

8. Where bicycle (mountain bike) use is allowed on the CDNST, consider establishing bicycle use prohibitions and restrictions (36 CFR part 261) to mitigate the effects of such use on the nature and purposes of the CDNST. Management practices and actions that would promote or result in increased bicycle use on the CDNST should not occur.

Regulatory Certifications

Environmental Impact

The directives would provide policy and procedural guidance to agency officials implementing the National Trails System Act. CDNST management decisions implementing the directives would include appropriate site-specific environmental analysis and public involvement. The directives would have no effect on the ground until site-specific planning decisions are completed, with opportunity for public involvement. Section 31b of USDA Forest Service Handbook 1909.15 (57 FR 43180, September 18, 1992) excludes from documentation in an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement “rules, regulations, or policies to establish Service-wide administrative procedures, program processes, or instructions.” The agency’s conclusion is that the directives fall within this category of actions and that no extraordinary circumstances exist which would require preparation of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.

Regulatory Impact

The directives have been reviewed under USDA procedures and Executive Order (E.O.) 12866 on regulatory planning and review. The directives would not have an annual effect of \$100 million or more on the economy, nor would it adversely affect productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health and safety, or State and local governments. The directives would not interfere with any action taken or planned by another agency, nor would they raise new legal or policy issues. Finally, the directives would not alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of beneficiaries of such programs. Accordingly, the directives are not subject to OMB review under E.O. 12866.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

The directives have been considered in light of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 602 *et seq.*). The directives

would not have any effect on small entities as defined by the Regulatory Flexibility Act. The directives would not directly affect small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions. Therefore, the agency has determined that the directives would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act because the directives would not impose record-keeping requirements on them; the directives would not affect their competitive position in relation to large entities; and it would not affect their cash flow, liquidity, or ability to remain in the market.

No Takings Implications

The directives have been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in E.O. 12630. It has been determined that the directives would not pose the risk of a taking of private property.

Federalism and Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments

The agency has considered the directives under the requirements of E.O. 13132 on federalism, and has determined that the directives conform with the federalism principles set out in this E.O.; would not impose any compliance costs on the States; and would not have substantial direct effects on the States, the relationship between the Federal government and the States, or the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, the agency has determined that no further assessment of federalism implications is necessary.

Moreover, the directives would not have Tribal implications as defined by E.O. 13175, Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments, and therefore advance consultation with Tribes is not required.

Energy Effects

The directives have been reviewed under E.O. 13211 of May 18, 2001, Actions Concerning Regulations That Significantly Affect the Energy Supply. It has been determined that the directives would not constitute a significant energy action as defined in the E.O.

Unfunded Mandates

Pursuant to Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1531–1538), which the President signed into law on March 22, 1995, the agency has assessed the effects of the directives

on State, local, and Tribal governments and the private sector. The directives would not compel the expenditure of \$100 million or more by any State, local, or Tribal government or anyone in the private sector. Therefore, a statement under section 202 of the act is not required.

Controlling Paperwork Burdens on the Public

These directives do not contain any recordkeeping or reporting requirements or other information collection requirements as defined in 5 CFR part 1320 that are not already required by law or not already approved for use. Accordingly, the review provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and its implementing regulations at 5 CFR part 1320 do not apply.

Dated: June 1, 2007.

Richard Stem,

Deputy Regional Forester.

[FR Doc. 07–2840 Filed 6–11–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign–Trade Zones Board

[Docket 21–2007]

Foreign–Trade Zone 65 – Panama City, FL, Application for Subzone Status, Eastern Shipbuilding Group, Inc., (Shipbuilding)

An application has been submitted to the Foreign–Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the Port of Panama City, Florida, grantee of FTZ 65, requesting special–purpose subzone status for the shipbuilding facilities of Eastern Shipbuilding Group (ESG), in Panama City, Florida. 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 June 5, 2007.

The proposed subzone would comprise ESG’s facilities at two sites in Bay County, Florida: *Site 1* “Nelson Street Shipyard” (27.2 acres/4 parcels/82,500 sq.ft.) – 2200 Nelson Street, Panama City, Florida; and, *Site 2* “Allanton Shipyard” (142.5 acres, 67,300 sq.ft.) – 13300 Allanton Road, Panama City, located 15 miles southeast of Site 1. The ESG facilities (580 employees) are used for the construction, fabrication, and repair of commercial and military oceangoing vessels for domestic and international customers. Foreign components that

may be used at the ESG facilities (representing 25 – 40% of material value) may include plastic tubes/pipes/hoses/fittings/floor coverings/seals/gaskets/o-rings, rubber mats/gaskets/o-rings/seals/knobs/dampeners, carpeting (will be admitted under privileged foreign (PF) status (19 CFR § 146.41)), articles of plaster, tableware, steel and iron pipe/tube/profiles/casings/fittings, stainless steel pipe/tube/flanges, doors, windows, structures, tanks, drums, LNG containers, anchors, articles of copper, couplings (of nickel, aluminum, lead, zinc, tin), articles of chromium, flexible tubing, marine steam turbines, engines (diesel and spark ignition) and parts, turbojets, propellers, gas turbines and parts, pumps, compressors, fans, air conditioners, furnaces and parts, heat exchange units, chillers, water heaters and parts, centrifuges, filters and filtering equipment, cranes, trash compactors, valves, bearings (items subject to AD/CVD orders will be admitted under PF status), gears, flywheels, clutches, parts of transmissions, generators and sets, starters, radio transceivers and remote controllers, radar equipment, parts of signaling equipment, electric switchgear and control panels, ignition wiring sets, compasses, instruments and meters, navigational instruments, thermostats, marine chronometers, furniture, and lamps (duty rate range: free – 9.0%; 25¢/ea.+3.9%, *ad valorem*; 84¢/bbl).

