SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the Yuba County Water Agency (YCWA) have made available for public review and comment the Draft EIR/EIS for the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord (Yuba Accord).

Two public hearings will be held to provide interested individuals and organizations with an opportunity to comment verbally and in writing on the Draft EIR/EIS.

The purpose of the Yuba Accord is to resolve instream flow issues associated with operation of the Yuba River Development Project (Yuba Project) in a way that protects and enhances lower Yuba River fisheries and local water-supply reliability. At the same time, it would provide revenues for local flood control and water supply projects, water for the CALFED Program to use for protection and restoration of Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) fisheries, and improvements in statewide water supply management, including supplemental water for the Central Valley Project (CVP) and the State Water Project (SWP).

DATES: Two public hearings will be held on August 1, 2007 from 2 to 3 p.m. and from 6 to 7 p.m. in Marysville, California.

Submit written comments on the Draft EIR/EIS on or before August 24, 2007 at the address provided below.

ADDRESSES: The hearings will be at the Yuba County Water Agency, 1220 F Street, Marysville, CA 95901.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Tim Rust, Reclamation, Bureau of Reclamation, Division of Resources Management, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825, at (916) 978–5316, or by e-mail at trust@mp.usbr.gov; or Mr. Curt Aikens, YCWA, 1220 F Street, Marysville, CA 95901, at (530) 741–6278, or by e-mail at caikens@ycwa.com.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Yuba Accord represents an effort on the part of the Yuba River stakeholders to find a solution to the challenges of competing interests by providing water for fisheries, developing new tools to ensure local reliable water supply, crafting a revenue stream to pay for the Yuba Accord, and providing additional water for out-of-county environmental and consumptive uses. These various objectives would be met through implementation of the Yuba Accord, which includes the “Principles of Agreement for Proposed Lower Yuba River Fisheries Agreement” (Fisheries Agreement), the “Principles of Agreement for Proposed Conjunctive Use Agreements” (Conjunctive Use Agreements), and the “Principles of Agreement for Proposed Long-term Transfer Agreement” (Water Purchase Agreement).

The Yuba Accord agreements are:

- A Fisheries Agreement among YCWA, California Department of Fish and Game, and the collective non-governmental organizations, with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service supporting the agreement. Under the Yuba Accord Fisheries Agreement, YCWA would revise the operation of the Yuba Project to provide higher flows in the lower Yuba River to protect and enhance fisheries and to increase downstream water supplies.
- Conjunctive Use Agreements between YCWA and water districts within Yuba County for the implementation of a comprehensive program of conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater supplies and actions to improve water use efficiencies.
- A Water Purchase Agreement among YCWA, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), and Reclamation. Under this agreement, Reclamation and DWR would purchase water for the CALFED Environmental Water Account and for the CVP and SWP project uses.

All three of these agreements need to be in place for the Yuba Accord to be implemented.

The Draft EIR/EIS analyzes the impacts of implementing the Yuba Accord on surface water hydrology, groundwater hydrology, water supply, hydropower, flood control, water quality, fisheries, wildlife, vegetation, special-status species, recreation, visual, cultural resources, Indian Trust Assets, air quality, land use, socioeconomic, growth inducement, and environmental justice resources and conditions.

Alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS include the No Action Alternative, No Project Alternative, Proposed Project/Action Alternative (Yuba Accord Alternative), and Modified Flow Alternative. In addition, the Draft EIR/EIS addresses other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions in conjunction with the implementation of the Yuba Accord, thus analyzing cumulative impacts.

Copies of the Draft EIR/EIS are available for public review at the following locations:

- Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825.
- Yuba County Water Agency, 1220 F Street, Marysville, CA 95901.
- Department of Water Resources, Division of Environmental Services, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.
- Sacramento Public Library, 828 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.
- Yuba County Library, 303 2nd Street, Marysville, CA 95901.

If special assistance is required at the public hearings, please contact Dianne Simodynes (e-mail: Dianne.Simodynes@hdrinc.com). Please notify Ms. Simodynes as far in advance of the hearings as possible to enable Reclamation to secure the needed services. If a request cannot be honored, the requestor will be notified.

