various forms and narrative statements required are collected from the applicants (rural community facilities, such as schools, libraries, hospitals, and medical facilities for example). The purpose of collecting the information is to determine such factors as: eligibility of the applicant; the specific nature of the proposed project; the purposes for which loan and grant funds will be used; project financial and technical feasibility; and, compliance with applicable laws and regulations. In addition, for grants funded pursuant to the competitive evaluation process, information collected facilitates the Rural Utilities Service's selection of those applications most consistent with DLT goals and objectives in accordance with the authorizing legislation and implementing regulation.

Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 50 hours per response. In addition, it is estimated each of the anticipated 150 award recipients will average 12 hours to provide legal, audit, and related documentation.

Respondents: Business or other for-profit and non-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 300.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 1.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 16,800.

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from Bob Turner, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, at (202) 720–0696.

Comments are invited on (a) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumption used; (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 those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques on other forms of information technology. Comments may be sent to F. Lamont Heppe, Jr., Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1400 Independence Ave., SW., Stop 1522, Room 4034 South Building, Washington, DC 20250–1522.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: December 2, 1999.

Christopher A. McLean,

Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service.

[FR Doc. 99–32141 Filed 12–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Census Bureau

Evaluation of the Census 2000 Telephone Questionnaire Assistance (TQA) Program

ACTION: Proposed collection; comment request.

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, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before February 11, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Linda Engelmeier, Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 5027, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at LEngelme@doc.gov).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument(s) and instructions should be directed to Wendy Davis, Bureau of the Census, DSCMO 2424/2, Washington, DC 20233–0001, (301) 457–4051.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

Customer satisfaction surveys will be administered to a sample of people who access the Telephone Questionnaire Assistance (TQA) program through either the English or Spanish toll free telephone numbers. The caller will be asked to complete an Interactive Voice Response (IVR) survey that asks callers to rate different characteristics of their TQA interaction. The survey will be tailored to whether the caller completed his/her call using the available IVR instrument or by speaking with a TQA agent. In general, the surveys evaluate specific aspects of the callers' TQA experience, but callers will also be asked to rate their overall satisfaction with TQA.

This evaluation is unique, given its technical environment. This evaluation will serve as an indication of the success of the TQA 2000 project (as measured by customer satisfaction), thereby providing substantial feedback for future Census telephone products.

A systematic sample will be selected at the point when the call enters the TQA network, but prior to the caller hearing the greeting to the TQA system in the IVR. Once callers enter the IVR, they will be notified that they have been selected to participate in a short customer satisfaction survey. Approximately 50,000 TQA respondents will be asked to participate in the survey, with an expected response rate of 15 percent resulting in 7,500 completed customer satisfaction surveys. The sample selection begins at the open of TQA 2000 (March 3, 2000) and will be completed by the end of the TQA progam (June 8, 2000).

II. Method of Collection

The customer satisfaction surveys will be administered at the conclusion of the respondents call to TQA. When the callers indicate that they have completed their TQA transaction, they will be informed that they will be automatically transferred to an automated customer satisfaction survey and that the survey is estimated to take less than 3 minutes to complete. Once the transfer takes place, the caller will be prompted to indicate whether they have a touch tone phone or not. The customer satisfaction survey will be tailored to their touch tone or rotary capabilities. The completed surveys will be compiled for evaluation purposes.

III. Data

OMB Number: Forthcoming.

Form Number: This telephone survey will have no form.

Type of Review: Regular Submission.

Affected Public: Those who receive Census short or long forms or update/leave (US and Puerto Rico) and have direct access to a telephone.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 50,000.

Estimated Time Per Response: 2 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1,667.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: There is no cost to the respondent other than the time taken to complete the survey.

Respondents Obligation: Voluntary.

Legal Authority: Title 13, United States Code, Sections 141 and 193.

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: December 8, 1999.

Linda Engelmeier,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 99–32159 Filed 12–10–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Export Administration

[Docket No. 99–BXA–04]

MK Technology Associates, Ltd., Respondent; Decision and Order

This matter is before me for review pursuant to § 766.22 of the Export Administration Regulations. On October 20, 1999, Administrative Law Judge Harry J. Gardner issued a recommended decision and order that granted the respondent's motion for summary dismissal of the charging letter and ordered that the case be dismissed with prejudice to the Bureau of Export Administration's Office of Export Enforcement. For the reasons stated below, I am adopting the ALJ's recommended decision and order.

