

kit meets this programmatic intent. Certification under the urban bus program is available to other parties complying with program requirements.

In summary, the Agency believes that the information that DDC has presented, supported as discussed above, adequately demonstrates compliance with the applicable life cycle cost requirements of the urban bus program.

IV. Certification

The Agency has reviewed the information of the DDC notification of intent to certify, comments received from interested parties, and other information, and finds that the notification of intent to certify complies with the life cycle cost requirements specified in section 85.1403(b)(2)(ii). These findings do not change the Agency's findings stated in the notice of October 2, 1995 (60 FR 51472).

Today's Federal Register notice announces certification for the above-described equipment on the basis of compliance with the life cycle cost requirements. The effective date of certification is the date of a letter provided earlier from the Director of the Engine Programs and Compliance Division to DDC. A copy of this letter can be found in the public docket at the address listed above.

V. Operator Responsibilities and Requirements

Today's Federal Register notice does not change the responsibilities and/or requirements of bus operators affected by the urban bus retrofit/rebuild program.

Today's Federal Register notice announces that the above-discussed DDC equipment complies with the life cycle cost requirements specified in section 85.1403(b)(2)(ii). Therefore, the certification emission levels of the equipment will be considered by the Agency when it establishes final post-rebuild levels as required pursuant to 85.1403(c)(1)(iii). DDC's upgrade kit is certified to emission levels of 0.30 g/bhp-hr for 1979 through 1987 model year 6V92TA MUI engines, and 0.23 g/bhp-hr for 1988 and 1989 model year 6V92TA MUI engines. If either or both of those certification levels are established as post-rebuild values, then operators complying with compliance program 2 would use such levels, as appropriate, in calculations for determining fleet target emissions for 1998 and thereafter.

Copies of the DDC notification, DDC's letter to the Agency dated December 15, 1995, the summary of the APTA survey, and public comments are available for

review in the public docket located at the address indicated above.

Dated: July 3, 1996.

Mary D. Nichols,

Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 96-18179 Filed 7-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5540-3]

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

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of Agency Certification of Equipment for the Urban Bus Retrofit/Rebuild Program.

SUMMARY: The Agency received a notification of intent to certify equipment signed January 2, 1996, from the Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) with principal place of business at 13400 Outer Drive, West; Detroit, Michigan, 48239, for certification of urban bus retrofit/rebuild equipment pursuant to 40 CFR Sections 85.1401-85.1415. The equipment is applicable to Detroit Diesel Corporation's (DDC) petroleum-fueled 6V92TA model engines having Detroit Diesel Electronic Control (DDEC II) fuel injection. Certification is restricted to 1988 through 1990 model year engines. On April 17, 1996, EPA published a notice in the Federal Register that the notification had been received and made the notification available for public review and comment for a period of 45 days (61 FR 16739). EPA has completed its review of this notification, and the comments received, and the Director of the Engine Programs and Compliance Division has determined that it meets all the requirements for certification. Accordingly, EPA has approved the certification of this equipment effective June 28, 1996. (EPA provided a letter to DDC on this date stating Director of the Engine Programs and Compliance Division had granted certification.)

The certified equipment provides 25 percent or greater reduction in exhaust emissions of particulate matter (PM) for the engines for which it is certified (see below), and meets the requirements of the urban bus retrofit/rebuild program for certification. Therefore, as discussed below, this equipment may be used by operators choosing compliance program 2 and operators choosing compliance program 1 unless rebuild equipment is certified to trigger the 0.10 g/bhp-hr

standard for these engines under the urban bus retrofit/rebuild program.

EPA anticipated reviewing the cost information supplied by DDC to determine whether it complied with the life cycle cost requirements. In general, equipment certified as meeting both the emissions requirements and cost requirements can be considered by EPA when revising the post-rebuild PM levels to be used by transit operators choosing to comply with Option 2 (the averaging program). However, equipment has already been certified for these engines as meeting both the emissions requirements and cost requirements of the regulations (i.e. the 25 percent PM reduction standard has already been triggered for these engines). Two current equipment certifications (Engelhard Corporation (60 FR 28402, May 31, 1995), and Johnson Matthey (61 FR 16773, April 17, 1996)) are certified to the same PM level as the DDC equipment certified today. Because the DDC rebuild equipment will not have a lower certification level than the equipment already certified, EPA sees no program benefit for basing certification on the basis of meeting life cycle costs.

