

D R A F T
Supporting Statement
for
Information Collection Request

Motor Vehicle Emission and Fuel Economy Compliance;
Light Duty Vehicles, Light Duty Trucks, and Highway Motorcycles

EPA ICR 0783.54

April, 2008

Compliance and Innovative Strategies Division
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
Office of Air and Radiation
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Part A SUBMISSION

Section 1: Identification Of The Information Collection

1(a) Title And Number Of The Information Collection

Motor Vehicle Emission and Fuel Economy Compliance; Light Duty Vehicles, Light Duty Trucks, and Highway Motorcycles, EPA ICR number 0783.54, OMB control number 2060-0104.

1(b) Short Characterization/Abstract

Beginning with the 1968 model year, the Federal Government has regulated air pollution emitted by motor vehicles. While light vehicles (passenger cars and light trucks) were the first to be regulated, other classes (e.g., motorcycles and recreational vehicles) have subsequently been included. The first (and continuing) phase of regulation consisted of prototype certification: manufacturers demonstrate that a particular design meets applicable requirements and they received a “certificate” (license) allowing that design to be sold; EPA performs “confirmatory” tests on some of the vehicles as part of this certification program. Subsequent program developments addressed compliance with emissions requirements after the vehicles are sold; vehicles failing to meet requirements in-use are potentially subject to recall and repair by the manufacturer. During these three and a half decades of emission control, considerable progress has been made in reducing vehicular air pollution. A new passenger car today will emit much less than one tenth the exhaust pollution of its uncontrolled predecessor.

During the 1973 oil embargo, there was a need for improved automotive fuel economy information. EPA was able to fulfill part of this need using information collected during its emission testing program. (To determine the mass of pollution emitted, the quantity and composition of a vehicle’s exhaust must be determined. Using that information, the quantity of fuel consumed can be calculated.) This limited information was expanded by adding a “highway” driving schedule and by implementing a voluntary program whereby vehicle manufacturers tested and submitted information on a more complete spectrum of their product line. (Because the emission certification program emphasized “worst case” vehicles, it might not accurately reflect a manufacturer’s entire product line, hence the need for additional information.) Congress subsequently enacted legislation mandating fuel economy labeling, establishing average fuel economy standards, and imposing “gas guzzler” taxes. Those activities all rely on information generated under EPA’s emission compliance and fuel economy programs.

At the request of OMB, this ICR was organized in November, 2006, into five Information Collections (ICs): 1) Light Duty Vehicles and Light Duty Trucks Emissions, 2) Fuel Economy, 3) Manufacturers’ In-Use Vehicle Program, 4) Highway Motorcycles, and 5) Defect Reports and Voluntary Emissions Recall Reports. The inclusion of these elements in one ICR is historic, and keeping them together provides some continuity. Moreover, these programs not only share many test procedures, they also rely on the same kinds of

information and are administered by the same EPA staff. The IC organization should provide more transparency in accounting for burdens of a large and complex program.

This ICR covers the application (and supporting test results) submitted by these categories of vehicle manufacturers prior to production as well as various reports and information during and after production, including the manufacturer's In-Use Vehicle Program (IUVP), and the Defect Report/Voluntary Emissions Recall Report (DR/VERR) system that covers both HMCs and LDVs. In addition, LDV manufacturers are required to submit fuel economy reports for vehicles covered under the Energy Conservation and Policy Act. EPA's processing of this information is conducted by the Compliance and Innovative Strategies Division, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Office of Air and Radiation.

Information collected consists of descriptions of motor vehicles (with emphasis on emission control systems), test results, defect and recall reports, and (for LDVs and motorcycles) sales information. These data are reviewed to verify that the necessary tests have been performed, the manufacturer's product line meets emission standards, and the LDV fuel economy reports are accurate. LDV fuel economy information is used by EPA as well as the Internal Revenue Service ("gas guzzler" taxes), the Department of Energy (Fuel Economy Guides) and the Department of Transportation (Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards).

All reporting covered by this ICR can now be done electronically via EPA's web-based vehicle and engine certification system, Verify, with the following exceptions: 1) implementation of new fuel economy label data reporting is still underway, 2) Independent Commercial Importers and Alternative Fuels Converters are scheduled to be included in Verify later this year, and 3) the DR/VERR system is currently separate and not computerized or standardized. Manufacturers also have the option of submitting some information outside of Verify where it is convenient to do so, working with their EPA certification representatives. Subject to confidentiality claims, this information is made available to interested parties upon request. Fuel economy ratings and emission test information is available on the internet.

Approximately 173 passenger car, light truck, and motorcycle manufacturers (including 35 light duty, 13 independent commercial importers 5 alternative fuels vehicle converters, and 120 motorcycle manufacturers) will submit applications each year to certify their products. The motor vehicle emission and fuel economy compliance programs, along with the HMC program, the IUVP, and the DR/VERR program, will impose a cost of about \$58.3 million annually on the regulated industries: \$39.9 million in labor costs, \$12.2 million in operation and maintenance costs, and \$6.3 million in capital and startup costs.

Additional details on the coverage of this ICR are given in Section 2(b), below.

Section 2: Need For And Use of the Collection

2(a) Need/Authority For The Collection

Under Title II of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7521 et seq.), EPA is charged with issuing certificates of conformity for motor vehicle designs that comply with applicable emission standards. A manufacturer must have a certificate before vehicles may be legally introduced into commerce. Similar provisions in the Energy Policy Conservation Act (codified as Title III of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act, 15 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.) require fuel economy ratings to be determined and vehicles to be labeled. To ensure compliance with these statutes, EPA reviews product information and manufacturer test results; EPA also tests some vehicles to confirm manufacturer results. Information is also shared with other agencies: the Internal Revenue Service for “gas guzzler” taxes and the Department of Transportation for Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) requirements.

EPA’s emission compliance and fuel economy programs are statutorily mandated; the Agency does not have discretion to cease these functions. Under Section 206(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7525) “... The Administrator shall test ... any new motor vehicle ... submitted by a manufacturer ... If such vehicle ... conforms ... the Administrator shall issue a certificate of conformity.” EPA uses the information supplied by the manufacturer to verify that the proper test vehicles have been selected and that the necessary testing has been performed to assure that each vehicle design complies with emission standards. This information is also used by various state and local governments in running their vehicle Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) programs. Similarly, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act requires that “... Average fuel economy ... shall be calculated by the EPA Administrator ...”; 15 U.S.C. 2003. Automobile manufacturers are required to affix fuel economy labels “as determined in accordance with rules of the EPA Administrator”; 15 U.S.C. 2006. While EPA has delegated a substantial portion of the process of calculating fuel economy labels to the manufacturers, the test results upon which such labels are based are subject to EPA confirmatory testing. Such confirmation testing assures that results from different manufacturers can be accurately used for comparison.

The compliance program for HMCs operates in a largely similar fashion except that fuel economy requirements do not apply to motorcycles.

Relevant portions of the above statutes can be found in Appendix I. The regulations dealing with LDV/LDT and HMC emission control can be found in 40 CFR Parts 85 and 86. EPA’s LDV fuel economy provisions are found in 40 CFR Part 600. The regulations are not attached to this statement due to their length and technical nature.

