

#### D. Cumulative Effects

*Cumulative exposure to substances with a common mechanism of toxicity.* Section 408(b)(2)(D)(v) requires that, when considering whether to establish, modify, or revoke a tolerance, the Agency consider "available information" concerning the cumulative effects of a particular pesticide's residues and "other substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity." The EPA does not have, at this time, available data to determine whether paraquat dichloride has a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances or how to include this pesticide in a cumulative risk assessment. For the purposes of this tolerance action, the EPA has not assumed that paraquat dichloride has a common mechanism of toxicity with other substances.

#### E. Safety Determination

1. *U.S. population—i. Acute risk.* The acute dietary exposure analysis (food only) showed that exposure from all established and proposed paraquat dichloride tolerances would be 26.5% of the aRfD for the general U.S. population.

ii. *Chronic risk.* The chronic dietary exposure analysis (food only) showed that exposure from all established and proposed paraquat dichloride tolerances would be 6.8% of the cRfD for the general U.S. population.

2. *Females 13–50 years of age—Acute risk.* The acute dietary exposure analysis (food only) showed that exposure from all established and proposed paraquat dichloride tolerances would be 41.8% of the aRfD for the most exposed sub-population (females 13–19, not pregnant or nursing).

3. *Infants and children—i. Acute risk.* The acute dietary exposure analysis (food only) showed that exposure from all established and proposed paraquat dichloride tolerances would be 38.3% of the aRfD for the next most exposed sub-population (children 1–6 years).

ii. *Chronic risk.* The chronic dietary exposure analysis (food only) showed that exposure from established and proposed paraquat dichloride tolerances would be 19.7% of the cRfD for the most exposed sub-population (children 1–6 years). The next most exposed sub-population was non-nursing infants with an exposure of 12.7% of the cRfD. There is no indication of quantitative or qualitative increased susceptibility of rats or mice to *in utero* and/or prenatal/postnatal exposure to paraquat dichloride. The EPA has determined that a developmental neurotoxicity study is not required. Infants and children are not expected to show any

particular sensitivity to paraquat dichloride.

Syngenta has considered the potential aggregate exposure from food and water and concluded that aggregate exposure is not expected to exceed 100% of the acute or chronic reference dose and that there is a reasonable certainty that no harm will result to infants and children from the aggregate exposure to paraquat dichloride.

#### F. International Tolerances

Compatibility between U.S. tolerances and Codex Maximum Residue Levels (MRLs) exist for eggs, milk, ruminant tissues, passion fruit, sunflower seed and vegetables including beans (succulent), brassica (cole) leafy vegetables group, carrots, cassava, corn (sweet), cucurbits, fruiting vegetables, lettuce, onions (dry bulb and green), peas (succulent), pigeon peas, turnips (roots and tops), and yams.

Incompatibilities of U.S. tolerances and Codex MRLs on the following raw plant commodities remain because of differences in agricultural practices: Cottonseed, dry hops, dry peas/beans, maize, olives, potatoes, rice, sorghum, soybeans and wheat. No questions of compatibility exists with respect to commodities where no Codex MRLs have been established but United States tolerances exist or where Codex MRLs have been established but U.S. tolerances do not exist.

[FR Doc. 05–12445 Filed 6–28–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–S

### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

#### Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Submitted for Review to the Office of Management and Budget

June 16, 2005.

**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(s), as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) 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 Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments should be submitted on or before July 29, 2005. If you anticipate that you will be submitting PRA 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 Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) comments to Leslie F. Smith, Federal Communications Commission, Room 1–A804, 445 12th Street, SW., DC 20554 or via the Internet to [Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov](mailto:Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov), and/or to Kristy L. LaLonde, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Room 10236 NEOB, Washington, DC 20503, (202) 395–3087 or via the Internet at [Kristy.L.LaLonde@omb.eop.gov](mailto:Kristy.L.LaLonde@omb.eop.gov). If you would like to obtain or view a copy of this new information collection, you may do so by visiting the FCC PRA Web page at: <http://www.fcc.gov/omd/pra>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For additional information or copies of the information collection(s), contact Leslie F. Smith at (202) 418–0217 or via the Internet at [Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov](mailto:Leslie.Smith@fcc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission has requested approval of these information collections under the emergency processing provisions of the PRA by July 1, 2005.

*OMB Control Number:* 3060–XXXX.

*Title:* Federal Communications Commission Proposes Collection of Location Information, Provision of Notice and Reporting on Interconnected voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) E911 Compliance.

*Type of Review:* Emergency.

*Form Number:* N/A.

*Respondents:* Business or other for-profit entities; Not-for-profit institutions; State, Local or Tribal Governments; and Individuals or households.

*Number of Respondents:* 100.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 0.09 hours–16 hours.

*Frequency of Response:* Recordkeeping; on occasion, annual,

and one-time reporting requirements; third party disclosure.