The DDC notification, as well as other materials specifically relevant to it, are contained in Public Docket A-93-42, category XII, entitled "Certification of Urban Bus Retrofit/Rebuild Equipment". This docket is located in room M-1500, Waterside Mall (Ground Floor), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 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.

DATES: The effective date of certification is June 28, 1996, which is the date on which the Director of the Engine Programs and Compliance Division notified DDC in writing that certification was approved.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tom Stricker, Engine Programs and Compliance Division (6303J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St. SW., Washington, D.C. 20460. Telephone: (202) 233-9322.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

By a notification of intent to certify signed January 2, 1996, Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) applied for certification of equipment applicable to its 1988 through 1990 model year 6V92TA model urban bus engines

having Detroit Diesel Electronic Control (DDEC II) fuel injection. The equipment to be certified, referred to as an upgrade kit, is basically later model-year components (such as turbocharger, blower, fuel injectors, and cylinder kits) which replace the original parts on the engine.

All parts of the certified equipment are contained in two basic types of kits. One of each basic type of kit is required for the rebuild of an engine. Three combinations of the two basic types of kits are certified—the specific combination to be used with a particular engine depends upon the direction of engine rotation, orientation of the engine block, and engine power level. One basic type of kit includes a gasket kit, cylinder kit, and remanufactured fuel injectors. The other basic type of kit includes remanufactured parts, including camshafts, blower assembly, turbocharger, and cylinder head assemblies. In addition, the kit includes an updated computer program for the engine's computer.

The DDC upgrade kit is intended for use on 1988 through 1990 model year 6V92TA model urban bus engines having Detroit Diesel Electronic Control (DDEC II) fuel injection. The 1988 through 1990 6V92TA DDEC II models were originally manufactured to either a 253 horsepower (hp) configuration or a 277 hp configuration. Use of today's certified upgrade kit will result in a 277 hp engine configuration, regardless of the engine configuration of the original engine. DDC did not attempt to certify the 253 hp version of the 1991 engine

configuration. To ensure that transit operators only upgrade their engines to the 277 hp engine configuration, DDC will only provide the computer program (or, as DDC refers to it, the certification word code) for the 1991 model year 277 hp engine configuration.

In accordance with 40 CFR 85.1406, and consistent with the discussion in the preamble to final rule (58 FR 21359, April 23, 1993), DDC based its certification demonstration on existing new engine certification data. The baseline test data are from a 1988 6V92TA DDEC II engine (253 hp) tested in DDC's 1989 new engine certification program. Test data for the upgraded engine configuration are from a 1991 6V92TA DDEC II engine (277 hp), tested in DDC's 1991 new engine certification program. Emission test data supplied by DDC in its notification are shown below in Table A.

TABLE A.—EMISSION TEST DATA (g/bhp-hr)

Gaseous and particulate emissions	Baseline 1988 6V92TA DDEC II (253 hp)	Upgrade 1991 6V92TA DDEC II (277 hp)
HC	0.66	0.43
CO	1.44	1.85
NO _x	8.19	4.77
PM	0.315	0.218
Smoke emissions:		
Accel	3.3%	5.4%
Lug	1.8%	0.9%
Peak	4.7%	10.6%

Although baseline test data are only provided for the 253 hp engine configuration, and not the 277 hp engine configuration, EPA believes that the 1988 through 1990 models with the 277 hp engine configuration will still achieve at least a 25 percent reduction in PM with the upgrade kit installed. DDC provided test data from engine development testing which show the 1988 through 1990 277 hp engine configuration emits 0.319 g/bhp-hr, essentially equal to the 0.315 g/bhp-hr level shown by the 253 hp baseline engine.

In addition to demonstrating reductions in PM exhaust emissions, the data indicate that applicable engines with the certified equipment installed will comply with the federal 1988 model year emission standards for hydrocarbon (HC), carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), and smoke emissions.