2(b) Practical Utility/Users of the Data

The discussion in this section outlines the major features of the programs covered by this ICR as well as summarizing some of the recent historical and ongoing developments that have a bearing on the information burden.

Emissions Program For Light Duty Vehicles and Trucks

Motor vehicle manufacturers must submit an application for emission certification prior to

production. The application describes the major aspects of the proposed product line, technical details of the emission control systems, and the results of tests to indicate compliance with emissions limitations. The application and supporting test results are reviewed and, if appropriate, a certificate of conformity is issued. EPA will conduct a limited number of confirmatory tests at its laboratory to verify the manufacturer's results and insure that EPA and manufacturer laboratory tests are properly correlated. The testing regime was significantly reorganized in the Supplementary Federal Test Procedure rulemaking in 1996 (61 FR 54851). Another major change occurred with the CAP2000 program (85 FR 23905, May 4, 1999). Costs associated with these and all other testing requirements are treated as ongoing capital costs in the current ICR rather than as one-time startup costs.

Under the CAP2000 program, an initial step in the certification process is to divide a manufacturer's product line into groups of vehicle designs that are expected to have similar emission control characteristics; the top level of such groups is the "durability group" of vehicles expected to have similar deterioration over their useful lives. This rulemaking redirected EPA and manufacturer effort toward in-use compliance and gave manufacturers more control over pre-production certification, with savings in paperwork burden that were reflected in ICR 0783.38. Deterioration factors are established for each group, which are then used to adjust results from low mileage test vehicles to predict useful-life emission levels. A deterioration factor is established either by testing (including bench testing and artificial aging) or by "carrying over" a factor from a previously certified similar group.

Light duty vehicles (passenger cars) and light duty trucks are divided into durability groups based on a number of fundamental characteristics, including combustion cycle (diesel, spark ignited, number of strokes per cycle, etc.), engine type (piston, rotary, air/water cooling media), fuel (gasoline, methanol, flexible, etc.), and catalyst loading per unit engine displacement. (The actual classification process is somewhat more complicated; see 40 CFR 86.1820.) Each durability group may be further divided (depending on the particular manufacturer's product line) into "test groups". Test groups include vehicles which will be certified to a single emission standard, have the same number and arrangement of cylinders, and fall within a limited range (slightly less than one liter) of displacement. (Test groups are defined in 40 CFR 86.1827.)

Light duty vehicles and trucks also must be certified to meet applicable evaporative emissions and refueling emission requirements. Test groups for these vehicles may therefore be further divided into evaporative/refueling families for this purpose; in this case, each test group and evaporative/refueling combination will receive a separate certificate of conformity.

When a new model year vehicle is sufficiently similar to the previous year's model that the "durability group", "test group", or "test group/evaporative family" descriptions do not need to be changed, a certification application can be "carried over" from the previous application. The burden of preparing the application in such cases will be less because previous test results can be used, and the vehicle will be less likely to be selected for confirmatory testing. If the model has changed such that its durability characteristics, test

group designations, or evaporative emissions characteristics change, then new supporting application information will be required. Likewise, there are provisions for the “carry-across” of emissions data from similar vehicles between test groups. Similarly, when manufacturers make minor changes that affect the durability, test group, or evaporative emissions characteristics for an already certified engine model, a “running change” for that change must be submitted and a new certificate issued if the effect on emissions is substantial. The paperwork burden for such running changes is usually quite small. These three provisions significantly reduce testing and reporting burdens.

Information gathered for purposes of certification is also used by EPA in the fuel economy program (15 U.S.C. 2000, et seq.) as well as EPA in-use testing program. For example, when a particular vehicle type is discovered to exceed emission standards, the manufacturer’s application may be reviewed to determine the cause of the failure. (Typically, part specifications in the application are much more detailed than those in the service literature.) EPA’s motor vehicle emission in-use compliance program is covered by and discussed with more detail in ICR 0222.08 (OMB Control No. 2060-0086).

Manufacturers’ In-Use Vehicle Program

Another aspect of the emphasis on in-use compliance from the CAP2000 program is the IUVP. Beginning with model year 2001, manufacturers are required to recruit and test “as is” high-mileage (generally over 50,000 miles) LDV/LDTs for compliance with emissions requirements. This requirement was extended to “medium duty passenger vehicles” (MDPVs) in the final Tier 2 regulations in February, 2000, and to all other complete Otto-cycle heavy duty vehicles up to 14,000 GVWR (gross vehicle weight rating) in regulations finalized in October, 2000. The window for these tests is between four and five years from the end of production of the test group. Likewise, beginning with model year 2004, low-mileage vehicles (over 10,000 miles) are to be recruited and tested within one year of the end of production. The burden of the IUVP was considered in the Regulatory Support Document for the CAP2000 program and were incorporated into the 0783 ICR series. This estimate is updated in the current ICR. Unlike the previous renewal, this renewal can rely on IUVP submission counts that are sufficiently mature to provide a accurate counts.

In addition to the low- and high-mileage in-use testing requirements, the IUVP program requires manufacturer confirmatory testing, in cases where the specified thresholds of failures occur in the in-use testing. The burden of such rare instances is included in this ICR.

Fuel Economy for Light Duty Vehicles

Some of the product information used to verify emission compliance is also used, in conjunction with additional tests and projected sales, to establish fuel economy ratings. Based on test results, EPA calculates a fuel economy number for each vehicle model. EPA then computes an average fuel economy for each manufacturer that is weighted by the number of units of each of its vehicle models in that year. This “harmonic mean” calculation is statutory (49 U.S.C. 32904). Separate numbers are calculated for passenger

cars and for light duty trucks up to 8500 pounds GVWR. These are the numbers used, after certain adjustments, by the Department of Transportation to determine each manufacturer's compliance with the CAFE program. In a separate program, the fuel economy ratings, used to comply with EPA's labeling requirements for new vehicles (40 CFR Part 600, Subpart D), are listed by model type. These ratings are computed as the sales weighted harmonic mean of the "base levels" within each model type, which in turn are calculated as the sales weighted harmonic mean of the configurations/subconfigurations within each base level. This procedure is intended to ensure that the most representative fuel economy values are posted on new vehicles, which are sold by the manufacturer's model designation rather than categories that correspond to the test groups that are used for generating fuel economy data as a part of the certification process.

Since the last renewal, EPA completed a rulemaking to revise EPA's method of calculating the label fuel economy values for new vehicles. This "five-cycle" methodology is optional for model years 2008 to 2010, and mandatory thereafter. The costs of the program through 2010 were added to the FE IC baseline in ICR 0783.51; the remaining costs are included in this renewal. This renewal also includes an adjustment for inclusion of MDPVs in the CAFE program starting in model year 2011.

Fees for Light Duty Vehicles and Trucks

The last renewal included the reporting burden for the light duty portion of the certification fees program. This burden was consolidated into OMB 2060-0545 on December 22, 2006. In this way, on-road and off-road fees can now be considered in the same information collection request. Consequently, this ICR no longer covers certification fees for motorcycles or light-duty vehicles.

