FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 5. The Service Agreement adds Dupont as an eligible customer under the Tariff.

PP&L requests an effective date of October 27, 1997, for the Service Agreement.

PP&L states that copies of this filing have been supplied to Dupont and to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

Comment date: November 24, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

21. The Dayton Power and Light Company

[Docket No. ER98–290–000]

Take notice that on October 27, 1997, Dayton Power and Light Company (Dayton), submitted service agreements establishing Delmarva Power and Light Company, Entergy Power Marketing Corp., Ohio Power Valley Electric Corporation, QST Energy Trading, Inc., as customers under the terms of Dayton's Open Access Transmission Tariff.

Dayton requests an effective date of one day subsequent to this filing for the service agreements. Accordingly, Dayton requests waiver of the Commission's notice requirements. Copies of filing were served upon establishing Delmarva Power and Light Company, Entergy Power Marketing Corp., Ohio Power Valley Electric Corporation, QST Energy Trading, Inc., and the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

Comment date: November 24, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

22. PP&L, Inc.

[Docket No. ER98–291–000]

Take Notice that on October 27, 1997, PP&L, Inc., (formerly known as Pennsylvania Power & Light Company) (PP&L), filed a Service Agreement dated October 1, 1997, with Eastern Power Distribution Incorporated (EPDI), under PP&L's FERC Electric Tariff, Original Volume No. 5. The Service Agreement adds EPDI as an eligible customer under the Tariff.

PP&L requests an effective date of October 27, 1997, for the Service Agreement.

PP&L states that copies of this filing have been supplied to EPDI and to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.

Comment date: November 24, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

23. Fall River Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.

[Docket No. OA98–1–000]

Take notice that on October 8, 1997, Fall River Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., tendered for filing a petition for waiver of the requirements of Order No. 888 and Order No. 889.

Comment date: November 24, 1997, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

24. Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative, Inc.

[Docket No. OA98–4–000]

Take notice that on October 30, 1997, Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative, Inc. (Wolverine), tendered for filing a Request for Waiver, in accordance with Section 35.28(d) of the Commission's Regulations, 18 CFR 35.28(d).

In Wolverine's Request for Waiver, Wolverine seeks a waiver of the OASIS and standards of conduct requirements of Order Nos. 889 and 889-A.

Comment date: November 25, 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. 97–30466 Filed 11–19–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5924–7]

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 (EPA).

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

SUMMARY: NOPEC Corporation has submitted to EPA a notification of intent to certify urban bus retrofit/rebuild equipment pursuant to 40 CFR part 85, subpart O. The notification describes equipment consisting of biodiesel fuel additive in combination with a particular exhaust system catalyst.

Pursuant to section 85.1407(a)(7), today's **Federal Register** document 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. EPA will review this notification of intent to certify, as well 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 as discussed below.

The candidate equipment is identical to equipment supplied by Twin Rivers Technologies, Limited Partnership, and which was previously certified as described in the **Federal Register** on October 22, 1996 (61 FR 54790).

The NOPEC notification of intent to certify, as well as other materials specifically relevant to it, are contained in category XVIII 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 document initiates a 45-day period during which EPA will accept written comments, as discussed further below, relevant to whether or not the equipment described in the NOPEC notification of intent to certify should be certified. Comments should be provided in writing to Public Docket A–93–42, Category XVIII, at the address below, and an identical copy should be submitted to William Rutledge, also at the address below.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before January 5, 1998.

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

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

2. William Rutledge, Engine Compliance Group, Engine Programs and Compliance Division (6403J), 401 ''M'' Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460.

The NOPEC 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 a.m. until 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. As provided in 40 CFR part 2, a reasonable fee may be charged by EPA for copying docket materials.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Rutledge, Engine Programs and Compliance Division (6403J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street S.W., Washington, DC 20460. Telephone: (202) 564–9297.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Program Background

On April 21, 1993, EPA 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 PM 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 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 EPA. Emissions requirements under either of the two compliance programs 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. For Option 1, information on life cycle costs must be submitted in the notification of intent to certify if certification of the equipment is intended 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.

As noted above, operators of affected buses must use equipment which has been certified by EPA. An important element of the certification process is input from the public based on review of notifications of intent to certify. It is expected that engine manufacturers, bus manufacturers, transit operators, and industry associations will be able to provide valuable information related to the installation and use of particular equipment by transit operators. Such information will be useful to the Engine Programs and Compliance Division in its role of determining whether any specific equipment can be certified.