DDC is certifying this equipment to a PM emission level of 0.23 g/bhp-hr for the 1988 through 1990 model year upgrade. The certification level represents a 27 percent reduction in PM from the 1988 baseline configuration. The certification levels for this equipment in the urban bus program are indicated below in Table B, and apply only to the model numbers listed.

TABLE B.—RETROFIT/REBUILD PM CERTIFICATION LEVELS FOR DDC EQUIPMENT

Engine model	Model year	Model No.	Certification level (g/bhp-hr)
6V92TA	1988–1990	8067–7B27	0.23
DDEC II		8067–7B28	
		8067–7B21	
		8067–7B22	
		8067–3B21	
		8067–3B22	
		8067–7B23	
		8067–7B24	
		8067–4B23	
		8067–4B25	

DDC submitted life cycle cost information in its application for certification and indicated that this equipment would meet the life cycle cost requirements (\$2,000 in 1992 dollars) for all urban bus operators. The suggested list price of the kit was stated to be \$6,581.81, compared to \$6,966.27 for a standard rebuild. DDC also

calculated a \$1,440 fuel penalty, resulting from a fuel economy decrease of approximately 4.7 percent with the upgrade kit installed.

As discussed in the Summary section above, EPA had anticipated reviewing the cost information supplied by DDC to determine whether it complied with the life cycle cost requirements of the

regulations (that is, whether the equipment would be available for less than the life cycle cost limit of \$2,000 (in 1992 dollars) incremental to a standard rebuild). However, because equipment has already been certified for these engines as meeting both the emissions requirements and cost requirements of the regulations (i.e., the

25 percent PM reduction standard has already been triggered for these engines), EPA sees no program benefit for basing certification on the basis of complying with life cycle cost requirements, and therefore, has not reviewed the cost information supplied by DDC.

Section IV below discusses operator requirements and responsibilities, including use of the DDC equipment to meet program requirements.

II. Summary and Analysis of Comments

EPA received comments from two parties on this DDC notification: Johnson Matthey (JMI) and students of Florida International University (FIU).

Johnson Matthey, a manufacturer of exhaust system aftertreatment devices, has comments in two general areas: cost and compliance. Regarding costs associated with use of the DDC equipment, JMI believes that the DDC equipment does not meet the life cycle cost requirements of the regulations. JMI believes the fuel economy penalty calculated by DDC does not accurately reflect typical transit operator fuel costs. In addition, JMI believes that most transit operators do not use strictly original equipment (OE) parts to rebuild their engines. JMI comments that use of less expensive non-OE parts is typical, and would make the cost of a standard rebuild less expensive than the cost provided by DDC. In addition, JMI comments that transit operators typically rebuild or recondition certain components in-house, for a cost less than the cost provided by DDC.

Finally, JMI comments that certain fleets are not properly installing certified equipment. Specifically, JMI states that although some fleets are purchasing certified engine upgrade kits, they are rebuilding certain parts rather than the using the appropriate part contained in the upgrade kit. JMI asks whether such engines are in a certified configuration, how EPA ensures the product is used properly, and what method of traceability is in place for the components of a certified kit.

EPA appreciates the effort put forth by JMI to provide comments regarding this equipment. As discussed above, the Agency believes that there is no need to evaluate the life cycle cost data nor to respond at this time to comments concerning life cycle costs because the requirement to reduce PM by 25 percent has been triggered for applicable engines with the certification on May 31, 1995, of an exhaust catalyst manufactured by the Engelhard Corporation (60 FR 47170). Certification of this DDC equipment on the basis of

meeting life cycle cost requirements would not influence EPA's revision of post-rebuild PM levels in mid-1996, because the 0.23 g/bhphr certification level of the DDC equipment is equal to the certification level of both the Engelhard catalyst and the Johnson Matthey catalyst (61 FR 16773, April 17, 1996). Thus, EPA sees no programmatic benefit, at this time, to basing certification on compliance with the life cycle cost requirements.

Regarding JMI's comments on improper installation of certified equipment, EPA notes that equipment manufacturers must supply instructions for proper installation of certified equipment. Transit operators who improperly install, or fail to install, certified equipment, may not be in compliance with either of the two compliance programs. EPA has authority to conduct, and plans to conduct, transit operator audits to determine whether transit operators are complying with program regulations.

