Pentachlorophenol (Including Its Salts) and Inorganic Arsenic'' which is published in the July 1984 Federal Register, Vol. 49, No. 136, p. 28674. Facilities that choose to participate in the voluntary PEL can do the following to exempt themselves from the respirator requirements. First, the facility needs to conduct air monitoring for air-borne arsenic. Facilities that have air-borne arsenic levels that are higher than the permissible exposure limit would have to continue to require plant personnel to wear respirators. If a facility's air-borne arsenic levels are below the permissible exposure limit they are no longer required to wear respirators. Depending on how close the levels are to the permissible exposure limit, the facility is required to retest periodically or fill out a checklist, which indicates if arsenic exposure levels are likely to increase due to changes in the facility's industrial process.

Participating facilities must submit the air monitoring test results to EPA or if arsenic levels are low and testing is not required then they can simply fill out the checklist and submit it to EPA. All submissions must certify that the information provided is accurate.

EPA uses the certification and air monitoring data to determine if the wood preserving facility is complying with the air-borne arsenic levels set by the cancellation order, which was set to ensure that plant personnel are not exposed to levels of arsenic that pose an unacceptably high health risk. This data will also be used to monitor which wood preserving facilities are participating in the PEL program and thus could be exempt from the pesticide label requirement to wear a respirator. Because the information that is submitted to EPA would not be confidential business information the submittals from the facilities will not be handled as such.

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 OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR Part 9.

The EPA would like to solicit comments to:

(i) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(ii) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(iii) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(iv) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

*Burden Statement:* This information collection assumes that of the estimated 300 wood preserving plants that use arsenic formulation, 200 of these participate in the PEL program. The majority of the participants, 150, have conducted monitoring in the past that has demonstrated that arsenic levels are well below the permissible exposure level. These facilities that are not required to test are required to simply fill out and submit the 6 question PEL checklist, which asks if the facility has changed their process and in doing so may have increased the levels of air-borne arsenic. These 150 plants will spend .75 hours on each submittal at a cost of $14.95 per hour in wages and 110% in overhead for a total cost of $30.45 per hour. Thus each facility will spend $22.84 for the annual submission. Collectively, the 150 plants will spend $3,426 on filling out and submitting the checklist.

EPA estimates that each of the approximately 50 plants that are required to monitor during a given year will spend 17.5 hours on preparing and conducting the tests. When calculating cost EPA assumes an hourly wage of $14.95 with 110% added as overhead for a total hourly cost of $30.45. Thus, a single facility will spend approximately $532 on each test. Collectively, the 50 plants that conduct monitoring will spend $26,644 on monitoring. The total cost for monitoring and submittal costs is $30,070.

This estimate includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information.

Dated: March 5, 1996.

Elaine Stanley,

*Director, Office of Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 96–7279 Filed 3–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

**[FRL–5446–9]**

## Notice of Proposed Purchaser Agreement Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as Amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency.

**ACTION:** Notice; request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with Section 122 of 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. 9622, notice is hereby given that a proposed purchaser agreement associated with property adjacent to the Foote Mineral Superfund Site, Exton, PA, was executed by the Agency on March 15, 1996 and is subject to final approval by the United States Department of Justice. The Purchaser Agreement would resolve certain potential EPA claims under Section 107 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9607, against Key West Connection Corporation. (''The purchasers''). The settlement would require Key West Connection Corporation to pay $5,000 within five (5), days of the effective date of the Agreement to the EPA Hazardous Substances Superfund.

For thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice, the Agency will receive written comments relating to the proposed settlement. The Agency's response to any comments received will be available for public inspection at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, PA 19107.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before April 25, 1996.

**AVAILABILITY:** The proposed agreement and additional background information relating to the settlement are available for public inspection at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, PA 19107. A copy of the proposed agreement may be obtained

from Suzanne Canning, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Regional Docket Clerk (3RC00), 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, PA 19107. Comments should reference the ''Foote Mineral Superfund Site; Key West Connection Corporation'' and ''EPA Docket No. III–96–07–DC'', and should be forwarded to Suzanne Canning at the above address.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bonnie A. Pugh (3RC23), Assistant Regional Counsel, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, PA 19107, Phone: (215) 597–8448.

Dated: March 15, 1996.

