

Agreements Program announced in the **Federal Register** on July 16, 2010 (75 FR 41662). The new deadline for final applications is February 22, 2011. The program extends the solicitation period due to a typo made in the deadline date published in the original announcement.

Limitation of Liability

In no event will NOAA or the Department of Commerce be responsible for proposal preparation costs if this program is cancelled because of other agency priorities. Publication of this announcement does not oblige NOAA to award any specific project or to obligate any available funds. Applicants are hereby given notice that funding for the Fiscal Year 2011 program is contingent upon the availability of Fiscal Year 2011 appropriations.

Universal Identifier

Applicants should be aware they are required to provide a Dun and Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number during the application process. See the October 30, 2002, **Federal Register**, (67 FR 66177) for additional information. Organizations can receive a DUNS number at no cost by calling the dedicated toll-free DUNS Number request line at 1-866-705-5711 or via the Internet at <http://www.dunandbradstreet.com>.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

NOAA must analyze the potential environmental impacts, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), for applicant projects or proposals which are seeking NOAA federal funding opportunities. Detailed information on NOAA compliance with NEPA can be found at the following NOAA NEPA Web site: <http://www.nepa.noaa.gov/>, including our NOAA Administrative Order 216-6 for NEPA, http://www.nepa.noaa.gov/NAO216_6_TOC.pdf, and the Council on Environmental Quality implementation regulations, http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/regs/ceq/toc_ceq.htm. Consequently, as part of an applicant's package, and under their description of their program activities, applicants are required to provide detailed information on the activities to be conducted, locations, sites, species and habitat to be affected, possible construction activities, and any environmental concerns that may exist (e.g., the use and disposal of hazardous or toxic chemicals, introduction of non-indigenous species, impacts to endangered and threatened species,

aquaculture projects, and impacts to coral reef systems). In addition to providing specific information that will serve as the basis for any required impact analyses, applicants may also be requested to assist NOAA in drafting of an environmental assessment, if NOAA determines an assessment is required. Applicants will also be required to cooperate with NOAA in identifying feasible measures to reduce or avoid any identified adverse environmental impacts of their proposal. The failure to do so shall be grounds for not selecting an application. In some cases if additional information is required after an application is selected, funds can be withheld by the Grants Officer under a special award condition requiring the recipient to submit additional environmental compliance information sufficient to enable NOAA to make an assessment on any impacts that a project may have on the environment.

The Department of Commerce Pre-award Notification Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements contained in the **Federal Register** notice of October 1, 2001 (66 FR 49917), as amended by the **Federal Register** notice published on: October 30, 2002 (67 FR 66109); December 30, 2004 (69 FR 78389); and February 11, 2008 (73 FR 7696) are applicable to this solicitation.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This document contains collection-of-information requirements subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA). The use of Standard Forms 424, 424A, 424B, SF-LLL, and CD-346 has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the respective control numbers 0348-0043, 0348-0044, 0348-0040, 0348-0046, and 0605-0001. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the PRA unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Executive Order 12866

This notice has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866.

Executive Order 13132 (Federalism)

It has been determined that this notice does not contain policies with Federalism implications as that term is defined in Executive Order 13132.

Administrative Procedure Act/Regulatory Flexibility Act

Prior notice and an opportunity for public comment are not required by the

Administrative Procedure Act or any other law for rules concerning public property, loans, grants, benefits, and contracts (5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2)). Because notice and opportunity for comment are not required pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553 or any other law, the analytical requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) are inapplicable. Therefore, a regulatory flexibility analysis has not been prepared.

Dated: October 27, 2010.

Christopher C. Cartwright,

Associate Assistant Administrator for Management and CFO/CAO, Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management.

[FR Doc. 2010-27702 Filed 11-2-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-08-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-830]

Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Mexico.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from ArcelorMittal las Truchas, S.A. de C.V. (AMLT), an exporter of carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico, and pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.221(c)(3), the Department is initiating a changed circumstances review of the antidumping order on carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico. Based on the information received, we preliminarily determine that AMLT is the successor-in-interest to Siderurgica Lazaro Cardenas las Truchas S.A. de C.V. (Sicartsa) for purposes of determining antidumping duty liability. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 3, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric B. Greynolds, Program Manager, Office of AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution

Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-6071.

