results will now be due no later than June 18, 2010.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: May 11, 2010.

John M. Andersen,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2010–11868 Filed 5–17ndash;10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–843), (A–570–901]

Certain Lined Paper Products from India and People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limits for the Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cindy Robinson or Stephanie Moore, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3797 or (202) 482–3692, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 26, 2009, the U.S. Department of Commerce ("Department") published a notice of initiation of both the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain lined paper products (CLPP) from India, and the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on CLPP from the People's Republic of China (PRC), covering the period September 1, 2008, to August 31, 2009. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 74 FR 54956 (October 26, 2009). The preliminary results of these reviews are currently due no later than June 9, 2010.[1]

Extension of Time Limit of Preliminary Results

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), requires that the Department make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order for which a review is requested. Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act further states that if it is not practicable to complete the review within the time period specified, the administering authority may extend the 245-day period to issue its preliminary results to up to 365 days.

We determine that completion of the preliminary results of these two reviews within the 245-day period is not practicable for the following reasons. Specifically, the CLPP from India review covers two mandatory respondents, one of which has not been individually examined previously. Given the complexity of the issues associated with this case, the Department needs additional time to address these issues with the new respondent. The CLPP from the PRC review covers four respondents. The Department needs additional time to analyze issues regarding affiliation for one respondent, and another respondent's claim of no shipments during the period of review. Further, the Department needs additional time to gather and analyze a significant amount of information associated with affiliation, companies' sales practices, the manufacturing costs regarding one respondent, and the customs entry data regarding another respondent. Finally, domestic interested parties have raised other issues in the CLPP from the PRC review which require the collection of additional information. Given the number and complexity of issues in these cases, and in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, we are fully extending the time period for issuing the preliminary results of these reviews by 120 days. Therefore, the preliminary results are now due no later than October 7, 2010. The final results continue to be due 120 days after publication of the preliminary results.

This notice is published pursuant to sections 751(a)(3)(A) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 12, 2010.

John M. Andersen,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2010–11872 Filed 5–17–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–475–059]

Pressure Sensitive Plastic Tape From Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* May 18, 2010.

SUMMARY: On February 22, 2010, the Department of Commerce (the Department) preliminarily determined that Evotape S.p.A was the successor-in-interest to Tyco Adhesives Italia S.p.A. (Tyco), and that Evotape Packaging S.r.l. (Evotape Packaging) and Evotape Masking S.r.l. (Evotape Masking) are both successors-in-interest to Evotape S.p.A for purposes of determining antidumping liability. *See Pressure Sensitive Plastic Tape from Italy: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review,* 75 FR 8925 (February 26, 2010) (*Preliminary Results*). We confirm our preliminary determination in these final results of changed circumstances review.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terre Keaton Stefanova or Rebecca Trainor, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; *telephone:* (202) 482–1280 and (202) 482–4007, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 27, 2009, Evotape Packaging requested that the Department conduct an expedited changed circumstances review to determine that it is the successor-in-interest to Tyco for purposes of determining antidumping liability.[1] On September 10, 2009, the Department initiated a changed circumstances review but did not expedite the review, as requested by Evotape Packaging, because questions remained as to the factual claims

[1] As explained in the memorandum from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, the Department has exercised its discretion to toll deadlines for the duration of the closure of the Federal Government from February 5, through February 12, 2010. Thus, all deadlines in this segment of the proceeding have been extended by seven days. The revised deadline for the preliminary results of these antidumping duty administrative reviews is now June 9, 2010. See Memorandum to the Record from Ronald Lorentzen, DAS for Import Administration, regarding ≥Tolling of Administrative Deadlines As a Result of the Government Closure During the Recent Snowstorm, "dated February 12, 2010."

[1] The cash deposit rate currently applicable to Tyco is zero percent. The all-others rate is 10 percent.

forming the basis of the change circumstances review request. *See Pressure Sensitive Plastic Tape from Italy: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review,* 74 FR 47555 (September 16, 2009) (Initiation Notice). On February 22, 2010, the Department preliminarily determined that Evotape S.p.A was the successor-in-interest to Tyco, and that Evotape Packaging and Evotape Masking were both successors-in-interest to Evotape S.p.A. As the ultimate successors-in-interest producing in-scope merchandise, we preliminarily found that Evotape Packaging and Evotape Masking should be assigned the antidumping duty cash deposit rate that is currently in effect for Tyco. *See Preliminary Results.*

On March 12, 2010, we received comments from 3M Company (3M), a U.S. producer of the domestic like product and an interested party in this review. On March 18, 2010, we received rebuttal comments from Evotape Packaging and its affiliates Evotape Masking and Evotape S.p.A (collectively Evotape). For further discussion, *see* "Analysis of Comments Received" section below.

