Response: The OMB guidelines provide that agencies are “required to undertake only the degree of correction that they conclude is appropriate for the nature and timeliness of the information involved, and explain such practices in their annual fiscal year reports to OMB.” (67 FR 8453) Further, the OMB guidelines direct agencies to weigh the costs and benefits of higher quality information. The Department’s guidelines are in compliance OMB guidelines.

Substantially the Same and Acceptable Error

Comment: Several commenters objected to the Department’s assertion that it need not correct information that was within an “acceptable degree of imprecision” and information that failed to meet the applicable standards but would have been substantially the same or statistically the same had the applicable standards been met. One of these commenters also objected to the Department’s assertion that it would not correct information the correction of which would serve no useful purpose.

Response: In the course of simplifying the Department’s administrative correction mechanisms, references to the concepts of “acceptable degree of imprecision” and “substantially the same or statistically the same” have been removed from that part of the Department’s guidelines. However, these concepts are fundamental to scientific inquiry and have not been discarded. In fact, the concept of “acceptable degree of imprecision” is inherent in OMB’s view of “reproducibility” and is part of OMB’s (and the Department’s) definition of that term (67 FR 8456, 8457, 8460).

Similarly, concepts of acceptable statistical variability are essential to the scientific process. Information that falls within clearly delineated and acceptable statistical ranges is in fact scientifically correct. The Department has retained the assertion that no initial request for correction will be considered under these procedures concerning disseminated information the correction of which would serve no useful purpose, but has explained what is meant by “serve no useful purpose.” Specifically, “[c]orrection of disseminated information would serve no useful purpose with respect to information that is not valid, used, or useful after a stated short period of time” (such as a weather forecast or atomic time). The Department points out that information need not be corrected if the information would have been substantially or statistically the same or if the information is within an acceptable degree of error, in line with the scientific process.

Budget Constraints

Comment: Several commenters stated that budgetary constraints should not be a basis for failing to correct information determined by the Department to be flawed. Some of these commenters stated that Section 515 gives the public the right to seek and obtain correction of federally disseminated information. One commenter suggested that “this noncorrection of known errors seems to be too smooth a path of evasion by the most interested staff members, against those requesters seeking legitimate redress and whose claim of error is acknowledged to be correct.”

Response: The Department points out that budgetary constraints do not exempt information from any necessary correction. However, the OMB guidelines direct agencies to weigh the costs and benefits of higher quality information. The Department’s intent in including the statement regarding resources unavailable to that official is now more correctly expressed, consistent with OMB’s guidelines, as an examination of costs and benefits of higher quality information.

Department of Commerce and Operating Unit Web Sites

The Web sites that publish the Department of Commerce’s information quality guidelines are noted below. The first site includes this document for the Department of Commerce. The remaining sites document the information quality guidelines for Commerce’s operating units.

- http://www.esa.doc.gov
- http://www.census.gov
- http://www.doc.gov/eda
- http://www.ita.doc.gov
- http://www.mbda.gov
- http://www.noaa.gov
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textile finishing plant of Brittany Dyeing and Printing Corporation (Inc.), located in New Bedford, Massachusetts (Subzone 28E), at the location described in the application, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations, including §400.28, and further subject to the following restrictions:

1. Privileged foreign status (19 CFR 146.41) shall be elected on all foreign status fabric admitted to the subzone;
2. No activity under FTZ procedures shall be permitted and that would result in a change in textile quota category or country of origin, and/or alter applicable U.S. quota/visa requirements;
3. All FTZ activity shall be subject to §146.63(d) of the U.S. Customs Service regulations (19 CFR part 146).

Signed at Washington, DC, this 30th day of September 2002.

