

Farm Service Agency (FSA) is seeking comments from all interested individuals and organizations on the extension of a currently approved information collection with revision in support of the Disaster Assistance program. The information collection is needed to identify disaster areas and establish eligible FSA counties for the purpose of making emergency loans available to eligible and qualified farmers and ranchers. The total burden hours have been revised to reflect the number of Secretarial requests for natural disaster assistance during the 2005 crop year.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before July 17, 2006, to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments concerning this notice should be addressed to Diane Sharp, Director, Production, Emergencies and Compliance Division, to Farm Service Agency, USDA, Mail Stop 0517, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-0517 and to the Desk Officer for Agriculture, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503. Comments also may be submitted by e-mail to: [Diane.Sharp@usda.gov](mailto:Diane.Sharp@usda.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Helen Smith, Section Head, Emergency and Preparedness and Program Branch, (202) 720-6601.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Description of Information Collection

*Title:* Disaster Assistance Program (General).

*OMB Number:* 0560-0170.

*Expiration Date of Approval:* November 30, 2006.

*Type of Request:* Extension with revision.

**Abstract:** The information collection is necessary for FSA to effectively administer the regulations relating to identifying disaster areas for the purpose of making emergency loans available to qualified and eligible farmers and ranchers who have suffered weather-related physical or production losses or both in such areas. Before emergency loans can become available, the information needs to be collected to determine if the disaster areas meet the criteria of having a qualifying loss in order to be considered as an eligible County.

*Estimated of Burden:* Average 0.483 hour per response.

*Type of Respondents:* Farmers and ranchers.

*Estimated Annual Number of Respondents:* 1,758.

*Estimated Annual Number of Responses per Respondent:* 1.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 849.

Comment is invited on: (1) Whether this collection of information is necessary for the stated purposes and the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical or scientific utility; (2) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

All comments received in response to this notice, including names and addresses when provided, will be a matter of public record. Comments will be summarized and included in the submission for Office of Management and Budget approval.

Signed at Washington, DC, on May 11, 2006.

**Teresa C. Lasseter,**

*Administrator, Farm Service Agency.*

[FR Doc. E6-7483 Filed 5-16-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-05-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

##### Forest Service

##### Siuslaw Resource Advisory Committee

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Siuslaw Resource Advisory Committee will meet in Florence, OR. The purpose of the meeting is to Review RAC FY07 Business, Information Share, Public Forum and 2007 Project Review/Recommendations.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held June 8, 2006, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Community Baptist Church, 4590 Highway 101, Florence Oregon 97439.

##### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Linda Stanley, Community Development Specialist, Siuslaw National Forest, 541/928-7085 or write to Forest Supervisor, Siuslaw National Forest, P.O. Box 1148, Corvallis, OR 97339.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** A public input period will begin before 2007 project review.

Dated: May 9, 2006.

**José Linares,**

*Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 06-4602 Filed 5-16-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-11-M**

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### Bureau of Industry and Security

##### Action Affecting Export Privileges; Ruo Ling Wang, Beijing Rich Linscience Electronics Company, and Jian Gou Qu Order Making Order Denying Export Privileges of Ruo Ling Wang Applicable to Related Person Jian Gou Qu

In the Matter of: Ruo Ling Wang, No. 2 Zhong Guan Cun South Avenue, Cyber Mode Room 1001, Haidian District, Beijing, China 100086; Respondent: Beijing Rich Linscience Electronics Company, No. 2 Zhong Guan Cun South Avenue, Cyber Mode Room 1001, Haidian District, Beijing, China 100086; and Jian Gou Qu, currently incarcerated at: Inmate Number 07512-089, MCC Chicago, Metropolitan Correctional Center, 71 West Van Buren Street, Chicago, IL 60605, and with an address at: No. 2 Zhong Guan Cun South Avenue, Cyber Mode Room 1001, Haidian District, Beijing, China 100086; Related Persons

Pursuant to Sections 766.25(h) and 766.23 of the Export Administration Regulations<sup>1</sup> ("EAR"), the Bureau of Industry and Security ("BIS"), U.S. Department of Commerce, through its Office of Export Enforcement ("OEE"), has requested that I make the Denial Order that was imposed against the individual Ruo Ling Wang ("Wang") on April 18, 2006 (71 FR 23896, April 25, 2006) applicable to Jian Gou Qu ("Qu"), currently incarcerated at MCC Chicago, Metropolitan Correctional Center, 71 West Van Buren Street, Chicago, IL 60605, and with an address at No. 2 Zhong Guan Cun South Avenue, Cyber Mode Room 1001, Haidian District, Beijing, China 100086, (hereinafter, the "Related Person"), as a person related to Wang.

