Whereas, the Board adopted the alternative site framework (ASF) (15 CFR Sec. 400.2(c)) as an option for the establishment or reorganization of zones;

Whereas, the World Trade Center Savannah, LLC, grantee of FTZ 104, submitted an application to the Board (FTZ Docket B–9–2014, docketed 02–04–2014) for authority to expand the service area of the zone to include the Counties of Burke, Candler, Emanuel, Jefferson, Jenkins, Johnson, Laurrens, Montgomery, Tattnall, Telfair, Toombs, Treutlen, Washington and Wheeler, as described in the application, adjacent to the Savannah Customs and Border Protection port of entry;

Whereas, notice inviting public comment was given in the Federal Register (79 FR 7642–7643, 02–10–2014) and the application has been processed pursuant to the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations; and,

Whereas, the Board adopts the findings and recommendations of the examiner’s report (including addendum), and finds that the requirements of the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations are satisfied with regard to expanding the service area of FTZ 104 to include Candler, Emanuel, Jenkins, Tattnall, Toombs, and Treutlen Counties, Georgia.

Now, therefore, the Board hereby orders:

The application to reorganize FTZ 104 to expand the service area under the ASF is approved with regard to the inclusion of Candler, Emanuel, Jenkins, Tattnall, Toombs, and Treutlen Counties, Georgia, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board’s regulations, including Section 400.13, and to the Board’s standard 2,000-acre activation limit for the zone.

Signed at Washington, DC, this day of March 12, 2015.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,
Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Enforcement and Compliance, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2015–06470 Filed 3–19–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Patent Reexaminations


ACTION: Proposed collection; comment request.

SUMMARY: The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies 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 May 19, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

• Email: InformationCollection@uspto.gov. Include “0651–0064 Patent Reexaminations” in the subject line of the message.

• Mail: Marcie Lovett, Records Management Division Director, Office of the Chief Information Officer, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information should be directed to Raul Tamayo, Senior Legal Advisor, Office of Patent Legal Administration, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450; by telephone at 571–272–7728; or by email to Raul.Tamayo@uspto.gov with “Paperwork” in the subject line. Additional information about this collection is also available at http://www.reginfo.gov under “Information Collection Review.”

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is required by 35 U.S.C. 131 and 151 to examine applications and, when appropriate, allow applications and issue them as patents. Chapter 30 of Title 35 U.S.C. provides that any person at any time may file a request for reexamination by the USPTO of any claim of a patent on the basis of prior art patents or printed publications. Once initiated, the reexamination proceedings under Chapter 30 are substantially ex parte and do not permit input from third parties. The rules outlining ex parte reexaminations are found at 37 CFR 1.510–1.520. Chapter 30 of Title 35 U.S.C. provides that any person at any time may file a request for reexamination by the USPTO of any claim of a patent on the basis of prior art patents or printed publications. Once initiated, the reexamination proceedings under Chapter 30 are substantially ex parte and do not permit input from third parties. The rules outlining ex parte reexaminations are found at 37 CFR 1.510–1.570.

35 U.S.C. 257 permits a patent owner to request supplemental examination of a patent by the USPTO to consider, reconsider, or correct information believed to be relevant to the patent. The rules outlining supplemental examination are found at 37 CFR 1.601–1.625.

The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act terminated inter partes reexamination effective September 16, 2012. However, inter partes reexamination proceedings based on inter partes reexamination requests filed before September 16, 2012, continue to be prosecuted. Therefore, this collection continues to include items related to the prosecution of inter partes reexamination proceedings. The rules outlining inter partes reexaminations are found at 37 CFR 1.903–1.931.

Thus, the items included in this collection cover (i) requests for ex parte reexamination, (ii) requests for supplemental examination, and (iii) information that may be submitted by patent owners and third party requesters in relation to the prosecution of an ex parte or inter partes reexamination proceeding. It should be noted that the Requests for Ex Parte Reexamination and Supplemental Examination are distinct collections from the Request for Ex Parte Reexamination and Supplemental Examination Transmittal Forms, respectively. Whereas the transmittal forms are used by a requester (patent owner or third party) as a checklist to ensure compliance with the requirements of the statutes and rules for ex parte reexaminations and supplemental examinations, the requests themselves represent the substantive analysis undertaken by requesters of ex parte reexamination and supplemental examination.

