

deemed to be final and administrative remedies will be deemed to be exhausted. Consequently, the name of the party to whom the penalty claim was issued will appear on the list. However, provision is made for an appeal to the Secretary of the Treasury (now delegated to the Secretary of Homeland Security) by the person named on the list, for the removal of its name from the list. If the Secretary finds that such person or entity has not committed any of the enumerated violations for a period of not less than 3 years after the date on which the person or entity's name was published, the name will be removed from the list as of the next publication of the list.

#### Reasonable Care Required

Section 592A also requires any importer of record entering, introducing, or attempting to introduce into the commerce of the United States textile or apparel products that were either directly or indirectly produced, manufactured, supplied, sold, exported, or transported by such named person to show, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that such importer has exercised reasonable care to ensure that the textile or apparel products are accompanied by documentation, packaging, and labeling that are accurate as to their origin. Reliance solely upon information regarding the imported product from a person named on the list is clearly not the exercise of reasonable care. Thus, the textile and apparel importers who have some commercial relationship with one or more of the listed parties must exercise a degree of reasonable care in ensuring that the documentation covering the imported merchandise, as well as its packaging and labeling, is accurate as to the country of origin of the merchandise. This degree of reasonable care must involve reliance on more than information supplied by the named party.

In meeting the reasonable care standard when importing textile or apparel products and when dealing with a party named on the list published pursuant to section 592A of the Tariff Act of 1930, an importer should consider the following questions in attempting to ensure that the documentation, packaging, and labeling are accurate as to the country of origin of the imported merchandise. The list of questions is not exhaustive but is illustrative.

(1) Has the importer had a prior relationship with the named party?

(2) Has the importer had any detentions and/or seizures of textile or apparel products that were directly or

indirectly produced, supplied, or transported by the named party?

(3) Has the importer visited the company's premises and ascertained that the company has the capacity to produce the merchandise?

(4) Where a claim of an origin conferring process is made in accordance with 19 CFR 102.21, has the importer ascertained that the named party actually performed the required process?

(5) Is the named party operating from the same country as is represented by that party on the documentation, packaging or labeling?

(6) Have quotas for the imported merchandise closed or are they nearing closing from the main producer countries for this commodity?

(7) What is the history of this country regarding this commodity?

(8) Have you asked questions of your supplier regarding the origin of the product?

(9) Where the importation is accompanied by a visa, permit, or license, has the importer verified with the supplier or manufacturer that the visa, permit, and/or license is both valid and accurate as to its origin? Has the importer scrutinized the visa, permit or license as to any irregularities that would call its authenticity into question?

The law authorizes a semiannual publication of the names of the foreign entities and/or persons. On October 8, 2003, CBP published a notice in the **Federal Register** (68 FR 58123) which identified two (2) entities which fell within the purview of section 592A of the Tariff Act of 1930.

#### 592A List

For the period ending March 30, 2004, CBP has identified no foreign entities that fall within the purview of section 592A of the Tariff Act of 1930. The two (2) entities named on the list published on October 8, 2003, have not committed any of the enumerated violations for a period of not less than three (3) years after the initial publication of their names. Accordingly, these two (2) entities are removed and, as no new entities are named, CBP is not listing any foreign entities on the 592A list for the period starting March 31, 2004, and ending September 30, 2004.

Dated: May 6, 2004.

**Jayson P. Ahern,**

*Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations.*

[FR Doc. 04-10855 Filed 5-12-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4820-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR-4903-N-34]

### Notice of Submission of Proposed Information Collection to OMB; Monitoring Residual Receipts Accounts

**AGENCY:** Office of the Chief Information Officer, HUD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The proposed information collection requirement described below has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

HUD is requesting OMB approval to collect information from multifamily projects with HUD-insured and HUD-held mortgages. The Department must collect information on residual receipts accounts in order to ensure the appropriate management of funds.

**DATES:** *Comments Due Date:* June 14, 2004.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB approval Number (2502-Pending) and should be sent to: HUD Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503; fax: 202-395-6974.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Wayne Eddins, Reports Management Officer, AYO, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20410; e-mail [Wayne\\_Eddins@HUD.gov](mailto:Wayne_Eddins@HUD.gov); telephone (202) 708-2374. This is not a toll-free number. Copies of available documents submitted to OMB may be obtained from Mr. Eddins.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This Notice informs the public that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has submitted to OMB, for emergency processing, a survey instrument to obtain information from faith based and community organizations on their likelihood and success at applying for various funding programs. This Notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affecting agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the

accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including through the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

This Notice also lists the following information:  
*Title of Proposal:* Monitoring Residual Receipts Accounts.  
*OMB Approval Number:* 2502–Pending.  
*Form Numbers:* None.  
*Description of the Need for the Information and Its Proposed Use:* Pursuant to the Regulatory Agreement for Multifamily Housing insured mortgages, under Sections 207, 220,

221(d)(4), 231, 232, and 236, owners are required to adhere to certain guidelines regarding Surplus Cash and to establish a Residual Receipt Account. These receipts are completed and submitted to HUD by owners of insured multifamily projects. The information collected is used by HUD, owners, and non-profit entities for the disbursement of funds.  
*Respondents:* Business or other for-profit, and Not-for-profit institutions.  
*Frequency of Submission:* Annually.

