for selective updating (including Standard Land Use Coding Manual (SLUCM) updating) and enhanced public understanding of the land-use compatibility guidelines, its application and interpretation through incentives and other programs.

Education of the Public

Education of the public should concentrate on the following frequently misunderstood issues:

- Environmental noise exposure is measured and described most generally by Day-Night Average A-Weighted Sound Level (DNL). DNL should be defined clearly and its significance and use explained clearly.

- Relation of DNL to Percent Highly Annoyed describes long-term community response to the overall sound environment (indices of health and welfare effects).

- Although the A-Weighted Maximum Sound Level for a single flyover is easily understood, it is useful only for analyzing short-term responses.

- Every change in the noise environment does not necessarily impact public health and welfare.
- Aircraft noise predictions below DNL 65 dB can be less accurate and should be interpreted with caution.

FICON Report Recommendations

- Continue use of the DNL metric as the principal means for describing long-term noise exposure to civil and military aircraft operations.

- Continue agency discretion in the use of supplemental noise analysis.
- Improve public understanding of the DNL, supplemental methodologies and aircraft noise impacts.

- If screening analysis shows that noise sensitive areas will be at or above DNL 65 dB and will have an increase of DNL 1.5 dB or more, further analysis should be conducted of noise sensitive areas between DNL 60-65 dB having an increase of DNL 3 dB or more due to the proposed airport noise exposure.

- If the DNL 65 dB screening test calls for further analysis between DNL 60-65 dB, agency mitigation options should include noise sensitive areas between DNL 60-65 dB that are projected to have an increase of 3 dB or more as a result of the proposed airport noise exposure.

- If an FAA FAR Part 150 program is included by the FAA as a NEPA mitigation measure, the FAA and the airport operator are responsible for ensuring that the commitment is carried out and the Part 150 study scope conforms to the NEPA scope of analysis.

- Increase research (R&D) on methodology development and on the impact of aircraft noise. To foster this, a standing federal interagency committee should be established to assist agencies in providing adequate forums for discussions of public and private sector proposals identifying needed research and in encouraging the conduct of research in these areas.

The following initial R&D issues are recommended:

- Evaluate potential modifications to the 1980 FICON land use compatibility table to improve its usefulness for both routine land use planning and planning for noise-sensitive land uses.

- Continue research into community reaction to aircraft noise, including sleep disturbance, speech interference, and non-auditory health effects of noise.

- Investigate differences in perceptions of aircraft noise, ground transportation noise (highways and railroads), and general background noise.

- Continue and expand research on the airport noise impacts of rotary-wing operations.

It is the FICON's belief that these recommendations will provide both immediate and long-term improvements in airport noise analysis. Federal interagency encouragement of a continuing review of airport noise analysis will provide a forum to address related public concerns.

While the FICON is seeking to achieve improved uniformity among Federal agencies in airport noise analysis, it must also recognize that agencies have differing legislative mandates and operating environments. These recommendations should be viewed as general guidance. Each Federal agency must determine how it can best use this guidance, supplementing it as appropriate to meet agency needs, within the framework of the NEPA requirements. The FICON Report neither addresses the adequacy of compliance with NEPA to date by the participating agencies, attempts to redefine thresholds of significance of impact under NEPA, nor modifies the NEPA regulations or procedures of the agencies.

Public Review and Comment

Any person may express his or her views on the FICON Report by submitting written comments to the Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Environment and Energy, AEE-300, 800 Independence Avenue, Washington, DC 20501. Since the primary impact of the report's recommendations will be on the assessment of civil airport noise impacts for which the FAA is responsible, the FAA is serving the focal point for the receipt of public comments. Copies of such written responses will be provided to all agencies participating in FICON.

The Environmental Protection Agency is reviewing its procedures for evaluating airport noise impacts based on the report findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and any resulting change in regulations and/or procedures will follow the agency's rules for public review and comment prior to adoption.

Issued in Washington, DC on September 18, 1992.

Richard E. Sanderson,
Director, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 92-23180 Filed 9-23-92; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6550-50-M

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Neil St. John Raymond, et al.; Change in Bank Control Notices; Acquisitions of Shares of Banks or Bank Holding Companies

The notificants listed below have applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notices are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the notices have been accepted for processing, they will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for that notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than October 8, 1992.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Boston (Robert M. Brady, Vice President) 600 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02108:

1. *Neil St. John Raymond, d/b/a Candlewood Associates*, Boston, Massachusetts, and/or *Elizabeth W. Raymond, Ipswich, Massachusetts*, to acquire 88.0 percent of the voting shares of *First Ipswich Bancorp, Ipswich, Massachusetts*, for a total of 88.2 percent, and thereby indirectly acquire *The First National Bank of Ipswich, Ipswich, Massachusetts*.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, September 18, 1992.

Jennifer J. Johnson,
Associate Secretary of the Board.
[FR Doc. 92-23184 Filed 9-23-92; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6210-01-P

Chisholm Bancshares, Inc., et al.; Formations of; Acquisitions by; and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied for the Board's approval under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842) and § 225.14 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.14) to become a bank holding company or to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the applications are set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

Each application is available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the application has been accepted for

processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Any comment on an application that requests a hearing must include a statement of why a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute and summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received not later than October 18, 1992.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (James M. Lyon, Vice President) 250 Marquette Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480:

1. *Chisholm Bancshares, Inc.*, Chisholm, Minnesota; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of *Farmers & Merchants State Bank, Cook, Minnesota*.

