

TABLE 3.—SMALL NONROAD SPARK IGNITION ENGINE MANUFACTURER BURDEN HOURS AND COSTS—Continued

Collection activity	Defect information reports	Voluntary emission recall (VER) reports/records	VER progress reports
Total Cost Per Respondent (\$)	818	492	79
Total Cost (\$)	4,090	2,460	395

ICR-2: The projected hour burden is as follows: reading or listening to questions, burden hours = 8 minutes. Responding to questions (verbally or in writing), burden hours = 7 minutes. The frequency of response is once per respondent per year. The estimated number of likely respondents is 300. The total burden for all respondents is 75 hours.

The projected *cost* burden is as follows: reading or listening to questions, burden cost = \$1.60. Responding to questions (verbally or in writing), burden cost = \$1.40. The total cost for all respondents is \$900.

ICR-3: EPA's burden estimates for this collection are broken down according to the respondent burden and cost. EPA may perform two surveys annually, one of manufacturers of on-highway light-duty motor vehicles or light-duty trucks, and the other of heavy-duty engines or large non-road compression ignition engines, which will require either telephone or in-person interviews with one hundred (100) individual vehicle owners or dealerships or fleets per survey. A burden estimate of twenty (20) minutes per individual vehicle owner is based on agency experience with similar questions asked of individuals as part of the in-use recall testing program. A burden estimate of thirty (30) minutes per dealership or fleet is based on contact with dealership and fleets made as part of the in-use recall testing program. The burden estimate is calculated from an average of the two different burdens assuming that one half of the respondents are individual vehicle owners and the other half are dealerships or fleets. Therefore, the total respondent burden will be 2,500 minutes for each survey. Individuals, dealerships, or fleets will be asked to respond to only one survey in any given year. Costs to respondents associated with this ICR are attributed to individual or staff time involved in responding to the information requests. The costs for respondents for reading or listening to and responding to questions (verbally or in writing) are \$8.50 per respondent. Therefore, the total respondent cost for each survey will be \$850.

Dated: February 23, 1996.
Robin Miles-McLean,
Acting Director, Office of Mobile Sources.
[FR Doc. 96-4961 Filed 3-1-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5433-6]

Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses; Public Review of Cost Information Related to the Certification of Retrofit/Rebuild Equipment

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of agency receipt of cost information related to certification of equipment and initiation of 45-day public review and comment period.

SUMMARY: This notice addresses a shortcoming in the current certification of certain equipment certified under the urban bus retrofit/rebuild program. The effective date of certification of Detroit Diesel Corporation's (DDC) equipment for upgrading its 1979 through 1989 model year urban bus engines of model 6V92TA equipped with mechanical unit injection (MUJ) is October 2, 1995 (60 FR 51472). That certification was based on reduction in particulate matter (PM) of 25 percent or more, but not on DDC's guarantee to make the equipment available to all operators for less than the applicable life cycle ceiling (hereinafter referred to as "cost/availability"). Although DDC, in its notification of intent to certify, requested certification on the basis of cost/availability, as stated in the October 2, 1995 Federal Register notice, the Agency at that time saw no advantage to certification on that basis. Upon reconsideration, the Agency believes that it may be beneficial to the program to expand the basis of certification of DDC's upgrade kit to include the basis of cost/availability. Further, in addition to the request in its notification of intent to certify signed March 16, 1995, DDC reiterated its request in a letter to the Agency dated December 15, 1995, that this equipment be certified on the basis of cost/availability. Copies of both DDC's notification and the letter are available

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

DDC has submitted to the Agency new information relevant to the certification of urban bus retrofit/rebuild equipment pursuant to 40 CFR Part 85, Subpart O. Pursuant to section 85.1407(a)(7), today's Federal Register notice announces that the information is available for public review and comment, and initiates a 45-day period during which comments can be submitted. The Agency will review this information, as well as comments received, to determine whether certification of the DDC equipment should be expanded to include the basis of cost/availability. If DDC's certification is expanded to include the cost/availability basis, then the certification level of the equipment may be considered when "post-rebuild" PM levels are established in mid-1996. The post-rebuild levels to be established in mid-1996 would be used by operators complying with compliance program 2 when calculating average fleet emissions for 1998 and thereafter. Therefore, to expand DDC's certification to include the basis of cost/availability may tend to lower ambient levels of PM emissions from fleets which comply with compliance program 2.

