exemption is expected not to be significant.

ii. *Drinking water.* Sodium metasilicate residues in drinking water from use as a pesticide are expected to be minimal when compared to the ubiquity of naturally occurring forms of silicon dioxide in the environment and the widespread use of sodium metasilicate in dishwashing soaps, other soaps and detergents, etc. Because of the gel-forming properties of sodium metasilicate, leaching from the soil is very unlikely. In fact, sodium metasilicate is used for soil stabilization.

2. *Non-dietary exposure.* There may be non-dietary exposure to sodium metasilicate from non-pesticidal uses of sodium metasilicate, but significantly increased non-dietary exposure and non-occupational exposure from sodium metasilicate when used as a pesticide is not expected.

E. Cumulative Exposure

Because of the low oral toxicity of sodium metasilicate and because of the fact that its presence in the diet is, for the most part, as a direct food additive, no cumulative mode of exposure is expected for sodium metasilicate.

F. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population.* Based on its low toxicity, there is reasonable certainty that no harm will result from aggregate exposure of the U.S. population, including infants and children, to residues of sodium metasilicate. This includes all anticipated dietary exposures and all other exposures for which there is reliable information. There is an inconsequential increase in dietary exposure resulting from application as a pesticide.

2. *Infants and children.* Based on the low toxicity of sodium metasilicate, there is a reasonable certainty that no harm to children or adults will result from aggregate exposure to sodium metasilicate. Exempting sodium metasilicate from the requirement of a tolerance should pose no significant risk to humans.

G. Effects on the Immune and Endocrine Systems

To date there is no evidence to suggest that sodium metasilicate functions in a manner similar to any known hormone, or that it acts as an endocrine disruptor.

H. Existing Tolerances

There are no existing tolerances for sodium metasilicate in the United States.

I. International Tolerances

There are no known approved codex maximum residue levels established for residues of sodium metasilicate.

[FR Doc. 04–28499 Filed 12–28–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[DA 04–3840]

The Federal Communications Commission's Form 501 Approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In this document, the Office of Management and Budget issued a Notice of Action approving the revised Federal Communications Commission Form 501, Slamming Complaint Form. The form was revised to ensure that consumers have to file a slamming complaint only once, rather than having to seek multiple avenues of redress.

DATES: Effective November 29, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Marks or Kelli Farmer of the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–2512 (voice).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's document, DA 04–3840, released December 7, 2004. To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (Braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an e-mail to *fcc504@fcc.gov* or call the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau at (202) 418–0530 (voice), (202) 418–0432 (TTY). This document can also be downloaded in Text and ASCII formats at: *http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/policy/slamming.*

Federal Communications Commission.

Jay Keithley,

Deputy Bureau Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau.

[FR Doc. 04–28421 Filed 12–28–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission for Extension Under Delegated Authority

December 20, 2004.

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 (PRA) 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 Paperwork Reduction (PRA) comments should be submitted on or before February 28, 2005. 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 Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments to Cathy Williams, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1–C823, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554 or via the Internet to *Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collection(s), contact Cathy Williams at 202–418–2918 or via the Internet at *Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060–0170.

Title: Section 76.1030, Notifications Concerning Interference to Radio Astronomy, Research and Receiving Installations.