Background

Sicartsa, as an exporter of carbon and certain steel alloy wire rod from Mexico to the United States, participated in the Department's administrative reviews with respect to wire rod from Mexico for the periods April 10, 2002, to September 30, 2003, and October 1, 2003, to September 30, 2004; the Department issued the final results of the reviews, giving Sicartsa a 1.06 percent margin, and a 1.26 percent margin, respectively. See *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico*, 70 FR 25809 (May 16, 2005); see also *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico*, 71 FR 27989 (May 15, 2006).

On September 10, 2010, AMLT filed a request for a changed circumstances review claiming that Sicartsa changed its name to AMLT. AMLT requested that it receive the same antidumping duty treatment accorded to Sicartsa and submitted documentation in support of its claim. AMLT requested that the Department combine the notice of initiation of the review and the preliminary results of review in a single notice as this review essentially involves only corporate name changes.

On October 6, 2010, petitioners submitted comments regarding AMLT's September 10, 2010, request for a changed circumstances review.¹ On October 6, 2010, the Department issued a questionnaire to AMLT regarding its September 10, 2010, submission. On October 18, 2010, AMLT submitted its questionnaire response.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to this order is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm, in solid cross-sectional diameter.

Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions for (a) stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining steel products (*i.e.*, products that contain by weight one or more of the

following elements: 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium).

Also excluded from the scope are 1080 grade tire cord quality wire rod and 1080 grade tire bead quality wire rod. This grade 1080 tire cord quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod measuring 5.0 mm or more but not more than 6.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.15 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.30 mm or less with 3 or fewer breaks per ton, and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.006 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium.

This grade 1080 tire bead quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod measuring 5.5 mm or more but not more than 7.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.2 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.78 mm or larger with 0.5 or fewer breaks per ton; and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of soluble aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.008 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) either not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium (if chromium is not specified), or not more than 0.10 percent in the aggregate of copper and nickel

and a chromium content of 0.24 to 0.30 percent (if chromium is specified).

For purposes of the grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and the grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod, an inclusion will be considered to be deformable if its ratio of length (measured along the axis—that is, the direction of rolling—of the rod) over thickness (measured on the same inclusion in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod) is equal to or greater than three. The size of an inclusion for purposes of the 20 microns and 35 microns limitations is the measurement of the largest dimension observed on a longitudinal section measured in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod. This measurement methodology applies only to inclusions on certain grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and certain grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after July 24, 2003.

The designation of the products as "tire cord quality" or "tire bead quality" indicates the acceptability of the product for use in the production of tire cord, tire bead, or wire for use in other rubber reinforcement applications such as hose wire. These quality designations are presumed to indicate that these products are being used in tire cord, tire bead, and other rubber reinforcement applications, and such merchandise intended for the tire cord, tire bead, or other rubber reinforcement applications is not included in the scope. However, should the petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such products for other than those applications, end-use certification for the importation of such products may be required. Under such circumstances, only the importers of record would normally be required to certify the end use of the imported merchandise.

All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope.

The products subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3011, 7213.91.3015, 7213.91.3092, 7213.91.4500, 7213.91.6000, 7213.99.0030, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0000, 7227.90.6010, and 7227.90.6080 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

¹ Petitioners are Georgetown Steel, Gerdau USA Inc., Nucor Steel Connecticut Inc., Keystone Consolidated Industries Inc., Rocky Mountain Steel Mills, and Mittal Steel USA.

Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review

During 2007, Mittal Steel merged with Arcelor S.A. to form ArcelorMittal. The merger was finalized on November 13, 2007. As part of the merger process, but prior to its formal completion, ArcelorMittal acquired 100 percent of Sicartsa. The acquisition was completed in April 2007. On February 25, 2008, Sicarsta changed its name to AMLT. On September 10, 2010, AMLT filed its changed circumstances review request in which it claimed that it is the successor-in-interest to Sicartsa.