Category VII of Public Docket A-93-42, entitled "Certification of Urban Bus Retrofit/Rebuild Equipment" contains the new cost information and DDC's notification of intent to certify, as well as other materials specifically relevant to it. This docket is located at the address below.

Today's notice initiates a 45-day period during which the Agency will accept written comments relevant to whether the certification of DDC's equipment should be expanded to include the basis of cost/availability. Comments should be provided in writing to Public Docket A-93-42, Category VII, at the address below. An identical copy should be submitted to William Rutledge, also at the address below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before April 18, 1996.

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

1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Public Docket A-93-42 (Category VII), Room M-1500, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460.
2. William Rutledge, Engine Programs and Compliance Division (mail code 6403J), 401 "M" Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460.

The DDC notification of intent to certify, as well as other materials specifically relevant to it, are contained in the public docket indicated above. Docket items may be inspected from 8:00 a.m. until 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. As provided in 40 CFR Part 2, a reasonable fee may be charged by the Agency for copying docket materials.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

William Rutledge, Engine Programs and Compliance Division (6403J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460. Telephone: (202) 233-9297.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

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

A key aspect of the program is the certification of retrofit/rebuild equipment. Emissions requirements under either of the two compliance options depend on the availability of retrofit/rebuild equipment certified for each engine model. To be used for Program 1, equipment must be certified as meeting a 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM standard or, if equipment is not certified as meeting the 0.10 PM standard, as achieving a 25 percent reduction in PM. Equipment used for Program 2 must be certified as providing some level of PM

reduction that would in turn be claimed by urban bus operators when calculating their average fleet PM levels attained under the program. For Program 1, information on life cycle costs must be submitted in the notification of intent to certify in order for certification of the equipment to initiate (or trigger) program requirements. To trigger program requirements, the certifier must guarantee that the equipment will be available to all affected operators for a life cycle cost of \$7,940 or less at the 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM level, or for a life cycle cost of \$2,000 or less for the 25 percent or greater reduction in PM emissions. Both of these values are based on 1992 dollars and are increments above costs associated with a standard rebuild. If the Agency determines that the life cycle cost limit is met, then certification would be based on "cost/availability" in addition to reducing PM emissions.

Under program 2, operators calculate their average fleet emissions using specified "pre-rebuild" and "post-rebuild" engine PM emission levels (as well as other factors). The final rulemaking of April 21, 1993, established the pre-rebuild emissions levels, and intended that post-rebuild levels be established at two subsequent points in time, based on the certification levels of equipment certified by those points. Post-rebuild levels were established for the first two years of the program in a Federal Register notice of September 2, 1994 (59 FR 45626), which set 0.30 g/bhp-hr for 6V92TA engines of model years 1979 through 1987. This level was established as required by the final rule, that is, as a "default" level for these engines in the event that no equipment was certified by July 1, 1994. As explained in the final rulemaking and the September 2, 1994, Federal Register, EPA determined that this "default" level could be attained by rebuilding the engines with the available DDC upgrade kit which, although not certified by July 1, 1994 under the urban bus program, has emissions performance supported by data from the Agency's new-engine certification program.

The post-rebuild level established by the above-mentioned September 2, 1994, Federal Register notice for the 1979-1987 6V92TA engines (0.30 g/bhp-hr) is less than the pre-rebuild level (0.50 g/bhp-hr). That reduction in PM levels, and the assumed rebuild schedule of the regulation [§ 85.1403(c)(1)(iv)], means that operators choosing to comply with compliance program 2 and having 6V92TA MUI engines of certain model years must reduce average fleet PM

emissions during calendar years 1995 and 1996 an amount equivalent to rebuilding those model year engines with DDC's upgrade kit.

