

Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 74, No. 215

Monday, November 9, 2009

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

November 4, 2009.

The Department of Agriculture has submitted the following information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13. Comments regarding (a) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology should be addressed to: Desk Officer for Agriculture, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), *OIRA_Submission@OMB.EOP.GOV* or fax (202) 395-5806 and to Departmental Clearance Office, USDA, OCIO, Mail Stop 7602, Washington, DC 20250-7602. Comments regarding these information collections are best assured of having their full effect if received within 30 days of this notification. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling (202) 720-8958.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number and the agency informs potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information that such persons are not required to respond to

the collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Farm Service Agency

Title: Highly Erodible Land Conservation and Wetland Conservation (7 CFR part 12).

OMB Control Number: 0560-0185.

Summary of Collection: The Food Security Act of 1985 as amended by the Federal Agriculture Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 and the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (the 1996 Act), and the Agricultural Assistance Act of 2003 (the 2003 Act) provides that any person who produces an agricultural commodity on a field that is predominately highly erodible, converts wetland, or plants an agricultural commodity on converted wetland after December 23, 1985, shall be ineligible for certain program benefits. These provisions are an attempt to preserve the nation's wetland and to reduce the rate at which soil is lost from highly erodible land. In order to ensure that persons who request benefits subject to the conservation restrictions get technical assistance needed and are informed regarding the compliance requirements on their land, the Farm Service Agency (FSA) collects information using several forms from producers with regard to their financial activities on their land that could affect their eligibility for requested USDA benefits.

Need and Use of the Information: Information must be collected from producers to certify that they intend to comply with the conservation requirements on their land to maintain their eligibility. Additional information may be collected if producers request that certain activities be exempt from provisions of the statute in order to evaluate whether the exempted conditions will be met. The collection of information allows the FSA county employees to perform the necessary compliance checks and fulfill USDA's objectives towards preserving wetlands and reducing erosion.

Description of Respondents:

Individuals or households; Business or other for-profit; Not-for-profit institutions; Federal Government; State, local or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 262,788.

Frequency of Responses: Reporting: On occasion.

Total Burden Hours: 262,346.

Ruth Brown,

Departmental Information Collection Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. E9-26921 Filed 11-6-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Eastern Idaho Resource Advisory Committee; Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Idaho Falls, ID

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the authorities in the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463) and under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106-393) the Caribou-Targhee National Forests' Eastern Idaho Resource Advisory Committee will meet Tuesday, November 10, 2009 in Idaho Falls for a 2009 Informational meeting. The meeting is open to the public.

DATES: The meeting will be held on November 10, 2009 from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting location is the Caribou-Targhee National Forest, 1405 Hollipark Drive, Idaho Falls, ID 83401.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brent Larson, Caribou National Forest Supervisor and Designated Federal Officer, at (208) 524-7500.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The 2009 informational meeting on November 10, 2009, begins at 10 a.m., at the Caribou National Forest, 1405 Ballpark Drive, Idaho Falls, ID 83401.

Dated: October 22, 2009.

Robbert Mickelsen,

Staff Ecosystem Manager.

[FR Doc. E9-26798 Filed 11-6-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the

Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Agency: National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

Title: Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership (HMEP) Program Application Requirements.

OMB Control Number: None.

Form Number(s): None.

Type of Request: Regular submission.

Burden Hours: 1,344.

Number of Respondents: 12.

Average Hours per Response: 112.

Needs and Uses: The objective of the NIST Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program (HMEP) is to enhance productivity, technological performance, and strengthen the global competitiveness of small- and medium-sized U.S.-based manufacturing firms.

Affected Public: Not-for-profit institutions; State or local government; consortia of not-for-profit institutions.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain benefits.

OMB Desk Officer: Jasmeet Seehra, (202) 395-3123.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, (202) 482-0266, Department of Commerce, Room 7845, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at dHynek@doc.gov).

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to Jasmeet Seehra, OMB Desk Officer, FAX number (202) 395-5806 or via the Internet at Jasmeet_K_Seehra@omb.eop.gov.

Dated: November 4, 2009.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. E9-26920 Filed 11-6-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Action Affecting Export Privileges; Orion Air, S.L.; Syrian Pearl Airlines

In the Matter of:

Orion Air, S.L., Canada Real de Merinas, 7 Edificio 5, 3'A, Eissenhower Business Center, 28042 Madrid, Spain;
Ad. de las Cortes Valencianas no 37, Esc.A Puerta 45 46015 Valencia, Spain;
Syrian Pearl Airlines, Damascus International Airport, Damascus, Syria; Respondents.

