

Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20460.

2. *In person or by courier.* Deliver your comments to: Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (PIRIB), Information Resources and Services Division (7502C), Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 119, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA. The PIRIB is open from 8:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The PIRIB telephone number is (703) 305-5805.

3. *Electronically.* You may submit your comments electronically by e-mail to: opp-docket@epa.gov, or you can submit a computer disk as described above. Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. Avoid the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Electronic submissions will be accepted in WordPerfect 6.1/8.0 or ASCII file format. All comments in electronic form must be identified by docket control number OPP-181084. Electronic comments may also be filed online at many Federal Depository Libraries.

*D. How Should I Handle CBI that I Want to Submit to the Agency?*

Do not submit any information electronically that you consider to be CBI. You may claim information that you submit to EPA in response to this document as CBI by marking any part or all of that information as CBI. Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. In addition to one complete version of the comment that includes any information claimed as CBI, a copy of the comment that does not contain the information claimed as CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public version of the official record. Information not marked confidential will be included in the public version of the official record without prior notice. If you have any questions about CBI or the procedures for claiming CBI, please consult the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**

*E. What Should I Consider as I Prepare My Comments for EPA?*

You may find the following suggestions helpful for preparing your comments:

1. Explain your views as clearly as possible.
2. Describe any assumptions that you used.
3. Provide copies of any technical information and/or data you used that support your views.
4. If you estimate potential burden or costs, explain how you arrived at the estimate that you provide.
5. Provide specific examples to illustrate your concerns.
6. Offer alternative ways to improve the proposed rule or collection activity.
7. Make sure to submit your comments by the deadline in this document.
8. To ensure proper receipt by EPA, be sure to identify the docket control number assigned to this action in the subject line on the first page of your response. You may also provide the name, date, and **Federal Register** citation.

## II. Background

### *What Action is the Agency Taking?*

Under section 18 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 U.S.C. 136p), at the discretion of the Administrator, a Federal or State agency may be exempted from any provision of FIFRA if the Administrator determines that emergency conditions exist which require the exemption. The Minnesota and North Dakota Departments of Agriculture have requested the Administrator to issue specific exemptions for the use of tetraconazole on sugar beets to control *Cercospora* leaf spot. Information in accordance with 40 CFR part 166 was submitted as part of these requests.

As part of these requests, the Applicants assert that emergency conditions exist because the registered alternative fungicides (benomyl and thiophanate methyl, TPTH, EBDC fungicides mancozeb, maneb, and copper hydroxide) no longer provide the level of control of *Cercospora* leafspot that they historically did, or which would avoid decreased productivity and yields. Without this use, the Applicants assert that significant economic losses will occur for the sugar beet industry in these states.

The Applicants propose to make no more than three applications of tetraconazole, formulated as a liquid with 1 pound active ingredient (a.i.) per gallon at a rate of 1.625 ounces a.i. per acre, on up to 1,660,000 acres of sugar beets in North Dakota and Minnesota. Use at this rate on the maximum

number of acres could result in application of a total of 168,594 pounds a.i., or 168,594 gallons of formulation. The proposed use season is June 15 through September 30, 2002.

This notice does not constitute a decision by EPA on the applications themselves. The regulations governing section 18 of FIFRA require publication of a notice of receipt of an application for a specific exemption proposing use of a new chemical (i.e., an active ingredient) which has not been registered by the EPA. The notice provides an opportunity for public comment on the applications.

The Agency, will review and consider all comments received during the comment period in determining whether to issue the specific exemptions requested by the Minnesota and North Dakota Departments of Agriculture.

### List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests.

Dated: January 18, 2002.

**Rachel C. Holloman,**  
*Acting Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.*

[FR Doc. 02-2514 Filed 2-5-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-S**

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Report No. 2529]

### Petition for Reconsideration of Action in Rulemaking Proceeding

February 1, 2002.

Petition for Reconsideration has been filed in the Commission's rulemaking proceeding listed in this Public Notice and published pursuant to 47 CFR Section 1.429(e). The full text of this document is available for viewing and copying in Room CY-A257, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, Qualex International (202) 863-2893. Oppositions to this petition must be filed by February 21, 2002. See Section 1.4(b)(1) of the Commission's rules (47 CFR 1.4(b)(1)). Replies to an opposition must be filed within 10 days after the time for filing oppositions has expired.

Subject: Amendment of FM Table of Allotments (MM Docket No. 99-196).

Number of petitions f

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Report No. 2528]

### Petition for Reconsideration of Action in Rulemaking Proceeding

February 1, 2002.

Petition for Reconsideration has been filed in the Commission's rulemaking proceeding listed in this Public Notice and published pursuant to 47 CFR Section 1.429(e). The full text of this document is available for viewing and copying in Room CY-A257, 445 12th Street, SW., Washington, DC or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, Qualex International (202) 863-2893. Oppositions to this petition must be filed by February 21, 2002. See Section 1.4(b)(1) of the Commission's rules (47 CFR 1.4(1)). Replies to an opposition must be filed within 10 days after the time for filing oppositions has expired.

