from 1989 through 1992 and field trial residue data, MBC exposure was calculated. This exposure multiplied by the cancer potency factor (Q*) generates the potential cancer risk attributable to MBC at the 95% confidence interval. Life-time cancer risk for the total U.S. population for all seasons is calculated to be 2.71 x 10^{-7}. With the addition of grape and pear uses the lifetime cancer risk is 2.89 x 10^{-7}. The most sensitive sub-population is non-hispanic other than black or white, with a cancer risk of 4.56 x 10^{-7}.

5. *Infants and children*. Based on the acute and chronic dietary assessments, there is reasonable certainty of no harm to children who consume food treated with TM. Potential exposure from water or non-occupational exposure is minimal. Inhalation and dermal exposure is unlikely. The acute MOEs for dietary ingestion are large.

The potential of TM to induce toxic effects in children at a greater sensitivity than the general population has been assessed by the rat and rabbit developmental and 2-generation reproduction studies. No major teratogenic or fetotoxic effects were present in the absence of maternal toxicity. The TM 2-generation reproduction study showed thyroid and liver effects in both the parental and first generation pups. The effects were greater in the parental animals than in subsequent generations. This would indicate that there is no greater sensitivity for neo-nates, infants and children to TM than the general population. The reproductive and developmental data base is complete. There is no need to impose an additional safety factor to protect infants and children. Based on the level of potential exposure and similar sensitivity to the adult population, infants and children are well protected by the current TM regulatory policy.

F. International Tolerances

The CODEX Maximum Residue Limits (MRL) for thiophanate-methyl are expressed as the metabolite MBC. The grape MRL is 10 mg/kg and the pear MRL is 5 mg/kg. (Mary Waller)

[FR Doc. 97–20990 Filed 8–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5871–7]

De Minimis Settlement Under Section 122(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, Peerless Industrial Paint Coatings Site, City of St. Louis, St. Louis County, Missouri; Notice of Request for Public Comment

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has entered into a *de minimis* administrative settlement to resolve claims under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9622(g). The settlement is intended to resolve the liability of Westinghouse Electric Corporation (Westinghouse) for the response costs incurred and to be incurred at the Peerless Industrial Paint Coatings Site, City of St. Louis, St. Louis County, Missouri.

DATES: Written comments must be provided on or before September 8, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to the Regional Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region VII, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101 and should refer to: In the Matter of the Peerless Industrial Paint Coatings Superfund Site, City of St. Louis, St. Louis County, Missouri, EPA Docket Nos. VII–97–F–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Denise L. Roberts, Assistant Regional Counsel, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region VII, 726 Minnesota Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas 66101, (913) 551–7559.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Westinghouse Electric Corporation (''Westinghouse'' or *de minimis* party''), the settling party, is a *de minimis* generator of hazardous substances found at the Peerless Industrial Paint Coatings Site, which is the subject Superfund Site. On April 21, 1997, Region VII entered into a *de minimis* administrative settlement to resolve claims under Section 122(g) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622(g).

The Peerless Industrial Paint Coatings Site (the ''Site'') is located in St. Louis at 1265 Lewis Street, St. Louis, Missouri, approximately ¼ mile north of downtown St. Louis in an industrial section of the city. The *de minimis* party, Westinghouse, is a corporation that operated a facility in Manor, Pennsylvania from 1937 until July 1995 which manufactures and sells paints and resins to commercial customers. Westinghouse sold polyester resins and alkyds to Peerless Industrial Paint Coatings (''Peerless''), a St. Louis corporation, at very low prices. Westinghouse admitted that it sold secondary coatings or materials to Peerless at very low prices, which were less than the costs of disposal for hazardous wastes at an authorized permitted facility. Peerless was a manufacturer of paints and magazine coatings that purchased large quantities of paint materials at low prices and accumulated more materials on-site than could be used. In June 1993, the EPA began a removal action at the site. Approximately 3500 drums of hazardous substances that demonstrated the characteristic of ignitability were removed from the facility at the cost of $1,089,062.71.

The settlement has been approved by the U.S. Department of Justice because the response costs in this matter exceed $500,000.00. The EPA estimates the total past and future costs will be approximately $1,342,357.05. Pursuant to the Administrative Order on Consent, the *de minimis* party is responsible for its attributable share of 1.71 percent of the hazardous substances removed from the Site. Westinghouse had agreed to pay a total of $27,920.07 which is further detailed as follows: $17,720.07 is its attributable share of past costs, $5,100.00 is its attributable share of anticipated future costs; and $5,100.00 is a premium of 100% for future cost overruns. The EPA determined these amounts to be the *de minimis* party's fair share of liability based on the amount of hazardous substances found at the Site and contributed by the settling party. The settlement includes contribution protection from lawsuits by other potentially responsible parties as provided for under section 122(g)(5) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622(g)(5).