Highway Motorcycles

Federal standards for HMCs have been in effect since the 1978 model year. On January 15, 2004, EPA finalized the first revision to these standards, as well as including for the first time engines with displacements of less than 50cc and adding new standards that will require the use of low permeability fuel tanks and fuel hoses. These provisions begin going into effect with the 2006 or later model years (small volume manufacturers have an extended schedule and in some cases different standards). There are several other special provisions to reduce the regulatory burden on small manufacturers. The Paperwork Reduction Act burdens for the highway motorcycle program were adjusted in ICR 0783.43 and 0783.46. These burdens are updated in the present ICR.

The program for regulating emissions from HMCs is similar in outline to that for light duty vehicles: manufacturers group vehicles/engines into engine families, conduct emissions tests (using the same federal test procedure as for light duty vehicles, with minor modifications) to demonstrate compliance with exhaust emissions standards, calculate durability factors for useful-life compliance, and submit an application for certification along with an application fee. EPA issues a certificate, possibly after confirmatory testing. Carry-over and carry-across are extensively used. Manufacturers are potentially subject to

EPA in-use compliance tests, although EPA does not currently conduct such tests.

Defect Reports and Voluntary Emissions Recall Reports

A reporting component of the light duty and highway motorcycle programs requires filing of defect reports, voluntary emissions recall reports, and voluntary recall quarterly reports by manufacturers for in-use vehicles. The information burden of this DR/VERR program was included in the ICR 0282 series (OMB 2060-0048) until 0282.12, when the highway, light-duty vehicle portion was split off and designated ICR 1916.01 (OMB 2060-0425). In September, 2003, ICR 1916 was consolidated into the present ICR 0783. Despite initial steps to computerize this reporting in calendar 2005, the filing of these reports is still done in a variety of ways by manufacturers using no unified format.

Recreational Vehicles

On November 8, 2002, EPA published final rules on the control of emissions from 2006 and later model year recreational vehicles (off-highway motorcycles, snowmobiles, and all-terrain vehicles) as well as a number of other off-road engine categories. The recreational vehicle burdens were incorporated in this ICR in 0783.43 and 0783.44. The burden for recreational vehicles was subsequently shifted to ICR 1695.08 (OMB number 2060-0338), and are no longer reflected in this collection.

Investigation into Possible Noncompliance of Motor Vehicles

The LDV/LDT and HMC emissions compliance programs include pre-production, production, and in-use components. Motor vehicles are evaluated as prototypes prior to production, and those designs that meet applicable criteria are certified for introduction into commerce. EPA also has discretion to conduct selective enforcement testing of assembly line vehicles. This was an important enforcement tool for EPA prior to CAP2000, but since then it has been replaced by the IUVP: no selective enforcement tests have been performed since. While EPA retains the statutory authority to conduct assembly line tests and under exceptional circumstances might use it, no burden is assigned to this activity in the current or this ICR. Finally, in addition to the manufacturer IUVP and voluntary recalls, EPA conducts its own in-use compliance testing program. That program is covered separately in ICR 222.08 (OMB Control No. 2060-0086).

CFEIS and Verify

Electronic submission by manufactures to the Certification and Fuel Economy Information System (CFEIS) began to be implemented for LDV/LDTs after CAP2000. In 2003, manufacturers who meet the qualifying criteria were permitted to self-generate a certificate of conformity under the CFEIS ACGM (Automatic Certificate Generation by Manufacturers) system. At that time the system was also expanded to include certification submittals for some of the heavier vehicles coming into the program (heavy duty chassis certified engines, medium duty passenger vehicles). The Verify system currently under development will replace CFEIS and integrate it with other compliance databases (heavy

duty, nonroad, motorcycle). Implementation of pilot system databases began in 2005 with the highway motorcycle and recreational vehicle reporting system. A feature of the new database is the updating of the manufacturer submission process via an easy-to-use web interface. The savings from this, along with other features, including improved coordination with California's certification process and improved manufacturer capacity to self-correct submissions, are not included in the current baseline or the this draft ICR, but may be updated if an adequate basis can be determined for estimating the savings. New data sets to replace that CFEIS data sets that are currently being submitted through Verify for LDV/LDT certification applications are scheduled for testing later in 2008 with full rollout by the end of the year.

Section 3: Nonduplication, Consultations, and Other Collection Criteria

3(a) Nonduplication

Efforts have been made to eliminate duplication in this information collection. The fuel economy and emission compliance programs have been highly integrated; the same information serves two purposes. Furthermore, as mentioned above, EPA is implementing the Verify system, under which the manufacturer submission process occurs within a Central Data Exchange (CDX) environment that should further help minimize duplication in submissions.

Because of its specialized nature and the fact that product plans and emission performance information must be submitted to EPA prior to the start of production, this information is not available from any source other than the manufacturer.

3(b) Public Notice Prior to ICR Submission to OMB

EPA solicited public comment by means of a Federal Register Notice published on ____, 2008, __ Federal Register ____.

3(c) Consultations

In preparing the previous ICR submission, EPA consulted with the following individuals working in the regulated industry:

| <u>Individual</u> | <u>Firm</u> | <u>Telephone</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Randy Harvey | General Motors | (248) 685-6976 |
| Mike Fuhrer | Ford | (313) 323-0403 |
| Jerry Steffy | Harley Davidson | (414) 465-6101 |

These individuals have experience with various aspects of EPA's current programs. Their comments have been reflected in the burden estimates discussed below. EPA wishes to thank them and their colleagues for their assistance in preparing this report.

3(d) Effects of Less Frequent Collection

As required by the Clean Air Act (42 USC 7525(a)), emission and fuel economy information is submitted on a yearly basis coinciding with the manufacturer's "model year." EPA allows applicants to define their own "model year", within limits, thus granting some flexibility in this regard. Major product changes typically occur at the start of a model year. For these reasons, a collection frequency longer than a model year is not possible. However, when a vehicle design is "carried over" to a subsequent model year, the amount of new information required is substantially reduced. Other information collections listed in Appendix II are conducted according to schedules that were determined in rulemakings that included paperwork burden analyses as mandated by the Paperwork Reduction Act.

3(e) General Guidelines

Manufacturers are required to keep some records for periods longer than three years. This requirement stems from the statutory requirement that manufacturers warrant some items for periods longer than 3 years. Manufacturers must also recall vehicle classes failing to meet emission standards during their useful life, typically 5 to 11 years depending on vehicle type. In order to satisfy these obligations, manufacturers must retain product information, with particular emphasis on the emission control systems. This information is vital in assuring that repairs and replacement parts properly function during the life of the warranty and that emissions limitations are met during the full useful lives. EPA believes that this recordkeeping requirement does not impose an unreasonable burden given the warranty and recall obligations. In fact, manufacturers would probably retain this information to support their normal business of supplying replacement parts.

This information collection activity complies with the remaining guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.5.

