other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity is also considered. There is no reliable information to indicate that toxic effects produced by cyhalofop-butyl, cyhalofop-acid and cyhalofop-diacid would be cumulative with those of any other pesticide chemical. Thus, it is appropriate to consider only the potential risks of cyhalofop-butyl and cyhalofop-acid in an aggregate exposure assessment.

E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population.* Using the conservative exposure assumptions described above, and based on the completeness and reliability of the toxicity data, aggregate exposure to cyhalofop-butyl, as determined under the guidance of the FQPA, will utilize no more than 1.3% of the reference dose (RfD) from the dietary exposure for all subgroups of the U.S. population. Generally, and under the FQPA, EPA has no concern for exposures below 100% of the RfD because the RfD represents the level at or below which daily aggregate dietary exposure over a lifetime will not pose appreciable risks to human health. Therefore, there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from exposure to cyhalofop-butyl residues.

2. *Infants and children.* Data from developmental toxicity studies in rats and rabbits and a multigeneration reproduction study in the rat are considered in assessing the potential for additional sensitivity of infants and children to residues of cyhalofop-butyl. The developmental toxicity studies are designed to evaluate adverse effects on the developing organism resulting from pesticide exposure during prenatal development. Reproduction studies provide information relating to effects from exposure of both parents to the pesticide on the reproductive capability and potential systemic toxicity of mating animals and on various parameters associated with the well-being of offspring. FFDCA section 408 provides that EPA may apply an additional safety factor for infants and children in the case of threshold effects to account for prenatal and postnatal toxicity and the completeness of the data base. Based on the current toxicological data requirements, the data base for cyhalofop-butyl relative to prenatal and postnatal effects for children is complete. Overall, cyhalofop-butyl had no effect on reproduction or embryo-fetal development at any dosage tested. Further, for cyhalofop-butyl, the no observed adverse effect level (NOAEL) in the chronic mouse study (0.3 mg/kg/day), which was used to calculate the RfD (0.003 mg/kg/day), is already lower than the NOAELs from the developmental studies in rats and rabbits. Therefore, an additional FQPA uncertainty factor is not needed and the RfD at 0.003 mg/kg/day is appropriate for assessing risk to infants and children. Using the conservative exposure assumptions previously described, the percent RfD utilized by the potential aggregate exposure to residues of cyhalofop-butyl on rice is about 1.3% for non-nursing infants, the most sensitive population subgroup. Therefore, based on the completeness and reliability of the toxicity data and the conservative exposure assessment, Dow AgroSciences LLC concludes that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to cyhalofop-butyl on rice.

F. International Tolerances

There is no Codex maximum residue level established for residues of cyhalofop-butyl, cyhalofop-acid and cyhalofop-diacid on any food or feed crop.

[FR Doc. 01–10122 Filed 4–24–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[PF–1018; FRL–6778–4]

Notice of Filing a Pesticide Petition to Establish a Tolerance for a Certain Pesticide Chemical in or on Food

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the initial filing of a pesticide petition proposing the establishment of regulations for residues of a certain pesticide chemical in or on various food commodities.

DATES: Comments, identified by docket control number PF–1018, must be received on or before May 25, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted by mail, electronically, or in person. Please follow the detailed instructions for each method as provided in Unit I.C. of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number PF–1018 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Leonard Cole, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone number: (703) 305–5412; e-mail address: cole.leonard@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. General Information

A. Does this Action Apply to Me?

You may be affected by this action if you are an agricultural producer, food manufacturer or pesticide manufacturer. Potentially affected categories and entities may include, but are not limited to:

Categories	NAICS codes	Examples of potentially affected entities
Industry	111 112 311 32532	Crop production Animal production Food manufacturing Pesticide manufacturing

This listing is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather provides a guide for readers regarding entities likely to be affected by this action. Other types of entities not listed in the table could also be affected. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes have been provided to assist you and others in determining whether or not this action might apply to certain entities. If you have questions regarding the applicability of this action to a particular entity, consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

B. How Can I Get Additional Information, Including Copies of this Document and Other Related Documents?

1. *Electronically.* You may obtain electronic copies of this document, and certain other related documents that might be available electronically, from the EPA Internet Home Page at http://www.epa.gov/. To access this document, on the Home Page select ''Laws and Regulations,'' ''Regulations and Proposed Rules,'' and then look up the entry for this document under the ''**Federal Register**—Environmental Documents.'' You can also go directly to the **Federal Register** listings at http://www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/.