Scope of the Finding

The product covered by the finding is pressure sensitive plastic tape (PSP Tape) measuring over one and three-eighths inches in width and not exceeding four mils in thickness, currently classifiable under subheadings 3919.10.20 and 3919.90.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and for customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

3M argues that because Evotape Masking has stated on the record that it does not ship or sell the subject merchandise to the United States, and has no future plans to do so, this changed circumstances review has been a purely theoretical exercise, and the Department has wasted its resources by granting a meaningless changed circumstances review request. On the other hand, 3M argues, if Evotape is indeed interested in the U.S. market, and has misled the Department regarding its intentions, the credibility of the information on the record is called into question. Under either scenario, according to 3M, there appears to be no reason to grant Evotape's changed circumstances request at this time. (*See* Pressure Sensitive Tape from Italy: Comments of 3M Company on the Preliminary Results of the Changed Circumstances Review (March 12, 2010)).

Evotape asserts that 3M has not challenged any of the Department's preliminary findings, but opposes Evotape's changed circumstances request at this late date based solely on the representation of Evotape Masking that it has no intention to ship subject merchandise to the United States. Evotape asserts further that Evotape Packaging originally requested the changed circumstances review because it is the entity that intends to ship PSP Tape to the United States. Evotape contends, however, that it was appropriate, as a matter of law, for the Department to have ruled as it did with regard to both Evotape Packaging and Evotape Masking, even though Evotape Masking has no intention to export subject merchandise to the United States, because both companies are successors-in-interest to Evotape S.p.A. Evotape adds that, unlike in an annual administrative review which requires U.S. entry of a respondent's merchandise during the review period for that respondent to have standing to request the review, there is no requirement in the statute or in the Department's regulations mandating that an applicant for a changed circumstances review possess a present or future intention to ship subject merchandise to the United States. Evotape argues that the only requirement is that the applicant be an interested party, which is defined to include a "foreign manufacturer, producer, or exporter * * * of the subject merchandise." *See* sections 771(9)(A) and 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.216. Evotape concludes that because both Evotape Packaging and Evotape Masking are producers of in-scope merchandise, a fact which is undisputed, either or both of these companies were entitled to file a changed circumstances review request. Accordingly, it argues, 3M's opposition is without merit. As there has been no challenge to the substance of the Department's preliminary determination, Evotape requests that the Department issue its final determination, consistent with its preliminary determination. (*See* Evotape's Reply to 3M's Post-Preliminary Determination Comments: Changed Circumstances Review in Pressure Sensitive Tape from Italy Case No. A–475–059 (March 18, 2010)).

The Department's Position

As stated in the *Initiation Notice,* the Department initiated this changed circumstances review because Evotape presented sufficient information to warrant doing so under section 751(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216 (*see Initiation Notice,* 74 FR 47555). We agree with Evotape that neither the statute nor the Department's regulations make the initiation and conduct of a changed circumstances review contingent upon an interested party's intent to export the subject merchandise to the United States. Notwithstanding this fact, however, we note that at this time both Evotape Packaging and Evotape Masking are interested parties under section 771(9)(A) of the Act, as both produce PSP Tape, and Evotape Packaging exports it to the United States. Therefore, we have properly conducted this changed circumstances review in accordance with the statute and our regulations, and have concluded it based on the successor-in-interest analysis set out in the *Preliminary Results.*

Final Results of Changed-Circumstances Review

For the reasons stated in the *Preliminary Results,* we continue to find that Evotape S.p.A is the successor-in-interest to Tyco, and that Evotape Packaging and Evotape Masking are both successors-in-interest to Evotape S.p.A. Thus, Evotape Packaging and Evotape Masking should receive the same antidumping duty rate with respect to PSP Tape as Tyco. The cash deposit determination from this changed circumstances review will apply to all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this changed circumstances review. This deposit rate shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review in which Evotape participates.

