

Alternative A: Current Management (No Action)

This alternative reflects current management, including activities previously undertaken, or already planned or approved, and is the baseline for comparing the other two alternatives. In addition to actions identified as common to all, under alternative A, there would be little or no change in our current refuge programs at Monomoy NWR. We would initiate few, if any, new wildlife population, habitat, or ecosystem management activities. No new public recreational opportunities would be undertaken, and there would be no enhancements to existing programs and opportunities. The Monomoy Wilderness would continue to be managed to protect wilderness character. The refuge would continue its current operations and maintenance activities within its current staffing and funding levels.

Alternative B: Enhanced Management of Habitat and Public Uses (Service-Preferred Alternative)

Alternative B, in comparison to alternative A, represents an extension and progression of all areas of refuge management. Under alternative B, new biological program activities would be initiated. Special emphasis would be placed on obtaining baseline data to increase our knowledge of wildlife populations and habitats in this dynamic coastal environment, enhance our ability to evaluate those resources in a regional context, and anticipate the effects of climate change. The new information would be used to develop the detailed step-down plans proposed under this alternative. Wildlife and habitat surveys and inventories would be prioritized to provide the data needed to evaluate the effectiveness of refuge management, and to adapt management as warranted, in order to achieve long-range refuge goals and objectives.

Under alternative B, new and existing compatible wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities would be provided consistent with refuge purposes for protecting migratory birds and wilderness character. Special emphasis would be placed on providing enhanced, sustainable, and compatible opportunities for all six priority wildlife-dependent recreational uses defined in the Administration Act. Staffing would be modestly increased to accommodate new programs and activities, and proposed new visitor contact facilities would provide better access to information and support

quality educational and interpretive programs.

Alternative C: Natural Processes

Alternative C proposes less intensive management on all refuge lands. It would be guided by a philosophy of allowing natural processes and succession of habitats to progress, consistent with preserving wilderness character, and to the extent that it does not compromise refuge purposes and goals. Generally, wildlife and habitat management, and inventories and monitoring efforts, would be reduced from those planned under alternative A. We would manage the refuge visitor services program with an emphasis on providing wildlife-dependent recreation that uses hand tools and non-motorized equipment, protects naturalness, and provides solitude or primitive, unconfined recreation.

Under all alternatives, the boundary of the refuge would be modified to include an area on Nauset/South Beach, approximately 717 acres, that is within the Cape Cod National Seashore boundary, but which accreted and joined the refuge's South Monomoy Island. With this addition, the refuge comprises 8,321 acres. We would incorporate the Nauset/South Beach addition into, and manage it consistent with, the refuge's existing designated wilderness area.

Public Involvement

We will give the public an opportunity to provide input at public meetings. You can obtain the schedule from the address or Web site listed in this notice (see **ADDRESSES**). You may also submit comments anytime during the public comment period.

Public Availability of Comments

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: March 5, 2014.

Deborah Rocque,

Acting Regional Director, Northeast Region.

[FR Doc. 2014-07531 Filed 4-9-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-991 (Second Review)]

Silicon Metal From Russia; Revised Schedule for the Subject Review

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

DATES: *Effective:* April 7, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Haines (202-205-3200), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter 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 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this review may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background. On December 11, 2013, the Commission established a schedule for the conduct of this review (78 FR 76856, December 19, 2013). Subsequently, counsel for the domestic interested party filed a request to appear at the hearing or, in the alternative, for consideration of cancellation of the hearing. Counsel indicated a willingness to submit responses to any Commission questions in lieu of an actual hearing. No other party filed a timely request to appear at the hearing. Consequently, the public hearing in connection with the review, scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. on April 10, 2014, at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building, is cancelled. Parties to the investigation should respond to any written questions posed by the Commission in their post-hearing briefs, which are due to be filed on April 21, 2014.

For further information concerning this investigation see the Commission's notice cited above and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR Part 201), and part 207, subparts A and C (19 CFR Part 207).

