

to balance a co-production intent with the current institutional and resource constraints, strives to apply the concept of bridging knowledge systems—maintaining the integrity of different knowledge systems while weaving them together—and aims to create equitable space for all knowledge systems and knowledge holders. In doing so, USGCRP will respect the rights, values, and knowledge held by Indigenous and local communities.

#### IV. Development of Associated Products

In addition to a use-inspired, knowledge-informed NNA1 report, input from the public, Tribes, and agencies emphasized the need for an array of products associated with NNA1. Public and Tribal input emphasized the diversity of perspectives that people hold on nature and the impact of nature on their lives. The comments requested that USGCRP reflect that diversity, and as much as possible, do so in the voices of people themselves. In response to this input, USGCRP will explore the feasibility of video-based products related to the scope of NNA1. Video-based products would allow people from various perspectives to share their stories and reactions to questions such as: why is nature important to me, how is nature changing, and why does this matter?

USGCRP will also explore development of special issues of peer-reviewed journals and publication of technical reports on specific topics, with the intent that these efforts address additional questions received through the engagement process, close research gaps, strengthen individual aspects of the available knowledge base, and potentially serve as inputs to NNA1. For example, one such journal special issue recommended through Tribal Consultation is an Indigenous-led volume that explores perspectives of Indigenous Knowledge holders and scholars relevant to the scope of NNA1. A technical report with a focus on nature literacy relevant to the scope of NNA1 has also been recommended.

We seek public input on all aspects of the proposed NNA1.

**Responses:** Response to this Request for Comment is voluntary. Respondents need not comment on all topics. Responses may be used by the U.S. Government for program planning on a non-attribution basis. The United States Department of Interior therefore requests that no business proprietary information or copyrighted information be submitted in response to this Request for Comment. Please note that the U.S. Government will not pay for response

preparation, or for the use of any information contained in the response.

**Eric Werwa,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary—Policy and Environmental Management, Office of Policy, Management, and Budget.*

[FR Doc. 2023–16794 Filed 8–3–23; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4334–63–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[BLM\_CO\_FRN\_MO4500171447]

#### Notice of Availability of the Draft Resource Management Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Colorado River Valley Field Office and Grand Junction Field Office Resource Management Plans, Colorado

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (FLMPA), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Colorado River Valley Field Office (CRVFO) and Grand Junction Field Office (GJFO), and by this notice is providing information announcing the opening of the comment period on the Draft RMP/Supplemental EIS and is announcing the comment period on the BLM's proposed areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs).

**DATES:** This notice announces the opening of a 90-day comment period for the Draft RMP/Supplemental EIS beginning on the date following the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) publication of its Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft RMP/Supplemental EIS in the **Federal Register**. The EPA usually publishes its NOAs on Fridays.

To afford the BLM the opportunity to consider comments in the Proposed RMP/Final Supplemental EIS, please ensure that the BLM receives your comments prior to the close of the 90-day public comment period or 15 days after the last public meeting, whichever is later.

In addition, this notice also announces the opening of a 60-day comment period for ACECs. The BLM must receive your ACEC-related comments by October 3, 2023.

**ADDRESSES:** The Draft RMP/Supplemental EIS is available for review on the BLM ePlanning project Website at: <https://go.usa.gov/xtrgf>.

Written comments related to the supplemental EIS for the CRVFO and GJFO RMPs/EISs may be submitted by any of the following methods:

- **Website:** <https://go.usa.gov/xtrgf>
- **Mail:** BLM Upper Colorado River District, Attn: Supplemental EIS, 2518 H Road, Grand Junction, CO 81506

Documents pertinent to this proposal may be examined online at <https://go.usa.gov/xtrgf> and at the Grand Junction and Colorado River Valley Field Offices.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Bruce Krickbaum, Project Manager, telephone 970–240–5399; address BLM Upper Colorado River District, 2518 H Road, Grand Junction, CO 81506; email [ucrd-seis@blm.gov](mailto:ucrd-seis@blm.gov). Individuals in the United States who are deaf, deafblind, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability may dial 711 (TTY, TDD, or TeleBraille) to access telecommunications relay services for contacting Mr. Krickbaum. Individuals outside the United States should use the relay services offered within their country to make international calls to the point-of-contact in the United States.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This document provides notice that the BLM Colorado State Director has prepared a Draft RMP/Supplemental EIS for the two RMPs/EISs, provides information announcing the opening of the comment period on the Draft RMP/Supplemental EIS, and announces the comment period on the BLM's proposed ACECs. The planning area is located in Garfield, Mesa, Eagle, Pitkin, Routt, Rio Blanco, and Montrose counties, Colorado, and encompasses approximately 1.56 million acres of public land and 1.92 million acres of Federal mineral estate.

