cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action and two Alternatives. Per 40 CFR 1501.7, the issues raised during the scoping period (March 22–May 8, 2017) were used to inform the analyses and identify the alternatives considered in the EIS. Alternatives for the Project that were analyzed in the Final EIS include:

- **Alternative A—Proposed Action:** As described above in Section I, second paragraph. The Proposed Action Alternative would be as approved from the time of the original PAP and initial approval of the mining plan modification in 2008 until 2033.

- **Alternative B—Continuation of San Juan Mine Operations Following Generating Station Shut-Down in 2022:** This alternative assumes that the remaining units of the Generating Station shut down in 2022, but that mining continues at the DLE at the same rate (approximately 3 million tons annually) from 2023 through 2033. After 2023, this alternative assumes that either a new operator will purchase the Generating Station or the mine will send the coal to an unidentified coal-fired power plant. Without knowing the location of the end-use of the DLE coal, the Final EIS bounds the potential effects of combusting DLE coal at an unidentified power plant by relying on the analysis of effects at the San Juan Generating Station. Under Alternative B, the mining techniques would be identical to those for the Proposed Action.

- **Alternative C—No Action Alternative:** This alternative assumes that the ASLM disapprove the mining plan modification for the DLE at the San Juan Mine, the ASLM disapproves of the mining plan modification, and mining ceases on August 31, 2019. Implementation of the No Action Alternative would result in the discontinuation of mining activities in the DLE on August 31, 2019, completion of all mining activities at the San Juan Mine in December 2019 and cessation of burning coal from San Juan Mine at the Generating Station approximately 6 months later. Under this alternative, SJCC would complete reclamation activities of all surface disturbance in accordance with its existing permit. Considering mining activities in the DLE have been ongoing since 2008 and have continued throughout the NEPA process, the baseline conditions for the No Action Alternative includes mining through August 2019.

A wide range of additional Alternatives were considered by the OSMRE but not carried forward for detailed analysis in the EIS. The following Alternatives were not analyzed in the EIS because they either did not meet the purpose and need of the Project or were not considered technically feasible or economically feasible or cost-effective:

- **Alternative D—“Just” Transition Alternative**
- **Alternative E—Alternative Panel Alignment, Timing or Sequence**
- **Alternative F—Continue to Mine at a Rate of 6 Million Tons Per Year**
- **Alternative G—Modifications to Underground Mining Technique**
- **Alternative H—Relocation of Portal Sites**
- **Alternative I—Alternative Coal Combustion Residue Disposal Sites**

### V. Environmental Impact Analysis

The Final EIS analyzes the potential environmental impacts to 16 different resource categories, including:

- **Air Quality**
- **Climate Change**
- **Geology and Soils**
- **Archaeology and Cultural Resources**
- **Water Resources and Hydrology**
- **Vegetation**
- **Wildlife and Habitats**
- **Special Status Species**
- **Land Use, Transportation, and Agriculture**
- **Recreation**
- **Social and Economic Values**
- **Environmental Justice**
- **Visual Resources**
- **Noise and Vibration Impacts**
- **Hazardous and Solid Wastes**
- **Public Health and Safety**

### VI. Public Comment Procedures

In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality’s regulations for implementing NEPA and the DOI’s NEPA regulations, OSMRE solicited public comments on the Draft EIS. The comment period was held for over 45 days from May 25, 2018 to July 9, 2018. OSMRE held five public meetings in New Mexico and Colorado from June 25, 2018 to June 29, 2018. During the public comment period, over 3,000 comments on the Draft EIS were submitted. OSMRE considered these comments in developing the Final EIS.

**Dated:** March 1, 2019.

**Marcelo Calle,**
Acting Regional Director, Western Region.
December 19, 2018, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on behalf of Tela Innovations, Inc. of Los Gatos, California. The complaint was amended on February 7, 2019.

Supplements to the amended complaint were filed on February 13 and 26, 2019. The complaint, as amended, 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 integrated circuits and products containing the same by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,943,966 ("the '966 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 7,948,012 ("the '012 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 10,141,334 ("the '334 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 10,141,335 ("the '335 patent"); and U.S. Patent No. 10,186,523 ("the '523 patent"). The amended complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by the applicable Federal Statute.

The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue a limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders.

**ADDRESSES:** The amended 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) 205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at https://www.usitc.gov. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at https://edis.usitc.gov.


