

manufactured, processed or otherwise used in excess of the reporting thresholds established in section 313(f)(1). EPA has authority to revise these threshold amounts pursuant to section 313(f)(2); however, such revised threshold amounts must obtain reporting on a substantial majority of total releases of the chemical at all facilities subject to section 313. A revised threshold may be based on classes of chemicals or categories of facilities. Section 328 provides EPA with general rulemaking authority to develop regulations necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act.

EPA has established an alternate threshold for those facilities with low amounts of a listed toxic chemical in wastes. A facility that meets the current section 313 reporting thresholds, but estimates that the total amount of the chemical in total waste does not exceed 500 pounds per year, can take advantage of an alternate manufacture, process or otherwise use threshold of 1 million pounds per year, for that chemical, provided that certain conditions are adhered to. The amounts in total waste are the combined total of amounts released at the facility, treated at the facility (as represented by amounts destroyed or converted by treatment processes), recovered at the facility as a result of recycling operations, combusted for the purpose of energy recovery at the facility, and transferred from the facility to off-site locations for the purpose of recycling, energy recovery, treatment, or disposal.

Each qualifying facility that chooses to apply the revised manufacture, process or otherwise use threshold must file an annual certification statement in lieu of a complete Form R. This annual certification is submitted to both the EPCRA reporting center and the designated state recipient in the same manner that the Form R is submitted. The annual certification provides a signed statement that the sum of the amount of the TRI chemical in wastes did not exceed 500 pounds for this reporting year, and that the chemical was manufactured, processed, or otherwise used in an amount not exceeding 1 million pounds during this reporting year.

The primary function served by the certification statement is to satisfy the statutory requirement to maintain reporting on a substantial majority of releases for all listed chemicals. Without the certification statement, users of TRI data would have no access to any information on these chemicals. The certification statement can also be considered a de facto range report that indicates that the sum of amounts of the

chemical in waste did not exceed 500 pounds, which can be useful to any party interested in amounts being handled at a particular facility or for broader statistical purposes. Additionally, the certification statement provides compliance monitoring and enforcement programs along with other interested parties a means to track chemical management activities and verify overall compliance with the rule.

This ICR is similar to the one previously approved by OMB, but has been amended slightly to reflect TRI delisting actions that have occurred since the last ICR and which impact the estimated number of potential certifications. To date, EPA has either completely removed or modified the listing for 7 chemicals. This reduces the number of certification statements estimated by approximately 12 percent compared to the previous ICR for the alternate threshold, which acts to reduce the estimated burden for this data collection.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 34.5 hours per response. This estimate 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 and 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. No person is 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 displayed in 40 CFR Part 9.

Respondents/Affected Entities: Chemical facilities that manufacture, process or otherwise use certain toxic chemicals and which are required, under EPCRA section 313, to report annually to EPA their environmental releases of such chemicals.

Estimated No. of Respondents: 10,257

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 709,784 hours.

Frequency of Collection: Annual.

Dated: July 31, 1996.

Joseph Retzer,

Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 96-20249 Filed 8-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5549-3]

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 a notification of intent to certify urban bus retrofit/rebuild equipment pursuant to 40 CFR Part 85, Subpart O. 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 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 Engine Control Systems Ltd. (ECS) notification of intent to certify, as well as other materials specifically relevant to it, are contained in category XIV-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 XIV-A, at the address below. An identical copy should be submitted to Anthony Erb, also at the address below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before September 23, 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 XIV-A), Room M-1500, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460.
2. Anthony Erb, Engine Compliance Programs Group, Engine Programs and Compliance Division (6405J), 401 "M" Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460.

The ECS 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: Anthony Erb, Engine Compliance and Programs Division (6403J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460. Telephone: (202) 233-9259.

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.

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 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 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. Both

of these values are based on 1992 dollars.