Regarding traceability of certified parts, equipment manufacturers are required to provide part numbers in their notification of intent to certify, that will assist EPA in determining whether a transit operator has used appropriate parts on an engine.

Comments from FIU, in general, support the need to reduce PM in urban areas, however, FIU has provided comments that, in general, appear relevant to the promulgation of the original retrofit regulations, rather than to this particular certification. FIU mistakenly comments that this DDC certification would affect all pre-94 model year urban buses, noting that approximately 35,000 of these buses exist. In addition, FIU implies in their comments that, as a result of this certification, rebuilds of affected engines will cost \$8,000 over the cost of a standard rebuild. Finally, FIU comments that students of the university, based on an informal survey, support the certification of the DDC equipment.

Although the retrofit program, in general, may affect as many as 35,000 or more buses of 1993 and earlier model year, this particular certification applies only to 1988 through 1990 model year DDC 6V92TA DDEC II engines, less than 20 percent of the total urban bus fleet. Regarding FIU's discussion of the cost of a rebuild using the DDC equipment, the Agency is not analyzing costs related to this equipment. Further, the \$8,000 cost FIU associated with this equipment would be substantially higher than what the Agency would expect from an engine upgrade kit. FIU appears to have confused the \$7,940 life cycle cost (in

1992 dollars) associated with the 0.10 g/bhphr PM standard as the cost for the DDC equipment. While certain comments provided by the students of FIU are not entirely appropriate or consistent with program background and intricacies, the Agency appreciates the review of and support for the urban bus program and DDC's notification that the students have provided.

III. Certification Approval

The Agency has reviewed this notification, along with comments received from interested parties, and finds that the equipment described in this notification of intent to certify:

(1) reduces particulate matter exhaust emissions by at least 25 percent, without causing the applicable engine families to exceed other exhaust emissions standards;

(2) will not cause an unreasonable risk to the public health, welfare or safety;

(3) will not result in any additional range of parameter adjustability; and

(4) with the exception of the life cycle cost requirements of 85.1403(b)(2)(ii), meets other requirements necessary for certification under the Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses (40 CFR Sections 85.1401 through 85.1415).

The Agency hereby certifies this equipment for use in the urban bus retrofit/rebuild program as discussed below in Section IV.

IV. Operator Requirements and Responsibilities

In a Federal Register notice dated May 31, 1995 (60 FR 28402), the Agency certified an exhaust catalyst manufactured by the Engelhard Corporation, as a trigger of program requirements. For urban bus operators affected by this program and electing to comply with program 1 requirements, that certification means that rebuilds and replacements of model year 1988 through 1990 6V92TA DDEC IIs (and all other engines for which that catalyst is applicable) performed 6 months or more after that date of certification, must be performed with equipment certified to reduce PM emissions by 25 percent or more. The certified DDC equipment may be used immediately by urban bus operators who have chosen to comply with either program 1 or program 2, as follows.

Today's Federal Register notice certifies the above-described DDC equipment, when properly applied, as meeting the requirement to reduce PM by 25 percent. Urban bus operators who choose to comply with program 1 may use the certified DDC equipment until

equipment is certified which triggers the 0.10 g/bhphr standard for the 1988 through 1990 6V92TA DDEC II engines.

Operators that have chosen to comply with program 2 may use the certified DDC equipment, as discussed in the above paragraph, along with the respective PM certification level from Table B when calculating their average fleet PM level.

As stated in the program regulations (40 CFR 85.1401 through 85.1415), operators should maintain records for each engine in their fleet to demonstrate that they are in compliance with the requirements beginning on January 1, 1995. These records include purchase records, receipts, and part numbers for the parts and components used in the rebuilding of urban bus engines.

Richard Wilson,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 96-18387 Filed 7-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5539-3]

Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Notice of Revocation for Technician Certification Programs

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of revocation.

