

accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) and (2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: August 26, 2013.

**Ronald K. Lorentzen,**  
*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2013-20899 Filed 8-26-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

### Determination Under the Textile and Apparel Commercial Availability Provision of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement (“CAFTA–DR Agreement”)

**AGENCY:** The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.  
**ACTION:** Determination to add a product in unrestricted quantities to Annex 3.25 of the CAFTA–DR agreement.

**SUMMARY:** The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (“CITA”) has determined that certain polyester/nylon cut corduroy fabric, as specified below, is not available in commercial quantities in a timely manner in the CAFTA–DR countries. The product will be added to the list in Annex 3.25 of the CAFTA–DR Agreement in unrestricted quantities.

**DATES:** Effective August 27, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Maria Dybczak, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-3651.

*For Further Information Online:*  
<http://web.ita.doc.gov/tacgi/CaftaReqTrack.nsf> under “Approved Requests,” Referencen number: 184.2013.07.25.Fabric.Alston&BirdforSPCGlobal

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

**Authority:** The CAFTA–DR Agreement; Section 203(o)(4) of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (“CAFTA–DR Implementation Act”), Public Law 109-53; the Statement of Administrative Action, accompanying the CAFTA–DR Implementation Act; and Presidential Proclamations 7987 (February 28, 2006) and 7996 (March 31, 2006).

#### Background:

The CAFTA–DR Agreement provides a list in Annex 3.25 for fabrics, yarns, and fibers that the Parties to the CAFTA–DR Agreement have determined are not available in commercial quantities in a timely manner in the territory of any Party. The CAFTA–DR Agreement provides that this list may be modified pursuant to

Article 3.25(4)–(5), when the President of the United States determines that a fabric, yarn, or fiber is not available in commercial quantities in a timely manner in the territory of any Party. See Annex 3.25 of the CAFTA–DR Agreement; see also section 203(o)(4)(C) of the CAFTA–DR Implementation Act.

The CAFTA–DR Implementation Act requires the President to establish procedures governing the submission of a request and providing opportunity for interested entities to submit comments and supporting evidence before a commercial availability determination is made. In Presidential Proclamations 7987 and 7996, the President delegated to CITA the authority under section 203(o)(4) of CAFTA–DR Implementation Act for modifying the Annex 3.25 list. Pursuant to this authority, on September 15, 2008, CITA published modified procedures it would follow in considering requests to modify the Annex 3.25 list of products determined to be not commercially available in the territory of any Party to CAFTA–DR (*Modifications to Procedures for Considering Requests Under the Commercial Availability Provision of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement*, 73 FR 53200) (“CITA’s procedures”).

On July 25, the Chairman of CITA received a request for a Commercial Availability determination (“Request”) from Alston & Bird, LLP on behalf of SPC Global, LLC, for certain polyester/nylon cut corduroy fabric, as specified below. On July 29, 2013, in accordance with CITA’s procedures, CITA notified interested parties of the Request, which was posted on the dedicated Web site for CAFTA–DR Commercial Availability proceedings. In its notification, CITA advised that any Response with an Offer to Supply (“Response”) must be submitted by August 8, 2013, and any Rebuttal Comments to a Response must be submitted by August 14, 2013, in accordance with sections 6 and 7 of CITA’s procedures. No interested entity submitted a Response to the Request advising CITA of its objection to the Request and its ability to supply the subject product.

In accordance with section 203(o)(4)(C) of the CAFTA–DR Implementation Act, and section 8(c)(2) of CITA’s procedures, as no interested entity submitted a Response to object to the Request with an offer to supply the subject product, CITA has determined to add the specified fabric to the list in Annex 3.25 of the CAFTA–DR Agreement.

The subject product has been added to the list in Annex 3.25 of the CAFTA–

DR Agreement in unrestricted quantities. A revised list has been posted on the dedicated Web site for CAFTA–DR Commercial Availability proceedings.

**Specifications:** Certain Polyester/Nylon Cut Corduroy Fabric.

HTS: 5801.32.0000.

