Industries, Inc., Commercial 76 Auto Truck Stop, Cooper & Son, Inc., Maritrans Operating Partners L.P., f/k/ a Sonet Marine and Sonat Marine, Cortez Shell, Inc., Cypress Tire & Auto Service, D&R Truck Service, Inc., Daniel Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc., Dart Container Corporation, De Soto County Board of County Commissioners, Dick Smith Motors, Inc., Dodge City, Inc., Don Olson Firestone, Dunson Harvesting, Inc., East Bay Sanitation, Edward's Asphalt, Inc., Ekiert Tire Center, Ernie's Amoco Station, Evans Automotive, F.W. Woolworth, Co., Farrell Lines Incorporated/Austral Patriot, Firestone—M.R. Lambert Firestone, Flohl's Service Station, Florida—Department of Agriculture, Florida Favorite Fertilizer, Inc., Florida Refuse Service, Inc., Florida West Coast Distributors, Inc., FMC Corporation, Freeman & Sons, Inc. n/ k/a Brungart Equipment Co., Inc., G&B Oil Products, Gadd Concrete, Inc., Gator Concrete n/k/a Metro Concrete Co., Gene's '66' Service, Goochland Nurseries, Inc., Gray Enterprises of Tampa, Inc., Green Acres R.V. Center, Inc., Griffin's Concrete, Inc., Growers Service Co., Inc., Gulf Coast Lead Company n/k/a Gulf Coast Recycling, Inc., Hanna Transfer Company, Hendry County School Board, Henkels & McCoy Equipment Co., Inc., Herman's Auto Clinic, Hertz Penske Truck Leasing, Inc., Highland County School District, Hillsborough County Aviation Authority, Hunt Refining Company f/ k/a Hunt Oil Company, Hydraulic Equipment Co., Import City, J.C. Penney Co., Inc., J.H. Williams Oil Company, Inc., Jim's Gulf Station, John Deere Industrial Equipment Co., Johnson's Chevron, Joie Chitwood Chevrolet, Inc., Jones Oil & Tire, Inc., Kash N' Karry, Kent Oil Company, Inc., Kings Point Vehicle Storage Club, Inc., Krispy Kreme Doughnuts, Larkin Contracting, Inc., Lee Myles Associates Corp., Linder Industrial Machinery, M&M Lawn Mower Sales and Service, Inc., Macasphalt Corporation n/k/a Ashland-Warren, Inc., Masons Concrete of Crystal River, Inc., McGinnes Lumber Company at Plant City, McLeods 66 Service, Moran Towing Corp. National Guard Amory, Tag-Fl, National Sea Products (U.S.) Corps. Ltd., John H. Patterson, On Site Truck Services, Inc., Orange Co. of Florida, Inc., Orange State Oil Co., Parcel Delivery of Tampa, Inc., Parkwood Auto Service, Paul Bundy Exxon Station, Peace River Electric

Cooperative, Inc., Pennington Auto Service Center, Pepsico Truck Leasing Co., L.P./General Electric Capital Co., Plant City Steel Corporation n/k/a Harsco Corporation, Precision Automotive Limited, Precision Toyota, Inc. f/k/a University Toyota, Inc., Pride Manufacturing Company, Ram Industries, Inc., Reco-Tricote, Inc., Richens and Son, Inc., Roberts Motor Company, Inc., Roundtree Transport & Rigging, Inc., Roy's Gulf Station, Royal Caribbean Cruises, Ltd., Schwend, Inc., Sorrells Bros. Packing Co., Inc., South Dale Mabry Exxon (Britt's Exxon), South Howard Auto Service (pre-83), Southland Industries, Southside Shell Service, Standard Marine Supply Corp., Standard Sand & Silica Company, Stauffer Chemical Co., Suncoast Helicopters, Inc., Tampa Maid Sea Products, Inc., Ullrich's, Union Carbide Corporation, Utility Trailer & Brake Service, Inc., Vassallo, Inc. f/k/ a Forder Vassallo, Inc., Venice Flying Service, Inc., Virgil's "66", Inc., West Trucking Company, Inc., Wilson Davis Ford, Inc., Winter Garden Citrus Growers Association. Winter Haven Citrus Growers Assoc., Woodcook's Gulf, and Yarbrough Tire Service, Inc.