II. Notification of Intent To Certify

By a notification of intent to certify signed February 6, 1997, NOPEC Corporation, with principal place of business at 1248 George Jenkins Boulevard, Lakeland, Florida 33815, applied for certification of equipment applicable to certain urban bus engines manufactured by Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC).

The NOPEC notification of intent to certify is unique in that the NOPEC candidate equipment conforms to the specifications of equipment previously certified by EPA for use in the Urban Bus Retrofit/Rebuild program. The specifications for the previously-certified equipment, supplied by Twin Rivers Technologies, Limited Partnership, are public information and described in a **Federal Register** document dated October 22, 1996 (61 FR 54790). The October 1996 document provides complete equipment specifications, including specifications of the biodiesel component of the certified Twin Rivers' equipment. The NOPEC notification relies on the same emissions certification data that is the basis of the Twin Rivers' certification. Both the emissions test data and biodiesel specification referenced in the NOPEC notification, are public information. As just noted, the specifications for the biodiesel was published in the October 1996 document. The testing used to demonstrate the emissions performance of the Twin Rivers' equipment was conducted under the auspices of the National Biodiesel Board, which has indicated in a letter to EPA that the data is in the public domain. Additionally, as with the Twin Rivers' equipment, the NOPEC equipment utilizes the same Engelhard exhaust catalyst and, with some configurations, fuel injection retard.

Today's document will begin a 45-day period during which the public can review and comment on the candidate equipment and other aspects of the NOPEC notification. The following is a brief description of the candidate equipment.

III. Description of Previously-Certified Equipment and Identical Candidate Equipment

The equipment is applicable to petroleum-fueled Detroit Diesel Corporation (DDC) two-stroke/cycle engines originally equipped in urban buses from model year 1979 to model year 1993, excluding the 1990 model year DDC model 6L71TA engines. The two configurations of the equipment, described more fully below, are: (1) a biodiesel fuel additive used in conjunction with an exhaust system catalytic converter muffler; and, (2) the biodiesel additive and catalytic converter used in conjunction with a fuel injection timing retard.

The certification announced in the **Federal Register** document of October 22, 1996, applies to equipment configurations of B20, catalyst, and timing retard that comply with specifications described below. NOPEC intends to comply with identical specifications.

The key component of the equipment is a particular oxidation catalyst-muffler unit designed to replace the typical noise muffler in the exhaust system of applicable recipient engines. The particular catalyst is the CMX'' manufactured by the Engelhard Corporation and certified for use in the urban bus retrofit/rebuild program on May 31, 1995 (60 FR 28402). The NOPEC equipment must use CMX'' catalyst muffler units supplied by Engelhard and meeting the specifications covered by Engelhard's certification of May 31, 1995. EPA requires that use of catalysts of any other specification, or supplied by any other catalyst supplier, be the subject of a separate notification of intent to certify. In a letter to EPA dated February 17, 1997, Engelhard states that it will notify EPA and NOPEC if the specifications for its catalyst change. Engelhard's letter is in the public docket. The technical specifications for the CMX are confidential information available to EPA.

Another component of the equipment is use of biodiesel provided by NOPEC as an additive that complies with the specifications below. In general, biodiesel is an ester-based fuel oxygenate derived from biological

sources for use in compression-ignition (that is ''diesel'') engines. It is the alkyl ester product of the transesterification reaction of biological triglycerides, or biologically-derived oils. While many biological oil sources can produce esters through this reaction, the candidate equipment is limited to the identical specification of the certification announced in the **Federal Register** document of October 22, 1996. It will comply with the following specification.

The biodiesel component of the equipment is to be supplied by NOPEC and must be blended at a nominal 20 percent volume with federally-required low sulfur diesel fuel (with a maximum sulfur content of 0.05 weight percent). This blend is referred to as ''B20''. The B20 blend is no less than 19 percent and no more than 21 percent by volume biodiesel, with the specified diesel. The use of B20 alone (that is, without the catalyst) is not candidate for certification because emissions test data is not available which sufficiently demonstrate that it will reduce PM. The biodiesel component is limited to mono-alkyl methyl esters meeting the specifications of Table 1 below.