Section 85.1403(c) requires that final post-rebuild levels be established based on equipment certified by July 1, 1996, to meet the PM standard *and* as being available to all operators for less than an appropriate life cycle cost ceiling. These "post-rebuild" levels are to be used in the calculations of fleet target levels for 1998 and thereafter, for engines scheduled for retrofit/rebuild in calendar years 1997 and thereafter. Section 85.1403(c)(1)(iii) requires that post-rebuild emission levels be the *lowest* emission level (greater than 0.1 g/bhp-hr) certified as meeting the emission *and* cost requirements of § 85.1403(b)(2), for any engine model for which no equipment has been certified by July 1, 1996 as meeting the requirements of § 85.1403(b)(1).

The Agency announced certification of the DDC upgrade kit for the 1979-1989 6V92TA engines in the Federal Register on October 2, 1995 (60 FR 51472) based on compliance with the 25% reduction standard, but without determination of compliance with the life cycle cost ceiling. That certification does not restrict use of the upgrade kit by operators under either compliance program 1 or 2, until other equipment is certified which triggers the 0.10 g/bhp-hr standard.

Section 85.1403 of the program regulations requires that the post-rebuild emission levels established in mid-1996 be the *lowest* emission level (greater than 0.10 g/bhp-hr) certified as meeting the emission *and* life cycle cost requirements. The DDC upgrade kit is currently certified to 0.30 g/bhp-hr for the above-mentioned 1979 through 1987 6V92TA engines, but unless certification includes the basis of cost/availability, it would not be considered when we establish the final post-rebuild levels. Other equipment is certified to 0.38 g/bhp-hr for the 1979 through 1987 6V92TA engines and is also certified as available to all operators for no more than the applicable life cycle cost. If no other equipment is certified in the meantime, the "post-rebuild" level would probably be set to this 0.38 level.

Additionally, as noted above, the post-rebuild level for the 1979 through 1987 6V92TA engines has already been established at 0.30 g/bhp-hr (the Federal Register notice of September 2, 1994), but only for the first two years of the program. Therefore, if no other equipment is certified prior to July 1, 1996 to a lower level, and lacking any compelling reason not to certify this equipment on the basis of cost/

availability, then it would not be consistent with the Federal Register notice of September 2, 1994 to establish the post-rebuild level higher than 0.30 g/bhp-hr.

II. Information Concerning Cost and Availability

By a notification of intent to certify signed March 16, 1995, and with cover letter dated April 11, 1995, Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) applied for certification of equipment applicable to its 6V92TA model engines having mechanical unit injectors (MUI) that were originally manufactured between January 1979 and December 1989. The effective date of certification of that DDC equipment was established in the Federal Register on October 2, 1995 (60 FR 51472). That certification is currently based on reduction in particulate matter (PM) of 25 per cent or more. DDC, in its notification of intent to certify, requests certification on the basis of cost/availability and guarantees to make the equipment available to all operators for less than the applicable life cycle ceiling (hereinafter referred to as "cost/availability"). As stated in the Federal Register notice of October 2, 1995, however, the Agency saw no advantage to such certification at that time because the emission standard had been triggered earlier by certification of other equipment. As explained above, the Agency upon reconsideration believes that it may be beneficial to the program to expand the basis of certification of DDC's upgrade kit to include the basis of cost/availability.

In its notification, DDC states that the equipment will be offered to all affected urban bus operators for a maximum purchase price of \$5,562, and has submitted life cycle cost information. DDC claims that the life cycle cost is less than \$2,000 (1992 dollars) incremental to the cost for a standard rebuild. DDC claims that the only incremental cost, compared to a standard rebuild, is the cost of a blower by-pass valve assembly, which DDC states has a suggested price of \$97.36 if purchased separately. DDC indicates that there is no incremental installation cost, fuel cost, or maintenance cost compared to that related to a standard engine overhaul.

In addition to its initial request in its notification of intent to certify, DDC reiterated its request that this equipment be certified on the basis of cost/availability in a letter to the Agency dated December 15, 1995, and provided updated information concerning transit pricing level. DDC indicates that the suggested transit list price of the upgrade kit is less than the suggested

list price of the individual components, if purchased separately, that are currently replaced or reworked during a standard rebuild. In other words, all of the components of their upgrade kit, with exception of the blower by-pass valve assembly, are non-incremental to a "standard" rebuild. Other new information in the docket include a summary of a survey conducted by the American Public Transit Association (APTA) on engine rebuilding practices.

