

### b. What Do the Proposals Address?

The proposals need to provide information that allows a determination of whether the substance is a POP in the context of the Protocol. The proposals (e.g., risk profiles) are described as a comprehensive review of the scientific information related to the determination of general human health and environmental risks associated with the uses and releases of a substance. Specifically, the proposals document the following characteristics: potential for long-range transport; toxicity; persistence; and bioaccumulation. The POPs Protocol provides guidance on numerical descriptors, as appropriate, to assist in the evaluation of the above characteristics in the context of the program. In addition to individual determinations, the evaluation includes a consideration as to whether sufficient information exists to suggest that the substance is likely to have significant adverse human health and/or environmental effects as a result of its long-range transboundary atmospheric transport (LRAT). The protocol also provides guidance to assist in the evaluation of socio-economic information to help frame the strategy for reducing risks from the proposed substances. The proposal must include, as available, information on release to the environment, including production, uses, and emissions, plus socio-economic factors related to the alternatives and/or techniques available to reduce emissions of the proposed substance. At this time, the proposals are available for public review and submission of comments and information (see the **ADDRESSES** section of this NODA for where to find these proposals) to supplement information contained in the dossiers. All relevant comments and information will be considered during the technical reviews of these proposals.

### c. What Is Involved in the Technical Review of These Proposals?

The Executive Body (EB) (which is the Convention's "conference of the parties"), has decided that the Task Force on POPs shall prepare technical reviews of such proposals when requested to do so, and present relevant documentation on the proposals to the Working Group on Strategies and Review (WGSR). The WGSR is the group under the Convention which amongst other activities, develops "strategies (i.e., negotiates) for action on substances and proposes such actions for adoption by the EB. Membership of the Task Force is open to experts from all Parties to the Convention, and to authorized

representatives of intergovernmental or accredited non-governmental organizations. The Task Force on POPs receives its instructions from the annual work plan of the EB, but reports to the WGSR.

A definitive description of the process for technical reviews of the proposals can be found at the following Web site: <http://www.unece.org/env/popsxg/proposals%20for%20NEW%20pops.htm>.

The proposals submitted by the European Commission and the Netherlands will be considered by the EB of the Convention at its session on December 12–15, 2005 for acceptability and referral to the Task Force on POPs for technical review. These proposals can be reviewed at the website listed above in the **ADDRESSES** section of this NODA. Comments and information may be submitted until December 9, 2005 to the entities listed in the **ADDRESSES** section.

### d. Other Proposals

Last year Norway submitted a proposal for pentbromodiphenyl ether (PeBDE) and Sweden submitted a proposal for perfluorocotane sulfonate (PFOS). These proposals were referred by the EB of the Convention for technical review to the Task Force on POPs in its session in December 2004. Both of these substances underwent the first stage of technical review by the Task Force on POPs, and have been recommended by the WGSR as POPs, as defined under the POPs Protocol to the EB of the Convention. (<http://www.unece.org/env/documents/2005/eb/wg5/eb.air.wg.5.2005.1.e.pdf>).

Based on the recommendation of the WGSR, the Task Force on POPs is expected to be asked by the EB to develop proposed management strategies for both PeBDE and PFOS. To develop these management strategies, information on production/uses/emissions, measured environmental levels in areas distant from sources, abiotic and biotic degradation processes, and rates, degradation products, bio-availability; and socio-economic factors related to the alternatives and/or the techniques available to reduce the emissions of the proposed substance including: Alternatives to the existing uses and their efficacy; any known adverse environmental or human health effects associated with the alternatives; process changes, control technologies, operating practices, and other pollution prevention techniques which can be used to reduce the emissions of the substance, and their applicability and effectiveness; and the non-monetary costs and benefits as well as the

quantifiable costs and benefits associated with the use of these alternatives and/or techniques is being sought. This information may be submitted until December 9, 2005 to the entities listed in the **ADDRESSES** section.

Dated: November 14, 2005.

**William L. Wehrum,**

*Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.*

[FR Doc. 05–23227 Filed 11–22–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560–50–P**

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–8001–6]

### Adequacy of Illinois Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Program

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed determination of adequacy.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 5 is proposing to approve a modification to Illinois' approved municipal solid waste landfill (MSWLF) permit program. The modification allows the State to issue research, development and demonstration (RD&D) permits to owners and operators of MSWLF units in accordance with its State law and regulations.

**DATES:** All comments on Illinois' application for approval of its research, development and demonstration permit modification must be received by close of business on December 23, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to Donna Twickler, Waste Management Branch (Mail code: DW–8J), U.S. EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604, telephone: (312) 886–6184. Comments may also be submitted electronically to: [twickler.donna@epa.gov](mailto:twickler.donna@epa.gov) or by facsimile at (312) 353–4788. You may examine copies of the relevant portions of Illinois' regulations during normal business hours at U.S. EPA Region 5.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Donna Twickler, Waste Management Branch (Mail code DW–8J), U.S. EPA Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, telephone (312) 886–6184, [twickler.donna@epa.gov](mailto:twickler.donna@epa.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### A. Background

On March 22, 2004, U.S. EPA issued a final rule amending the municipal solid waste landfill criteria in 40 CFR part 258 to allow for research,

development and demonstration (RD&D) permits (69 FR 13242). This rule allows for variances from specified criteria for a limited period of time, to be implemented through State-issued RD&D permits. RD&D permits are only available in States with approved MSWLF permit programs which have been modified to incorporate RD&D permit authority. While States are not required to seek approval for this new provision, those States that are interested in providing RD&D permits to owners and operators of MSWLFs must seek approval from U.S. EPA before issuing such permits. Approval procedures for new provisions of 40 CFR part 258 are outlined in 40 CFR 239.12.

