trucks would be appropriate, which are submitted before 4:30 p.m. April 24, 1981, and will respond to any comments as appropriate.

ADDRESS: Written comments to the docket should be mailed to: Director, Standards and Regulations Division, Attention: ONAC Docket 81-02 (Medium and Heavy Trucks), ANR-460, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460.

Copies of the International Harvester and Mack Trucks petitions can be obtained from Mr. Charles Monney, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA Public Information Center (PM-215), Room 2104D, Washington, D.C. 20460. Copies of these documents, related correspondence, and other supporting documents are available for public inspection between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. at the Central Docket Section of the Environmental Protection Agency, West Tower, Gallery, 101 M Street, SW., Washington D.C. 20460. As provided in 40 CFR Part 2, a reasonable fee may be charged for copying services.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Timothy Barry, Project Officer, Standards and Regulations Division, ANR-460, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 20460, or phone (202) 260-7271.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1.0 Introduction

EPA published noise emission regulations for newly-manufactured medium and heavy trucks on April 13, 1979 (44 FR 15384). Those regulations require, in part, that vehicles subject to the regulations manufactured after January 1, 1982, meet a not-to-exceed noise level of 85 dB and that vehicles manufactured after January 1, 1980, meet a not-to-exceed noise level of 80 dB when measured in accordance with a specified test procedure.

On September 2, 1980, International Harvester (IH) submitted a petition for reconsideration of the regulation which proposed that the 1982 medium and heavy truck noise emission standard of 85 dB be withdrawn. IH promised in its initial petition to submit an analysis supporting the issues raised by their petition within 30 days, and to submit an analysis of the community noise impact of the 1982 standard within 60 days.

Those documents were forwarded to the Agency on October 2, and November 19, 1980, respectively.

In these submittals, IH contended that the 1982 standard would impose an
Analyzing the historical sales and market share data published by the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association (MVMA), their statistical annual reports, figure (A-1), (1) shows a fluctuating sales market. The market share for category 3, 4, and 5 shows similar market share trends and when combined, market share already declines. (2) After a 5-year period of sustained growth, the market share for category 7 vehicles has a dramatically declining trend between 1973 and 1980. The dramatic growth in category 7 is in direct contrast to the market share of category 6. The markedly diverse market behavior in 1973 and 1980 of categories 6 and 7 tracks the releases on the market of the apparently inverse growth patterns. A review of the variations on basic medium trucks models indicates that market share by class indicates a consistent skewing toward those classes that are indicated for duty use rather than the lighter 3, 4, and 5 categories. (1) Significant shifts in truck class purchases, (2) a general decline in total sales and (3) reduced rates of fleet growth since 1973 when the EPA's original economic analysis was completed. Subsequent analysis by EPA of historical truck usage and available projections for future sales tend to support the projections' claims. The claims, which have not been anticipated in 1974, have been taken into consideration in this revised EPA analysis. Projections of costs, sales, and market shares have been updated to assess the potential economic effects on the industry. The projected time frame is expected to be from 1980 to 1985. This revised analysis is not intended to classify a truck according to its intended use or "duty." This is usually a combination of fuel rating, engine power, and torque, and truck configuration (i.e., fixed body, van, etc.). The second scheme is the gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) (Table A-1) which rates a truck purely on the load carrying capacity of the vehicle. The third scheme is a further division of the GVWR rating into medium trucks as those in GVWR 3-6 and heavy trucks as those in GVWR 7-8. The EPA's assertion of an inverse sales trend and market share for the future medium trucks is supported by a recent study by Chase Econometrica. (1) The EPA analysis of future medium trucks is based on the assumption that the cost structure of the medium truck market will be similar to that of the large truck market. This assumption seems appropriate, but there is no reason to assume that the cost structure of the medium truck market will be similar to that of the large truck market. The EPA's analysis of future medium trucks is based on the assumption that the cost structure of the medium truck market will be similar to that of the large truck market. This assumption seems appropriate.
would not be at risk from noise exposure. If anything, recent community
survey data suggest the identified level of 55 dB may be too high.
4. EPA analysis has never assumed
that the “effect” of this regulation would
be immediate. The rate of vehicle
turnover in the fleet was considered and
the full benefits and full costs of the
regulations were not expected to accrue
until the truck fleet has been fully
replaced by quieter trucks in the year
2002.
5. The statements about minimal
detectable changes in sound level are
valid when considering a single-
noise exposure. However, as stated,
previously, the manufacturer has
not considered noise level changes with
noise exposure changes. Even small changes in
noise exposure are significant.
6. The argument that it makes little
sense to go to an 80 dB truck regulation
since most of the benefits would be
achieved with an 85 dB level, erroneously
assumes that no significant benefit
would be gained below an 85 dB level.
EPA projects that in the year 2001, an 83
dB regulation would reduce impacts by
10.0 percent, while the 60 dB regulation
would provide a benefit of
approximately 27.3 percent, an additive
3.3 percent reduction. A noise stringent
limit of, say, 75 dB would yield benefits
of about 33 percent. The benefits
therefore, of going from an 83 dB to an
85 dB truck regulation, are significant.
3.3 ISSUE
The question has been raised as to the
compatibility of the medium and heavy
truck noise emission regulation with the
noise emission regulation for truck-
mounted solid waste compactors.
Response
The truck-mounted solid waste
compactor (compressor) regulation was
developed to be compatible with the
existing truck regulation. The noise
emission levels established for
compactors are predicated, in large part,
on the noise emission of the truck
chassis. Therefore, the 85 dB and 80 dB
truck noise regulations and their
attendant effective dates served as the
basis for the 70 and 70 dB compactor
regulations and their respective effective
dates.
The relationship between the
different noise emission measurement
schemes and levels for the truck and compactor
regulations was carefully assessed.
Under the truck emission regulation, a
truck containing it or away from it
is somehow permitted to generate a
higher peak noise level than if permitted
during compaction. The contention that
the regulations are not compatible,

