

mandatory only where a pesticide's registration has been suspended and canceled. Finally, BASF requested EPA provide advance public notice of its voluntary cancellation proposal. This notice provides the public with such notice. EPA will also publish the existing stocks provisions that are established if the requested termination is approved.

#### VII. Public Record and Electronic Submissions

The official record for this action, as well as the public version, has been established for this action under docket control number "OPP-66257" (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 Virginia 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 5.1/6.1 or ASCII file format. All comments and data in electronic form must be identified by the docket control number "OPP-66257." Electronic comments on this action may be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

#### List of Subjects

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

Dated: July 23, 1998.

#### Jack E. Housenger,

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

[FR Doc. 98-20410 Filed 7-29-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6132-9]

#### Proposed Settlement Under Section 122(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act: Woodward Metal Processing Site

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of proposed administrative settlement and opportunity for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to enter into an administrative settlement to resolve certain claims under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended (CERCLA). Notification is being published to inform the public of the proposed settlement and of the opportunity to comment. This settlement is intended to resolve 19 parties' liability for certain response costs incurred by EPA at the Woodward Metal Processing Superfund Site in Jersey City, New Jersey.

**DATES:** Comments must be provided on or before August 31, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be addressed to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Regional Counsel, 290 Broadway—17th Floor, New York, NY 10007, and should refer to: In the Matter of the Woodward Metal Processing Superfund Site: Woodward Metal Processing Administrative Settlement, under section 122 (h) of CERCLA, U.S. EPA Index No. II-CERCLA-98-0110.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Regional Counsel, 290 Broadway—17th Floor, New York, NY 10007; Attention: Virginia A. Curry, Esq. (212) 637-3134, or curry.virginia@epa.mail.epa.gov

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In accordance with section 122(i)(1) of CERCLA, notification is hereby given of a proposed administrative settlement concerning the Woodward Metal Processing Superfund Site located in Jersey City, New Jersey. Section 122(h) of CERCLA provides EPA with authority to settle certain claims for costs incurred by the United States when the settlement is in the public interest and has received the approval of the Attorney General. Parties will pay a total of \$1,795,051 to reimburse EPA for response costs incurred at the

Woodward Metal Processing Superfund Site.

Dated: July 20, 1998.

**Jeanne M. Fox,**

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 98-20415 Filed 7-29-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

#### FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

#### Change in Bank Control Notices; Acquisitions of Shares of Banks or Bank Holding Companies

The notificants listed below have applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notices are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The notices also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for that notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than August 14, 1998.

**A. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis** (Karen L. Grandstrand, Vice President) 90 Hennepin Avenue, P.O. Box 291, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480-0291:

1. *Adeline M. Morgan*, Montgomery, Minnesota; to acquire voting shares of F and O, Inc., Montgomery, Minnesota, and thereby indirectly acquire voting shares of First National Bank of Montgomery, Montgomery, Minnesota.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, July 27, 1998.

**Robert deV. Frierson,**

Associate Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 98-20381 Filed 7-29-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-F

#### FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

#### Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR Part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or

bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. The application also will be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act. Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than August 24, 1998.

**A. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta** (Lois Berthaume, Vice President) 104 Marietta Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303-2713:

1. *Alabama National BanCorporation*, Birmingham, Alabama; to merge with Community Financial Corporation, Mableton, Georgia, and thereby indirectly acquire Georgia State Bank, Mableton, Georgia.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, July 27, 1998.

**Robert deV. Frierson,**

*Associate Secretary of the Board.*

[FR Doc. 98-20380 Filed 7-29-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-F

---

## FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Federal Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The FTC has submitted to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act information collection requirements stemming from (1) a regulation that the Commission enforces and (2) a study to assess the effectiveness of Commission divestiture orders in merger cases. On May 13, 1998, the FTC solicited comments concerning these information collection requirements. No comments were received. The current Office of Management and Budget (OMB) clearances expire on July 31, 1998. The FTC proposes that OMB extend its

approval for the regulation an additional three years from clearance expiration and that approval for the divestiture order study be extended through December 31, 1999.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before August 31, 1998.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** Send written comments to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, New Executive Office Building, Room 10202, Washington, D.C. 20503, ATTN: Edward Clarke, Desk Officer for the Federal Trade Commission, and to Gary M. Greenfield, Office of the General Counsel, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C. 20580, (202) 326-2753. All comments should be identified as responding to this notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for additional information or copies of the proposed information collection requirements should be addressed to Gary M. Greenfield at the address listed above.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FTC has submitted requests for OMB review of the two items described below. Further information concerning the entities subject to, and the burden estimates for, these requirements can be found at 63 FR 26607 (May 13, 1998). The relevant information collection requirements are as follows.

#### 1. **The Telemarketing Sales Rule, 16 CFR Part 310 (OMB Control Number 3084-0097).**

*Description of the information collection and proposed use:* The Telemarketing Sales Rule implements the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act, 15 U.S.C. 6101-6108 ("Telemarketing Act" or "the Act"). The Act seeks to prevent deceptive or abusive telemarketing practices. As specified by the Act, the Telemarketing Rule mandates certain disclosures regarding telephone sales and requires telemarketers to retain certain records regarding advertising, sales, and employees. The disclosures provide consumers with information necessary to make informed purchasing decisions. The records are to be made available for inspection by the Commission and other law enforcement personnel to determine compliance with the Rule.

*Estimate of information collection annual hours burden:* 2,301,000 hours.

The estimated recordkeeping burden is 50,000 hours for all industry members affected by the Rule. The estimated burden related to the disclosures that the Rule requires is 2,251,000 hours (rounded to nearest thousand) for all

affected industry members, for a total of 2,301,000 burden hours.

*Recordkeeping:* At the time the Commission issued the Rule, it estimated that during the initial and subsequent years after the Rule took effect, 100 new telemarketing entities per year would find it necessary to revise their practices to conform with the Rule and that it would take each such entity approximately 100 hours to develop a compliant recordkeeping system, for a total of 10,000 burden hours a year. The Commission received no comments of any kind in connection with this estimate when it was issued and this estimate continues to be appropriate. There is no reason to believe that the number of new entrants into the telemarketing field who find it necessary to revise their recordkeeping system as a result of the Rule's recordkeeping requirements has increased. Of the estimated 39,900 industry members who have already assembled and retained the required records in their recordkeeping systems, staff estimates that each member requires only one hour per year to file and store records required by the Rule. This estimate was rounded up to 40,000 hours. Therefore, the total yearly burden hours associated with the Rule's recordkeeping requirements is 50,000.

*Disclosure:* Staff previously calculated the burden associated with the Rule's disclosure requirements based primarily on the total number of telemarketing calls and the amount of time needed to make the required basic disclosures, as well as the number of calls resulting in sales and the amount of time needed to make the additional disclosures required before a customer pays for goods or services. While this methodology remains appropriate in large part, staff has determined that the resulting burden estimate substantially overstates the impact of the Rule unless the analysis is refined to take into account the number of firms that would make the required disclosures even in the absence of the Rule.

As noted above, the purpose of the Rule's disclosure provisions is to help prevent consumer injury from deceptive or abusive telemarketing practices by ensuring that telemarketers provide consumers with information they need to avoid being misled. In fact, however, the vast majority of telemarketing firms are legitimate businesses. Although telemarketing fraud causes significant harm to consumers—Congress has estimated that misrepresentations or material omissions in telemarketing sales presentations result in \$3 billion to \$40 billion annually in consumer injury—the harm caused by