phone line and a high-speed modem per the following information.

TTN BBS: 919–541–5742 (1200–14400 bps, no parity, 8 data bits, 1 stop bit) Voice Helpline: 919–541–5384

Also accessible via Internet: TELNET ttnbbs.rtpnc.epa.gov

Off-line: Mondays from 8:00 AM to 12:00 Noon ET

When first signing on, the user will be required to answer some basic informational questions for registration purposes. After completing the registration process, proceed through the following series of menus:

<T> GATEWAY TO TTN TECHNICAL AREAS (Bulletin Boards)

<M> OMS

<K> Rulemaking and Reporting <3> Fuels

<9> Reformulated gasoline

A list of ZIP files will be shown, all of which are related to the reformulated gasoline rulemaking process. To download any file, type the instructions below and transfer according to the appropriate software on your computer: <D>ownload, <P>rotocol, <E>xamine,

<N>ew, <L>ist, or <H>elp Selection or <CR> to exit: D

filename.zip

You will be given a list of transfer protocols from which you must choose one that matches with the terminal software on your own computer. The software should then be opened and directed to receive the file using the same protocol. Programs and instructions for de-archiving compressed files can be found via <S>ystems Utilities from the top menu, under <A>rchivers/de-archivers. After getting the files you want onto your computer, you can quit the TTN BBS with the <Gsoodbye command. Please note that due to differences between the software used to develop the document and the software into which the document may be downloaded, changes in format, page length, etc. may occur.

The remainder of this preamble is organized into the following sections:

- I. Withdrawal of Change to JP–4 to Gasoline Production Ratio
- II. Withdrawal of JP-4 Adjustment Multi-Refinery Requirement
- III. Withdrawal of Change to the Valid Range Limits for RVP under the Simple Model

I. Withdrawal of Change to JP-4 to Gasoline Production Ratio

EPA received comments from Shell Oil Company, Phillips 66 Company, and Chevron USA Products Company objecting to the change of the 1990 JP– 4 to gasoline production ratio from 0.5 to 0.2. A discussion of EPA's perspective on this regulatory provision was presented in Section IV, Part B.2 of the DFRM preamble. See 59 FR 36944 (July 20, 1994). For the most part, commenters expressed the belief that the selection of the 0.2 JP-4 to gasoline production ratio was arbitrary. In addition, EPA was faulted with disregarding the significant economic and competitive impact of redefining the ratio on those refiners with ratios falling below 0.2. In fact, most commenters supported allowing baseline adjustments for all refiners that produced JP-4 in 1990, thereby eliminating the need for a JP-4 to gasoline ratio altogether.

Since commenters objected to the change in specifying this ratio, as announced in the DFRM, EPA is withdrawing the action in the July DFRM which lowered the 1990 JP–4 to gasoline production ratio to 0.2. The 0.2 ratio will not go into effect on September 19th. The criteria for an adjustment to an individual baseline based on production of JP–4 will include a 1990 JP–4 to gasoline production ratio of 0.5, as was promulgated in the December 1993 final regulations for reformulated gasoline.

II. Withdrawal of JP-4 Adjustment Multi-Refinery Requirement

A. Withdrawal of Relaxation of the Requirement That All Refineries in an Aggregate Produced JP–4 in 1990

In August, EPA received comments from Chevron USA Products Company regarding the revised JP-4 adjustment appearing in the July DFRM. In addition to the JP-4 to gasoline production ratio, Chevron objected to the change in the multiple refinery requirement discussed in Preamble Section VI.B.1. See 59 FR 36944 (July 20, 1994). Chevron argued in their comments that the combined provisions for the JP-4 adjustment (ratio and multi-refiner requirement) were designed to benefit a certain class of refiners and thereby providing that class of refiners with competitive advantages not offered to all refiners.

The DFRM would have altered the regulations to allow utilization of the JP-4 adjustment for those refiners with multiple refineries (milti-refinery refiner) regardless of whether or not each of their refineries produced JP-4 in 1990. The DFRM revised provision was intended to treat refiners who produced JP-4 equally regardless of whether or they owned more than one refinery. Since the Agency received a critical comment on the revised multiple refinery provision in the DFRM, EPA is now withdrawing that provision. The requirement for multi-refinery refiner reverts to the original provision

contained in the December 1993 final reformulated gasoline rule. Therefore, baseline adjustments are only allowed for multi-refinery refiners where each of a refiner's refineries produced JP–4 in 1990.

B. Withdrawal of the Requirement for an Aggregate JP–4 Production Ratio Calculation

The July DFRM also contained a provision which would have required refiners of multiple refineries to average their 1990 JP-4 production to 1990 gasoline production ratio across all of their refineries. See 59 FR 36944 (July 20, 1994). The Agency received adverse comments on this provision from Chevron and Pennzoil. While Chevron did not specifically mention objections to this element of the multi-refinery requirement promulgated in the DFRM, the Agency understands Chevron's critical comments as applying equally to each component of the DFRM multirefinery requirement. Pennzoil objected to the DFRM's requirement to average the JP-4 to gasoline production ratio over all a refiner's refineries (in essence an aggregate ratio) if the ratio reverts back to 0.5 as promulgated in the December 1993 RFG final regulations. Pennzoil claimed that the combination of the higher, more stringent ratio threshold (0.5) and the more restrictive requirement to calculate across all of a multi-refiner's refineries would eliminate the meaningful relief to JP-4 producers.

Since EPA received adverse comments on those provisions, it is withdrawing those regulatory provisions receiving negative comments. Today's action withdraws the July DFRM JP–4 adjustment multiple refinery provisions. The multiple refinery provisions in § 80.91(e)(7) remain as promulgated in the December 1993 reformulated gasoline final rule.

III. Withdrawal of Change to the Valid Range Limits for RVP Under the Simple Model

In August, the American Automobile Manufacturers Association (AAMA) submitted comments to the Agency which objected to the change in the low end valid range for RVP under the Simple Model. Their concern is that low RVP fuels might have high driveability indices (DIs). According to AAMA, high DI fuels produce higher vehicle emissions and poor customer satisfaction. As explained in their comments, unlike the Complex Model, the Simple Model does not limit distillation temperatures and the promulgated extension of the RVP valid