

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY****Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**

[Project No. 11072-001 New York]

**Trenton Falls Hydroelectric Company, Inc.; Notice of Availability of Draft Environmental Assessment**

January 23, 1998.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) regulations, 18 CFR part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 FR 47897), the Office of Hydropower Licensing has reviewed the application for original license for the Boye Dam Hydroelectric Project, located on the East Branch of the Fish Creek in Lewis County, New York, and has prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the project.

Copies of the DEA are available in the Public Reference Branch, Room 2-A, of the Commission's offices at 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

Any comments should be filed within 45 days from the date of this notice and should be addressed to David P.

Boergers, Acting Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. For further information, contact William Diehl at (202) 219-2813 or Ed Lee at (202) 219-2809.

**David P. Boergers,***Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 98-2152 Filed 1-28-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[FRL-5956-6]

**Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request; Landfill Methane Outreach Program ICR**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this document announces that EPA is planning to submit the following proposed Information Collection Request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB): The Landfill Methane Outreach Program ICR, EPA ICR #1849.01. Before submitting the ICR to OMB for review and approval, EPA is soliciting comments on specific aspects of the

proposed information collection described below.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before March 2, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to The Docket Clerk, Docket #A-98-06, located in the U.S. EPA Office of Air & Radiation. One original and two copies of each comment should be submitted. Hand delivery of comments should be made to: Air Docket, USEPA, MC 6102, 401 M Street, SW, Room M1500, Washington, DC 20460.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tom Kerr, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Atmospheric Pollution Prevention Division, (6202J), 401 M St., SW, Washington, DC 20460, or call (202) 564-9768.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** EPA is seeking comment on the ICR for the Landfill Methane Outreach Program (EPA ICR #1849.01).

**Affected Entities:** Entities affected by this action are landfill gas-to-energy project developers, landfill owners and landfill gas energy customers that have joined the Landfill Methane Outreach Program.

**Abstract:** The Landfill Methane Outreach Program is an EPA-sponsored voluntary program that encourages landfill owners, communities and project developers to implement methane recovery technologies to utilize the methane as a source of fuel and to reduce emissions of landfill methane, a potent greenhouse gas. The Landfill Methane Outreach Program further encourages utilities and other energy customers to support and promote the use of landfill methane at their facilities. The Landfill Methane Outreach Program signs voluntary Memoranda of Understanding with these organizations to enlist their support in promoting cost-effective landfill gas utilization. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15.

The EPA would like to solicit comments to:

(i) evaluate whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) evaluate the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) enhance the quality, clarity and utility of the information to be collected; and

(iv) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond including the use of electronic, Internet-based or other technological collection techniques.

**Burden Statement:** The estimated average public burden per respondent for new Allies is 5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering the necessary data, and completing the collection of information. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing or providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

**Respondents:** Landfill owners, landfill gas energy purchasers, and landfill gas project developers.

**Estimated number of respondents:** 500.

**Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:** 2,500 hours.

**Frequency of Collection:** as needed.

Dated: January 16, 1998.

**Edward Callahan,***Acting Director, Office of Atmospheric Programs, Office of Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 98-2209 Filed 1-28-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

[FRL-5956-2]

**Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses; Approval of an Application for Certification of Equipment and Amendment to a Previously-Approved Certification**

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of agency approval of an application for equipment certification.

**SUMMARY:** The Agency received a notification of intent to certify urban

bus retrofit/rebuild equipment for 4-stroke petroleum fueled diesel engines pursuant to 40 CFR part 85, subpart O from Engine Control Systems Ltd. (ECS). Pursuant to section 85.1407(a)(7), a June 16, 1997 **Federal Register** document summarized the notification and announced that the notification would be available for public review and comment, and initiated a 45-day period during which comments could be submitted. In the notice the Agency stated it would review this notification of intent to certify, as well as comments received, to determine whether the equipment should be certified.

This action also notified the public that ECS proposed to amend its' two-stroke engine certification. On January 6, 1997, EPA approved certification of the ECS retrofit kit which demonstrated a 25% reduction in PM for 1979 to 1993 Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) 2-stroke engines. On February 11, 1997, ECS requested that this certification be modified to also include 8V71N engines for model years 1973 to 1984.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Agency received an application dated October 31, 1996, from Engine Control Systems Ltd. with principal place of business at 165 Pony Drive, Newmarket, Ontario, Canada for certification of urban bus retrofit/rebuild equipment pursuant to 40 CFR sections 85.1401-85.1415. On June 16, 1997, EPA published notification that the application had been received and made the application available for public review and comment for a period of 45 days (62 FR 32602). EPA has completed its review of this application and the Director of the Engine Program & Compliance Division (EPCD) has determined that it meets the requirements for certification. Testing demonstrated that the equipment

reduced particulate matter (PM) by 18% for petroleum fueled diesel Cummins L-10 engines and all other 4-stroke engines that were originally manufactured prior to and including 1993 engines and is certified for Program 2 only. It does not apply for operators utilizing Program 1 as ECS did not demonstrate the minimum 25% reduction in PM necessary for Program 1 certification.

