II. Method of Collection

The Census Bureau will use mail out/ mail back survey forms to collect data. We ask respondents to return monthly report forms within 10 days, quarterly report forms within 15 days, and annual report forms within 30 days of the initial mailing. Telephone calls and/or letters encouraging participation will be mailed to respondents who have not responded by the designated time.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0607–0395.

Form Number: See Chart Above.

Type of Review: Regular submission. *Affected Public:* Business or other forprofit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 8,182.

Estimated Time per Response: 1.332 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 10,857 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: The estimated cost to respondents for all the CIR reports in Wave II for fiscal year 2008 is \$185,329.

Respondent's Obligation: The CIR program includes both mandatory and voluntary surveys.

Legal Authority: Title 13, United States Code, Sections 61, 81, 131, 182, 224, and 225.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: February 22, 2007.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. E7–3433 Filed 2–27–07; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign–Trade Zones Board

Order No. 1501

Approval for Expansion of Authority for Subzone 99E The Premcor Refining Group Inc. (Oil Refinery), Delaware City, DE

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 Delaware Economic Development Office, grantee of FTZ 99, has requested authority on behalf of The Premcor Refining Group Inc. (Premcor), to expand the scope of manufacturing activity conducted under zone procedures within Subzone 99E at the Premcor refinery in Delaware City, Delaware (FTZ Docket 21–2006, filed 5/ 31/2006);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment has been given in the **Federal Register** (71 FR 34303, 6/14/2006);

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations would be satisfied, and that approval of the application would be in the public interest if approval is subject to the conditions listed below;

Now, therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The application to expand the scope of manufacturing authority under zone procedures within Subzone 99E, is approved, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28, and subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Foreign status (19 CFR § 146.41, 146.42) products consumed as fuel for the petrochemical complex shall be subject to the applicable duty rate.
- Privileged foreign status (19 CFR § 146.41) shall be elected on all foreign merchandise admitted to the subzone, except that non-privileged foreign (NPF) status (19 CFR § 146.42) may be elected on refinery inputs covered under HTSUS Subheadings #2709.00.10, #2709.00.20, #2710.11.25, #2710.11.45, #2710.19.05, #2710.19.10, #2710.19.45, #2710.99.10, #2710.99.05, #2710.99.10, #2710.99.16, #2710.99.21 and #2710.99.45 which are used in the production of:

-petrochemical feedstocks (examiners

report, Appendix "C");

-products for export;

-and, products eligible for entry under HTSUS #9808.00.30 and #9808.00.40 (U.S. Government purchases).

Signed at Washington, DC, this 12th day of February 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration.

Alternate Chairman Foreign–Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary. [FR Doc. E7–3434 Filed 2–27–07; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign–Trade Zones Board

Order No. 1500

Expansion of Foreign–Trade Zone 164, Muskogee, Oklahoma

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 Muskogee City–County Port Authority, grantee of Foreign– Trade Zone 164, submitted an application to the Board for authority to expand FTZ 164–Site 1 to include two additional parcels and to expand the zone to include two additional sites in Muskogee and McAlester, Oklahoma, within and adjacent to the Tulsa Customs and Border Protection port of entry (FTZ Docket 29–2006; filed 7/12/ 06);

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the **Federal Register** (71 FR 40991, 7/19/06) and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner's report, and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations are satisfied, and that the proposal is in the public interest;

Now, therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The application to expand FTZ 164 is approved, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28. Signed at Washington, DC, this 12th day of February 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration. Alternate Chairman Foreign–Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary. [FR Doc. E7–3428 Filed 2–27–07; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

[Docket No. 05-BIS-10

In the Matter of: William Kovacs, 24 Georgetown Road, Boxford, MA 01921, Respondent; Final Decision and Order

This matter is before me upon a Recommended Decision and Order of an Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ"), as further described below.

