downloaded or printed from the following Web site: ftp://ftpfc.sc.egov.usda.gov/NHQ/practicestandards/federal-register/. Single copies of these standards are available from NRCS in Washington, DC. Submit individual inquiries in writing to Daniel Meyer, National Agricultural Engineer, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Post Office Box 2890, Room 6139-S, Washington, DC 20013-2890.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section** 343 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 requires NRCS to make available, for public review and comment, proposed revisions to conservation practice standards used to carry out the highly erodible land and wetland provisions of the law. For the next 30 days, NRCS will receive comments relative to the proposed changes. Following that period, a determination will be made by NRCS regarding disposition of those comments, and a final determination of changes will be made.

Signed in Washington, DC, on November 17, 2004.

### Bruce I. Knight,

Chief, Natural Resources Conservation Service.

[FR Doc. 04-26446 Filed 11-30-04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3410-16-P

### **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

[I.D. 112604D]

### Submission for OMB Review; **Comment Request**

The Department of Commerce has submitted 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: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Title: Emergency Beacon

Registrations.

Form Number(s): None. OMB Approval Number: 0648–0295. Type of Request: Regular submission. Burden Hours: 5,000.

Number of Respondents: 20,000. Average Hours Per Response: 15

minutes.

Needs and Uses: An international system exists to use satellites to detect and locate ships, aircraft, or individuals in distress if they are equipped with an emergency radio beacon. Persons purchasing such a beacon must register it with NOAA. The data provided in the registration can assist in identifying who is in trouble and also suppressing the consequences of false alarms.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; business or other for-profit organizations; not-for-profit institutions; Federal Government; State, Local or Tribal Government.

Frequency: On occasion. Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory. *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 David Rostker@omb.eop.gov.

Dated: November 23, 2004.

#### Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 04-26512 Filed 11-30-04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510-HR-S

## **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

[I.D. 112604C]

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The Department of Commerce has submitted 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: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Title: Coastal Zone Management Program Administration.

Form Number(s): None.

OMB Approval Number: 0648-0119. Type of Request: Regular submission. Burden Hours: 9,361.

Number of Respondents: 35.

Average Hours Per Response: Performance Reports 27 hours; Assessment and Strategy 240 hours; 306A documentation - 5 hours; Amendments and Routine Program Changes 8 hours; and 6217 Nonpoint

Pollution Control Program 150 hours.

Needs and Uses: Coastal zone management grants provide funds to states and territories to implement federally approved coastal management plans, revise assessment document and multi-year strategy, submit Section

306A documentation on the approved coastal zone management plans, submit requests to approve amendments or program changes, and to complete the state's coastal nonpoint source pollution program.

Affected Public: State, local or tribal government.

Frequency: On occasion, semiannually, annually.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain 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 David Rostker@omb.eop.gov.

Dated: November 23, 2004.

### Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 04-26513 Filed 11-30-04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510-JE-S

# **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

[I.D. 112604B]

### Submission for OMB Review; **Comment Request**

The Department of Commerce has submitted 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: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Title: Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey.

Form Number(s): None. OMB Approval Number: 0648-0052. *Type of Request:* Regular submission. Burden Hours: 43,934.

Number of Respondents: 712,229.

Average Hours Per Response: 7 minutes for fishing households; 7 minutes for party/charter boat operators; 4.5 minutes for intercepted anglers; 3 minutes for supplemental economic data from fishing households; 5 minutes for supplemental economic data from party/charter boat operators; 8 minutes

for supplemental economic data from intercepted anglers; 1.5 minutes for verification calls; 1 minute for nonfishing households, and .5 minutes for non-households.

Needs and Uses: Marine recreational anglers are surveyed for catch and effort data, fish biology data, and angler socioeconomic characteristics. These data are required to carry out provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), as amended, regarding conservation and management of fishery resources.

Affected Public: Business or other forprofit, and individuals or households. Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary. 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 David Rostker@omb.eop.gov.

Dated: November 23, 2004.

### Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–26514 Filed 11–30–04; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–22–S

### **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

### **Bureau of Industry and Security**

[Docket Nos. 04-BIS-02 and 04-BIS-03]

### **Decision and Order**

In the Matters of: Technology Options (India) Pvt. Ltd., Pilot #168, Behind Maria Mansion, CST Road, Kalina, Mumbai 400 098 India; and Shivram Rao, of Technology Options (India) Pvt. Ltd., Pilot #168, Behind Maria Mansion, CST Road, Kalina, Mumbai 400 098 India, Respondents.