In addition, EPA has completed its review of ECS' February 11, 1997 request to modify the certification approved by EPA on January 6, 1997 (62 FR 46) which demonstrated a 25% reduction in PM for 1979 to 1993 DDC 2-stroke engines to also include 8V71N engines for model years 1973 to 1984. EPA published notice of this amendment request and requested comments for a period on 45 days in the same notice cited above. EPA has completed its review of this request and the Director of EPCD approves the certification amendment to include the 8V71N model for model years 1973 to 1984 for both programs 1 and 2.

**DATES:** The date of this document, January 29, 1998, is the official certification date for both the application and the amendment approval.

**ADDRESSES:** The ECS applications, as well as other materials specifically relevant to them, are contained in Public Docket A-93-42 (Category XIV-A or XVI-A), entitled "Certification of Urban Bus Retrofit/Rebuild Equipment." This docket is located in room M-1500, Waterside Mall (Ground Floor), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW, Washington, DC 20460.

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:** Anthony Erb, Engine Compliance Programs Group, Engine Programs & Compliance Division (6403J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St. SW, Washington, D.C. 20460. Telephone: (202) 233-9259.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Background**

On October 31, 1996 ECS applied for certification of a kit, for use on 4-cycle petroleum fueled diesel Cummins L-10 and all other 4-stroke petroleum fuel urban bus engines that were originally manufactured prior to and including the 1993 model year. The kit includes a diesel oxidation converter muffler (CM). The application was submitted under EPA's Urban Bus/Retrofit program under Program 2 only.<sup>1</sup>

The CM functions as a catalytic converter and a muffler. It takes the place of the original muffler in the engine exhaust system. Through testing in accordance with the Federal Test Procedure for heavy-duty diesel engines, ECS documented that emissions of particulate matter (PM) were reduced by 19% with the candidate equipment installed on the test engine. The CM is certified for use with Program 2 to provide an 18% reduction relative to the original engine configuration. Additionally, the equipment is certified to provide an 18% reduction on engines equipped with certified rebuild kits that do not include a converter muffler. This equipment is certified to the PM emission levels as specified in Table A. below.

TABLE A.—ECS RETROFIT/REBUILD CERTIFICATION LEVELS FOR CUMMINS ENGINES<sup>2</sup>

Engine family	Control parts list (CPL)	Manufacture dates	New engine PM level	Retrofit PM level with CM	Retrofit PM level with CM and Cummins kit
343B .....	780	11/20/85 to 12/31/87 ...	0.58	0.48 .....	0.28
343B .....	781	11/20/85 to 12/31/87 ...	.59	.48 .....	.28
343C .....	0774	11/20/85 to 12/31/89 ...	.46	.38 .....	.28
343C .....	0777	11/20/85 to 12/31/89 ...	.61	.50 .....	.28
343C .....	0996	12/04/87 to 08/19/88 ...	.61	.50 .....	.28
343C .....	1226	07/26/88 to 12/31/90 ...	.50	.41 .....	.28
343F .....	1226	07/12/90 to 08/26/92 ...	.45	.37 .....	.28
343F .....	1441	12/18/90 to 12/31/92 ...	.46	.38 .....	.28
343F .....	1622	04/24/92 to 12/31/92 ...	.46	.38 .....	.28
343F .....	1624	04/24/92 to 12/31/92 ...	.45	.37 .....	.28

<sup>1</sup> EPA promulgated the Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses on April 23, 1993 (58 FR 21359). This final rule established the provisions for an urban

bus retrofit/rebuild program as required by section 219(d) of the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990.

TABLE A.—ECS RETROFIT/REBUILD CERTIFICATION LEVELS FOR CUMMINS ENGINES<sup>2</sup>—Continued

Engine family	Control parts list (CPL)	Manufacture dates	New engine PM level	Retrofit PM level with CM	Retrofit PM level with CM and Cummins kit
Other 4-stroke engines .....	.....	1985 to 1993 .....	.....	18% reduction from original PM levels.	N/A

<sup>2</sup>The New Engine PM certification levels are based on the certification level or the average test audit result for each engine family. It is noted that for engine family 343F, although the PM standard for 1991 and 1992 was 0.25 g/bhp-hr and the NO<sub>x</sub> standard was 5.0 g/bhp-hr, Cummins certified the 1226, 1441, 1622, and 1624 CPLs to a Federal Emission Limit (FEL) of 0.49 g/bhp-hr PM and 5.6 g/bhp-hr NO<sub>x</sub> under the averaging, banking and trading program.

