

[www.blm.gov/id/st/en/res/resource\\_advisory.html](http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/res/resource_advisory.html).

All meetings are open to the public. The public may present written comments to the RAC in advance of or at the meeting. Each formal RAC meeting will also have time allocated for receiving public comments. Depending upon the number of persons wishing to comment and time available, the time for individual oral comments may be limited. Individuals who plan to attend and need special assistance, such as sign language interpretation or other reasonable accommodations, should contact the BLM as provided above.

Dated: December 14, 2011.

**Gary D. Cooper,**  
District Manager.

[FR Doc. 2011-32838 Filed 12-21-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-GG-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

[NPS-PWR-PWRO-1108-8862; 2031-A038-409]

#### Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ General Management Plan, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, CA

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Extended Public Comment Period for Draft Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan, Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

**SUMMARY:** The National Park Service has prepared a Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Plan/DEIS). The Plan/DEIS evaluates four alternatives for updating the current approach to management in Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) and Muir Woods National Monument. The original Notice of Availability (published in the **Federal Register** on September 12, 2011) announced a 60-day public comment period. In recognition of the complexity of the proposed plan alternatives, and with deference to interest from the public and interested organizations, the comment period has been reopened and extended through December 9, 2011.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** It will not be necessary for individuals, organizations, and agencies that have already commented to do so again. All other comments must now be postmarked or transmitted no later than December 9, 2011. Respondents wishing to comment electronically may do so online <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/goga>, or letters may be submitted via

regular mail to: Frank Dean, General Superintendent, GGNRA, Ft. Mason, Bldg. 201, San Francisco, CA 94123.

Up-to-date information may be obtained by contacting GGNRA at (415) 561-4930.

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: November 3, 2011.

**John H. Williams,**  
Acting Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

[FR Doc. 2011-32833 Filed 12-21-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-70-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-721]

### Certain Portable Electronic Devices And Related Software; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Determination To Review In Part A Final Initial Determination; Schedule for Filing Written Submissions

**AGENCY:** U.S. 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 17, 2011, finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in this investigation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Amanda S. Pitcher, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2737. 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 17, 2010, based on a complaint filed by HTC Corporation (“HTC”) of Taiwan. 75 FR 34,484–85 (June 17, 2010). The complaint alleged violations of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain portable electronic devices and related software by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent Nos. 6,999,800 (“the ‘800 patent”); 5,541,988 (“the ‘988 patent”); 6,320,957 (“the ‘957 patent”); 7,716,505 (“the ‘505 patent”); and 6,058,183 (“the ‘183 patent”) (subsequently terminated from the investigation). The complaint named Apple Inc. as the Respondent.

October 17, 2011, the ALJ issued his final ID, finding no violation of section 337 by the respondent. Specifically, the ALJ found that the Commission has subject matter jurisdiction and that Apple did not contest that the Commission has *in rem* and *in personam* jurisdiction. The ALJ also found that there was an importation into the United States, sale for importation, or sale within the United States after importation of the accused portable electronic devices and related software. Regarding infringement, the ALJ found that Apple does not infringe claims 1–3 and 8–10 of the 800 patent, claims 1 and 10 of the ‘988 patent, claims 8–9 of the ‘957 patent and claims 1–2 of the ‘505 patent. With respect to invalidity, the ALJ found that the asserted claims are not invalid. Finally, the ALJ concluded that an industry exists within the United States that practices the ‘988 and ‘957 patents, but not the ‘800 and ‘505 patents as required by 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(2).

On October 31, 2011 HTC filed a petition for review of the ID, which also included a contingent petition for review. Also on October 31, 2011, Apple filed a contingent petition for review. On November 8, 2011, the parties filed responses to the petition and contingent petitions for review.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ’s final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review the final ID in part. Specifically, the Commission has determined to review the ALJ’s findings

with respect to the '800 patent. The Commission also determined to review the ALJ's construction and finding that the accused portable electronic devices and related software do not meet the "manually operable selector" limitation of independent claim 1 of the '988 patent and independent claim 8 of the '957 patent. Having reviewed this limitation, the Commission declines to take a position on it. The Commission has determined not to review any other issues in the ID. The investigation is therefore terminated with respect to the '500, '988 and '957 patents.

