

The proposed action will include mechanical removal of salt cedar and follow-up treatments using herbicide. Two alternatives were discussed in an environmental assessment made available to the public during the formal public review period initiated on January 19, 2012:

1. Mechanical Removal of salt cedar with follow-up herbicide treatments, prescribed burning of debris and native plant restoration. (Preferred Alternative).
2. No Action would be taken to control non-native salt cedar and no restoration of native plant species would occur.

#### PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

On January 19, 2012 the Draft Environmental Assessment for removing salt cedar on the IBWC tract known as Broad Canyon Arroyo was released for public review by the USIBWC. Notice of this document was published in the **Federal Register** and made available on the USIBWC Web site: [www.ibwc.gov/Organization/Environmental/EIS\\_EA\\_Public\\_Comment.html](http://www.ibwc.gov/Organization/Environmental/EIS_EA_Public_Comment.html).

An electronic copy of the draft EA was also made available through the San Andres NWR Web site at: <http://www.fws.gov/southwest/refuges/newmex/sanandres/index.html>. Public review of the draft EA was completed following a 30 day review period.

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Pursuant to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) guidance (40 Code of Federal Regulations 1500–1508), The President's Council on Environmental Quality issued regulations for NEPA implementation which included provisions for both the content and procedural aspects of the required Environmental Assessment (EA) the USIBWC has prepared the draft EA. A careful review of the draft EA indicates that there will not be a significant impact on the quality of the human environment as a result of this proposal. This determination is based on the following factors:

1. The proposed action will occur in a localized area belonging to the International Boundary and Water Commission and will be of short duration during part of the year. The proposed activities are not national or regional in scope.
2. The proposed action will not significantly affect public health or safety. The methods used are limited in scope, monitored by San Andres National Wildlife Refuge staff and occur in areas with no

- public access.
3. The proposed action will not significantly impact unique characteristics of the geographic area such as historical or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. The proposed action will impact the abundance of the non-native salt cedar on less than 26 acres.
  4. The effects of the proposed action are not considered highly controversial. The use of mechanical extraction and follow-up herbicide treatments as a management tool to reduce an exotic species is accepted among wildlife experts.
  5. The possible effects of the proposed action are not highly uncertain and do not involve unique or unknown risks.
  6. The proposed action does not establish a precedent for actions with future significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.
  7. There are no significant cumulative effects identified by the EA. Mechanical extraction of salt cedar will be limited in scope and time, will be coordinated with other management agencies, and will stay within management objectives.
  8. The proposed action will not affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, nor will it cause a loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources. The fieldwork conducted under the proposed action does not constitute an undertaking as defined by the National Historic Preservation Act.
  9. The proposed action will fully comply with the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. The proposed action would not affect non-target federally or state listed threatened and endangered species. The proposed action will likely benefit native wildlife populations, particularly neotropical migrant birds by replacing a monotypic stand of non-native salt cedar with a diverse native plant community.
  10. The proposed action will result in the irretrievable loss of some individual salt cedar. The proposed action will reduce the amount of salt cedar on a small parcel in an area that is made up of salt cedar along the river for miles in either direction. Impacts to the statewide

population of salt cedar are determined to be insignificant.

11. The proposed action will not have any significant adverse effects on wetlands and floodplains, pursuant to Executive Orders 11990 and 11988 because the study area is not located within any wetlands and the amount of floodplain affected is minimal.
12. The proposed action will not threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. The proposed action will be conducted consistent with any and all requisite approvals or authorizations of the cooperating agencies.

On the basis of the information contained in the environmental assessment, it is the determination of the USIBWC that the proposed action does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment under the meaning of Section 102 (2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. Accordingly, requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality are fulfilled and an environmental impact statement is not required.