EPA will consider public comments on the proposed settlement for thirty days. 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, Program Services Branch, Waste Management Division, 61 Forsyth Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303, (404) 562–8887.

Written comment may be submitted to Mr. Greg Armstrong at the above address within 30 days of the date of publication.

Dated: August 21, 1997.

#### Richard D. Green,

Acting Director, Waste Management Division. [FR Doc. 97–22953 Filed 8–27–97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

# Public Information Collections Approved by Office of Management and Budget

August 21, 1997.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has received Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for the following public information collections pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104–13. 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 control number. For further information contact Shoko B. Hair, Federal Communications Commission, (202) 418–1379.

#### **Federal Communications Commission**

OMB Control No.: 3060–0742. Expiration Date: 12/31/99. Title: Number Portability—47 CFR Part 52, Subpart C, Sections 52.21–52.31.

Form No.: N/A.

*Respondents:* Business or other for profit.

Estimated Annual Burden: 237 respondents; 4.74 hours per response (avg.); 1125 total annual burden hours for all collections.

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Cost Burden: \$0. Frequency of Response: On occasion.

Description: In the First Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration (First Reconsideration Order) issued in CC Docket No. 95-116, the Commission generally affirms and clarifies rules promulgated in the First Report and Order issued in this proceeding which implements the statutory requirement that local exchange carriers (LECs) provide number portability as set forth in Section 251 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (1996 Act). The Commission requires the following information to be collected from various entities: a. Field Test report: The First Report and Order requires carriers participating in a field test of number portability in the Chicago, Illinois area to jointly file with the Commission a report of their findings within 30 days after completion of the test. At this time, it is not clear how many carriers will be participating, but it is likely to include several new entrant local exchange carriers (LECs) and the dominant incumbent LEC in the region. See 47 CFR Section 52.23(g). (11 respondents=20 hours per respondent=220 annual burden hours). b. Requests for long-term number portability in areas inside or outside the 100 largest MSAs: The First Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration requires that long-term

number portability must be provided by

LECs and CMRS providers inside the

100 largest Metropolitan Statistical

Areas (MSAs) in switches for which

another carrier has made a specific

request for number portability, according to the Commission's deployment schedule. A carrier must make its specific requests for deployment of number portability in particular switches at least nine months before the deadline for completion of number portability in that MSA. After carriers have submitted requests for number portability, a wireline carrier or CMRS provider must make readily available upon request, to any interested parties, a list of its switches for which portability has been requested, and those for which portability has not been requested. (80 respondents=3 hours per response=240 total annual hours). States will have the option of aggregating switch requests in the 100 largest MSAs. (50 respondents=3 hours per response=150 total annual hours). After the deadline for deployment in an MSA, carriers must deploy number portability in additional switches in that MSA upon request within certain time frames. After December 31, 1998, for LECs and after June 30, 1999, for CMRS providers outside the 100 largest MSAs, the First Report and Order continues to require deployment within six months after a specific request by another telecommunications carrier. The request must specifically request long-term number portability, identify the area covered by the request, and provide a tentative date six or more months in the future when the carrier expects to need number portability in order to port prospective customers. See 47 CFR Sections 52.23(b) and 52.31(a). (80 respondents×3 hours per response=240 hours). c. State notification of intention to "opt out" of regional database system: The First Report and Order requires state regulatory commissions to file with the Commission a notification if they opt to develop a state-specific database for the provision of number portability in lieu of participating in a regional database system. See 47 CFR Section 52.25(g). (5 respondents×3 hours=15 annual hours). d. Carrier petitions challenging state decision to "opt out" of regional database system: The First Report and Order permits carriers to challenge decisions made by states to develop a state-specific number portability database in lieu of participating in the regional databases by filing a petition with the Commission. Such carrier petitions must demonstrate that the state decision to opt out would significantly delay deployment of permanent number portability or result in excessive costs to carriers. See 47 CFR Section 52.25(g). respondents×10 hours=20 hours). e. Proposal to administer database(s): The

