unauthorized States, EPA) should ensure that a completion determination has been made through appropriate procedures. Providing meaningful opportunities for public participation in the decisionmaking process should be a crucial component of a completion determination procedure. The Agency believes that the following generally are appropriate procedures for making completion determinations.[5]

At permitted facilities, the agency (EPA or the authorized States) should modify the permit to reflect the agency's determination that corrective action is complete. The current regulations in 40 CFR 270.42 provide procedural requirements for facility requested permit modifications. In most cases, completion of corrective action will be a Class 3 permit modification, and the agency should follow those procedures (or authorized State equivalent), including the procedures for public involvement. In cases where no other permit conditions remain, the permit could be modified not only to reflect the completion determination, but also to change the expiration date of the permit to allow earlier permit expiration (*see* 40 CFR 270.42 (Appendix I(A)(6)).

At non-permitted facilities where facility-wide corrective action is complete, and all other RCRA obligations at the facility have been satisfied, EPA or the authorized State may acknowledge completion of corrective action by terminating interim status through final administrative disposition of the facility's permit application (*see* 40 CFR 270.73(a)). To do so, the permitting authority at the facility (EPA or the authorized State or both, depending on the authorization status of the State) should process a final decision following the procedures for permit denial in 40 CFR part 124, or authorized equivalent.[6]

EPA recognizes that referring to this decision as a ''permit denial'' can be confusing to the public and problematic to the facility when the facility is in compliance, is not seeking a permit, and does not have an active permit ''application.'' Therefore, regulatory agencies may choose to use alternate terminology (e.g., a ''no permit necessary determination'') to refer to this decision, though it is issued through the permit denial process or authorized equivalent. Regardless of the terminology used, the basis for the decision should be stated clearly, generally that: (1) There are no ongoing treatment, storage, or disposal activities that require a permit; (2) all closure and post-closure requirements applicable at the regulated units have been fulfilled; and (3) all corrective action obligations have been met.

EPA and the authorized States may develop procedures for recognizing completion of corrective action at non-permitted facilities other than the permit decision process described above. For example, an agency may have procedures for issuing a notice informing the facility and the public that the facility has met its corrective action obligations, rather than issuing a final permit decision. EPA believes the alternative procedures should provide procedural protections equivalent to, although not necessarily identical to, those required by EPA's 40 CFR part 124 requirements (or the authorized State equivalent). Owners and operators should be aware that informal communications regarding the current status of cleanup activities at the site are not the same as completion determinations.

Use of an alternative procedure might be especially useful in acknowledging completion of a corrective action remedy (or a determination that no corrective action is necessary) that covers only a portion of the facility. A partial completion determination might be used at a facility that has cleaned up a portion of a facility and where a partial completion determination will facilitate the productive reuse of that portion of the facility. An alternative approach could also acknowledge completion of corrective action at a facility with ongoing RCRA activities. For example, a facility may be conducting post-closure care at a regulated unit under an alternate non-permit authority, as allowed under the October 22, 1998 Post-Closure rule (*see* 63 FR 56710), yet may have completed corrective action at its solid waste management units. In this case, interim status generally should not be terminated because all RCRA obligations have not been met, but it may be appropriate to issue a letter (as described above) recognizing completion of the corrective action obligations to bring finality to that process.

By following appropriate procedures the authorized agency can make a sound, well informed completion determination. However, EPA notes that, whether at a permitted or non-permitted facility and regardless of the completion determination procedure used, if EPA or the authorized state discovers unreported or misrepresented releases subsequent to the completion determination, then EPA and the authorized State may conclude that additional cleanup is needed.[7]

Where Can I Obtain Additional Information About Completion of Corrective Action?

For further information on completion of corrective action, please contact Barbara Foster at 703–308–7057 or Peter Neves at 202–564–6072.

[FR Doc. 01–24603 Filed 10–1–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[5] Of course, if a facility's permit provides otherwise, these procedures would not be appropriate at that facility.

[6] Under EPA permit denial procedures in 40 CFR part 124, EPA must issue, based on the administrative record, a notice of intent to deny the facility permit (*see* 40 CFR 124.6(b) and 124.9). The notice must be publicly distributed, accompanied by a statement of basis or fact sheet, and there must be an opportunity for public comment, including an opportunity for a public hearing, on EPA's proposed permit denial (*see* 40 CFR 124.7, 124.8, 124.10, 124.11, and 124.12). In making a final permit determination, EPA must respond to any public comments (*see* 40 CFR 124.17). Under 40 CFR 124.19, final decisions are subject to appeal.

