

in that the same manner or quantity as in the past 12 months;

(3) All grain to be stored in such an alternative facility must be company-owned; and

(4) All grain to be stored in such an alternative facility must be accounted for through inventory records.

Proposals must include the following information:

(1) Location of the storage site;

(2) Description of alternative storage facility;

(3) Quantity of grain stored in the alternative storage facility in the past 12 months;

(4) Quantity of corn or wheat to be stored in facility;

(5) Information on the severity of storage congestion in the geographical area including any other facility within 10 miles of such site; and

(6) Dollar amount per bushel of incentive payment requested.

Operators entering into agreements with CCC will be required to meet certain documentation and certification requirements. These requirements will allow CCC to verify the quantity of corn or wheat stored in the alternative storage facility.

III. Transportation Differential

CCC is seeking proposals on up to 200,000 metric tons (MT, 2204.623 pounds) for a transportation differential incentive on the movement of corn, wheat or soybeans through regions other than the Central Gulf. This is designed to reduce transportation demand on the Mississippi River system and alleviate costs associated with these alternative transportation modes and handling locations. The movement of corn, wheat or soybeans subject to the differential must be completed by November 1, 2005. This incentive is intended to encourage new routes and is destination neutral.

Re-direction of existing sales and new sales are eligible. There are no restrictions on flagging of ocean carriers or on the interested parties' domicile. Transshipments are allowed if the eligible commodity has been shipped from the customs territory of the U.S. via Great Lakes coastal range and its identity has been preserved until shipped from Canada. Proposed transshipment routes must be included in the proposal.

Interested parties must demonstrate:

(1) Financial ability to perform;

(2) Performance history in the movement of bulk grains;

(3) Access to handling facilities through ownership, contractual or put-through agreement, and

(4) That they are not currently debarred, suspended or proposed for

debarment from any Federally administered program.

The proposal must include:

(1) The commodity to be shipped;

(2) Tonnage of the commodity

(minimum 10,000 MT);

(3) Final intended destination including transshipment routes if any;

(4) Transportation mode;

(5) Proposed rate of incentive per metric ton (MT) of the commodity;

(6) Time-frame for completion; and

(7) Explanation as to how the movement reduces transportation demand on the Mississippi River system.

Interested parties may submit multiple proposals.

IV. Proposal Evaluation Criteria and Award

Proposals must be evaluated objectively in accordance with the regulations on "Competition in the awarding of discretionary grants and cooperative agreements" found at 7 CFR 3015.158. The following criteria must be used equally in the evaluation:

(1) Proposal's cost in relation to current market values for both commodities and transportation;

(2) Net positive impact on transportation logjams; and

(3) Overall cost effectiveness of proposal.

CCC will notify interested parties of approval of their proposals on October 17, 2005.

Signed at Washington, DC September 29, 2005.

Michael W. Yost,

Executive Vice-President, Commodity Credit Corporation.

[FR Doc. 05-19999 Filed 9-30-05; 3:02 pm]

BILLING CODE 3410-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Census Bureau

Decennial Short Form Experiment

ACTION: Proposed collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before December 5, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Diana Hynek, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6625, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at DHynek@doc.gov).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument(s) and instructions should be directed to Elizabeth Martin, Census Bureau, Building 3, Room Number 3715, Washington, DC 20333, 301-763-4905 (elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

Introduction

The Census Bureau plans to conduct an experimental mailing for the Decennial Short Form. The goal of this experiment is to improve the quality of data collected in the 2010 Census and the response to the mailed Short Form.

The experiment will include treatment groups that encompass three objectives. The first objective of the test is to evaluate the effects of the wording of the instruction about whom to list as Person 1. The instruction used in Census 2000 caused confusion and errors by respondents in cognitive interviews. Consequently, the instruction was revised to try to correct the problems identified in cognitive testing. The revised version has been through two additional rounds of cognitive testing, and it seems to promote more accurate responses. The field test will provide empirical evidence that we will use to evaluate the success of the revised instruction.

The second goal of the field test is to evaluate an additional question series that is designed to alleviate respondent confusion about what constitutes a completed form. The additional question will provide respondents with a clear stopping point, which is currently lacking. (Respondents in previous cognitive interviews spent considerable time trying to figure out when and where they are supposed to stop.) The final question series will collect the respondent's name, phone number, and proxy status. (In some cases, someone outside the household completes the questionnaire—*e.g.*, a child of an elderly individual. This type of respondent is a "proxy" respondent for the household.) This information will be used to evaluate the effect of the revised instruction on the frequency with which respondents erroneously leave themselves off the form. An experimental version will further ask respondents to make sure that the forms

are complete before they mail them back.

The third goal of the field test is to evaluate how a compressed mailing schedule with a "due date" on the form impacts the rate and speed of response. By "compressed" we mean that the mailing schedule will differ from the standard 2000 Census approach, where the Short Form is mailed 2 weeks before "Census Day." In the compressed approach, we will time the mailing so that households receive the questionnaire a few days before "Census Day." "Census Day" for this test will be approximately one month after we receive OMB approval.