Notification

This notice serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.306. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing these final results and notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) and (2) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.221(c)(3).

Dated: May 12, 2010.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010–11866 Filed 5–17–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

National Institute of Standards and Technology Performance Review Board Membership

The National Institute of Standards and Technology Performance Review Board (NIST PRB) reviews performance appraisals, agreements, and recommended actions pertaining to employees in the Senior Executive Service and ST–3104 employees. The Board makes recommendations to the appropriate appointing authority concerning such matters so as to ensure the fair and equitable treatment of these individuals.

This notice lists the membership of the NIST PRB and supersedes the list published in **Federal Register** Vol. 73, No. 164, pages 49646–49647, on August 22, 2008:

Michael Culpepper (C), Chief Human Capital Officer, National Institute of Standards & Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899. *Appointment Expires:* 12/31/12.

Robert Dimeo (C), Deputy Director, NIST Center for Neutron Research, National Institute of Standards & Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899. *Appointment Expires:* 12/31/12.

Stella Fiotes (C), (Alternate) Chief Facilities Management Officer, National Institute of Standards & Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899. *Appointment Expires:* 12/31/12.

Ellen Herbst (C), Senior Advisor for Policy and Program Integration, Office of the Deputy Secretary, Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230. *Appointment Expires:* 12/31/2012.

Sivaraj Shyam-Sunder (C), (Alternate) Director, Building and Fire Research Laboratory, National Institute of Standards & Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899. *Appointment Expires:* 12/31/10.

Dated: May 11, 2010.

Katharine Gebbie,

Director, Physics Laboratory.

[FR Doc. 2010–11843 Filed 5–17–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

RIN 0648–XV36

Stanford University Habitat Conservation Plan

AGENCIES: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce; Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior (DOI).

ACTION: Notice; correction.

SUMMARY: NMFS and FWS published a notice in the Federal Register on April 12, 2010, announcing the availability of the Stanford University Habitat Conservation Plan (Plan), the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Authorization of Incidental Take and Implementation of the Plan, and the Implementing Agreement (IA) for public review and comment. The document contained incorrect dates and contact information.

DATES: This correction is effective May 18, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gary Stern, 707–575–6060; or Sheila Larsen, 916–414–6600.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Need for Correction

In the **Federal Register** of April 12, 2010, in FR Doc. 2010-8300, on page 18483, in the first column, correct the "**DATES**" paragraph to read:

DATES: Written comments on the DEIS, Plan, and IA, must be received by 5 p.m. Pacific Time on July 15, 2010.

In the same **Federal Register** notice, on page 18483, in the first column, correct the "**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**" paragraph to read:

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: (1) Ms. Sheila Larsen, Senior Staff Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at 2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605, Sacramento, California 95825; telephone 916–414–6600; or (2) Gary Stern, San Francisco Bay Region Supervisor, National Marine Fisheries Service, 777 Sonoma Avenue, Room 325, Santa Rosa, CA 95404 ; telephone 707–575–6060.

Dated: May 11, 2010.

Angela Somma,

Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.

Dated: May 11, 2010.

Alexandra Pitts,

Acting Deputy Region Director, Pacific Southwest Region, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 2010–11852 Filed 5–17–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODES 3510–22–S, 4310–55–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–XV09

Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Open Water Marine Survey Program in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, Alaska

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

ACTION: Notice; proposed incidental harassment authorization; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS received an application from Shell Offshore Inc. (Shell) for an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) to take marine mammals, by harassment, incidental to a proposed open water marine survey program in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, Alaska, between July and October 2010. Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), NMFS is requesting comments on its proposal to issue an IHA to Shell to take, by Level B harassment only, eight species of marine mammals during the specified activity.

DATES: Comments and information must be received no later than June 17, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the application should be addressed to Michael Payne, Chief, Permits, Conservation and Education Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910. The mailbox address for providing e-mail comments is *PR1.0648-XV09@noaa.gov*. NMFS is not responsible for e-mail comments sent to addresses other than the one provided here. Comments sent via e-mail, including all attachments, must not exceed a 10-megabyte file size.

Instructions: All comments received are a part of the public record and will