submission within 90 days or notify the State that EPA has determined that all or part of the submission is inconsistent with the Clean Water Act or the Guidance and identify any necessary changes to obtain EPA approval. If the State fails to make the necessary changes within 90 days, EPA must publish a document in the **Federal Register** identifying the approved and disapproved elements of the submission and a final rule identifying the provisions of part 132 that shall apply for discharges within the State.

U.S. EPA has received the submission from Pennsylvania. The bulk of this submission consists of new, revised or existing water quality standards which EPA is reviewing for consistency with the Guidance in accordance with 40 CFR parts 131 and 132.5. EPA is not soliciting comment on those portions of this submission relating to the water quality criteria and methodologies, use designations or antidegradation. EPA also is not soliciting comment on the Guidance itself.

Instead, EPA is only requesting comment on whether it should approve, pursuant to 40 CFR 123.62, and 132.5(g), those portions of this submission that revise the Commonwealth's approved National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program. In most cases, these revisions relate to the following provisions of 40 CFR part 132, appendix F: Procedure 3 (''Total Maximum Daily Loads, Wasteload Allocations for Point Sources, Load Allocations for Nonpoint Sources, Wasteload Allocations in the Absence of a TMDL, and Preliminary Wasteload Allocations for Purposes of Determining the Need for Water Quality Based Effluent Limits''); Procedure 4 (''Additivity''); Procedure 5 (''Reasonable Potential''); Procedure 6 (''Whole Effluent Toxicity''); Procedure 7 (''Loading Limits''); Procedure 8: (''Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations Below the Quantification Level''); and Procedure 9 (''Compliance Schedules''). EPA is not soliciting comment on the Commonwealth's adoption of requirements pertaining to Implementation Procedure 1 (''Site Specific Modifications'') because those requirements constitute parts of the Commonwealth's water quality standards, not its NPDES program.

Under 40 CFR 123.62(b)(2) and 132.5(e), whenever EPA determines that a proposed revision to a State NPDES program is substantial, EPA must provide notice and allow public comment on the proposed revisions. The extent to which the States have modified their NPDES programs to be consistent with the Guidance varies significantly, depending on the extent to which their existing programs already were ''as protective as'' the implementation procedures in the Guidance. EPA has not conducted a State-by-State review of the submissions to ascertain for each State individually whether their changes constitute substantial program modifications. However, in light of the fact that the States have modified these programs in response to the explicit statutory mandate contained in section 118(c) of the Clean Water Act, EPA believes that it is appropriate to consider the NPDES component of the States' submission to be substantial program modifications, and therefore has decided to solicit public comment regarding those provisions.

Based on General Counsel Opinion 78–7 (April 18, 1978), EPA has long considered a determination to approve or deny a State NPDES program submission to constitute an adjudication because an ''approval,'' within the meaning of the APA, constitutes a ''license,'' which, in turn, is the product of an ''adjudication.'' For this reason, the statutes and Executive Orders that apply to rulemaking action are not applicable here. Among these are provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.* Under the RFA, whenever a federal agency proposes or promulgates a rule under section 553 (of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA)), after being required by that section or any other law to publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking, the agency must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis for the rule, unless the Agency certifies that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. If the Agency does not certify the rule, the regulatory flexibility analysis must describe and assess the impact of a rule on small entities affected by the rule.

Even if the NPDES program modification were a rule subject to the RFA, the Agency would certify that approval of the State's modified program would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. EPA's action to approve an NPDES program modification merely recognizes revisions to the program which have already been enacted as a matter of State law; it would, therefore, impose no additional obligations upon those subject to the State's program. Accordingly, the Regional Administrator would certify that this program modification, even if a rule, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Thomas C. Voltaggio,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.

[FR Doc. 98–9819 Filed 4–13–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Farm Credit Administration Board; Amendment to Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY: Farm Credit Administration.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3)), the Farm Credit Administration gave notice on April 6, 1998 (63 FR 16813) of the regular meeting of the Farm Credit Administration Board (Board) scheduled for April 9, 1998. This notice is to amend the agenda by adding an item for a closed session of that meeting.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Floyd Fithian, Secretary to the Farm Credit Administration Board, (703) 883–4025, TDD (703) 883–4444.

