Organic Chemical Manufacturing Industry (SOCMI)—40 CFR Part 60, Subpart VV; was approved 04/29/96; OMB No. 2060–0012; expires 04/30/99.

EPA ICR No. 1557.03; New Source Performance Standards for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills; was approved 04/29/96; OMB No. 2060–0220; expires 04/30/99.

EPA ICR No. 1770.02; Import of PCB Wastes for Disposal; was approved 04/26/96; OMB No. 2070–0149; expires 04/30/99.

EPA ICR No. 0649.06; NSPS for Metal Furniture Coating—40 CFR Part 60, Subpart EE; was approved 04/29/96; expires 04/30/99.

EPA ICR No. 1542.03; Tribal Assumption of the Section 404 Permit Program; was approved 04/26/96; OMB No. 2040–0140; expires 04/30/98.

EPA ICR No. 1772.01; Information Collection Activities Associated with EPA's Energy Star Building Program; was approved 04/29/96; OMB No. 2060–0347; expires 04/30/96.

EPA ICR No. 0275.06; Preaward Compliance Review Report; was approved 04/29/96; OMB No. 2090–0014; expires 04/30/99.

EPA ICR No. 1710.02; Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Disclosure Requirements; was approved 04/22/96; OMB No. 2070–0151; expires 04/30/99.

EPA ICR No. 0982.05; Standards of Performance for NSPS, Metallic Mineral Processing Plants—Subpart LL; was approved 03/31/96; OMB No. 2060–0016; expires 03/31/99.

EPA ICR No. 1608.01; State/Tribal Municipal Solid Waste Landfill (MSWLF) Program Adequacy Determinations; was approved 04/15/96; OMB No. 2050–0152; expires 04/30/99.

EPA ICR No. 0746.03; NSPS for Calciners and Dryers in Mineral Industries—Subpart UUU; was approved 03/31/96; OMB No. 2060–0252; expires 03/31/99.

EPA ICR No. 0795.09; Notification of Chemical Experts—TSCA Section 12(b); was approved 04/26/96; OMB No. 2070–0030; expires 04/30/96.

EPA ICR No. 0152.05; Notice of Arrival of Pesticides and Devices; was approved 04/25/96; OMB No. 2070–0030, expires 04/30/99.

EPA ICR No. 0783.33; Application of Motor Vehicle Emission Certification and Fuel Economy Labeling; was approved 08/24/95; OMB No. 2060–0104; expires 08/31/98.

EPA ICR No. 1188.05; Significant New Use Rules for Exsiting Chemicals—TSCA Section 5(a)(2); was approved 04/17/96; OMB No. 2070–0038; expires 04/30/99.

EPA ICR No. 1031.05; Allegations of Significant Adverse Reactions to Human Health or the Environment—TSCA Section 8(c); was approved 04/15/96; OMB No. 2070–0017; expires 04/30/99.

EPA ICR No. 0575.07; Health and Safety Data Reporting, Submission of Lists and Copies of Health and Safety Studies; was approved 04/15/96; OMB No. 2070–0004; expires 04/30/99.

EPA Withdrawals From OMB

EPA ICR NO. 0370.14; UIC Land Disposal Restrictions, Phase III, Decharacterized Wastewaters, Barbamate Wastes, and Spent Potliners; OMB No. 2040–0042; was withdrawn from OMB 04/28/96.

EPA ICR No. 1088.07; Agency Information Activities Renewal for NSPS Subpart Db; OMB No. 2060–0072; was withdrawn from OMB 04/29/96.

EPA ICR No. 1442.12; Land Disposal Restrictions—Phase III: Decharacterized Wastewaters, Barbamate Wastes, and Spent Aluminum Potliners: Final Rule; OMB No. 2050–0085; was withdrawn from OMB 04/29/96.