II. Notification of Intent to Certify

By a notification of intent to certify signed December 13, 1995, ECS has applied for certification of equipment applicable to Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) two-cycle engines originally equipped in an urban bus from model year 1979 to model year 1993 (Table A). The notification of intent to certify states that the equipment being certified is an oxidation converter muffler (OCM). The OCM contains an oxidation catalyst developed specifically for diesel applications, packaged as a direct replacement for the muffler. The application states that the candidate equipment provides a 25 percent or greater reduction in emissions of particulate matter (PM) for petroleum fueled diesel engines relative to an original engine configuration with no after treatment installed. The engines are to be rebuilt to original specifications, or not rebuilt but able to meet specified engine calibrations. A 25 percent reduction is also claimed for engines that have been retrofit/rebuilt with certified new rebuild kits that do not include after treatment devices. The latter applies to the DDC retrofit/rebuild kits which were certified on October 2, 1995 (60 FR 51472) and July 19, 1996 (61 FR 37738).

TABLE A.—CERTIFICATION LEVELS

Engine Models	Model Year	PM Level ¹ with OCM	PM Level ² with OCM and DDC Certified Re-build Kit	Code/Family
6V92TA MUI	1979-87	0.38	0.22	All
	1988-1989	0.23	0.17	All
6V92TA DDEC I	1986-87	0.23	N/A	All
6V92TA DDEC II	1988-90	0.23	0.17	All
	1991	0.23	N/A
	1992-93	0.19	N/A	All
6V71N	1973-89	0.38	N/A	All
6V71T	1985-86	0.38	N/A	All
6L71TA	1988-89	0.23	N/A	All
6L71TA DDEC	1990-91	0.23	N/A	All

¹ The original PM certification levels for the 1991 6V92TA DDEC II, and 6L71TA DDEC engine models are based on Federal Emission Limits (FELs) under the averaging, banking and trading program. These limits are higher than the 1991 PM standard of 0.25 g/bhp-hr. The PM level listed in this table for the engines that are equipped with the OCM provide at least a 25% reduction from the original certification levels. The 1992 to 1993 6V92TA DDEC II engine models were also certified using FELs under the trading and banking program and likewise the PM levels for the engines equipped with the OCM represent at least a 25% reduction from the original certification levels.

² For 6V92TA MUI and 6V92TA DDEC II models that are rebuilt using a certified DDC emissions retrofit kit, ECS is certifying the PM engine emissions to reduced levels as provided in Table A, provided the OCM is installed at the same time the rebuild with the certified DDC upgrade kit takes place. The DDC upgrade kit certification notifications were published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on October 2, 1995 (60 FR 51472) and July 19, 1996 (61 FR 37738) respectively.

ECS indicates that the maximum cost in 1995 dollars will not exceed \$2,169.00 (or \$2,000 in 1992 dollars). Equipment cost is listed to be \$2,089.00 and installation costs are not to exceed \$80.00 (maximum of 2.0 hours of labor time estimated). ECS states that there is no fuel economy impact based on the fuel economy data generated during testing, and that no incremental maintenance will be necessary due to the addition of this equipment. Therefore, this equipment may qualify as a trigger for program requirements for the 25% reduction standard. However, it is noted that designation as a trigger is not necessary in this case as trigger technology is already certified for the 25% reduction standard for every engine model for which this technology would be certified.

ECS presents exhaust emission data from testing the candidate equipment configurations on two engines using the federal engine-dynamometer test

procedures of 40 CFR Part 86, as well as chassis dynamometer testing. A 1991 model year DDC 6V92TA DDEC II engine was tested on an engine dynamometer and a 1987 model year DDC 6V71N engine was tested on a chassis dynamometer. The 6V71N engine was selected to represent a "worst case", with respect to PM, for the engines for which certification of the equipment is being sought based on a pre-rebuild PM level for the 6V71N of 0.50, from the table in 40 CFR section 85.1403(c)(1)(iii)(A). The 6V71N engine qualifies as a "worst case" engine for all two-stroke/cycle engines with the exception of the 1990 DDC 6L71TA. The 1991 6V92TA DDEC engine was tested to show the ability of the OCM to reduce PM based on a "pre-rebuild" certification level of 0.31 g/bhp-hr. All testing was conducted using test fuel having a maximum sulfur level of 0.05 weight percent.