Fiber Content: 80–95% polyester, 5–20% nylon.

Yarn Size:

Warp: Polyester filament between 111–222 decitex (English: 100–200 denier).

Fill: Polyester filament 111–278 decitex (English: 100–250 denier) and bi-constituent polyester-nylon filament between 222–389 decitex (English: 200–350 denier).

NOTE 1: In the bi-constituent yarn, the polyester and nylon are mixed prior to extrusion.

NOTE 2: The yarn size designations describe a range of specifications for yarn in its greige condition. They are intended as specifications to be followed by the mill in sourcing yarn used to produce the fabric. Weaving, dyeing, and finishing can alter the characteristics of the yarn as it appears in the finished fabric. This specification therefore includes yarns appearing in the finished fabric as finer or coarser than the designated yarn sizes provided that the variation occurs after processing of the greige yarn and production of the fabric.

Thread count: 20–34 warp ends x 50–67 fill picks per centimeter (English: 50–86 warp ends x 127–170 fill picks per inch).

Weight: 220–290 grams per sq. meter (English: 6.48–8.55 oz per sq. yard).

Width: 142–162 cm (English: 56–64 inches).

Weave: Cut corduroy with 3–6 wales per cm (English: 8–16 wales per inch).

Finishing: Piece dyed or of yarns of different colors.

**Kim Glas,**

*Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.*

[FR Doc. 2013-20765 Filed 8-26-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

### Fees for Reviews of the Rule Enforcement Programs of Designated Contract Markets and Registered Futures Associations

**AGENCY:** Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of FY 2013 Schedule of Fees.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission charges fees to designated contract markets and registered futures associations to recover the costs incurred by the Commission in the operation of its program of oversight of self-regulatory organization rule enforcement programs, specifically National Futures Association, a

registered futures association, and the designated contract markets. The calculation of the fee amounts charged for FY 2013 by this notice is based upon an average of actual program costs incurred during FY 2010, 2011, and 2012.

**DATES:** *Effective date:* Each SRO is required to remit electronically the fee applicable to it on or before October 28, 2013.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mark Carney, Chief Financial Officer, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, (202) 418-5477, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW., Washington, DC 20581. For information on electronic payment, contact Jennifer Fleming, (202) 418-5034, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW., Washington, DC 20581.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**I. Background Information**

*A. General*

This notice relates to fees for the Commission’s review of the rule enforcement programs at the registered futures associations<sup>1</sup> and designated contract markets (DCM) each of which is a self-regulatory organization (SRO) regulated by the Commission. The Commission recalculates the fees charged each year to cover the costs of operating this Commission program.<sup>2</sup> All costs are accounted for by the Commission’s Budget Program Activity Codes (BPAC) system, formerly the Management Accounting Structure Codes (MASC) system, which records each employee’s time for each pay period. The fees are set each year based on direct program costs, plus an overhead factor. The Commission calculates actual costs, then calculates an alternate fee taking volume into

account, then charges the lower of the two.<sup>3</sup>

*B. Overhead Rate*

The fees charged by the Commission to the SROs are designed to recover program costs, including direct labor costs and overhead. The overhead rate is calculated by dividing total Commission-wide overhead direct program labor costs into the total amount of the Commission-wide overhead pool. For this purpose, direct program labor costs are the salary costs of personnel working in all Commission programs. Overhead costs consist generally of the following Commission-wide costs: indirect personnel costs (leave and benefits), rent, communications, contract services, utilities, equipment, and supplies. This formula has resulted in the following overhead rates for the most recent three years (rounded to the nearest whole percent): 153 percent for fiscal year 2010, 145 percent for fiscal year 2011, and 161 percent for fiscal year 2012.