2. *Frandsen Financial Corporation*, Forest Lake, Minnesota; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of *Citizens State Bank of East Grand Forks, East Grand Forks, Minnesota*; *First State Bank of Ada, Ada, Minnesota*; *Nimrod Enterprises, Inc., Foley, Minnesota*, and thereby indirectly acquire *State Bank of Foley, Foley, Minnesota*; and *The Gilmanton Co., Foley, Minnesota*, and thereby indirectly acquire *First State Bank of Gilman, Inc., Gilman, Minnesota*.

C. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City (John E. Yorke, Senior Vice President) 925 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 64190:

1. *F.S.B. Properties, Inc. Employee Stock Ownership Plan*, Quinton, Oklahoma; to acquire 37.8 percent of the voting shares of *F.S.B. Properties, Inc., Quinton, Oklahoma*, and thereby indirectly acquire *Farmers State Bank, Quinton, Oklahoma*.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, September 18, 1992.

Jennifer J. Johnson,
Associate Secretary of the Board

[FR Doc. 92-23183 Filed 9-23-92; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6210-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Resources and Services Administration

Program Announcement for Allied Health Project Grants for Fiscal Year 1993

The Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), announces that applications for fiscal year (FY) 1993 Allied Health Project Grants are being accepted under the authority of section 796, title VII, of the Public Health Service Act (the Act), as amended by the Health Professions Reauthorization Act of 1988, Public Law 100-607.

This program announcement is subject to reauthorization of this legislative authority and to the appropriation of funds. The period of Federal support will not exceed three years.

The Administration's budget request for FY 1993 does not include funding for this program. Applicants are advised that this program announcement is a contingency action being taken to assure that should funds become available for this purpose, they can be awarded in a timely fashion consistent with the needs of the program as well as to provide for even distribution of funds throughout the fiscal year. This notice regarding applications does not reflect any change in this policy.

Previous Funding Experience

Previous funding experience is provided to assist potential applicants to make better informed decisions regarding submission of an application of this program. In FY 1992, HRSA reviewed 113 applications for Allied Health Project Grants. Of those applications, 48 percent were approved and 54 percent were not recommended for further consideration. Eleven projects, or 10 percent of the applications received, were funded. In FY 1991, HRSA reviewed 125 applications for Allied Health Project Grants. Of those applications, 20 percent were approved and 80 percent were not recommended for further consideration. Ten projects, or 8 percent of the applications received, were funded.

Purposes

Section 796 authorizes the award of grants for the costs of planning, developing, establishing, operating, and evaluating projects for:

(1) Improving and strengthening the effectiveness of allied health administration, program directors, faculty, and clinical faculty;

(2) Improving and expanding program enrollments in those professions in greatest demand and whose services are most needed by the elderly;

(3) Promoting the effectiveness of allied health practitioners in geriatric assessment and the rehabilitation of the elderly through interdisciplinary training programs;

(4) Emphasizing innovative models to link allied health clinical practice, education and research;

(5) Adding and strengthening curriculum units in allied health programs to include knowledge and practice concerning prevention and health promotion, geriatrics, long-term care, home health and hospice care, and ethics; and

(6) The recruitment of individuals into allied health professions including projects for:

(A) The identification and recruitment of highly qualified individuals, including the provision of educational and work experiences for recruits at the secondary and collegiate levels;

(B) The identification and recruitment of minority and disadvantaged students, including the provision of remedial and tutorial services prior and subsequent to admission; the provision of work-study programs for secondary students, and recruitment activities directed toward primary school students; and

(C) The coordination and improvement of recruitment efforts among official and voluntary agencies and institutions, including official departments of education, at the city, county, and State, or regional level.

National Health Objectives for the Year 2000

The Public Health Service (PHS) is committed to achieving the health promotion and disease prevention objectives of Healthy People 2000, a PHS-led national activity for setting priority areas. This program, Allied Health Project Grants, is related to the priority area of Educational and Community-Based Programs. Potential applicants may obtain a copy of Healthy People 2000 (Full Report; Stock No. 017-001-00474-0) or Healthy People 2000 (Summary Report; Stock No. 017-001-00473-1) through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402-0325 (Telephone 202-783-3238).

Education and Service Linkage

As part of its long-range planning, HRSA will be targeting its efforts to strengthening linkages between U.S. Public Health Service education programs and programs which provide

comprehensive primary care services to the underserved.

Eligible Applicants

To be eligible for a grant, an applicant must be a school, university or other public or nonprofit private educational entity which provides for allied health personnel education and training.

Review Criteria

The review criteria, stated below, which were established in FY 1990 after public comment, will remain unchanged in FY 1993.

- The extent to which the proposed project meets the legislative purpose;
- The background and rationale for the proposed project;
- The extent to which the project contains clearly stated realistic and achievable objectives;
- The extent to which the project contains a methodology which is integrated and compatible with project objectives, including collaborative arrangements and feasible workplans;
- The evaluation plans and procedures for program and trainees, if involved;
- The administrative and management capability of the applicant to carry out the proposed project, including institutional infrastructure and resources;
- The extent to which the budget justification is complete, cost-effective and includes cost-sharing, when applicable; and
- Whether there is an institutional plan and commitment for self-sufficiency when Federal support ends.

Other considerations

In addition, the following funding factor may be applied in determining the funding of approved applications.

Special consideration is defined as the enhancement of priority scores by merit reviewers based on the extent to which applications address special areas of concern.

It is not required that applicants request consideration for a funding factor. Applications which do not request consideration for funding factors will be reviewed and given full consideration for funding.

Established Special Consideration

The following special consideration was established in FY 1991 after public comment and the Administration is extending it in FY 1993.

Applicants demonstrating affiliation agreements for interdisciplinary training experiences in one or more of the following: a nursing home; hospital or