

*D. How Should I Handle CBI that I Want to Submit to the Agency?*

Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. You may claim information that you submit to EPA in response to this document as CBI by marking any part or all of that information as CBI. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes any information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public version of the official record. Information not marked confidential will be included in the public version of the official record without prior notice. If you have any questions about CBI or the procedures for claiming CBI, please consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

*E. What Should I Consider as I Prepare My Comments for EPA?*

You may find the following suggestions helpful for preparing your comments:

1. Explain your views as clearly as possible.
2. Describe any assumptions that you used.
3. Provide copies of any technical information and/or data you used that support your views.
4. If you estimate potential burden or costs, explain how you arrived at the estimate that you provide.
5. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns.
6. Offer alternative ways to improve the notice or collection activity.
7. Make sure to submit your comments by the deadline in this notice.
8. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, be sure to identify the docket ID number assigned to this action in the subject line on the first page of your response. You may also provide the name, date, and **Federal Register** citation.

**II. What Action is the Agency Taking?**

The Agency is seeking comment on two documents that describe how EPA develops and uses pesticide surface water modeling scenarios in ecological and drinking water exposure and risk assessments. These documents are entitled "Pesticide Root Zone Model (PRZM) Field and Orchard Crop Scenario Metadata" and "Standard Procedures for Conducting Quality Control and Quality Assurance for PRZM Field and Orchard Crop

Scenarios" and can be found at the following web addresses: [http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/models/water/op\\_scenario\\_metadata\\_df\\_061602.htm](http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/models/water/op_scenario_metadata_df_061602.htm) and [http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/models/water/qa\\_qc\\_documentation\\_ver2.htm](http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/models/water/qa_qc_documentation_ver2.htm)

Modeling scenarios are defined as the set of characteristics of the agricultural crop to which a pesticide may be applied (e.g., cotton) and the field information on which the crop is actually grown (e.g., soils) that are necessary to estimate pesticide transport to surface water. The modeling sites, or scenarios, the OPP uses to estimate environmental concentrations in surface water are documented in and developed through the use of these documents.

These documents were developed to support the following activities: OP Cumulative Risk Assessment, the Agency's Information Quality Guideline, data quality guidelines and to improve environmental assessments.

The first document, "PRZM Field and Orchard Crop Scenario Metadata," provides a detailed listing of the parameters and associated values specific to a crop and field combination (e.g., a cotton field in Yazoo County, Mississippi). OPP evaluated several approaches to documenting the parameters from a modeling scenario used to estimate environmental exposures. This format is believed to provide the most appropriate means to readily document and recall critical information contained in a given scenario. Users of this format, whether Agency staff or the public, will be able to quickly document a scenario in a consistent manner that meets quality standards implemented by the OPP. In addition, users who retrieve information or wish to understand the content of a crop-field scenario for a pesticide assessment will be assured of a standardized format which simplifies review. Information in this document reflects the results of the second document "Standard Procedures for Conducting Quality Control and Quality Assurance for PRZM Field and Orchard Crop Scenarios."

Standard Procedures for Conducting Quality Control and Quality Assurance for PRZM Field and Orchard Crop Scenarios describes the set of procedures, methods, and references to "construct" or review for consistency the information contained in a crop-field scenario. The steps and recommendation described in this guidance provide a sound scientific basis for selecting information with relevance to what is observed in an actual agricultural field such as cotton. The methodology is intended to give the

regulated community, decision-makers and the public confidence that assessments resulting from the use of scenarios representing an agricultural field reflect conditions that are likely to occur in the "real world." Numerous methods and sources of credible scientific information are given in this document and are considered readily available to the public through voice contact, public information sources (e.g., public libraries) or the world wide web. The Agency has identified and described as best possible information to support this guidance and seeks comments on what additional information would help improve modeling scenarios.

**List of Subjects**

Environmental protection, Environmental modeling, Pesticide Root Zone Model, PRZM, Surface water exposure, Pesticides, Crops, Modeling Guidance.

Dated: August 5, 2002.

**Sidney Abel, III,**

*Chief, Environmental Risk Branch I, Office of Pesticide Programs.*

[FR Doc. 02-20874 Filed 8-20-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-S**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

**[FRL-7264-3]**

**Peak Oil Superfund Site; Notice of Proposed de Minimis Settlement**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed de minimis settlement.

**SUMMARY:** Under section 122(g)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), the Environmental Protection Agency has offered a de minimis settlement at the Peak Oil Superfund Site (Site) under an Administrative Order on Consent (AOC) to settle claims for past and future response costs at the Site. Approximately 263 parties have returned signature pages accepting EPA's settlement offer. For thirty (30) days following the publication of this notice, EPA will receive written comments relating to the settlement. EPA may withdraw from or modify the proposed settlement should such comments disclose facts or considerations which indicate the proposed settlement is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate. Copies of the proposed settlement are available from:

Ms. Paula V. Batchelor, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV, CERCLA Program Services Branch, Waste Management Division, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303, (404) 562-8887.

Comments should reference the Peak Oil Superfund Site, Tampa, Florida, and EPA Docket No. CER-04-2002-3753. Written comments may be submitted to Mr. Greg Armstrong at the above address within 30 days of the date of publication.

