

to lease. Operations could be allowed to directionally drill a well under the tract, but will not result in surface disturbance on the tract. However, surface disturbance could occur on lands adjacent to this proposed lease.

Bruce Dawson,

Field Manager, Jackson Field Office.

[FR Doc. 03-30878 Filed 12-12-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GJ-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Work Group (AMWG), Notice of Meeting

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of conference call.

SUMMARY: The Adaptive Management Program (AMP) was implemented as a result of the Record of Decision on the Operation of Glen Canyon Dam Final Environmental Impact Statement to comply with consultation requirements of the Grand Canyon Protection Act (P.L. 102-575) of 1992. The AMP provides an organization and process to ensure the use of scientific information in decision making concerning Glen Canyon Dam operations and protection of the affected resources consistent with the Grand Canyon Protection Act. The AMP has been organized and includes a federal advisory committee (AMWG), a technical work group (TWG), a monitoring and research center, and independent review panels. The TWG is a subcommittee of the AMWG and provides technical advice and information for the AMWG to act upon. **DATES:** The AMWG will conduct the following conference call:

Wednesday, December 17, 2003. The conference call will begin at 1 p.m. and conclude at 3 p.m. MOUNTAIN TIME.

Agenda: The purpose of the conference call will be to discuss how to improve interactions between the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program and the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center's science advisors.

To register for the conference call, please contact Linda Whetton at (801) 524-3880 at least two (2) days prior to the call. You will be given the phone number and password at that time.

To allow full consideration of information by the AMWG members, written notice must be provided to Dennis Kubly, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Colorado Regional Office, 125 South State Street, Room 6107, Salt

Lake City, Utah, 84138; telephone (801) 524-3715; faxogram (801) 524-3858; e-mail at dkubly@uc.usbr.gov (5) days prior to the meeting. Any written comments received will be provided to the AMWG and TWG members prior to the meeting.

Due to difficulties caused by holidays and leave schedules in setting up this conference call, this notice may be published in a shorter time than normally required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act. However, an e-mail message will be sent by Reclamation to those persons who have expressed interest in the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program to allow them full participation on the conference call.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dennis Kubly, telephone (801) 524-3715; faxogram (801) 524-3858; or via e-mail at dkubly@uc.usbr.gov.

Dated: November 26, 2003.

Dennis Kubly,

Chief, Adaptive Management Group, Environmental Resources Division, Upper Colorado Regional Office, Salt Lake City, Utah.

[FR Doc. 03-30848 Filed 12-12-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Sanction for Breach of Commission Administrative Protective Order

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Sanction for breach of Commission administrative protective order.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the sanction imposed by the Commission for a breach of the administrative protective order ("APO") issued in *Hot Rolled Steel Products from Argentina, China, Indonesia, Kazakstan, the Netherlands, Romania, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand, and Ukraine (Hot Rolled Steel Products)*, Inv. Nos. 701-TA-404-408 and 731-TA-898-908 (Final). The Commission determined that attorney Bruce Aitken breached the APO in the *Hot Rolled Steel Products* investigations by failing to provide adequate supervision over another attorney who had little experience in the bracketing of business proprietary information ("BPI") and who prepared a public version of a brief containing BPI and served the brief on other parties to the investigations, some of whom were not signatories to the APO. This public reprimand is being issued because the aforementioned breach is the fourth

breach for Mr. Aitken occurring within a three-year, one-month period. On November 14, 2001, the Commission had previously publicly reprimanded Mr. Aitken for the second and third of the four breaches. 66 FR 57110 (November 14, 2001).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carol McCue Verratti, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-3088. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal at 202-205-1810. General information concerning the Commission can also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In connection with the *Hot Rolled Steel Products* investigations, Bruce Aitken filed an application for access to APO information with the Commission. In that application, he swore (i) not to disclose without written permission any of the information obtained under the APO except to certain enumerated categories of approved persons, (ii) to serve all materials containing BPI disclosed under the APO as directed by the Secretary, and (iii) to otherwise comply with the terms of the APO and the Commission's regulations regarding access to BPI. He also acknowledged in the APO that violation of the APO could subject him, and his firm, to disbarment from practice before the Commission, referral to the U.S. Attorney or appropriate professional association, or "[s]uch other administrative sanctions as the Commission determines to be appropriate * * *." 19 CFR 207.7(d). The Commission granted his application.