**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**


**Scope of Investigation:** Having considered the amended complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on March 8, 2019, 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 products identified in paragraph (2) by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 2, 32, and 33 of the '966 patent; claims 2, 27, and 28 of the '012 patent; claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 15, 20, and 24 of the '334 patent; claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 15, 20, and 24 of the '335 patent; and claims 1–12, 14–20, 22–24, and 26 of the '523 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

2. Pursuant to section 210.10(b)(1) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10(b)(1), the plain language description of the accused products or category of accused products, which defines the scope of the investigation, is “Intel’s 14nm or smaller Tri-Gate integrated circuits and products that contain such Intel integrated circuits, specifically, microprocessors, modems, field programmable gate arrays (FPGAs), printed circuit boards, chipsets, laptops, desktops, computer tablets, all-in-one PCs, notebooks, servers, board-level computers, and board-level computer kits”;

3. Pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(b)(1), 19 CFR 210.50(b)(1), the presiding administrative law judge shall take evidence or other information and hear arguments from the parties and other interested persons with respect to the public interest in this investigation, as appropriate, and provide the Commission with findings of fact and a recommended determination on this issue, which shall be limited to the statutory public interest factors set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(1), (f)(1), (g)(1);

4. 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 complainant is: Tela Innovations, Inc., 475 Alberto Way, Suite 120, Los Gatos, CA 95032.

   b. The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the amended complaint is to be served:

   - Acer. Inc., 1F, 88, Sec. 1, Xintai 5th Road, Xizhi, New Taipei City 221, Taiwan
   - Acer America Corporation, 333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 1500, San Jose, CA 95110
   - AsusTek Computer Inc., No. 15, Li-Te Road, Beitou District, Taipei 112, Taiwan
   - Asus Computer International, 800 Corporate Way, Fremont, CA 94539
   - Intel Corporation, 2200 Mission College Boulevard, Santa Clara, CA 95052
   - Lenovo Group Ltd., No. 6 Chiang Ye Road, Shangdi Information Industry Base, Beijing 100085, China
   - Lenovo (United States) Inc., 1009 Think Place, Morrisville, NC 27560
   - Micro-Star International Co., Ltd., No. 69, Lide Street, Zhonghe District, New Taipei City 235, Taiwan
   - Msi Computer Corp., 901 Canada Court, City of Industry, CA 91748

   (5) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the amended 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(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 amended complaint and the notice of investigation.

Extensions of time for submitting responses to the amended 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 amended complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the amended 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 amended 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.

By order of the Commission.
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Extension of Public Comment Period for Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

On February 8, 2019, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama in the lawsuit entitled United States et al. v. Drummond Company, Inc. d/b/a ABC Coke (Drummond), Civil Action No. 2:19–cv–00240–AKK. The United States is joined in this matter by the Jefferson County Board of Health (JCBH). At the request of some members of the public, DOJ is extending the public comment period for an additional 30 days.

This case relates to alleged releases of benzene from Drummond’s coke by-product recovery plant in Tarrant, Alabama (Facility). The case involves claims for civil penalties and injunctive relief under the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq., and its implementing regulations known as National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs), including 40 CFR part 61, subpart L (Benzene Emissions from Coke By-product Recovery Plants), subpart V (Equipment Leaks and Fugitive Emissions), and subpart FF (Benzene Waste Operations), as well as related claims under laws promulgated by the Jefferson County Board of Health. The settlement resolves the alleged claims by requiring Drummond to, among other things: (1) Pay a civil penalty of $775,000 for the past alleged violations to be split equally between the United States and JCBH; (2) undertake fixes to the Facility to bring it into compliance; (3) implement a leak detection and repair program to ensure compliance and reduce potential future fugitive benzene emissions; and (4) implement a supplemental environmental project of two years of semi-annual use of an infrared camera as part of leak detection efforts at a cost of $16,000.

Notice of the lodging of the decree was originally published in the Federal Register on February 14, 2019. See 84 FR 4104 (February 14, 2019). The publication of the original notice opened a thirty (30) day period for public comment on the Decree. The publication of the present notice extends the period for public comment on the Decree to April 17, 2019.

Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to United States et al. v. Drummond Company, Inc. d/b/a ABC Coke, D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–2–1–10717. All comments must be submitted no later than April 17, 2019. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments: Send them to:

By email ........ pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov
By mail ........ Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department website: https://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees. We will provide a paper copy of the Consent Decree upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please mail your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611. Please enclose a check or money order for $10.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

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

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

On March 7, 2019, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the District of Oregon in the lawsuit entitled United States v. Astoria Marine Construction Company, Civil Action No. 3:19–cv–00337–SB. The United States filed this lawsuit under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (“CERCLA”), 42 U.S.C. 9001 et seq., alleging releases and threats of releases of hazardous substances at or from the Astoria Marine Construction Company

Superfund Site in Astoria, Oregon. The proposed Consent Decree requires Astoria Marine Construction Company to pay the Environmental Protection Agency $285,000 for past response costs. If any Remediation Funds remain after cleanup is complete, Astoria Marine Construction Company will pay EPA up to an additional $365,000 from such funds before distributing any additional funds to itself or its attorneys. If entered by the Court, the proposed Consent Decree would conclude this matter in its entirety.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to United States v. Astoria Marine Construction Company, D.J. Ref. No. 90–11–3–11100/1. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments: Send them to:

By email ........ pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov
By mail ........ Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the consent decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department website: https://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees. We will provide a paper copy of the consent decree without appendix, reproduction cost) or $4.25 for the consent decree and appendix (25 cents per page reproduction cost) or $4.25 for the consent decree without appendix, payable to the United States Treasury.

Susan M. Akers,
Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.