

Western Power under Commonwealth's FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 6, accepted for filing in Docket No. OA96-167-000.

*Comment date:* February 6, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

23. Commonwealth Electric Company  
[Docket No. ER97-1151-000]

Take notice that on January 8, 1997, Commonwealth Electric Company (Commonwealth), tendered for filing a non-firm point-to-point transmission service agreement between Commonwealth and Cambridge Electric Light Company (Cambridge). Commonwealth states that the service agreement sets out the transmission arrangements under which Commonwealth will provide non-firm point-to-point transmission service to Cambridge under commonwealth's FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 6, accepted for filing in Docket No. OA96-167-000.

*Comment date:* February 6, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

24. Cambridge Electric Light Company  
[Docket No. ER97-1152-000]

Take notice that on January 8, 1997, Cambridge Electric Light Company (Cambridge), tendered for filing a non-firm point-to-point transmission service agreement between Cambridge and Equitable Power Services Company (Equitable Power). Cambridge states that the service agreement sets out the transmission arrangements under which Cambridge will provide non-firm point-to-point transmission service to Equitable Power under Cambridge's FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 8, accepted for filing in Docket No. OA96-178-000.

*Comment date:* February 6, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

25. New England Power Company  
[Docket No. ER97-1153-000]

Take notice that on January 8, 1997, New England Power Company (NEP), filed three service agreements with Plum Street Energy Marketing, Inc., Coral Power, L.L.C. and Equitable Power Services Company for non-firm, point-to-point transmission service under NEP's open access transmission service, FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 9.

*Comment date:* February 6, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

26. Public Service Electric and Gas Company

[Docket No. ER97-1154-000]

Take notice that on January 8, 1997, Public Service Electric and Gas Company (PSE&G), tendered for filing agreements to provide non-firm transmission service to Central Vermont Public Service Corporation and Plum Street Energy Marketing, Inc., pursuant to PSE&G's Open Access Transmission Tariff presently on file with the Commission in Docket No. OA96-80-000.

PSE&G further requests waiver of the Commission's regulations such that the agreements can be made effective as of December 31, 1996.

*Comment date:* February 6, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

27. Interstate Power Company

[Docket No. ER97-1171-000]

Take notice that on December 24, 1996, Interstate Power Company requests that Rate Schedule No. 21 be removed from the Ratis report.

*Comment date:* February 5, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

28. Clear Lake Cogeneration Limited Partnership

[Docket No. QF83-205-006]

On January 17, 1997, Clear Lake Cogeneration Limited Partnership (Applicant) tendered for filing a supplement to its filing in this docket. No determination has been made that the submittal constitutes a complete filing.

The supplement provides additional information pertaining primarily to the ownership and the electric power production capacity of the cogeneration facility.

*Comment date:* February 12, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

29. Cogenron Inc.

[Docket No. QF85-116-003]

On January 17, 1997, Cogenron Inc. (Applicant) tendered for filing a supplement to its filing in this docket. No determination has been made that the submittal constitutes a complete filing.

The supplement provides additional information pertaining primarily to the ownership and the electric power production capacity of the cogeneration facility.

*Comment date:* February 12, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

30. Western Resources, Inc.

[Docket No. ER97-1143-000]

Take notice that on January 7, 1997, Western Resources, Inc. (Western Resources), tendered for filing a proposed change to its Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Electric Rate Schedule No. 250. Western Resources states the purpose of the change is to modify the Electric Power Supply Agreement between Western Resources and the City of Burlingame, Kansas, by adding Service Schedule GD to the contract. The change is proposed to become effective March 10, 1997.

Copies of the filing were served upon the City of Burlingame and the Kansas Corporation Commission.

*Comment date:* February 6, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraph

E. Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-2308 Filed 1-29-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[FRL-5682-4]

**Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses; Public Review of a Notification of Intent to Certify Equipment**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice of Agency receipt of a notification of intent to certify equipment and initiation of 45-day public review and comment period.

**SUMMARY:** Johnson Matthey Incorporated (JMI) has submitted to the Agency a notification of intent to certify

urban bus retrofit/rebuild equipment pursuant to 40 CFR Part 85, Subpart O. The equipment, referred to by JMI as the Catalytic Reduction Technology-Cam (CRT-C) kit, consists of proprietary cam shafts, a CEM II™ catalytic exhaust muffler, and instructions that the engine must be rebuilt using specific engine rebuild parts and certain engine settings. The candidate kit is applicable to all 6V92TA, 6V71T, and 6V71TA urban bus engine models made by Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) from model years 1979 to 1989 and equipped with mechanical unit injectors (MUI).

JMI intends this equipment to be certified to the particulate matter standard of 0.10 grams per brake-horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr) for less than the applicable life cycle cost limit. If the Agency certifies that this (or other) equipment complies with the 0.10 g/bhp-hr standard and is available for less than the applicable cost limit, then operators with affected engines will be required to use equipment certified to the 0.10 g/bhp-hr standard.

