In the PF, the Department discussed in detail Lucy [—?—] Hunter as well as the L. Pope and Lucy Pope the petitioner claimed as the wife of Burton Hunter. None of the evidence for the PF demonstrated any descent from a historical Choctaw Indian tribe or other historical Indian tribe for Lucy Hunter or the other Pope women the petitioner claimed. The evidence behind the Dawes Commission Roll index reference pertains to a Lucy Pope who is not the petitioner’s claimed ancestor although her married name is the same as that of two individuals previously analyzed in the PF. Therefore, the Dawes Commission Roll evidence does not demonstrate Indian ancestry for Burton Hunter’s documented wife Lucy or either of the Pope women whom the petitioner claimed as the wife of its ancestor Burton Hunter.

None of the material submitted for the FD changes the conclusions of the PF that the petitioner does not meet the requirements of criterion 83.7(e), which requires that the petitioner’s membership consist of individuals who descend from a historical Indian tribe or from historical Indian tribes that combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity.

To summarize, the petitioner claims to have descended as a group from a historical tribe of Choctaw Indians. There is no primary or reliable secondary evidence submitted by the petitioner or located by the Department showing that any of the named ancestors or members of the group descended from a historical Choctaw Indian tribe or any other Indian tribe. None of the documentation on the petitioner’s members and their claimed individual ancestors, submitted by the petitioner or found by the Department’s researchers, supports the petitioner’s claim of descent from a historical Choctaw Indian tribe in any other Indian tribe. No document in the record identified the petitioner’s members and claimed ancestors as part of the historical Choctaw or other Indian tribe. In fact, the evidence shows the petitioner’s members and claimed ancestors were consistently identified as non-Indians living in non-Indian communities. The extensive evidence in the record does not demonstrate descent from any historical Indian tribe.

The Department declines to acknowledge the CNP petitioner as an Indian tribe because the evidence in the record does not demonstrate, by the standard set forth at 25 CFR 83.6(d), that the membership descends from a historical Indian tribe as required by mandatory criterion 83.7(e).

After the publication of notice of the FD, the petitioner or any interested party may file a request for reconsideration with the Interior Board of Indian Appeals (IBIA) under the procedures set forth in section 83.11 of the regulations. The IBIA must receive this request no later than 90 days after the publication of the FD in the Federal Register. The FD will become final and effective as provided in the regulations 90 days from the Federal Register publication, unless a request for reconsideration is received within that time.

Dated: April 21, 2011.

Larry Echo Hawk,
Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.
[FR Doc. 2011–10117 Filed 4–26–11; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–G1–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
National Park Service

Backcountry Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.


SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)), the National Park Service (NPS) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the Backcountry Management Plan for Grand Canyon National Park. This plan will help guide park decisions on protecting natural and cultural resources while providing for a variety of visitor opportunities to experience the park’s backcountry. Over 94% of the park has been proposed as wilderness, and an updated plan is needed to comply with NPS wilderness policy and other policies. A range of reasonable alternatives for managing the park’s backcountry will be developed, with public input, through this planning process and will include, at a minimum, a no-action and an agency preferred alternative.

Major issues the plan will address include visitor access and use of the park’s backcountry, levels of commercial services, levels of administrative and scientific research activities, management of natural and cultural resources, and the protection of wilderness character. The National Park Service will identify additional issues to be addressed through public scoping.

A scoping newsletter is being prepared that details the issues identified to date. Copies of that information will be made available on NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) at http://parkplanning.nps.gov/grca.

DATES: The Park Service will accept comments from the public through June 27, 2011. Public meetings will occur in Flagstaff and Grand Canyon, Arizona and other locations to be determined. Specific dates, times, and locations will be announced in the local media and on the Internet at http://parkplanning.nps.gov/grca.

ADDRESSES: Information will be available for public review and comment online at http://parkplanning.nps.gov/grca, in the Office of the Superintendent, Jane Lyder, 1 Village Loop, Grand Canyon, Arizona 86023, 928–638–7945, or in the Office of Planning and Compliance, 1 Village Loop, Grand Canyon, Arizona 86023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jane Lyder, Acting Superintendent, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, Arizona, 86023, 928–638–7945, Jane_Lyder@nps.gov or Rachel Bennett, Environmental Protection Specialist, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, Arizona 86023, 928–638–7326, Rachel_Bennett@nps.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: If you wish to comment on the scoping newsletter or on any other issues associated with the plan, you may submit your comments by any one of several methods. You may comment via the Internet at http://parkplanning.nps.gov/grca. If you do not have access to a computer, you may mail comments to Jane Lyder, Acting Superintendent, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, AZ 86023. Finally, you may hand-deliver comments to Grand Canyon National Park Headquarters, 1 Village Loop, Grand Canyon, AZ.

Before including your address, phone number, e-mail 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.
INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–770]

In the Matter of Certain Video Game Systems and Wireless Controllers and Components Thereof; Notice of Institution of Investigation


ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on March 21, 2011, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Creative Kingdoms, LLC of Wakefield, Rhode Island and New Kingdoms, LLC of Nehalem, Oregon. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain video game systems and wireless controllers and components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,500,917 (“the ‘917 patent”); U.S. Patent No. 6,761,637 (“the ‘637 patent”); U.S. Patent No. 7,850,527 (“the ‘527 patent”); and U.S. Patent No. 7,896,742 (“the ‘742 patent”). The complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

The complainants request that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue an exclusion order and a cease and desist order.

ADDRESS: The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, is 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., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–8100.

General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at 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.


Scope of Investigation: Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on April 19, 2011, ordered that—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain video game systems and wireless controllers and components thereof that infringe one or more of claims 1–7 of the ‘917 patent; claims 1, 2, 7, 11, 14, 17, and 72 of the ‘637 patent; claims 1–12, 17–19, 22–24, 27, 37–41, 45–50 of the ‘527 patent; and claim 24 of the ‘742 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainants are: Creative Kingdoms, LLC, 195 Walden Way, Wakefield, RI 02879. New Kingdoms, LLC, 17005 Miami Forest Road, Nehalem, OR 97131.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served: Nintendo Co., Ltd., 11–1 Kamitoba hokotate-cho, Minami-ku, Kyoto 601–8501, Japan.

Nintendo of America, Inc., 4820 150th Avenue, NE., Redmond, WA 98052.

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Paul J. Luckern, Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d)–(e) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

Issued: April 20, 2011.

By order of the Commission.

James R. Holbein,
 Acting Secretary to the Commission.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act

Notice is hereby given that on April 12, 2011, a proposed Consent Decree was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin in United States v. Waste Management of Wisconsin, Inc., et al., Civil Action No. 2:11–cv–00346–WEC.

In this action, the United States asserted claims against thirty-eight parties for recovery of response costs incurred by the United States in connection with the Muskego Sanitary Landfill Superfund Site (the “Site”) in Muskego, Wisconsin, pursuant to Sections 106 and 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (“CERCLA”), 42 U.S.C. 9606 and