2. *In person.* The Agency has established an official record for this action under docket control number PF–1018. The official record consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, any public comments received during an applicable comment period, and other information related to this action, including any information

claimed as confidential business information (CBI). This official record includes the documents that are physically located in the docket, as well as the documents that are referenced in those documents. The public version of the official record does not include any information claimed as CBI. The public version of the official record, which includes printed, paper versions of any electronic comments submitted during an applicable comment period, is available for inspection in the Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The PIRIB telephone number is (703) 305–5805.

C. How and to Whom Do I Submit Comments?

You may submit comments through the mail, in person, or electronically. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, it is imperative that you identify docket control number PF–1018 in the subject line on the first page of your response.

1. *By mail*. Submit your comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460.

2. *In person or by courier*. Deliver your comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA. The PIRIB is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The PIRIB telephone number is (703) 305–5805.

3. *Electronically*. You may submit your comments electronically by e-mail to: opp-docket@epa.gov, or you can submit a computer disk as described above. Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. Avoid the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Electronic submissions will be accepted in Wordperfect 6.1/8.0 or ASCII file format. All comments in electronic form must be identified by docket control number PF–1018. Electronic comments may also be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

D. How Should I Handle CBI That I Want to Submit to the Agency?

Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. You may claim information that you submit to EPA in response to this document as CBI by marking any part or all of that information as CBI. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes any information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public version of the official record. Information not marked confidential will be included in the public version of the official record without prior notice. If you have any questions about CBI or the procedures for claiming CBI, please consult the person identified under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

E. What Should I Consider as I Prepare My Comments for EPA?

You may find the following suggestions helpful for preparing your comments:

1. Explain your views as clearly as possible.
2. Describe any assumptions that you used.
3. Provide copies of any technical information and/or data you used that support your views.
4. If you estimate potential burden or costs, explain how you arrived at the estimate that you provide.
5. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns.
6. Make sure to submit your comments by the deadline in this notice.
7. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, be sure to identify the docket control number assigned to this action in the subject line on the first page of your response. You may also provide the name, date, and **Federal Register** citation.

II. What Action is the Agency Taking?

EPA has received a pesticide petition as follows proposing the establishment and/or amendment of regulations for residues of a certain pesticide chemical in or on various food commodities under section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a. EPA has determined that this petition contains data or information regarding the elements set forth in section 408(d)(2); however, EPA has not fully evaluated the sufficiency of the submitted data at this time or whether the data support granting of the petition. Additional data may be needed before EPA rules on the petition.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Agricultural commodities, Feed additives, Food additives, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: April 9, 2001.

James Jones,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Summary of Petition

The petitioner summary of the pesticide petition is printed below as required by section 408(d)(3) of the FFDCA. The summary of the petition was prepared by the petitioner and represents the view of the petitioner. EPA is publishing the petition summary verbatim without editing it in any way. The petition summary announces the availability of a description of the analytical methods available to EPA for the detection and measurement of the pesticide chemical residues or an explanation of why no such method is needed.

FMC Corp.

PP 1F6266

EPA has received a pesticide petition (PP 1F6266) from FMC Corp., 1735 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103 proposing, pursuant to section 408(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d), to amend 40 CFR part 180 by establishing a tolerance for residues of bifenthrin ((2-methyl 1,1′-biphenyl-3-yl) methyl-3-(2-chloro-3,3,3,-trifluoro-1-propenyl)-2,2-dimethylcyclopropanecarboxylate) in or on the raw agricultural commodity citrus fruits at 0.05 parts per million (ppm). EPA has determined that the petition contains data or information regarding the elements set forth in section 408(d)(2) of the FFDCA; however, EPA has not fully evaluated the sufficiency of the submitted data at this time or whether the data support granting of the petition. Additional data may be needed before EPA rules on the petition.

A. Residue Chemistry

1. *Plant metabolism*. The metabolism of bifenthrin in plants is adequately understood. Studies have been conducted to delineate the metabolism of radiolabelled bifenthrin in various crops all showing similar results. The residue of concern is the parent compound only.

2. *Analytical method*. There is a practical analytical method for detecting and measuring levels of bifenthrin in or on food with a limit of detection that allows monitoring of food with residues at or above the levels set in these tolerances (Gas Chromatography with Electron Capture Detection (GC/ECD) analytical method P-2132M, PP 0E3921, MRID 41658601).

