

- Estimated Number of Respondents: 3,500 annually.
- Estimated Number of Responses: 3,500.
- Average Hours per Response: 1 hour (60 minutes).
- Total Estimated Burden: 3,500 annual hours.
- Frequency: On occasion.
- Obligation to Respond: Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

**DATES:** Submit comments to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for up to 30 days from November 15, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct comments to the Department of State Desk Officer in the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). You may submit comments by the following methods:

- Email:  
*oira\_submission@omb.eop.gov*. You must include the DS form number, information collection title, and OMB control number in the subject line of your message.
  - Fax: (202) 395–5806. Attention: Desk Officer for Department of State.
- FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** You may obtain copies of the proposed information collection and supporting documents from Sumitra Siram, Office of Admissions, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM), PRM/Admissions, 2401 E Street NW., Suite L505, SA–1 Washington, DC 20522, who may be reached on (202) 453–9250 or at *SiramS@state.gov*.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** We are soliciting public comments to permit the Department to:

- Evaluate whether the proposed information collection is necessary to properly perform our functions.
- Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the proposed collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used.
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected.
- Minimize the reporting burden on those who are to respond,

#### Abstract of Proposed Collection

The Affidavit of Relationship (AOR) is required by the Department of State to establish qualifications for access to the Priority 3—Family Reunification category of the United States Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP)—by persons of certain nationalities of special humanitarian concern who are family members of qualifying “anchors” (persons already admitted to the U.S. as refugees or granted asylum, including persons who may now be lawful permanent residents or U.S. citizens).

Qualifying family members of U.S.-based anchors include spouses, unmarried children under age 21, and parents. Eligible nationalities are selected following careful review of several factors, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees’ annual assessment of refugees in need of resettlement, prospective or ongoing repatriation efforts, and U.S. foreign policy interests. The Priority 3 category is outlined in the annual Proposed Refugee Admissions—Report to Congress, which is submitted on behalf of the President in fulfillment of the requirements of Section 207(e)(1)–(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and authorized by the annual Presidential Determination for Refugee Admissions.

#### Methodology

Information for the Affidavit of Relationship (AOR) is collected in person by Voluntary Agencies around the United States, which are organizations that work under cooperative agreements with the Department of State, to provide a means for current or former refugees and asylees to claim a relationship with certain family members that would qualify those family members to apply for access to refugee processing under the Priority 3 category of the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program. The Voluntary Agencies then forward the completed AORs to the Department of State’s Refugee Processing Center (RPC) for data entry and case processing.

Dated: November 8, 2011.

**Kelly A. Gauger,**

*Deputy Director, Office of Admissions, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 2011–29472 Filed 11–14–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710–33–P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 7686]

#### Culturally Significant Objects Imported for Exhibition Determinations: “The Renaissance Portrait From Donatello to Bellini”

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given of the following determinations: Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Act of October 19, 1965 (79 Stat. 985; 22 U.S.C. 2459), Executive Order 12047 of March 27, 1978, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2681, *et seq.*; 22 U.S.C. 6501 note, *et seq.*), Delegation of Authority No. 234 of October 1, 1999, and Delegation of Authority No. 236–3 of August 28, 2000,

I hereby determine that the objects to be included in the exhibition “The Renaissance Portrait from Donatello to Bellini,” imported from abroad for temporary exhibition within the United States, are of cultural significance. The objects are imported pursuant to loan agreements with the foreign owners or custodians. I also determine that the exhibition or display of the exhibit objects at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, New York, from on or about December 19, 2011, until on or about March 18, 2012, and at possible additional exhibitions or venues yet to be determined, is in the national interest. I have ordered that Public Notice of these Determinations be published in the **Federal Register**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information, including a list of the exhibit objects, contact Paul W. Manning, Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser, U.S. Department of State (telephone: (202) 632–6469). The mailing address is U.S. Department of State, SA–5, L/PD, Fifth Floor (Suite 5H03), Washington, DC 20522–0505.

Dated: November 8, 2011.