"...would not be at risk from noise
暴露。如果任何近的社区
调查数据表明，识别的水平
为55分贝可能过高。
4. EPA的分析从未假定
该“影响”这一规定
不会立即产生。车辆
流量在该系列中被考虑
了，并且该规定的全部益处和
全部成本在该规定中
没有预计到直到该卡车
系列在2002年被全
部替换较为安静的卡车。
5. 关于可检测到的
声音水平变化的声明
在考虑单
次噪声暴露时是有效的。
但是，如前所述，制造商
没有考虑声音水平变化
与声音暴露变化。
即使小的变化在
声音暴露中是重要的。声明
是不正确的。
6. 论点认为，它不太
可能有太大的
意义去制定一项
噪声水平为80分贝
的卡车法规
因为，大多数
好处将会在85分贝
水平下实现。
EPA预测，在2001年，一个
83分贝的法规
将减少影响
10.0%。
而60分贝的法规
将提供一个
好处的
大约27.3%。
增加
3.3%。声音严格的
限制，例如，75分贝
将导致好处
为约33%
。因此，从83分贝到
85分贝的卡车
法规，它们的
好处是显著的。
3.3问题
问题被提出了，
即中等和重型
卡车的噪声
排放法规与
卡车
垃圾分拣器的
噪声排放法规
是否兼容？
响应
卡车
垃圾分拣器（压缩机）的法规
是开发为与
现有的卡车
法规兼容的。
噪声
排放水平为
压缩机
确立，大
部分在
卡车
底盘的噪声
排放基础上。因此，85分贝和80分贝
卡车噪声法规
和它们各自的
有效日期
是相同的。
卡车
噪声法规
和它们各自的
有效日期
是相同的。
卡车
噪声法规
和它们各自的
有效日期
是相同的。
卡车
噪声法规
和它们各自的
有效日期
是相同的。
卡车
噪声法规
和它们各自的
有效日期
是相同的。
otherwise be deferred and would defeat the purpose of this action. However, even though this is a final action by the Agency, the Agency will accept comments from the public on this action until 4:30 p.m. on April 24, 1981.

With respect to amendment of the truck-mounted solid waste compactor regulation, the Agency finds further that notice-and-comment procedures are unnecessary and contrary to the public interest because compliance with the 70 day rule and the delay in the certification date predicated upon the availability of truck chassis meeting an 80 dB standard.

EPA has determined that this action is not a "significant" regulation, and therefore, does not require a Regulatory Analysis in accordance with Executive Order 12291.

This amendment is issued under the authority of Section 6 of the Noise Control Act of 1965.

Dated: January 19, 1981.

Dwight M. Costil, Administrator.

[252.252, 252.202 (Amended)]

40 CFR Part 252 is amended by removing the word "1980" and inserting, in its place, the word "1983" in paragraph 252.252(a) of Subpart B, and in paragraph 252.202(a) of Subpart F.

Sec. 252.252 [amended]

Editorial Note—This appendix is printed for information purposes only and will not be reprinted in the CFR.

Appendix B—Prepared Revised Economic Analysis

of the Medium and Heavy Truck Noise Limitation Regulation

Review of the baseline production and market share trend data submitted by two major truck manufacturers in their petitions to EPA indicate that (1) Significant deflation in truck sales prices (2) a general decline in total sales and (3) reduced rate of fleet growth since 1976 when the EPA original economic analysis supporting the medium and heavy truck noise emission regulation was completed. Subsequent analysis by EPA of historical truck sales data and available projections for future sales tended to support the petition's claims. These changes, which could not have been anticipated in 1976, have been taken into consideration in this revised EPA analysis. Predictions of costs, sales, and market variables are based on the potential economic effects on the industry. A principal element in this revised analysis is the competitive environment.