Before including your name, address, phone number, e-mail 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: June 18, 2007.

John F. Davis,
Deputy Regional Director, Mid-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. E7–12728 Filed 6–29–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MN–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–744 (Second Review)]

Brake Rotors From China


ACTION: Institution of a five-year review concerning the antidumping duty order on brake rotors from China.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it has instituted a review pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the
antidumping duty order on brake rotors from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act, interested parties are requested to respond to this notice by submitting the information specified below to the Commission; 1 to be assured of consideration, the deadline for responses is August 21, 2007. Comments on the adequacy of responses may be filed with the Commission by September 14, 2007. For further information concerning the conduct of this review and rules of general application, consult the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

DATES: Effective Date: July 2, 2007.


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 April 17, 1997, the Department of Commerce issued an antidumping duty order on imports of brake rotors from China (62 FR 18740). Following five-year reviews by Commerce and the Commission, effective August 14, 2002, Commerce issued a continuation of the antidumping duty order on imports of brake rotors from China (67 FR 52933). The Commission is now conducting a second review to determine whether revocation of the order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry within a reasonably foreseeable time. It will assess the adequacy of interested party responses to this notice of institution to determine whether to conduct a full review or an expedited review. The Commission’s determination in any expedited review will be based on the facts available, which may include information provided in response to this notice.

Definitions.—The following definitions apply to this review:

1. Subject Merchandise is the class or kind of merchandise that is within the scope of the five-year review, as defined by the Department of Commerce.

2. The Subject Country in this review is China.

3. The Domestic Like Product is the domestically produced product or products which are like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the Subject Merchandise. In its original determination and its expedited five-year review determination, the Commission defined the Domestic Like Product as all aftermarket brake rotors, coextensive with Commerce’s scope.

4. The Domestic Industry is the U.S. producers as a whole of the Domestic Like Product, or those producers whose collective output of the Domestic Like Product constitutes a major proportion of the total domestic production of the product. In its original determination and its expedited five-year review determination, the Commission defined the Domestic Industry as all producers of aftermarket brake rotors. In its original determination, the Commission also determined that appropriate circumstances existed to exclude AlliedSignal from the domestic aftermarket rotor industry as a related party; however, in its expedited five-year review determination, the Commission did not find that appropriate circumstances existed to exclude any producer from the domestic industry.

5. An Importer is any person or firm engaged, either directly or through a parent company or subsidiary, in importing the Subject Merchandise into the United States from a foreign manufacturer or through its selling agent.

Participation in the review and public service list.—Persons, including industrial users of the Subject Merchandise and, if the merchandise is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations, wishing to participate in the review as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in 19 CFR 351.304 of the Commission’s rules, no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register. The Secretary will maintain a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the review.

Former Commission employees who are seeking to appear in Commission five-year reviews are reminded that they are required, pursuant to 19 CFR 201.15, to seek Commission approval if the matter in which they are seeking to appear was pending in any manner or form during their Commission employment. The Commission is seeking guidance as to whether a second transition five-year review is the “same particular matter” as the underlying original investigation for purposes of 19 CFR 201.15 and 18 U.S.C. 207, the post employment statute for Federal employees. Former employees may seek informal advice from Commission ethics officials with respect to this and the related issue of whether the employee’s participation was “personal and substantial.” However, any informal consultation will not relieve former employees of the obligation to seek approval to appear from the Commission under its rule 201.15. For ethics advice, contact Carol McCue Verratti, Deputy Agency Ethics Official, at 202–205–3088.

Limited disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI) under an administrative protective order (APO) and APO service list.—Pursuant to section 207.7(a) of the Commission’s rules, the Secretary will make BPI submitted in this review available to authorized applicants under the APO issued in the review, provided that the application is made no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register. Authorized applicants must represent interested parties, as defined in 19 U.S.C. 1677(9), who are parties to the review. A separate service list will be maintained by the Secretary for those parties authorized to receive BPI under the APO.

