

inch gauge (psig) to clean gas pipes. A total of 15 natural gas blows were completed intermittently over approximately four hours through a number of open pipe ends which were located less than 20 feet off the ground.

Efforts were made to eliminate or control potential ignition sources outside the power generation building. However, many ignition sources existed inside the building: electrical power to the building was on, welders were actively working, and diesel-fueled heaters were running.

Initial calculations by CSB investigators reveal that approximately 400,000 standard cubic feet of natural gas were released to the atmosphere near the building in the final ten minutes before the blast. Just over 2 million standard cubic feet of gas were released in total over the course of the morning. At approximately 11:15 a.m., the released natural gas found an ignition source and exploded.

The meeting will be videotaped and an official transcript will be included in the investigative file. All staff presentations are preliminary and are intended solely to allow the Board to consider the issues and factors involved in this case in a public forum. No factual analyses, conclusions, findings or recommendations of the staff should be considered final. Only after the Board has considered and approved the urgent recommendations will there be an approved final record.

Christopher W. Warner,
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2010-13588 Filed 6-2-10; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 6350-01-P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the Connecticut Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and the Federal Advisory Committee Act, that a planning meeting of the Connecticut State Advisory Committee will convene at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 22, 2010 at the University of Connecticut, School of Law, Faculty Lounge, 55 Elizabeth Street, Hartford, Connecticut 06105. The purpose of the meeting is to consider possible findings and recommendations on a draft report about school choice, high school attainment rates, and civil rights.

Members of the public are entitled to submit written comments; the

comments must be received in the regional office by July 22, 2010. The address is Eastern Regional Office, 624 9th St., NW., Washington, DC 20425. Persons wishing to e-mail their comments, or who desire additional information should contact the Eastern Regional Office at 202-376-7533 or by e-mail to: ero@usccr.gov.

Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least ten (10) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

Records generated from this meeting may be inspected and reproduced at the Eastern Regional Office, as they become available, both before and after the meeting. Persons interested in the work of this advisory committee are advised to go to the Commission's Web site, <http://www.usccr.gov>, or to contact the Eastern Regional Office at the above e-mail or street address.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Commission and FACA.

Dated in Washington, DC, May 28, 2010.

Peter Minarik,
Acting Chief, Regional Programs
Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 2010-13397 Filed 6-3-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335-01-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: Defense Priorities and Allocations System.

OMB Control Number: 0694-0053.

Form Number(s): None.

Type of Request: Regular submission.

Burden Hours: 14,477.

Number of Respondents: 18,000.

Average Hours Per Response: 5 seconds to 15 minutes.

Needs and Uses: This record keeping requirement is necessary for administration and enforcement of delegated authority under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061, *et seq.*) and the Selective Service Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 468). Any person who receives a priority rated order under the

implementing DPAS regulation (15 CFR 700) must retain records for at least 3 years.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: On occasion.

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

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, by e-mail to Jasmeet_K_Seehra@omb.eop.gov, or by fax to (202) 395-5167.

Dated: June 1, 2010.

Gwellnar Banks,
Management Analyst, Office of the Chief
Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2010-13430 Filed 6-3-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-33-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Alaska Region Gear Identification Requirements

AGENCY: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

ACTION: Notice.

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.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before August 3, 2010.

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 and instructions should be directed to Patsy A. Bearden, (907) 586-7008 or patsy.bearden@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

Regulations at 50 CFR part 679.24(a) require that all hook-and-line, longline pot, and pot-and-line marker buoys carried onboard or used by any vessel regulated under 50 CFR part 679 shall be marked with the vessel name and Federal fisheries permit number or Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) vessel registration number. The regulations also specify the size and color of markings. The marking of gear aids law enforcement and enables other fishermen to report on misplaced gear.

II. Method of Collection

No information is submitted; this is a gear-marking requirement.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0648-0353.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations; individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,692.

Estimated Time per Response: 15 minutes per buoy.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 3,138.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$16,920.

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: June 1, 2010.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2010-13431 Filed 6-3-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 22-2009]

Foreign-Trade Zone 203; Application for Subzone Authority; REC Silicon; Invitation for Public Comment on Preliminary Recommendation

The FTZ Board is inviting public comment on its staff's preliminary recommendation pertaining to the application by the Port of Moses Lake Public Corporation to establish a subzone at the REC Silicon facility in Moses Lake, Washington (Docket 22-2009). The staff's preliminary recommendation is for approval of the application with a restriction prohibiting admission of foreign status silicon metal subject to an anti-dumping duty (AD) or countervailing duty (CVD) order. The bases for this finding are as follows:

Analysis of the application record indicates that full approval of the request could negatively impact domestic silicon metal production. This finding is based primarily on the potential impact to domestic silicon metal prices compounded by multiple applications potentially involving avoidance of AD/CVD duties on silicon metal used in export production.

Although REC Silicon's current domestic purchases account for only a small portion of domestic silicon metal production, the company has been expanding its capacity and will need increased amounts of silicon metal as that production comes online. Thus, access to silicon metal subject to AD/CVD duties for its export production (currently over 95% of production) could encourage the company to source silicon metal subject to AD/CVD orders for its expanded production, instead of increasing domestic sourcing or sourcing imported silicon metal that is not subject to AD/CVD orders.

A key consideration in this request is the cumulative effect on domestic silicon metal prices and on the integrity of the domestic silicon metal industry's AD/CVD relief should there be multiple applications to avoid AD/CVD duties on silicon metal for export production. In addition to the REC Silicon application, a similar application is pending for Dow Corning Corporation in Kentucky and

we have received indication that further requests are being prepared for additional facilities. In its application, REC Silicon indicates that if it is granted full approval, other U.S. polysilicon producers will likely apply for similar benefits. Given the production capacity of REC Silicon's domestic facilities, as well as those of the other U.S. producers, the ripple effect on silicon metal suppliers would be significant and the resulting impact would likely be a decline in the U.S. price of silicon metal.

Currently, very little silicon metal subject to AD/CVD orders is imported into the United States. However, the potential increase in supply to the U.S. market from the use of silicon metal subject to AD/CVD orders at this plant and others in the industry, and the resulting price effect, would likely be significant.

In part due to the AD/CVD duties in place, U.S. silicon metal prices have increased. This has led to the recent restarting of a shuttered silicon metal production facility in New York. A weakening of the U.S. price of silicon metal could threaten the viability of this facility as well as the continuation of production at other domestic facilities.

Given the volume of silicon metal involved in the current and anticipated applications, even a limit on the amount of silicon metal subject to AD/CVD orders that could be used in the facility for export production could have a significant impact on the U.S. price of silicon metal. The timing of that impact would also be occurring as domestic silicon metal production facilities are recovering and restarting, likely due (at least in part) to the relief provided through the AD/CVD orders that are in place. The FTZ regulations require that evaluations of manufacturing authority consider, "whether the approval is consistent with trade policy and programs, and whether its net economic effect is positive" (15 CFR 400.31(a)). In this case, given the potential impact on the silicon metal industry and based on the evidence currently on the record, the staff is unable to find that the net (national) economic effect of approving the use of silicon metal subject to AD/CVD orders for export production would be positive.

While unrestricted approval could have a negative impact, the issues raised do not extend to silicon metal not subject to AD/CVD orders. No arguments or evidence have been presented to the FTZ Board in opposition to FTZ savings on silicon metal not subject to AD/CVD orders. Since REC Silicon indicated that they do not currently anticipate using silicon