Background

Research by Dillman, Parsons, and Mahon-Taft (2004) revealed that the instruction used in Census 2000 caused serious confusion and errors by respondents in cognitive interviews. Almost half (13 of 30) of the respondents expressed confusion about whom to list as Person 1, and 13 percent left themselves or someone else off the form entirely. Misunderstanding this instruction may cause coverage errors since subsequent questions ask for each person's relationship to Person 1—the householder. Respondents who list the wrong person as Person 1 will be reporting relationship incorrectly for the members of their households.

Another challenge in the current questionnaire is that some respondents are unclear what constitutes a completed form. Respondents in recent cognitive interviews spent considerable time trying to figure out when and where they are supposed to stop. While this may not affect the quality of the data, it does increase respondent burden and may also delay return of the form.

Finally, the mail back response rate and the speed with which households return their questionnaires is highly correlated with the cost of the Decennial Census. The current form does not provide households with any indication of the questionnaire due date. This fact may delay response, and therefore increase the number of contacts (followup mailings and in-person contacts) necessary to obtain a completed questionnaire.

Based on these issues, we have designed a field test to evaluate new methods to address these concerns. There are three objectives of this special mailout test:

1. Evaluate the effects of the wording of the instruction about who to list as Person 1.
2. Evaluate the proportion of respondents who forget to enumerate themselves by asking them to provide

their personal information at the end of the form.

3. Evaluate how a compressed schedule with a fixed due date impacts unit response patterns.

In order to assess these treatments, the Census Bureau has proposed the following design:

- Group 1. Housing units in this treatment group will receive questionnaires with the same wording for the Person 1 instruction that we used in the Census 2000 questionnaire. In the Final Question, respondents will be asked to provide their name, telephone number and proxy information. The mail out schedule will be the conventional schedule. The questionnaire will be mailed two weeks before "Census Day", and there will be no explicit deadline.

- Group 2. Housing units in this treatment group will receive questionnaires with the revised wording for the Person 1 instruction. In the Final Question, respondents will be asked to provide their name, telephone number and proxy information. The mailout schedule will be the conventional schedule. The questionnaire will be mailed two weeks before "Census Day" and there will be no explicit deadline.

- Group 3. Housing units in this treatment group will receive questionnaires with the revised wording for the Person 1 instruction. In the Final Question, respondents will be asked to check over their answers before considering the survey complete. The mailout schedule will be the conventional schedule. The questionnaire will be mailed two weeks before "Census Day" and there will be no explicit deadline.

- Group 4. Housing units in this treatment group will receive questionnaires with the revised wording for the Person 1 instruction. In the Final Question, respondents will be asked to check over their answers before considering the survey complete. The mailout schedule will be compressed, so that the survey is received closer to "Census Day" and an explicit due date will be provided.

II. Method of Collection

The Census Bureau will select a national sample of households for the Short Form Mail Experiment. The sample will be drawn from the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) Delivery Sequence File (DSF), which contains all delivery point addresses serviced by the USPS. The USPS list sometimes misses new housing, includes vacant units, excludes addresses where the addressee has requested removal from the list, and may have limited information for

individuals who live in apartments or who have post office boxes and rural route addresses. Even so, it is the most cost effective approach available for the test. We do not anticipate that the limitations of the address list will have a substantial impact on the results of the experiment.

In order to obtain completed surveys from 10,000 households, we plan to draw an initial sample of 24,000 households. (Since previous Census Bureau mailout tests have obtained response rates of 40 to 50 percent, we have assumed a response rate of 45 percent and an undeliverable rate of 7 percent.) The sample will be allocated proportionately across the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

We will mail the following independent mailing pieces to households at all sampled addresses: An advance letter, an original questionnaire with postage-paid return envelope, and a reminder card. A replacement questionnaire with postage-paid return envelope will be mailed to those who request them. All mailing pieces will be delivered by the USPS via first class postage.

The advance letter will be delivered approximately three weeks after we receive approval from OMB to conduct the test. This letter will inform respondents that they will soon receive a census form. About a week later, each sampled address will receive a mailing package that includes the questionnaire (English only) and a return envelope. Approximately one week after the initial questionnaires have been delivered, the USPS will deliver a reminder post card to each address. This postcard—which will be mailed seven days following the mailing of the questionnaire—will serve as a thank-you for respondents who have mailed back the questionnaire and will be a reminder for those who have not. A second postcard, which will be mailed approximately 10 days later, will be sent only to non-respondents.

III. Data

OMB Number: None.
Form Number: D-61A.
Type of Review: Regular.
Affected Public: Individuals.
Maximum Number of Respondents: 24,000 housing units.
Estimated Time Per Response: All questionnaires will require approximately 10 minutes for response.
Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: A maximum burden of 4,000 hours
Estimated Total Annual Cost: There is no cost to respondents except for their time to respond.
Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.

