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

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

Title: NIST Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) Client Impact Survey.

OMB Control Number: 0693–0021.

Form Number(s): None.

Type of Request: Regular submission.

Burden Hours: 1,067.

Number of Respondents: 8,000.

Average Hours per Response: 8 minutes.

Needs and Uses: The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) sponsors the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP), a national network of fifty-nine locally-based manufacturing extension centers. The centers work with small manufacturers to help improve their productivity, profitability, and enhance their overall economic competitiveness. Each center is a partnership involving federal, state, local, and client resources. The MEP Centers provide hard-to-find technical assistance and latest business practices within reach of the nation's more than 330,000 small and mid-sized manufacturers.

NIST MEP surveys all clients provided substantive services and collects data on sales, investment, cost savings, and jobs impacts as well as a limited set of qualitative questions. NIST MEP surveys center clients for two primary purposes:

• To collect aggregate information on program performance indicators to report to various stakeholders on program performance. The survey provides information about the quantifiable impacts that clients attribute to the services provided by MEP centers. NIST MEP also conducts other episodic studies to evaluate the system's impact that corroborate and complement the survey results.

• To provide center-specific program performance and impact information for center use. Centers use this information to communicate results to their own stakeholders, at both the state and federal level. The Centers' management and NIST MEP use these results to evaluate center performance and effectiveness. The MEP Center review criteria and process place a strong emphasis on a center's ability to demonstrate impacts based on the survey results.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: Annually.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

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 6625, 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: September 5, 2008.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. E8–21032 Filed 9–10–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–P

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: Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS).

Title: Prior Notification of Exports Under License Exception AGR.

OMB Control Number: 0694–0123.

Form Number(s): BIS–748P.

Type of Request: Regular submission.

Burden Hours: 161.

Number of Respondents: 167.

Average Hours per Response: 58 minutes.

Needs and Uses: Section 906 of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act (TSRA) requires that exports of agricultural commodities, medicine or medical devices to Cuba or to the government of a country that has been determined by the Secretary of State to have repeatedly provide support for acts of international terrorism, or to any other entity in such a country, are made pursuant to one-year licenses issued by the U.S. Government. The TSRA further provides that the requirements of one-year licenses shall not be more restrictive than license exceptions administered by the Department of Commerce, except that procedures shall be in place to deny licenses for these exports to any country, or entity within a country, promoting international terrorism.

To meet the requirements of TSRA, BIS has imposed a prior notification procedure under License Exception AGR, and exports and certain reexports of agricultural commodities will be authorized under License Exception AGR.

Affected Public: Business and other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to retain or obtain benefits.

OMB Desk Officer: David Rostker, (202) 395–3897.

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 6625, 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 David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, FAX number (202) 395–7285 or via the Internet at *David_Rostker@omb.eop.gov*.

Dated: September 5, 2008.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. E8–21033 Filed 9–10–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–33–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 48–2008]

Foreign-Trade Zone 176—Rockford, IL Application for Subzone Cellusuede Products, Inc. (Flock Fiber) Rockford, IL

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the Greater Rockford Airport Authority, grantee of FTZ 176, requesting special-purpose subzone status for the manufacture of flock fiber at the facility of Cellusuede Products, Inc. (Cellusuede), located in Rockford, Illinois. 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 3, 2008.

The Cellusuede facility (55 employees, 9 acres, 7–9 million pounds of flock per year) is located at the intersection of North Madison Street and Prairie Street, in Rockford, Illinois. The facility is used to manufacture and warehouse precision cut flocking (duty-free). Components and materials sourced from abroad (representing 50–65% of the value of the finished product) include: Synthetic filament tow, artificial filament tow, polyester fibers, polypropylene fibers and rayon fibers (HTSUS duty rate ranges from 4.3 to 7.5%).

FTZ procedures would exempt Cellusuede from customs duty payments on the foreign components used in export production. The company anticipates that 10–20 percent of the plant's shipments will be exported. On its domestic sales, Cellusuede could choose the duty-free rate during customs entry procedures that applies to finished flock for the foreign inputs noted above. The request indicates that the savings from FTZ procedures would help improve the plant's international competitiveness.