	Number of respondents	Annual responses	×	Hours per response	=	Burden hours
Reporting Burden .....	20,000	20,000		2		40,000

*Total Estimated Burden Hours:* 40,000.  
*Status:* Request for approval of an existing information collection in use without an OMB control number.  
**Authority:** Section 3507 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. 35, as amended.  
 Dated: May 6, 2004.  
**Wayne Eddins,**  
*Departmental PRA Compliance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*  
 [FR Doc. 04–10808 Filed 5–12–04; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4210–72–P**

2965, Portland, Oregon 97208, telephone (503) 326–2368, e-mail *Ken\_Denton@or.blm.gov*, or visit the SEIS Web site at [http://www.or.blm.gov/planning/Port-Orford-Cedar\\_SEIS/](http://www.or.blm.gov/planning/Port-Orford-Cedar_SEIS/).  
**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Port-Orford-cedar is killed by an exotic root disease (*Phytophthora lateralis*) that is linked, at least in part, to transport of spore-infested mud by humans and animals. Water-borne spores then readily spread the disease down slope and down stream.  
 The Management of Port-Orford-Cedar in Southwest Oregon ROD/RMP Amendment was developed with public participation through a year-long planning process. This ROD/RMP Amendment, together with a similar one signed by the Forest Service in March, 2004, addresses management on approximately 270,000 acres of Port-Orford-cedar stands in the planning area. The ROD/RMP Amendment will help maintain Port-Orford-cedar as an ecologically and economically significant species on BLM lands. It includes a series of generally required actions, actions that can be applied to specific projects when there is a management risk to Port-Orford-cedar, and an emphasis on keeping the disease out of uninfested watersheds.  
 The Port-Orford-cedar RMP Amendment is essentially the same as Alternative 2 in the Proposed RMP Amendment/Final SEIS published on January 23, 2004 (see Notice of Availability, **Federal Register**, p. 3340). The BLM received five protests to the Proposed Amendment/Final SEIS. As a result of the protests, minor modifications were made in preparing the ROD/RMP Amendment. These modifications adopted a mitigation measure described in the SEIS, adopted NOAA-Fisheries consultation recommendations for monitoring and examining stream temperatures,

corrected errors that were noted during review of the Proposed Amendment/Final SEIS, and provide further clarification for the decision. No inconsistencies with state or local plans, policies, or programs were identified during the Governor's Consistency Review of the Proposed Amendment/Final SEIS.  
**Judy Ellen Nelson,**  
*Acting Associate State Director, Oregon and Washington, Bureau of Land Management.*  
 [FR Doc. 04–10916 Filed 5–11–04; 11:31 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4310–33–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
**Bureau of Land Management**  
**[OR–930–6333 PH COMP, HAG 4–0161]**  
**Notice of Availability of Record of Decision for the Resource Management Plan (RMP) Amendment/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for Management of Port-Orford-Cedar in Southwest Oregon**  
**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management (BLM).  
**ACTION:** Notice of Availability (NOA) of Record of Decision (ROD).  
**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), and BLM management policies, the BLM announces the availability of the ROD/RMP Amendment for Management of Port-Orford-Cedar in Southwest Oregon, affecting the Coos Bay, Medford, and Roseburg Districts. The Oregon State Director will sign the ROD/RMP Amendment, which becomes effective immediately.  
**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ken Denton, SEIS Team Leader, P.O. Box

2965, Portland, Oregon 97208, telephone (503) 326–2368, e-mail *Ken\_Denton@or.blm.gov*, or visit the SEIS Web site at [http://www.or.blm.gov/planning/Port-Orford-Cedar\\_SEIS/](http://www.or.blm.gov/planning/Port-Orford-Cedar_SEIS/).  
**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Port-Orford-cedar is killed by an exotic root disease (*Phytophthora lateralis*) that is linked, at least in part, to transport of spore-infested mud by humans and animals. Water-borne spores then readily spread the disease down slope and down stream.  
 The Management of Port-Orford-Cedar in Southwest Oregon ROD/RMP Amendment was developed with public participation through a year-long planning process. This ROD/RMP Amendment, together with a similar one signed by the Forest Service in March, 2004, addresses management on approximately 270,000 acres of Port-Orford-cedar stands in the planning area. The ROD/RMP Amendment will help maintain Port-Orford-cedar as an ecologically and economically significant species on BLM lands. It includes a series of generally required actions, actions that can be applied to specific projects when there is a management risk to Port-Orford-cedar, and an emphasis on keeping the disease out of uninfested watersheds.  
 The Port-Orford-cedar RMP Amendment is essentially the same as Alternative 2 in the Proposed RMP Amendment/Final SEIS published on January 23, 2004 (see Notice of Availability, **Federal Register**, p. 3340). The BLM received five protests to the Proposed Amendment/Final SEIS. As a result of the protests, minor modifications were made in preparing the ROD/RMP Amendment. These modifications adopted a mitigation measure described in the SEIS, adopted NOAA-Fisheries consultation recommendations for monitoring and examining stream temperatures,

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**  
**Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act**  
 Under a 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on April 22, 2004, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States of America, State of California, and South Coast Air Quality Management District v. Keysor-Century Corporation*, Civil Action Number 04–2823–CAS (RCx), was lodged with the United States District Court for the Central District of California.  
 The consent decree resolves claims against one defendant, Keysor-Century Corporation (“Keysor”), brought by the United States on behalf of the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”), by the State of California on behalf of the Department of Toxic Substances Control and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District under four statutes: Clean Air Act (“CAA”), 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q; Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (“RCRA”), 42 U.S.C. 6901–6992k; Emergency Planning and Community