Illinois MSWLF permit program was approved on January 3, 1994 (59 FR 86). On September 21, 2005, Illinois applied for approval of its RD&D permit provisions. Illinois submitted its rules under R05-1 for review.

## B. Decision

After a thorough review, U.S. EPA Region 5 is proposing that Illinois' RD&D permit provisions as defined under Illinois rule R05-1 are adequate to ensure compliance with the Federal criteria as defined at 40 CFR 258.4.

**Authority:** This action is issued under the authority of section 2002, 4005 and 4010(c) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6912, 6945 and 6949(a).

Dated: November 16, 2005.

**Norman Niedergang,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.*

[FR Doc. 05-23228 Filed 11-22-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

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

November 10, 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, Public Law 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 [plarenz@fcc.gov](mailto:plarenz@fcc.gov).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*OMB Control No.:* 3060-0526.

*OMB Approval Date:* 10/26/2005.

*Expiration Date:* 10/31/2008.

*Title:* Density Pricing Zone Plans, Expanded Interconnection with Local Telephone Company Facilities, CC Docket No. 91-141.

*Form No.:* N/A.

*Estimated Annual Burden:* 17 responses; 816 total annual burden hours; approximately 48 hours average per respondent.

*Needs and Uses:* The Commission requires Tier 1 Local Exchange Carriers (LECs) to provide expanded opportunities for third-party interconnection with their interstate special access facilities. The LECs are permitted to establish a number of rate zones within study areas in which expanded interconnection is operational. In the Fifth Report and Order in CC Docket No. 96-262, the Commission allows price cap LECs to define the scope and number of zones within a study area. These LECs must file and obtain approval of their pricing plans which will be used by FCC staff to ensure that the rates are just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

*OMB Control No.:* 3060-0742.

*OMB Approval Date:* 11/01/2005.

*Expiration Date:* 11/30/2008.

*Title:* Telephone Number Portability (47 CFR Part 52, Subpart C, Sections 52.21-52.33) and CC Docket No. 95-116.

*Form No.:* N/A.

*Estimated Annual Burden:* 2,027 responses; 14,333 total annual burden hours; approximately 2-149 hours average per respondent.

*Needs and Uses:* 47 CFR Part 52, Subpart C implements the statutory requirement that local exchange carriers (LECs) and Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) providers provide local number portability (LNP). This collection is being revised to include the implementation of wireless carriers providing LNP. Wireline carriers began providing LNP in 1998. In a *Memorandum Opinion and Order* (FCC 02-215) in CC Docket No. 95-116, the Commission extended the deadline for CMRS providers to offer LNP. Long-term number portability must be provided by LECs and CMRS providers in switches for which another carrier has made a specific request for number portability, according to the Commission's deployment schedule. Carriers that are unable to meet the deadlines for implementing a long-term number portability solution are required 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.

Incumbent LECs may recover their carrier-specific costs directly related to providing long-term number portability by establishing in tariffs filed with the Commission certain number portability charges. Incumbent LECs are required to include many details in their cost support that are unique to the number portability proceeding pursuant to the Cost Classification Order. For instance, incumbent LECs must demonstrate that any incremental overhead costs claimed in their cost support are actually new costs incremental to and resulting from the provision of long-term number portability. Incumbent LECs are required to maintain records that detail both the nature and specific amount of these carrier-specific costs that are directly related to number portability, and those carrier-specific costs that are not directly related to number portability.

*OMB Control No.:* 3060-0989.

*OMB Approval Date:* 11/01/2005.

*Expiration Date:* 11/30/2008.

*Title:* Procedures for Applicants Requiring Section 214 Authorization for Domestic Interstate Transmission Lines Acquired Through Corporate Control, 47 CFR Sections 63.01, 63.03 and 63.04.

*Form No.:* N/A.

*Estimated Annual Burden:* 86 responses; 959 total annual burden hours; approximately 1.5-12 hours average per respondent.

*Needs and Uses:* Procedures for Applicants Requiring Section 214 Authorization for Domestic Interstate Transmission Lines Acquired Through Corporate Control are set forth for common carriers requiring authorization under section 214 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act), 47 U.S.C. 214, to acquire domestic interstate transmission lines through a transfer of control. Under section 214 of the Act, carriers must obtain Federal Communications Commission (FCC) approval before constructing, acquiring, or operating an interstate transmission line. Acquisitions involving interstate common carriers therefore require affirmative action by the FCC before the acquisition can occur.

*OMB Control No.:* 3060-0770.

*OMB Approval Date:* 11/07/2005.

*Expiration Date:* 11/30/2008.

*Title:* Price Cap Performance Review for Local Exchange Carriers, CC Docket No. 94-1 (New Services).

*Form No.:* N/A.

*Estimated Annual Burden:* 34 responses; 170 total annual burden hours; approximately 5 hours average per respondent.