Section 766.23 of the EAR provides that "[i]n order to prevent evasion, certain types of orders under this part may be made applicable not only to the respondent, but also to other persons then or thereafter related to the respondent by ownership, control, position of responsibility, affiliation, or other connection in the conduct of trade

<sup>1</sup> The EAR are currently codified at 15 CFR parts 730-774 (2006).

or business. Orders that may be made applicable to related persons include those that deny or affect export privileges \* \* \* 15 CFR 766.23(a).

On April 18, 2006, I issued an Order pursuant to section 11(h) of the Export Administration Act of 1970, as amended (currently codified at 50 U.S.C. app. Sections 2401–2420 (2000)) (“Act”)<sup>2</sup> and section 766.25 of the EAR denying the export privileges under the Regulations of Ruo Ling Wang, No. 2 Zhong Guan Cun South Avenue, Cyber Mode Room 1001, Haidian District, Beijing, China 100086 for 10 years and naming Beijing Rich Linscience Electronics Company, No. 2 Zhong Guan Cun South Avenue, Cyber Mode Room 1001, Haidian District, Beijing, China 100086 as a Related Person. The Order was based on Wang’s conviction of violating the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701–1706 (2000)) (“IEEPA”) for making unlicensed exports of electronic components and semiconductor chips to the People’s Republic of China.

BIS has presented evidence that indicates that Qu is related to Wang by ownership, control, position of responsibility, affiliation, or other connection in the conduct of trade or business, and that it is necessary to add this individual to the Wang Denial Order in order to avoid evasion of that Order. The basis for naming Qu to the Wang Denial Order include the facts that Qu is Wang’s husband and Wang and Qu are the owners of Beijing Rich Linscience Electronics Company (“BRLE”) and BRLE was receiving illegal exports from the United States of electronic components and semiconductor chips, items subject to the EAR.

On April 19, 2006, I gave notice to Qu, by Federal Express and registered mail at his address in Chicago, Illinois, (Inmate Number 07512–089, MCC Chicago, Metropolitan Correctional Center, 71 West Van Buren Street, Chicago, IL 60605) notifying Qu that his export privileges under the EAR could be denied for up to 10 years as BIS

believes that Qu is related to Wang and adding him to the Wang Denial Order is necessary to prevent evasion.

Having received no response from Qu, I, following consultations with the Export Enforcement, including the Director, Office of Export Enforcement, have decided to name Qu as a related person to the Wang Denial Order, thereby denying Qu’s export privileges from 10 years from the date of Wang’s conviction.

I have also decided to revoke all licenses issued pursuant to the Act or EAR in which Qu had an interest at the time of Wang’s conviction. The 10-year denial period ends on May 2, 2015.

*Accordingly, it is hereby ordered*  
*First*, that having been provided notice and opportunity for comment as provided in Sections 766.25 and 766.23 of the Export Administration Regulations (the “Regulations”), the following individual, Jian Gou Qu, currently incarcerated at MCC Chicago, Metropolitan Correctional Center, 71 West Van Buren Street, Chicago, IL 60605 and with an address at No. 2 Zhong Guan Cun South Avenue, Cyber Mode Room 1001, Haidian District, Beijing, China 100086, has been determined to be related to Ruo Ling Wang, No. 2 Zhong Guan Cun South Avenue, Cyber Mode Room 1001, Haidian District, Beijing, China 100086, by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services, and it has been deemed necessary to make the Order denying the export privileges of Wang applicable to Qu in order to prevent evasion of the Wang Denial Order.

*Second*, that the denial of export privileges described in the Wang Denial Order, which was published in the **Federal Register** on April 25, 2006 at 71 FR 23896, shall be made applicable to Qu until its expiration on May 2, 2015, as follows:

I. Jian Gou Qu, currently incarcerated at MCC Chicago, Metropolitan Correctional Center, 71 West Van Buren Street, Chicago, IL 60605 and with an address at No. 2 Zhong Guan Cun South Avenue, Cyber Mode Room 1001, Haidian District, Beijing, China 100086, and when acting for or on behalf of Qu, his officers, representatives, agents, or employees (collectively, “Denied Person”) may not participate, directly or indirectly, 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. Benefiting 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.

II. No person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the Denied Person any item subject to the Regulations;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the Denied Person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the Denied Person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the Denied Person of any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

*Third*, that in accordance with the provisions of Section 766.23(c) of the Regulations, the Denied Person may, at any time, make an appeal related to this Order by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office

<sup>2</sup> 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)), as extended by the Notice of August 2, 2005 (70 FR 45273, August 5, 2005), has continued the Regulations in effect under the IEEPA.

of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022.

*Fourth*, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the Regulations where the only items involved that are subject to the Regulations are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

*Fifth*, that this Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until May 2, 2015.