CRVFO and GJFO management is identified in their respective 2015 RMPs. Apart from fluid mineral leasing decisions, all existing management as described in the CRVFO and GJFO approved RMPs remains in effect.

#### Purpose and Need for the Planning Effort

The purpose of the supplemental EIS is to supplement the EISs completed in 2014 for the CRVFO RMP and 2015 for the GJFO RMP by considering one or more additional alternatives with respect to the lands that are allocated as open or closed to oil and gas leasing in the planning decision areas, and to provide additional analysis of greenhouse gas emissions associated

with the fluid mineral management alternatives considered in the final EISs and the supplemental EIS.

The need for this supplemental EIS is to address the issues identified by the court in litigation involving the Colorado River Valley RMP (*Wilderness Workshop v. BLM*, 16-cv-01822), as described in settlement agreements in that case and a related case (*Wilderness Workshop v. BLM*, 18-cv-00987), and to revisit the Grand Junction RMP, as described in the BLM's motion for voluntary remand in litigation involving that RMP (*Center for Biological Diversity v. BLM*, 19-cv-02869). The need is also to consider new information, including relevant information provided through tribal consultation.

### Alternatives Including the Preferred Alternative

The BLM has analyzed two additional alternatives in detail. The three action alternatives (B through D) and the no action alternative (A) from the 2014 CRVFO and the 2015 GJFO Final EISs remain within the range of alternatives considered. Alternative E would close the areas with no-known, low, and medium potential for fluid mineral leasing to future fluid mineral leasing. Alternative E would also close areas that would be allocated as closed to fluid mineral leasing in alternative C of the 2014 CRVFO and 2015 GJFO Final EISs. Alternative E would designate the potential ACECs that were analyzed as closed to leasing in alternative C of the 2014 CRVFO and 2015 GJFO Final EISs. Alternative F would close the same areas as alternative E to future fluid mineral leasing, as well as additional areas identified by the public during scoping. Alternative F would designate all potential ACECs analyzed in alternative C of the 2014 CRVFO and 2015 GJFO Final EISs and would expand one existing ACEC. Alternative F would designate one FLPMA Section 202 Wilderness Study Area. The BLM did not identify any additional alternatives for detailed analysis.

The State Director has identified alternative E as the preferred alternative. Alternative E was found to best meet the State Director's planning guidance and, therefore, selected as the preferred alternative because it best meets the purpose and need.

### ACECs

Consistent with land use planning regulations at 43 CFR 1610.7-2(b), the BLM is announcing the opening of a 60-day comment period on the ACECs proposed for designation in the preferred alternative. Comments may be

submitted using any of the methods listed in the **ADDRESSES** section earlier.

The proposed ACEC included in the preferred alternative for CRVFO is:

- Greater Sage-grouse Habitat, 24,600 acres, to protect priority habitat for the greater sage-grouse. Close to fluid mineral leasing, right-of-way avoidance, visual resource management (VRM) Class II, prohibit net increase in motorized/mechanized routes.

The proposed ACECs included in the preferred alternative for GFJO are:

- Atwell Gulch, 6,100 acres (an additional 3,200 acres above current designation), to protect rare plants, cultural resources, scenic values, and wildlife habitat. Close to fluid mineral leasing, close to mineral material disposal and non-energy solid leasable mineral exploration and development, right-of-way exclusion, travel closed to motorized and mechanized travel (except for Sunnyside Rd), VRM Class II.

- Badger Wash, 2,200 acres, to protect rare plants and use as a hydrologic study area. Close to fluid mineral leasing, close to mineral material disposal and non-energy solid leasable mineral exploration and development, 1,800 acres right-of-way exclusion, 400 acres right-of-way avoidance, VRM Class II.

