DATES: Comments must be provided on or before April 15, 1996.

ADDRESSES: A copy of the proposed settlement may be obtained from Joan Martin-Banks (3HWll) in EPA's Region III Office, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, PA 19107, (telephone: 215/597–1192). Comments should be addressed to the Docket Clerk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, PA 19107, and should refer to: In *Re Novak Sanitary Landfill Superfund Site,* Lehigh County, Pennsylvania, U.S. EPA Docket No. III–95–57–DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wendy Miller (Mail Code 3RC32) (215) 597–3230, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice of *De Minimis* Settlement: In accordance with Section 122(i)(1) of CERCLA, notice is hereby given of a proposed administrative settlement concerning the Novak Sanitary Landfill Superfund Site, in Lehigh County, Pa. Notice of an opportunity for a public meeting pursuant to Section 7003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (''RCRA'') is also hereby given. The agreement was proposed by EPA Region III. Subject to review by the public pursuant to this Notice, the agreement has met with the approval of the Attorney General or her designee, United States Department of Justice.

Below are listed the parties who have executed binding certifications of their consent to participate in this settlement:

1. Acoustical Spray Insulators, Inc.
2. American National Can Company
3. Ecolab Inc.
4. Howmet Cercast (U.S.A., Inc.)
5. International Multifoods Corporation
6. Mancor PA, Inc.
7. The Asbury Graphite Mills, Inc.

These seven parties collectively have agreed to pay $300.920.38, subject to the contingency that EPA may elect not to complete the settlement if comments received from the public during this comment period or at a public meeting, if one is requested, disclose facts or considerations which indicate the proposed settlement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate. Money collected from *de minimis* parties will be used for past response costs incurred at or in connection with the Site. The amounts to be paid by the *de minimis* parties include a premium to cover the risk that unknown conditions are discovered or information previously unknown to EPA is received.

EPA is entering into this agreement under the authority of Sections 122(g) and 107 of CERCLA and Section 7003 of RCRA. Section 122(g) authorizes settlements with *de minimis* parties to allow them to resolve their liabilities at Superfund Sites without incurring substantial transaction costs. Each of the *de minimis* parties is responsible for less than one percent of the volume of waste that may have contained hazardous substance disposed of at the Site. EPA issued a draft settlement proposal on May 10, 1995 and agreed to a thirty day negotiation period. On July 31, 1995, EPA issued a final settlement proposal embodied in the Administrative Order on Consent which included several modifications made in response to comments by *de minimis* parties in letters to EPA and during negotiations with the Agency. The proposed settlement reflects and was agreed upon based on conditions known to parties on or about July 31, 1994. Six of the *de minimis* settling parties will be required to pay their volumetric share of the Government's past response costs, estimated costs incurred by the potentially responsible parties that performed the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (''RI/FS'') for the Site, and the estimated future response costs at the Site (excluding any federal claims for natural resource damages or any State claims), plus the premium amount. One *de minimis* party, The Asbury Graphite Mills, Inc., is required to pay its volumetric share of the Government's past response costs and the estimated future response costs at the Site (excluding any federal claims for natural resources damages or any State claims), plus the premium amount. The Asbury Graphite Mills, Inc. is not required to pay any amount toward the estimated costs of the RI/FS because it was among the parties that agreed to perform the RI/FS and it has certified that it paid more than its volumetric share toward that performance.

Stanley L. Laskowski,

Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 96–6246 Filed 3–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Commission announces that it intends to submit to the Office of Management and Budget a request to extend without change the existing collection of information listed below. The Commission is seeking public comments on the proposed extension.

DATES: Written comments on this notice must be submitted on or before May 14, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted to Frances M. Hart, Executive Officer, Executive Secretariat, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 10th Floor, 1801 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20507. As a convenience to commentators, the Executive Secretariat will accept comments transmitted by facsimile (''FAX'') machine. The telephone number of the FAX receiver is (202) 663–4114. (This is not a toll free number.) Only comments of six or fewer pages will be accepted via FAX transmittal. This limitation is necessary to assure access to the equipment. Receipt of FAX transmittals will not be acknowledged, except that the sender may request confirmation of receipt by calling the Executive Secretariat staff at (202) 663–4078 (voice) or (202) 663–4399 (TDD). (These are not toll-free numbers.) Copies of comments submitted by the public will be available for review at the Commission's library, Room 6502, 1801 L Street NW., Washington, DC, between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Margaret Ulmer Holmes, Office of Management, Room 2204, 1801 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20507, (202) 663–4279 (voice) or (202) 663–7114 (TDD).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Collection Title: Recordkeeping Requirements of Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, 29 C.F.R. Part 1607.

Form Number: None.

Frequency of Report: None required.

Type of Respondent: Businesses or other institutions, state or local governments, and farms.

Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code: Multiple.

Description of Affected Public: Any employer, labor organization, or employment agency covered by the federal equal employment opportunity laws.

Responses: 666,000.

Reporting Hours: 1,450,000.

Number of Forms: None.

Abstract: The records required to be maintained by 29 C.F.R. 1607.4 and

1607.15 are used by respondents to assure that they are complying with Title VII; by the Commission in investigating, conciliating, and litigating charges of employment discrimination; and by complainants in establishing violations of federal equal employment opportunity laws.

Burden Statement: There are no reporting requirements associated with UGESP. Thus the only paperwork burden derives from the required recordkeeping. There are a total of 666,000 employers who have 15 or more employees and that are, therefore, subject to the recordkeeping requirement. Prior to the imposition of the UGESP recordkeeping requirement, the Commission proposed to conduct a practical utility survey to obtain estimates of burden hours. The intended survey was not approved by OMB, however, and the Commission relied instead on data obtained from the Business Roundtable study on ''Cost of Government Regulation'' conducted by the Arthur Anderson Company.

In its initial estimate of recordkeeping burden the Commission relied on data from that study to derive the estimate of 1.91 million hours. In a subsequent submission to OMB for clearance of the UGESP collection, the Commission made an adjustment to reflect the increase in the incidence of computerized recordkeeping that had resulted in a reduction of total burden hours of approximately 300,000, and had brought the total burden down to 1.6 million hours.

In the calculation of the initial burden of UGESP compliance, the estimated number of employees covered by the guidelines was 71.1 million. Average cost per employee was taken to be $1.79. Since most of this cost, however, was for employers' administrative functions and represented the time spent in reviewing their selection processes for 'adverse impact' and in reviewing and validating their testing procedures, the actual recordkeeping function was estimated to be in the range of 10 to 15 percent of the total per-employee cost, or between $.179 and $.2685 per employee. The Commission used these per-employee costs, even though it believed that they were an over-estimate. In the initial estimate the Commission used the higher end of the range.

The Commission now believes that a better estimate is the midpoint of the range or $.22 per employee. The number of employees also has grown by 15 million since the initial estimate, so that there now are 86 million subject to UGESP. In addition, from the private employer survey the Commission has been conducting for the past 30 years (the EEO–1), it is aware that 29.7 percent of the private employers file their employment reports on magnetic tapes, on diskettes, or on computer printouts. Thus, at a minimum, that proportion of employers has computerized recordkeeping. From the same survey the Commission also has learned that when records are computerized, the burden hours for reporting, and thus for recordkeeping, are about one-fifth of the burden hours associated with non-computerized records. Therefore, the Commission's current estimate of recordkeeping burden hours is as follows:

Computerized recordkeepers—(.29)×86 mil×($.044)=	$1,097,360
All other recordkeepers—(.71)×86 mil×($.22)=	$13,433,200
Total recordkeeping cost=	$14,530,560

Total Burden Hours are then computed by dividing the total cost of recordkeeping by $10, the hourly rate of staff recordkeepers. The total new estimate of burden hours associated with the UGESP recordkeeping then is 1.45 million hours. Assumptions made in deriving the estimate are as follows:

Cost per employee for recordkeeping is $.22*

Cost per employee for computerized records is $.044*

Hourly rate of pay for recordkeeping staff is $10.00**

*Both of these are derived from a private employer study.

**To the extent that this is an under-estimate, the reporting burden is over-estimated.

Dated: March 11, 1996.

For the Commission.

Maria Borrero,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 96–6170 Filed 3–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collections being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission; Comments Requested

March 8, 1996.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications, 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 proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13. 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 Commissions burden estimates; (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 May 14, 1996. 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.

ADDRESS: Direct all comments to Dorothy Conway, Federal Communications, Room 234, 1919 M St., NW., Washington, DC 20554 or via internet to dconway@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collections contact Dorothy Conway at 202–418–0217 or via internet at dconway@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Approval Number: 3060–0564.

Title: 47 CFR 76.924 Cost accounting and cost allocation requirements.

Type of Review: Revision to an existing collection.

Respondents: Businesses or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 13,500.

Total Annual Burden: 72,000 hours.

Needs and Uses: Cost accounting and cost allocation requirements standardize the methodology in which cable operators report financial data. The Commission's system of cable rate regulation imposes a price cap on cable service rates with certain categories of costs defined as external to the cap. The cost accounting and cost allocation requirements are necessary in order to assure that costs that are intended to receive external treatment are in fact accorded such treatment. Cost accounting and cost allocation requirements are used by cable operators wishing to justify rates higher than their capped levels via a cost-of-service filing; and the requirements are necessary to permit accurate identification of such costs that will justify rates above the cap. On December 15, 1995, the Commission adopted a Second Report and Order, First Report