Subject: Telecommunications Industry's Environmental Civil Violations in U.S. Territorial Waters (South Florida and the Virgin Islands and along the Coastal Wetlands of Maine—FCC Accountability and Responsibility for Rulemaking regarding the NEPA, NHPA (RM-9913).

Number of Petitions Filed: 1.

William F. Caton,  
Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-2867 Filed 2-5-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-M

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[CS Docket No. 01-129, FCC 01-389]

### Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This document is in compliance with the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which requires the Commission to report annually to Congress on the status of competition in the market for the delivery of video programming. On December 27, 2001, the Commission adopted its eighth annual report ("*2001 Report*"). The *2001 Report* contains data and information that summarize the status of competition in markets for the delivery of video programming and updates the Commission's prior reports.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Marcia Glauber or Anne Levine,

Cable Services Bureau, (202) 418-7200, TTY (202) 418-7172.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This is a synopsis of the Commission's *2001 Report* in CS Docket No. 01-129, FCC 01-389, adopted December 27, 2001, and released January 14, 2002. The complete text of the *2001 Report* 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, Qualex International, Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW., Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554, telephone (202) 863-2893, facsimile (202) 863-2890, or e-mail at [qualex@aol.com](mailto:qualex@aol.com). In addition, the complete text of the *2001 Report* is available on the Internet at <http://www.fcc.gov/csb>.

### Synopsis of the 2000 Report

1. The Commission's *2001 Report* to Congress provides information about the cable television industry and other multichannel video programming distributors ("MVPDs"), including direct broadcast satellite ("DBS") service, home satellite dishes ("HSDs"), wireless cable systems using frequencies in the multichannel multipoint distribution service ("MMDS") and instructional television fixed service ("ITFS"), private cable or satellite master antenna television ("SMATV") systems, as well as broadcast television service. The Commission also considers several other existing and potential distribution technologies for video programming, including the Internet, home video sales and rentals, local exchange telephone carriers ("LECs"), and electric and gas utilities. In addition, for the first time, this year, the Commission addresses broadband service providers ("BSP"), a new category of entrant into the video marketplace.

2. The Commission also examines the market structure and competition. We evaluate horizontal concentration in the multichannel video marketplace and vertical integration between cable television systems and programming services. In addition, the *2001 Report* addresses competitors serving multiple dwelling unit ("MDU") buildings, programming issues, technical issues, and examines communities where consumers have a choice between an incumbent cable operator and another MVPD and reports on the incumbent cable operator's response to such competition in several cases. The *2001 Report* is based on publicly available data, filings in various Commission

rulemaking proceedings, and information submitted by commenters in response to a *Notice of Inquiry* (66 FR 35431) in this docket.

3. In the *2001 Report*, the Commission finds that competitive alternatives and consumer choices continue to develop. Cable television still is the dominant technology for the delivery of video programming to consumers in the MVPD marketplace, although its market share continues to decline. As of June 2001, 78 percent of all MVPD subscribers received their video programming from a local franchised cable operator, compared to 80 percent a year earlier. There has been an increase in the total number of subscribers to non-cable MVPDs over the last year, which is primarily attributable to the growth of DBS service. However, generally, the number of subscribers to, and market shares of, MVPDs using other distribution technologies (i.e., MMDS, SMATV, and OVS) have remained stable, although the number of HSD subscribers continues to decline. Significant competition from local telephone companies has not generally developed even though the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("1996 Act") removed some barriers to LEC entry into the video marketplace.

#### 4. Key Findings:

- **Industry Growth:** A total of 88.3 million households subscribed to multichannel video programming services as of June 2001, up 4.6 percent over the 84.4 million households subscribing to MVPDs in June 2000. This subscriber growth accompanied a 2.7 percentage point increase in multichannel video programming distributors' penetration of television households to 86.4 percent as of June 2001. The number of cable subscribers continued to grow, reaching 69 million as of June 2001, up about 1.9 percent over the 67.7 million cable subscribers in June 2000. The total number of non-cable MVPD households grew from 16.7 million as of June 2000 to 19.3 million homes as of June 2001, an increase of more than 15 percent. The growth of non-cable MVPD subscribers continues to be primarily attributable to the growth of DBS. Between June 2000 and June 2001, the number of DBS subscribers grew from almost 13 million households to about 16 million households, which is nearly two times the cable subscriber growth rate. DBS subscribers now represent 18.2 percent of all MVPD subscribers, up from 15.4 percent a year earlier.

- **Convergence of Cable and Other Services:** The 1996 Act removed barriers to LEC entry into the video marketplace