Legal Authority: Title 13 of the United States Code, sections 141 and 193.

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: September 29, 2005.

Madeleine Clayton,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 05-19894 Filed 10-4-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Action Affecting Export Privileges; Ghashim Group, Inc.; Mazen Ghashim; MNC Group International, In the Matter of: Ghashim Group, Inc., d.b.a. KZ Results, 3334 Walnut Bend Lane, Houston, Texas 77042, and Mazen Ghashim, 10734 Overbrook Lane, Houston, Texas 77042, Respondents, and MNC Group International, Inc., d.b.a. Wearform, d.b.a. Sports Zone, d.b.a. Soccer Zone, 3334 Walnut Bend Lane, Houston, Texas 77042; Related Person

Order Renewing Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges

Pursuant to Section 766.24 of the Export Administration Regulations ("EAR"),¹ the Bureau of Industry and

Security ("BIS"), U.S. Department of Commerce, through its Office of Export Enforcement ("OEE"), has requested that I renew for 180 days an Order temporarily denying the export privileges under the EAR of: Ghashim Group, Inc. doing business as ("d.b.a.") KZ Results, 3334 Walnut Bend Lane, Houston, Texas 77042 ("Ghashim Group") and Mazen Ghashim, 10734 Overbrook Lane, Houston, Texas 77042 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Respondents"); and related person MNC Group International, Inc. d.b.a. Wearform, d.b.a. Sports Zone, and d.b.a. Soccer Zone, 3334 Walnut Bend Lane, Houston, Texas 77042 ("MNC").

On April 7, 2005, I found that evidence presented by BIS demonstrated that the Respondents conspired to commit acts that violated the EAR, that such violations had been deliberate and covert, and that there was a strong likelihood of future violations, particularly given the nature of the transactions and the elaborate steps taken by Respondents to avoid detection by the U.S. Government while knowing that their actions were in violation of the EAR. 70 FR 17,645 (Apr. 7, 2005). This finding was based on evidence that indicated that Respondents had conspired with others to cause computers, which are subject to the EAR and controlled for national security and anti-terrorism reasons, to be illegally exported to Syria. The evidence also indicated that, after learning of the EAR requirements governing the export of computers to Syria, Respondents developed and implemented a scheme to avoid these requirements by causing computers to be exported to Syria through the United Arab Emirates with knowledge that violations of the EAR would occur.

I also found that MNC was a Related Person pursuant to 15 CFR 766.23 because it is owned and operated by Mazen Ghashim, who is the President of Ghashim Group, and it is operated out of the same facilities as Ghashim Group. The evidence showed Ghashim and MNC conspired to export garment samples, items that are subject to the EAR, from the United States to Syria without the required BIS export licenses in violation of the Regulations.

BIS believes that all of the facts found in the original Order continue to justify the renewal of the Order, particularly

given the nature of the transactions and the steps that have been taken by Respondents to avoid detection by the U.S. Government while knowing their actions were in violation of the EAR. BIS believes that the evidence described in its initial Temporary Denial Order request supports this Order.

Based on the evidence submitted by BIS, I find that renewal of the Order naming Respondents and the Related Person is necessary, in the public interest, to prevent an imminent violation of the EAR. A copy of the request for renewal of this Order was served upon Respondents and the Related Person in accordance with the requirements of 15 CFR 766.24 of the EAR, and no responses were received in opposition to this request within the applicable time period described in that section.

It is therefore ordered:

First, that the Respondents, Ghashim Group, Inc. D.B.A. KZ Results, 3334 Walnut Bend Lane, Houston, Texas 77042, its successors or assigns, and when acting for or on behalf of Ghashim Group, Inc., its officers, representatives, agents, or employees; Mazen Ghashim 10734 Overbrook Lane, Houston, Texas 77042, and, when acting for or on behalf of Mazen Ghashim, his representatives, agents, assigns or employees; and Related Person MNC Group International, Inc. d.b.a. Wearform, d.b.a. Sports Zone, and d.b.a. Soccer Zone, 3334 Walnut Bend Lane, Houston, Texas 77042, its successors or assigns, and when acting for or on behalf of MNC Group International, Inc., its officers, representatives, agents, or employees (collectively, the "Denied Persons"), 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 Export Administration Regulations ("EAR"), or in any other activity subject to the EAR, 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 EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR; or

C. Benefiting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported

¹ The EAR, which are currently codified at 15 CFR Parts 730-774 (2005), are issued under the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 2401-2420) (2000) (the "Act"). From August 21, 1994 through November 12, 2000, the Act was in lapse. During that period, the President, through Executive Order 12,924, which had been extended by successive Presidential Notices, the last of which was August 3, 2000 (3 CFR 200 Comp. 397 (2001)), continued the EAR in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701-1707 (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 13,222 of August 17, 2001 (3 CFR, 2001 Comp. 783 (2002)), as extended by the Notice of August 2, 2005, (70 FR 45,273 (Aug. 5, 2005)), continued the Regulations in effect under the IEEPA.