item requires any administrator selected by a state prior to the release of the First Report and Order, that wishes to bid for administration of one of the regional databases, must submit a new proposal in accordance with the guidelines established by the NANC. See 1st Report and Order, paragraph 97. (1 respondent=160 hours=160 annual hours). f. Petitions to extend implementation deadline: The First Report and Order requires carriers that are unable to meet the deadlines for implementing a long-term number portability solution to file with the Commission at least 60 days in advance of the deadline a petition to extend the time by which implementation in its network will be completed. See 47 CFR Sections 52.23(3) and 52.31(d). (8 respondents×10 hours=80 annual hours). The information collected by the Commission under the field test report requirement will be used by the Commission to evaluate the implementation of long-term number portability measures and to safeguard the reliability of the public switched network. The specific request requirements will serve to trigger the obligation of LECs to provide long-term number portability. The requirement that states notify the Commission of their intention to opt out of the regional database system will assist the Commission in monitoring the nationwide implementation of number portability. The option for states to aggregate switch requests in the top 100 MSAs will also enable the states and Commission to monitor nationwide implementation. The requirement that any administrator selected prior to the First Report and Order's release must submit a new proposal to administer other databases ensures that such proposals conform with the requirements specified by the NANC, consistent with the principles enunciated by the Commission in the First Report and Order. Petitions to extend implementation deadlines will be used by the Commission to determine whether circumstances exist which warrant extension of any of the deadlines announced by the Commission in the First Report and Order. The list of switches for which portability has been requested as required by the First Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration in the top 100 MSAs will enable the Commission, states and carriers to monitor implementation of nationwide number portability. You are required to respond.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0777. Expiration Date: 08/31/2000.

*Title:* Access Charge Reform—CC Docket No. 92–262 (Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking).

Form No.: N/A.

*Respondents:* Business or other for profit.

Estimated Annual Burden: 26 respondents; 360 hours per response (avg.); 9360 total annual burden hours for all collections.

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Cost Burden: \$289,000. Frequency of Response: On occasion.

*Description:* In the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM) issued in CC Docket No. 263, Access Charge Reform, the FCC proposes to make changes in the allocation of price cap LECs' interstate costs between regulated interstate services and nonregulated billing and collection activities. The Commission proposes collection of information under the following regulatory framework. a. General Purpose Computer Assets Study: Under this proposal, a price cap LEC would study the uses of the general purpose computer assets recorded in Account 2124 to determine the percentage of investment in that account that is used for billing collection activities. That percentage multiplied by the ratio of the dollar amount in Account 2124 to the dollar amount in Account 2110, which accumulates the total General Support Facilities (GSF) investment, would be applied to the interstate portion of Account 2110 to determine a dollar amount that represents general purpose computer assets used for interstate billing and collection category. The remainder of the interstate portion of Account 2110 shall be apportioned among the access elements and the interexchange category using the current investment allocator. General purpose computer expenses recorded in Account 6124 would be treated in a similar fashion to Account 2124. The interstate portion of Account 6124 would be allocated between (a) the billing and collection category and (b) all other elements and categories using the percentage derived for Account 2124. The remainder of Account 6120 (GSF expense) would be apportioned based on current GSF allocators. Appropriate downward exogenous cost adjustments would be made to all price cap baskets. We recognize that there are costs attached to a special study approach. To remedy this concern, we propose that each price cap LEC add to its cost allocation manual (CAM) a new section entitled "Interstate Billing and Collection." That section would describe: (1) the manner in which the price cap LEC provides interstate billing and collection services, and (2) the