3(f) Confidentiality

Information submitted by manufacturers is held as confidential until the specific vehicle to which it pertains is available for purchase. After vehicles are available, most information associated with the manufacturer/importer's application is available to the public. Under section 208 of the Clean Air Act (42 USC 7542(c)) all information, other than trade secret processes or methods, must be publicly available. Proprietary information is granted confidentiality in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, EPA regulations at 40 CFR Part 2, and class determinations issued by EPA's Office of General Counsel.

3(g) Sensitive Questions

No sensitive questions are asked in this information collection. This collection complies with the Privacy Act and OMB Circular A-108.

Section 4: Respondents and Information Requested

4(a) Respondents/NAICS Codes

The respondents are involved in the industries shown in the following table:

| Category | NAICS Codes ^A | Examples of Potentially Regulated Entities |
|----------|--|--|
| Industry | 336111 336112 | Motor vehicle manufacturers. |
| Industry | 335312 336312 336322 336399 454312 485310 | Alternative fuel vehicle converters |
| Industry | 811111 811112 811198 541514 423110 424990 441120 | Commercial Importers of Vehicles and Vehicle Components ^B |
| Industry | 336991 | Motorcycle and motorcycle parts manufacturers |
| Industry | 441222 | Motorcycle, boat, and other motor vehicle dealers |

^ANorth American Industry Classification System (NAICS)

4(b) Information Requested

(i) Data items

Manufacturers of light duty vehicles and highway motorcycles are required to submit descriptions of their planned product line, including detailed descriptions of the emission control system, test data, and demonstrations of compliance with other requirements, such as methods for determining deterioration factors for durability and (for cars and light trucks) requirements pertaining to computerized on-board devices (OBD). This information is organized into various groups with similar emission or (for cars and light trucks) fuel economy characteristics. Manufacturers supply test data to verify that their products will comply with the emission standards; test data is also used to establish fuel economy

ratings. They are also required to notify EPA of in-use defects experienced by their vehicles and reports of voluntary recalls. Light duty vehicle manufacturers also participate in the IUVP program to report the results of tests on in-use vehicles. Other major data items include submission of technical service bulletins; copies of warranties; Tier 2 averaging, banking, and trading calculations; and ORVR (On Road Vapor Recovery) safety reports. Given the diversity of vehicles produced and the complicated nature of the regulations, in certain instances manufacturers may also find it advantageous to request variances from standard EPA procedures.

A list of detailed information requirements and their corresponding regulation citations appears in Appendix II.

(ii) Respondent Activities

The emission and fuel economy compliance programs are, of necessity, quite complex given the diversity of products available. These programs have evolved over the past three decades to balance testing and reporting burdens against the risk of unnecessary air pollution and inaccurate fuel economy information. While there is no “typical” respondent, all manufacturers must describe their product and supply test data and other information to verify compliance. The biggest burden in this ICR comes from the cost of test facilities and the costs and labor hours of running tests to generate the data that must be reported to EPA. EPA will conduct a limited number of “confirmatory tests” to monitor manufacturer results. This requires test light duty vehicles be shipped to EPA’s laboratory. As yet there is no similar program for confirmatory testing of motorcycles. Manufacturers must also retain records. These tasks are repeated for each model year, although typically previous data and information can be “carried over” when no significant changes have occurred. If, during the course of a model year a product change is made (a “running change”), EPA must be notified. Under some circumstances additional test data may be required.

Manufacturers must also submit reports concerning defects that are discovered and voluntary recalls that are conducted; they may also be requested to review various aspects of in-use testing that EPA may elect to conduct. Manufacturers are also required to conduct their own in-use testing; this is the Manufacturers’ In-Use Vehicle Program (IUVP).

Section 5: The Information Collected—Agency Activities, Collection Methodology, and Information Management

5(a) Agency Activities

A significant portion of EPA’s emission and fuel economy compliance activity is spent reviewing applications to verify that the correct vehicle tests have been conducted and necessary information submitted. Running change submissions must also be selectively reviewed for possible emissions impacts and manufacturers’ evaluations thereof. A part of this process involves determining if “carry over” of data from a previous model year or “carry-across” data from testing of similar vehicles and engines is appropriate or if new testing will be required. EPA will also select a number of tests for confirmation at EPA’s

own laboratory.

EPA prepares an annual report of emission test results and reviews annual fuel economy reports submitted by the manufacturers.

5(b) Collection Methodology and Management

All routine information (test results, vehicle descriptions, and all aspects of certification applications) is electronically transmitted directly from the manufacturers through the Verify system. DR/VERR submissions are not yet computerized. Certification applications by Independent Commercial Importers are not currently computerized but are scheduled to become so in calendar 2008.

All information received by EPA is subject to review. Data submitted electronically is automatically screened; test results that are close to emission standards are reviewed in more detail. Descriptions of the proposed product line are checked to verify that the appropriate vehicles have been tested. (The emission and fuel economy programs rely on a combination of “worst case” and representative data to accomplish their goals.) Except for projected sales and a very limited amount of proprietary product information (typically catalyst formulations), all information is available to the public as soon as the vehicle is offered for sale. Emission and fuel economy data is available on the internet; other information is available upon request under the Freedom of Information Act.

5(c) Small Entity Flexibility

EPA has special procedures for small-volume LDV/LDT manufacturer certifications; i.e., those whose total sales are less than 10,000 units per year. These special procedures allow the small-volume manufacturer to submit a simplified application for certification with respect to durability demonstrations. These manufacturers also have reduced testing and reporting requirements under the IUVP. Further, by the very nature of their size, small volume manufacturers typically have very limited product lines. This characteristic both reduces the amount of information which must be submitted and also simplifies the process of selecting the correct test vehicle(s). There are also several special provisions to reduce the regulatory burden on small highway motorcycle manufacturers: in addition to hardship exemptions and program delays, manufacturers with sales less than 3000 per year and 500 employees may use broader definitions of engine categories, and those with less than 10,000 units per year have reduced certification submission requirements (no test results reported) and reduced durability showings.

5(d) Collection Schedule

Information must be submitted for each “model year” that a manufacturer intends to build (or import) vehicles. Submission is by test group or engine family. A “model year” is usually about one calendar year long; it typically begins prior to January 1st of the calendar year. If a product is unchanged between model years, much of the information can be “carried over.” The collection frequency and burden are determined to a large extent by the

manufacturer's marketing and product plans. However, as required by law, some submission is required for each model year's production. Other information collections listed in Appendix II are conducted according to schedules that were determined in rulemakings.

Section 6: Estimating the Burden and Cost of the Collection

6(a) Estimating Respondent Burden

The burden estimates below separately consider five ICs covered by this ICR: LDV/LDT emissions, LDV/LDT fuel economy, Manufacturer's IUVP, the HMC program, and the DR/VERR system, all described above in section 2(b).

In agreement with the approved disaggregation of this ICR into five ICs, each engine family's activities under one of the five ICs is counted as a "response". As explained in support of that action, this is by far the most logical and tractable unit of activity for burden accounting.