Urban bus operators who choose to comply with Program 2 and use the ECS equipment will use the PM emission value from Table A when calculating their average fleet PM level.

In addition, EPA has completed its review of ECS' February 11, 1997 request to amend the kit approved by EPA on January 6, 1997 (62 FR 46) which demonstrated a 25% reduction in PM for 1979 to 1993 DDC 2-stroke engines to also include 8V71N engines for model years 1973 to 1984. The certification covers those engines that are rebuilt to original specifications or in-use engines that are not rebuilt at the time the CM is installed provided the engine meets specified oil consumption limits. This certification does not trigger any new rebuild requirements for applicable engines because the requirement to use equipment certified to achieve at least a 25% reduction has already been triggered for the 8V71N engines. The PM certification levels are provided in Table B. below.

TABLE B.—ECS RETROFIT/REBUILD CERTIFICATION LEVELS FOR DDC 8V71N MODELS

DDC engine model	Model year	PM level with converter muffler	Code/family
8V71N .....	1973-84	0.38	All.

**II. Summary and Analysis of Comments**

EPA received comments from one party on the ECS application during the comment period. The Chicago Transit Authority commented on the backpressure shown in the data for the 4-stroke kit noting the increase by 4.7% (from 2.36" Hg to 2.47" Hg with a new catalytic converter. The CTA expressed concerns about the increase in backpressure restriction of the engine and the negative effects, as the catalytic converter accumulates mileage in service. The CTA also commented that the fuel consumption increased from 0.397 lb/bhp-hr in the baseline engine

test to 0.403 lb/bhp-hr in the test with the catalyst by 1.51%. It was noted by CTA that if the increase in fuel consumption in a 4-stroke Cummins engine also applies to the 2-stroke DDC engine, CTA will incur an additional expense of approximately \$122,766 based on it's operation of 1,115 buses with DDC 6V92TA diesel engines. CTA also commented that the catalytic converter should be tested for structural durability to ensure it will hold up in service and that in the absence of a durability test structural failure of the catalytic muffler should be covered for 150,000 miles with no time limitation.

In regard to concerns expressed relative to the backpressure concern, ECS indicates in a letter to EPA dated September 17, 1997, that it designs its catalyst units to provide backpressure comparable to the original muffler. The test catalyst utilized the minimum catalyst volume in what ECS termed the poorest flowpath that could be used for Cummins L10 engines according to ECS. ECS reported that all tests to date have shown that the converter muffler designs maintain exhaust system backpressure under the maximum level recommended by Cummins (3 inches of Mercury). The catalyst used by ECS for exhaust testing had been degreened, that is, put in place on an exhaust system for 100 hours under steady state conditions to more closely represent the performance of an in-use catalyst.

With regard to comments on fuel consumption, the CTA noted that if the 1.51% increase in fuel consumption seen in the 4-stroke testing were applicable to the 2-stroke engines, CTA would incur additional fuel expenses for a large number of engines in its fleet. Since the certification being discussed herein relative the 4-stroke application and the testing performed on the 4-stroke engine is relevant only to the 4-stroke application, the discussion of the application of the 4-stroke catalyst and its application and effects on fuel economy on a 2-stroke engine would not be pertinent. Therefore, this comment does not address the 4-stroke application. Further, since the 4-stroke

application being reviewed herein is for certification under Program 2 only, operators are not required to purchase this equipment as it is not trigger technology. Any decision by an operator to purchase this equipment can be made by an operator based on individual fleet composition and evaluation of the costs associated with available compliance options.

With regard to CTA's concern that the catalytic converter should be tested for structural durability to ensure it will hold up in service and that in the absence of the durability test structural failure of the catalytic muffler should be covered for 150,000 miles with no time limitation, the regulations at section 85.1409(a) require that the certifier shall warrant the retrofit/rebuild equipment will not cause an urban bus engine to exceed emission requirements for a period of 150,000 miles from when the equipment is installed. Section 85.1409(b) requires that the certifier shall replace all defective parts, free of charge for a period of 100,000 miles from when the equipment is installed. There is no time limitation on the time the warranties are in effect. In addition, there is no requirement in the regulations that the certifier shall provide durability data on the equipment. As discussed in the preamble to the final rule (58 FR page 21379, April 21, 1993) EPA decided not to require durability testing for this program. Any change to the warranty requirements can be made only through a regulatory amendment process which is beyond the scope of the certification decision being made in this document.

With regard to the ECS request to amend the previously certified kit to include the DDC 8V71N, CTA commented on engine exhaust backpressure restriction and structural durability of the catalytic converter. Again, in the absence of a durability test, CTA recommended that the structural failure of the catalytic converter muffler should be covered for 150,000 miles with no time limitation.

