

listed below is coming up for renewal. Before submitting the renewal package to the Office of Management and Budget, EPA is soliciting comments on specific aspects of the collection as described.

**DATES:** EPA requests comments by no later than September 11, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** Call the Acid Rain Hotline (202/233-9620), or Kenon Smith (202/233-9164). Send written comments (in duplicate) regarding these burden estimates or any other aspect of this information collection, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Kenon Smith, 401 M Street, SW., 6204J, Washington, DC 20460.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** *Title:* Acid Rain Program ICR; OMB Control Numbers: 2060-0258 and 2060-0221.

*Abstract:* The Acid Rain Program was established under Title IV of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. 40 CFR part 72 *et seq.* The program calls for major reductions of the pollutants that cause acid rain while establishing a new approach to environmental management.

Emissions monitoring and reporting is the foundation upon which the allowance trading system is based. Without accurate monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting of emissions, the integrity and efficiency of the allowance system would be undermined. There would be no assurance that emissions had been reduced and economic benefits of a market-based system could not be realized.

The total public reporting burden for the regulations implementing the ARP was estimated in the Agency's initial ICR (2060-0221 and 2060-0258) at 1,880,959 hours distributed over approximately 2007 respondents affected by this rule. In order to obtain a permit, the public reporting burden to develop a permit application and compliance plan including certification of a designated representative is estimated at 370 hours per application. For tracking and transferring allowances, the public reporting burden to complete and submit an allowance tracking system general account application (if necessary) and an allowance transfer form is estimated to average 30 hours and 2 hours, respectively. The burden for assembling and submitting an application to obtain allowances from the conservation and renewable energy reserve is estimated to average 80 hours per application. To meet the emissions monitoring requirements, the public reporting burden is estimated to average 40 hours per report per plant for preparing and

submitting quarterly emissions data reports, and 20 hours per plant for submitting a one-time monitoring plan. A burden on the voluntary small diesel refineries program is estimated to be 270 hours for the entire industry. The opt-in program carries an estimated reporting burden averaging 80 hours per response and an annual recordkeeping burden averaging 2 hours per respondent. Finally, for auctions and direct sales, the estimated burden for submitting a bid or application is approximately 5 hours. All these burden estimates include time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the necessary data, and completing the collection of information.

In addition to the above requirements, affected sources must meet the annual compliance certification requirements; the public burden for this annual year-end reporting is estimated at 8,416 hours, which includes the submission of detailed information on plant operations, such as utilization data and dispatch system information. These estimates for compliance reporting are not included in the above total burden estimates which are already in the existing ICR.

The information collection requirements and detailed information on the burden estimates contained in the ICR document (Jan. 11, 1993) are available for viewing at Air Docket No. A-91-43. The EPA would like to elicit comments to:

- (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility;
- (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information;
- (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Dated: June 28, 1995.

**Janice Wagner,**

*Acting Director, Acid Rain Division.*

[FR Doc. 95-17209 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[FRL-5257-2]

**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:** The Agency has received from the Lubrizol Corporation, a notification of intent to certify urban bus retrofit/rebuild equipment pursuant to 40 CFR Part 85, Subpart O. EZ-TRAP™ is Lubrizol's trademark for this equipment. Pursuant to § 85.1407(a)(7), today's **Federal Register** notice summarizes the notification below, 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 comments received, to determine whether the equipment 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.

This notification of intent to certify, as well as other materials specifically relevant to it, are contained in Category VI-A of Public Docket A-93-42, entitled "Certification of Urban Bus Retrofit/Rebuild Equipment". 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 or not the equipment included in this notification of intent to certify should be certified. Comments should be provided in writing to Public Docket A-93-42, Category VI-A, 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 August 28, 1995.

**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 VI-A), Room M-1500, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460.
2. William Rutledge, Technical Support Branch, Manufacturers Operations Division (6405J), 401 "M" Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460.

The Lubrizol 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, Manufacturers Operations Division (6405J), 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 sets out a specific annual target level for average PM emissions from urban buses in an operator's fleet.

A key aspect of the program is the certification of retrofit/rebuild equipment. To meet either of the two compliance options, operators of the affected buses must use equipment which has been certified by the Agency. 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 Program 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 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.

Under Program 1, additional information regarding cost must be submitted in the notification of intent to certify, 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.

**II. Notification of Intent To Certify**

By a notification of intent to certify dated May 15, 1995, Lubrizol Corporation has applied for certification of equipment applicable to certain petroleum-fueled diesel engines used in urban buses of 1993 and earlier model years. The notification of intent to certify states that the candidate equipment will comply with the 0.10 g/bhp-hr particulate matter (PM) standard on petroleum fueled diesel engines that have been rebuilt to the engine manufacturer's specifications. No life cycle cost data is submitted with the notification of intent to certify, therefore, the equipment will not trigger program requirements. The use of the equipment by transit operators to meet program requirements is discussed further below.