Several public comments concerning cost/availability were received in response to DDC's notification. The following is a summary of the comments, along with the Agency's response, as appropriate:

The People Moving Company of the Greater Bridgeport Transit District states that thirteen of its engines have been rebuilt using DDC's low-emission rebuild kits, and their experience has been positive. They support DDC's claim that the kits provide better fuel economy.

The Muncie Indiana Transit System comments that the DDC kit exceeds the life cycle cost ceiling and does not contain all parts to rebuild an engine, such as rod and main bearings. Muncie, however, does not provide any detailed information to support its claim concerning costs. The comment that the kit does not contain all of the parts necessary to rebuild an engine, may be correct. However, there is no requirement that every part necessary to rebuild an engine be included with equipment certified under the program. The life cycle cost ceiling is meant to reflect costs of certified equipment which are incremental to costs of a standard rebuild. In particular, section 85.1403(b)(2) states that the purchase price of retrofit/rebuild equipment excludes equipment costs incurred for a standard rebuild. Therefore, to the extent that a component (such as a bearing) is replaced in a standard rebuild, it is not necessary to include the component as part of the certified upgrade kit, or to include its cost in the purchase price of the kit.

Muncie also questions whether tune-ups and related emissions-affecting parts are considered warranty items. The emissions performance and defect warranties, required pursuant to section 85.1409, apply to all parts of the certified equipment described in DDC's notification of intent to certify, for the mileage intervals specified in section 85.1409. In its notification, DDC states that the scheduled maintenance and parts necessary to perform the scheduled maintenance are identical before and after rebuild and, therefore,

there are no incremental maintenance costs involved.

The Engelhard Corporation provides in-depth comments concerning the life cycle costs. Engelhard states that the DDC upgrade kit will exceed the life cycle cost ceiling, and notes three areas that DDC has not addressed in its life cycle cost analysis. First, Engelhard indicates that an engine must be removed from a bus in order to install the components of the DDC upgrade kit, which would require additional labor hours over an in-frame overhaul. Second, Engelhard states that the DDC kit contains additional components which are not typically replaced during an in-frame overhaul, including camshafts, turbocharger, rollers, injectors, heads, and valves. Third, Engelhard notes that transit operators commonly use aftermarket components which are priced substantially less than DDC components.

With regard to Engelhard's first concern, the preamble to the final rulemaking (April 21, 1993, 58 FR 21367) is clear—the certifier may assume that the engine is removed from the coach during a standard rebuild. It is therefore not necessary for DDC to include cost related to removing an engine for installation of the DDC upgrade kit. Second, the Agency believes that the parts, which Engelhard refers to as "additional" and not typically replaced during an in-frame overhaul, are emission-related components. The Agency believes that it is not unreasonable to include emission-related components in a kit because it provides assurance that engines so rebuilt will result in a known condition and a known engine emissions configuration, both of which are important to in-use emissions performance. Further, DDC indicates that all of the parts in its kit, with exception of the blower bypass valve assembly, are normally replaced at engine overhaul.

Third, the cost differential related to use of aftermarket parts is addressed by a cost analysis presented by Engelhard. Engelhard provides an analysis of the cost of a rebuild using aftermarket parts, and compares it to the purchase price of the DDC kit added to the cost of the labor required to remove and install an engine. This comparison indicates that the difference in costs is greater than the life cycle cost ceiling of \$2,000. The Agency notes, however, that when the engine removal/installation costs are not included pursuant to the above discussion, the cost differential is less than \$2,000. Therefore, this data does not substantiate Engelhard's claim that the life cycle cost ceiling is exceeded.

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.

Today's Federal Register notice announces that information is available for public review and comment, and initiates a 45-day period during which comments can be submitted. The Agency will review this information, as well as comments received, to determine whether certification of the DDC equipment should be expanded to include the basis of cost/availability. If the Agency expands the certification of this equipment to include the basis of cost/availability, then 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.

At a minimum, EPA expects to evaluate this notification of intent to certify, and other materials submitted as applicable, to determine whether there is adequate demonstration of compliance with the cost/availability requirements of § 85.1403(b)(2) and § 85.1407(a)(2), including whether the data provided by DDC complies with the life cycle cost requirements.