*Total Annual Burden:* 435,894 hours.

*Total Annual Cost:* \$43,162,335.

*Privacy Impact Assessment:* No impact(s).

*Needs and Uses:* On June 3, 2005, the Commission released a *First Report and Order* in WC Docket No. 04–36 and a *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* in WC Docket No. 05–196, FCC 05–116 (*Order*) in which the Commission established rules requiring providers of interconnected VoIP—meaning VoIP service that allows a user generally to receive calls originating from and to terminate calls to the public switched telephone network (PSTN)—to provide enhanced 911 (E911) capabilities to their customers as a standard feature of service. See *IP-Enabled Services*, WC Docket No. 04–36, *E911 Requirements for IP-Enabled Service Providers*, WC Docket No. 05–196, FCC 05–116 (rel. June 3, 2005). The *Order* requires collection of information in six instances:

*A. Location Registration.* The *Order* requires providers of interconnected VoIP services to obtain location information from their customers for use in the routing of 911 calls and the provision of location information to emergency answering points.

*B. Provision of Automatic Location Information (ALI).* In order to meet the obligations set forth in the *Order*, interconnected VoIP service providers will place the location information for their customers into, or make that information available through, specialized databases maintained by local exchange carriers (and, in at least one case, a state government) across the country.

*C. Customer Notification.* In order to ensure that consumers of interconnected VoIP services are aware of their interconnected VoIP service's actual E911 capabilities, the *Order* requires that all providers of interconnected VoIP service specifically advise every subscriber, both new and existing, prominently and in plain language, the circumstances under which E911 service may not be available through the interconnected VoIP service or may be in some way limited by comparison to traditional E911 service.

*D. Record of Customer Notification.* The *Order* requires VoIP providers to obtain and keep a record of affirmative acknowledgement by every subscriber, both new and existing, of having received and understood this advisory.

*E. User Notification.* In addition, in order to ensure to the extent possible that the advisory is available to all potential users of an interconnected

VoIP service, interconnected VoIP service providers must distribute to all subscribers, both new and existing, warning stickers or other appropriate labels warning subscribers if E911 service may be limited or not available and instructing the subscriber to place them on and/or near the customer premises equipment used in conjunction with the interconnected VoIP service.

*F. Compliance Letter.* The *Order* requires all interconnected VoIP providers to submit a letter to the Commission detailing their compliance with the rules set forth in the *Order* no later than 120 days after the effective date of the *Order*. This letter will enable the Commission to ensure that interconnected VoIP providers have achieved E911 compliance by the established deadline.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Marlene H. Dortch,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 05–12556 Filed 6–28–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712–01–P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### Public Information Collections Approved By Office of Management and Budget

June 15, 2005.

**SUMMARY:** 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:** Paul J. Laurenzano, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington DC, 20554, (202) 418–1359 or via the Internet at [pl Laurenzano@fcc.gov](mailto:pl Laurenzano@fcc.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*OMB Control No.:* 3060–0816.

*OMB Approval date:* 5/26/2005.

*Expiration Date:* 5/31/2008.

*Title:* Local Telephone Competition and Broadband Reporting, WC Docket No. 04–141, FCC 04–266 (Report and Order).

*Form No.:* FCC form 477.

*Estimated Annual Burden:* 2,800 responses; 61,320 total annual burden hours; approximately 21.9 hours average per respondent.

*Needs and Uses:* FCC Form 477 seeks to gather information on the

development of local competition and deployment of broadband service also known as advanced telecommunications services. The data are necessary to evaluate the status of developing competition in local exchange telecommunications markets and to evaluate the status of broadband deployment. The information is used by Commission staff to advise the Commission about the efficacy of Commission rules and policies adopted to implement the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

*OMB Control No.:* 3060–1046.

*OMB Approval date:* 5/25/2005.

*Expiration Date:* 05/31/2008.

*Title:* Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunication Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96–128, Order on Reconsideration.

*Form No.:* N/A.

*Estimated Annual Burden:* 4,854 responses; 485,400 total annual burden hours; 100 hours average response time per respondent.

*Needs and Uses:* On October 3, 2003, the Commission issued a Report and Order that required “Completing Carriers” to compensate payphone service providers (PSPs) for each and every completed call using a coinless access number (CC Docket 96–128/FCC 03–235). This Order on Reconsideration, released on October 22, 2004, does not change this compensation framework, but rather refines and builds upon its approach. It provides guidance on the types of contracts that the Commission would deem to be reasonable methods of compensating PSPs, extends the time period that carriers must retain certain payphone records, and clarifies the rules’ reporting, certification, and audit requirements.

Federal Communications Commission.

**Marlene H. Dortch,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 05–12737 Filed 6–28–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6712–01–P**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

### Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission for Extension Under Delegated Authority.

June 17, 2005.

**SUMMARY:** The Federal Communications Commission, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burden invites the general public and other