**J. Adam Erelli,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 2011–29473 Filed 11–14–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710–05–P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 7685]

#### Bureau of Political-Military Affairs; Statutory Debarment Under the Arms Export Control Act and the International Traffic in Arms Regulations

**ACTION:** Notice; Notice of Correction.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the Department of State has imposed statutory debarment pursuant to § 127.7(c) of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (“ITAR”) (22 CFR parts 120 to 130) on persons convicted of violating or attempting to violate Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, (“AECA”) (22 U.S.C. 2778). Further, a public notice was published in the **Federal Register** on Tuesday, November 2, 1993, listing persons statutorily debarred pursuant to the ITAR; this notice makes one correction to that notice.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* The effective date is the date of this notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lisa Aguirre, Director, Office of Defense Trade Controls Compliance, Bureau of

Political-Military Affairs, Department of State (202) 632-2798.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 38(g)(4) of the AECA, 22 U.S.C. 2778(g)(4), prohibits the Department of State from issuing licenses or other approvals for the export of defense articles or defense services where the applicant, or any party to the export, has been convicted of violating certain statutes, including the AECA. The statute permits limited exceptions to be made on a case-by-case basis. In implementing this provision, Section 127.7 of the ITAR provides for "statutory debarment" of any person who has been convicted of violating or conspiring to violate the AECA. Persons subject to statutory debarment are prohibited from participating directly or indirectly in the export of defense articles, including technical data, or in the furnishing of defense services for which a license or other approval is required.

Statutory debarment is based solely upon conviction in a criminal proceeding, conducted by a United States Court, and as such the administrative debarment procedures outlined in Part 128 of the ITAR are not applicable.

The period for debarment will be determined by the Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs based on the underlying nature of the violations, but will generally be for three years from the date of conviction. Export privileges may be reinstated only at the request of the debarred person followed by the necessary interagency consultations, after a thorough review of the circumstances surrounding the conviction, and a finding that appropriate steps have been taken to mitigate any law enforcement concerns, as required by Section 38(g)(4) of the AECA. Unless export privileges are reinstated, however, the person remains debarred.

Department of State policy permits debarred persons to apply to the Director, Office of Defense Trade Controls Compliance, for reinstatement beginning one year after the date of the debarment. Any decision to grant reinstatement can be made only after the statutory requirements of Section 38(g)(4) of the AECA have been satisfied.

Exceptions, also known as transaction exceptions, may be made to this debarment determination on a case-by-case basis at the discretion of the Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs, after consulting with the appropriate U.S. agencies. However, such an exception would be granted

only after a full review of all circumstances, paying particular attention to the following factors: Whether an exception is warranted by overriding U.S. foreign policy or national security interests; whether an exception would further law enforcement concerns that are consistent with the foreign policy or national security interests of the United States; or whether other compelling circumstances exist that are consistent with the foreign policy or national security interests of the United States, and that do not conflict with law enforcement concerns. Even if exceptions are granted, the debarment continues until subsequent reinstatement.

Pursuant to Section 38(g)(4) of the AECA and Section 127.7(c) of the ITAR, the following persons are statutorily debarred as of the date of this notice (Name; Date of Conviction; District; Case No.; Month/Year of Birth):

(1) Heriberto Alanis-Ortiz; September 11, 2010; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 7:10CR00178-S1-001; January 1978.

(2) Amen Ahmed Ali, (aka Ali Amen Alrowhani, Amin Al Rohany, Ameen Alrohany); January 18, 2011; U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California; Case No. 1:06CR00292-001; June 1950.

(3) Rogelio Barajas; February 15, 2011; U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois; Case No. 09-CR-1058; August 1967.

(4) Brian William Barthrop; December 22, 2010; U.S. District Court, District of Arizona; Case No. CR-09-00731-001-TUC-RRC (CRP); October 1946.

(5) Jesse Ivan Cantu; March 15, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 1:10CR01201-002; December 1986.

(6) Charles Carper; October 20, 2010; U.S. District Court, District of Hawaii; Case No. 1:08CR00655-002; May 1986.

(7) Isaac Cervantes-Sanchez; February 24, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 7:10CR01331-S1-001; March 1981.

(8) Chitron Electronics, Inc.; February 9, 2011; U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts; Case No. 1:08-CR-10386-004-PBS.

(9) Lawrence Davis (aka Larry Davis); April 23, 2009; U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York; Case No. 1:07-CR-1023-01(LAK); July 1945.

