document. No Confidential Business Information (CBI) should be submitted through e-mail.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Mark Wilhite, Special Review Branch (7508W), Special Review and Reregistration Division, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20046. Office location, telephone number, and e-mail address: Special Review Branch, 3rd floor, 2800 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, (703) 308–8586, e-mail: wilhite.mark@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background Information

Vinclozolin (trade names Ronilan, Curalan, and Ornilan) is a fungicide first registered in 1981 to control various types of rot caused by *Botrytis spp.*, *Sclerotinia spp*, and other types of mold and blight causing organisms, on strawberries, lettuce (all types), stonefruit, tomatoes, grapes, raspberries, onions, succulent beans, residential turf, recreational areas, golf courses, commercial and industrial sites. Vinclozolin is also registered for use on ornamental plants in green houses and nurseries. BASF, the sole registrant of vinclozolin used on food commodities, sought a new section 3 registration for use of vinclozolin on succulent beans. EPA was unable to make the ''reasonable certainty of no harm'' finding mandated by section 408(b)(2) of the FFDCA for a new succulent beans use and associated tolerances if all existing uses remained in place. To reduce aggregate risk posed by exposure to vinclozolin, and thereby enable the Agency to make a ''reasonable certainty of no harm'' finding for succulent beans and the related tolerances, BASF requested the voluntary cancellation of some registered uses.

II. BASF Request to Amend Registrations

On April 30, 1997, BASF submitted a written request to EPA seeking to amend the registrations for vinclozolin. Specifically, BASF requested that EPA delete from registration numbers 7969-53, 7969-57, 7969-62, and 7969-85 the use of vinclozolin on plums, including plums grown for prunes, grapes, tomatoes, residential turf, and turf in parks, school grounds, and recreational areas.

III. Deletions Pursuant to Voluntary Requests

Under section 6(f)(1) of FIFRA, registrants may request at any time that EPA amend a pesticide registration to delete one or more uses (7 U.S.C. 136d(f)(1)). Consistent with 6(f)(1) of FIFRA, EPA is publishing a notice of receipt of the request and allowing 30 days for public comment.

IV. Existing Stocks

Effective immediately, all vinclozolin products being manufactured must reflect the changes described in this notice. Retailers, distributors, and end-users may sell, distribute, or use products with the previously approved labeling which are already in channels of trade until such supplies are exhausted.

V. Proposed Use Deletion

The use deletions will take effect on October 14, 1997 unless before that date EPA publishes a notice in the **Federal Register** modifying this proposed order.

EPA approves BASF's request to delete plums, including plums grown for prunes, grapes, tomatoes, residential turf, and turf in parks, school grounds, and recreational areas from vinclozolin products with EPA registration numbers 7969-53, 7969-57, 7969-62, and 7969-85.

VI. Public Comment Procedures

EPA invites interested parties to submit written comments in response to this notice. Comments must be submitted by September 12, 1997. Comments must bear a document control number. Three copies of the comments should be submitted to either location under ''ADDRESSES'' at the beginning of this notice.

Information submitted as a comment concerning this notice may be claimed confidential by marking any or all that information as Confidential Business Information (CBI). EPA will not disclose information so marked, except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A second copy of such comments, with the CBI deleted, also must be submitted for the public for inclusion in the public record. EPA may publicly disclose without prior notice information not marked confidential.

VII. Rulemaking Record

The official record for this notice, as well as the public version, has been established for this document under docket number ''OPP–66243'' (including comments and data submitted electronically as described below). A public version of this record, including printed, paper versions of electronic comments, which does not include any information claimed as CBI, is available for inspection from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The official record is located at the address in ''ADDRESSES'' at the beginning of this document.

Electronic comments can be sent directly to EPA at:

opp-docket@epamail.epa.gov

Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Comment and data will also be accepted on disks in Wordperfect 5.1 file format or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket number OPP–66243. Electronic comments on this document may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Use deletions.

Dated: August 7, 1997.

Jack E. Housinger,

Acting Director, Special Review and Reregistration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 97–21411 Filed 8–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

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

August 7, 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 September 12, 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: 3060–0774.

Title: Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96–45.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

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

Number of Respondents: 5,565,451.

Estimated Time Per Response: 3.1 hours (avg.).

Cost to Respondents: N/A.