TABLE 1.—BIODIESEL COMPONENT SPECIFICATIONS

Feedstock: Original-use, plant oil sources only		
Composition: Methyl esters of the following carbon chain length:		
Sum of C16 + C18's	90.5 wt % min	Determined by GC.
Fraction < C16	2.0 wt % max	Determined by GC.
Fraction > C18	7.5 wt % max	Determined by GC.
Blend Ratio: minimum 19 percent and maximum 21 percent by volume biodiesel complying with the above specifications for feedstock and composition, and the balance federally required low sulfur diesel fuel complying with 40 CFR Section 80.29.		

The biodiesel component of the candidate equipment must comply with the specifications of Table 1. The biodiesel component of the NOPEC notification is limited to a nominal B20 blend, and to biodiesel meeting the specified carbon chain-lengths and consisting of esters produced from methyl alcohol and feedstocks of original-use plant oil sources. Because the certification testing was conducted solely using soy methyl ester, EPA believes that compliance with the carbon chain-length specifications and the specified blend ratio of Table 1 are appropriate to provide assurance of the emissions performance. This specification, including the feedstock and alcohol limitations, is discussed further in the following section. Consistent with the previously certified Twin Rivers' equipment, blend ratios less than 19 percent or greater than 21 percent is not part of the NOPEC notification.

The candidate equipment includes a biodiesel component having a relatively limited specification. Biodiesel not complying with the specifications of Table 1, and biodiesel provided or produced by others, must be certified to be used in compliance with the urban bus program. Certification by other parties or involving other biodiesel specifications may be appropriate upon satisfactory compliance with the requirements of the urban bus program (40 CFR part 85, subpart O).

EPA understands that industry consensus-based fuel specifications of such physical and fuel properties for biodiesel is being developed by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM), in cooperation with petroleum, engine, and biodiesel industry interests. NOPEC states that it will maintain compliance with ASTM specifications as they evolve.

For certain DDC engines equipped with MUI as indicated in Table 2, the candidate equipment includes fuel injection timing retard from zero to four (4) degrees from stock timing. The emission data indicate that PM is reduced 24.5 percent when timing is retarded four (4) degrees. While these data do not show 25 percent reduction, EPA believes the data support certification of retard from zero to three (3) degrees as providing PM reduction of at least 25 percent on MUI engines. Zero to three (3) degree range of retard, then, can be used by operators electing either compliance program 1 or 2 and otherwise in compliance with program requirements. MUI engines retarded four (4) degrees do not reduce PM emissions by at least 25 percent and, therefore, can be used only by operators electing compliance Option 2. Operators electing compliance program 2 and using any retard, must use the PM certification level specified in Table 3 for the applicable engine when calculating fleet emissions averages.

Injection retard on MUI engines is accomplished by adjusting fuel injector height (for four degrees retard, 0.028 inches is added to the stock injector timing height).

As discussed in the **Federal Register** document of October 22, 1996, analysis indicates that 1990 through 1993 model year Detroit Diesel Corporation 6V92TA DDEC engines (when using B20 with catalyst) will exceed applicable federal standards for NO_x unless timing retard is used. Therefore, the only configuration for these engines requires retarding the injection timing one (1) degree. The NOPEC notification states that one (1) degree retard on these DDEC engines is accomplished by relocating the reference timing sensor.

IV. Emissions Test Data and Certification Levels

Reductions in PM emissions are demonstrated using engine dynamometer (transient) testing in accordance with the Federal Test Procedure for heavy-duty diesel engines. The engine dynamometer data, the same used previously by Twin Rivers, are shown below in Table 2, and are the bases for the PM reduction attributed to the candidate NOPEC equipment when used on applicable engines. The emissions test data are part of NOPEC's notification of intent to certify. A letter from the National Biodiesel Board (NBB) states that the emissions data are in the public domain. All testing was conducted using soy methyl ester (SME) additive blended with #2 low-sulfur diesel fuel. Hereinafter, the term *B20* is used to mean biodiesel blended at the ratio of 20 percent by volume with federally required low-sulfur diesel fuel (with a maximum sulfur content of 0.05 weight percent). The letter from NBB and NOPEC's notification are available in the public docket located at the above-mentioned address.

