

TABLE 2. — REGISTRANTS REQUESTING VOLUNTARY CANCELLATION—Continued

EPA Com- pany No.	Company Name and Address
010163	Gowan Co., Box 5569, Yuma, AZ 85366.
010370	Agrevo Environmental Health, 95 Chestnut Ridge Rd., Montvale, NJ 07645.
034704	Cherie Garner, Agent For: Platte Chemical Co., Inc., Box 667, Greeley, CO 80632.
050534	ISK Biosciences Corp., 5966 Heisley Rd., Box 8000, Mentor, OH 44061.
051036	Micro-Flo Co., Box 5948, Lakeland, FL 33807.
062719	DowElanco, 9330 Zionsville Rd., 308/3E, Indianapolis, IN 46268.
067517	R. E. Broyles, Agent For: PM Resources Inc., 1401 Hanley Rd., St. Louis, MO 63144.
070596	Nufarm Americas Inc., Agent For: Nufarm BV, 1009-D W., St. Martens Drive, St. Joseph, MO 64506.

III. Procedures for Withdrawal of Request

Registrants who choose to withdraw a request for cancellation must submit such withdrawal in writing to James A. Hollins, at the address given above, postmarked before January 12, 1998. This written withdrawal of the request for cancellation will apply only to the applicable 6(f)(1) request listed in this notice. If the product(s) have been subject to a previous cancellation action, the effective date of cancellation and all other provisions of any earlier cancellation action are controlling. The withdrawal request must also include a commitment to pay any reregistration fees due, and to fulfill any applicable unsatisfied data requirements.

IV. Provisions for Disposition of Existing Stocks

The effective date of cancellation will be the date of the cancellation order. The orders effecting these requested cancellations will generally permit a registrant to sell or distribute existing stocks for 1 year after the date the cancellation request was received. This policy is in accordance with the Agency's statement of policy as prescribed in **Federal Register** (56 FR 29362) June 26, 1991; [FRL 3846-4]. Exceptions to this general rule will be made if a product poses a risk concern, or is in noncompliance with reregistration requirements, or is subject to a data call-in. In all cases, product-specific disposition dates will be given in the cancellation orders.

Existing stocks are those stocks of registered pesticide products which are currently in the United States and which have been packaged, labeled, and released for shipment prior to the effective date of the cancellation action. Unless the provisions of an earlier order apply, existing stocks already in the hands of dealers or users can be distributed, sold or used legally until

they are exhausted, provided that such further sale and use comply with the EPA-approved label and labeling of the affected product(s). Exceptions to these general rules will be made in specific cases when more stringent restrictions on sale, distribution, or use of the products or their ingredients have already been imposed, as in Special Review actions, or where the Agency has identified significant potential risk concerns associated with a particular chemical.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests, Product registrations.

Dated: June 29, 1997.

Linda A. Travers,

Director, Information Resources and Services Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 97-18086 Filed 7-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

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

July 10, 1997.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. No person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) that

does not display a valid control number. Comments are requested concerning: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Commission, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Written comments should be submitted on or before August 15, 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., N.W., Washington, DC 20554 or via Internet to jboley@fcc.gov.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Approval Number: 3060-XXXX.
Title: Section 90.176, Coordination notification requirements on frequencies below 512 MHz.

Type of Review: New collection.
Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 15.
Estimated Time Per Response: .25 hours

Cost to Respondents: N/A.
Total Annual Burden: 975 hours.
Needs and Uses: Section 90.176 requires each Private Land Mobile

frequency coordinator to provide, within one business day, a listing of their frequency recommendations to all other frequency coordinators in their respective pool, and, if requested, an engineering analyses. They can use any method to ensure compliance with the one business day requirement and must provide, at a minimum, the name of the applicant; frequency or frequencies recommended; antenna locations and heights; the effective radiated power; the type(s) of emissions; description of the service area; and date and time of the recommendation. Should a conflict in recommendations arise the affected coordinators are jointly responsible for taking action to resolve the conflict, up to and including notifying the Commission that an application may have to be returned.

