available and reliable information that lambda-cyhalothrin and other substances that may have a common mechanism of toxicity would have cumulative effects. Therefore for purposes of this request it is appropriate only to consider the potential risks of lambda-cyhalothrin in an aggregate exposure assessment.

E. Safety Determination

The acceptable RfD based on a NOEL of 0.1 mg/kg bw/day from the chronic dog study and a safety factor of 100 is 0.001 mg/kg bw/day. A chronic dietary exposure/risk assessment has been performed for lambda-cyhalothrin using the above RfD. Available information on anticipated residues, monitoring data and percent crop treated was incorporated into the analysis to estimate the Anticipated Residue Contribution (ARC). The ARC is generally considered a more realistic estimate than an estimate based on tolerance level residues.

1. *U.S. population*. The ARC from established tolerances and the current and pending actions are estimated to be 0.00005 mg/kg bw/day and utilize 5.0 per cent of the RfD for the U.S. population. For the acute dietary assessment the MOEs at the 95th, 99th, and 99.9th percentiles are 2074, 742, and 237, respectively.

2. *Infants and children*. FFDCA section 408 provides that EPA shall apply an additional tenfold margin of safety for infants and children in the case of threshold effects to account for pre- and post-natal toxicity and the completeness of the database unless EPA determines that a different margin of safety will be safe for infants and children. EPA generally defines the level of appreciable risk as exposure that is greater than 1/100 of the NOEL in the animal study appropriate to the particular risk assessment. This hundredfold uncertainty (safety) factor/margin of exposure is designed to account for combined inter and intraspecies variability. EPA believes that reliable data support using the standard hundredfold margin/factor and not the additional tenfold margin/factor when EPA has a complete database under existing guidelines and when the severity of the effect in infants and children or the potency or unusual toxic properties of a compound do not raise concerns regarding the adequacy of the standard margin/factor.

In assessing the potential for additional sensitivity of infants and children to residues of lambda-cyhalothrin, EPA considered the data from oral developmental toxicity studies in the rat and rabbit, as well as data from a multi-generation reproduction study in the rat. The developmental toxicity studies are designed to evaluate adverse effects in the developing organism resulting from pesticide exposure during prenatal development in the mothers. Reproduction studies provide information relating to effects from exposure to the pesticide on the reproductive capability of mating animals and data on systemic toxicity.

i. *Pre-natal effects.* A developmental toxicity study in rats given gavage doses of 0, 5, 10, and 15 mg/kg/day with no developmental toxicity observed under the conditions of the study. The developmental NOEL is greater than 15 mg/kg/day, the highest dose tested. The maternal NOEL and LOEL are established at 10 and 15 mg/kg/day, respectively, based on reduced body weight gain.

A developmental toxicity study in rabbits given gavage doses of 0, 3, 10, and 30 mg/kg/day with no developmental toxicity observed under the conditions of the study. The maternal NOEL and LOEL are established at 10 and 30 mg/kg/day, respectively based on decreased body weight gain. The developmental NOEL is greater than 30 mg/kg/day, the highest dose tested.

ii. *Post-natal effects.* A three-generation reproduction study in rats fed diets containing 0, 10, 30, and 100 ppm with no developmental toxicity observed at 100 ppm, the highest dose tested. The maternal NOEL and LOEL for the study are established at 30 (1.5 mg/kg/day) and 100 ppm (5 mg/kg/day), respectively, based upon decreased parental body weight gain. The reproductive NOEL and LOEL are established at 30 (1.5 mg/kg/day) and 100 ppm (5 mg/kg/day), respectively, based on decreased pup weight gain during weaning.

In EPA's review of the toxicity endpoints for lambda-cyhalothrin they concluded that the data on developmental and reproductive toxicity tests do not indicate any increased pre- or post-natal sensitivity. Therefore, EPA concluded that reliable data support use of a hundredfold safety factor and that an additional tenfold safety factor is not needed.

Based on this information the ARC for children 1-6 years old, and non-nursing infants (subgroups most highly exposed) utilizes 0.000159 mg/kg bw/day (15.9% of the RfD) and 0.000101 mg/kg bw/day (10.1% of the RfD), respectively. Generally speaking, the Agency has no cause for concern if anticipated residues contribution for all published and proposed tolerances is less than the RfD.

For the acute dietary assessment the MOEs at the 95th, 99th, and 99.9th percentiles are 658, 248, and 132, respectively for children 1–6 years old. For non-nursing infants the MOEs at the 95th, 99th and 99.9th percentiles are 710, 316, and 152, respectively.