Edward Drusina  
Commissioner  
International Boundary and Water  
Commission, United States Section

Date: August 8, 2012

[FR Doc. 2012-20016 Filed 8-15-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7010-01-P

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-834]

#### Certain Mobile Electronic Devices Incorporating Haptics; Amendment of 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 the presiding administrative law judge's ("ALJ") initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 7) amending the complaint and notice of investigation in the above-captioned investigation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**  
Sidney A. Rosenzweig, Office of the  
General Counsel, U.S. International

Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-2532. 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 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>. 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 April 6, 2012, based on a complaint filed by Immersion Corporation of San Jose, California ("Immersion"), alleging a violation of 19 U.S.C. 1337 in the importation, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain mobile electronic devices incorporating haptics, by reason of the infringement of claims of six patents, including U.S. Patent Nos. 6,429,846 ("the '846 patent") and 8,031,181 ("the '181 patent"). 77 FR 20847 (Apr. 6, 2012). The notice of institution named four respondents: Motorola Mobility, Inc. and Motorola Mobility Holdings, Inc., both of Libertyville, Illinois; HTC Corporation of Taoyuan, Taiwan; and HTC America, Inc. of Bellevue, Washington.

On May 21, 2012, Immersion moved for leave to amend its complaint and the notice of investigation to assert claims 1, 3-7, 13-16, 18, 19, and 22 of the '846 patent, based upon a recent certificate of correction issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office for that patent. Immersion also sought leave to assert claim 7 of the '181 patent, which it alleged had been omitted from the notice of investigation because of a typographical error.

On May 31, 2012, the respondents opposed the motion in substantial part. On July 18, 2012, the ALJ issued the subject ID granting Immersion's motion.

No petitions for review of the ID were filed. The Commission has determined not to review the 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 sections 210.14 and 210.42 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.14, 210.42).

Issued: August 13, 2012.

By order of the Commission.

**William R. Bishop,**

*Hearings and Meetings Coordinator.*

[FR Doc. 2012-20129 Filed 8-15-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Extension to Public Comment Period for Consent Decree Lodged Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

On May 17, 2012, the United States published a notice that a proposed Consent Decree had been lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts in *United States v. Bayer CropScience Inc. et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:12-cv-10847 and *Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Bayer CropScience Inc. et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:12-cv-10849, related to natural resource damages claims of the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts against Bayer CropScience Inc. and Pharmacia Corporation in connection with the Industri-plex Superfund Site, located in Woburn, Massachusetts. 77 FR 29361. That notice indicated that the Department of Justice would receive comments concerning the settlement for a period of 30 days from the date of the notice. In response to a comment submitted during the initial comment period that requested additional information concerning the settlement and that the comment period be extended, the United States is posting information related to the settlement at the following Web site, <http://www.fws.gov/newengland/>, and is extending the public comment period. The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication any additional comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to *United States v. Bayer CropScience Inc.*, D.J. Ref. 90-11-2-228/7. Comments may also be submitted by email to [pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov](mailto:pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov). A copy of the comments should be sent to Donald G. Frankel, Senior Counsel, Environmental Enforcement Section, Department of Justice, Suite 616, One Gateway Center, Newton, MA 02458 ([douglas.frankel@usdoj.gov](mailto:douglas.frankel@usdoj.gov)).

During this extended public comment period, the Consent Decree may be

examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, [http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent\\_Decrees.html](http://www.usdoj.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 "Consent Decree Copy" ([EESCDCopy.ENRD@usdoj.gov](mailto:EESCDCopy.ENRD@usdoj.gov)), fax no. (202) 514-0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514-5271. In requesting a copy of the Consent Decree from the Consent Decree Library, please enclose a check in the amount of \$5.50 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury (if the request is by fax or email, forward a check to the Consent Decree library at the address stated above).

**Ronald G. Gluck,**

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

[FR Doc. 2012-20088 Filed 8-15-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-15-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

#### Notice of Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers by (TA-W) number issued during the period of July 30, 2012 through August 3, 2012.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made for workers of a primary firm and a certification issued regarding eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222(a) of the Act must be met.

I. Under Section 222(a)(2)(A), the following must be satisfied:

(1) A significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) The sales or production, or both, of such firm have decreased absolutely; and

(3) One of the following must be satisfied:

(A) Imports of articles or services like or directly competitive with articles