study it uses to determine the portion of Account 2124 investment that it attributes to the billing and collection category. The special study would then be subject to the same independent audit requirements as other regulated and nonregulated cost allocations. In addition, to obtain an independent certification of the validity of the procedures adopted by the price cap LEC, we would instruct the independent auditors to examine the design and execution of the study during the first independent audit following the addition of the billing and collection section to the CAM and to report their conclusions on the validity of the study. We also note, that price cap LECs may already be required to study the use of computer investment in Account 2124 as part of the process of allocating that investment between regulated and nonregulated activities pursuant to the Part 64 joint cost rules. (13 respondents  $\times$  700 hours per response = 9100 total annual hours). b. Tariff Filings: The FNPRM contains a proposal that may require the filing of tariffs with the Commission. The Commission proposes to permit price cap LECs to assess a PICC on special access lines to recover revenues for the common line basket. The special access PICC would be no higher than the PICC that an incumbent LEC could charge of a multi-line business line. Under our proposal, the special access PICC would not recover TIC or marketing expense. Consistent with our approach to reform the interstate access charge regime, however, we tentatively conclude that the scope of this proceeding should be limited to incumbent price cap LECs. (13 respondents  $\times$  20 hours per response=260 hours). Our authority to collect this information is provided under 47 U.S.C. §§ 201-205 and 303(r). The information collected under this FNPRM would be used by the FCC by incumbent LECs for use in determining the proper allocation of general purpose computer costs to the billing and collection category. Your response would be mandatory. Public reporting burden for the collection of information is as noted above. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of the collections of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden to Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Washington, D.C. 20554.

Federal Communications Commission.

#### William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-22850 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

# **FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY**

[FEMA-1186-DR]

# Colorado: Amendment to Notice of a **Major Disaster Declaration**

**AGENCY:** Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice amends the notice of a major disaster for the State of Colorado (FEMA-1186-DR), dated August 1, 1997, and related determinations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 12, 1997.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Madge Dale, Response and Recovery Directorate, Federal Emergency

Management Agency, Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-3260.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that the incident period for this disaster is closed effective August 12, 1997.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83.516, Disaster Assistance.)

#### Lacy E. Suiter,

Executive Associate Director, Response and Recovery Directorate.

[FR Doc. 97-22944 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6718-02-P

#### FEDERAL EMERGENCY **MANAGEMENT AGENCY**

[FEMA-1177-DR]

# Idaho; Amendment to Notice of a Major **Disaster Declaration**

**AGENCY:** Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice amends the notice of a major disaster for the State of Idaho, (FEMA-1177-DR), dated June 13, 1997, and related determinations.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 11, 1997.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Magda Ruiz, Response and Recovery Directorate, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-3260.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The notice of a major disaster for the State of Idaho, is hereby amended to include the following areas among those areas determined to have been adversely affected by the catastrophe declared a major disaster by the President in his declaration of June 13, 1997: The county of Bonneville for Individual Assistance (already designated for Public Assistance).

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83.516, Disaster Assistance.)

#### Dennis H. Kwiatkowski,

Deputy Associate Director, Response and Recovery Directorate.

[FR Doc. 97-22945 Filed 8-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-02-P

# FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS **EXAMINATION COUNCIL**

[Docket No. AS97-1]

# Appraisal Subcommittee; Rules of Operation; Amendment

**AGENCY:** Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council.

**ACTION:** Notice of amended expedited vote procedures.

**SUMMARY:** The Appraisal Subcommittee ("ASC") of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council is amending Section 3.13 of its Rules of Operation, which governs the transaction of business by circulation of written items, i.e., by notation vote. As amended, the Section will allow each ASC member to vote in one of three ways: to approve, to disapprove or to veto. A vote to veto will require the issue to be placed on the agenda for the next scheduled ASC meeting. If a veto is not exercised, a majority will decide the matter, provided a quorum of ASC members participates in the voting process. In general, the Section previously required unanimous approval by all ASC members. A single member's "no" vote or failure to vote within a reasonable time operated as a veto.

# **EFFECTIVE DATE:** Immediately.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Ben Henson, Executive Director, or Marc L. Weinberg, General Counsel, at (202) 634-6520, via Internet e-mail at benh1@asc.gov and marcw1@asc.gov, respectively, or by U.S. Mail at Appraisal Subcommittee, 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20037.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The ASC, on May 29, 1991, adopted Rules of Operation, which were published at 56 FR 28561 (June 21, 1991). The Rules of Operation describe, among other things, the organization of ASC meetings, notice requirements for meetings, quorum requirements and certain practices regarding the disclosure of information. The ASC, at its August 13, 1997 meeting, approved a total, substantive revision of Section 3.13 of the Rules of Operation, which deals with notation voting.