

including, but not limited to, the following information:

- An overview of the registration review case status.
- A list of current product registrations and registrants.
- **Federal Register** notices regarding any pending registration actions.
- **Federal Register** notices regarding current or pending tolerances.
- Risk assessments.
- Bibliographies concerning current registrations.
- Summaries of incident data.
- Any other pertinent data or information.

Each docket contains a document summarizing what the Agency currently knows about the pesticide case and a preliminary work plan for anticipated data and assessment needs. Additional documents provide more detailed information. During this public comment period, the Agency is asking that interested persons identify any additional information they believe the Agency should consider during the registration reviews of these pesticides. The Agency identifies in each docket the areas where public comment is specifically requested, though comment in any area is welcome.

2. *Other related information.* More information on these cases, including the active ingredients for each case, may be located in the registration review schedule on the Agency's Web site at http://www.epa.gov/oppsrrd1/registration_review/schedule.htm. Information on the Agency's registration review program and its implementing regulation may be seen at http://www.epa.gov/oppsrrd1/registration_review.

3. *Information submission requirements.* Anyone may submit data or information in response to this document. To be considered during a pesticide's registration review, the submitted data or information must meet the following requirements:

- To ensure that EPA will consider data or information submitted, interested persons must submit the data or information during the comment period. The Agency may, at its discretion, consider data or information submitted at a later date.
- The data or information submitted must be presented in a legible and useable form. For example, an English translation must accompany any material that is not in English and a written transcript must accompany any information submitted as an audiographic or videographic record. Written material may be submitted in paper or electronic form.

- Submitters must clearly identify the source of any submitted data or information.

- Submitters may request the Agency to reconsider data or information that the Agency rejected in a previous review. However, submitters must explain why they believe the Agency should reconsider the data or information in the pesticide's registration review.

As provided in 40 CFR 155.58, the registration review docket for each pesticide case will remain publicly accessible through the duration of the registration review process; that is, until all actions required in the final decision on the registration review case have been completed.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests.

Dated: June 18, 2013.

Michael Goodis,

Acting Director, Pesticide Re-Evaluation Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 2013-15325 Filed 6-25-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Information Collection Being Reviewed by the Federal Communications Commission

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission (FCC), as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork burdens, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on the following information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995. Comments are requested concerning 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; the accuracy of the Commission's burden estimate; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; 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; and ways to further reduce the information collection burden on small

business concerns with fewer than 25 employees.

The FCC 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 PRA that does not display a valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number.

DATES: Written PRA comments should be submitted on or before August 26, 2013. 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 PRA comments to Cathy Williams, FCC, via email PRA@fcc.gov and to Cathy.Williams@fcc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information about the information collection, contact Cathy Williams at (202) 418-2918.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Control Number: 3060-1078.

Title: Rules and Regulations

Implementing the Controlling the Assault of Non-Solicited Pornography and Marketing Act of 2003, CG Docket No. 04-53.

Form Number: N/A.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit entities; Not-for-profit institutions; Individuals or households.

Number of Respondents and Responses: 5,443,062 respondents; 5,443,062 responses.

Estimated Time per Response: 1-10 hours (average per response).

Frequency of Response:

Recordkeeping requirement; On occasion reporting requirements; Third party disclosure requirement.

Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain benefits. The statutory authority for this information collection is the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003, 15 U.S.C. 7701-7713, Public Law 108-187, 117 Stat. 2719.

Total Annual Burden: 30,254,373 hours.

Total Annual Cost: \$16,244,026.

Nature and Extent of Confidentiality: Confidentiality is an issue to the extent that individuals and households provide personally identifiable information, which is covered under the FCC's system of records notice (SORN), FCC/CGB-1, "Informal Complaints and Inquiries." As required by the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. 552a, the Commission also published SORN, FCC/CGB-1,

“Informal Complaints and Inquiries,” in the **Federal Register** on December 15, 2009 (74 FR 66356), which became effective on January 25, 2010.

Privacy Impact Assessment: Yes. The Privacy Impact Assessment was completed on June 28, 2007. It may be reviewed at: http://www.fcc.gov/omd/privacyact/Privacy_Impact_Assessment.html. The Commission is in the process of updating the PIA to incorporate various revisions to it as a result of revisions to the SORN.

Needs and Uses: The reporting requirements included under this OMB Control Number 3060–1078 enable the Commission to collect information regarding violations of the Controlling the Assault of Non-Solicited Pornography and Marketing Act of 2003 (CAN–SPAM Act). This information is used to help wireless subscribers stop receiving unwanted commercial mobile services messages.