Pursuant to § 85.1407(a)(7), today's Federal Register notice summarizes the notification, announces that the notification is available for public review and comment, and initiates a 45-day period during which comments can be submitted. The Agency will review this notification of intent to certify, as well as any comments it receives, to determine whether the equipment described in the notification of intent to certify should be certified. If certified, the equipment can be used by urban bus operators to reduce the particulate matter of urban bus engines.

The notification of intent to certify, as well as other materials specifically relevant to it, are contained in Category XV-A of Public Docket A-93-42, entitled "Certification of Urban Bus Retrofit/Rebuild Equipment". This docket is located at the address listed below.

Today's notice initiates a 45-day period during which the Agency will accept written comments relevant to whether or not the equipment included in this notification of intent to certify should be certified. Comments should be provided in writing to the addresses below.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before March 17, 1997.

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

1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Public Air Docket A-93-42 (Category XV-A), Room M-1500, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460.

2. William Rutledge, Engine Compliance Programs Group, Engine

Programs and Compliance Division (6403J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460.

The JMI 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 St. SW, Washington, D.C. 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: Option 1 establishes particulate matter emissions requirements for each urban bus engine in an operator's fleet which is rebuilt or replaced; Option 2 is a fleet averaging program that establishes a specific annual target level for average PM emissions from urban buses in an operator's fleet.

A key aspect of the program is certification of retrofit/rebuild equipment, which begins when an equipment manufacturer submits an application for certification (referred to in the rule as a notification of intent to certify). To meet either of the two compliance options, operators of the affected buses must use equipment that has been certified by EPA. Emissions requirements under either of the two options depend on the availability of retrofit/rebuild equipment certified for each engine model. To be used for Option 1, equipment must be certified as meeting a 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM standard or as achieving a 25 percent reduction in PM. Equipment used for Option 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.

Under Option 1, additional information regarding cost must be submitted in the notification, in order for certification of that equipment to initiate (or trigger) program requirements for a particular engine model. In order for the equipment to serve as a trigger, the certifier must guarantee that the equipment will be offered to affected operators for \$7,940 or less at the 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM level, or for \$2,000 or less for the 25 percent or greater reduction in PM. Both of the above amounts are based on 1992 dollars and include life cycle costs incremental to the cost of a standard rebuild.

**II. Notification of Intent to Certify**

In a notification of intent to certify equipment signed December 9, 1996, Johnson Matthey (JMI) has applied for certification of equipment under the Environmental Protection Agency's (the Agency) Urban Bus Retrofit/Rebuild Program. The candidate kit is applicable to all 6V92TA, 6V71T, and 6V71TA urban bus engine models made by Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) from model years 1979 to 1989 and equipped with mechanical unit injectors (MUI). The equipment, referred to as the Catalytic Reduction Technology—Cam (CRT-C) kit, consists of proprietary cam shafts, a CEM II™ catalytic exhaust muffler, and installation instructions that require the engine to be rebuilt using specified engine rebuild parts and certain engine settings. The CRT-C kit would be available in three horsepower levels (253, 277, and 340) for 6V92TA engines, and in one horsepower level (265) for 6V71 engines.

The CEM II™ catalytic exhaust muffler of the CRT-C kit contains a different formulation from the CEM™ certified for the urban bus program as described in the Federal Register on April 17, 1996 (61 FR 16773). Therefore, transit operators cannot use the previously certified CEM™ in place of the new CEM II™. The CEM II™ is the same size and shape as the CEM™, is a direct, bolt-on replacement for the original equipment muffler, and is designed to fit the specific bus/engine combination.

The CRT-C kit is to be used in conjunction with an engine rebuild performed in accordance with standard DDC rebuild procedures using a list of specified engine rebuild parts. The installation instructions state that the list of parts for the rebuild (excluding the cams) can be purchased from traditional DDC or equivalent parts sources. The subject of equivalent parts

is discussed below. The notification states that the candidate equipment achieves a particulate matter (PM) level of 0.10 g/bhp-hr, and the life cycle cost is guaranteed by JMI to be less than \$7,940 (in 1992 dollars) for all affected operators. The use of the equipment by transit operators to meet program requirements is discussed below.

The kit instructions includes new settings for the fuel injector height and fuel modulator, as appropriate to each engine model.

JMI presents exhaust emissions data from testing two Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) engines in accordance with procedures set forth at 40 CFR Part 86, Subparts N and I. The notification indicates that the test

engines were selected as "worst case" based on Table 3 of 58 FR 21373 (April 23, 1993). A DDC engine model 6V92TA MUI was tested both in a 1984 model year configuration and retrofitted with the CRT-C kit, and a DDC engine model 6V71TA MUI (originally 1983 model year) was only tested retrofitted with the CRT-C kit. Table A below summarizes the data.