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Act, the Department will conduct a changed circumstances review upon receipt of a request from an interested party or receipt of information concerning an antidumping duty order which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of the order. On September 10, 2010, AMLT submitted its request for a changed circumstances review. With its request, AMLT submitted certain information related to its claim that Sicartsa changed its name to AMLT, and that this name change has not affected the company's management, sales operations, supplier relationships or customer base in any meaningful way. In accordance with section 751(b) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216, the Department has determined that there is a sufficient basis to initiate a changed circumstances review to determine whether AMLT is the successor-in-interest to Sicartsa.

In making a successor-in-interest determination in antidumping proceedings, the Department typically examines several factors including, but not limited to: (1) Management; (2) production facilities; (3) supplier relationships, and (4) customer base. See, e.g., *Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460, 20462 (May 13, 1992) and *Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 70 FR 22847 (May 3, 2005) (*Plate from Romania*), unchanged in the *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania*, 70 FR 35624 (June 21, 2005). While no single factor or combination of factors will necessarily be dispositive, the Department generally will consider the new company to be the successor to the predecessor company if the resulting operations are essentially the same as

those of the predecessor company. See, e.g., *Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944, 6945 (February 14, 1994), and *Plate from Romania*, 70 FR 22847. Thus, if the record evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as the predecessor company, the Department may assign the new company the cash deposit rate of its predecessor. See, e.g., *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway*, 75 FR 32370, 32371 (June 8, 2010), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(i), we preliminarily determine that AMLT is the successor-in-interest to Sicartsa. AMLT claims that the name change has not affected the company's management, sales operations, supplier relationships, or customer base in a meaningful way. In its September 10, 2010, submission AMLT provided evidence supporting its claim. This documentation consists of: (1) An excerpt of the ArcelorMittal 2007 Annual Report indicating that ArcelorMittal acquired 100 percent interest of Sicartsa prior to Sicartsa's name change; (2) Sicartsa's Stock Register indicating the completion of ArcelorMittal's acquisition of Sicartsa; (3) Notary Public Office No.18 Federal District, Mexico certifying that Sicartsa changed its name to AMLT; (4) the articles of amendment that reflect the name change; and (5) a copy of an extraordinary shareholders' meeting approving the name change. In its October 18, 2010, submission AMLT provided additional evidence supporting its claim that management structure, sales operations, supplier relationships, and customer base have not changed significantly. While there has been turnover with respect to several senior management positions over the course of the period corresponding to 2007, 2008, and 2010, the board members remained the same. See AMLT's October 18, 2010, questionnaire response at Exhibit 1. The production operations also remained the same during the 2007, 2008, and 2010 time period, which is evident through business licenses, utility bills and invoices. See AMLT's October 18, 2010, questionnaire response at Exhibits 2, 3, and 4. Additionally, the suppliers for Sicartsa and AMLT, while not identical, overlap during the relevant time period

to a degree that provides support for consistency in supplier base. See AMLT's October 18, 2010, questionnaire response at Exhibits 8, 9, and 10 and the Memorandum to the File from Eric B. Greynolds, Program Manager, Office 3, Operations, "Analysis of Supplier and Customer Data" (October 25, 2010) (Supplier and Customer Data Memorandum), a business proprietary document of which the public version is on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU). The customers for Sicartsa and AMLT overlap to an even greater degree than the suppliers, which again provides consistency in the customer base. See AMLT's October 18, 2010, questionnaire response at Exhibits 5, 6, and 7 and the Supplier and Customer Data Memorandum.

The documentation described above demonstrates that there was little to no change in management structure, sales operations, supplier relationships, or customer base. For these reasons, we preliminarily find that AMLT is the successor-in-interest to Sicartsa and, thus, should receive the same antidumping duty treatment with respect to carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod from Mexico.

When "expedited action is warranted," the Department may publish the notice of initiation and preliminary determination concurrently. See 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii); see also *Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Italy: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Changed Circumstances Review*, 68 FR 13672 (March 20, 2003), unchanged in *Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Italy: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 68 FR 25327 (May 12, 2003). The Department has determined that such action is warranted because AMLT has provided *prima facie* evidence that AMLT is the successor-in-interest, and we have the information necessary to make a preliminary finding already on the record.

Based on the record evidence, we find that AMLT operates as the same business entity as Sicartsa. Thus, we preliminarily determine that AMLT is the successor-in-interest to Sicartsa.