3. *Magnitude of residues*. Field residue trials meeting EPA study requirements have been conducted at the maximum label rate for the crop subgroup leaf petioles. Results from these trials demonstrate that the highest bifenthrin residues found will not exceed the proposed tolerance of 2.0 ppm when the product is applied following the proposed use directions.

B. Toxicological Profile

1. *Acute toxicity*. For the purposes of assessing acute dietary risk, FMC has used the maternal NOAEL of 1.0 mg/kg/day from the oral developmental toxicity study in rats. The maternal lowest effect level (LEL) of this study of 2.0 mg/kg/day was based on tremors from day 7–17 of dosing. This acute dietary endpoint is used to determine acute dietary risks to all population subgroups.

2. *Genotoxicity*. The following genotoxicity tests were all negative: gene mutation in Salmonella (Ames); chromosomal aberrations in Chinese hamster ovary and rat bone marrow cells; HGPRT locus mutation in mouse lymphoma cells; and unscheduled DNA synthesis in rat hepatocytes.

3. *Reproductive and developmental toxicity*—i.*Rat reproduction study*. Parental toxicity occurred as decreased body weight at 5.0 milligrams/kilograms/day (mg/kg/day) with a no observed adverse effect level (NOAEL) of 3.0 mg/kg/day. There were no developmental (pup) or reproductive effects up to 5.0 mg/kg/day (highest dose tested).

ii. *Postnatal sensitivity*. Based on the absence of pup toxicity up to dose levels which produced toxicity in the parental animals, there is no evidence of special postnatal sensitivity to infants and children in the rat reproduction study.

4. *Subchronic toxicity*. The maternal NOAEL of 1.0 mg/kg/day from the oral developmental toxicity study in rats is also used for short- and intermediate-term margins of exposure (MOE) calculations (as well as acute, discussed in (1) above). The maternal LEL of this study of 2.0 mg/kg/day was based on tremors from day 7–17 of dosing.

5. *Chronic toxicity*—i. The reference dose (RfD) has been established at 0.015 mg/kg/day. This RfD is based on a 1–year oral feeding study in dogs with a NOAEL of 1.5 mg/kg/day, based on intermittent tremors observed at the lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) of 3.0 mg/kg/day; an uncertainty factor of 100 is used.

ii. Bifenthrin is classified as a Group C chemical (possible human carcinogen) based upon urinary bladder tumors in mice; assignment of a Q* has not been recommended.

6. *Animal metabolism*. The metabolism of bifenthrin in animals is adequately understood. Metabolism studies in rats with single doses demonstrated that about 90% of the parent compound and its hydroxylated metabolites are excreted.

7. *Metabolite toxicology*. The Agency has previously determined that the metabolites of bifenthrin are not of toxicological concern and need not be included in the tolerance expression.

8. *Endocrine disruption*. No special studies investigating potential estrogenic or other endocrine effects of bifenthrin have been conducted. However, no evidence of such effects was reported in the standard battery of required toxicology studies, which have been completed and found acceptable. Based on these studies, there is no evidence to suggest that bifenthrin has an adverse effect on the endocrine system.

C. Aggregate Exposure

1. *Dietary exposure*—i. *Food*. Tolerances have been established for the residues of bifenthrin, in or on a variety of raw agricultural commodities. Tolerances, in support of registrations, currently exist for residues of bifenthrin on the following crops: hops, strawberries, corn (grain, forage and fodder), sweet corn, eggplant, cottonseed, artichokes, peppers (bell and non-bell), lettuce (head) and grapes. Also for the crop group cucurbit vegetables and the subgroups edible-podded legume, succulent shelled peas, caneberries and brassica (head and stem). Also, for the livestock commodities of cattle, goats, hogs, horses, sheep, poultry, eggs and milk. Pending tolerances for citrus, bananas, peanuts, pears, potatoes, spinach and the subgroup herbs also exist. For the purposes of assessing the potential dietary exposure for these existing and pending tolerances, FMC has utilized available information on anticipated residues, monitoring data and percent crop treated as follows:

