

energy conservation or using available water resources in the public interest.

As necessary, describe studies required to adequately define the extent, potential severity, and potential approaches to mitigation of impacts that may be associated with the proposed development.

Other Study and/or Permit Requirements

Describe planned response to other applicable regulatory requirements, including the National Historic Preservation Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, and state and local laws and licensing requirements. Also describe any known potential for impact on lands or resources of American Indian tribes, including trust resources.

Project Development Costs and Economic Analysis

Estimate the costs of development, including the cost of studies to determine feasibility, environmental compliance, project design, construction, financing, and the amortized annual cost of the investment. Estimate annual operation, maintenance, and replacement expenses, annual payments to the United States that are potentially associated with the Kendrick Project. Estimate costs associated with any anticipated additional transmission or wheeling services. Identify proposed methods of financing the project. Estimate the anticipated return on investment and present an economic analysis that compares the present worth of all benefits and the costs of the project.

Performance Guarantee and Assumption of Liability

Describe plans for (1) providing the Government with performance bonds or irrevocable letter of credit covering completion of the proposed project; (2) assuming liability for damage to the operational and structural integrity of Seminole Dam and Reservoir facilities or other aspects of the Kendrick Project caused by construction, commissioning, operation, and/or maintenance of the pumped-storage hydroelectric power development; and (3) obtaining general liability insurance.

Other Information

This final paragraph is provided for the applicant to include additional information considered relevant to Reclamation's selection process in this matter.

Selection of Lessee

Reclamation will evaluate proposals received in response to this published notice. Proposals will be ranked according to response to the factors described in Fundamental Considerations and Requirements and Proposal Content Guidelines sections provided in this notice. In general, Reclamation will give more favorable consideration to proposals that (1) are well adapted to developing, conserving, and utilizing the water resource and protecting natural resources; (2) clearly demonstrate that the offeror is qualified to develop the hydropower facility and provide for long-term operation and maintenance; and (3) best share the economic benefits of the pumped-storage hydroelectric power development among parties to the LOPP. A proposal will be deemed unacceptable if it is inconsistent with Kendrick Project purposes, as determined by Reclamation.

Reclamation will give preference to those entities that qualify as preference entities (as defined under Proposal Content Guidelines) provided that the preference entity is well qualified and their proposal is at least as well adapted to developing, conserving, and utilizing the water and natural resources as other submitted proposals. Preference entities will be allowed 90 days to improve their proposals, if necessary, to be made at least equal to a proposal(s) that may have been submitted by a non-preference entity.

As noted, this Notice of Intent to accept proposals does not obligate Reclamation to ultimately select a lessee for pumped-storage hydroelectric power development on Seminole Reservoir.

Notice and Time Period To Enter Into LOPP

Reclamation will notify, in writing, all entities submitting proposals of Reclamation's decision regarding selection of the potential lessee. The selected lessee will have 3 years from the date of such notification to accomplish NEPA compliance and enter into a LOPP for the proposed development of pumped-storage hydroelectric power at Seminole Reservoir. The lessee will then have up to 3 years from the date of execution of the lease to complete the designs and specifications and an additional 2 years to secure financing and to begin construction. Such timeframes may be adjusted by Reclamation for just cause resulting from actions and/or

circumstances that are beyond the control of the lessee.

Michael S. Black,

Regional Director, Missouri Basin—Interior Region 5, Bureau of Reclamation.

[FR Doc. 2020–08832 Filed 4–24–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4332–90–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1131]

Certain Wireless Mesh Networking Products and Related Components Thereof; Commission Determination To Review in Part and Vacate in Part a Final Initial Determination and To Affirm the Finding of No Violation of Section 337; Termination of the Investigation

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 Administrative Law Judge's ("ALJ") final initial determination ("ID"), issued on January 10, 2020, affirm the ID's finding of no violation of section 337 in the above-referenced investigation, and vacate in part the ID. The investigation is terminated.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Benjamin S. Richards, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–5453. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. For help accessing EDIS, please email EDIS3Help@usitc.gov. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at <https://www.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal, telephone (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on September 10, 2018, based on a complaint, as supplemented, filed by SIPCO LLC of Ashburn, Virginia ("SIPCO"). See 83 FR 45681–82 (Sep. 10, 2018). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), based upon the importation into the United States,