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 7, 2014.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2014-08066 Filed 4-9-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-501 (Remand Proceeding)]

Certain Encapsulated Integrated Circuit Devices and Products Containing Same; Notice of a Commission Final Determination of Violation of Section 337; Issuance of a Limited Exclusion Order; Termination of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined that there is a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, by respondents Carsem (M) Sdn Bhd; Carsem Semiconductor Sdn Bhd; and Carsem, Inc. (collectively, "Carsem," or respondents) in the above-captioned investigation. The Commission has issued a limited exclusion order directed to the infringing products of Carsem and has terminated the 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 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 under section 337 of the Tariff Act of

1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on December 19, 2003, based on a complaint filed by Amkor Technology Inc. ("Amkor"). See 68 FR 70836 (Dec. 19, 2003). Amkor alleged a violation of section 337 by respondents Carsem in the importation, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain encapsulated integrated circuit devices and products containing same in connection with claims 1-4, 7, 17, 18 and 20-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,433,277 ("the '277 patent"); claims 1-4, 7 and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,630,728 ("the '728 patent"); and claims 1, 2, 13 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,455,356 ("the '356 patent"). All three patents are owned by Amkor. The investigation also concerns a third-party, ASAT, Inc. ("ASAT"), and its invention ("ASAT invention"), which Carsem argued was invalidating prior art to Amkor's asserted patents.

On November 18, 2004, the ALJ issued a final initial determination ("Final ID") finding no violation of section 337. After reviewing the Final ID in its entirety, the Commission on March 31, 2005, modified the ALJ's claim construction and remanded the investigation to the ALJ with instructions "to conduct further proceedings and make any new findings or changes to his original findings that are necessitated by the Commission's new claim construction." Commission Order ¶ 8 (March 31, 2005). On November 9, 2005, the ALJ issued a remand initial determination ("Remand ID"). The Remand ID found a violation of section 337 with regard to six claims of the '277 patent, but found no violation in connection with the asserted claims of the '728 or '356 patents.

Completion of this investigation was delayed because of difficulty in obtaining from third-party ASAT certain documents that Carsem asserted were critical for its affirmative defenses. The Commission's efforts to enforce a February 11, 2004, subpoena *duces tecum* and *ad testificandum* directed to ASAT resulted in a July 1, 2008, order and opinion of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia granting the Commission's second enforcement petition. On July 1, 2009, after ASAT had complied with the subpoena, the Commission issued a notice and order remanding this investigation to the ALJ so that the ASAT documents could be considered. On October 30, 2009, the ALJ issued a supplemental ID ("First Supplemental ID"), finding that the ASAT invention was not prior art, and reaffirming his finding of a violation of section 337.

On February 18, 2010, the Commission reversed the ALJ's finding that ASAT invention is not prior art to Amkor's asserted patents, and remanded the investigation to the ALJ to make necessary findings in light of the Commission's determination that the ASAT invention is prior art. On March 22, 2010, the ALJ issued a Supplemental ID ("Second Supplemental ID") in which he found that the '77 and '728 patents were invalid in view of ASAT prior art and determined that there was no violation of Section 337 in the present investigation. On July 20, 2010, the Commission determined not to review the ALJ's Remand ID and Second Supplemental ID. As a result, the Commission determined that there is no violation of section 337 in this investigation. Amkor appealed the Commission's decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit ("the Court").

On August 22, 2012, the Court ruled on Amkor's appeal reversing the Commission's determination that the '277 Patent is invalid under 35 U.S.C. 102(g)(2), declining to affirm the Commission's invalidity determination on the alternative grounds raised by Carsem, and remanding for further proceedings consistent with its opinion. *Amkor Technology Inc. v. International Trade Commission*, 692 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 2012) ("*Amkor Technology*"). On October 5, 2012, Carsem filed a combined petition for panel rehearing and for rehearing *en banc*. The Court denied Carsem's petition on December 7, 2012, and issued its mandate on December 19, 2012, returning jurisdiction to the Commission.

On January 14, 2013, the Commission issued an Order ("Commission's Order") directing the parties to the investigation to submit their comments regarding what further proceedings must be conducted to comply with the August 22, 2012, judgment of the Court in *Amkor Technology*. The parties filed their initial and responsive submissions.

On June 5, 2013, the Commission issued a Notice ("Commission's Notice") requesting briefing on remedy, bonding and the public interest in the above-captioned investigation, as well as responses to certain questions posed by the Commission regarding the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement and the public interest. 78 FR 35051 (June 11, 2013). The Commission also set a schedule for the filing of written submissions. The parties have filed their initial and reply submissions pursuant to the Commission Notice.

Having examined the record in this investigation, including the parties'