[7] Of course, if EPA subsequently discovers a situation that may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to human health or the environment, EPA may elect to use its RCRA section 7003 imminent and substantial endangerment authority, or other applicable authorities, to require additional work at the facility.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–7070–5]

San Gabriel Superfund Site; Notice of Administrative Settlement

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. 9600 *et seq.*, notice is hereby given that an Agreement and Covenant Not to Sue (Prospective Purchaser Agreement, or PPA) associated with the San Gabriel Superfund Site Superfund Site was executed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on September 25, 2001. The Prospective Purchaser Agreement resolves potential claims of the United States under sections 106 and 107(a) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9606 and 9607(a) against Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation, a Delaware corporation, (the Purchaser). The Purchaser plans to acquire Aerojet-General Corporation's electronics plant, comprising approximately 70, located at 1100 West Hollyvale Avenue, Azusa, California

within the Baldwin Park Operable Unit (BPOU) of the San Gabriel Valley Superfund Site. The Purchaser intends to use the plant for the design and manufacture of space-based sensors and smart weapons.

A notice of the proposed PPA and opportunity for public comment was published August 10, 2001 at 66 FR 42227. Based on a review of the public comments and EPA's independent analysis of the facts and circumstances concerning this matter, EPA has modified the proposed PPA.

The primary modification is that EPA has significantly increased the amount of consideration required in exchange for the liability release granted to the Purchaser. Specifically, the PPA now requires Aerojet to provide an additional $40 million in cash for deposit into a third-party escrow account.

The settlement now provides the following benefits to EPA: the Purchaser will pay EPA $325,000 in cash, to be held in reserve in a special account for future cleanup work at the BPOU; Aerojet, a potentially responsible party at the BPOU, will pay EPA $9 million as partial reimbursement of its past costs to be held in the same special account for the same purposes; Aerojet will pay $40 million into a third-party escrow account that may, with EPA approval, be used to fund construction of the groundwater remedy at the BPOU; and Aerojet's parent company, GenCorp Inc., will provide a written guaranty of $25 million to assure Aerojet's performance of future cleanup activities.

DATES: This Prospective Purchaser Agreement, as modified, is effective September 25, 2001.

Public Comments: The public comment period on the proposed Prospective Purchaser Agreement closed on September 10, 2001. EPA received 100 comments from various entities and individuals. Responses to these comments have been prepared and are available for public inspection at the address below.

ADDRESSES: The Prospective Purchaser Agreement, as modified, the Response to Public Comments and additional background documents relating to the settlement are available for public inspection in the Superfund Records Center, San Gabriel Valley Superfund Site file, at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105. The modified Prospective Purchaser Agreement can be accessed through the Internet on EPA Region 9's Website located at: *http://www.epa.gov/region09/waste/brown/ppa.html.*

A copy of the Agreement may be obtained from Lewis Maldonado, Senior Counsel (ORC–3), Office of Regional Counsel, U.S. EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105. Comments should reference ''Northrop Grumman PPA, San Gabriel Superfund Site'' and ''Docket No. 2001–15'' and should be addressed to Lewis Maldonado at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lewis Maldonado, Senior Counsel (ORC–3), Office of Regional Counsel, U.S. EPA Region IX, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105; phone: (415) 744–1342; fax (415) 744–1041; e-mail: *maldonado.lewis@epa.gov.*

Dated: September 25, 2001.

John Kemmerer,

Acting Director, Superfund Division, Region IX.

[FR Doc. 01–24593 Filed 10–1–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Farm Credit Administration Board; Regular Meeting

AGENCY: Farm Credit Administration.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)), that the November 8, 2001 regular meeting of the Farm Credit Administration Board (Board) will not be held. The Board will hold a special meeting at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, November 6, 2001. An agenda for that meeting will be published at a later date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kelly Mikel Williams, Secretary to the Farm Credit Administration Board, (703) 883–4025, TDD (703) 883–4444.

ADDRESSES: Farm Credit Administration, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102–5090.

Dated: September 28, 2001.

Jeanette C. Brinkley,

Acting Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.

[FR Doc. 01–24774 Filed 10–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6705–01–M

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

September 24, 2001.

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 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 comments should be submitted on or before December 3, 2001. 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 comments to Les Smith, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1–A804, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554 or via the Internet to *lesmith@fcc.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collection(s), contact Les Smith at 202–418–0217 or via the Internet at *lesmith@fcc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060–0057.

Title: Application for Equipment Authorization, 47 CFR Sections 2.911, 2.925, 2.932, 2.944, 2.960, 2.1033(a), and 2.1043.

Form Number: FCC 731.

Type of Review: Revision of currently approved collections.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities.

Number of Respondents: 5,600.

Estimate of Time Per Response: 18 to 30 hrs. (avg. 24 hrs.).

Frequency of Response: Record-keeping; On occasion reporting requirements.

Total Annual Burden: 134,400.

Total Annual Costs: $1,120,000.

Needs and Uses: Under sections of 47 CFR parts 15 and 18 of FCC Rules,