a. *Acute exposure and risk*. Acute dietary exposure risk assessments are performed for a food-use pesticide if a toxicological study has indicated the possibility of an effect of concern occurring as a result of a 1 day or single exposure. For the purposes of assessing acute dietary risk for bifenthrin, the maternal NOAEL of 1.0 mg/kg/day from the oral developmental toxicity study in rats was used. The maternal LEL of this study of 2.0 mg/kg/day was based on tremors from day 7–17 of dosing. This acute dietary endpoint was used to determine acute dietary risks to all population subgroups. Available information on anticipated residues, monitoring data and percent crop treated was incorporated into a Tier 3 analysis; using Monte Carlo modeling for commodities that may be consumed in a single serving. These assessments show that the MOEs are greater than the EPA standard of 100 for all subpopulations. The 99.9th percentile of exposure for the overall U. S. population was estimated to be 0.004291 mg/kg/day (MOE of 233). The 99.9th percentile of exposure for all infants less than 1 year old was estimated to be 0.002903 mg/kg/day (MOE of 344). The 99.9th percentile of exposure for nursing infants less than 1 year old was estimated to be 0.002058 mg/kg/day (MOE of 485). The 99.9th percentile of exposure for non-nursing infants less than 1 year old was estimated to be 0.003030 mg/kg/day (MOE of 330). The 99.9th percentile of exposure for children 1 to 6 years old (the most highly exposed population subgroup) was estimated to be 0.008328 mg/kg/day (MOE of 120). Therefore, FMC concludes that the acute dietary risk of bifenthrin, as estimated by the dietary risk assessment, does not appear to be of concern.

b. *Chronic exposure and risk*. The acceptable RfD is based on a NOAEL of 1.5 mg/kg/day from the chronic dog study and an uncertainty factor of 100 is 0.015 mg/kg/day. The endpoint effect of concern was tremors in both sexes of dogs at the LEL of 3.0 mg/kg/day. A chronic dietary exposure/risk assessment has been performed for bifenthrin using the above RfD. The chronic exposures are estimated to be 0.000165 mg/kg body weight (bwt)/day and utilize 1.1% of the RfD for the overall U.S. population. Children 1-6 years old (subgroups most highly exposed) is estimated to be 0.000342 mg/kg bwt/day and utilizes 2.3% of the RfD. Generally speaking, the EPA has no cause for concern if the total dietary exposure from residues for uses for which there are published and proposed tolerances is less than 100% of the RfD. Therefore, FMC concludes that the chronic dietary risk of bifenthrin, as estimated by the dietary risk

assessment, does not appear to be of concern.

ii. *Drinking water*. Laboratory and field data have demonstrated that bifenthrin is immobile in soil and will not leach into ground water. Other data show that bifenthrin is virtually insoluble in water and extremely lipophilic. As a result, FMC concludes that residues reaching surface waters from field runoff will quickly adsorb to sediment particles and be partitioned from the water column. Further, a screening evaluation of leaching potential of a typical pyrethroid was conducted using EPA's Pesticide Root Zone Model (PRZM3). Based on this screening assessment, the potential concentrations of a pyrethroid in ground water at depths of 1 and 2 meters are essentially zero (<<0.001 parts per billion (ppb)). Surface water concentrations for pyrethroids were estimated using PRZM3 and Exposure Analysis Modeling System (EXAMS) using standard EPA cotton runoff and Mississippi pond scenarios. The maximum concentration predicted in the simulated pond was 0.052 ppb. Concentrations in actual drinking water would be much lower than the levels predicted in the hypothetical, small, stagnant farm pond model since drinking water derived from surface water would normally be treated before consumption. Based on these analyses, the contribution of water to the dietary risk estimate is negligible. Therefore, FMC concludes that together these data indicate that residues are not expected to occur in drinking water.

2. *Non-dietary exposure*. Laboratory and field data have demonstrated that bifenthrin is immobile in soil and will not leach into ground water. Other data show that bifenthrin is virtually insoluble in water and extremely lipophilic. As a result, FMC concludes that residues reaching surface waters from field runoff will quickly adsorb to sediment particles and be partitioned from the water column. Further, a screening evaluation of leaching potential of a typical pyrethroid was conducted using EPA's PRZM3. Based on this screening assessment, the potential concentrations of a pyrethroid in ground water at depths of 1 and 2 meters are essentially zero (<<0.001 parts per billion). Surface water concentrations for pyrethroids were estimated using PRZM3 and EXAMS using standard EPA cotton runoff and Mississippi pond scenarios. The maximum concentration predicted in the simulated pond was 0.052 ppb. Concentrations in actual drinking water would be much lower than the levels predicted in the hypothetical, small, stagnant farm pond model since drinking water derived from surface water would normally be treated before consumption. Based on these analyses, the contribution of water to the dietary risk estimate is negligible. Therefore, FMC concludes that together these data indicate that residues are not expected to occur in drinking water.