Major components of the candidate equipment are: (1) A ceramic particulate filter assembly for the diesel exhaust, which in most installations takes the place of the original system muffler; (2) a proprietary diesel fuel soluble catalyst (additive); (3) gold plated fuel injectors; and, (4) a sensor to monitor engine exhaust backpressure. In operation, copper in the fuel additive (EZ-ADD™) is deposited on the ceramic exhaust filter along with exhaust particulates. The copper acts as a catalyst to lower the oxidation temperature of the particulates and thus promotes auto-regeneration of the trap under a variety of operating conditions. The nozzle tips of the fuel injectors are gold plated to minimize formation of deposits.

The notification of intent to certify states that the candidate equipment is applicable to the following engines:

Manufacturer	Engine model	Model Year
Cummins .....	L-10 .....	1985-1991
Cummins .....	L-10 EC .....	1992-1993
Cummins .....	C-Series .....	1990-1992
Cummins .....	B-Series .....	1990-1992
MAN .....	.....	1979-1992
Caterpillar .....	3208 .....	1982-1992

Lubrizol Corporation presents exhaust emission data from testing the equipment on a recently rebuilt 1987 model year Cummins L-10 engine documenting PM emissions from one cold start cycle plus seven hot start cycle transient exhaust emission tests. During one of the hot cycles the trap experienced significant regeneration.

The PM emissions from this cycle, the highest of all cycles (including the cold cycle), was 0.028 g/bhp-hr. Exhaust testing with the equipment installed also showed that hydrocarbon (HC), carbon monoxide (CO), and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), emissions were less than the federal emission standards for 1987. Smoke emission measurements for the engine with the candidate equipment installed indicates compliance with applicable standards, with smoke opacity measurements of less than 1 percent for the acceleration, lugging, and peak modes.

Lubrizol Corporation has submitted no life cycle cost information for this equipment because it is not intended to trigger program requirements. Therefore, its use will be at the option of urban bus operators and will not be required if the Agency approves the request for certification of this candidate equipment.

Section 85.1406(d) of the regulations governing urban bus equipment certification states, in part, "\* \* \* installation of any certified retrofit/rebuild equipment shall not cause or contribute to an unreasonable risk to the public health, welfare or safety \* \* \*". Information on health effects related to the candidate equipment has been provided by Lubrizol with its notification of intent to certify, and this has been reviewed by the Agency's Office of Research And Development (ORD). In its report entitled "Inhalation Risk Assessment Of Lubrizol Corporation's EZ-TRAP™ System", ORD indicates the potential for dioxin formation. The report states:

"ORD's major concern is whether the use of the EZ-TRAP™ system with Lubrizol would, or would not, result in dioxin formation and emissions. Although there are no data relating to dioxin formation in diesel engines generally, ORD's concern in this instance is based on the similarity of the experimental evidence defining the requisite conditions for dioxin formation in combustion processes, post-combustion, with the conditions anticipated with the use of the copper-based additive in diesel fuel burned by buses. Specifically, with regard to the latter; (1) particles are retained in the filter trap at temperatures associated with formation in other combustion sources; (2) the particles provide reactive surfaces for chemical reactions to transpire; (3) trace levels of chlorine may be present in the diesel fuel; and, (4) copper is the most potent catalyst identified to date in the overall dioxin formation reactions.

"Therefore, based on a review of the available information, ORD concludes

that although the EZ-TRAP™ System will likely reduce health hazards associated with the pollutant emissions from diesel-fueled vehicles; it is not possible at present to state whether the net public health risk would increase, decrease, or remain unchanged. This is due to the lack of information on inhalation of combustion products from copper-containing diesel fuel, similarity of test engine conditions to real world operation conditions, and potential dioxin formation and emissions.”

The ORD report is available in the public docket. The Agency requests information on dioxin formation in diesel exhaust, especially as it relates to use of a copper-based fuel additive.

Section 211 of the Clean Air Act sets forth fuel and fuel additive prohibitions, and gives the Agency authority to waive certain of those prohibitions. The Agency, however, does not believe that Lubrizol must obtain a fuel additive waiver under Section 211(f)(4) of the Clean Air Act before certifying its additive system for the following reasons.