Order Renewing Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges

Pursuant to Section 766.24 of the Export Administration Regulations, 15 CFR Parts 730-774 (2009) ("EAR" or the "Regulations"), I hereby grant the request of the Bureau of Industry and Security ("BIS") to renew for 180 days the Order Temporarily Denying the Export Privileges of Respondents Orion Air, S.L. and Syrian Pearl Airlines (collectively, "Respondents"), as I find that renewal of the temporary denial order ("TDO" or the "ORDER") is necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation of the EAR.

I. Procedural History

On May 7, 2009, I signed an Order Temporarily Denying the Export Privileges of the Respondents for 180 days on the grounds that its issuance was necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation of the Regulations. Pursuant to Section 766.24(a), the TDO was issued *ex parte* and was effective upon issuance. Copies of the TDO were sent to each Respondent in accordance with Section 766.5 of the Regulations and the Order was published in the **Federal Register** on May 26, 2009.¹ The TDO would expire on November 3, 2009, unless renewed in accordance with Section 766.24 of the Regulations.

On October 13, 2009, BIS, through its Office of Export Enforcement ("OEE"), filed a written request for renewal of the TDO against the Respondents for 180 days and served a copy of its request on the Respondents in accordance with Section 766.5 of the Regulations. No opposition to renewal of the TDO has been received from either Orion Air or Syrian Pearl Airlines.

II. Discussion

A. Legal Standard

Pursuant to section 766.24(d)(3) of the EAR, the sole issue to be considered in determining whether to continue a TDO is whether the TDO should be renewed to prevent an imminent violation of the EAR as the term "imminent" violation is defined in Section 766.24. "A violation may be 'imminent' either in time or in degree of likelihood." 15 CFR 766.24(b)(3). BIS may show "either that a violation is about to occur, or that the general circumstances of the matter under investigation or case under criminal or administrative charges demonstrate a likelihood of future violations." *Id.* As to the likelihood of future violations, BIS may show that

"the violation under investigation or charges is significant, deliberate, covert and/or likely to occur again, rather than technical and negligent[.]" *Id.* A "lack of information establishing the precise time a violation may occur does not preclude a finding that a violation is imminent, so long as there is sufficient reason to believe the likelihood of a violation." *Id.*

B. Findings

As part of its initial TDO request, BIS presented evidence that on or about May 1, 2009, Orion Air re-exported a BAE 146-300 aircraft (tail number EC-JVO), an item subject to the Regulations because the aircraft contains greater than a 10 percent de minimis of U.S.-origin content, to Syria and specifically to Syrian Pearl Airways without the U.S. Government authorization required by General Order No. 2 of Supplement 1 to Part 736 of the EAR. This re-export took place after Orion Air had been directly informed of the export licensing requirements by the U.S. Government, and thus had actual as well as constructive notice of those licensing requirements, and occurred despite assurances made by Orion Air that it would put the transaction on hold based on the U.S. Government's concerns. BIS has also produced evidence that the re-exported aircraft bears the livery, colors and logos of Syrian Pearl Airlines, a national of Syria, a Country Group E:1 destination. The aircraft currently remains in Syria under the control of Syrian Pearl Airways and is flight capable. These facts, in addition to Orion's conscious disregard of U.S. Government warnings, heighten the concerns of further violations in connection with this aircraft should the TDO not be renewed.

Additionally, BIS argued that future violations of the EAR remain imminent based on previous statements by Orion Air to the U.S. Government that Orion Air had planned to re-export an additional BAE 146-300 aircraft, currently located in the United Kingdom, to Syria and specifically to Syrian Pearl Airlines. Evidence indicates that the issuance of the original TDO prevented this unlicensed reexport to Syria, and to date neither Orion nor Syrian Pearl has presented BIS with evidence of an alternative disposition of the second aircraft that is in compliance with the Regulations. Therefore, absent renewal of the TDO, there remains a risk that this aircraft would be reexported contrary to U.S. export control laws.

I find the facts and circumstances here, including those which led to the initial TDO, show that renewal of the

¹ 74 FR 24,786.