The Agency requests that those commenting also consider the regulatory requirements, plus provide comments on experience and/or knowledge related to rebuilding DDC 6V92TA MUI engines, including the specific parts, respective frequency of usage in rebuilds, and costs.

The date of this notice initiates a 45-day period during which the Agency will accept written comments relevant to whether or not the equipment described in the DDC notification of intent to certify should be certified pursuant to the urban bus retrofit/rebuild regulations. Interested parties are encouraged to review the notification of intent to certify and provide comment during the 45-day period. Please send separate copies of your comments to each of the above two addresses.

The Agency will review the cost information related to the notification of

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

Dated: February 23, 1996.

Richard Wilson,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 96-4954 Filed 3-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5433-9]

Common Sense Initiative Council (CSIC); Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notification of Public Advisory CSIC Printing Sector Subcommittee Meeting; Common Sense Initiative Council Meeting; and CSIC Petroleum Sector Subcommittee Meeting; Open Meetings.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given that, pending resolution of EPA's FY 1996 appropriation, the Common Sense Initiative Council, and the Printing and Petroleum Sector Subcommittees of the Common Sense Initiative Council will meet on the dates and times described below. All meetings are open to the public. Seating at all three meetings will be on a first-come basis and limited time will be provided for public comment. For further information concerning specific meetings, please contact the individuals listed with the Council and two Sector Subcommittee announcements below.

(1) Printing Sector Subcommittee—March 18 and 19, 1996

Notice is hereby given that the Printing Sector Subcommittee, pending resolution of EPA's FY 1996 appropriation, will hold an open meeting on Monday, March 18, 1996, from 2:30 p.m. EST to 5:00 p.m. EST and Tuesday, March 19, 1996, from 1:00 p.m. EST to 4:00 p.m. EST. The Printing Sector's Workgroups will meet on Monday, March 18, from 10:00 a.m. EST until 2:00 p.m. EST and on Tuesday, March 19, 1996, from approximately 8:30 a.m. EST until noon, EST. The Subcommittee and Workgroup Meetings will be at the Embassy Suites Hotel, 1250 22nd Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037 (telephone number 857-3388).

The purpose of the Subcommittee meeting is to discuss the three projects under consideration by the Subcommittee. The Compliance Tools Workgroup is working on the Multi-Media Flexible Permitting Project, the New York City Education Workgroup is moving ahead with plans for pollution prevention education for small printers, and the Living Lab Workgroup has been looking at information/data collection and management systems. The purpose of the workgroup meetings prior to the Subcommittee meeting is to further develop the workplan for these projects. Agendas will be available March 11, 1996.

For further information concerning this meeting of the Printing Sector Subcommittee, please contact Ginger Gotliffe of EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance at 202-564-7072, or Nancy Cichowicz, EPA, Region III, at 597-2030.

(2) Common Sense Initiative Council Meeting—March 20 and 21, 1996

The Common Sense Initiative Council, pending resolution of EPA's FY 1996 appropriation, will hold an open meeting on Wednesday, March 20, 1996, from 1:30 p.m. EST to 5:30 p.m. EST, and on Thursday, March 21, 1996, from 8:30 a.m. EST to 3:30 p.m. EST. The meeting will be held at the Crystal Gateway Marriott, 1700 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia (telephone number 703-920-3230).

The Council agenda will focus on a variety of topics including: anticipated second year CSI activities; presentations and discussions with the Council's Operating Principles and Public Health Workgroups; and cross-cutting, broad policy discussions on CSI community-based efforts and alternative regulatory strategies. In addition to these topics, the Iron and Steel Sector Subcommittee will present a Brownfields recommendation for the Council's consideration. Other sector recommendations may be presented to the Council for review and action. Also, EPA will present a preliminary draft workplan (on ensuring stakeholder awareness of and ready access to agency regulatory interpretations and determinations that affect environmental practices of the regulated community) as a followup action to a previously approved Council recommendation.

For further information concerning this Common Sense Initiative Council Meeting, contact Prudence Goforth, DFO on (202) 260-7417.