Faryar Shirzad,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

[FR Doc. 02–25629 Filed 10–7–02; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–05–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Foreign-Trade Zones Board
[Order No. 1248]

Grant of Authority for Subzone Status; Reebok International, Ltd. (Footwear); Lancaster, Stoughton and Norwood, MA

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, the Foreign-Trade Zones Act provides for * * * the establishment * * * of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes,” and authorizes the Foreign-Trade Zones Board to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs ports of entry; and, Whereas, the Board’s regulations (15 CFR Part 400) provide for the establishment of special-purpose subzones when existing zone facilities cannot serve the specific use involved, and when the activity results in a significant public benefit and is in the public interest;

Whereas, the Massachusetts Port Authority, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 27, has made application to the Board for authority to establish special-purpose subzone at the footwear warehousing and distribution facilities of Reebok International, Ltd., located in Lancaster, Stoughton and Norwood, Massachusetts (FTZ Docket 13–2002, filed 2/7/02);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the Federal Register (67 FR 7131, 2/15/02); and, Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner’s report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations are satisfied, and that approval of the application is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby grants authority for subzone status at the footwear distribution facilities of Reebok International, Ltd., located in Lancaster, Stoughton and Norwood, Massachusetts (Subzone 27M), at the location described in the application, and subject to the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations, including §400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 30th day of September 2002.

Faryar Shirzad,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board

Attest:
Dennis Puccinelli,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02–25627 Filed 10–7–02; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Foreign-Trade Zones Board
[Docket 38–2002]

Foreign-Trade Zone 40—Cleveland, Ohio, Area Application for Expansion

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board), by the Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 40, requesting authority to expand its zone (Site 3) in the Cleveland, Ohio, area, within the Cleveland Customs port of entry. The application was submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR Part 400). It was formally filed on September 26, 2002.

FTZ 40 was approved on September 29, 1978 (Board Order 135, 43 FR 46886, 10/11/78) and expanded in June 1982 (Board Order 194, 47 FR 27579, 6/25/82); April 1992 (Board Order 574, 57 FR 13694, 4/17/92); February 1997 (Board Order 870, 62 FR 7750, 2/20/97); June 1999 (Board Order 1040, 64 FR 33242, 6/22/99) and April 2002 (Board Order 1224, 67 FR 20087, 4/15/02). The general-purpose zone project currently consists of the following sites in the Cleveland, Ohio, area: Site 1 (94 acres)—Port of Cleveland complex on Lake Erie at the mouth of the Cuyahoga River, Cleveland; Site 2 (175 acres)—the IX Center (formerly the “Cleveland Tank Plant”), in Brook Park, adjacent to the Cleveland Hopkins International Airport; Site 3 (1,900 acres)—Cleveland Hopkins International Airport complex; Site 4 (450 acres)—Burke Lakefront Airport, 1501 North Marginal Road, Cleveland; Site 5 (298 acres)—Emerald Valley Business Park, Cooran Road and Beaver Meadow Parkway, Glenwillow; Site 6 (30 acres)—Collinwood site, South Waterloo (South Marginal) Road and East 152nd Street, Cleveland; Site 7 (47 acres)—Water Tower Industrial Park, Coit Road and East 140th Street, Cleveland; Site 8 (83 acres)—Strongsville Industrial Park, Royalton Road (State Route 82), Strongsville; Site 9 (13 acres)—East 40th Street between Kelley & Perkins Avenues (3830 Kelley Avenue), Cleveland; and, Site 10 (15 acres)—Franie Industrial Park, Forman Road, Ashtabula.

The applicant is now requesting authority to expand existing Site 3 by adding the 42-acre Snow Road Industrial Park, 18901 Snow Road, Brook Park. The site is contiguous to the Cleveland Hopkins International Airport complex (Site 3). The facility was the former tire warehousing and distribution facility of Goodyear Corporation, and it is now owned by the Crow Holdings Industrial Trust which is redeveloping the site as an industrial complex. The site will provide public warehousing and distribution services to area businesses. No specific manufacturing requests are being made at this time. Such requests would be made to the Board on a case-by-case basis.

In accordance with the Board’s regulations, a member of the FTZ Staff has been designated examiner to investigate the application and report to the Board.

Public comment on the application is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board’s Executive Secretary at one of the following addresses:

2. Submissions via the U.S. Postal Service: Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, FCB—