Baseline testing was conducted on the 6V71N engine after rebuild to the manufacturer's original engine configuration. The 6V92TA DDEC II engine was a former durability test engine that had been used by the manufacturer (DDC) and was purchased from DDC in 1994. This engine was not rebuilt and had accumulated 1120 hours of operation prior to the baseline test. Subsequent engine tests were performed after the candidate equipment was installed.

Table B summarizes the emission levels from the engine dynamometer testing for the 6V92TA DDEC II engine and for the chassis tests performed on the 6V71N engine. The driving cycles used for the chassis testing were the Central Business District (CBD), and the New York Bus Composite Cycle (NYC). Additional testing information is provided in the attachments to the notification.

TABLE B.—TEST ENGINE EMISSION

Engine	Gaseous and Particulate				Smoke			Comment
	HC	CO	NO _x	PM	ACC	LUG	Peak	
Engine Dyno	g/bhp-hr				percent opacity			1991 EPA stds. Baseline. With catalyst.
1991 6V92TA DDEC	1.3 0.42 0.14	15.5 1.19 0.39	10.7 4.95 4.87	0.25 0.18 0.13	20 3.4 3.8	15 0.6 0.8	50 5.8 6.4	
Chassis Dyno	g/mile				percent opacity			
1987 6V71N	3.25 0.57 4.82 1.46	43.04 3.47 35.56 6.80	31.93 26.16 26.61 25.54	2.94 1.64 2.47 1.55	N/A N/A N/A N/A	N/A N/A N/A N/A	N/A N/A N/A N/A	Baseline CBD. CBD with catalyst. Baseline NYC. NYC with catalyst.

Section 85.1406(a) of the program regulations state "The test results must demonstrate that the retrofit/rebuild equipment * * * will not cause the urban bus engine to fail to meet any applicable Federal emission requirements set for that engine in the applicable portions of 40 CFR part 86 * * *".

ECS's emission test data indicate that the candidate equipment reduces hydrocarbon (HC) and carbon monoxide (CO), when compared with baseline (pre-retrofit) emissions. In the test sequence, for the 1991 6V92TA DDEC engine, the test on the engine that was equipped with the catalytic converter shows a 26% decrease in PM emissions compared to the baseline engine. This test also shows that hydrocarbon (HC), carbon monoxide (CO), and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) emissions are within the applicable emission standards. ECS provided smoke emission test measurements for this engine indicating that the engine complies with

applicable smoke standards with the OCM installed. In the CBD chassis test sequence for the 1987 6V71N engine, the test with the OCM in place produced a 42% reduction in PM compared to the baseline test. In the NYC chassis test sequence the reduction in PM with the OCM in place was 37%. The information submitted by ECS indicates that this equipment achieves a 25% or greater reduction in PM emissions and will be sold for less than the cost ceiling of \$2,000 (1992 dollars). Urban bus operators are currently required to use equipment that is certified to provide 25% or greater equivalent reduction to comply with Program 1 of the regulation. Certification of the ECS equipment will provide another choice of certified equipment from which operators may choose. Under Program 1, the requirement to use equipment providing a 25% reduction will continue until equipment which reduces PM emissions to 0.10 g/bhp-hr is certified at or below

the \$7,940 life cycle cost ceiling. If equipment is certified to the 0.1 g/bhp-hr PM level below the life-cycle cost ceiling, operators under Program 1 will be required to use it.

If EPA approves ECS's certification request, urban bus operators who chose to comply under Option 2 of this regulation may also use this equipment.

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

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 ECS 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 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: August 1, 1996.