Total Annual Burden: 1,784,220 hours.

Needs and Uses: Congress has directed the Commission to implement a new set of universal service support mechanisms that are explicit and sufficient to advance the universal service principles enumerated in Section 254 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and such other principles as the Commission believes are necessary and appropriate for the protection of the public interest, convenience and necessity, and are consistent with the Act.

In the Report and Order, the Commission promulgates the rules and requirements to preserve and advance universal service. The collections are necessary to implement Section 254.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–21367 Filed 8–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[FCC 97–264]

Supplemental Pleading Cycle Established for Comments on Petition for Declaratory Ruling of the Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association

Released: July 28, 1997.

On December 16, 1996, the Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association (CTIA) filed a Petition for Declaratory Ruling (''CTIA Petition'') requesting that the Commission preempt moratoria imposed by state and local governments on the siting of telecommunications facilities. On December 18, 1996, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau issued a public notice, 62 FR 04047 (January 28, 1997), seeking comment on the CTIA Petition. CTIA and the supporting commenters contend that the Commission has the jurisdiction under Section 253(a) and 332(c)(3) of the Communications Act to preempt local siting moratoria because such moratoria are not individual land use ''decisions'' or ''disputes,'' which Congress has stated are to be reviewed by the courts under Section 332(c)(7) of the Communications Act, but rather are blanket ordinances that act as barriers to entry.

Following the submission of the comments on the CTIA Petition, representatives from CTIA and four wireless companies made ex parte presentations in which they raised additional issues and arguments. In the ex parte presentations, the representatives recommended that the Commission adopt guidelines for local moratoria. Specifically, they asked that we find that:

(1) All siting moratoria that exceed 90 days (current and prospective) are invalid and preempted as impermissible entry regulation of Commercial Mobile Radio Services (CMRS).

(2) Moratoria of open-ended duration constitute per se violations of Sections 253(a) and 332(c)(3) of the Communications Act.

(3) Moratoria that preclude the filing and processing of applications constitute per se violations.

(4) Moratoria that discriminate against new CMRS providers by allowing certain CMRS licensees to build and modify facilities while new entrants are precluded from deploying services should be declared per se invalid entry regulation.

(5) Moratoria based directly or indirectly on radiofrequency (RF) emissions and related health concerns should be per se preempted.

The Commission also received numerous comments and other ex parte filings arguing that the Commission does not have the jurisdiction to preempt state and local siting moratoria. Most recently, on July 15, 1997, the Commission's Local and State Government Advisory Committee (LSGAC) submitted an ex parte letter in which it argued that Congress had made clear its intent to protect state and local authority over the siting of personal wireless service facilities from interference by the Commission. LSGAC argued that neither Section 332(c)(3)(A) nor Section 253 of the Communications Act govern the adoption of siting moratoria by local governments. LSGAC contends that Section 332(c)(7) of the Communications Act provides that it is the only section of the Act that affects local land use authority over personal wireless service facilities and that Section 332(c)(7) reserves to courts of competent jurisdiction the settlement of local zoning disputes.

Based on our review of the record received in response to the CTIA Petition and the subsequent ex parte filings, we tentatively conclude that, pursuant to Sections 253(d) and 332(c)(3) of the Communications Act, we have the authority to consider whether local facility siting moratoria may prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting the ability of wireless service providers to offer service in violation of Section 253(a) or whether moratoria constitute local regulation of CMRS entry prohibited by Section 332(c)(3). We recognize that, pursuant to Section 332(c)(7)(B)(v), parties adversely affected by decisions regarding the placement, construction, and modification of personal wireless service facilities that are inconsistent with the limitations set forth in Sections 332(c)(7)(B)(i)-(iii) are directed to seek relief from a ''court of competent jurisdiction.'' We believe that Section 332(c)(7)(B)(v) does not, however, limit our authority to review local facility siting moratoria which may constitute entry barriers under Sections 253(d) or entry regulations under 332(c)(3). In this regard, certain moratoria, especially moratoria of unlimited duration, may constitute impermissible CMRS entry regulation or may prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting CMRS entry into a local marketplace. Accordingly, to the extent that moratoria of unlimited or unspecified duration may constitute barriers to the provision of telecommunications services, we believe that we have the jurisdiction to preclude such moratoria under Section