most existing projects). We also want to use beaches on the Atlantic coast for our shots. The coastlines in Europe where turbines exist are very different from the coastline in the United States.

Comment: The geology of the Atlantic OCS indicates it is a natural gas province. For example in the 1970s, there was a natural gas discovery off the coast of Atlantic City, New Jersey. Natural gas production accidents do not yield oil and tar balls. A better hypothetical would be beach closures from hurricanes and nor'easters. The respondents should be familiar with these kinds of events.

Response: These hypothetical beach closure questions have been dropped altogether.

Comment: There is a question asking for personal annual income from working. There are many who have considerable income without working. Is it the intent not to capture this information? They have the time and the resources to be frequent ocean beach users.

Response: The income question has been changed to read: ''Which category is closest to your personal annual income before taxes?''

Comment: The stratum sample sizes for the survey gives the appearance of being arbitrary. Consider that New Jersey & Delaware has a stratum of population of 8.8 million with a sample size of 200 participants. That works out to 22.73 participants per million. Compare to Pennsylvania 10.4 million population with 150 participants which is 14.42 participants per million. So citizens of Delaware are about 50% more likely to be selected as compared to Pennsylvania citizens. For full disclosure the University of Delaware is conducting the survey and I am a resident of Pennsylvania who is also a property owner in New Jersey. Further someone in Memphis, TN, is part of the survey universe, however someone living in Vermont is excluded. I have family members who live in Vermont and frequently visit the Jersey Shore.

Response: Based on this comment and comments from others we have redesigned the sampling strategy to include two separate samples: A General Population Sample and an Oversample Sample. The former is a random draw from all individuals in the 20 states in our region (now including Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, and Georgia) and the latter is a random draw from all beachgoers in the same states. Since both of these samples are randomly drawn, the representation is proportional to state populations.

Comment: A good property of selected stratum is to have homogeneity within the stratum (*http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stratified_sampling*). The use of New York state as a stratum fails this principal. There is Long Island which is the beach community. New York City a major city with near by ocean beaches. Up state New York has ocean beaches which are more distant. Does not make sense to put Hampton's and Buffalo in the same stratum!

Response: See comment to previous question. We no longer stratify by state.

Comment: The total sample size for the participants of 1,400 is reasonable for obtaining summary insights. The data collection includes attributes, such as distance to the beach, education, number of children, employment status and income. If this survey has a goal of obtaining insights at this kind of granular level then the sample size will need to be adjusted to meet these goals.

Response: Our budget limits us to the sample size we are using.

Comment: The statistical survey design should follow Dillman's Tailored Design Method (*http://www.amazon.com/Internet-Phone-Mail-Mixed-Mode-Surveys/dp/1118456149/ref=dp_ob_title_bk*). This is the approach that is being used by BOEM in Alaska in the Arctic Communities Survey.

Response: Our survey follows Dillman's method fairly closely. It may depart in a few instances based on our own judgment calls, but it is largely based on Dillman.

Comment: The commenter made the following recommendations:

- Establish clear goals for the information collection, which then drives the design.
- Use Dillman's Tailored Design Method.
- Create stratums that are approximately homogeneous. Suggested stratums: Near Ocean Beaches (SC coast, Outer Banks, Tidewater VA, Delmarva, Jersey shore, Long Island, Rhode Island, Cape Cod), Metro Areas (Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York City, Boston metro areas), Inland (Other parts of SC, NC, VA, MD, Central PA, NJ, CT, MA), Distant Areas (OH, WV, TN, KY, Western PA, Upstate NY, VT, NH).
- Use zip codes for location of respondents.
- Publish the raw data so it can be independently analyzed.

Response: We addressed most of the recommendations in our responses. As noted, our survey was designed with a specific economic model in mind—a travel cost model; we use Dillman's approach fairly closely, but not always; we no longer stratify by geography; and we will use zip codes for location of the respondents. In addition, we plan to publish the raw data.

Public Availability of Comments: Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: October 1, 2015.

Deanna Meyer-Pietruszka,

Chief, Office of Policy, Regulations, and Analysis.

[FR Doc. 2015–25971 Filed 10–15–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–956]

Certain Recombinant Factor VIII Products; Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting an Unopposed Motion To Amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination (''ID'') (Order No. 10) granting an unopposed motion to add as complainants Baxalta, Inc. of Deerfield, Illinois; Baxalta US Inc. of Deerfield, Illinois; and Baxalta GmbH of Glattpark, Switzerland.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lucy Grace D. Noyola, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–3438. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (*http://www.usitc.gov*). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *http://edis.usitc.gov.* Hearing-impaired

persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on May 22, 2015, based on a complaint filed by Baxter International Inc. of Deerfield, Illinois; Baxter Healthcare Corporation of Deerfield, Illinois; and Baxter Healthcare SA of Glattpark, Switzerland (''Baxter''). 80 *FR* 29745 (May 22, 2015). The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain recombinant factor VIII products by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,100,061; 6,936,441; and 8,084,252. *Id.* The notice of investigation named Novo Nordisk A/S of Bagsvaerd, Denmark and Novo Nordisk Inc. of Plainsboro, New Jersey (''Novo Nordisk'') as respondents. *Id.* at 29746. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (''OUII'') also was named as a party to the investigation. *Id.*

On September 3, 2015, Baxter filed a motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to add Baxalta, Inc., Baxalta US Inc., and Baxalta GmbH (''the Baxalta entities'') as complainants. Neither Novo Nordisk nor OUII opposed the motion.

On September 16, 2015, the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') issued an ID, Order No. 10, granting the motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation. The ALJ found good cause for the amendment. The ALJ found the amendment would not prejudice the parties because (1) they have been aware of a corporate transition involving Baxter and the Baxalta entities since the service of the complaint and the notice of investigation and (2) Baxter has been responding to discovery requests as though they were directed to Baxter and the Baxalta entities and will continue to do so. The ALJ found that having the correct parties in the investigation would simplify and streamline the discovery process. No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 8, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–26295 Filed 10–15–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–958]

Certain Automated Teller Machines and Point of Sale Devices and Associated Software Thereof; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting Complainant's Motion To Amend the Complaint and the Notice of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination (''ID'') (Order No. 9) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ''), granting the complainant's unopposed motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to change the corporate name of the complainant.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Needham, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–5468. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (*http://www.usitc.gov*). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *http://edis.usitc.gov.* Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on June 9, 2015, based on a complaint filed by Global Cash Access, Inc. (''Complainant''). 80 *FR* 32605–06. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (''section 337''), in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain automated teller machines, point of sale devices, and associated software that infringes claims 1–3, 5–7, and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,081,792. *Id.* The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents NRT Technology Corp. of Toronto, Canada and NRT Technologies, Inc., of Las Vegas, Nevada. *Id.* at 32606. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (OUII) is a party to the investigation. *Id.*

On August 26, 2015, Complainant filed an unopposed motion to amend the complaint and the notice of investigation to change the name of Complainant to Everi Payments Inc. to reflect a corporate name change. Complainant asserts that good cause exists for the amendments.

On September 15, 2015, the ALJ issued the subject ID, granting Complainant's motion to amend the complaint and the notice of investigation. The ALJ found good cause for granting the motion because it is early in the investigation and the amendments will not affect discovery or any issue to be litigated. No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

The Commission has determined not to review the subject ID.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 9, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015–26307 Filed 10–15–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1110–0058]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed eCollection, eComments Requested; Revision of a Currently Approved Collection; National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)

AGENCY: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

ACTION: 30-Day notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division has submitted the following information collection request to the