On August 12, 2004, the Commission released an *Order*, Rules and Regulations Implementing the Controlling the Assault of Non-Solicited Pornography and Marketing Act of 2003, CG Docket No. 04–53, FCC 04–194, published at 69 FR 55765, September 16, 2004, adopting rules to prohibit the sending of commercial messages to any address referencing an Internet domain name associated with wireless subscribers’ messaging services, unless the individual addressee has given the sender express prior authorization. The information collection requirements consist of 47 CFR 64.3100(a)(4), (d), (e) and (f) of the Commission’s rules.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Office of Managing Director.

[FR Doc. 2013–15207 Filed 6–25–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[MB Docket No. 09–182; MB Docket No. 07–294; DA–13–1317]

Media Bureau Invites Comments on Study Submitted by the Minority Media and Telecommunications Council in 2010 Quadrennial Review of Broadcast Ownership Rules

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This document seeks comment on a May 30, 2013, study from the Minority Media and

Telecommunications Council (MMTC) titled *The Impact of Cross Media Ownership on Minority/Women Owned Broadcast Stations* (the Study) in the above referenced dockets.

DATES: Interested parties may file comments on or before July 22, 2013, and reply comments on or before August 6, 2013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Benjamin Arden, Media Bureau, at (202) 418–2330 or email at Benjamin.Arden@fcc.gov, or Brendan Holland, Media Bureau, at (202) 418–2330 or email at Brendan.Holland@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The complete text of the document is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554, and may also be purchased from the Commission’s copy contractor, BCPI, Inc., Portals II, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20054. Customers may contact BCPI, Inc. at their Web site <http://www.bcpicom> or call 1–800–378–3160.

Summary of the Public Notice

1. On May 30, 2013, the Minority Media and Telecommunications Council (MMTC) submitted a study by Fratrik, Dr. Mark R., Vice President and Chief Economist, BIA/Kelsey, entitled *The Impact of Cross Media Ownership on Minority/Women Owned Broadcast Stations* (the Study) in the above-referenced dockets. According to MMTC, the Study examines whether, and to what extent, cross-ownership might have a material adverse impact on minority and women ownership of commercial broadcast stations. MMTC suggests that the Commission seek public comment regarding the extent to which the Study may or should be relied on by the Commission in the ongoing media ownership and diversity proceedings.

2. The Media Bureau invites public comment on the Study from interested parties. The complete text of the Study dated May 30, 2013, is as follows:

The Impact of Cross Media Ownership on Minority/Women Owned Broadcast Stations

Mark R. Fratrik, Ph.D., Vice President, Chief Economist, BIA/Kelsey¹

¹This report was underwritten by a grant from the Minority Media and Telecommunications Council (MMTC). The author is appreciative of the survey design and evaluation guidance received from MMTC’s volunteer peer reviewers—Dr. Jannette Dates, Dean Emerita, School of Communications, Howard University; Dr. Philip

May 30, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	1
Procedure	2
Results	5
Competition in the Local Market	5
Provision of News and Information and Challenges	8
Conclusion	9
Appendix A—Survey Questionnaire	12

The Impact of Cross Media Ownership on Minority/Women Owned Broadcast Stations

Executive Summary

3. The marketplace in which local radio and television stations, as well as local newspapers has changed quite dramatically in the past few years. Competition for audiences as well as for local advertisers has noticeably increased. At the same time, these traditional media are still important players in the advertising marketplace and the provision of news and entertainment to their local communities.

4. The regulations governing the ownership of these traditional media have changed too, though the ban on broadcast-newspaper local ownership is still in place. Many analysts have examined the continuance of that ban and relaxing other local broadcast ownership rules on the impact on competition and the provision of diverse viewpoints. There has not been any specific study on the impact of relaxing these local cross-ownership rules on the impact on minority and/or women owned broadcasters.

5. In this study we focus in on that research question—whether the existence of a commonly owned cross-media operation has a disparate impact on minority and/or women owned broadcast stations. Specifically, we surveyed both minority and/or women owned broadcast stations in markets with cross-media operations along with non-minority/non-women owned broadcast stations in the same markets. In that survey we asked respondents in several different ways to offer their views on the importance of these local cross-media operations. We wanted to see if there was a difference in the responses of the two groups of stations of these cross-media operations.

Napoli, Professor of Communication and Media Management at the Fordham Schools of Business and Director of the university’s Donald McGannon Communication Research Center; and Allen Hammond, Esq., Associate Dean for Faculty Development, Phil and Bobbie Sanfilippo Chair and Professor of Law, and Director of the Broadband Institute of California, Santa Clara University School of Law.