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, Bake and Wallowa Counties, OR and Nez Perce and Adam 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