The parties are requested to brief their positions on the issues under review with reference to the applicable law and the evidentiary record. In connection with its review, the Commission is particularly interested in a response to the following questions:

1. In the Accused iPhones, is the applications processor power management unit (AP PMU) a part of the personal digital assistant (PDA), the mobile phone system, or both?

2. In the Accused iPhones, when the VDD\_FAULT\_LOWER threshold is met, irrespective of whether the SOC1 threshold is met, does the PDA, the mobile phone system, or both, switch between modes? In the Accused iPhones, when the SOC1 threshold is met, irrespective of whether the VDD\_FAULT\_LOWER threshold is met, does the PDA, the mobile phone system, or both, switch between modes?

3. Do the claims, specification, or prosecution history require that only one of the systems (*i.e.*, either the mobile phone system or PDA) power off when each of the thresholds is met?

4. Are there separate thresholds in HTC's domestic industry products that result in the mobile phone system turning off separately from the PDA? If the mobile phone and PDA systems turn off simultaneously, is there record evidence proving that the thresholds are separately set to the same limits?

5. Is claim 1 of the '800 patent anticipated by the Qualcomm pdQ device? Please explain where each element is present in the pdQ device.

6. Do the Accused iPhones meet the "switching the mobile phone system from standby mode to sleep mode when the mobile phone system has been idle for a first period of time" limitation of claim 1 of the '800 patent? <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Questions 6 and 7 pertain to issues argued by the parties but not addressed in the ID. The Commission's rules of practice and procedure provide that the initial determination of the ALJ shall include "\* \* \* conclusions and the reasons or bases therefor necessary for the disposition of all material issues of fact, law, or discretion presented in the record \* \* \*." 19 CFR 210.42(d). The

7. Do the HTC domestic industry products meet the "switching the mobile phone system from standby mode to sleep mode when the mobile phone system has been idle for a first period of time" limitation of claim 1 of the '800 patent?

8. Do the Accused iPhones meet the "switching the PDA system from normal mode to sleep mode when the PDA system has been idle for a second period of time" limitation of claim 1 of the '800 patent?

9. Although the Commission has determined to review the '800 patent in its entirety, can the parties respond to Apple's argument that, because HTC did not petition for review of the limitations of claim 1 of the '800 patent on which the ALJ made no findings concerning infringement, "HTC has therefore waived any argument on review that these claim limitations are present in the accused iPhones?" Respondent Apple Inc.'s Response to HTC's Petition for Review of Initial Determination at 3. In your response, please reference any relevant Section 337 or Federal Circuit precedent.

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may (1) issue an order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States, and/or (2) issue one or more cease and desist orders that could result in the respondent(s) being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, *see In the Matter of Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843 (December 1994) (Commission Opinion).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or cease and desist orders would have on (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S.

Commission generally anticipates that the ALJs will adjudicate all issues presented in the record.

production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation. If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade Representative, as delegated by the President, has 60 days to approve or disapprove the Commission's action. See Presidential Memorandum of July 21, 2005, 70 FR 43251 (July 26, 2005). During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed if a remedy is ordered.

*Written Submissions:* The parties to the investigation are requested to file written submissions on the issues identified in this notice. Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the recommended determination by the ALJ on remedy and bonding. Complainant and OUII are also requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration.

Complainant is also requested to state the date that the '800 patent expires and the HTSUS numbers under which the accused products are imported. The written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than close of business on Friday, December 30, 2011. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on Friday, January 6, 2012. No further submissions on these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission. The page limit for the parties' initial submissions on the questions posed by the Commission is 50 pages. The parties reply submissions, if any, are limited to 25 pages.

Persons filing written submissions must file on or before the deadlines stated above and by noon the following business day submit 8 true copies thereof with the Office of the Secretary. Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment unless the information has already been granted such treatment during the proceedings. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary of the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons

why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 210.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is sought will be treated accordingly. All non-confidential written submissions will be available for public inspection on EDIS.