In accordance with the Board's regulations, Elizabeth Whiteman of the FTZ staff is 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 November 10, 2008. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to November 25, 2008.

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at each of the following locations:

U.S. Department of Commerce Export Assistance Center, 605 Fulton Ave., Suite E103, Rockford, IL 61103.

Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 2111, 1401 Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Whiteman at *Elizabeth_Whiteman@ita.doc.gov* or (202) 482–0473.

Dated: September 3, 2008.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. E8–21231 Filed 9–10–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

Revised Proposal for Available Alternative Site-Designation and -Management Framework

SUMMARY: Based on comments received in response to the May 8, 2008, notice (73 FR 26077–26078), the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board staff is making a number of revisions to its proposal to make available an alternative framework (for grantees that choose to participate) to designate and manage their general-purpose FTZ sites. Comments on the May proposal were overwhelmingly supportive overall with regard to making such a framework available to grantees on an optional basis. However, comments also raised a number of important questions and concerns.

In response, we have made some significant revisions to the proposal. Key revisions are allowance for a special transitional phase for each grantee applying to transfer to the alternative framework, elimination of a general initial limit on the number of ''usage-driven'' (formerly ''user-driven'') sites, elimination of the concept of an ''anchor'' site, and flexibility on the duration of the sunset limits for ''magnet'' sites—with five years established as a minimum rather than a fixed standard—so that the FTZ Board may take specific circumstances into account.

Comments and questions are summarized and addressed below by general topic. The revised proposal is delineated after the discussion of the comments/questions.

Comments Received

Comments on Overall Framework and Application Process

(1) One commenter suggested that, recognizing that a number of FTZ grantees currently have more FTZ sites and/or acreage than envisioned under the standard numbers associated with the proposed alternative site-designation and -management framework (''alternative framework''), the FTZ Board could require participating grantees to submit a plan in advance of an application to restructure the grantee's zone project outlining the process and standards to be used in assessing which of the grantee's existing sites to propose for continued FTZ status.

(2) One commenter stated that a grantee seeking to use the alternative framework would be changing its zone plan, which could only be accomplished through application to and approval by the FTZ Board. However, designating existing sites as Anchor or magnet sites should be at the grantees' discretion. Further, requiring grantees to recompile economic data to resubstantiate the designation of already approved sites would tend to be time-consuming while yielding little benefit.

(3) More than one commenter suggested a transitional period that would allow grantees whose numbers of existing sites exceed the envisioned standard limitations the opportunity to exceed those standard limitations if they believe it is desirable to do so for an initial period, with a sunset provision for all affected sites helping to ''weed out'' unused or unneeded zone sites at the end of the initial period.

(4) One commenter indicated that the FTZ Board should provide an appeals process for any existing property owners that may be ''detrimentally impacted'' by a grantee's decisionmaking process regarding whether to retain FTZ designation at currently designated sites. The framework should also address issues of concurrence needed from property owners that may not necessarily agree to have zone status removed.

(5) One commenter stated that it is important that the process be managed as a flexible framework rather than as a set of rigid requirements. The final framework should set general standards but specific grants of authority should be based on grantee requests and the FTZ Board's assessment of applications. It would be incumbent on grantees to demonstrate the need to diverge from the established general standards.

(6) One commenter stated that, for states where local inventory taxes can be a possible issue for approval of new sites, the FTZ Board should require evidence of taxing authority concurrence as part of the designation process. However, for existing FTZ sites being considered as part of the reframing of a zone project under the new framework, no new taxing authority approvals should be required. Also, if under the new framework FTZ designation is removed from a site either at the grantee's discretion or via a sunset mechanism, a taxing authority approval previously in place for the site should ''remain in place'' in the event of a future request for redesignation of the site as magnet or user-driven.

(7) One commenter suggested that the FTZ Board allow a grantee to benefit from some of the proposal's benefits (''floating acreage,'' simplified process for minor boundary modifications) within a 2,000-acre limitation but based on the grantee's own zone-site management plan, which the FTZ Board