(10) Gwendolyn Douglas (aka Gwen Douglas); April 14, 2009; U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York; Case No. 07CR-1006; March 1955.

(11) Cesar Augusto Flores-Demara; February 14, 2011; U.S. District Court, District of Arizona; Case No. CR-10-

01581-001-TUC-DCB(CRP); February 1974.

(12) Ernesto Gonzalez-Reyes; October 4, 2010; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 7:10CR00440-001; August 1961.

(13) Mythili Gopal; August 18, 2008; U.S. District Court, District of the District of Columbia; Case No. CR 07-0292-01; June 1970.

(14) Noshir S. Gowadia; February 4, 2011; U.S. District Court, District of Hawaii; Case No. 1:05CR00486-001; April 1944.

(15) Raul Gutierrez-Marroquin; February 17, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 1:10CR01201-001; May 1988.

(16) Fidel Jesus Hernandez; November 23, 2010; U.S. District Court, District of Arizona; Case No. CR-07-02111-002-TUC-DCB(CRP); February 1973.

(17) Boniface Ibe; July 12, 2011; U.S. District Court, District of Maryland; Case No. DKC-8-11-CR-00097-001; June 1961.

(18) Gong Kim; January 25, 2011; U.S. District Court, District of Oregon; Case No. CR-10-25-01-HA; August 1971.

(19) Mark Komoroski; July 29, 2010; U.S. District Court, Middle District of Pennsylvania; Case No. 3:CR08-228; July 1962.

(20) Chi Tong Kuok, (aka Edison Kuok, Eddy Kuok, James Kuok, Yoko Chong, Yoko Kawasaki); September 16, 2010; U.S. District Court, Southern District of California; Case No. 09CR2581-BEN; March 1967.

(21) Jose Lara; January 27, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 1:10CR00698-001; October 1983.

(22) Gregorio Larios, Jr.; March 17, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 1:10CR00742-001; November 1980.

(23) Sergio Rafael Lopez-Medina; March 15, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 1:10CR00699-002; August 1990.

(24) Xiaodong Sheldon Meng; June 24, 2008; U.S. District Court, Northern District of California; Case No. CR-04-20216-001-JF; January 1964.

(25) Chano Miller; January 7, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida; Case No. 0:10CR60177-COHN-2; December 1956.

(26) Jose Jesus Miramontes-Duarte; April 23, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 7:09CR00339-002; May 1951.

(27) Abraham Molina-Barron; May 13, 2011; U.S. District Court, District of Arizona; Case No. CR-10-02778-001-TUC-CKJ(HCE); December 1972.

(28) Jacques Monsieur; October 1, 2010; U.S. District Court, Southern

District of Alabama; Case No. 09–00186–001–WS; March 1953.

(29) George Frank Myles Jr. (aka George Miles); November 10, 2008; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida; Case No. 07–20930–CR–UNGARO; September 1948.

(30) Emenike Charles Nwankwoala; January 6, 2011; U.S. District Court, District of Maryland; Case No. PJM–8–10–CR–00179–001; October 1960.

(31) Andrew V. O'Donnell; August 1, 2011; U.S. District Court, Northern District of Georgia; Case No. 1:10–CR–491–CAP; July 1997.

(32) Joseph O'Toole; December 14, 2010; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida; Case No. 0:10CR60177–COHN–1; May 1931.

(33) Sergio Perez-Contreras; August 2, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 7:09CR00339–001; March 1938

(34) Julio Cesar Ramirez; June 30, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 7:11CR00288–001; July 1989.

(35) Julio Salazar-Galan; October 22, 2010; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 1:10CR00400–001; July 1990.

(36) Juan Saucedo-Rangel; May 23, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 7:10CR01794–001; May 1981.

(37) Christian Sepulveda-Ortiz; December 17, 2010; U.S. District Court, District of Arizona; Case No. CR–10–02111–001–TUC–CKJ(DTF); June 1983.

(38) Parthasarathy Sudarshan; June 17, 2008; U.S. District Court, District of the District of Columbia; Case No. CR 08–0037; June 1960.

(39) Paul Taylor; March 18, 2011; U.S. District Court, District of Delaware; Case No. 09CR121–LPS; August 1966.

(40) Alain Teran; January 13, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 1:10CR00699–001; June 1986.

