

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**International Trade Administration**

[C-475-819]

Certain Pasta From Italy: Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of the Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* February 7, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Holland or Chris Siepmann, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-1279 and (202) 482-7958, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

On August 31, 2010, the U.S. Department of Commerce ("Department") published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain pasta from Italy, covering the period January 1, 2009, through December 31, 2009. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Deferral of Initiation of Administrative Review*, 75 FR 53274 (August 31, 2010). The preliminary results of this administrative review are currently due no later than April 2, 2011.

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), requires the Department to issue the preliminary results of an administrative review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of a countervailing duty order for which a review is requested and issue the final results within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within the time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend these deadlines to a maximum of 365 days and 180 days, respectively.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results

The Department requires additional time to review and analyze submitted information and to issue supplemental questionnaires. Therefore, it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original

time limit, and the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results by 120 days. The preliminary results will now be due no later than August 1, 2011, the first business day following 120 days from the current deadline. See *Notice of Clarification: Application of "Next Business Day" Rule for Administrative Determination Deadlines Pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930, as Amended*, 70 FR 24533 (May 10, 2005). The final results continue to be due 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(3)(A) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 31, 2011.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2011-2636 Filed 2-4-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**Arbitration Panel Decision Under the Randolph-Sheppard Act**

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of arbitration panel decision under the Randolph-Sheppard Act.

SUMMARY: The Department of Education (Department) gives notice that on September 28, 2010, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Ron Armstrong v. Ohio Rehabilitation Commission, Bureau of Services for the Blind and Visually Impaired, Case no. R-S/08-4*. This panel was convened by the Department under 20 U.S.C. 107d-1(a), after the Department received a complaint filed by the petitioner, Ron Armstrong.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You may obtain a copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision from Suzette E. Haynes, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 5022, Potomac Center Plaza, Washington, DC 20202-2800. Telephone: (202) 245-7374. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll-free, at 1-800-877-8339.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 6(c) of the Randolph-Sheppard

Act (Act), 20 U.S.C. 107d-2(c), the Secretary publishes in the **Federal Register** a synopsis of each arbitration panel decision affecting the administration of vending facilities on Federal and other property.

Background

Ron Armstrong (Complainant) alleged violations by the Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission, Bureau of Services for the Blind and Visually Impaired, the State licensing agency (SLA), under the Act and implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395. Specifically, Complainant alleged that the SLA improperly administered the Ohio Randolph-Sheppard Vending Facility Program in violation of the Act, implementing regulations under the Act, and State rules and regulations. Complainant further alleged that the SLA's selection committee denied him an opportunity to manage Vending Facility 495 by inappropriately applying selection criteria that led to another candidate being selected to manage Vending Facility 495.

Prior to Complainant applying for Vending Facility 495 in 2006, he had managed the facility part-time for four years. Complainant requested a State fair hearing on the SLA's decision to award Vending Facility 495 to another candidate. A State fair hearing on this matter was held. On December 8, 2008, the hearing officer issued a decision denying Complainant's grievance. On January 6, 2009, the SLA adopted the hearing officer's decision as final agency action. Complainant sought review of the SLA's final agency by a Federal arbitration panel.

According to the arbitration panel, the issues to be resolved were: (1) Whether the selection committee violated the Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) when it applied the 2006 labor goal to determine a labor percentage for 2005 for both Complainant and the other candidate when there did not exist a labor goal in 2005 and the 2006 rule required application of labor percentages for two years; (2) Whether the selection committee considered all of the documents in both the Complainant's and the other candidate's vending operator files as required by the OAC; (3) Whether the selection committee invited the grantor (building representative) to participate on the selection committee as required by the OAC; and (4) What the remedy should be if the provisions of the Act or any of the implementing regulations and state rules and regulations were violated.