Mary D. Nichols,

Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 96-20246 Filed 8-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

[FRL-5549-6]

Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC); Executive Committee Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, as amended (5 U.S.C., App. 2), notice is hereby given that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Research and Development (ORD), Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) will hold its Executive Committee Meeting, August 20-21, 1996, at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel, 1250 South Hayes Street, Arlington, Virginia. The meeting will start at 9 a.m. and recess at 5:15 p.m. on August 20, 1996, and start at 9 a.m. and adjourn at 4 p.m. on August 21, 1996. All times noted are eastern time. The meeting is open to the public. Any member of the public wishing to make comments at the meeting, should contact Shirley Hamilton, Designated Federal Official,

Office of Research and Development (8701), 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460; by telephone at (202) 260-0468. In general, each individual making an oral presentation will be limited to a total time of 3 minutes. Anyone desiring a draft BOSC agenda may fax their request to Shirley R. Hamilton, (202) 260-0929.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shirley R. Hamilton, Designated Federal Official, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, NCERQA (MC8701), 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460, 202-260-0468.

Dated: August 2, 1996.

Robert J. Huggett,

Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc. 96-20227 Filed 8-7-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[OPPTS-42052S; FRL-5384-2]

Urea-formaldehyde Pressed Wood; Notice of Availability of Final Report on Formaldehyde Exposure Testing Pilot Study; Plans for Peer Review

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of the final report of a pilot study addressing exposure testing of indoor emissions of formaldehyde gas from urea-formaldehyde pressed wood building materials. Such materials are used in the construction of conventionally-built and manufactured housing, cabinets and furniture. In September, 1996, the Agency will submit this report for peer review by experts on residential indoor air. The peer review will assist EPA in determining the future course of its formaldehyde exposure testing efforts and its ongoing regulatory investigation of formaldehyde emissions from pressed wood building materials used in building homes, cabinets and furniture.

DATES: Any person having comments on the final report should submit such comments to EPA by September 30, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Written comments regarding the pilot study final report should be sent in triplicate, to: Document Control Office (7407), Room G-099, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Written comments must be identified by the docket number OPPTS-42052S.

Comments and data may also be submitted electronically by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: oppt.ncic@epamail.epa.gov. Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comments and data will also be accepted on disks in WordPerfect in 5.1 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket number OPPTS-42052S. No confidential business information (CBI) should be submitted through e-mail. Electronic comments on this notice may be filed online at many Federal Depository Library. Additional information on electronic submissions can be found under "SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION".

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request a copy of "Residential Indoor Air Formaldehyde Testing Program: Pilot Study Final Report" contact: Susan B. Hazen, Director, Environmental Assistance Division (7408), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460; Telephone (202) 554-1404; TDD: (202) 554-0551; e-mail: TSCA-Hotline@epamail.epa.gov. By internet: e-mail requests to:

oppt.ncic@epamail.epa.gov. The report is also available on EPA's gopher server ([gopher://gopher.epa.gov](http://gopher.epa.gov)) and the world wide web ([www](http://www.epa.gov)) (<http://www.epa.gov>) under the heading "Rules, Regulations and Legislation."

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA is concerned about formaldehyde that is emitted by urea-formaldehyde (UF) pressed wood products. UF pressed wood products include particleboard, hardwood plywood and medium density fiberboard. They are used as interior building materials and as components of doors, cabinets and furniture. Formaldehyde emissions from these products can elevate the concentrations of this gas in homes and other indoor settings where such products are used and may irritate the eyes, nose and respiratory systems of the large number of persons so exposed.

In the Federal Register of December 23, 1992 (57 FR 61240) (FRL-4178-1), EPA published its 1992 Master Testing List which set forth the Agency's chemical testing agenda under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). Among other priorities, the list identified a need for testing that would better characterize formaldehyde levels in conventional and manufactured housing when these houses are new and over a period of time. Contemporary exposure data in