OMB Disapproval

EPA ICR No. 1442.111; Land Disposal Restrictions, Supplemental Proposal to Phase IV: Clarification of Bevill Exclusion for Mining Wastes; Changes to the Definition of Solid Waste for Mineral Processing Wastes; was disapproved by OMB 04/05/96.

Extension of Expiration Dates

EPA ICR 0116.04; Emission Control System Performance Warranty Regulations and Voluntary Aftermarket Part Certification Program; OMB No. 2060–0060; expiration date was extended to 07/31/96.

EPA ICR No. 1088.06; NSPS for Industrial, Commercial, Institutional Steam Generating Units (Subpart DB), Information Requirement, S02, PM, NOX; OMB No. 2060–0072; expiration date was extended to 07/31/96.

Dated: May 22, 1996.

Joseph Retzer,

Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 96–13714 Filed 5–30–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

[FRL–5510–3]

Soil Screening Guidance

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of availability of Soil Screening Guidance.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has developed the Soil Screening Guidance which is now available. This guidance presents a framework for developing soil screening levels (SSLs), focusing primarily on a simple methodology for developing site-specific screening levels, but including generic levels and the opportunity to do more detailed modeling. The guidance can serve as a tool to expedite the evaluation of contaminated soils at sites addressed under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), commonly known as Superfund. The guidance is intended to be used to screen out areas of sites, exposure pathways, or chemicals of concern from further consideration, assuming certain conditions are present, or to determine that further study is warranted at a site. It is not a rule, does not have the force of a regulation, nor should it be interpreted to represent cleanup standards for a site.

The Soil Screening Guidance is presented in three documents: (1) a Quick Reference Fact Sheet, which provides an overview of the development and use of soil screening levels; (2) a User's Guide, which provides details for implementing a simple methodology for calculating site-specific SSLs; and (3) a Technical Background Document (TBD), which presents generic SSLs and the technical foundation for the methodology for establishing SSLs. These documents are available from the National Technical Information Service at the address listed below. Additional supporting information, including summaries of previous outreach activities, is available for inspection in the Superfund Docket at the address listed below.

As part of the development of the Soil Screening Guidance, EPA conducted extensive outreach and peer review. A major component of that outreach was providing the document for public comment (59 FR 67706, December 30, 1994). As a result of comments received during the public comment period and the independent scientific peer review conducted concurrently, several changes were made to the guidance. The highlights of that process are presented below. In addition, EPA has developed a more detailed Response to Comments on the public review draft and the independent scientific peer review. This document is also available from the National Technical Information Service (see below).

DATES: The Soil Screening Guidance was signed by Assistant Administrator Laws on May 17, 1996 and is now being published by National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

ADDRESSES: Copies of the draft Soil Screening Guidance may be ordered

through the NTIS at (703)487–4650 as follows:

Soil Screening Guidance Quick Reference Fact Sheet, 9355.4–14FSA, PB96–963501, EPA/540/F–95/041

Technical Background Document for Soil Screening Guidance, 9355.4–17A, PB96–963502, EPA/540/R–95/128

Soil Screening Guidance: User's Guide, 9355.4–23, PB96–963505, EPA/540/R–96/018

Soil Screening Guidance: Response to Comments, 9355.4–22, PB96–963506, EPA/540/R–96/019

Members of the public are invited to inspect the docket developed to support the Soil Screening Guidance at the Superfund Docket, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1235 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia. [Docket Number SSL]. The docket is available for inspection between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. Appointments to review the docket can be made by calling (703) 603–9232. The public may copy a maximum of 266 pages from the docket free of charge, however a charge of 15 cents will be incurred for each additional page, plus a $25.00 administrative fee.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The RCRA/Superfund Hotline at (800) 424–9346 (in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, (703) 412–9810). The Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) Hotline number is (800) 553–7672 (in the Washington, DC metropolitan area, (703) 412–3323). You may also contact David Cooper, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (5204G), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460, at (703) 603–8763.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) responds to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances under the authority of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). Regulations governing such responses are found in the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan or NCP. The process for remedy selection in the NCP generally requires that a remedial investigation be performed to identify the nature and extent of contamination at National Priorities List (NPL) sites. From sampling results, as well as site observations obtained in the field, specific contaminants and exposure pathways of concern are identified and used in a baseline risk assessment performed to determine whether remedial action is warranted. (See source documents 1 and 2 listed at the end of this document.)