Public Comment

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 14 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to the issues raised in those comments, may be filed not later than 21 days after the date of publication of this notice. All written comments shall be submitted in

accordance with 19 CFR 351.303. Any interested party may request a hearing within 14 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held no later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Persons interested in attending the hearing, if one is requested, should contact the Department for the date and time of the hearing. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.216(e), the Department will issue the final results of its antidumping duty changed circumstances review not later than 270 days after the date on which the review is initiated, or within 45 days if all parties agree to our preliminary results.

During the course of this antidumping duty changed circumstances review, cash deposit requirements for the subject merchandise exported by AMLT will continue to be the all others rate established in the investigation. *See Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, Moldova, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukraine*, 67 FR 65945 (October 29, 2002). The cash deposit rate will be altered, if warranted, pursuant only to the final results of this review.

We are issuing and publishing these preliminary results and notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) and (2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: October 27, 2010.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010-27783 Filed 11-2-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648-XA014

Pacific Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meetings.

SUMMARY: The Pacific Fishery Management Council's (Council's) Ad Hoc Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Review Committee (EFHRC) will hold a work session, which is open to the public, to plan the periodic 5-year review of groundfish Essential Fish Habitat (EFH).

DATES: The work session will be held Monday, December 20, 2010 from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The work session will be held at the Hyatt Place Hotel Portland Airport, 9750 NE Cascades Parkway, Portland, OR 97220, (503) 288-2808.

Council Address: Pacific Fishery Management Council, 7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 101, Portland, OR 97220-1384.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Chuck Tracy, Staff Officer, Pacific Fishery Management Council; telephone: (503) 820-2280.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of the work session is to develop recommendations for the process and scope of the groundfish EFH periodic 5-year review, and for the role of the EFHRC in that review. Recommendations are tentatively scheduled to be presented to the Council at the April 2011 Council meeting in San Mateo, CA.

Although non-emergency issues not contained in the meeting agenda may come before the EFHRC for discussion, those issues may not be the subject of formal EFHRC action during this meeting. EFHRC action will be restricted to those issues specifically listed in this notice and any issues arising after publication of this notice that require emergency action under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, provided the public has been notified of the EFHRC's intent to take final action to address the emergency.

Special Accommodations

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Ms. Carolyn Porter at (503) 820-2280 at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Dated: October 29, 2010.

Tracey L. Thompson,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2010-27744 Filed 11-2-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648-XA007

New England Fishery Management Council (NEFMC); Public Meeting; Correction

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and

Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of correction to a public meeting; addition to agenda.

SUMMARY: The New England Fishery Management Council (Council) will hold a three-day meeting on Tuesday through Thursday, November 16-18, 2010 to consider actions affecting New England fisheries in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ).

DATES: The meeting will be held on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, November 16-18, starting at 8:30 a.m. each day.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Ocean Edge Resort, 2907 Main Street, Brewster, MA 02631-1946; telephone (508) 896-9000; fax: (508) 896-9123.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul J. Howard, Executive Director, New England Fishery Management Council; telephone: (978) 465-0492.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The original notice published in the **Federal Register** on October 28, 2010 at 75 FR 66357.

Thursday, November 18, 2010

The New England Fishery Management Council's November 16-18 agenda will occur as previously published in the **Federal Register** on October 28, 2010. On Thursday, November 18, 2010, however, the final day of the meeting, there will be an addition to the items the Council will address. Just prior to adjournment, the Council will receive a report from the Joint Spiny Dogfish Committee, during which the NEFMC is scheduled to approve management measures for this fishery for the 2011 fishing year.

The spiny dogfish resource is managed jointly by the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, which recently set the annual quota and trip limits for the fishery for May 1, 2011-April 30, 2012. The New England Council will vote on the same issues and adjourn following discussion of any other outstanding Council business.

Although other non-emergency issues not contained in this agenda may come before this Council for discussion, those issues may not be the subjects of formal action during this meeting. Council action will be restricted to those issues specifically listed in this notice and any issues arising after publication of this notice that require emergency action under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, provided that the public has been notified of the Council's intent to take final action to address the emergency.