In a charging letter filed on June 28, 2005, the Bureau of Industry and Security ("BIS") alleged that Respondent, William Kovacs, committed six violations of the Export Administration Regulations ("Regulations")¹, issued under the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 2401-2420 (2000)) (the "Act"),² related to the illegal export of an industrial furnace to the Beijing Research Institute of Materials and Technology ("BRIMT") in the People's Republic of China. The export of the furnace, which took place in 1999, required a license because the exporter, Elatec (Kovacs' company), knew or had reason to know at the time of the export that the item would be

² From August 21, 1994, through November 12, 2000, the Act was in lapse. During that period, the President, through Executive Order 12924, which had been extended by successive Presidential Notices, the last of which was August 3, 2000, (3 CFR, 2000 Comp. 397 (2001)), continued the Regulations in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701-1706 (2000)) ("IEEPA"). On November 13, 2000, the Act was reauthorized and it remained in effect through August 20, 2001. Since August 21, 2001, the Act has been in lapse and the President, through Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001, (3 CFR, 2001 Comp. 783 (2002)), which has been extended by successive Presidential Notices, the most recent being that of August 3, 2006, (71 FR 44,551 (August 7, 2006)), has continued the Regulations in effect under IEEPA.

used in the design, development, production, or use of missiles in or by China, as described in 744.3(a)(2) of the Regulations. A license application submitted for the export was explicitly denied by BIS before the export occurred, and no license for the export was ever obtained.

The charging letter alleged that Kovacs sold, transferred, forwarded and/or disposed of the furnace with knowledge that a violation would subsequently occur, that Kovacs conspired to export the furnace without a license, that Kovacs caused the furnace to be exported without a license, and that Kovacs took actions with the intent to evade the Regulations in connection with the furnace export. Further, the charging letter alleged that Kovacs made two false statements to the U.S. Government during the investigation of the illegal export.

In accordance with 766.3(b)(1) of the Regulations, on June 28, 2005, BIS mailed the notice of issuance of the charging letter by certified mail to Kovacs at his last known address. The notice of issuance of a charging letter was received and signed for by Kovacs on July 5, 2005. To date, Kovacs has not filed an answer to the charging letter with the ALJ, as required by the Regulations.

In accordance with 766.7 of the Regulations, BIS filed a Motion for Default Order on January 11, 2007. This Motion for Default Order recommended that Kovacs be denied export privileges under the Regulations for a period of 5 years and be assessed a monetary penalty of \$66,000. Under 766.7(a) of the Regulations, "[f]ailure of the respondent to file an answer within the time provided constitutes a waiver of the respondent's right to appear," and "on BIS's motion and without further notice to the respondent,]the ALJ] shall find the facts to be as alleged in the charging letter." Based upon the record before him, the ALJ held Kovacs in default.

On January 26, 2007, the ALJ issued a Recommended Decision and Order in which he found that Kovacs committed one violation each of § 764.2(b), (d), (e) and (h) of the Regulations, and two violations of § 764.2(g) of the Regulations. The ALJ also recommended the penalty of denial of Kovacs' export privileges for five years and a monetary penalty of \$66,000.

The ALJ's Recommended Decision and Order, together with the entire record in this case, has been referred to me for final action under § 766.22 of the Regulations.

I find that the record supports the ALJ's findings of fact and conclusions of

law. I also find that the penalty recommended by the ALJ is appropriate, given the nature of the violations and the facts of this case, and the importance of preventing future unauthorized exports.

Based on my review of the entire record, I affirm the findings of fact and conclusions of law contained in the ALJ's Recommended Decision and Order.

Accordingly, it is therefore ordered, First, that a civil penalty of \$66,000 is assessed against Kovacs which shall be paid to the Department of Commerce within 30 days from the date of entry of this Order. Payment shall be made in the manner specified in the attached instructions.

Second, that pursuant to the Debt Collection Act of 1982, as amended (31 U.S.C. §§ 3701–3720E (2000)), the civil penalty owed under this Order accrues interest as more fully described in the attached Notice, and, if payment is not made by the due date specified herein, Kovacs will be assessed, in addition to the full amount of the civil penalty and interest, a penalty charge and an administrative charge, as further described in the attached Notice.

Third, that, for a period of five years from the date of this Order, William Kovacs, 24 Georgetown Road, Boxford, MA 01921, and when acting for or on behalf of Kovacs, his representatives, agents, assigns and employees (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Denied Person"), may not, directly or indirectly, participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as "item") exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations, including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations; or

C. Benefitting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations.

¹The charged violations occurred from 1998, 1999 and 2001. The Regulations governing the violations at issue are found in the 1998, 1999 and 2001 versions of the Code of Federal Regulations (15 CFR parts 730–774 (1998–1999, 2001)). Actions taken during this administrative enforcement proceeding are governed by the Regulations in effect at the time such actions take place.