F. International Tolerances

There are Codex maximum residue levels established for residues of cyhalothrin, as the sum of all isomers, in or on the following crops and commodities: pome fruits at 0.2 ppm; cabbage, head at 0.2 ppm; potatoes at 0.02 ppm; cotton seed at 0.02 ppm; cotton seed oil, crude at 0.02 ppm; and cotton seed oil, edible at 0.02 ppm. (Adam Heyward)

[FR Doc. 97–25499 Filed 9–22–97; 3:06 pm]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Submitted to OMB for Review and Approval

September 19, 1997.

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

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before October 27, 1997. If you anticipate that you will be submitting comments, but find it difficult to do so within the period of

time allowed by this notice, you should advise the contact listed below as soon as possible.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Note: The Commission is submitting this information collection to the Office of Management and Budget under the emergency provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. OMB approval is requested by October 12, 1997.

OMB Approval Number: 3060–0004.

Title: Guidelines for Evaluating the Environmental Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation (Second Memorandum Opinion and Order, ET Docket No. 93–62).

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Individuals or households; business or other for-profit; not-for-profit institutions; and state, local or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 126,108.

Estimated Time Per Response: 1.77 hours (avg.). The estimated time per response varies with the number of transmitters considered, e.g., a site with a single transmitter might require one hour to determine compliance, while a site with many co-located transmitters may require considerably more time.

Cost to Respondents: The estimated cost to respondents to perform the environmental evaluations per service varies. For example, complex situations that require a consulting engineer @ $100 per hour may require additional time to perform an evaluation; portable devices authorized under Part 2 of the rules require a specific absorption rate of RF energy test with an average cost of approximately $5,000 per test; and other applicants will use OET Bulletin #65 to perform environmental evaluations, and will no financial burden associated with the evaluation.

Total Annual Burden: 223,376 hours.

Needs and Uses: This revised information collection is a result of responsibility placed on the FCC by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. NEPA requires that each federal agency evaluate the impact of ''major actions significantly effecting the quality of the human environment.'' It is the FCC's opinion that this is the most efficient and reasonable method of complying with NEPA with regard to the environmental issue of radio frequency radiation from FCC-regulated transmitters. The Commission will require applicants to perform an environmental evaluation with respect to radio frequency electromagnetic fields. Applicants are required to consider contributions from other transmitters within the vicinity of their facility in order to assess the cumulative exposure. Accordingly, to correctly determine compliance with the Commission's exposure limits, an applicant must locate, determine ownership, and gather technical information for all contributing transmitters. Applicants are generally required, as part of the authorization and licensing process, to indicate compliance with the Commission environmental rules. Supporting information may be requested and reviewed by the Commission's engineers, attorneys, and paraprofessional staff to determine whether the environmental evaluation is sufficiently complete and in accordance with the Commission's rules.

OMB Approval Number: 3060–0213.

Title: Section 73.3525, Agreements for removing application conflicts.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit and not-for-profit institutions.

Number of Respondents: 38.

Estimated Time Per Response: 8 hours.

Cost to Respondents: $60,800.

Total Annual Burden: 39 hours (1 hour per respondent, 8 hours per attorney which includes 1 hour consultation time with respondent). The 8 hours attorney time is reflected in the cost estimate not the total annual burden hours.)

Needs and Uses: Section 73.3525 requires applicants for a construction permit for a broadcast station to obtain approval from the FCC to withdraw, dismiss or amend its application when that application is in conflict with another application pending before the FCC. In the event that the proposed withdrawal of a conflicting application would unduly impede achievement of a fair, efficient and equitable distribution of radio service, the FCC must issue an order providing further opportunity to apply for the facilities specified in the application(s) withdrawn. Upon release of this order, Section 73.3525(b) requires that the party proposing withdrawal of its application give notice in a daily newspaper of general circulation published in the community in which the proposed station would have been located. This notice must be published twice a week for two consecutive weeks within the three-week period immediately following release of the FCC's order. Additionally, within 7 days of the last of publication of the notice, the applicant proposing to withdraw shall file with the FCC a statement giving the dates on which the notice was published, the text of the notice, and the name and location of the newspaper in which the notice appeared. The data in the request for approval is used by FCC staff to assure that the agreement is in compliance with its rules and regulations and Section 311 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. The newspaper publication gives interested parties an opportunity to apply for the facilities specified in the withdrawn application(s).

Federal Communications Commission.

Shirley S. Suggs,

Chief, Publications Branch.

[FR Doc. 97–25360 Filed 9–24–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–U

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Submitted to OMB for Review and Approval

September 18, 1997.

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