ACTION: Notice of Public Meeting.

SUMMARY: A peer-review workshop will be held by the Environmental Criteria and Assessment Office (ECAO) of EPA's Office of Health and Environmental Assessment to review a draft of EPA's Mercury Study Report to Congress (hereafter ''Draft Report''). This Draft Report is being prepared by EPA in response to Section 112(n)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) as amended in 1990, which requires EPA to submit to Congress a study on mercury emissions.

The Draft Report focuses on sources of mercury emissions to include electric utility steam generating units, municipal waste combustion units, and other sources, including area sources. Congress directed that the report evaluate many aspects of mercury emissions, including the rate and mass of emissions, health and environmental effects, technologies to control such emissions, and the costs of such controls.

DATES: The workshop will be held on January 25 and 26, 1995, at the Andrew W. Breidenbach Environmental Research Center (AWBERC), 26 W. Martin Luther King Drive, Cincinnati, Ohio. The workshop will begin at 8:30 a.m. both days.

ADDRESSES: Eastern Research Group, Inc. (ERG), an EPA contractor is providing logistical support for the peer review workshop. Members of the public wishing to attend the workshop as observers should register by phoning ERG at 617–674–7374. Please note that space is limited and registrations will be accepted on a first-come, first-serve basis.

Time will be allowed for public comment on both days of the workshop. Members of the public wishing to present formal comments at the workshop should indicate so when registering. Time will be limited in order to give everyone an equal opportunity to speak.

Copies of the Draft Report will be available at the workshop. Additional copies also will be available after the workshop. To obtain a copy of this Draft Report, interested parties should contact the ORD Publications Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 26 W. Martin Luther King Drive, Cincinnati, Ohio 45268; telephone (513) 569–7562; fax (513) 569–7566. Please provide your name, mailing address, the document title (Mercury Study Report to Congress), and the document numbers (EPA/600/P–94/002Aa and Ab).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Rita Schoeny, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Health and Environmental Assessment, Environmental Criteria and Assesment Office, 26 W. Martin Luther King Drive, Cincinnati, Ohio 45268; telephone (513) 569–7544.

Martha Keating, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; telephone (919)–541–5340.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In response to a mandate from Congress, EPA has prepared a seven-volume Mercury Study Report to Congress. The seven volumes are as follows:

1. Executive Summary
2. Inventory of Anthropogenic Mercury Emissions in the United States
3. An Assessment of Exposure from Anthropogenic Mercury Emissions in the United States
4. Health Effects of Mercury and Mercury Compounds
5. An Ecological Assessment for Anthropogenic Mercury Emissions in the United States
6. Characterization of Human Health and Wildlife Risks from Anthropogenic Mercury Emissions in the United States
7. An Evaluation of Mercury Control Technologies, Costs, and Regulatory Issues

A peer-review workshop is being held as part of the process of scientific review of the Draft Report. The Draft Report, authored primarily by EPA scientists with input from outside scientific experts, is developmental and does not represent Agency policy. The Draft Report is being made available to the public as part of the Agency's continuing commitment to conduct assessments of important environmental contaminants in an open and participatory manner, to keep the public informed, and to encourage public review of significant assessments. The public is invited to attend the workshop. Seating will be limited, and advance registration is suggested. Information about attending the meetings and obtaining a copy of the Draft Report is provided elsewhere in this notice. After the workshop, the Draft Report will be revised and subjected to final Agency review before submission to the Office of Management and Budget and ultimately to Congress.

Dated: January 11, 1995.

Joseph K. Alexander,

Acting Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc. 95–1249 Filed 1–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[OPP–180957; FRL 4928–2]

Receipt of Application for Emergency Exemption to Use Propazine; Solicitation of Public Comment

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: EPA has received specific exemption requests from the Oklahoma and the New Mexico Departments of Agriculture (hereafter referred to as the ''Applicants'') to use the pesticide propazine (CAS 139–40–2) to treat up to 280,000 and 50,000 acres, respectively, of sorghum to control pigweed. The Applicants propose the use of a new (unregistered) chemical; therefore, in accordance with 40 CFR 166.24, EPA is soliciting public comment before making the decision whether or not to grant the exemptions.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before February 2, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Three copies of written comments, bearing the identification notation ''OPP–180957'' should be submitted by mail to: Public Response and Program Resource Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments to: Rm. 1132, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

Information submitted in any comment concerning this notice may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as ''Confidential Business Information.'' Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain Confidential Business Information must be provided by the submitter for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments filed pursuant to this notice will be available for public inspection in Rm. 1132, Crystal Mall No. 2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Andrea Beard, Registration Division (7505W), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW, Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Floor 6, Crystal Station #1, 2800 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, (703) 308–8791.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to section 18 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 U.S.C. 136p), the Administrator may, at her discretion, exempt a state agency from any registration provision of FIFRA if she determines that emergency conditions exist which require such exemption. The Applicants have requested the Administrator to issue specific exemptions for the use of propazine on sorghum to control pigweed. Information in accordance with 40 CFR part 166 was submitted as part of this request.

