

tend to mis-represent our purpose and intent. This also would cast an untrue representation of the product and put us at a competitive disadvantage.

Kool-Fire IS NOT A HYBRID HEAT PUMP. Hybrid system tests are based on the assumption that at some outdoor temperature, the heat pump electrical energy usage for "heating" will stop and some other "single" source fuel will turn "on" for "heating". With Kool-Fire systems, the outdoor fan turns "off" when the fossil fuel burner turns "on", THE COMPRESSOR NEVER TURNS "OFF". Therefore, electricity PLUS another energy source are used simultaneously.

IV. UNIQUE Kool-Fire features vs. "ordinary" furnaces:

Some of Kool-Fire's differences compared to "ordinary" fossil fuel furnaces are as follows:

a. There is no steel plate heat exchanger, Kool-Fire is an absorption heating system causing heat to be absorbed into refrigerant which has a boiling point of -40 Degree F. (Similar to a "boiler" system)

b. Kool-Fire's absorption system surface is constantly "wet", surface temperatures never exceed 55 Degree F.

c. Combustion air, both primary and secondary, on a Kool-Fire constantly changes from +50 to -40 Degree F. due to the fact that all combustion occurs OUTDOORS.

d. Some of the test data I supplied Mr. Dougherty on Kool-Fire was done by Ontario Hydro and others throughout the 80's. I NOTED that the Canadian Gas Association (CGA) test report of November 20, 1980, on an "early" version of Kool-Fire, indicates a "tested" heating output of 12.33 KW with a "combined" measured input of 10.26 KW. THIS TEST INDICATES KOOL-FIRE HAD A COMBINED EFFICIENCY OF 120%, which NO OTHER fossil fuel appliance in the world has achieved. This data does not reflect the over 20% efficiency improvement due to design changes since that time.

e. When Kool-Fire cycles "off", unlike vented furnaces, there is little heat build-up in the exchanger because the absorption coil is exposed to outdoor ambient. Kool-Fire's outdoor exchanger cools from 55 Degrees to ambient rapidly. This fact eliminates any possibility of acid formation on the outdoor exchanger.

f. Kool-Fire's design assures that a "matched" exchange rate exists between the amount of liquid refrigerant boiling and the amount of fossil fuel burning under the outdoor exchanger. This fact of its design insures that the surface temperature of the exchanger does not exceed 55 Degree F.

Note: A limit control set at 65 Degree F., which is located "upstream" on the compressor suction line, senses return gas temperature. Two (2) 90 Degree F. limit controls are also located on the top of the outdoor exchanger coil. Any of these controls will shut the fossil fuel burner "off", then turn the outdoor fan "on", in the event of "low" refrigerant charge in the system.

To summarize:

Kool-fire burns its fossil fuel, OUTDOORS, and is subject to extreme fluctuation of temperatures that will have to be duplicated in order to obtain accurate test results.

Kool-Fire systems function more like a "boiler" than like a furnace. The heat transfers medium used is refrigerant instead of water. *I know of none other like it in the world.*

V. Concerning an HSPF rating for Kool-Fire systems:

*At this point, Mr. Ed Pollock, Mr. Brian Dougherty, and I all agree that Kool-Fire units cannot be tested and assigned an HSPF rating because of their unique, dual-fuel, burner-assisted design. Kool-fire DOES NOT USE any supplemental electrical resistance heat.*

VI. Thoughts about Heating Season Operating Costs (HSOC):

a. Existing DOE test procedures have been developed to provide an ACCURATE evaluation and comparison of products.

b. Instead of modifying existing procedures, is the DOE at a point that NEW test procedures are required that will reflect the Comparative Annual Integrated Fuel Efficiency (CAIFE) of Kool-Fire and other "unitue/dual-fuel" systems, that could emerge in the future?

c. DOE might consider developing a test procedure that measures the actual fuel utilization of those energy sources used in the "heating" mode based on their "economic" balance point. Then factor this information in conjunction with the "thermal" balance point of the structure.

d. Tests should consider including the TOTAL BTU OUTPUT, related costs to purchase the INPUT FUEL being consumed, and efficiencies of same. These facts could be cross-plotted on some type graph format to find the "economic" balance point of the fuels being consumed. This information could then be factored with the "bin" temperature profiles for a given geographical location. These "bin" temperatures could be the same as used by DOE in tests used for "ordinary" heating systems.