Within the LDV/LDT Emissions, Fuel Economy, IUVP, and HMC programs, the estimation of respondent burden hours and respondent costs essentially breaks down as testing costs, which constitute the majority of Operations and Maintenance, testing facilities costs, which constitute the majority of Startup and Capital, the labor hours to conduct the tests, and additional costs and hours associated with other reporting and recordkeeping burdens. In addition, some features are specific to particular programs (notably, procurement for IUVP and confirmatory testing burdens on manufacturers for LDV/LDTs and permeation testing for HMCs). The DR/VERR program is entirely reporting and recordkeeping, but includes both LDV/LDTs and HMCs.

The labor hours associated with conducting tests in this ICR have been updated to reflect information developed for the Labeling Rule (71 FR 77871; December 27, 2006) cost study and reflected in ICR 0783.51. These estimates were also slightly modified to reflect preliminary efforts for a possible greenhouse gasses regulatory proposal. These updates affect not only the LDV/LDT program but the HMC and IUVP programs. In addition, this ICR incorporates a minor correction in the labor hours associated with conducting evaporative testing of LDV/LDTs and savings in reporting labor hours due to incorporation of the IUVP program into Verify. Aside from these and some other minor adjustments (such as elimination of the costs and hours associated with the small number of Certification Short Tests, now regarded as voluntary), the majority of changes in this ICR reflect changes in the estimated numbers of mandatory tests performed. It is anticipated that the estimated number of tests will be updated through additional Verify queries for the final ICR.

The largest burden is from the LDV/LDT Emissions IC and from the Fuel Economy IC that was separated from it into a separate IC. The basic outline of these burden estimates dates back to the CAP2000 cost study and the ICR that incorporated it (ICR 0783.38). The present burden estimate continues the process of updating based on a renewed examination

of the burdens, consultations with industry, and consultations with program administrators within EPA. The only significant program change affecting the Emissions IC since the last renewal is the cold hydrocarbon testing program; burden of that program was added to the baseline in ICR 0783.52 and is included in this renewal.

It is worth emphasizing again in this renewal that the separation of Fuel Economy and Emissions is somewhat arbitrary and results in some counting difficulties, because the same city (FTP) and highway emissions tests can be used for both purposes in some circumstances. This will also be true for USO6, SCO3 and Cold CO tests for the five-cycle fuel economy labeling calculations required beginning model year 2011 and optional now. In other cases, it is possible for either a highway or city test to be used only for emissions purposes, or only for fuel economy purposes. This results in some very difficult queries of the database, but it also means that the combined testing burden for the Emissions and Fuel Economy ICs should be accurate.

The regulatory program and the automotive industry have evolved together now for more than three decades, and the highway motorcycle industry almost as long. It is no longer possible to determine what these industries would look like without the reporting and recordkeeping mandated by the Clean Air Act but with the rest of the Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder still in force. Manufacturers consulted respond with widely varying estimates of what their burdens of complying with the Act would be in the absence of EPA testing and reporting oversight.

Whereas manufacturers develop their products within the context of compliance with all the requirements of the Clean Air Act, we understand the Paperwork Reduction Act to be centrally concerned with reporting and recordkeeping burdens. Thus, we start with the burden of submitting information to EPA and keeping copies of that information. From there we go on to consider the costs of developing the information that has to be reported. Consequently, this ICR has traditionally included the burden of conducting tests that have to be reported to support EPA's oversight of compliance with the Clean Air Act. We take the cost of conducting the tests to include the capital costs of building the facilities to run the tests and the associated operations and maintenance costs, such as mileage accumulation for durability determinations, and labor costs.

Estimated Respondent Burden Hours:

| Respondent Burden Hours | Engine Families/ Year | Burden/ Response (hours) | Total (hours) |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| LDV/LDT Emissions | 505 | 744.6 | 376,022 |
| LDV/LDT Fuel Economy | 294 | 626.8 | 184,276 |
| IUVP | 271 | 273.9 | 74,220 |
| Highway Motorcycles | 418 | 20.2 | 8,570 |
| Defect, Recall Reports | 383 | 10.5 | 4,012 |
| TOTAL | | | 647,100 |

6(b) Estimating Respondent Costs

(i) Estimating labor costs

The estimated cost for labor in the last renewal was based on the Federal pay grades (with a 24% benefits and overhead adjustment) performing tasks similar to those performed by management, technical, and secretarial labor in the automotive industry conducting compliance activities. This averaged to \$55.82 per hour for the light duty emissions and fuel economy programs. This average closely tracks the BLS rates for engineering managers mechanical engineers, and secretaries multiplied by 1.6; consequently, the labor costs in this ICR have been updated from the May 2005 BLS National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates (http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/naics4_336100.htm , accessed August 22, 2006). With a 160% overhead multiplier, these are \$81.38, \$49.71, and \$33.57, respectively. The resulting overall average for the Emissions IC becomes \$59.02 per hour. Use of these rates represent a small reduction in the rates previously used for the Cold Hydrocarbon burden adjustment (ICR 0783.52).

Information technology specialists for analysis and coding and label redesign are priced at \$100 per hour. These are considered one-time startup costs and are not included in the labor burden.

We have estimated labor costs between these three categories for each labor item. Applied to the total of 647,100 hours, the annual respondent labor burden is \$ \$39,876,745.

(ii) Estimating Operations and Maintenance Costs

| O&M Costs: Program/Activity | Number of Engine Families | Burden/ Response (\$) | Total (\$) |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| LDV/LDT Emissions: | 505 | \$10,221 | \$5,161,637 |
| LDV/LDT Fuel Economy | 294 | \$9,576 | \$2,815,275 |
| IUVP | 271 | \$14,510 | \$3,932,148 |
| Highway Motorcycles | 418 | \$656 | \$274,134 |
| Defect, Recall Reports | 383 | \$9 | \$3,331 |
| TOTAL | | | \$12,186,526 |

Operations and Maintenance costs are very largely those associated with running tests; there are also small cost elements associated with other reporting and recordkeeping activities. O&M costs in this ICR are therefore highly dependent on the fluctuations in the size of the industries and do not reflect program changes.

O&M test costs here follow the cost study for the Labeling Rule and will be updated to reflect the most recent information on the numbers of light-duty emissions and fuel economy tests run for the final ICR. They already reflect an increase in the number of highway motorcycle engine families being certified. A major change in the O&M costs comes from inclusion of testing estimates for model years 2011 and after that were fully

considered in the cost study for the Label Rule and accompanying ICR but which were not added to the baseline at that time as they were outside the three-year time horizon for the ICR.

The O&M cost estimates for the Label Rule affected the Fuel Economy IC and are here used to update the IUVP, Emissions, and HMC ICs. The number of highway tests in the FE IC has also been updated to reflect the inclusion of MDPVs in NHTSA’s CAFE program beginning in model year 2011 (71 FR 17566, April 6, 2006).

