

513-569-7566. Copies of the Integrated Report will be available on or about May 30, 1996. Please provide your name and mailing address, and request the document by the title and EPA number (EPA/600/P-93/001aF). Also, a limited number of the 1993 individual reports on the separate city studies are still available. The EPA document numbers for the separate three city reports are: Boston (EPA/600/AP-93/001b) Baltimore (EPA/600/AP-93/001c) and Cincinnati (EPA/600/AP-93/001d). There will be a limited number of paper copies of the Integrated Report available from the above source. Requests will be filed on a first-come-first-served basis. After the supply is exhausted, copies of the Integrated Report and any of the individual final reports on the separate city studies can be purchased separately or as a set, from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) by calling (703) 487-4650 or sending a facsimile to (703) 321-8547. The NTIS order numbers are: Urban Soil Lead Abatement Demonstration Project. Volume 1: Integrated Report (PB96-168356), Urban Soil Lead Abatement Demonstration Project. Volume 2: Boston Report (PB96-168364), Urban Soil Lead Abatement Demonstration Project. Volume 3: Baltimore Report (PB96-168372), and Urban Soil Lead Abatement Demonstration Project. Volume 4: Cincinnati Report (PB96-168380). The NTIS ordered number for the four volume set is PB96-168349.

An official copy, on diskette only, of the underlying data sets used in the EPA Integrated Report and a copy of the accompanying documentation, can be obtained by contacting: Dr. Robert W. Elias, National Center for Environmental Assessment (MD-52), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711; telephone: (919) 541-4167; facsimile: (919) 541-5078. e-mail: elias.robert@epamail.epa.gov

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Robert W. Elias, National Center for Environmental Assessment (MD-52), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711; telephone: (919) 541-4167; facsimile: (919) 541-5078. e-mail: elias.robert@epamail.epa.gov: or Larry J. Zaragoza, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (5204G), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone: (703) 603-8867, facsimile: (703) 603-9100, e-mail: zaragoza.larry@epamail.epa.gov

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Urban Soil Lead Abatement Demonstration Project, generally known as the Three-

City Lead Study, was authorized in 1986 under Section 111(b)(6) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act [42 U.S.C. §9611(a)(6)] and was initiated in December 1986 in cooperation with states, state health departments, and local scientists. The purpose was to determine whether abatement of lead in soil could reduce the lead in blood of inner city children. The three selected cities, chosen in late 1987, were Boston, Baltimore, and Cincinnati. The individual results for each of the three cities were initially presented at an EPA-sponsored symposium in August 1992 and published as final reports in August 1993.

While not part of the original project plan, EPA believed that all interested parties would benefit from an integrated assessment of data from the three coordinated studies. Thus, as an adjunct to the original project, this Integrated Report was developed. It includes further statistical analysis and integrates and standardizes, as appropriate, the results of the individual three cities studies into a single report.

The final EPA Integrated Report on the Three-City Lead Study basically confirms the findings of the individual city reports. The Integrated Report concludes that:

(1) When soil is a significant source of lead in the child's environment, the abatement of that soil will result in a reduction in exposure that will, under certain conditions, cause a reduction in childhood blood lead concentrations.

(2) Although these conditions for a reduction in blood are not fully understood, it is likely that four factors are important: (1) The past history of exposure of the child to lead, as reflected in the preabatement blood lead; (2) the magnitude of the reduction in soil lead concentrations; (3) the magnitude of the other sources of lead exposure, relative to soil; and (4) a direct exposure pathway between soil and the child.

Dated: May 16, 1996.
Joseph K. Alexander,
Deputy Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc. 96-12865 Filed 5-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Commission announces that on May 15, 1996 it submitted the existing collection of information listed below to the Office of Management and Budget for approval. No public comments were received in response to the Commission's March 15, 1996 initial notice of the proposed collection.

DATES: Written comments on this notice must be submitted on or before June 21, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted to Desk Officer for Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, 725 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Room 10235, Washington, D.C. 20503, (202) 395-7316, Facsimile (202) 395-6974.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Margaret, Ulmer Holmes, Office of Management, Room 2204, 1801 L Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20507, (202) 663-4279 (voice) or (202) 663-7114 (TDD).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Collection Title: Recordkeeping Requirements of Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, 29 C.F.R. Part 1607.

Form Number: None.

Frequency of Report: None required.

Type of Respondent: Business, non-profit institutions, federal, state, or local governments, and farms.

Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code: Multiple.

Description of Affected Public: Any employer, labor, organization, or employment agency covered by the federal equal employment opportunity laws.

Responses: 666,000.

Reporting Hours: 1,450,000.

Number of Forms: None.