IN CONCLUSION:

The intent of all the DOE testing is to provide an accurate, fair evaluation so that United States consumers will be provided factual information to enable them to make an informed purchasing decision. Unfortunately, times are changing and technology has advanced. I realize this stretches the imagination of those in the DOE and NIST who are responsible to be sure that this intent is fulfilled.

*As previously described, Mr. Ed Pollock and I have agreed upon a course of action to resolve this matter.*

We will be glad to work and supply input for this test procedure in co-operation with Mr. Pollock from DOE and Mr. Dougherty from NIST. I am sure Mr. Dave Young from Ontario Hydro will be able to provide valuable input to this process. I have contacted Mr. Hank Rutkowski, a well-known Mechanical Engineer from the HVAC industry, who is knowledgeable of existing test procedures and is willing to lend his expertise. Mr. Gerry Vandaarvart, the inventor of Kool-fire from Canada, can offer valuable assistance to arrive at an accurate "certification" and proper "heating" mode test procedure.

*I sincerely hope I have supplied enough facts to warrant a PROMPT, FAVORABLE*

*RESPONSE to our "waiver" request and to motivate DOE to IMMEDIATELY grant an "interim waiver".*

Respectfully,

J.N. (Jim) Friedrich, CMS,  
President.

cc: Mr. Gerry Vandaarvart (Kool-Fire Research & Development)  
Mr. Dave Young (Ontario Hydro)  
Mr. Hank Rutkowski, Mechanical Engineer  
Mr. Brian Dougherty (NIST)  
Mr. Edward Pollock (DOE)

[FR Doc. 95-5291 Filed 3-2-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER-FRL-4720-8]

### Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared January 30, 1995 through February 03, 1995 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) 260-5076.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in the Federal Register dated April 10, 1994 (59 FR 16807).

#### Draft EISs

ERP No. D-AFS-J31024-UT Rating EO2, Blanchett Park Dam and Irrigation Reservoir, Construction and Operation, Uintah Water Conservancy District (UWCD), Special-Use-Permit and COE Section 404 Permit, Ashley National Forest, Vernal Ranger District, Uintah County, UT.

#### Summary

EPA supported the USFS selection of No Action as the agency preferred alternative. EPA expressed environmental objections with the build alternative due to the unmitigable impacts to over 50 acres of montane peat fen and loss of a portion of a genetically pure native salmonid population.

ERP No. D-AFS-L65235-ID Rating EO2, Boise River Wildfire Recovery Project, Implementation, North Fork Boise River and Mores Creek Drainages, Boise National Forest, Idaho City and Mountain Home Ranger Districts, Boise and Elmore Counties, ID.

**Summary**

EPA expressed objections to the sale's potential effect on water quality. Additional information is needed on cumulative effects, water quality/fish habitat effectiveness monitoring and documentation for environmental effort predictions.

ERP No. D-AFS-L81011-AK Rating LO, Helicopter Glacier Landing Tours, Implementation, Issuance of Special-Use-Permits, Tongass National Forest, Chatham Area, Juneau Ranger District, Alaska.

**Summary**

EPA had no objection to the proposed action.

**Final EISs**

ERP No. F-BLM-L67027-ID Stone Cabin Open Pit Gold and Silver Mine Development and Operation, Plan of Operations Approval and NPDES Permit Issuance, Florida Mountain, Boise District, Owyhee County, ID.

**Summary**

EPA continued to have environmental concerns with the preferred alternative. EPA's concerns are based on the proposed mitigation plan for the COE Section 404 permit application for wetland fill and on the effectiveness of the proposed treatment technology at the Delamar mine site.

Dated: February 28, 1995.

B. Katherine Biggs,

*Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.*

[FR Doc. 95-5304 Filed 3-2-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

**[ER-FRL-4720-7]****Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability**

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 260-5076 OR (202) 260-5075.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed February 20, 1995 Through February 24, 1995 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 950057, DRAFT EIS, DOE, WA, Washington Windplant No. 1, Construction and Operation, 115 Megawatt (MW) Windpower Project, Conditional-Use-Permit, NPDES and COE Section 404 Permits, Klickitat County, WA, Due: April 17, 1995, Contact: Kathy Fisher (503) 230-4275.