(ii) Estimating Capital Costs

| Annualized Capital Costs: Program/Activity | Number Engine Families/ Year | Total (\$) |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| LDV/LDT Emissions: | 505 | \$2,649,283 |
| LDV/LDT Fuel Economy | 294 | \$1,457,775 |
| IUVP | 271 | \$2,107,260 |
| Highway Motorcycles | 418 | \$66,324 |
| Defect, Recall Reports | 383 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | | \$6,280,643 |

To perform the required testing, a combination of “environmental,” standard, and evaporative emissions test cells are required. (A portion of the testing must be done at cold and warm temperatures to verify that emissions controls remain effective.) The cost estimates for these facilities have been updated to reflect the results of the cost study and ICR for the Labeling Rule: Environmental test cells are now priced at \$9 million for a facility that can conduct SCO3 tests and \$10 million for Cold CO facilities having capacities of 300 tests per year; standard cells remain \$4 million with a capacity of 750 tests per year. A significant change in this ICR is made for evaporative emissions testing capital costs based on new information from EPA’s testing laboratory: from \$600,000 with a capacity of 1,000 to \$300,000 with a capacity of 90 tests per year. Some other tests are variations on the estimates for these facilities.

These capital costs have long been treated as ongoing costs rather than start-up costs in the 0783 series. In effect, this allows a capital cost to be attributed on a per-test basis. Because of the wide variety of circumstances among manufacturers (land availability, capital availability, lending terms, labor shifts) and the continuing changes in the numbers of vehicles and engines being certified from year to year, this is the best method of counting facilities capital costs and one which allows continuity of treatment from one collection request to another. This also has the result, as with O&M costs, that collection requests can reflect changes in the information burden due to market forces in the industry that are much too complicated to model. The changes in this estimate from the last renewal reflect re-estimations and changes in the industry, not program changes by EPA.

The annualized depreciated costs of these facilities using the standard assumptions of 7%

interest yearly over ten years is \$6,280,643. This is regarded as a permanent capital cost item; that is, we regard the capital stock as being continuously depreciated and replaced.

(iii) Estimating Start-up Costs

Some capital costs in this ICR are one-time costs, unlike our treatment of facilities capital costs. These should be taken off the books after ten years. This ICR in the Fuel Economy IC significantly includes startup costs beginning in December, 2006, associated with the Labeling Rule amounting to \$1,731,380 annually.

6(c) Estimating Agency Burden

The emission and fuel economy compliance programs are administered by EPA's Certification and Compliance Division and Laboratory Operations Division. Approximately 26 full time employee equivalents are directly involved in the emission and fuel economy programs; their cost is approximately \$2.9 million, including benefits but not overhead. EPA also participates in a program whereby the agency contracts with an organization that provides qualified persons to perform duties for the agency that are not performed by EPA employees. The cost associated with these persons that work directly on emission and fuel economy programs for the two divisions is approximately \$0.5 million, not including overhead. Overhead percentage for the entire division is approximately 45, yielding an estimated total agency cost of \$4.9 million.

6(d) Estimating the Respondent Universe and Total Burden and Costs

From the above discussion the following total burden and cost estimates can be calculated. (Due to the diverse nature of the motor vehicle industry, there is no typical or average respondent. Respondents can be large manufacturers with many products such as General Motors; they can also be small importers of a few specialized motorcycles per year.)

6(e) Bottom Line Burden Hours and Cost

(i) Respondent Tally

| | |
|------------------|----------------|
| RESPONDENTS | 173 |
| BURDEN HOURS | 647,100 |
| LABOR COST | \$39.9 million |
| OPERATING COST | \$12.2 million |
| CAPITALIZED COST | \$6.3 million |

(ii) Agency Tally

| | |
|---------------------|---------------|
| EMPLOYEES | 26 |
| CONTRACT LABOR COST | \$0.5 million |
| COST | \$4.9 million |

6(f) Reasons for change in burden

The change in burden is due to the changes in methodology and coverage outlined above in 6(a) combined with new counts of the numbers of respondents, test groups, and tests performed. EPA has not made any program changes (other than approved rulemakings) since the previous ICR renewal. The effect of these changes can be summarized as follows:

Labor hours: The current inventory authorizes 647,815 hours annually. This renewal requests 647,100 hours. This change is the result of many corrections, with a moderate increase in light-duty emissions hours and smaller increases in the fuel economy, motorcycle, and defect-reporting programs offset by a moderate decrease in IUVP hours reflecting efficiencies in that program due to Verify, the completion of EPA audits of manufacturer IUVP procedures, and the maturing of the program, which was a startup at the time of the last renewal.

Labor costs: As stated above, this request uses BLS labor costs with a 160% multiplier, which allows for the effects of inflation while maintaining consistency with the previous estimate based on comparable costs for EPA labor. In addition, the labor cost estimate reflects changes in the number of vehicles being certified and the consequent reports being submitted in connection with certification and post-certification requirements.

Capital and O&M costs: The current baseline authorizes \$12,109,395; the present estimate requests \$18,467,168. As discussed above, this change reflects multiple changes both in the capital cost estimate and the O&M burden, among which those having the most impact are the following: first, the inclusion of \$1,731,380 in out-year (Model Year 2011 and after) capital and O&M costs associated with testing under the Labeling Rule; second, addition of \$336,670 to the Fuel Economy IC due to adjustments for inclusion of highway tests for CAFE MDPVs, addition of ICI highway tests erroneously omitted previously, and a minor adjustment of an error in the O&M portion of the breakout to five ICs; third, an increase in the capital cost of conducting evaporative emissions tests for the light-duty and IUVP programs from \$600 to \$1,333 per test and in the costs of O&M associated with all tests based on Labeling Rule levels; fourth, an increase in the cost of facilities capable of Cold CO tests based on industry estimates from the Labeling Rule; and fifth, updates in the numbers of vehicle certifications or IUVP tests processed, and associated capital and O&M costs, for the motorcycle and IUVP programs. The testing burden for the light-duty and fuel economy programs will be further updated if more recent information is available in time for the final ICR.

6(g) Burden Statement

The table in Section 6(e) presents the total estimated burden for the motorcycle and light-duty emission and fuel economy compliance programs, the IUVP program, and DR/VERR program; approximately 647,176 hours per year. Annual operating and capitalized costs are approximately \$3.1 million and \$8.3 million respectively. Because the universe of vehicle manufacturers is quite diverse, there is no “typical” respondent. However, the burden estimates for the various individual activities in section 6(a) can be used to estimate the

burden for a particular respondent. These estimates include time to review applicable regulations and guidance documents, generate and gather the necessary information, and submit documents.

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 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. 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.

To comment on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including the use of automated collection techniques, EPA has established a public docket for this ICR under Docket ID No. OAR-2004-0092, which is available for public viewing at the Air And Radiation Docket in the EPA Docket Center (EPA/DC), EPA West, Room B102, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, DC. The EPA Docket Center Public Reading Room is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number for the Reading Room is (202) 566-1744, and the telephone number for the Air and Radiation Docket is also (202) 566-1744. An electronic version of the public docket is available through EPA Dockets (EDOCKET) at <http://www.epa.gov/edocket>. Use EDOCKET to submit or view public comments, access the index listing of the contents of the public docket, and to access those documents in the public docket that are available electronically. Once in the system, select "search," then key in the docket ID number identified above. Also, you can send comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503, Attention: Desk Office for EPA. Please include the EPA Docket ID No. (OAR-2004-0092) and OMB control number (2060-0104) in any correspondence.