Dated: August 8, 2002.

Anita L. Davis,

Acting Chief, CERCLA Program Services Branch, Waste Management Division.

[FR Doc. 02-21292 Filed 8-20-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[MM Docket No. 02-138; FCC 02-166]

### Mountain Wireless, Inc. and Clear Channel Broadcasting License, Inc.

**AGENCY:** Federal Communications Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In this document, the FCC designates the applications to assign the licenses of radio stations WSKW(AM) and WHQO(FM), Skowhegan, Maine, from Mountain Wireless, Inc. ("Mountain") to Clear Channel Broadcasting Licenses, Inc. ("Clear Channel"). The Commission cannot find, based on the record, that grant of these applications is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity. Accordingly, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 309(e), the Commission designates the applications for hearing to determine whether the public interest, convenience, and necessity will be served by grant of the applications.

**DATES:** See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for document filing dates.

**ADDRESSES:** Please file documents with the Investigations and Hearing Division, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, Room 3-B431, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Charles W. Kelley, Chief, Investigations and Hearing Division, Enforcement Bureau, at (202) 418-1420.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a summary of the Federal Communications Commission's Hearing Designation Order, MM Docket No. 02-138, adopted on June 5, 2002 and released on July 10, 2002. The full text

is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Information Center, Room CY-A257, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554. The full text may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, Qualex International, Room CY-B402, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554, telephone (202) 863-2983, facsimile (202) 863-2898, or via e-mail at [qualexint@aol.com](mailto:qualexint@aol.com), or may be viewed via the internet at: [http://www.fcc.gov/Document\\_Indexes/Media/2002\\_index\\_MB\\_Order.html](http://www.fcc.gov/Document_Indexes/Media/2002_index_MB_Order.html). Alternative formats are available to persons with disabilities by contacting Martha Contee at (202) 418-0260 or TTY (202) 418-2555.

### Synopsis of the Order

1. In March 1996, the Commission relaxed the numerical station limits in its local radio ownership rule in accordance with Congress's directive in section 202(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Since then, the Commission has received applications proposing transactions that would comply with the new limits, but that nevertheless could produce concentration levels that raised significant concerns about the potential impact on the public interest. In response to these concerns, the Commission concluded that it has an independent obligation to consider whether a proposed pattern of radio ownership that complies with the local radio ownership limits would otherwise have an adverse competitive effect in a particular local radio market and thus would be inconsistent with the public interest. In August 1998, the Commission also began flagging public notices of radio station transactions that would result in one entity controlling 50 percent or more of the advertising revenues in the relevant Arbitron radio market or two entities controlling 70 percent or more of the advertising revenues in that market. On November 8, 2001, we adopted the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in MM Docket No. 01-317, 16 FCC Rcd 19861 (2001), 66 FR 63986, December 11, 2001 ("Local Radio Ownership NPRM"). We expressed concern that our current policies on local radio ownership did not adequately reflect current industry conditions and had led to unfortunate delays in the processing of assignment and transfer applications. Accordingly, we adopted the *Local Radio Ownership NPRM* to undertake a comprehensive examination of our rules and policies concerning local radio ownership and to develop a new framework that will be more responsive to current marketplace

realities while continuing to address our core public interest concerns of promoting diversity and competition. In the *Local Radio Ownership NPRM*, we also set forth an interim policy to guide our actions on radio assignment and transfer of control applications pending a decision in that proceeding. Under our interim policy, we presume that an application that falls below the 50/70 screen will not raise competition concerns unless a petition to deny raising competition issues is filed. For applications identified by the 50/70 screen, the interim policy directs the Commission's staff to conduct a public interest analysis, including an independent preliminary competition analysis, and sets forth generic areas of inquiry for this purpose. The interim policy also sets forth timetables for staff recommendations to the Commission for the disposition of cases that may raise competition concerns.

2. On September 18, 2001, Mountain and Clear Channel filed applications proposing to assign the licenses of WSKW(AM) and WHQO(FM) from Mountain to Clear Channel. The applications were unopposed. Clear Channel currently owns six stations in the Augusta-Waterville, Maine Arbitron metropolitan market ("Augusta-Waterville metro"): (1) WFAU(AM), Gardiner, Maine; (2) WABK-FM, Gardiner, Maine; (3) WCME(FM), Boothbay Harbor, Maine; (4) WIGY(FM), Madison, Maine; (5) WKCG(FM), Augusta, Maine; and (6) WTOS-FM, Skowhegan, Maine.

3. Section 310(d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the "Communications Act"), 47 U.S.C. 310(d), requires the Commission to find that the public interest, convenience and necessity would be served by the assignment of Mountain's radio broadcast licenses to Clear Channel before the assignment may occur. Under the interim policy set forth in our *Local Radio Ownership NPRM* we conduct a public interest analysis, including but not limited to an independent preliminary competition analysis of the proposed transaction based on publicly available information and information in the Commission's records. Under the interim policy, to decide whether a proposed assignment serves the public interest, we first determine whether it complies with the specific provisions of the Communications Act, other applicable statutes, and the Commission's rules, including our local radio ownership rules. If it does, we then consider any potential public interest harms of the proposed transaction as well as any potential public interest benefits to