The requirement is necessary to avoid situations where harmful interference is created because two or more coordinators recommend the same frequency in the same area at approximately the same time to different applicants.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-18585 Filed 7-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CS Docket No. 97-141, FCC 97-194]

Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in Markets for the Delivery of Video Programming

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice of inquiry.

SUMMARY: The Commission is required to report annually to Congress on the status of competition in markets for the delivery of video programming pursuant to Section 628(g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. On June 3, 1997, the Commission adopted a *Notice of Inquiry* to solicit information from the public for use in preparing the competition report that is to be submitted to Congress in December 1997. The *Notice of Inquiry* will provide parties with an opportunity to submit comments and information to be used in conjunction with publicly available information and filings submitted in relevant Commission proceedings to assess the extent of competition in the market for the delivery of video programming.

DATES: Comments are due by July 23, 1997, and reply comments are due by August 20, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marcia Glauber, Cable Services Bureau, (202) 418-7200, or Rebecca Dorch, Office of General Counsel, (202) 418-1880.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Notice of Inquiry* in CS Docket No. 97-141, FCC 97-194, adopted June 3, 1997, and released June 6, 1997. The complete text of this *Notice of Inquiry* is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20554, and may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service (202) 857-3800, 1900 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20054.

Synopsis of the Notice of Inquiry

1. Section 628(g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended ("Communications Act"), 47 U.S.C. § 548(g), requires the Commission to deliver an annual report to Congress on the status of competition in markets for the delivery of video programming. The *Notice of Inquiry* ("NOI") is designed to solicit comments and information that the Commission can use to prepare its fourth annual report ("1997 Competition Report"). Specifically, the *NOI* invites commenters to submit data, information and analysis regarding the cable industry, existing and potential competitors to cable systems, and prospects for increasing competition in markets for delivery of video programming. Commenters also are requested to identify and comment on existing statutory provisions they perceive as restraining competition or inhibiting development of robust competition in markets for the delivery of video programming. The Commission expects to use the information that is submitted by commenters to supplement publicly available information and relevant comments that have been filed in other Commission proceedings.

2. As in previous reports, we seek factual information and statistical data regarding the status of video programming distributors using different technologies, and changes that have occurred in the past year. We seek information on multichannel video programming distributors ("MPVDs") using predominantly wired distribution

technologies, including cable systems, private cable or satellite master antenna television ("SMATV") systems, and open video systems ("OVS"). We also request data for those relying predominantly on wireless distribution technologies, such as over-the-air broadcast television, multichannel multipoint distribution service ("MMDS"), instructional television fixed service ("ITFS"), local multipoint distribution service ("LMDS"), direct broadcast satellite ("DBS") service, and home satellite dish ("HSD") service, and for other potential distribution mechanisms, including interactive video and data services ("IVDS"), the Internet, and public utility companies.

3. The *NOI* asks a variety of questions concerning each of these video delivery services. In addition to statistical data on each of these delivery services, we seek information regarding: (a) industry transactions, including information on mergers, acquisitions, consolidations, swaps and trades, and cross-ownership; (b) other structural developments that affect distributors' delivery of video programming; (c) regulatory and judicial developments that affect use of different technologies; and (d) the effects of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("1996 Act") and its implementation.

4. The 1996 Competition Report described various technological advances that may affect industry structure and competition in markets for the delivery of video programming. For this year's report, we seek updated information on: (a) developments in the deployment, or planned deployment, of advanced technologies, such as digital compression, switched digital services, and upgraded architectures; (b) different transmission facilities used for distribution of multichannel video programming, such as copper wire, coaxial cable, optical fiber, broadcast and other terrestrial radio frequency communications, terrestrial microwave, satellites, and use of the Internet; (c) the hybridization of different transmission media; and (d) system configurations and designs that may facilitate competition, such as the distribution of different types of signals and different types of services over the same transmission facility. In addition, we request information about developments in set-top boxes, including updates on interoperability, portability and market-driven standards. We also seek information on whether multichannel video distributors are leasing or selling reception equipment to subscribers, and the competitive impact, if any, of these marketplace alternatives. We further invite comment on the use of digital forms of communications and on