The public uses this information collection to request ex parte reexamination and supplemental examination, to prosecute reexamination proceedings, and to ensure that the associated documentation is submitted to the USPTO.

II. Method of Collection

By mail, facsimile, hand delivery, or electronically to the USPTO.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0651–0064.

Form Number(s): PTO/SB/57 and PTO/SB/59.

Type of Review: Renewal of an existing collection.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; businesses or other for-profits; and not-for-profit institutions.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 4,170 responses per year.

Estimated Time per Response: The USPTO estimates that it will take the public from 0.30 hours (18 minutes) to 0.55 hours to gather the necessary information, prepare the appropriate
form or other documents, and submit the information to the USPTO. The time per response, estimated annual responses, and estimated annual hour burden associated with each instrument in this information collection is shown in the table below.

### Estimated Total Annual Hour Burden

95,290 hours.

### Estimated Total Annual Cost Burden (Hourly): $37,067,810 per year. The USPTO expects that the information in this collection will be prepared by attorneys. Using the professional rate of $389 per hour for attorneys in private firms, the USPTO estimates that the respondent cost burden for this collection will be approximately $37,067,810 per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IC No.</th>
<th>Information collection instrument</th>
<th>Estimated time for response</th>
<th>Estimated annual responses</th>
<th>Estimated annual burden hours</th>
<th>Rate ($/hr)</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ......</td>
<td>Request for Supplemental Examination Transmittal Form (PTO/SB/59).</td>
<td>18 minutes ..........</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$389.00</td>
<td>$5,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ......</td>
<td>Request for Supplemental Examination.</td>
<td>25 hours ..........</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>486,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ......</td>
<td>Request for Ex Parte Reexamination Transmittal Form (PTO/SB/57).</td>
<td>18 minutes ..........</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>52,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ......</td>
<td>Request for Ex Parte Reexamination.</td>
<td>55 hours ..........</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>24,750</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>9,627,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ......</td>
<td>Petition in a Reexamination Proceeding (except for those specifically enumerated in 37 CFR 1.55(i) and 1.937(d)).</td>
<td>23 hours ..........</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>28,750</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>11,183,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ......</td>
<td>Patent Owner’s 37 CFR 1.530 Statement.</td>
<td>8 hours ..........</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>497,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ......</td>
<td>Third Party Requester’s 37 CFR 1.535 Reply.</td>
<td>8 hours ..........</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>155,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ......</td>
<td>Amendment in Ex Parte or Inter Partes Reexamination.</td>
<td>33 hours ..........</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>8,985,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ......</td>
<td>Third Party Requester’s 37 CFR 1.947 Comments in Inter Partes Reexamination.</td>
<td>41 hours ..........</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>159,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ......</td>
<td>Response to Final Rejection in Ex Parte Reexamination.</td>
<td>17 hours ..........</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>2,645,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 ......</td>
<td>Patent Owner’s 37 CFR 1.951 Response in Inter Partes Reexamination.</td>
<td>41 hours ..........</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>1,594,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 ......</td>
<td>Third Party Requester’s 37 CFR 1.951 Comments in Inter Partes Reexamination.</td>
<td>41 hours ..........</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>1,594,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 ......</td>
<td>Petition to Request Extension of Time in Ex Parte or Inter Partes Reexamination.</td>
<td>30 minutes ..........</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>77,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ......</td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
<td>..........................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of unique mailings to 180.

Postage

The USPTO expects that approximately 95 percent of the responses in this collection will be submitted electronically. Of the remaining 5 percent, the vast majority—98 percent—will be submitted by mail, for a total of 204 mailed submissions. The documentation for requests for supplemental examination and requests for *ex parte* reexamination will typically be mailed to the USPTO with the appropriate transmittal form, reducing

### 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, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions 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 respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information.
technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they will also become a matter of public record.