Certification.—Pursuant to section 207.3 of the Commission’s rules, any person submitting information to the Commission in connection with this review must certify that the information is accurate and complete to the best of the submitter’s knowledge. In making the certification, the submitter will be deemed to consent, unless otherwise specified, for the Commission, its employees, and contract personnel to use the information provided in any other reviews or investigations of the same or comparable products which the Commission conducts under Title VII of the Act, or in internal audits and investigations relating to the programs.
and operations of the Commission pursuant to 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3.

Written submissions.—Pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission’s rules, each interested party response to this notice must provide the information specified below. The deadline for filing such responses is August 21, 2007. Pursuant to section 207.62(b) of the Commission’s rules, eligible parties (as specified in Commission rule 207.62(b)(1)) may also file comments concerning the adequacy of responses to the notice of institution and whether the Commission should conduct an expedited or full review. The deadline for filing such comments is September 14, 2007. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of sections 201.8 and 207.3 of the Commission’s rules and any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6 and 207.7 of the Commission’s rules. The Commission’s rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means, except to the extent permitted by section 201.8 of the Commission’s rules, as amended, 67 FR 68036 (November 8, 2002). Also, in accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission’s rules, each document filed by a party to the review must be served on all other parties to the review (as identified by either the public or APO service list as appropriate), and a certificate of service must accompany the document (if you are not a party to the review you do not need to serve your response).

Inability to provide requested information.—Pursuant to section 207.61(c) of the Commission’s rules, any interested party that cannot furnish the information requested by this notice in the requested form and manner shall notify the Commission at the earliest possible time, provide a full explanation of why it cannot provide the requested information, and indicate alternative forms in which it can provide equivalent information. If an interested party does not provide this notification (or the Commission finds the explanation provided in the notification inadequate) and fails to provide a complete response to this notice, the Commission may take an adverse inference against the party pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act in making its determination in the review.

Information To Be Provided in Response To This Notice of Institution: As used below, the term “firm” includes any related firms.

(1) The name and address of your firm or entity (including World Wide Web address if available) and name,
television number, fax number, and e-mail address of the certifying official.
(2) A statement indicating whether your firm/entity is a U.S. producer of the Domestic Like Product, a U.S. union or worker group, a U.S. importer of the Subject Merchandise, a foreign producer or exporter of the Subject Merchandise, a U.S. or foreign trade or business association, or another interested party (including an explanation). If you are a union/worker group or trade/business association, identify the firms in which your workers are employed or which are members of your association.
(3) A statement indicating whether your firm/entity is willing to participate in this review by providing information requested by the Commission.
(4) A statement of the likely effects of the revocation of the antidumping duty order on the Domestic Industry in general and/or your firm/entity specifically. In your response, please discuss the various factors specified in section 752(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) including the likely volume of subject imports, likely price effects of subject imports, and likely impact of imports of Subject Merchandise on the Domestic Industry.
(5) A list of all known and currently operating U.S. producers of the Domestic Like Product. Identify any known related parties and the nature of the relationship as defined in section 771(4)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1677(4)(B)).
(6) A list of all known and currently operating U.S. importers of the Subject Merchandise and producers of the Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country that currently export or have exported Subject Merchandise to the United States or other countries after calendar year 2006.
(7) If you are a U.S. producer of the Domestic Like Product, provide the following information on your firm’s operations on that product during calendar year 2006 (report quantity data in units and value data in U.S. dollars, f.o.b. plant). If you are a union/worker group or trade/business association, provide the information on an aggregate basis, for the firms in which your workers are employed/which are members of your association.
(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total production of Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country accounted for by your firm’s(s’) production;
(b) Capacity (quantity) of your firm to produce the Domestic Like Product;
(c) the quantity and value of U.S. commercial shipments of the Domestic Like Product produced in your U.S. plant(s); and
(d) the quantity and value of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of the Domestic Like Product produced in your U.S. plant(s).
(8) If you are a U.S. importer or a trade/business association of U.S. importers of the Subject Merchandise from the Subject Country, provide the following information on your firm’s(s’) operations on that product during calendar year 2006 (report quantity data in units and value data in U.S. dollars). If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.
(a) The quantity and value (landed, duty-paid but not including antidumping duties) of U.S. imports and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total U.S. imports of Subject Merchandise from the Subject Country accounted for by your firm’s(s’) imports;
(b) the quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping duties) of U.S. commercial shipments of Subject Merchandise imported from the Subject Country;
(c) the quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping duties) of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of Subject Merchandise imported from the Subject Country.
(9) If you are a producer, an exporter, or a trade/business association of producers or exporters of the Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country, provide the following information on your firm’s(s’) operations on that product during calendar year 2006 (report quantity data in units and value data in U.S. dollars, landed and duty-paid at the U.S. port but not including antidumping duties). If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.
(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total production of Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country accounted for by your firm’s(s’) production;
(b) Capacity (quantity) of your firm to produce the Domestic Like Product in the Subject Country; and
(c) the quantity and value of your firm’s(s’) exports to the United States of Subject Merchandise and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total exports to the United States of Subject Merchandise from the Subject Country accounted for by your firm’s(s’) exports.
(10) Identify significant changes, if any, in the supply and demand conditions or business cycle for the Domestic Like Product that have occurred in the United States or in the
market for the Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country after 2001, and significant changes, if any, that are likely to occur within a reasonably foreseeable time. Supply conditions to consider include technology; production methods; development efforts; ability to increase production (including the shift of production facilities used for other products and the use, cost, or availability of major inputs into production); and factors related to the ability to shift supply among different national markets (including barriers to importation in foreign markets or changes in market demand abroad). Demand conditions to consider include end uses and applications; the existence and availability of substitute products; and the level of competition among the Domestic Like Product produced in the United States, Subject Merchandise produced in the Subject Country, and such merchandise from other countries.