TABLE 2.—TEST ENGINE EMISSIONS (TRANSIENT TESTS)

	Gaseous and particulate					Smoke			Comment
	HC	CO	NO_X	PM	ΔPM	ACC	LUG	PEAK	
Engine:	g/bhp-hr				(percent)	Percent opacity			
	1.3	15.5	10.7	0.60	.....	20	15	50	1988 HDDE Standards.
Engine Dyno:									
1977 6V71N MUI[1]	0.86	3.18	11.72	0.282	.....	1.2	1.8	1.8	Baseline (2D).
Do	0.42	1.64	11.72	0.159	−43.6	1.4	2.1	2.1	2D + cat.
Do	0.38	0.86	12.11	0.166	−41.1	0.9	1.7	1.7	B20[3] + cat.[4]
Do	0.53	1.37	8.1	0.247	−12.4	4.6	5.4	5.6	2D, cat + 4° retard.
Do	0.42	0.94	8.47	0.213	−24.5	2.2	2.8	2.9	B20, cat + 4° retard.
	g/bhp-hr				ΔPM (percent)	Percent opacity			
1988 6V92TA DDEC[2] II	0.60	1.60	8.52	0.20	.....	6.0	5.3	8.7	Baseline (2D).
Do	0.21	0.95	9.06	0.11	−45.0	3.7	1.7	6.9	B20 + cat.
Do	0.29	1.21	8.18	0.14	−30.0	6.5	2.1	11.6	2D, cat + 1° retard.
Do	0.25	1.05	8.35	0.12	−40.0	5.1	2.5	8	B20, cat + 1° retard.

[1] MUI = Mechanical Unit Injector.
[2] DDEC = Detroit Diesel Electronic Control.
[3] The B20 used is SME blended 20 percent by volume with low-sulfur diesel fuel.
[4] The data include an invalid cold cycle. See the FEDERAL REGISTER document on October 22, 1996 (61 FR 54790) for discussion.

Table 3 below lists PM certification levels for the equipment. These levels are determined by applying the PM percentage reductions, predicted by the test data of Table 2, to the pre-rebuild PM levels provided in the program regulations [section 85.1403(c)]. The test data indicate that PM is reduced by 41.1 percent on the MUI engines (24.5 percent with 4 degrees retard) and 45.0 percent on DDEC engines (40.0 percent with 1 degree retard). No configuration of the candidate equipment is certified for the 6L71TA MUI of model year 1990, because the MUI test engine was determined not to be a ''worst-case'' test engine as required by the program regulations at section 85.1406(a)(2).

TABLE 3.—EQUIPMENT CONFIGURATIONS AND PM EMISSIONS LEVELS

Engine model	Model year	Equipment configuration	
		B20, Cat + stock timing	B20, Cat + retard[1]
6V92TA MUI	79–87	0.29	0.38[2]
6V92TA MUI	88–89	0.18	0.23[2]
6V92TA DDEC I	86–87	0.16	0.18
6V92TA DDEC II	88–89	0.17	0.19
6V92TA DDEC II	90–91	Not certified	0.19
6V92TA DDEC II	92–93	Not certified	0.15
6V71N MUI	73–87	0.29	0.38[2]
6V71N MUI	88–89	0.29	0.38[2]
6V71T MUI	85–86	0.29	0.38[2]
8V71N MUI	73–84	0.29	0.38[2]
6L71TA MUI	90	Not certified	Not certified
6L71TA MUI	88–89	0.18	0.23[2]
6L71TA DDEC	90–91	0.16	0.18

[1] Up to and including four (4) degrees fuel injection retard for MUI engines, and one (1) degree retard for DDEC engines.
[2] Not certified for compliance program 1.

As discussed in the **Federal Register** document of October 22, 1996, the data support a net programmatic benefit from certifying B20 with the oxidation catalyst, basically because it shows PM reductions compared with the baseline of conventional (low sulfur) diesel fuel without an exhaust catalyst. EPA believes that most of the reduction in PM emissions from the kit is probably attributable to the exhaust catalyst, although some additional PM emissions reduction is expected to be realized from addition of biodiesel.

The **Federal Register** document of October 22, 1996, discussed limited data provided by Twin Rivers which indicate that engine-out emissions of unregulated aldehydes may increase when fuel injection timing is retarded. As stated in that document, it is uncertain whether there would be an increase in ambient levels of aldehydes or, if there is an increase, whether it would become irritating to exposed populations. Operators concerned with the possibility for increased irritation to exposed populations may want to minimize the potential for increased ambient levels through management practices. Additional discussion is provided in the **Federal Register** document of October 22, 1996.