EIS No. 950058, DRAFT EIS, FRC, WI, Wisconsin River Basin Hydroelectric Project, Application for Licensing for ten FERC Hydroelectric Projects: Nos. 2119, 2239, 2476, 1999, 2212, 2590,

2256, 2255, 2291 and 2292, Vilas, Forest, Oneida, Lincoln, Marathon, Portage and Wood Counties, WI and Gogebic County, MI, Due: April 17, 1995, Contact: Sabina Joe (202) 219-1648.

EIS No. 950059, FINAL EIS, AFS, OR, Washington Analysis Area/Baker City Municipal Watershed Project, Implementation, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, Baker Ranger District, Baker County, OR, Due: April 03, 1995, Contact: Chuck Ernst (503) 523-1901.

EIS No. 950060, FINAL EIS, NPS, NV, AZ, Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Management of Burros, Implementation, Clark Co., NV and Mohave Co., AZ, Due: April 03, 1995, Contact: Kent Turner (702) 293-8946.

EIS No. 950061, DRAFT EIS, AFS, CA, San Bernardino National Forest, Realignment and Reconstruction, Falls Road, Implementation, San Bernardino County, CA, Due: April 17, 1995, Contact: Hal Seyden (909) 884-6634.

EIS No. 950062, DRAFT EIS, AFS, CO, Loveland Ski Area Master Development Plan, Implementation, Arapaho National Forest, Clear Creek Ranger District, Clear Creek County, CO, Due: April 17, 1995, Contact: Sue Greenley (303) 567-2901.

EIS No. 950063, FINAL EIS, USN, RI, Davisville Naval Construction Battalion Center, Base Reuse and Development Plan, Implementation, Town of North Kingstown, Washington County, RI, Due: April 03, 1995, Contact: Robert Ostermueller (215) 595-0759.

EIS No. 950064, DRAFT EIS, USN, PA, Philadelphia (Former) Naval Base Hospital Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, City of Philadelphia, PA, Due: April 17, 1995, Contact: Tina Deininger (610) 595-0759.

EIS No. 950065, FINAL EIS, USN, CA, US Navy Lease of Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, (Naval Supply Center) Property of the Port of Oakland for Development of Intermodal Rail Facilities and Maritime Cargo-Related Tenant Uses, Alameda County, CA, Due: April 03, 1995, Contact: Raymond Chiang (415) 244-3022.

Dated: February 28, 1995.

B. Katherine Biggs,

*Associate Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.*

[FR Doc. 95-5305 Filed 3-2-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

**[FRL-5162-8]****Committee Meetings of the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission**

**AGENCY:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is announcing a meeting of the Public Advisory Committee (PAC) of the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission (Commission).

The PAC will meet from 10:00 a.m., MST on Thursday, March 9, to 12:00 Noon on Saturday, March 11, at the Woodlands Plaza Hotel, 1175 West Route 66, Flagstaff, Arizona. Activities on Thursday, March 9, will include a briefing on technical documents produced by the Commission's various committees, and a field trip to a visibility monitoring station at the Grand Canyon. Friday, March 10 and Saturday, March 11, will be devoted to a workshop during which the PAC will review the Commission's emissions inventory, emissions management scenarios, economic and demographic projections, and methodologies for assessing social, environmental, equity, and administrative impacts of emissions management scenarios.

The Commission was established by the EPA on November 13, 1991 (see 56 FR 57522, November 12, 1991). All meetings are open to the public. These meetings are not subject to provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, as amended.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. John T. Leary, Project Manager for the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission, Western Governor's Association, 600 17th Street, Suite 1705, South Tower, Denver, Colorado 80202; telephone number (303) 623-9378; facsimile machine number (303) 534-7309.

Dated: February 23, 1995.

Mary D. Nichols,

*Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 95-5016 Filed 3-2-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**[FRL-5164-3]****Science Advisory Board; Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meetings**

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given that several committees of the Science Advisory