Today's Federal Register notice announces the availability of a new tool which may reduce significantly the time it takes to complete soil investigations and cleanup actions, as well as improve the consistency of these actions across the nation. The guidance was written to enhance the efficiency of remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) work at Superfund National Priorities List (NPL) sites. This guidance on developing soil screening levels is expected to assist site managers in quickly identifying contaminated soil of potential concern and in screening out from further consideration those soils that do not warrant additional study.

The Soil Screening Guidance presents three recommended methods for developing risk-based, soil screening levels, but emphasizes a simple, site-specific approach. The formulae and exposure assumptions used to develop the screening levels have been taken from the Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund [1,2] and have been widely accepted in the Superfund program for a number of years. These levels are then compared to on-site soil contaminant levels. Areas of a site which fall below the screening levels may be eliminated from further assessment. Areas above the screening levels generally warrant further evaluation of the potential risks that may be posed by site contaminants to determine the need for response action. While the guidance is recommended for use as a screening tool to determine if further study of specific portions of a site is warranted, the levels should not be interpreted to represent cleanup standards for a site.

Background

In 1993 EPA's Office of Emergency and Remedial Response (OERR) developed a draft fact sheet entitled: ''Interim Soil Screening Level Guidance.'' This guidance discussed the development and use of risk-based Soil Screening Levels (SSLs) for 30 common Superfund soil contaminants. The document was issued on September 30, 1993, to provide the basis for discussion of the SSL project with stakeholders and is available for review as background information in the Superfund Docket. The effort to develop such a guidance was requested under both the EPA Administrator's June 19, 1991, ''30-Day Study,'' and the more recent Superfund Administrative Improvements Initiatives announced by the Deputy Administrator on June 23, 1993. This guidance was subsequently revised and expanded to become the ''Soil Screening Guidance,'' dated December 1994. This guidance was provided to the public for comment (59 FR 67706) and submitted to independent scientific peer review. As a result of comments received in this process, we made several changes to the document. Some of the most significant comments are highlighted here. The Response to Comments provides a more in-depth discussion of these changes and many other, less significant technical changes.

(1) Guidance needs to be more user friendly. EPA has modified the presentation of the guidance because many people commented that it was not clear how to implement the guidance. The Soil Screening Guidance has been reorganized into a ''user's guide'' to provide more useful information on how to develop simple site-specific screening levels and compare those to contaminant concentrations found at sites.

(2) Generic SSLs will be misused. The generic SSLs are still part of the framework, but they have been moved to the Technical Background Document in an effort to prevent their misuse. They now appear in a section which discusses the technical assumptions that go into the development of those numbers.

(3) Generic SSLs are too conservative. Another impetus for moving the generic levels to the TBD is concern that the generic levels were too conservative. One of the modeling inputs leading to this conservatism is the assumption of an infinite source of contamination. To address this concern, the new guidance provides an opportunity use site-specific information to develop a conservative estimate of the volume of contamination at the site.

(4) Sampling strategy was based on an assumption that is not appropriate for all sites. One of the peer reviewers commented that the approach for sampling the site to determine the contaminant concentrations was dependent on the assumption of a log-normal distribution of contamination that may not actually occur at the site. That approach has been replaced by a strategy that includes adequate sampling of surface soil in the exposure area, compositing of some samples to reduce laboratory costs, and comparison of the screening level with the maximum of the composite samples from each exposure area. The strategy balances the desire for a statistically based sampling strategy with the need to control the number of samples and the laboratory costs.