As stated in the October 1996 **Federal Register**, EPA is, in general, concerned when unregulated emissions increase. While EPA has not conducted a formal health risk analysis associated with the

above-mentioned increase in unregulated aldehyde emissions, it is uncertain whether there is any potential for an increased health risk. In the judgement of the Director of the Engine Programs and Compliance Division, the increase in emissions does not appear to be significant. Additionally, EPA believes that certifying the Twin Rivers' configurations with retarded timing is beneficial, for several reasons. The configuration of B20, catalyst, and timing retard meet the program requirement to reduce PM emissions, when compared to the baseline of neat diesel fuel without catalyst, plus provide a benefit of reduced emissions of NO_X. The Twin Rivers' certification made those configurations available as options to interested operators.

In summary, while there are uncertainties, in EPA's judgement, the program benefits and above factors offset these uncertainties. Therefore, EPA certified the Twin Rivers configurations with retarded injection timing and proposes to certify the NOPEC equipment likewise.

While unregulated aldehyde emissions data from buses using the certified Twin Rivers' equipment and the candidate equipment described in today's **Federal Register** document are limited, the data indicate that the directional changes in emissions relative to conventional diesel are dependent upon the fuel injection timing employed with a catalyst. If stock timing is used, aldehyde emissions can be expected to decrease relative to a baseline of conventional diesel without a catalyst. However, if retarded timing is used, then aldehyde emissions can be expected to increase relative to the baseline. Transit operators should be aware that with configurations using retarded timing, there is a possibility for ambient levels of aldehydes to increase. An increase in ambient levels is most likely to occur in micro environments having topographic or construction features (e.g., without adequate ventilation) that limit ambient dispersion of pollutants, such as enclosed bus malls or maintenance bays. If there is an increase in ambient levels, then there may be increased respiratory irritation by exposed populations. In summary, it is uncertain whether there would be an increase in ambient levels or, if there is an increase, whether it would become irritating to exposed populations. Operators concerned with the possibility may want to minimize the potential for increased ambient levels through its management practices, such as bus routing, bus scheduling, and/or mix of emission reduction technologies.

In the October 1996 **Federal Register** document, EPA stated that it is interested in gathering additional information on unregulated aldehyde emissions, and requested the public and industry provide information with regard to the content of the exhaust of compression-ignition engines fueled with any blend of biodiesel. Additionally, we requested operators using the retarded configuration to provide EPA information on related public complaints or comments, and actions taken to avert or correct perceived problems. No new information has been received since that document.

All configurations, that is, the biodiesel additive and catalyst, are covered by emissions performance and defect warranties offered by NOPEC described by the urban bus regulations at section 85.1409.

Section 211 of the Clean Air Act establishes fuel and fuel additive prohibitions, and gives EPA authority to waive certain of those prohibitions. EPA, however, does not believe that NOPEC 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. EPA believes that certification of an urban bus retrofit system constitutes the certification of an engine under section 206 for the purposes of the urban bus retrofit/rebuild program, and, since the additive is used in the certification of the system, a waiver is not required to market the additive in the limited context of use with the certified retrofit system. This determination does not affect whether the additive is ''substantially similar to any fuel or fuel additive'' outside the context of the urban bus retrofit/rebuild program. EPA's position on this matter is discussed in additional detail as it relates to use of another fuel additive (Lubrizol Corporation) at 60 FR 36139 on July 13, 1995.

If EPA certifies the candidate NOPEC equipment, then operators may use it immediately, as discussed below. NOPEC's notification indicates that the candidate equipment is to be certified for compliance option 2; however, as discussed below, EPA believes that configurations utilizing the catalytic muffler and reducing PM by at least 25 percent may also be used in compliance with some option 1 requirements (that is, for those particular engines requiring equipment certified to reduce PM by at least 25 percent). It cannot be used for engines for which the 0.10 g/bhp-hr standard is triggered.