The *de minimis* settlement provides that the EPA covenants not to sue the *de minimis* party for response costs at the Site or for injunctive relief pursuant to Sections 106 and 107 of CERCLA and section 7003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1980, as amended (RCRA), 42 U.S.C. 6973. The settlement contains a reopener clause which nullifies the covenant not to sue if any information becomes known to the EPA that indicates that the parties no longer meet the criteria for a

de minimis settlement set forth in Section 122(g)(1)(A) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622(g)(1)(A). The covenant not to sue does not apply to the following matters:

(a) Liability for failure to meet a requirement of the Administrative Order on Consent;

(b) Liability resulting from any future arrangement for disposal or treatment of a hazardous substance, pollutant or contaminant at the Site after the effective date of the Administrative Order on Consent;

(c) Criminal liability; or

(d) Liability for damages or injury to, destruction of, or loss of the natural resources.

The *de minimis* settlement will become effective upon the date which the EPA issues a written notice to the party that the statutory public comment period has closed and that comments received, if any, do not require modification of or EPA withdrawal from the settlement.

William Rice,

Acting Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–20978 Filed 8–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

August 4, 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 7, 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 Commissions, 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 collections contact Judy Boley at 202–418–0214 or via internet at jboley@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Approval No.: 3060–XXXX.

Title: Public Notice—Procedures for Petitions for Preemption under Section 253 of the Communications Act.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: New collection.

Respondents: Individuals or households; business or other for-profit entities; state, local or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 60.

Estimated Hour Per Response: 125 hours per response (average).

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 7,500 hours.

Needs and Uses: Section 253 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, added by the Telecommuncations Act of 1996, requires the Commission, with certain important exceptions, to preempt the enforcement of any State or local statute or regulation, or other State or local legal requirement (to the extent necessary) that prohibits or has the effect of prohibiting the ability of any entity to provide any interstate or intrastate telecommunications service. The Commission's consideration of preemption begins with the filing of a petition by an aggrieved party. The petition is placed on public notice and commented on by others. The Commission's decision is based on the public record, generally composed of the petition and comments. The Public Notice the Commission proposed to release establishes guidelines relating to its consideration of preemption petitions. Consideration of a petition requesting Commission action pursuant to Section 253 necessarily will involve state or local statutes, regulations, ordinances, or other legal requirements that will likely be initially unfamiliar to the Commission. In order to render a timely and informed decision, the Commission expects petitioners and commenters to provide it with relevant information sufficient to describe the legal regime involved in the controversy and to establish the factual basis necessary for decision. The Commission will use the information to discharge its statutory mandate relating to the preemption of State or local statutes or regulations, or other State or local legal requirements.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–21036 Filed 8–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Notice of Agency Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the ''Government in the Sunshine Act'' (5 U.S.C. 552b), notice is hereby given that at 10:02 a.m. on Tuesday, August 5, 1997, the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation met in closed session to consider certain corporate, supervisory, and administrative enforcement activities.

In calling the meeting, the Board determined, on motion of Director Joseph H. Neely (Appointive), seconded by Director Nicolas P. Restinas (Acting Director, Office of Thrift Supervision), concurred in by Ms. Leann Britton, acting in the place and stead of Director Eugene A. Ludwig (Comptroller of the Currency), and Acting Chairman Andrew C. Hove, Jr., that Corporation business required its consideration of the matters on less than seven days' notice to the public; that no earlier notice of the meeting was practicable; that the public interest did not require consideration of the matters in a meeting open to public observation; and that the matters could be considered in a closed meeting by authority of subsections (c)(2), (c)(4), (c)(6), (c)(8), (c)(9)(A)(ii), and (c)(10) of the ''Government in the Sunshine Act'' (5 U.S.C. 552b (c)(2), (c)(4), (c)(6), (c)(8), (c)(9)(A)(ii)), and (c)(10)).

The meeting was held in the Board Room of the FDIC Building located at 550 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC

Dated: August 5, 1997.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Robert E. Feldman,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–21124 Filed 8–6–97; 12:39 pm]

BILLING CODE 6714–01–M