Stanley L. Laskowski,

*Acting Regional Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III.*

[FR Doc. 96–7278 Filed 3–25–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

---

**[OPPTS–44623; FRL–5358–3]**

## TSCA Chemical Testing; Receipt of Test Data

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the receipt of test data on n-butyl acetate (CAS No. 123–86–4), submitted pursuant to a testing consent order under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). Publication of this notice is in compliance with section 4(d) of TSCA.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Susan B. Hazen, Director, Environmental Assistance Division (7408), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E–543B, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460, (202) 554–1404, TDD (202) 554–0551; e-mail:TSCA-Hotline@epamail.epa.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under 40 CFR 790.60, all TSCA section 4 consent orders must contain a statement that the results of testing conducted pursuant to testing consent orders will be announced to the public in accordance with section 4(d).

I. Test Data Submissions

Test data for n-butyl acetate were submitted by the Chemical Manufacturers Association Oxo Process Panel on behalf of the following sponsors: Aristech Chemical Corporation, BASF Corporation, BP Chemicals, Inc., Eastman Chemical Company, Hoechst Celanese Chemical Group, Inc., Rhone-Poulenc, Inc., Shell Oil Company, Union Carbide Corporation, and Vista Chemical Company pursuant to a consent order at 40 CFR 799.5000. They were received by EPA on March 6, 1996. The submission includes a final report entitled ''n-Butyl Acetate, A Two-week Inhalation Probe Study in the Rat.'' This chemical is used as a solvent for coatings, as a process solvent, and for miscellaneous solvent uses.

EPA has initiated its review and evaluation process for this data submission. At this time, the Agency is unable to provide any determination as to the completeness of the submission.

II. Public Record

EPA has established a public record for this TSCA section 4(d) receipt of data notice (docket number OPPTS–44623). This record includes copies of all studies reported in this notice. The record is available for inspection from 12 noon to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays, in the TSCA Public Docket Office, Rm. B–607 Northeast Mall, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 2603.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Test data.

Dated: March 19, 1996.

Charles M. Auer,

*Director, Chemical Control Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics.*

[FR Doc. 96–7274 Filed 3–25–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–F**

---

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### Licensee Order To Show Cause

The Acting Chief, Audio Services Division, Mass Media Bureau, has before her the following matter:

| Licensee | City/State | MM docket No. |
|---|---|---|
| Cen-Ten Productions, Inc.. (Regarding the silent status of Station KJCO (FM)) | Yuma, Colorado.. | 96–49 |

Pursuant to Section 312(a)(3)( and (4) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, Cen-Ten Productions, Inc. has been directed to show cause why the license for Station KJCO (FM) should not be revoked, at a proceeding in which the above matter has been designated for hearing concerning the following issues:

(1) To determine whether Cen-Ten Productions, Inc. has the capability and intent to expeditiously resume the broadcast operations of KJCO (FM), consistent with the Commission's Rules.

(2) To determine whether Cen-Ten Productions, Inc. has violated Sections 73.1740 and/or 73.1750 of the Commission's Rules.

(3) To determine, in light of the evidence adduced pursuant to the foregoing issues, whether Cen-Ten Productions, Inc. is qualified to be and remain the licensee of Station KJCO (FM).

A copy of the complete *Show Cause Order and HDO* in this proceeding is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Dockets Branch (Room 239), 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. The complete text may also be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, International Transcription Service, 2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037 (telephone 202–857–3800).

Federal Communications Commission

Linda Blair,

*Acting Chief,*

*Audio Services Division, Mass Media Bureau.*

[FR Doc. 96–7224 Filed 3–25–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712–01–P**

---

### Licensee Order To Show Cause

The Acting Chief, Audio Services Division, Mass Media Bureau, has before her the following matter:

| Licensee | City/State | MM Docket No. |
|---|---|---|
| Oakhill-Jackson Economic Development Corp.. | Cedar Rapids, Iowa. | 96–47. |

(regarding the silent status of noncommercial, educational station KOJC (FM))

Pursuant to Section 312(a)(3) and (4) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, Oakhill-Jackson Economic Development Corp. has been directed to show cause why the license for Station KOJC (FM) should not be revoked, at a proceeding in which the above matter has been designated for hearing concerning the following issues:

(1) To determine whether Oakhill-Jackson Economic Development Corp. has the capability and intent to expeditiously resume the broadcast operations of KOJC (FM), consistent with the Commission's Rules.

(2) To determine whether Oakhill-Jackson Economic Development Corp.