the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain wireless mesh networking products and related components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patents Nos. 6,914,893 (“the ‘893 patent”); 7,103,511 (“the ‘511 patent”); 8,964,708 (“the ‘708 patent”); and 9,439,126 (“the ‘126 patent”). *See id.* The notice of investigation names the following respondents: Emerson Electric Co. of St. Louis, Missouri; Emerson Process Management LLLP of Bloomington, Minnesota; Emerson Process Management Asia Pacific Private Limited of Singapore; Emerson Process Management Manufacturing (M) Sdn. Bhd. of Nilai, Malaysia; Fisher-Rosemount Systems, Inc. of Round Rock, Texas; Rosemount Inc. of Shakopee, Minnesota; Analog Devices, Inc. of Norwood, Massachusetts; Linear Technology LLC of Milpitas, California; Dust Networks, Inc. of Union City, California; Tadiran Batteries Inc. of Lake Success, New York; and Tadiran Batteries Ltd. of Kiryat Ekron, Israel. *See id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not a party to this investigation. *See id.*

During the course of the investigation, respondents Dust Networks, Inc., Tadiran Batteries Inc., and Tadiran Batteries Ltd. were terminated from the investigation. The remaining respondents are Emerson Electric Co.; Emerson Process Management LLLP; Emerson Process Management Asia Pacific Private Limited; Emerson Process Management Manufacturing (M) Sdn. Bhd.; Fisher-Rosemount Systems, Inc.; Rosemount Inc.; Analog Devices, Inc.; and Linear Technology LLC (collectively “Respondents”). The asserted claims of the ‘126 patent and ‘511 patent were also terminated from the investigation. The ‘893 and ‘708 patents remain asserted in this investigation.

On January 10, 2020, the ALJ issued the final ID in this investigation. The ID found no violation of section 337. The ID’s finding included subsidiary findings that SIPCO failed to show infringement of any asserted claim of the ‘893 or ‘708 patents and that all of the remaining asserted claims of the ‘708 patent were invalid. The ID also found that SIPCO failed to satisfy the domestic industry requirement for either of the ‘708 or ‘893 patents. The ID also included the ALJ’s recommended determination on remedy bonding. In the event the Commission were to find a violation of section 337, the ALJ recommended issuance of a limited exclusion order, a cease and desist order, and a bond of either 0.1%

or 0.05%, depending on the basis for the violation finding.

On January 27, 2020, SIPCO and Respondents submitted petitions seeking review of the ID. On February 4, 2020, SIPCO and Respondents submitted responses to the others’ petitions.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review the ID with respect to (1) the construction of “remote wireless device” in the ‘708 patent; (2) infringement and validity of the ‘708 patent; (3) infringement and validity of the ‘893 patent; and (4) whether SIPCO satisfies the domestic industry requirement of section 337 for the ‘708 or the ‘893 patent. The Commission has determined not to review the remainder of the ID.

On review, the Commission has determined to affirm the ID’s finding of no violation of section 337 with regard to the ‘708 patent and the ‘893 patent. In addition, the Commission has determined to vacate certain portions of the final ID. The Commission opinion is issued concurrently herewith.

The investigation is hereby terminated.

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 part 210 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 21, 2020.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2020–08831 Filed 4–24–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers

Notice is hereby given that, on April 1, 2020, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (“IEEE”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing additions or changes to its standards development activities. The notifications were filed

for the purpose of extending the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

Specifically, 31 new standards have been initiated and 10 existing standards are being revised. More detail regarding these changes can be found at: <https://standards.ieee.org/about/sasb/sba/jan2020.html>.

On February 8, 2015, the IEEE Board of Directors approved an update of the IEEE patent policy for standards development, which became effective on 15 March 2015. The updated policy is available at <http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/bylaws/approved-changes.pdf> and, from the effective date, will be available at <http://standards.ieee.org/develop/policies/bylaws/sect6-7.html>.

On September 17, 2004, IEEE filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on November 3, 2004 (69 FR 64105).

The last notification was filed with the Department on February 6, 2020. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 27, 2020 (85 FR 11396).

Suzanne Morris,

Chief, Premerger and Division Statistics Unit, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2020–08834 Filed 4–24–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Malathy Sundaram, M.D.; Decision and Order

On November 20, 2019, the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration (hereinafter, DEA or Government), issued an Order to Show Cause (hereinafter, OSC) to Malathy Sundaram, M.D. (hereinafter, Registrant) of Dover, New Hampshire. OSC, at 1. The OSC proposed the revocation of Registrant’s Certificate of Registration No. BS8504703. *Id.* It alleged that Registrant is without “authority to handle controlled substances in New Hampshire, the state in which . . . [Registrant is] registered with the DEA.” *Id.* (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(3)).

Specifically, the OSC alleged that, “[a]ccording to records of the New Hampshire Medical Board, the current status of . . . [Registrant’s] medical license is listed as ‘suspended’ because on September 6, 2019, . . .