The Act prohibits the introduction into commerce of any fuel or fuel additive that is not substantially similar to a fuel or fuel additive used in the certification of any model year 1975 or later vehicle or engine under Section 206. The Administrator may waive this prohibition, if she determines that certain criteria are met. The Agency believes that certification of an urban bus retrofit system constitutes the certification of an engine under Section 206, and, since the additive is used in the certification of the system, a waiver is not required to market the additive for use with the certified retrofit system.

Section 206 grants the Agency authority to issue a certificate of conformity to any vehicle that complies with regulations promulgated under Section 202.<sup>1</sup> Section 219(d) requires the Agency to regulate emissions from existing urban buses, and explicitly states that such regulations shall be promulgated under Section 202(a). Therefore, it is clear that Congress intended the urban bus retrofit standards to be Section 202 standards. Because the urban bus standards are Section 202 standards, the Agency can issue a certificate of conformity to those standards under Section 206. When the certification requirements of the urban bus retrofit program were issued, the Agency stated that those requirements are authorized by Section 206 (among

other sections of the Act). 58 FR at 21377, n.1 (April 21, 1993).

Further, the Agency believes that certification of an urban bus retrofit system qualifies as certification of a vehicle or engine. Certification of a retrofit system is certification of an engine because, under the urban bus retrofit regulations, such systems are certified for urban bus engines of specific engine families, and can only be used for engines in those families. The entire engine configuration (i.e., the existing engine combined with the retrofit system) must comply with the certification requirements in the urban bus retrofit regulations. In contrast, if retrofit systems were not certified on an engine family-specific basis, the Agency believes that such certifications would arguably not constitute the certification of an engine.

The argument that the urban bus retrofit system certification is the certification of an engine is supported by provisions in the urban bus regulations that are designed to ensure that the entire configuration (i.e., the engine plus the retrofit system) complies with applicable Section 202 emissions standards. These “safeguards” address the same concerns that the Section 211(f)(4) fuel additive waiver process is designed to address, i.e., the effect of a fuel additive on the emissions performance of the engine in which it is used.

First, when applying for certification of a retrofit system, the manufacturer must provide the Agency with a statement that use of the system “will not cause a substantial increase to urban bus engine emissions in any normal driving mode not represented during certification testing.” 40 CFR 85.1407(a)(1)(x). In addition, the Agency can deny certification, or decertify equipment, if there is reason to believe that the use of such equipment will cause an urban bus engine to exceed any applicable emission standard. At any time prior to certification, the Agency may notify the manufacturer that the equipment will not be certified pending further investigation, on the basis of information or test results from the manufacturer or on the basis of public comment, that indicates use of the equipment could cause an urban bus engine to exceed any applicable emission requirement, or could cause or contribute to an unreasonable risk to public health, welfare, or safety. 40 CFR 85.1408 (a)(2) and (a)(3). The manufacturer must respond in writing to such notification, or the Agency shall withdraw its notification of intent to certify. Finally, the equipment certifier must warrant that its retrofit equipment,

if properly installed and maintained, will not cause an urban bus engine to exceed applicable emissions standards for a period of 150,000 miles following installation of the equipment.

Because certification of an urban bus retrofit system is an engine certification, Lubrizol’s copper additive is “substantially similar” for purposes of Section 211(f)(1)(B) in the limited context of use in certified trap systems. The Agency has previously interpreted the term “substantially similar” as used in Section 211(f)(1) only in the context of introduction into commerce for general use. The approach discussed in this analysis would be a departure from this historical practice, because the copper additive would be deemed substantially similar only for a limited use (i.e., in a certified trap system). A Section 211(f)(4) waiver would be required to introduce the additive into commerce for any other use.<sup>2</sup> The Agency solicits comment on possible measures to ensure that the additive will only be used in certified retrofit systems.

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 Section 85.1406, including whether the testing accurately substantiates the claimed emission reduction or emission levels; and, (2) the requirements of Section 85.1407 for a notification of intent to certify.

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 candidate equipment on applicable engines; and, (b) whether the equipment is compatible with affected vehicles.

If the Agency approves Lubrizol’s request to certify this candidate equipment, urban bus operators who choose to comply with either Program 1 or Program 2 of the urban bus regulation may use the Lubrizol equipment. If certified, operators under Program 2 using this equipment will use the PM emission level(s) established during the certification review process, in the calculations for fleet level attained (FLA). Lubrizol projects a post-rebuild PM level of 0.01 g/bhp-hr with the

<sup>1</sup> Section 202(a) authorizes the Agency to establish emissions standards for new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines.

<sup>2</sup> This interpretation of “sub-sim” raises potential enforcement concerns, since the Agency does not have authority to enforce against an end user who may use the additive without the trap system.

equipment installed on the Cummins L-10 engine.