ADDRESSES: Farm Credit Administration, 1501 Farm Credit Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102–5090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Parts of this meeting of the Board were open to the public (limited space available), and parts of this meeting were closed to the public. The agenda for April 9, 1998, is amended by adding a closed session to read as follows:

Closed Session*

D. Report

—OSMO Report

Session Closed—Exempt pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (8) and (9).

Dated: April 9, 1998.

Floyd Fithian,

Secretary, Farm Credit Administration Board.

[FR Doc. 98–9947 Filed 4–10–98; 12:10 pm]

BILLING CODE 6705–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Notice of Public Information Collection(s) Submitted to OMB for Review and Approval

April 7, 1998.

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 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 May 14, 1998. 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 Judy Boley, Federal Communications Commission, Room 234, 1919 M St., NW., Washington, DC 20554 or via internet to jboley@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information or copies of the information collection(s), contact Judy Boley at 202–418–0214 or via internet at jboley@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control No.: 3060–0444.

Title: 220 and 800 MHz Construction Letter.

Form No.: FCC Form 800A.

Type of Review: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Individuals or households; business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 11,500.

Estimated Time Per Response: 1 hour.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting requirement.

Cost to Respondents: N/A.

Total Annual Burden: 11,500 hours.

Needs and Uses: Licensees are required to provide this information to verify a station has been placed into operation. The form has been revised to clarify the types of uses of the form and frequency of use. Except under limited circumstances, certain Part 90 licenses may not be transferred or assigned unless the underlying facility is constructed. This form will also be used to determine compliance with the Commission's construction rules when this information is not available for either a previous submission, manual records, or currently in the licensing database.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0813.

Title: Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems.

Form No.: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Individuals or households; business or other for-profit; not-for-profit institutions; state, local or tribal governments.

Number of Respondents: 42,031 respondents; 125,996 responses.

Estimated Time Per Response: .25 - 20 hours (range).

Frequency of Response: Recordkeeping; third party disclosure; quarterly and one time reporting requirements.

Cost to Respondents: $7,050,000.

Total Annual Burden: 194,457 hours.

Needs and Uses: The Commission requested and received emergency OMB approval for several burdens placed on the wireless E911 industry and on government entities and phone systems. Most of these public burdens are one time rather than ongoing requirements, and are minimal to ensure the rapid implementation of the technologies needed to bring emergency help to wireless callers throughout the United States. The Commission is now seeking three year approval of this information collection.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–9700 Filed 4–13–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Public Information Collections Approved by Office of Management and Budget

April 6, 1998.

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 Shoko B. Hair, Federal Communications Commission, (202) 418–1379.

Federal Communications Commission.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0825.

Expiration Date: 10/31/98.

Title: Requirements for Toll Free Service Access Codes 888/877.

Form No.: N/A.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Estimated Annual Burden: 370,430 respondents; 1 hour per response (avg.); 370,430 total annual burden hours for all collections.

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Cost Burden: $0.

Frequency of Response: On occasion; one time.

Description: On March 31, 1998, the Commission released an Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order, (CC Docket 95–155), FCC 98–48 (Fourth Report and Order) resolving how vanity numbers should be assigned. The Commission delegated authority to the Bureau to resolve those issues necessary for the assignment of the 888 set-aside vanity numbers and implementation of 877, including conservation plans, if needed on any or all toll free codes in use to prevent exhaust of toll free numbers before deployment of the next toll free code. The Commission concluded that vanity numbers in the 877 toll free code, and toll free codes beyond 877, shall be released and made available on a first-come, first-served basis as each toll free code is deployed. The Commission further concluded that 800 subscribers holding 800 vanity numbers that correspond to the 888 vanity numbers that were initially set aside shall be offered a right of first refusal to those 888 set-aside numbers. If the 800 subscriber refrains from exercising its option to reserve the corresponding 888 vanity number, that number shall be released and made available on a first-come, first-served basis. The 888 set-aside numbers are to be made available for assignment 90 days after the 877 code is deployed. This proceeding was initiated to ensure the promotion of efficient, fair, and orderly allocation and use of these limited numbering resources. In a letter order, the Bureau instructs DSMI to release 877 numbers into the general pool of available numbers on April 5, 1998 for reservation on a first-come, first-served basis. Further, the Bureau instructs DSMI to inform RespOrgs to notify their 800 subscribers of their right of first refusal of the set-aside 888 numbers. RespOrgs will have 15 days from the date of 877 deployment to notify customers of their rights of first refusal. These 800 subscribers will have 45 days to respond in writing to their RespOrgs. This means that these