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 sections 210.42–46 and 210.50 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42–46 and 210.50).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 16, 2011.

**James R. Holbein,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2011–32732 Filed 12–21–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE–11–039]

### Government in the Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** United States International Trade Commission.

**TIME AND DATE:** January 5, 2012 at 11 a.m.

**PLACE:** Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205–2000.

**STATUS:** Open to the public.

#### MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agendas for future meetings: none.
2. Minutes.
3. Ratification List.
4. Vote in Inv. No. 731–TA–410 (Third Review) (Light-Walled Rectangular Pipe from Taiwan). The Commission is currently scheduled to transmit its determination and Commissioners' opinions to the Secretary of Commerce on or before January 17, 2012.

5. Outstanding action jackets: none.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: December 20, 2011.

**William R. Bishop,**

*Hearings and Meetings Coordinator.*

[FR Doc. 2011–32986 Filed 12–20–11; 4:15 pm]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

Notice is hereby given that on December 15, 2011, a proposed Consent Decree (the Consent Decree) in *United States of America v. The Coeur d'Alenes Company*, Civil Action No. 11–CV–00633–EJL, was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Idaho.

In this action the United States sought reimbursement under Section 107 of CERCLA for past costs incurred at the Conjecture Mine Superfund Site (the Site), located in Bonner County, Idaho. The United States also sought injunctive relief under Section 106 of CERCLA, as well as a declaratory judgment under Section 113 of CERCLA for future costs to be incurred at the Site. Under the proposed Consent Decree, which is based on ability to pay, The Coeur d'Alenes Company has agreed to pay \$350,000.

The Consent Decree includes a covenant not to sue the Coeur d'Alenes Company pursuant to Sections 106 and 107 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9606 & 9607, and Section 7003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 6973.

For thirty (30) days after the date of this publication, the Department of Justice will receive comments relating to the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either emailed to [pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov](mailto:pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov) or mailed to P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611. In either case, the comments should refer to *United States of America v. The Coeur d'Alenes Company*, DJ. Ref. 90–11–3–10110/1. Commenters may request an opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area in accordance with Section 7003(d) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6973(d).

During the comment period, the Consent Decree may be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site: [http://www.justice.gov/enrd/Consent\\_Decrees.html](http://www.justice.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html). A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611, or by faxing or emailing a request to Tonia Fleetwood ([tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov](mailto:tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov)), fax no. (202) 514–0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514–1547. In requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library, please enclose a check

in the amount of \$7.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury or, if by email or fax, please forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the stated address.

**Robert E. Maher, Jr.,**

*Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.*

[FR Doc. 2011–32831 Filed 12–21–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–15–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Clean Water Act

Notice is hereby given that on December 14, 2011, a proposed Consent Decree (“Decree”) in *United States, et al. v. Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago*, Civil Action No. 1:11–cv–08859, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

In this action the United States, on behalf of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“U.S. EPA”), and the State of Illinois sought penalties and injunctive relief under the Clean Water Act (“CWA”) against the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (“Defendant”) relating to discharges from its combined sewer outfalls (“CSOs”). The Complaint alleges that Defendant violated the following CSO-related provisions of its CWA permits: The prohibition on discharging pollutants into waters of the United States that cause or contribute to violations of applicable water quality standards for dissolved oxygen, solids, and floatables. The United States also alleges that Defendant violated the requirement of its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System or NPDES permits to provide the equivalent of primary treatment for at least ten times the average dry weather flow for the average design year. The proposed Consent Decree between Defendant, the United States, and the State of Illinois requires the following: (1) A schedule for completion of the Tunnel and Reservoir Program (“TARP”), the long term control plan to increase Defendant's capacity to handle wet weather events and address CSO discharges in Chicago area waterways; (2) a plan to control floatables in such waterways; (3) post construction monitoring following completion of TARP; (4) payment of a civil penalty of \$675,000, of which \$350,000 will be paid to the United States and \$325,000 to the State of Illinois; and (5) a green infrastructure program to reduce CSO