(11) (OPTIONAL) A statement of whether you agree with the above definitions of the Domestic Like Product and Domestic Industry; if you disagree with either or both of these definitions, please explain why and provide alternative definitions.

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission’s rules.

By order of the Commission.


Marilyn R. Abbott,
Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E7–12668 Filed 6–29–07; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–581]

In the Matter of Certain Inkjet Ink Supplies and Components Thereof: Notice of a Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Granting the Joint Motion of Complainant Hewlett-Packard Company and Respondent All Media Outlet Corporation To Terminate the Investigation With Respect to That Respondent; Termination of the Investigation


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. 9) granting the joint motion of complainant Hewlett-Packard Company (“H–P”) and respondent All Media Outlet Corporation d/b/a Inkandbeyond.com (“All Media”) to terminate the investigation with respect to All Media, and terminating the investigation in its entirety.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michelle Walters, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–5468. 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 September 6, 2006, based on a complaint filed by H–P of California, subsequently amended, alleging violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain inkjet ink supplies and components thereof by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1–4, 7–9, 22, 24, and 25 of U.S. Patent No. 5,825,387; claims 1–9 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,793,329; claims 8–10, 14, and 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,674,042; claims 1–6 and 19–29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,588,880; claims 1–7 and 11–18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,364,472; claims 6, 7, 9, and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,089,687; and claims 1–3 and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,264,301. The complaint named six respondents: Ninestar Technology Co. Ltd. of China, Ninestar Technology Co. Ltd. of California, Aurora Eshop, Inc. d/b/a butterflyinkjet.com of California, Iowaink, LLC d/b/a iowaink.com of Iowa, L2 Commerce Inc. d/b/a Printmicro.com of California, and All Media Outlet Corp. d/b/a Inkandbeyond of California.

On March 19, 2007, H–P and All Media jointly moved to terminate the investigation with respect to All Media, based on a settlement agreement. The Commission investigative attorney supported the motion.

On June 6, 2007, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 9) granting the joint motion to terminate the investigation with regard to All Media. The ALJ found that the joint motion complied with the requirements of Commission Rule 210.21 (19 CFR 210.21). The ALJ also concluded that, pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(b)(2) (19 CFR 210.50(b)(2)), there is no evidence that termination of this investigation will prejudice the public interest. In addition, the ALJ noted that the termination of litigation under these circumstances as an alternative method of dispute resolution is generally in the public interest. Accordingly, the ALJ terminated the investigation as to All Media. In addition, the ALJ terminated the investigation in its entirety. No petitions for review of this ID were filed. The Commission has determined not to review the ID.


Marilyn R. Abbott,
Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E7–12752 Filed 6–29–07; 8:45 am]