Appendix I

Legal Authority & Regulatory Citations

Energy Policy and Conservation Act

15 U.S.C. 2003. Calculation of average fuel economy

(a) Method of calculation.

“(1) Average fuel economy for purposes of section 2002 (a) and (c) of this title shall be calculated by the EPA Administrator...”

(d) Testing and calculation procedures.

“(1) Fuel economy for any model type shall be measured, and average fuel economy of a manufacturer shall be calculated in accordance with testing calculation procedures established by EPA Administrator, by rule...”

15 U.S.C. 2005. Information and reports

(c) Tests, reports, etc. that may be required of manufacturers.

“(1) Every manufacturer shall establish and maintain such records, make such reports, conduct such tests, and provide such items and information as the Secretary or EPA Administrator may, by rule, reasonably require to enable the Secretary or the EPA Administrator to carry out their duties under this subchapter and under any rules prescribed pursuant to this subchapter...”

15 U.S.C. 2006. Labeling

(a) Label required on automobile; contents.

“(1) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2), each manufacturer shall cause to be affixed, and each dealer shall cause to be maintained, on each automobile manufactured in any model year after 1976, in a prominent place, a label ...”

“(3) The form and content of the labels required under paragraphs (1) and (2), and the manner in which such labels shall be affixed, shall be prescribed by the EPA Administrator by rule...”

Clean Air Act

42 U.S.C. 7525. Motor Vehicle and Motor Vehicle Engine Compliance Testing and

Certification

(a) Testing and issuance of certificate of conformity.

“(1) The Administrator shall test, or require to be tested in such manner as he deems appropriate, any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine submitted by a manufacturer to determine whether such vehicle or engine conforms with regulations prescribed under section 7521 of this title. If such vehicle or engine conforms to such regulations, the Administrator shall issue a certificate of conformity upon such terms, and for such period (not in excess of one year) as he may prescribe...”

45 U.S.C. 7542. Records and Reports

(a) Manufacturers’ responsibility.

“Every manufacturer shall establish and maintain such records, make such reports, and provide such information as the Administrator may reasonably require to enable him to determine whether such manufacturer has acted or is acting in compliance with this part and the regulations thereunder and shall, upon request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Administrator, permit such officer or employee at reasonable times to have access to and copy such records.”

CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS

40 CFR Part 85: Control of air pollution from mobile sources.

40 CFR Part 86: Control of air pollution from new and in-use highway vehicles and engines.

40 CFR Part 600: Fuel economy of motor vehicles

Appendix II

Data Items List

| <u>40 CFR citation</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|--|---|
| Part 85: Control of Air Pollution from Mobile Sources | |
| Subpart P: Importation of Motor Vehicles and Engines (Sections 85.1501 – 85.1515) | |
| [Note: All these import provisions are covered by ICR 10.09, (OMB Control No. 2060-0095) renewed through 2007] | |
| Subpart R: Exclusions and Exemptions | |
| 85.1705 | Reporting requirement. Application for testing exemption, motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine. |
| 85.1706 | Reporting requirement. Application pre-certification exemption, motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine. |
| 85.1708 | Reporting requirement. Application for national security exemption, motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine. |
| 85.1710 | Recordkeeping requirement. Create and maintain adequate records accessible to EPA at reasonable times, per memorandum of exemption. |
| 85.1712 | Reporting requirement. Application for confidential treatment of submitted information, applications for exemptions/exclusions. |
| Subpart S: Recall Regulations | |
| 85.1802 | Reporting requirement. Remedial plan required, nonconforming motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine class. |
| 85.1803 | Reporting requirement. Remedial plan contents and requirements. |
| 85.1806 | Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Remedial plan progress reports, owner notifications. |
| 85.1808 | Reporting requirement. Claims of confidential information. |
| Subpart T: Emission Defect Reporting | |
| 85.1903 | Reporting requirement. Emission defect reports, motor vehicles |

and motor vehicle engines.

- 85.1904 Reporting requirement. Voluntary emission recall reports, motor vehicle and motor vehicle engines.
- 85.1905 Reporting requirement. Request to use alternate report format.
- 85.1906 Recordkeeping requirement. Defect reports.
- 85.1908 Reporting requirement. Disclaimer of production warranty applicability.
- 85.1909 Reporting requirement. Request for confidential treatment of information.

Subpart V: Emissions Control System Performance Warranty Regulations

[Note: the Voluntary Aftermarket Part Certification Program is covered by ICR 116.07. However, the rest of the Subpart is Not covered in that ICR, in spite of that ICR's title. The following sections were erroneously excluded from the list in the draft ICR:]

- 85.2110 Reporting requirement. Submission of owner's manuals and warranty statements.
- 85.2123 Reporting requirement. Claims of confidentiality.

Subpart W: Emission Control System Performance Warranty Short Tests

- 85.2208 Reporting requirement. Application for alternative short test procedure.

Subpart Y: Fees [Supersedes Part 86, Subpart J for certification requests after May 11, 2004]

[Note: Non- LDV/LDT portions of Subpart Y, are covered by ICR 2080.02, OMB Control Number 2060-0545]

- 85.2406 Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Submission of statement that reduced fee is appropriate; request for revision; submission of model year reduced fee payment report. Three year retention of basis for reduced fee.
- 85.2407 Reporting requirement. Requests for fee refunds.
- 85.2408 Reporting requirement. Applicant, product identification, fee category.

Part 86: Control of Emissions from New and In-Use Highway Vehicles and Engines

[Note: Draft ICR omits Subpart A, General Provisions. Most active provisions are now in Subpart S. However, Subpart A still has important applicable provisions on retention of records:]

[Note: Applicable provisions are frequently repeated or incorporated several times for differing model years. For example, 86.091-7, 094-7 and 096-7, and 86.000-7 are cumulative, parallel provisions. Some such provisions, such as those for initial certification, that are deemed no longer applicable are excluded from this list.]

86.000-7, 86.091-7, 86.094-7, 86.096-7

Reporting and Recordkeeping requirements. Detailed records on all vehicles used in certification applications other than routine emissions tests must be kept for 6 or 8 years. Copies of instructions must be submitted to EPA. Averaging banking and trading records. Reporting of sales volumes. Covers through 2002 model vehicles.

Subpart B: Test Procedures

- 86.107 Reporting requirement. Gas chromatograph records required for evaporative emission test.
- 86.113 Reporting requirement. Availability and use of alternate fuels in-use.
- 86.129 Recordkeeping requirement. Fuel temperature profile determination.
- 86.142 Recordkeeping requirement. Exhaust emission test.
- 86.155 Recordkeeping requirement. Refueling test.
- 86.162 Reporting requirement. Request for alternate air conditioning test simulations.
- 86.163 Reporting requirement. Substantiation of alternate air conditioning test simulation correlation.