TABLE A.—EXHAUST EMISSIONS SUMMARY

Gaseous and particulate test	g/bhp-hr			
	1988 HDDE standards	1984 6V92TA MUI baseline	6V92TA MUI with CRT-C	6V71TA MUI with CRT-C
HC .....	1.3	0.7	0.3	0.2
CO .....	15.5	1.1	0.5	0.8
NO <sub>x</sub> .....	10.7	9.5	10.2	10.2
PM .....	0.60	0.56	0.08	0.096
BSFC <sup>1</sup> .....		0.475	0.470	0.464
Smoke test	Standards percent	Percent opacity		
ACCEL .....	20	3.1	2.9	2.3
LUG .....	15	2.0	2.0	1.3
PEAK .....	50	4.8	3.6	2.9

<sup>1</sup> Brake Specific Fuel Consumption (BSFC) is measured in units of lb/bhp-hr.

The data of Table A indicate that for both test engines, when rebuilt with the CRT-C kit, PM emissions are less than 0.10 g/bhp-hr, and emissions of hydrocarbon (HC), carbon monoxide (CO), and smoke opacity are within applicable federal standards. The data also indicate that the candidate kit increases NO<sub>x</sub> emissions roughly 7 percent above the level of the baseline 1984 model year configuration. This level (that is, with CRT-C installed) is less than the 1985-1989 federal standard for NO<sub>x</sub> (10.7 g/bhp-hr). The Agency requests comments on whether the emissions test data presented by JMI demonstrate that all engines for which certification is requested will meet applicable federal standards with the candidate kit installed.

The Agency does not believe that the information provided supports certification of engines beyond model year 1989, because the federal new engine standard for NO<sub>x</sub> dropped in 1990 to 6.0 g/bhp-hr and in 1991 to 5.0 g/bhp-hr. (The NO<sub>x</sub> level of either test engine, when rebuilt with the candidate kit, is greater than 10 g/bhp-hr.) Additionally, the Agency believes that there is no support for certification of DDC's "DDEC" engines, because neither test engine is equipped with electronically-controlled fuel injection. Therefore, applicability of the candidate kit has been restricted to 6V92TA, 6V71T, and 6V71TA urban bus engine

models made by Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) from model years 1979 to 1989 and equipped with mechanical unit injectors (MUI).

For the 6V92TA test engine, JMI also presents baseline test data from a standard 1984 model year configuration. This data documents PM emissions of 0.56 g/bhp-hr in the 1984 model year configuration. A list of parts used in the engine rebuild is provided in the notification. Other engines, for which the CRT-C kit is intended to apply, are expected to meet the 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM standard because the kit instructs the rebuild to replace all emissions-related parts during the rebuild with JMI-specified parts. The emission level of the recipient engine, prior to installation of CEM-II catalyst, is expected to be predictable because all emission-related parts are replaced using specific rebuild components and settings specified with the kit. The combination of the specified engine rebuild parts, proprietary camshafts, new settings of the kit, and CEM-II, results in a PM level less than 0.10 g/bhp-hr. The Agency requests comments on whether the emissions data presented by JMI demonstrate that all engines for which certification is intended will meet the 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM standard.

The part numbers of the specified rebuild components are provided in JMI's notification. JMI indicates that

replacing such emission-related components is typically part of a standard rebuild. JMI also states that other parts, equivalent to DDC parts, can be used for the standard rebuild required with installation of the equipment. JMI defines equivalent parts as parts which are substituted for original-equipment (OE) parts and have been engineered to represent equal usage with equivalent specifications, materials of construction, tolerances, and warranty, et cetera, and must have gained acceptance in the market place as equivalent replacements. The Agency asks for public comment regarding how an operator, or the Agency, knows that an aftermarket part is equivalent to an OE part, especially with respect to parameters that affect emissions performance, and what assurance there is that such parts would result in the same emissions performance. The use of aftermarket parts might also impact life cycle costs, which is discussed below.

JMI's notification provides life cycle cost information for the candidate kit. JMI guarantees that it will offer the kit for less than the life cycle ceiling of \$7,490 (in 1992 dollars) as applicable, to all affected operators. If certified as proposed in the notification (and in the absence of other earlier certification that triggers the 0.10 g/bhp-hr), the candidate kit would trigger program requirements for the 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM standard for applicable engines. Table B

below summarizes the life cycle costs for the CRT-C kit that are incremental to the cost associated with a standard rebuild.