SUMMARY: Through this action EPA is announcing the revocation of six programs previously approved to provide the technician certification exam in accordance with the regulations promulgated at 40 CFR 82.161. These six programs—AcuPro Refrigerant Recovery located in Phoenix, Arizona; Country Trade School located in Melbourne, Florida; Dundalk Community College located in Baltimore, Maryland; Northeast Institute located in Buffalo, New York; National Training Center located in Newport Beach, California; and National Training Fund located in Alexandria, Virginia—were issued letters of revocation on June 11, 1996, that included an explanation of the basis for EPA's decision.

These six programs have not complied with the recordkeeping and reporting requirements established for all technician certification programs pursuant to section 608 of the Clean Air Act Amendments (the Act). In accordance with those requirements, all approved technician certification programs must submit an activity report to EPA on a semi-annual basis. EPA sent to each of the above programs an information collection request issued pursuant to section 114(a) of the Act, in

which EPA requested that the programs submit the required activity report. That information request indicated that failure to respond could result in revocation. Subsequent attempts by EPA to contact these programs were unsuccessful.

In accordance with 40 CFR 82.161(e), EPA revoked approval of these programs on June 11, 1996. These programs are no longer authorized to certify technicians or issue valid certification credentials. However, technicians certified by these programs during the period that the programs operated an EPA-approved program will remain certified in accordance with 40 CFR 82.161(a).

DATES: The six programs listed above had their approval as a technician certification programs revoked, effective June 11, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cindy Newberg, Program Implementation Branch, Stratospheric Protection Division, Office of Atmospheric Programs, Office of Air and Radiation (6205-J), 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460. The Stratospheric Ozone Information Hotline at 1-800-296-1996 can also be contacted for further information.

Dated: July 2, 1996.

Paul M. Stolpman,

Director, Office of Atmospheric Programs.

[FR Doc. 96-18181 Filed 7-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[ER-FRL-5471-5]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared July 1, 1996 Through July 5, 1996 pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of FEDERAL ACTIVITIES AT (202) 564-7167. An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 5, 1996 (61 FR 15251).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-AFS-K65184-CA Rating EC2, Rock Creek Recreational Trails Management Plan, Implementation, Eldorado National Forest, Georgetown Ranger District, Eldorado County, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about potential noise impacts, the proposed level of use, funding feasibility, and the integration

of management on intermixed private lands. EPA recommended reconsideration of the level of participation, number of special events allowed and the ability to enforce road/trail closures with an all-season road.

ERP No. D-AFS-L61208-00 Rating EC2, Hells Canyon National Recreation Area (HCNRA), Comprehensive Management Plan, Implementation, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, Nez Perce and Payette National Forests, Baker and Wallowa Counties, OR and Nez Perce and Adams Counties, ID.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns based on potential adverse impacts of the action from roads, grazing and increased usage to air quality, riparian habitat and water quality.

ERP No. D-AFS-L65266-AK Rating EC2, King George Timber Sale Project, Timber Harvesting and Road Construction, Implementation, Tongass National Forest, Stikine Area, Etolin Island, AK.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns about road closure methods, water quality, wildlife habitat, especially fish habitat and suggested the final EIS include this information.

ERP No. D-BLM-K67035-NV Rating EC2, Bootstrap/Capstone and Tara Open-Pit Gold Mine Project, Construction and Operation Approval, Plan of Operation, Elko and Eureka Counties, NV.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns due to potential impacts to water quality and suggested that complete or partial backfilling of the Bootstrap/Capstone pit be included in the preferred alternative. The FEIS should further address impacts to water and air quality, wildlife, and wetlands; as well as cumulative impacts; mitigation; and waste rock characterization and handling.

ERP No. D-DOE-K11068-NV Rating EO2, Nevada Test Site (NTS) and Off-Site Locations, Implementation, at the Following Sites: Tonopah Test Range; Portions of the Nellis Air Force Range (NAFR) Complex; the Central Nevada Test Area and Shoal Area Project, Nye County, NV.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental objections due to a lack of mitigation to offset or reduce potential adverse impacts; a tendency to locate the proposed facilities in undisturbed rather than already-disturbed areas; and a lack of pollution prevention features.

ERP No. DS-AFS-L65201-OR Rating LO, Eagle Creek Timber Sale and Road Construction, Additional and Updated Information, Implementation, Mt. Hood