Subpart E: New Motorcycles, General Provisions

- 86.412 Reporting requirement. Submission of maintenance instructions and other documents that relate to emissions.
- 86.414 Reporting requirement. Submission of vehicle identification numbers, description of numbering system.

| | |
|--------|---|
| 86.415 | Reporting requirement. Submission of annual production reports. |
| 86.416 | Reporting requirement. Application for certification. |
| 86.421 | Reporting requirement. Election to test additional vehicles. |
| 86.423 | Reporting requirement. Submission of optional test data. |
| 86.427 | Reporting requirement. Emission testing. |
| 86.428 | Reporting requirement. Request for additional scheduled maintenance. |
| 86.429 | Reporting requirement. Request for unscheduled test vehicle maintenance. |
| 86.431 | Reporting requirement. Submission of all test data required. |
| 86.432 | Reporting requirement. Election to use optional method to determine deterioration factor using outliers. |
| 86.434 | Reporting requirement. Request for retest of confirmatory test. |
| 86.435 | Reporting requirement. Election of additional service accumulation. |
| 86.437 | Reporting requirement. Certification of compliance. |
| 86.438 | Reporting requirement. Amendments to the application. |
| 86.439 | Reporting requirement. Amendments to the application; alternate method. |
| 86.440 | Recordkeeping requirement. Maintenance of certification vehicle data for six years, one year for test data. |
| 86.445 | Reporting requirement. Application for hardship exemption. |
| 86-446 | Reporting requirement. Application for extension of deadlines for small-volume manufacturers. |
| 86.449 | Recordkeeping and reporting requirements. Averaging, banking and trading. |

Subpart F: New Motorcycles, Emissions Regulations

- 86.513 Reporting requirement. Availability of alternate fuels.
- 86.542 Recordkeeping requirement. Motorcycle certification testing.

Subpart G: Selective Enforcement Auditing

- 86.603 Reporting requirement. Assembly line data
- 86.604 Reporting requirement. Request for reconsideration on use of EPA data.
- 86.605 Recordkeeping requirement. Vehicle production data.
- 86.607 Reporting requirement. Request for alternate procedures, description of production changes.
- 86.609 Reporting requirement. Submission of test results and supporting information.
- 86.612 Reporting requirement. Nonconformance, corrective action.
- 86.615 Reporting requirement. Request for confidential treatment of information submitted.

Subpart H: General Provisions for In-Use Emissions

- 86.709 Reporting requirement. Request to use alternate production figures.

Subpart J: Certification Fees [applicable to applications before 7/12/2004, including some still active under import provisions of 40 CFR 85.1509]

- 86.908 Reporting requirement. Request for fee waiver/refund
- 86.909 Reporting requirement. Applicant, product identification, fee category.

Subpart K: Selective Enforcement Auditing of Light-Duty Trucks

- 86.1003 Reporting requirement. Assembly line data
- 86.1004 Reporting requirement. Request for reconsideration on use of EPA data.
- 86.1005 Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Maintenance and submission of vehicle production data.

- 86.1007 Reporting requirement. Request for alternate selection method.
- 86.1009 Reporting requirement. Submission of test results and supporting information.
- 86.1012 Reporting requirement. Nonconformance, corrective action.
- 86.1015 Reporting requirement. Request for confidential treatment of submitted information.

Subpart L: Nonperformance Penalties for Light-Duty Trucks

- 86.1106 Recordkeeping requirement. Production compliance audit information, recordkeeping.
- 86.1107 Reporting requirement. Request for reconsideration on use of EPA data.
- 86.1108 Recordkeeping requirement. Nonconformance penalty testing.
- 86.1110 Reporting requirement. Request for alternate test procedures.
- 86.1113 Reporting requirement. Nonconformance penalty calculation.
- 86.1114 Reporting requirement. Nonconformance, corrective action.

Subpart O: Short Test Procedures for LDVs, LDTs.

- 86.1427 Reporting requirement. Request for alternate short test procedure.
- 86.1442 Reporting requirement. Short test reports.

Subpart P: Idle Test Procedures for LDTs

- 86.1542 Reporting requirement. Idle test reports.

Subpart R: General NLEV Provisions

- 86.1705 Reporting requirement. Manufacturer's election of NLEV program.
- 86.1707 Reporting requirement. Manufacturer's decision to opt-out of NLEV program.
- 86.1712 Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Production reports, maintenance of records.

- 86.1721 Reporting requirement. Identification and production information, NLEV vehicles.
- 86.1723 Reporting requirement. Emission data, NLEV vehicles.
- 86.1734 Reporting requirement. Notification of production vehicle changes.

Subpart S: General Tier 2 Provisions

- 86.1805 Reporting requirement. Petition for alternative useful life definition.
- 86.1806 Reporting requirement. Request for alternative on board diagnostic system requirements.
- 86.1809 Reporting requirement. Submission of detailed calibration information.
- 86.1811 Reporting requirement. Election of alternate standards and phase-in requirements.
- 86.1817 Reporting requirement. Election of emission limits, submission of annual report.
- 86.1823 Reporting requirement. Description of durability demonstration program.
- 86.1826 Reporting requirement. Election of assigned deterioration factors.
- 86.1829 Reporting requirement. Request for waivers, data substitution.
- 86.1839 Reporting requirement. Substantiation of data substitution.
- 86.1840 Reporting requirement. Request for special test procedures.
- 86.1842 Reporting requirement. Notification of running changes.
- 86.1843 Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Application for certification and general information requirements.
- 86.1844 Reporting requirement. Product description, test data requirements.
- 86.1845 Reporting requirement. In-use testing verification requirements.
- 86.1846 Reporting requirement. Submit confirmatory testing plan when such testing is required.

| | |
|--|---|
| 86.1847 | Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, in-use and confirmatory testing. |
| 86.1862 | Reporting requirement. NOx averaging recordkeeping requirements. |
| Part 600 | |
| Subpart A: General Fuel Economy Provisions | |
| 600.005 | Recordkeeping requirement. Fuel economy data vehicles. |
| 600.006 | Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Fuel economy data vehicles. |
| 600.007 | Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Fuel economy data, imported vehicles. |
| 600.010 | Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Minimum fuel economy. |
| Subpart B: Fuel Economy Test Procedures | |
| 600.113 | Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Fuel analysis. |
| Subpart C: Calculating Fuel Economy Values | |
| 600.206 | Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Fuel economy data, dual fuel vehicles. |
| 600.207 | Reporting requirement. Model type fuel economy calculations. |
| 600.209 | Reporting requirement. Fuel economy label calculations. |
| Subpart D: Fuel Economy Labeling | |
| 600.305 | Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Fuel economy label. |
| 600.306 | Reporting requirement. Fuel economy label information. |
| 600.307 | Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Fuel economy label information. |
| 600.310 | Reporting requirement. High altitude fuel economy label, manufacturer request. |
| 600.311 | Reporting requirement. Range of fuel economy. |

600.312 Reporting and recordkeeping requirement. Fuel economy label calculations.

600.313 Reporting requirement. Fuel economy information.

600.314 Reporting requirement. Correction of fuel economy labels.

Subpart F: Procedures for Determining Manufacturer's Average Fuel Economy

600.507 Reporting requirement. Revised fuel economy data.

600.509 Reporting requirement. Voluntary fuel economy data.

600.510 Reporting requirement. Calculation of average fuel economy, adjustments.

600.512 Reporting requirement. Model year report.