On February 2, 2004, the Bureau of Industry and Security ("BIS") issued separate charging letters against the respondents, Technology Options (India) Pvt. Ltd. (Technology Options) and Shivram Rao (Rao), that alleged four violations each of the Export Administration Regulations

(Regulations).¹ The charging letters alleged that the respondents each committed one violation of section 764.2(d), two violations of section 764.2(h), and one violation of section 764.2(g) of the Regulations, issued under the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. 2401–2420 (2000)) ("Act").²

Specifically, the charging letters alleged that, on or about April 1, 2002, through on or about August 31, 2001, Technology Options and Shivram Rao, acting in his capacity as Managing Director of Technology Options, conspired with others, known and unknown, to export from the United States to the Indira Ghandi Centre for Atomic Research ("IGCAR") a thermal mechanical fatigue rest system and a universal testing machine, both items subject to the Regulations, without the required export licenses from BIS as provided in section 744.1(c) of the Regulations. At all relevant times, IGCAR was an organization on the Entity List set forth at Supplement No. 4 to part 744 of the Regulations. In furtherance of the conspiracy, BIS alleged that false documentation as submitted to the U.S. exporter that provided that a party other than IGCAR was the ultimate consignee for the export from the United States of the items at issue. By conspiring to bring about an act in violation of the Regulations, BIS charged that the respondents committed one violation each of section 764.2(d) of the Regulations.

The charging letters further alleged that, in connection with the export of the fatigue test system and universal testing machine to IGCAR, on or about June 13, 2000, and on or about December 21, 2000, the respondents took actions to evade the Regulations, including developing and employing a scheme by which Technology Options

would receive the export of the items at issue from the United States without a BIS export license and then divert them to the true ultimate consignee, IGCAR, in violation of the Regulations. BIS alleged that, by engaging in such transactions, the respondents committed two violations each of section 764.2(h) of the Regulations.

Finally, the charging letters alleged that, on or about August 16, 2001 through on or about April 8, 2002, in connection with the export of the fatigue test system reference above, the respondents made false statements to the U.S. Government regarding their knowledge of and involvement in the export. Specifically, BIS alleged that the respondents made inconsistent and false statements to U.S. Foreign Commercial Service Officers regarding the end user of the fatigue test equipment. In doing so, BIS charged that the respondents committed one violation each of section 764.2(g) of the Regulations.

On the basis of the factual record before the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), he found that the respondents failed to file an answer to BIS's charging letter within the time required by the Regulations. Indeed, service of the notice of issuance of a charging letter on the respondents was properly effected on February 16, 2004, a response to the charging letter was due no later than March 17, 2004, and the record does not include any such response from the respondents. The ALJ therefore held Technology Options and Rao in default.

Under the default procedures set forth in section 766.7(a) of the Regulations, "[f]ailure of the respondent to file answer within the time provided constitutes a waiver of the respondent's right to appear," and "on BIS's motion and without further notice to the respondent, [the ALJ] shall find the facts to be as alleged in the charging letter.' Accordingly, on October 28, 2004, the ALJ issued a Recommended Decision and Order, in which he found that the facts alleged in the charging letter constitute the findings of fact in this matter and, thereby, establish that the respondents committed one violation of section 764.2(d), two violations of section 764.2(h), and one violation of section 764.2(g) of the Regulations. The AJL also recommended a penalty of a 15-year denial of the respondents' export privileges.

Pursuant to section 766.22 of the Regulations, the ALJ's Recommended Decision and Order has been referred to me for final action. Based on my review of the entire record, I find that the record supports the ALJ's findings of fact and conclusions of law regarding each of the above-referenced charges. I

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The violations charged occurred between 2000 and 2002. The Regulations governing the violations at issue are found in the 2000, 2001, and 2002 versions of the Code of Federal Regulations (15 CFR parts 730 through 774 (2000–2002). The 2004 Regulations establish the procedures that apply to this matter.

<sup>&</sup>lt;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. Executive Order 13222 was reauthorized (3 CFR, 2001 Comp., p. 783 (2002)), which has been extended by successive Presidential Notices, the most recent being that of August 7, 2003 (68 FR 47833, August 11, 2003), continues the Regulations in effect under IEEPA