The firm with which Mr. Aitken is affiliated, Aitken Irvin Berlin & Vrooman, LLP, is very experienced in Commission practice as is Mr. Aitken, the senior name partner. Mr. Aitken appears frequently before the Commission and has sought access to APO information on a regular basis. He has been found to have previously breached an APO in recent prior investigations. None of these prior breaches was egregious enough to warrant a public reprimand when considered separately, but by the third breach the Commission determined that a public reprimand was warranted for the series of breaches. The Commission found that the series of breaches resulting in the previous public reprimand demonstrated a disturbing and unacceptable pattern of overall failure to safeguard information released

under APO. In spite of the public reprimand at that time, Mr. Aitken substantially participated in the *Hot Rolled Steel Products* investigations with a lawyer who was inexperienced in Commission title VII investigations, but who, despite his inexperience with Commission investigations, was named lead attorney and APO Compliance Officer for the firm. Although Mr. Aitken participated in the drafting of the confidential version of the brief, he did not participate in the preparation of the public version of the brief where historically his firm has committed most of its APO breaches. The Commission found that as the senior name partner in the firm with many years of experience in title VII investigations, Mr. Aitken failed in his obligations under the APO by not participating in the preparation of the public brief and/or supervising the other attorney more closely to prevent the next in a lengthy series of APO breaches that has been caused by various members of Mr. Aitken's firm.

Business proprietary information received from private parties plays an important role in Commission investigations. The Commission's ability to obtain such information depends on the confidence of the submitting parties that their proprietary information will be protected.

Bruce Aitken is reprimanded for breaching the APO in the *Hot Rolled Steel Products* investigations as stated above and for committing multiple APO breaches over a relatively short period of time.

The Commission determined to suspend Mr. Aitken's access to APO information for a period of six months from the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. In addition, the Commission directs the law firm of Aitken Irvin Berlin & Vrooman, LLP to have at least two attorneys review all documents to be filed with the Commission for APO compliance, to so certify to the Commission on an annual basis, and to continue that practice for five years commencing with the date of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

The authority for this action is conferred by section 207.7(d) of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (19 CFR 207.7(d)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 9, 2003.

Marilyn R. Abbott,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-30833 Filed 12-12-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-481]

In the Matter of Certain Display Controllers With Upscaling Functionality and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision to Review in Part A Final Initial Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337; Schedule for Filing Written Submissions on the Issues Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in part the final initial determination ("ID") issued by the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) on October 20, 2003, finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Liberman, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3115. Copies of the ALJ's ID and all other nonconfidential 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. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810. 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>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on October 18, 2002, based on a complaint filed by Genesis Microchip (Delaware) Inc. ("Genesis") of Alviso, California, against Media Reality Technologies, Inc. of Sunnyvale, California; Trumpion Microelectronics, Inc. of Taipei, Taiwan; and SmartASIC, Inc. ("SmartASIC") of San Jose, California. 67 FR 64411 (October 18, 2002). The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation and sale of certain

display controllers with upscaling functionality and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,738,867 ("867 patent").

On January 14, 2003, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 6) terminating respondent SmartASIC from the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement. On February 12, 2003, the Commission issued a notice of its decision not to review that ID (Order No. 6).

The evidentiary hearing in this investigation was held from July 14, 2003, through July 25, 2003. On October 20, 2003, the ALJ issued his final ID in which he found that there was no violation of section 337. All the parties to the investigation, including the Commission investigative attorneys filed timely petitions for review of various portions of the final ID, and all of them filed timely responses to the petitions.

Having examined the record in this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review:

- (1) The ALJ's construction of the claim term "pixel data";
- (2) The ALJ's construction of the "wherein" clause;
- (3) The ALJ's construction of the claim limitation "receiving means";
- (4) All of the ALJ's non-infringement findings;
- (5) The ALJ's finding that complainant Genesis does not practice any claims of the '867 patent;
- (6) The ALJ's finding that the Spartan reference does not anticipate (*i.e.*, invalidate) the asserted claims of the '867 patent; and
- (7) The ALJ's finding that the ACUTY Application Note does not anticipate the asserted claims of the '867 patent.

The Commission has determined not to review the remainder of the final ID.

On review, the Commission requests briefing, based on the evidentiary record, on the issues under review, and is particularly interested in receiving answers to the following questions:

1. What intrinsic and, to the extent it is applicable, extrinsic evidence supports your position on the issue of whether "the time to provide said plurality of destination pixel data" in the "wherein" clause includes the time to provide inactive pixels in a destination image frame?
2. What intrinsic and, to the extent it is applicable, extrinsic evidence supports your position on the issue of whether "a period to receive said source pixel data" in the "wherein" clause