(41) Eduardo Torres; November 4, 2010; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 1:10CR00330–001; August 1980.

(42) Andrei Antonio Torres-Vasquez; November 15, 2010; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 7:10CR01111–001; December 1985.

(43) Stephanie Monique Townsend; August 24, 2010; U.S. District Court, Southern District of California; Case No. 09CR4271–MMA; January 1989.

(44) Rolando Trevino; June 10, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Texas; Case No. 7:10CR01793–001; August 1987.

(45) Universal Industries Limited, Inc.; August 22, 2011; U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida; Case No. 9:11–80058–CR–MARRA–2.

(46) Yufeng Wei (aka Annie Wei); February 4, 2011; U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts; Case No. 1:08–CR–10386–002–PBS; April 1964.

(47) Zhen Zhou Wu (aka Alex Wu); January 27, 2011; U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts; Case No. 1:08–CR–10386–001–PBS; March 1964.

As noted above, at the end of the three-year period following the date of this notice, the above named persons/entities remain debarred unless export privileges are reinstated.

Debarred persons are generally ineligible to participate in activity regulated under the ITAR (see e.g., sections 120.1(c) and (d), and 127.11(a)). Also, under Section 127.1(c) of the ITAR, any person who has knowledge that another person is subject to debarment or is otherwise ineligible may not, without disclosure to and written approval from the Directorate of Defense Trade Controls, participate, directly or indirectly, in any export in which such ineligible person may benefit there from or have a direct or indirect interest therein.

Further, **Federal Register** document 93–26888, published at 58 FR 58586, Tuesday, November 2, 1993, is corrected on page 58586, line 50 through line 57 to read as follows:

1. Tsutomu Iida, 333 8th Maloka-Cho Totsuka-Ku, Kokohama, Japan, 18 U.S.C. 371 (conspiracy to violate 22 U.S.C. 2778), December 17, 1992, *United States v. Japan Aviation Electronics Industry, Ltd., et al.*, U.S. District Court, District of Columbia, Criminal Docket No. 91–516–10.

That notice of statutory debarment incorrectly identified the debarred party as “Tsotomu Ida.”

This notice is provided for purposes of making the public aware that the persons listed above are prohibited from participating directly or indirectly in activities regulated by the ITAR, including any brokering activities and in any export from or temporary import into the United States of defense articles, related technical data, or defense services in all situations covered by the ITAR. Specific case information may be obtained from the Office of the Clerk for the U.S. District Courts mentioned above and by citing the court case number where provided.

Dated: November 8, 2011.

**Andrew J. Shapiro,**

*Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State.*

[FR Doc. 2011–29470 Filed 11–14–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4710–25–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Notice of Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) Approvals and Disapprovals

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Monthly notice of PFC approvals and disapprovals. In October 2011, there were six applications approved. This notice also includes information on one application, approved in September 2011, inadvertently left off the September 2011 notice. Additionally, 14 approved amendments to previously approved applications are listed.

**SUMMARY:** The FAA publishes a monthly notice, as appropriate, of PFC approvals and disapprovals under the provisions of the Aviation Safety and Capacity Expansion Act of 1990 (Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990) (Pub. L. 101–508) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 158). This notice is published pursuant to paragraph d of § 158.29.

#### PFC Applications Approved

*Public Agency:* City of Orlando, Florida.

*Application Number:* 11–14–C–00–MCO.

*Application Type:* Impose and use a PFC.

*PFC Level:* \$3.00.

*Total PFC Revenue Approved In This Decision:* \$26,952,400.

*Earliest Charge Effective Date:* February 1, 2026.

*Estimated Charge Expiration Date:* June 1, 2026.

*Class of Air Carriers Not Required To Collect PFC's:* None.

*Brief Description of Projects Approved For Collection and Use:*

Emergency electrical system improvements; Landside phase 2 and airside terminal 4 phase 1 (design and construction).

Enplane road structural improvements (design and construction).

Landside signage improvements (design and construction).

Taxiway B–2 extension and taxiway B–1 rehabilitation (design and construction).

Elevator and escalator safety code compliance improvements (design and construction).

Runway 18U36R structural joint rehabilitation.

Closed circuit television improvements (design and construction).

*Brief Description of Projects Partially Approved For Collection and Use:*