*Sixth*, that this Order shall be published in the **Federal Register** and a copy served on the Related Person.

Dated: May 5, 2006.

**Eileen M. Albanese,**

*Director, Office of Exporter Services.*

[FR Doc. 06-4497 Filed 5-16-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-M

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

(A-549-817)

#### **Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Thailand: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Partial Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce ("the Department") has conducted an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Thailand produced and/or exported by Sahaviriya Steel Industries Public Company Limited ("SSI"), Nakornthai Strip Mill Public Co., Ltd. ("Nakornthai"), and G Steel Public Company Limited ("G Steel")<sup>1</sup> (formerly Siam Strip Mill Public Co., Ltd.). The period of review ("POR") is November 1, 2003, through October 31, 2004. Based on our analysis of comments received, these final results remain unchanged from the preliminary results. The final results are listed below in the "Final Results of Review" section.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 17, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen Bailey or Abdelali Elouaradia, Import Administration, International

Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0193 and (202) 482-1374, respectively.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

On December 9, 2005, the Department published the preliminary results and intent to revoke and partial rescission of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Thailand. *See Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Thailand; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent to Revoke and Rescind in Part*, 70 FR 73197 (December 9, 2005) (*Preliminary Results*).

We invited parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. On December 22, 2005, United States Steel Corporation (petitioner) requested that the Department issue a questionnaire to SSI requesting certain financial information for the post-POR period. On January 4, 2006, the Department contacted Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP, counsel to petitioner, and requested that petitioner provide a more thorough explanation for its December 22, 2005, request for certain post-POR financial information from SSI. *See* the Department's Memorandum to the File from Stephen Bailey, International Trade Compliance Analyst, dated January 5, 2006. On January 6, 2006, petitioner and Nucor Corporation (Nucor), a domestic interested party in this administrative review, submitted a joint letter providing a detailed explanation as to the relevance of the financial information petitioner requested the Department collect from SSI. On January 13, 2006, the Department requested SSI submit certain financial information for the post-POR period, which SSI did on January 18, 2006.

On January 17, 2006, SSI submitted a letter on the record of the 2004-2005 administrative review<sup>2</sup> requesting that the 2004-2005 administrative review be rescinded with respect to SSI because certain entries into the U.S. during the 2004-2005 POR were actually sold pursuant to sales in the 2003-2004 POR, and these sales have already been examined and verified by the Department in the 2003-2004 administrative review. On January 18, 2006, SSI submitted a letter on the

record of the 2003-2004 administrative review requesting certain information contained in its January 17, 2006, letter to the Department be placed on the record of the 2003-2004 administrative review. Specifically, SSI requested that information regarding its meaningful participation in the market for the 2004-2005 administrative review and the date of entry for merchandise entered during the 04-05 administrative review be placed on the record of the 2003-2004 administrative review. *See* SSI's January 18, 2006, letter to the Department at page 2 and exhibit A. On January 25, 2006, the Department issued a memorandum from Richard Weible, Office Director, to the File reiterating the Department's practice of conducting administrative reviews based on entries of subject merchandise during the POR. Furthermore, we explained that we intended to exclude sales that entered in the 04-05 administrative review period from the 03-04 administrative review. On January 27, 2006, SSI submitted a letter objecting to the Department's intention to exclude certain sales from the 03-04 administrative review.

On January 25, 2006, petitioner and Nucor filed joint comments on SSI's post-POR financial information submission. On January 31, 2006, SSI filed rebuttal comments to petitioner's and Nucor's January 25, 2006, comments regarding its post-POR financial information.

On February 7, 2006, the Department received case briefs from petitioner, Nucor and SSI. On February 10, 2006, SSI submitted a letter claiming that Nucor had submitted new factual information in its February 7, 2006, case brief. On February 13, 2006, the Department issued a letter to Nucor requesting that certain new factual information be edited from its case brief. On February 14, 2006, petitioner, Nucor and SSI submitted rebuttal briefs, and Nucor submitted a revised case brief excluding the new factual information as requested by the Department.

##### **Partial Rescission**

In our *Preliminary Results*, we announced our preliminary decision to rescind the review with respect to Nakornthai and G Steel because these companies had no entries of hot-rolled steel from Thailand during the POR. *See Preliminary Results*. We have received no new information contradicting this decision. Therefore, we are rescinding the administrative review with respect to Nakornthai and G Steel.

##### **Scope of the Antidumping Duty Order**

The products covered by this antidumping duty order are certain hot-

<sup>1</sup> The Department notes that it erroneously referred to G Steel as "G Street Public Company Limited" in the *Preliminary Results*.

<sup>2</sup> *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 70 FR 76024 (December 22, 2005).