- Glade Park-Pinyon Mesa, 27,200 acres, to protect occupied Gunnison Sage-grouse habitat. Close to fluid mineral leasing, close to mineral material disposal and non-energy solid leasable mineral exploration and development, right-of-way avoidance, travel limited to designated routes, VRM Class II.

- John Brown Canyon, 1,400 acres, to preserve old growth pinyon-juniper woodlands. Close to fluid mineral leasing, close to mineral material disposal and non-energy solid leasable mineral exploration and development, travel limited to designated routes, VRM Class II.

- Mt. Garfield, 5,700 acres (an additional 3,300 acres above current designation), to protect its scenic values. Close to fluid mineral leasing, close to mineral material disposal and non-energy solid leasable mineral exploration and development, travel limited to designated routes, right-of-way exclusion, VRM Class I.

- Plateau Creek, 200 acres, to protect special status fish species. Close to fluid mineral leasing, close to mineral material disposal and non-energy solid leasable mineral exploration and development, right-of-way avoidance, travel limited to designated routes, VRM Class II.

- Prairie Canyon, 6,900 acres, to protect rare plants and wildlife habitat. Close to fluid mineral leasing, close to mineral material disposal and non-energy solid leasable mineral exploration and development, 2,800 acres right-of-way exclusion, 2,600 acres right-of-way avoidance, travel limited to designated routes, VRM Class II.

- South Shale Ridge, 28,200 (an additional 400 acres above current designation), to protect rare plants, wildlife habitat, and scenic values. Close to fluid mineral leasing, close to mineral material disposal and non-energy solid leasable mineral exploration and development, right-of-way exclusion, travel limited to designated routes, VRM Class II.

The preferred alternative would not propose the following potential ACECs in CRVFO for designation: Abrams Creek, Dotsero Crater, Glenwood Springs Debris Flow Hazard Zones, Grand Hogback, Hardscrabble-East Eagle, Lyons Gulch, McCoy Fan Delta, Mount Logan Foothills, Sheep Creek Uplands, and The Crown Ridge.

The preferred alternative would not propose the following potential ACECs in GJFO for designation: Colorado River Riparian, Coon Creek, Gunnison River Riparian, Hawxhurst Creek, Indian Creek, Nine-mile Hill Boulders, Pyramid Rock Expansion, and Reeder Mesa.

### Schedule for the Decision-Making Process

The BLM will provide additional opportunities for public participation consistent with the NEPA and land use planning processes, including a 30-day public protest period and a 60-day Governor's consistency review on the Proposed RMP. The Proposed RMP/Final Supplemental EIS is anticipated to be available for public protest in the spring of 2024 with a supplemental approved RMP and Record of Decision in the summer of 2024.

The BLM will hold two public meetings. The specific dates and locations of these meetings will be announced least 15 days in advance through local media, newspapers, and the BLM website at <https://go.usa.gov/xtrgf>.

The BLM will continue to consult with Indian Tribal Nations on a government-to-government basis in accordance with Executive Order 13175, BLM MS 1780, and other Departmental policies. Tribal concerns, including impacts on Indian trust assets and potential impacts to cultural resources, will be given due consideration.

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.

(Authority: 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2, 43 CFR 1610.7–2)

**Douglas J. Vilsack,**

*BLM Colorado State Director.*

[FR Doc. 2023–16598 Filed 8–3–23; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4331–16–P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1293]

### **Certain Automated Put Walls and Automated Storage and Retrieval Systems, Associated Vehicles, Associated Control Software, and Component Parts Thereof; Notice of Final Determination Finding a Violation of Section 337; Issuance of a Limited Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist Orders; Termination of Investigation**

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined that respondents HC Robotics (a.k.a. Huicang Information Technology Co., Ltd.) and Invata, LLC (d/b/a Invata Intralogistics) (collectively, “Respondents”) have violated section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, by importing, selling for importation, or selling within the United States after importation certain automated put walls and automated storage and retrieval systems, associated vehicles, associated control software, and component parts thereof that infringe one or more claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,622,194 and 10,576,505. The Commission has determined that the appropriate remedies are a limited exclusion order (“LEO”) and cease and desist orders (“CDOs”) against each of Respondents. The Commission has also determined to set a bond in the amount of 100 percent of the entered value of the excluded articles imported during the period of Presidential review. This investigation is hereby terminated.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Richard P. Hadorn, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202)