D. Cumulative Effects

In consideration of potential cumulative effects of bifenthrin and other substances that may have a common mechanism of toxicity, to our knowledge there are currently no available data or other reliable information indicating that any toxic effects produced by bifenthrin would be cumulative with those of other chemical compounds; thus only the potential risks of bifenthrin have been considered in this assessment of its aggregate exposure. FMC intends to submit information for EPA to consider concerning potential cumulative effects of bifenthrin consistent with the schedule established by EPA at 62 FR 42020 (August 4, 1997) and other EPA publications pursuant to the FQPA.

E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population*. For the overall U.S. population, the calculated MOE at the 95th percentile was estimated to be 619; 348 at the 99th percentile; and 176 at the 99.9th percentile. For all infants less than 1 year old, the calculated MOE at the 95th percentile was estimated to be 532; 233 at the 99th percentile; and 169 at the 99.9th percentile. For nursing infants less than 1 year old, the calculated MOE at the 95th percentile was estimated to be 1,309; 450 at the 99th percentile; and 240 at the 99.9th percentile. For non-nursing infants less than 1 year old, the calculated MOE at the 95th percentile was estimated to be 474; 181 at the 99th percentile; and 168 at the 99.9th percentile. For the most highly exposed population subgroup, children1–6 years old, the calculated MOE at the 95th percentile was estimated to be 320; 208 at the 99th percentile; and 100 at the 99.9th percentile. Therefore, FMC concludes that there is reasonable certainty that no harm will result from acute exposure to bifenthrin.

2. *Infants and children*—i. *General*. In assessing the potential for additional sensitivity of infants and children to residues of bifenthrin, FMC considered data from developmental toxicity studies in the rat and rabbit, and a two-generation reproductive study in the rat. The developmental toxicity studies are designed to evaluate adverse effects on the developing organism resulting from pesticide exposure during prenatal development to one or both parents. Reproduction studies provide information relating to effects from exposure to the pesticide on the reproductive capability of mating animals and data on systemic toxicity. FFDCA section 408 provides that EPA may apply an additional margin of safety for infants and children in the case of threshold effects to account for prenatal and postnatal toxicity and the completeness of the data base.

ii. *Developmental toxicity studies*. In the rabbit developmental study, there were no developmental effects observed in the fetuses exposed to bifenthrin. The maternal NOAEL was 2.67 mg/kg/day based on head and forelimb twitching at the LOAEL of 4 mg/kg/day. In the rat developmental study, the maternal NOAEL was 1 mg/kg/day, based on tremors at the LOAEL of 2 mg/kg/day. The developmental (pup) NOAEL was also 1 mg/kg/day, based upon increased incidence of hydroureter at the LOAEL 2 mg/kg/day. There was 5/23 (22%) litters affected (5/141 fetuses since each litter only had one affected fetus) in the 2 mg/kg/day group, compared with zero in the control, 1, and 0.5 mg/kg/day groups. According to recent historical data (1992-1994) for this strain of rat, incidence of distended ureter averaged 11% with a maximum incidence of 90%.

iii. *Reproductive toxicity study*. In the rat reproduction study, parental toxicity occurred as decreased body weight at 5.0 mg/kg/day with a NOAEL of 3.0 mg/kg/day. There were no developmental (pup) or reproductive effects up to 5.0 mg/kg/day (highest dose tested).

iv. *Prenatal and postnatal sensitivity*—a.*Prenatal*. Since there was not a dose-related finding of hydroureter in the rat developmental study and in the presence of similar incidences in the recent historical control data, the marginal finding of hydroureter in rat fetuses at 2 mg/kg/day (in the presence of maternal toxicity) is not considered a significant developmental finding. Nor does it provide sufficient evidence of a special dietary risk (either acute or chronic) for infants and children which would require an additional safety factor.

b. *Postnatal*. Based on the absence of pup toxicity up to dose levels, which produced toxicity in the parental animals, there is no evidence of special postnatal sensitivity to infants and children in the rat reproduction study.

v. *Conclusion*. Based on the above, FMC concludes that reliable data support use of the standard 100-fold uncertainty factor, and that an additional uncertainty factor is not

needed to protect the safety of infants and children. As stated above, aggregate exposure assessments utilized less than 10% of the RfD for either the entire U. S. population or any of the 26 population subgroups including infants and children. Therefore, it may be concluded that there is reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from aggregate exposure to bifenthrin residues.

F. International Tolerances

There are no Codex, Canadian, or Mexican residue limits for the residue of bifenthrin in or on leaf petioles.