In a **Federal Register** document dated May 31, 1995 (60 FR 28402), EPA certified the CMX™ exhaust catalyst manufactured by the Engelhard Corporation, as a trigger of program requirements. Until the 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM standard is triggered, that certification means that rebuilds and replacements of applicable urban bus engines performed 6 months or more after that date of certification (that is, rebuilds or replacements after December 1, 1995), must be performed using equipment certified to reduce PM emissions by 25 percent or more. Under Option 1, operators could use the NOPEC equipment if certified to reduce PM by at least 25 percent, or other equipment certified to provide at least a 25 percent reduction, unless equipment is certified which triggers the 0.10 g/bhp-hr PM standard. The 0.10 g/bhp-hr standard has been triggered for 6V92TA MUI engines, such that rebuilds or replacements after September 14, 1997 must be performed using equipment certified to the 0.10 g/bhp-hr standard. The configuration of B20 blend, Engelhard catalyst, and injection retard has been demonstrated to comply with the standard to reduce PM by at least 25 percent, but only when used with the following engines: 6V92TA DDEC I and DDEC II, and 6L71TA DDEC.

Operators who choose to comply with Option 2 and install the NOPEC equipment, would use the PM emission level(s) established during the certification process, in their calculations for target or fleet level as specified in the program regulations.

In accordance with the program requirements of section 85.1404(a), operators using the candidate NOPEC equipment would have to maintain purchase records of the B20 blend if the operator purchases the premixed blend from a fuel supplier, or, of biodiesel and low-sulfur diesel fuel if the operator mixes the B20. Such records would be subject to review in the event of an audit of an urban bus operator by EPA. To be in compliance with program requirements, operators must be able to demonstrate that B20 is being used in the proper proportions required by the candidate equipment.

At a minimum, EPA expects to evaluate the NOPEC 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.

EPA 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 document initiates a 45-day period during which EPA will accept written comments relevant to whether or not the equipment described in the NOPEC 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.

Additionally, EPA is aware that the biodiesel industry is working to address other regulatory issues related to the EPA's fuel and fuel additive requirements under 40 CFR part 79. Today's **Federal Register** document applies to the limited context of the urban bus program, and is not intended to set precedent as a generic definition of ''biodiesel.''

EPA 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, EPA 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: November 13, 1997.

Robert D. Brenner,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 97–30519 Filed 11–19–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

November 14, 1997.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before January 20, 1998. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

ADDRESSES: Direct all comments to Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, Room 234, 1919 M St., N.W., Washington, DC 20554 or via internet to jboley@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collection(s), contact Judy Boley at 202–418–0214 or via internet at jboley@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control No.: 3060–0490.

Title: Section 74.902, Frequency assignments.

Form No.: FCC 330/FCC 327.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Businesses or other for profit.

Number of Respondents: 5.

Estimated Time Per Response: 0.5 hours.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement.

Cost to Respondents: N/A.

Total Annual Burden: 2.5 hours.

Needs and Uses: Section 74.902 dictates that when a point-to-point ITFS station on the E and F MDS channels is involuntarily displaced by an MDS applicant, that the MDS applicant files the appropriate application for suitable alternative spectrum. The applications that would be used would be the FCC 327 (3060–0055) and the FCC 330 (3060–0062). The burdens for these involuntarily displaced ITFS are included in the estimates for the FCC 327 and 330. Additionally, Section 74.902(i) requires that a copy of this application be served on the ITFS licensee to be moved. The data will be used by the ITFS licensee to oppose the involuntary migration if the proposal would not provide comparable ITFS service and to ensure that the public interest is served.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0491.

Title: Section 74.991, Wireless Cable Application Procedures.

Form No.: FCC 330/FCC 304.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Businesses or other for profit.

Number of Respondents: 100.

Estimated Time Per Response: 4.5 hours (0.5 hours respondent/4 hours attorney).

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement.

Cost to Respondents: $116,240.

Total Annual Burden: 50 hours.

Needs and Uses: Section 74.991 requires that a wireless cable application be filed on FCC 330 (3060–0062), Sections I and V, with a complete FCC 304 appended. The application must include a cover letter clearly indicating that the application is for a wireless cable entity to operate on ITFS channels. The applicant must also, within 30 days of filing its application give local public notice in a newspaper. The specific data that must be included in the newspaper publication is contained in Section 74.991(c). The notice must be published twice a week for two consecutive weeks. The data is used by FCC staff to insure that proposals to operate a wireless cable system on ITFS channels do not impair or restrict any reasonably foreseeable ITFS use. The data is also used to insure that applicants are qualified to become a Commission licensee and that proposals do not cause interference.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0206.

Title: Part 21, Multipoint Distribution Service.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Businesses or other for profit.

Number of Respondents: 8,299.