*C. Conduct of SRO Rule Enforcement Reviews*

Under the formula adopted by the Commission in 1993, the Commission calculates the fee to recover the costs of its rule enforcement reviews and examinations, based on the three-year average of the actual cost of performing such reviews and examinations at each SRO. The cost of operation of the Commission’s SRO oversight program varies from SRO to SRO, according to the size and complexity of each SRO’s program. The three-year averaging computation method is intended to smooth out year-to-year variations in cost. Timing of the Commission’s

reviews and examinations may affect costs—a review or examination may span two fiscal years and reviews and examinations are not conducted at each SRO each year.

As noted above, adjustments to actual costs may be made to relieve the burden on an SRO with a disproportionately large share of program costs. The Commission’s formula provides for a reduction in the assessed fee if an SRO has a smaller percentage of United States industry contract volume than its percentage of overall Commission oversight program costs. This adjustment reduces the costs so that, as a percentage of total Commission SRO oversight program costs, they are in line with the pro rata percentage for that SRO of United States industry-wide contract volume.

The calculation is made as follows: The fee required to be paid to the Commission by each DCM is equal to the lesser of actual costs based on the three-year historical average of costs for that DCM or one-half of average costs incurred by the Commission for each DCM for the most recent three years, plus a pro rata share (based on average trading volume for the most recent three years) of the aggregate of average annual costs of all DCMs for the most recent three years. The formula for calculating the second factor is:  $0.5a + 0.5vt =$  current fee. In this formula, “a” equals the average annual costs, “v” equals the percentage of total volume across DCMs over the last three years, and “t” equals the average annual costs for all DCMs. NFA has no contracts traded; hence, its fee is based simply on costs for the most recent three fiscal years. This table summarizes the data used in the calculations of the resulting fee for each entity:

	Actual total costs			3-year average actual costs	3-year % of volume	Volume adjusted costs	FY 2013 assessed fee
	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012				
CBOE Futures .....	\$	\$98,556	29,278	\$42,611	0.34	\$23,914	\$23,914
Chicago Board of Trade .....	87,953	5,260	238,392	110,535	29.25	280,868	110,535
Chicago Mercantile Exchange .....	882,542	422,837	757,347	687,575	50.14	730,502	687,575
ELX Futures .....			34,593	11,531	0.341	8,397	8,397
ICE Futures U.S. ....	94,043	17,624	221,813	111,160	3.20	80,237	80,237
Kansas City Board of Trade .....	227,296	30,976	34,335	97,536	0.18	50,133	50,133
Minneapolis Grain Exchange .....		88,790	60,897	49,896	0.05	25,321	25,321
NADEX North American .....			11,293	3,764	0.000	1,882	1,882
New York Mercantile Exchange .....	596,767	136,565	7,411	246,915	15.93	246,340	246,340
New York LIFFE .....		416,069	71,317	162,462	0.42	84,495	84,495
One Chicago .....			55,755	18,585	0.141	10,382	10,382
Subtotal .....	1,888,601	1,216,678	1,522,431	1,542,570	100	1,542,470	1,329,210
National Futures Association .....	1,206,393	416,615	487,328	703,445			703,445

<sup>1</sup> NFA is the only registered futures association.  
<sup>2</sup> See section 237 of the Futures Trading Act of 1982, 7 U.S.C. 16a, and 31 U.S.C. 9701. For a

broader discussion of the history of Commission fees, see 52 FR 46070, Dec. 4, 1987.

<sup>3</sup> 58 FR 42643, Aug. 11, 1993, and 17 CFR part 1, app. B.

	Actual total costs			3-year average actual costs	3-year % of volume	Volume adjusted costs	FY 2013 assessed fee
	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012				
Total .....	3,094,994	1,633,293	2,009,759	2,246,015	.....	.....	2,032,655

An example of how the fee is calculated for one exchange, the Chicago Board of Trade, is set forth here:

a. Actual three-year average costs equal 110,535.

b. The alternative computation is: (.5) (110,535) + (.5) (.292) (1,542,570) = 280,868.

c. The fee is the lesser of a or b; in this case 110,535.