TABLE B.—CRT-C KIT LIFE CYCLE COST SUMMARY  
[1992 dollars]

Maximum CRT-C Equipment Cost .....	\$6,550
Maximum Installation Cost (2 hours catalyst installation) .....	70
Fuel Economy Impact .....	0
Maintenance Cost .....	0
Less Cost for Standard Camshafts .....	(785)
Maximum CRT-C Equipment Cost .....	6,550
Maximum Life Cycle Cost (Sum of Above) .....	5,835

The Agency has determined that the value of the maximum CRT-C equipment cost (\$6,550) is approximately equivalent to \$7,404 in today's dollars. This is determined by multiplying the \$6,550 from Table B above by the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (that is, the CPI-U for all items) for November 1996, and then dividing by the average CPI-U determined for 1992. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the CPI-U before seasonal adjustment in November is 158.6 (on a reference base of 1982 to 1984 = 100), and the average CPI-U for 1992 is 140.3. The value may change as the CPI-U changes.

JMI indicates that the engine is to be rebuilt according to the engine manufacturer's standard written rebuild procedures and specifications except where amended by JMI written instructions. Therefore, JMI claims that the life cycle cost (\$5,835) of the CRT-C kit is incremental to the cost of a standard rebuild. Installation of the CRT-C kit is essentially identical to a standard engine rebuild and the installation of a muffler. The life cycle cost (in 1992 dollars) of the JMI kit is stated to be \$5,835, which includes the maximum purchase cost for the kit of \$6,550, and maximum installation cost of \$70. The incremental maintenance cost and fuel economy impact are stated to be zero. The camshafts provided with the CRT-C kit offset the need and cost for camshafts otherwise replaced during an engine rebuild (\$785).

As noted above, the CRT-C kit would be sold as complimentary to a standard engine rebuild. The balance of the specified parts for the standard rebuild (excluding the cams) would be purchased by the rebuilders from traditional DDC or equivalent parts sources. JMI indicates that because the

parts would typically be replaced anyway during an engine rebuild, purchase of the specified parts on the list would not represent an incremental life cycle cost. The list of the specific emission-related parts are an essential part of the CRT-C kit from an emissions standpoint, although the parts, per se, are not provided with the kit. The Agency requests public comment concerning whether the specified parts present incremental costs to a standard rebuild. This point is important because the life cycle cost analysis provided by JMI assumes that use of the listed part numbers will not impact life cycle costs of the candidate equipment.

JMI states in its notification that there is no fuel economy penalty associated with the candidate equipment. As shown in Table A above, this is supported by the data from the baseline and retrofit tests on the 6V92TA engine that indicate no fuel consumption impact of the CRT-C kit. At this point, the Agency has not determined whether a fuel consumption penalty exists, and requests comments concerning this issue. The Agency will use information gathered through public comment and from the certifier to resolve this issue.

The JMI notification provides a product warranty that references the emissions performance and emissions defect warranties required in accordance with section 85.1409 of the program regulations.

Even if ultimately certified by the Agency, the equipment described in JMI's notification may require additional review by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) before use in California. The Agency recognizes that special situations may exist in California that are reflected in the unique emissions standards, engine calibrations, and fuel specifications of the State. While requirements of the federal urban bus program apply to several metropolitan areas in California, the Agency understands the view of CARB that equipment certified under the urban bus program, to be used in California, must be provided with an executive order exempting it from the anti-tampering prohibitions of that State. Those interested in additional information should contact the Aftermarket Part Section of CARB, at (818) 575-6848.

If the Agency certifies the candidate equipment and no other certification triggers the 0.10 g/bhp-hr standard, then urban bus operators who choose to comply with compliance Option 1 of this regulation will be required to use equipment certified to the 0.10 g/bhp-hr standard no later than six months after certification, when applicable engines

are rebuilt or replaced. If certified, then operators using Option 2 will use the certification levels in calculations for fleet level attained (FLA).

The date of this notice initiates a 45-day period during which the Agency will accept written comments relevant to whether the equipment described in the JMI notification of intent to certify should be certified pursuant to the urban bus retrofit/rebuild regulations. Interested parties are encouraged to review this notification, and provide written comments during the 45-day review period. Separate comments should be provided in writing to each of the addresses listed under the Addresses section of this notice.

At a minimum, the Agency 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: (1) the certification requirements of § 85.1406, including whether the testing accurately substantiates the claimed emission reduction or emission levels; and, (2) the requirements of § 85.1407 for a notification of intent to certify, including whether the data provided by JMI complies with the life cycle cost requirements.

The Agency requests that those commenting also consider these regulatory requirements, plus provide comments on any experience or knowledge concerning: (a) problems with installing, maintaining, and/or using the equipment on applicable engines; and, (b) whether the equipment is compatible with affected vehicles.

The Agency will review this notification of intent to certify, along with comments received from the 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.

Mary D. Nichols,

*Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 97-2324 Filed 1-29-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5682-2]

**Notice of Open Meeting of the Environmental Financial Advisory Board on March 19-20, 1997**

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Environmental Financial Advisory Board (EFAB) will