Abstract: The records required to be maintained by 29 C.F.R. 1607.4 and 1607.15 are used by respondents to assure that they are complying with Title VII; by the Commission in investigating, conciliating, the litigating charges of employment discrimination; and by complainants in establishing violations of federal equal employment opportunity laws.

Burden Statement: There are no reporting requirements associated with UGESP. Thus the only paperwork burden derives from the required recordkeeping. There are a total of 666,000 employers who have 15 or more employees and that are, therefore, subject to the recordkeeping requirement. Prior to the imposition of

the UGESP recordkeeping requirement, the Commission proposed to conduct a practical utility survey to obtain estimates of burden hours. The intended survey was not approved by OMB, however, and the Commission relied instead on data obtained from the Business Roundtable study on "Cost of Government Regulation" conducted by the Arthur Anderson Company.

In its initial estimate of recordkeeping burden the Commission relied on data from that study to derive the estimate of 1.91 million hours. In a subsequent submission to OMB for clearance of the UGESP collection, the Commission made an adjustment to reflect the increase in the incidence of computerized recordkeeping that had resulted in a reduction of total burden hours of approximately 300,000, and had brought the total burden down to 1.6 million hours.

In the calculation of the initial burden of UGESP compliance, the estimated number of employees covered by the guidelines was 71.1 million. Average cost per employee was taken to be \$1.79. Since most of this cost, however, was for employers' administrative functions and represented the time spent in reviewing their selection processes for 'adverse impact' and in reviewing and validating their testing procedures, the actual recordkeeping function was estimated to be in the range of 10 to 15 percent of the total per-employee costs, or between \$.179 and \$.2685 per employee. The Commission used these per-employee costs, even though it believed that they were an over-estimate. In the initial estimate the Commission used the higher end of the range.

The Commission now believes that a better estimate is the midpoint of the range or \$.22 per employee. The number of employees also has grown by 15 million since the initial estimate, so that there now are 86 million subject to UGESP. In addition, from the private employer survey the Commission has been conducting for the past 30 years (the EEO-1), it is aware that 29.7 percent of the private employers file their employment reports on magnetic tapes, on diskettes, or on computer printouts. Thus, at a minimum, that proportion of employers has computerized recordkeeping. From the same survey the Commission also has learned that when records are computerized, the burden hours for reporting, and thus for recordkeeping, are about one-fifth of the burden hours associated with non-computerized records. Therefore, the Commission's

current estimate of recordkeeping burden hours is as follows:

Computerized recordkeepers—(.29) × 86 mil × (\$.044)=\$1,097,360

All other recordkeepers—(.71) × 86 mil × (\$.22)=\$13,433,200

Total recordkeeping cost = \$14,530,560

Total Burden Hours are then computed by dividing the total cost of recordkeeping by \$10, the hourly rate of staff recordkeepers. The total new estimate of burden hours associated with the UGESP recordkeeping then is 1.45 million hours. Assumptions made in deriving the estimate are as follows:

Cost per employee for manual records is \$.22*

Cost per employee for computerized records is \$.044*

Hourly rate of pay for recordkeeping staff is \$10.00**

* Both of these are derived from a private employer study.

** To the extent that this is an under-estimate, the reporting burden is over-estimated.

Dated: May 16, 1996.

For the Commission.

Maria Borrero,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 96-12767 Filed 5-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Change in Bank Control Notices; Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies; Correction

This notice corrects a notice (FR Doc. 96-9394) published on pages 16791 and 16792 of the issue for Wednesday, April 17, 1996.

Under the Federal Reserve Bank of New York heading, the entry for HSBC Holdings plc, London, England, and HSBC Holdings BV, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, is revised to read as follows:

1. *HSBC Holdings plc*, London, England; and *HSBC Holdings BV*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; to engage *de novo* through its subsidiary, *HSBC Futures, Inc.*, New York, New York, in executing and clearing, executing without clearing, clearing without executing, and providing other related services, including incidental advisory services, with respect to futures and options on futures on certain non-financial commodities. Also, to execute without clearing, and clear without executing, futures on certain financial products. The proposed activities would be provided to institutional investors and employees trading for their own

accounts throughout the world. (See, *J.P. Morgan & Co. Incorporated*, 80 Fed. Res. Bull. 151 (1994); and *Northern Trust Corporation*, 79 Fed. Res. Bull. 723 (1993)).

Comments on this application must be received by May 31, 1996.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, May 16, 1996.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 96-12794 Filed 5-21-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-F

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 *et seq.*) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the application has been accepted for processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act, including whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company can "reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency, that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices" (12 U.S.C. 1843). Any request for a hearing must be accompanied by a statement of the reasons a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute, summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing, and indicating how the party commenting would be aggrieved by approval of the proposal. Unless otherwise noted, nonbanking