

and new labeling will clarify expectations of applicators and set definitive standards for application practices. The Agency also believes that in addition to improved labeling a very important component for controlling drift is training and education of applicators and others involved in pesticide application decisions about the causes and consequences of drift, control methods, and legal requirements.

D. Other Options EPA Considered for Labeling

EPA considered a variety of other options for label statements for spray drift mitigation, some of which were offered by stakeholders. These other labeling options and the Agency's reactions are discussed below. The Agency welcomes comment on these other options.

Label Statement Option—"Do not Allow Spray Drift"

This option, which EPA has required on some product labels, oversimplifies and conflicts with the Agency's conclusions of the supporting scientific data that some *de minimus* degree of drift will occur as part of nearly all pesticide applications. Nevertheless, recognizing the inadequacies of this statement and its appearance on numerous product labels for many years, we believe that it has been effectively and practically enforced by EPA, states, and tribes. Enforcement authorities have used their discretion to pursue violations based on their evaluation of those cases where there may have existed the potential for an effect or concern for exposures and risks to off-target people, animals, plants, and the environment.

Label Statement Option—"Do not Allow Drift to Cause Adverse Effects"

EPA believes this statement is problematic from an enforcement perspective because the burden of proof must be shifted from the simple fact of drift to the "effect" of drift, which is less compatible with the nature of evidence gathered in field investigations. This would require the determination of the definition of "adverse effects" under numerous circumstances on a case-by-case basis.

An additional problem with this label statement is it suggests to applicators that drift is acceptable unless someone recognizes and reports effects and appropriate authorities rule the effects are "adverse."

Label Statement Option—"Minimize Drift to Sensitive Areas. If Drift Occurs and Causes Environmental and Economic Effects, Enforcement Action May be Taken"

"Minimize drift" suggests the Agency finds certain levels of off-target drift acceptable, contrary to EPA's policy as discussed above. Further, Agency enforcement authorities believe this statement compromises their responsibilities by jeopardizing their ability to take enforcement action when necessary. The second proposed statement also causes concern. Under this label statement EPA, states, and tribes would have to prove drift as well as both environmental and economic effects before taking further action.

Since there is no label minimization standard, this statement essentially provides tacit permission to allow drift to occur at certain levels, presumably at levels up to those that do not cause "environmental and economic effects." If certain levels of drift are permissible, a statement that off-target drift may result in enforcement action is nonsensical.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides.

Dated: August 9, 2001.

Marcia E. Mulkey,

Director, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 01-20798 Filed 8-21-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-S

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

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

August 14, 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, 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 October 22, 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, 445 12th Street, SW., Room 1-A804, Washington, DC 20554 or via the Internet to lesmith@fcc.gov.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control No.: 3060-0802.

Title: Administration of the North American Numbering Plan, Carrier Identification Codes (CICs), CC Docket 92-237, CICs Order on Reconsideration, FCC 97-386 (Message Intercept Requirement).

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension.

Respondents: Business or Other for Profit.

Number of Respondents: 1400.

Estimated Time Per Response: 9 hours per response (avg).

Total Annual Burden: 12,600 hours.

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Cost Burden: \$0.

Frequency of Response: Third Party Disclosure.

Needs and Uses: In the CICs Order on Reconsideration (FCC 97-386), the Commission requires local exchange carriers (LECs) to offer a standard intercept message on or before June 30, 1998, and to coordinate with interexchange carriers (IXCs) in developing it. This requirement is needed to educate end users about their need to use seven-digit carrier access codes (CACs) to reach carriers instead of the previous five-digit access codes.

Federal Communications Commission.

Magalie Roman Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-21127 Filed 8-21-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P