ECS has stated that it designs the systems to include a larger catalyst

volume which results in lower particulate mass flow through each individual substrate cell and a greater catalyst volume to ensure the substrate remains free from excessive carbon build up. According to ECS, this ensures that the converter muffler exhaust backpressure will remain within acceptable levels throughout the normal life. With regard to the request to perform durability testing and to require that the converter muffler should be warranted for 150,000 miles, please refer to the discussion of these concerns in the section above.

### III. Certification Approval

The Agency has reviewed this application, along with comments received from interested parties, and finds that this equipment reduces particulate matter emissions without causing urban bus engines to fail to meet other applicable Federal emission requirements. Additionally, EPA finds that installation of this equipment will not cause or contribute to an unreasonable risk to the public health, welfare or safety, or result in any additional range of parameter adjustability or accessibility to adjustment than that of the engine manufacturer's emission related part. The application meets the requirements for certification under the Retrofit/Rebuild Requirements for 1993 and Earlier Model Year Urban Buses (40 CFR sections 85.1401 and 85.1415). Thus, the Agency hereby approves the certification of this equipment.

### IV. Operator Requirements and Responsibilities

With regard to the 4-stroke kit, for operators who have chosen to comply with Program 2, this equipment is immediately available for use and those who use this certified kit may claim the PM emissions reduction as stated in Table A when calculating their Fleet Level Attained. With regard to the 2-stroke amendment for the previously certified kit, the kit may be used to meet the requirements of both Programs 1 and 2 for the 8V71N engine family for model years 1973-84.

As stated in the regulations, operators should maintain records for each engine in their fleet to demonstrate that they are in compliance with the requirements, beginning 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.

Dated: January 20, 1998.

**Richard D. Wilson,**

*Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 98-2211 Filed 1-28-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5956-5]

### Meeting of the Ozone Transport Commission for the Northeast United States

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Environmental Protection Agency is announcing the Winter meeting of the Ozone Transport Commission to be held on February 10, 1998.

This meeting is for the Ozone Transport Commission to deal with appropriate matters within the transport region, as provided for under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. This meeting is not subject to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, as amended.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held on February 10, 1998, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at: Hotel du Pont, 7th and Market Streets, Wilmington, DE 19801, (302) 594-3100.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** EPA: Susan Studlien, Region I, U.S.

Environmental Protection Agency, John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Boston, MA 02203, (617) 565-3800.

**THE STATE CONTACT:**

*Host Agency:* Carol Brown, Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation, 89 Kings Highway, Dover, DE 19903, (302) 739-4403.

**FOR DOCUMENTS AND PRESS INQUIRIES**

**CONTACT:** Stephanie A. Cooper, Ozone Transport Commission, 444 North Capitol Street, NW., Suite 638, Washington, DC 20001, (202) 508-3840, e-mail: ozone@sso.org.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 contain at section 184 provisions for the "Control of Interstate Ozone Air Pollution." Section 184(a) establishes an ozone transport region comprised of the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, parts of Virginia and the District of Columbia.

The Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation of the Environmental Protection Agency convened the first meeting of the commission in New York City on May 7, 1991. The purpose of the Transport Commission is to deal with ground level ozone formation, transport, and control within the transport region.

The purpose of this notice is to announce that this Commission will meet on February 10, 1998. The meeting will be held at the address noted earlier in this notice.

Section 176A(b)(2) of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 specifies that the meetings of Transport Commissions are not subject to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. This meeting will be open to the public as space permits.

*Type of Meeting:* Open.

*Agenda:* Copies of the final agenda will be available from Stephanie Cooper of the OTC office (202) 508-3840 (or by e-mail: ozone@sso.org) on Tuesday, February 3, 1998. The purpose of this meeting is to review air quality needs within the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic States, including reduction of motor vehicle and stationary source air pollution. The OTC is also expected to address issues related to the transport of ozone into its region, including actions by EPA under sections 110 and 126 of the Clean Air Act, and to discuss market-based programs to reduce pollutants that cause ozone.

**John DeVillars,**

*Regional Administrator, EPA Region I.*

[FR Doc. 98-2208 Filed 1-28-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5956-3]

### Proposed CERCLA Prospective Lessee Agreement for the True Temper Sports Facility Site

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA").

**ACTION:** Proposal of CERCLA prospective lessee agreement for the True Temper Sports Facility site.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9601 *et seq.*, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 ("SARA"), Public Law 99-499, notice is hereby given that a proposed lessee agreement ("PLA") for the True Temper Sports Facility Removal Action Site ("the Site") located in Geneva, Ohio, has been executed by Tackle Hill