The ALJ's decision sets out the factual background of this case. In summary, prior to the issuance of the charging letter, lawyers for the respondent and for the Office of Export Enforcement (OEE) attempted to conclude an agreement to extend the statute of limitations so that they could pursue further settlement negotiations. The success of that attempt is the issue now. After the attempted extension of the statute of limitations and after failed settlement negotiations, the Office of Export Enforcement issued a charging letter. The respondent moved to dismiss the charging letter claiming that the statute of limitations barred administrative action. The ALJ agreed. He found that the attorneys had failed to conclude an agreement to extend the statute. The ALJ recommended that I dismiss the charging letter.

Before addressing the merits of the ALJ's recommendation, I must deal with OEE's request that I remand the case to the ALJ to consider OEE's submission. The respondent filed its motion to dismiss the charging letter with the ALJ on August 18, 1999. The ALJ issued his recommended decision and order on October 20. OEE did not file a response to the motion with the ALJ. Neither counsel cites a rule that sets a time limit on OEE's response to the motion.

OEE now asks that I remand this case to the ALJ so that he may consider OEE's position. The respondent opposes this request. It argues that OEE had its chance to respond, that there are no disputed issues of fact, and that the respondent should not be put to the expense of further litigation because of the dereliction of OEE's attorneys in allowing two months to pass without responding to the motion.

I decline to remand this case to the ALJ since that would serve no purpose. First, there are no disputed issues of fact. This issue is about drafts of the ''agreement'' that purported to extend the statute of limitations and faxes of those drafts. Those drafts and faxes are in the record and neither side questions their authenticity. Not only are there no disputes on the facts, OEE adds no new facts that the ALJ did not consider. There is no reason to believe that the ALJ would come to any different conclusion. Finally, I have carefully considered OEE's submission to me. Giving it all possible weight, I cannot find a way to agree with its contention that the ALJ erred in concluding that there was no agreement to extend the statute of limitations.

Since there appears to be no rule requiring OEE to respond to the motion in a particular time, and since the ALJ does not appear to have set a briefing schedule, I see no justification to ''punish'' OEE or, as the respondent requests, preclude it from opposing the dismissal now. I will not, however, punish the respondent for OEE's inaction by imposing upon the respondent (or the ALJ for that matter) further unnecessary litigation.

On the merits of the issue, I agree with the ALJ and only add a few comments. The crux of the ALJ's decision is that no ''valid enforceable agreement with respect to the extension of the statue of limitations'' was concluded. Counsel for OEE argues that an agreement was reached, and that the language changes to the agreement that she made unilaterally were ''minor textual edits'' that did not materially change the burdens of the respondent under the agreement. I do not have to decide whether a minor change to the language of the agreement would have voided the respondent's ''offer'' to extend the statute of limitations. These changes were not ''minor.''

Counsel for OEE is correct that the language she proposed has similar meaning to the language that counsel for respondent proposed. But in the circumstances of this negotiation any difference in language was material. This language went to the heart of what violations were covered by the statute extension. Counsel for the respondent was very concerned with this language. He changed the language that OEE originally offered and even took the time to retype the entire document. He was surrendering his client's right to bar administrative punishment. Counsel for respondent immediately objected when he found out that his language had been changed. I cannot call the changes ''minor'' or ''immaterial.''

The most probative evidence that the exact language was important to the parties and not immaterial were the actions of counsel for OEE herself. If the language difference was so immaterial why did she reject the respondent's clear, unassailable agreement to extend the statue and then make her own changes to respondent's language? Why did she bother to rephrase and retype the document for something ''minor'' and ''immaterial''? How can OEE now argue that this is not a significant matter when the record clearly shows that, at the time, OEE's attorney was adamant in not accepting the respondent's language? It is clear that each attorney wanted her or his exact language. Neither got it. There was no agreement.

A paragraph that remained the same in all drafts of the agreement read:

> In the event of a dispute between the parties in any administrative proceeding or judicial action between the parties with respect to the statute of limitations, this Agreement may be introduced into evidence to show the parties' intent regarding the matters encompassed herein.

The question is, which copy of the agreement do we now look to? The copy that OEE's counsel said she was ''purging''? The copy that contains OEE counsel's unapproved edits of respondent's language and bears respondent's counsel's signature from an earlier, different draft? Or the copy OEE's counsel ''accepted'' after the statue had run but whose text OEE