The industry categories trucks by three different schemes. The first of these is to classify a truck according to its intended use or "utility." This is usually a combination of load rating, engine power and torque, and truck configuration (i.e., fixed body, van, etc.). The second scheme is the gross vehicle weight rating or GVWR (Table A-1) which relates a truck purely on the load carrying capacity of the vehicle. The third scheme is a further division of the GVWR rating into specific loads as those in GVWR 3-9 and heavy trucks as those in GVWR 7 and 8. Most truck manufacturers that use the medium duty in a cycle in classifying their vehicles as does the EPA. There is one manufacturer who elects to follow their own scheme. For this reason market share data from this source does not exhibit the same distribution of chassis, engine, and GVWR rating as the majority of the industry.

Market Analysis

Analysis of historical sales and market share data compiled by the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association (MOMA) in their statistical annual report, show (Figure A-1) that, even in a decreasing sales market (1) GVWR category 6 is steadily capturing an increasing share of the truck market. (2) Taken separately, categories 4, 6, and 5 show similar market share trends and, when combined, their market share has generally declined.

(3) After a 5-year period of sustained growth, the market share of category 6 vehicles appears to dramatically decline between 1978 and 1980.

(4) For a 10-year period, category 6 and 8 trucks show a dramatic increase that continued through 1980. This dramatic growth in category 9 is in direct contrast to the two category 6 and 8 trends. The markedly diverse market behavior in 1978 and 1980 of categories 6 and 8 trucks raises questions as to the cause of the apparently inverse growth patterns. A review of the variations in large medium truck models offered within the medium category indicates a consistent showing toward those intended for heavy duty use rather than the lighter 5 and 8 categories.

The EPA may be interpreted as an attempt of certain manufacturers to offer purchasers of medium trucks financing for those vehicles in the category 6 and 8 and to the extent that these vehicles are to be categorized by EPA in the discretion of the veteran's committee, the latter makes the former misleading.

The 1964-1965 data show that purchasers of category 6 trucks are apparently shifting to those of GVWR 7 and 8 which are basically medium trucks better suited to the operation of heavy equipment and an additional use to increase their load carrying capability. This shift could be the result of a desire in many cases, to increase the GVWR rating or "utility" of the vehicle.

From a noise quieting perspective, medium trucks are more easily quieted than heavy trucks since medium trucks offer less potential for chassis and engine compartment redesign. The "upgrading" of category 8 medium trucks produces a heavier truck but at the higher quieting costs of a medium truck. Thus, it now seems appropriate to include a percentage of GVWR category 7 trucks in the medium duty category for the purpose of determining noise quieting costs. For this reason EPA elected to combine the two market share of GVWR categories 9 and 10 (Figure A-2) to prevent a conservative approach of future market share development from data compiled by Chase Econometric and supplied to EPA by International Harvester. The dashed lines and verbal points on Figure A-3 represent Chase Econometric projections for future market share and are consistent with the historical trends. The solid line the data points in Figure A-3 represents EPA's estimate of market share for the combination of categories 4, 6, and 5. The industry did not provide data for these categories.

Estimation of the truck fleet shown in Figure A-4, was estimated from historical data obtained from MOMA (6) and a combination of industry and government forecasts for the future. EPA's Mobile Source Air Programs Office estimated for revision (1) conversion to diesel engine in GVWR category 6 by 1984 and 20 percent diesel penetration for categories 4 and 5 by 1987 in Commercial Car Journal (7) claims that GVWR category 6 will be 60 percent dieselized by the end of 1984 for categories 5 and 7, and the EPA Air Programs estimate for categories 4, 5, and 6, and utilization of gasoline from current (1980) diesel penetration to 1983 were made. Beyond this diesel penetration was assumed to hold constant.

To estimate the future growth of the truck fleet, EPA compared MMVAs, Engine Manufacturers Association (EMA), the Truck Manufacturers Association (TMA), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Office of the Secretary of Transportation, Transportation Systems Center (ODT/TSOC), the Department of Commerce Bureau of Industrial Economics (BIE), Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the President's Automobile Industry Council. These sources, only BIE and TSC were prepared to provide growth forecasts. The BIE projections are a short term projection to the mid-1980's TSC provided long term projections made by Data Resources Incorporated (DRI). The DRI forecasts are generated by a national economic model that incorporates both trend analysis and business cycle considerations. The DRI forecasts were made in the Fall of 1980 and therefore include data reflecting current economic conditions. The data reflects the current economic condition of the trucking industry. EPA has used the DRI projections because they appear to represent the best available forecasts.

Cost Comparison

A comparison of the estimated costs associated with the BB regulation (given that the BB regulation is already in place) is presented below. Tables A-2 through A-4 present EPA's estimates of unit base price incremental noise abatement costs and operating costs. The 1975 estimate are for the Background Document supporting the