Marcie Lovett,
Records Management Division Director, USPTO, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015–06461 Filed 3–19–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–16–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
[C–489–823]
Welded Line Pipe From the Republic of Turkey: Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Alignment of Final Determination With Final Antidumping Determination

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) preliminarily determines that countervailable subsidies are being provided to producers and exporters of welded line pipe from the Republic of Turkey (Turkey). The period of investigation is January 1, 2013, through December 31, 2013. Interested parties are invited to comment on this preliminary determination.

DATES: Effective March 20, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Eastwood or Dennis McClure, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20220; telephone: (202) 482–3874 or (202) 482–5973, respectively.

Alignment of Final Countervailing Duty (CVD) Determination With Final Antidumping Duty (AD) Determination

On the same day the Department initiated this CVD investigation, the Department also initiated a CVD investigation of welded line pipe from the Republic of Korea (Korea) and AD investigations of welded line pipe from Korea and Turkey.1 The CVD and AD investigations cover the same merchandise. On February 27, 2015, in accordance with section 705(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (Act), the petitioners2 requested alignment of the final CVD determination with the final AD determination of welded line pipe from Turkey. Therefore, in accordance with section 705(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.210(b)(4), we are aligning the final CVD determination with the final AD determination. Consequently, the final CVD determination will be issued on the same date as the final AD determination, which is currently scheduled to be issued no later than July 28, 2015, unless postponed.

Scope of the Investigation

The scope of the investigation covers welded line pipe, which is carbon and alloy steel pipe of a kind used for oil or gas pipelines, not more than 24 inches in nominal outside diameter. For a complete description of the scope of the investigation, see Appendix I.

Scope Comments

Certain interested parties commented on the scope of the investigation as it appeared in the Initiation Notice. For discussion of those comments, see the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.3

Methodology

The Department is conducting this CVD investigation in accordance with section 701 of the Act. For each of the subsidy programs found countervailable, we preliminarily determine that there is a subsidy (i.e., a financial contribution by an “authority” that gives rise to a benefit to the recipient) and that the subsidy is specific.4 For a full description of the methodology underlying our preliminary conclusions, see the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

The Preliminary Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS).5 ACCESS is available to registered users at http://access.trade.gov, and is available to all parties in the Central Records Unit, room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly at http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/. The signed Preliminary Decision Memorandum and the electronic versions of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Preliminary Determination and Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 703(d)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, we calculated a CVD rate for each individually-investigated producer/exporter of the subject merchandise. For companies not individually investigated, we have calculated an “all others” rate as described below. We preliminarily determine the countervailable subsidy rates to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Subsidy rate (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borusan Istikbal Ticaret, Borusan Mannesmann Boru Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S., Borusan Mannesmann Boru Yatirim Holding A.S., and Borusan Holding A.S.</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2 The petitioners in this investigation are American Cast Iron Pipe Company, Energeta (a division of IMI Metal vessel Group), Maverick Tube Corporation, Northwest Pipe Company, Stupp Corporation (a division of Stupp Bros., Inc.), Tex-Tube Company, TMK IPSCO, and Welspun Tubular LLC USA.

3 See Memorandum from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, regarding “Decision Memorandum for the Affirmative Preliminary Determination in the Countervailing Duty Investigation of Welded Line Pipe from the Republic of Turkey,” dated concurrently with this notice (Preliminary Decision Memorandum).

4 See sections 771(5)(B) and (D) of the Act regarding financial contribution; section 771(5)(E) of the Act regarding benefit; and section 771(5A) of the Act regarding specificity.

5 On November 24, 2014, Enforcement and Compliance changed the name of Enforcement and Compliance’s AD and CVD Centralized Electronic Service System (IA ACCESS) to AD and CVD Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). The Web site location was changed from http://iaaccess.trade.gov to http://access.trade.gov. The Final Rule changing the references to the Regulations can be found at 79 FR 69046 (November 20, 2014).