205–3179. 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](mailto: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 January 27, 2022, based on a complaint filed by OPEX Corporation (“OPEX”) of Moorestown, New Jersey. 87 FR 4290–91 (Jan. 27, 2022). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (“section 337”), based on the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain automated put walls and automated storage and retrieval systems, associated vehicles, associated control software, and component parts thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,104,601 (“the ‘601 patent’”), 8,276,740 (“the ‘740 patent’”), 8,622,194 (“the ‘194 patent’”), and 10,576,505 (“the ‘505 patent’”). *Id.* at 4291. The complaint further alleges that a domestic industry exists. *Id.* The notice of investigation named two respondents: (1) HC Robotics (a.k.a. Huicang Information Technology Co., Ltd.) of Hangzhou City, Zhejiang Province, China; and (2) Invata, LLC (d/b/a Invata Intralogistics) of Conshohocken, Pennsylvania. *Id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not named as a party. *Id.*

On September 13, 2022, the Commission terminated the investigation as to the OmniSort Generation 1 products based on a consent order. Order No. 10 (Aug. 12, 2022), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (Sept. 13, 2022). On October 11, 2022, the Commission terminated the investigation as to (i) the ‘601 patent, (ii) the ‘740 patent, (iii) asserted claims 2–4, 6, 10, 12–17, 19, and 20 of the ‘194 patent, and (iv) asserted claims 14, 17, and 21 of the ‘505 patent based on OPEX’s partial withdrawal of the complaint. Order No. 12 (Sept. 23, 2022), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (Oct. 11, 2022). On December 19, 2022, the Commission determined that the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement is satisfied in this

investigation as to the remaining asserted patents—*i.e.*, the ‘194 and ‘505 patents. *See* Order No. 17 (Nov. 23, 2022), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (Dec. 19, 2022).

On March 31, 2023, the chief administrative law judge issued a final initial determination (“ID”) on violation, which included a recommended determination (“RD”) on remedy and bonding. The ID finds violations of section 337 with respect to asserted claims 1 and 5 of the ‘194 patent and asserted claims 1–5, 7–9, 11–13, 15–16, and 18–20 of the ‘505 patent. Specifically, the ID finds that: (i) OPEX has standing to assert both the ‘194 and ‘505 patents; (ii) the asserted claims listed above are directly infringed by Respondents; (iii) Respondents both induced and contributed to the infringement of each of the asserted claims listed above; (iv) no asserted claim is invalid; and (v) OPEX has satisfied the domestic industry requirement as to both patents. The RD recommends that, should the Commission determine that violations of section 337 occurred, the Commission should: (i) issue an LEO against the Respondents’ infringing products; (ii) issue CDOs against each of Respondents; and (iii) set a 100 percent bond for importations of infringing products during the period of Presidential review.

On June 1, 2023, the Commission determined to review in part the final ID with respect to the ID’s finding that OPEX has satisfied the economic prong of the DI requirement. 88 FR 37271–73 (June 7, 2023). The Commission also determined to correct typographical/clerical errors on pages 8, 35, and 38 of the ID. *Id.* The Commission further determined not to review the remaining findings in the ID. *Id.* The Commission’s notice requested written submissions on remedy, the public interest, and bonding. *See id.* The Commission did not request briefing on any issue under review. *Id.*

The Commission did not receive submissions on the public interest from the parties pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(a)(4) (19 CFR 210.50(a)(4)). The Commission also did not receive any submissions on the public interest from members of the public in response to the Commission’s **Federal Register** notice. *See* 88 FR 23689 (Apr. 18, 2023).

On June 15, 2023, OPEX and Respondents each filed initial briefs on remedy, the public interest, and bonding. On June 22, 2023, OPEX and Respondents each filed reply briefs.

The Commission, having reviewed the record in this investigation, including the final ID, the parties’ petitions and