Sorghum is grown as a rotational crop with cotton and wheat, in order to comply with the soil conservation requirements. Propazine, which was formerly registered for use on sorghum, was voluntarily canceled by the former Registrant, who did not wish to support its re-registration. The Applicants claim that this has left sorghum growers in Oklahoma and New Mexico with no preemergent herbicides that will adequately control certain broadleaf weeds, especially pigweed. Until 1993–4, the first season an exemption was requested, growers were using existing stocks of propazine. The Applicants state that other available herbicides have serious limitations on their use, making them unsuitable for control of pigweed in sorghum. Although the original Registrant of propazine has decided not to support this chemical through reregistration, another company has committed to support the data requirements for this use. Propazine was once registered for this use, but has now been voluntarily canceled and is therefore considered to be a new chemical.

The Applicants state that, since growers used existing stocks of propazine between the time of its voluntary cancellation and the availability of propazine under an emergency exemption, yields have not shown a decrease. However, the Applicants claim that significant economic losses will occur without the availability of propazine.

The Applicants propose to apply propazine at a maximum rate of 1.2 lbs. active ingredient (a.i.), (2.4 pts. of product) per acre, by ground or air, with a maximum of one application per crop growing season. Therefore, use under this exemption could potentially amount to a maximum total of 336,000 lbs. of active ingredient (84,000 gal. of product) in Oklahoma, and 60,000 lbs. of active ingredient (15,000 gal. of product) in New Mexico. This is the second time that Oklahoma and New Mexico have applied for this use of propazine on sorghum under section 18 of FIFRA. Oklahoma and New Mexico were issued exemptions for this use for last growing season.

This notice does not constitute a decision by EPA on the applications themselves. The regulations governing section 18 require publication of a notice of receipt of an application for a specific exemption proposing use of a new chemical (i.e., an active ingredient not contained in any currently registered pesticide). Such notice provides for opportunity for public comment on the application. Accordingly, interested persons may submit written views on this subject to the Field Operations Division at the address above.

The Agency, accordingly, will review and consider all comments received during the comment period in determining whether to issue the emergency exemptions requested by the Oklahoma and New Mexico Departments of Agriculture.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests, Crisis exemptions.

Dated: January 6, 1995.

Lois Rossi,

Acting Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–1190 Filed 1–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Public Information Collection Requirement Submitted to Office of Management and Budget for Review

January 6, 1995.

The Federal Communications Commission has submitted the following information collection requirement to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3507).

Copies of this submission may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, Inc., 2100 M Street, NW., Suite 140, Washington, DC 20037, (202) 857–3800. For further information on this submission contact Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, (202) 418–0214. Persons wishing to comment on this information collection should contact Timothy Fain, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10214 NEOB, Washington, DC 20503, (202) 395–3561.

OMB Number: 3060–0149.

Title: Part 63—§ 214 Application and Supplemental Information Requirements (§ 63.01 - 63.601).

Action: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Businesses or other for-profit.

Frequency of Response: Quarterly, and on occasion reporting requirements.

Estimated Annual Burden: 510 responses, 13.3 hours average burden per response, 6,820 hours total annual burden.

Needs and Uses: The Commission modified its rules to enable local telephone companies (LECs) to participate in the video marketplace through video dialtone. The Commission concluded that allowing telephone company involvement in the video marketplace, consistent with statutory telephone company-cable television cross-ownership restrictions, will advance the FCC's goals of creating opportunities and incentives to develop an advanced telecommunications infrastructure, increasing competition in the video marketplace, and enhancing the diversity of video services to the American public in order to promote consumer choice.

The Commission decided that it will permit, but not require LECs to provide video dialtone to the public consistent with the existing regulatory framework for non-video enhanced services and subject to additional requirements. These additional requirements, which have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), provided, in relevant part, that: (1) LECs wishing to offer video dialtone must make available to multiple service providers, on a nondiscriminatory common carrier basis, a basic platform that will deliver video programming and potentially other services to end users; (2) local telephone companies will be permitted to provide some additional enhanced and other non-common carrier services to customers of the common carrier platform, and the Commission will apply existing safeguards against anticompetitive conduct; and (3) in addition to existing requirements of Part 63, telephone companies that wish to offer video dialtone must describe how their proposed construction and operation of the basic platform will serve multiple video programmers and expand as demand increases.

In CC Docket No. 87–266, MO&O on Reconsideration and Third FNPRM, the Commission requires LECs providing video dialtone service to notify the Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau of any anticipated or existing capacity shortfall in their video dialtone platform