[FR Doc. 01–10125 Filed 4–24–01 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Public Information Collections Approved by Office of Management and Budget

April 17, 2001.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has received Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for the following public information collections pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. An agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. For further information contact Shoko B. Hair, Federal Communications Commission, (202) 418–1379.

Federal Communications Commission

OMB Control No.: 3060–0741.

Expiration Date: 4/30/2004.

Title: Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96–98, Second Report and Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order, Second Order on Reconsideration, CC docket No. 99–273, First Report and Order.

Form No.: N/A.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Estimated Annual Burden: 2000 respondents; 114 hours per response (avg.); 228,030 total annual burden hours (for all collections approved under this control number).

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Cost Burden: $60,000.

Frequency of Response: On occasion; Third Party Disclosure.

Description: In the First Report and Order issued in CC Docket No. 99–273 (FCC 01–27), released January 23, 2001, the Commission adopted several of its tentative conclusions. The Commission concluded that the phrase ''in any format'' found in section 222(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, brings within the protections of section 222(e) those entities that seek subscriber list information to publish directories on the Internet. That phrase ''in any format'' makes clear Congress' intent not to restrict the kinds of directories that could be published using subscriber list information obtained pursuant to section 222(e). Internet databases that contain subscriber list information clearly fall within the very broad category of ''directories in any format.'' In order for directory publishers to provide accurate directory listings, it is essential that publishers have access to the subscriber list information local exchange carriers (LECs) acquire from their customers. (*No. of respondents:* 2000; *hours per response:* 8 hours; *total annual burden:* 16,000 hours). The Commission determined that competing directory assistance (DA) providers that offer call completion services for local or toll calls, provide telephone exchange, or telephone toll services, respectively, and thus qualify for nondiscriminatory access to LEC local directory assistance databases. The Commission also determined that because LECs do not have monopoly control over national directory assistance databases that LECs obtain from third parties, that LECs are not required to grant competing directory assistance providers nondiscriminatory access to such non-local directory assistance databases. The Commission concluded that LECs should not be required to provide nondicriminatory access to nonlocal directory listings since third parties have the same opportunities to secure the information directly. However, to the extent that a carrier provides access to national DA information to any other DA provider, including another LEC, it must make that same information available to competing DA providers under nondiscriminatory rates, terms, and conditions. The Commission concluded that when a competitive local exchange carrier (CLEC) or an interexchange carrier (IXC) (having entered an interconnection agreement with the relevant LEC) designates a DA provider to act as their agent, that competing DA provider is entitled to nondiscriminatory access to the providing LEC's local DA database. The DA providers database access will be consistent with the terms of the relevant interconnection agreement and with the terms of the DA providers' separate agreements with its carrier principal. The Commission expects that a DA provider's request for access will be accompanied by a letter or other documentation from the CLEC or IXC evidencing its intent that the DA provider receives database access so that it fulfills its obligations to the CLEC or IXC. (*No. of respondents:* 250; *hours per response:* 36 hours; *total annual burden:* 9000 hours). All of the collections implement the requirements of Sections 251 and/or 222 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. *Obligation to respond:* Mandatory.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0756.

Expiration Date: 10/31/2001.

Title: Procedural Requirements and Policies for Commission Processing of Bell Operating Companies Applications for the Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services Under Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Form No.: N/A.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit; State, Local or Tribal Government.

Estimated Annual Burden: 75 respondents; 250 hours per response (avg.); 18,820 total annual burden hours.

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Cost Burden: $0.

Frequency of Response: On occasion; Third Party Disclosure.

Description: In a Public Notice released March 23, 2001 (DA 01–734), the Commission updated the general procedural requirements and policies relating to the Commission processing of Bell Operating Company (BOC) applications to provide in-region, interLATA services pursuant to section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. Section 271 (Act). A BOC may decide whether and when to file an application. See Public Notice, DA 01–734. a. *Submission of Applications by the BOCs.* BOCs must file applications which provide information on which the applicant intends to rely in order to satisfy the requirements of section 271. The applications will contain two parts, which include: (1) a stand-alone document entitled Brief in Support of Application by [Bell company name] for Provision of In-region, InterLATA services in [State name] and (2) any supporting documentation. (*Number of respondents:* 4 BOCs) *hours per response:* 125 hours per state; *total annual burden:* 6125 hours). b. *Submission on Written Consultations by the State Regulatory Commissions.* State regulatory commissions will file any written consultation they wish the Commission to consider early in the application process. (*Number of*