(5) Non-residential land uses need to be considered. EPA received from many stakeholders that SSLs should be developed for other land uses such as industrial or recreational. EPA agrees in principle that other land uses need to be considered. However, as a first step in the development of screening levels EPA chose to focus on residential use because there is more agreement in the risk assessment community about the types of relevant pathways and assumptions appropriate for modeling residential exposures. Several of the Superfund reforms announced in October 1995 address non-residential land uses and should provide information which could be used to expand the soil screening guidance to other land uses.

Goals

EPA's goal in developing this guidance is to provide a tool which can be used to expedite the evaluation of contaminated soils at sites addressed under CERCLA. The guidance is intended to be used to screen out areas of sites, exposure pathways, or chemicals of concern from further consideration or to determine that further study is warranted at a site. It may be used where assumptions made in developing the tool (e.g., residential land use, no ecological concerns) are consistent with conditions found at specific sites.

This guidance is not intended to be, and should not be construed as a rule. Use of the guidance is not legally binding either on EPA staff or on other parties; rather it is intended to be a tool available for use under appropriate site-specific conditions. NPL sites do not all meet the conditions necessary for its use, consequently, EPA does not expect this tool to be useful at all NPL sites. EPA staff applying the guidance have discretion to follow it or diverge from it as site-specific conditions may warrant, and each site-specific action will be explained on its own record.

Please contact individuals and offices listed in the sections of this notice entitled ''Addresses'' and ''For Further Information Contact'' to learn more about the Soil Screening Guidance.

Source Documents

1. U.S. EPA. 1989. Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Volume 1: Human Health Evaluation Manual, Part A, Interim Final. EPA/540/1–89/002. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington D.C. NTIS PB90–155581/CCE.

2. U.S. EPA. 1991. Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, Volume 1: Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part B, Development of Risk-Based Preliminary Remediation Goals). Publication 9285.7–01B. Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, D.C. NTIS PB92–963333.

Dated: May 17, 1996.

Elliott P. Laws,

Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 96–13431 Filed 5–30–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collections Submitted to OMB for Review and Approval

May 23, 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. 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 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 July 1, 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 and Timothy Fain, OMB Desk Officer, 10236 NEOB 725 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20503 or fain_t@a1.eop.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 No.: 3060-0099.

Title: Form M - Annual Report Form M.

Form No.: FCC Form M.

Type of Review: Extension.

Respondents: Businesses or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 3.

Estimated Time Per Response: 1120 hours.

Total Annual Burden: 3360.

Needs and Uses: FCC Form M is the Annual Report of financial and operating information from all subject telephone companies having annual operating revenues in excess of $100 million. It is needed to provide the Commission with the data required to fulfill its regulatory responsibilities.

OMB Approval No.: 3060-0550.

Title: Certification of Franchising Authority to Regulate Basic Cable Service Rates and Initial Finding of Lack of Effective Competion.

Form No.: FCC Form 328.

Type of Review: Extension of currently approved collection.

Respondents: State, Local or Tribal Government.

Number of Respondents: 800.

Estimated Time Per Response: 30 minutes.

Total Annual Burden: 400 hours.

Needs and Uses: On 4/1/93, the Commission adopted a Report and Order, FCC 93-177, MM Docket No. 92-266. Among other things, this Report and Order implements Section 623(a)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, wherein a local franchise authority is required to file with the Commission a written certification when it requests to regulate basic service rates. Subsequently, the Commission developed the FCC Form 328 to provide a standardized, simple form for meeting this requirement. To fulfill the obligations set forth under Section 623(a)(3) a franchise authority must: (1) adopt regulations consistent with the Commission's regulations for basic cable service; (2) have legal authority to regulate basic service which comes from state law; (3) the personnel to administer such regulations; and (4) have procedural regulations allowing for public participation in rate regulation proceedings. The FCC Form 328 is reviewed by FCC staff to ensure that a franchising authority has met the criteria specified in Section 623(a)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934 as amended.