FTZ procedures would exempt ESG from customs duty payments on the foreign components used in export activity. On its domestic sales, the company would not be required to pay applicable customs duties on the foreign components, or it would be able to elect the duty rate that applies to finished oceangoing vessels (duty free) for the foreign components when the vessels are processed for customs entry. The manufacturing activity conducted under FTZ procedures would be subject to the “standard shipyard restriction” applicable to foreign-origin steel mill products (e.g., angles, pipe, plate), which requires that full customs duties be paid on such items. The application indicates that the savings from FTZ procedures would help improve the facilities’ international competitiveness. 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 is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board’s Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is August 13, 2007.

Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to August 27, 2007.

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at each of the following locations: Office of the Area Port Director, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, 2831 Talleyrand Avenue, Jacksonville, FL 32206; and, the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 2111, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230-0002.

For further information, contact Pierre Duy, examiner, at pierre_duy@ita.doc.gov, or (202) 482-1378.

Dated: June 5, 2007.

Pierre V. Duy,
Acting Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. E7-11320 Filed 6-11-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Action Affecting Export Privileges; Cirrus Electronics LLC et al.

In the Matter of: Cirrus Electronics LLC, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3703; and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3615; Cirrus Electronics Pte Ltd., Level 3, ECON Building, No. 2, Ang Mo Kio Street 64, Ang Mo Kio Industrial Park 3, Singapore; Cirrus Electronics Marketing (P) Ltd., 1303 Suraj Ganga Arcade, 332/7, 15th Cross 2nd Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore, India; Parthasarathy Sudarshan, Managing Director, CEO, President, and Group Head of Cirrus, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3703; and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3615; Mythili Gopal, International Manager of Cirrus, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3703; and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3615; Akn Prasad, CEO of India Operations of Cirrus, #303 Suraj Ganga Arcade, 332/7, 15th Cross 2nd Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore, India; Sampath Sundar, Director of Operations of Cirrus, Cirrus Electronics Pte Ltd., Level 3, ECON Building, No. 2, Ang Mo Kio Street 64, Ang Mo Kio Industrial Park 3, Singapore, Respondents.

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 issue an Order temporarily denying the export privileges under the EAR of:

(1) Cirrus Electronics, doing business as Cirrus Electronics LLC, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3703 and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3615 (“Cirrus U.S.A.”).

(2) Cirrus Electronics Pte Ltd., Level 3, ECON Building, No. 2, Ang Mo Kio Street 64, Ang Mo Kio Industrial Park 3, Singapore (“Cirrus Singapore”).

(3) Cirrus Electronics Marketing (P) Ltd., #303 Suraj Ganga Arcade, 332/7, 15th Cross 2nd Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore, India (“Cirrus India”).

(4) Parthasarathy Sudarshan, Managing Director, CEO, President, and Group Head of Cirrus, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3703 and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3615.

(5) Mythili Gopal, International Manager of Cirrus, 201 Huddersville Drive, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3703 and 22 Redglobe Court, Simpsonville, South Carolina 29681-3615.

(6) Akn Prasad, CEO of India Operations of Cirrus, #303 Suraj Ganga Arcade, 332/7, 15th Cross 2nd Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore, India.

(7) Sampath Sundar, Director of Operations of Cirrus, Cirrus Electronics Pte Ltd., Level 3, ECON Building, No. 2, Ang Mo Kio Street 64, Ang Mo Kio Industrial Park 3, Singapore.

(hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Respondents”) for 180 days.

In its request, BIS has presented evidence that shows that the Respondents knowingly engaged in conduct prohibited by the EAR and took actions to evade the EAR by shipping items through Singapore and concealing the true identity of the end-users. The Respondents participated in the export of items subject to the EAR to two end-users on the Entity List set forth in Supp. 4 to Part 744 of the EAR without the export licenses required by Section 744.1 of the EAR.

Specifically, the evidence shows that on at least five occasions between on or about September 30, 2005 and on or about April 17, 2006, the Respondents exported items subject to the EAR from the United States to the Vikram Sarabhai Space Centre (“VSSC”) and Bharat Dynamics Ltd. (“BDL”) in India without the license required by Section 744.1 of the EAR. VSSC and BDL are

U.S.C. app. 2401-2420 (2000)) (“EAA”). Since August 21, 2001, the EAA has been in lapse and the President, through Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 (3 CFR, 2001 Comp. 783 (2002)), as extended by the Notice of August 3, 2006 (71 FR 44551 (August 7, 2006)), has continued the Regulations in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701-1706 (2000)) (“IEEPA”).

¹ The EAR are currently codified at 15 CFR Parts 730-774 (2007). The EAR are issued under the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50