As noted above, the alternative calculation based on contracts traded is not applicable to NFA because it is not a DCM and has no contracts traded. The Commission's average annual cost for conducting oversight review of the NFA rule enforcement program during fiscal years 2010 through 2012 was 708,424 (one-third of 2,125,273). The fee to be paid by the NFA for the current fiscal year is 708,424.

**II. Schedule of Fees**

Therefore, fees for the Commission's review of the rule enforcement programs at the registered futures associations and DCMs regulated by the Commission are as follows:

	2013 fee lesser of actual or calculated fee
CBOE Futures .....	\$23,914
Chicago Board of Trade .....	110,535
Chicago Mercantile Exchange ..	687,575
ELX Futures .....	8,397
ICE Futures U.S. ....	80,237
Kansas City Board of Trade .....	50,133
Minneapolis Grain Exchange ...	25,321
NADEX North American .....	1,882
New York Mercantile Exchange	246,340
New York LIFFE .....	84,495
One Chicago .....	10,382
Subtotal .....	1,329,210
National Futures Association ....	703,445
Total .....	2,032,655

**III. Payment Method**

The Debt Collection Improvement Act (DCIA) requires deposits of fees owed to the government by electronic transfer of funds. See 31 U.S.C. 3720. For information about electronic payments, please contact Jennifer Fleming at (202) 418-5034 or [jfleming@cftc.gov](mailto:jfleming@cftc.gov), or see the CFTC Web site at [www.cftc.gov](http://www.cftc.gov), specifically, [www.cftc.gov/cftc/cftcelectronicpayments.htm](http://www.cftc.gov/cftc/cftcelectronicpayments.htm).

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 16a.

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 21, 2013, by the Commission.

**Christopher J. Kirkpatrick,**  
Deputy Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2013-20772 Filed 8-26-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

**CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU**

**Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Assessment (FINAL EA) and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for Renovation and Modernization of the Organization Headquarters Building, Washington, DC**

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Assessment (FINAL EA) and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for Renovation and Modernization of the organization headquarters building located at 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC.

**SUMMARY:** The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) is issuing this notice to advise the public that, on January 3, 2013, the CFPB prepared and completed, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) based on the Final Environmental Assessment (FINAL EA) for the project at 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC is to modernize the interior and courtyard space of the building. The building is currently used as the headquarters for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). Originally built in 1976, the building has three below ground levels that extend beneath a large public courtyard (two of which include secured parking) and seven floors above ground with the highest reserved for mechanical equipment. Storefront retail is located at the ground level. The CFPB prepared the final EA, dated July 2013, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

**DATES:** Comments must be received no later than September 25, 2013. The FONSI and/or Final EA are available as of the publication date of this notice.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested parties may request copies of the FONSI and/or Final EA, from: Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Facilities Office—

Projects, 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC, 20552. You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- *Electronic:* [michael.davis@cfpb.gov](mailto:michael.davis@cfpb.gov).
- *Mail/Hand Delivery/Courier:*

Michael Davis, Project Manager, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20552. All comments, including attachments and other supporting materials, will become part of the public record and subject to public disclosure. You should submit only information that you wish to make available publicly.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael Davis, Project Manager, Office of Administrative Operations, at (202) 435-9405.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Final EA evaluated the future project at 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC to modernize the interior and courtyard space of the building. The building is currently used as the headquarters for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). Originally built in 1976, the building has three below ground levels that extend beneath a large public courtyard (two of which include secured parking) and seven floors above ground with the highest reserved for mechanical equipment. Storefront retail is located at the ground level. The Final EA has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. Based on the results of the EA, the CFPB has issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) indicating that the proposed action will not have a significant impact on the environment. Minimization and mitigating measures will include: Compliance with applicable regulatory laws, procedures, and permits for all construction activities; site review by state historic preservation office before construction to avoid disturbance of any site with the potential for historical significance; and the application of best management practices (BMP) to minimize short term air quality and noise impact during construction activities.

Dated: August 21, 2013.

**Christopher D'Angelo,**  
Chief of Staff, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

[FR Doc. 2013-20896 Filed 8-26-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-AM-P