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 Lubrizol notification of intent to certify should be certified pursuant to the urban bus retrofit/rebuild program. Interested parties are encouraged to review the notification of intent to certify and provide comments during the 45-day period. Please send separate copies of your comments to each of the above addresses.

The Agency will review this 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: July 5, 1995.

**Mary D. Nichols,**

*Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 95-17127 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5258-1]

### Workshop on Exposure Factors Handbook

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

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces a peer review workshop sponsored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Risk Assessment Forum to review revisions to EPA's 1989 Exposure Factors Handbook (Handbook; EPA/600/8-89/043).

**DATES:** The workshop will begin on Tuesday, July 25, 1995, at 8:30 a.m. and end on Thursday, July 26, 1995, at 4 p.m. Members of the public may attend as observers.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the DoubleTree Hotel Park Terrace, 1515 Rhode Island Avenue, NW., at Scott Circle, Washington, DC.

Eastern Research Group, Inc. (ERG), an EPA contractor, is providing logistical support for the peer review workshop. Members of the public wishing to attend the workshop as an observer must register by phone with ERG at 617/674-7374 before July 20, 1995. Please note that space is limited and registrations will be accepted on a first-come, first-serve basis.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

William P. Wood, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Risk Assessment Forum (8101), 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, Tel: (202) 260-6743.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The revised Exposure Factors Handbook is intended to serve as a support document to EPA's Exposure Assessment Guidelines (57 FR 22888; May 29, 1992) by providing data on factors that may be needed to calculate human exposure to toxic chemicals. The Guidelines were developed to promote consistency across exposure assessment activities carried out by various EPA offices. The Handbook provides a common data base that all Agency programs can use to derive values for exposure assessment factors.

To obtain a single copy of the draft 1995 Handbook, interested parties should contact the ORD Publications Office, Center for Environmental Research Information, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 26 West Martin Luther King Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45268, Tel: 513/569-7562, Fax: 513/569-7566. Please provide your name, mailing address, and EPA document number EPA/600/P-95/002A. The document should be available for distribution on or about July 20, 1995.

Dated: July 5, 1995.

**J.K. Alexander,**

*Acting Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.*

[FR Doc. 95-17124 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[FRL-5257-1]

### Public Meetings of the Urban Wet Weather Flows Advisory Committee and the Sanitary Sewer Overflows Subcommittee

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is convening two separate public meetings: (1) The Urban Wet Weather Flows Advisory Committee (UWWF) meeting on August 2 and 3, 1995, and (2) the Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) Subcommittee meeting on August 17 and 18, 1995. These meetings are open to the public without need for advance registration. The UWWF Advisory Committee will discuss: (1) Substantive issues related to wet weather flows which may include water quality based requirements, control technologies, financial capability, monitoring,

environmental measures of success, watershed approach; (2) procedural issues related future Committee meetings; (3) goals, objectives, and desired outcomes of the Committee; and (4) information needs for future discussions. The Committee's agenda will also include a status report on the SSO Subcommittee and the Storm Water Phase II Subcommittee (dealing with discharges from sources other than those now requiring permits in the first phase of the storm water program). The SSO Subcommittee will discuss: (1) Goals, objectives and desired outcomes for the SSO policy dialogue, such as ensuring national consistency and adequate municipal investment in collection system operation and maintenance; (2) compliance priorities; (3) the overall SSO Strategy flowchart and components of the flowchart developed by the Subcommittee at its previous meeting; and (4) how watershed concepts could be incorporated into SSO efforts.

**DATES:** The UWWF Advisory Committee meeting will be held on August 2 and 3, 1995. On the 2nd, the meeting will begin at approximately 8:30 a.m. EST and run until about 5:00 p.m. On the 3rd, the meeting will run from about 8:30 a.m. until completion. The SSO Subcommittee meeting will be held on August 17 and 18, 1995. On the 17th, the meeting will begin at approximately 8:30 a.m. EST and run until about 5 p.m. On the 18th, the meeting will run from about 8:30 a.m. until completion.

**ADDRESSES:** The UWWF Advisory Committee and the SSO Subcommittee meetings will be held at the Georgetown University Conference Center, 3800 Reservoir Road, Washington DC 20057. The Conference Center telephone number is (202) 687-3200.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** For UWWF Advisory Committee meeting, contact William Hall, Matrix Manager, Office of Wastewater Management, at (202) 260-1458, or Internet: hall.william@epamail.epa.gov.

For SSO Subcommittee meeting, Contact Lam Lim of EPA's Office of Wastewater Management, at (202) 260-7371.

Dated: June 29, 1995.

**Michael Cook,**

*Director, Office of Wastewater Management, Designated Federal Official.*

[FR Doc. 95-17126 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P