

The Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Designation of Energy Corridors on Federal Land in the 11 Western States (Draft PEIS) was made available for public review and comment from November 16, 2007, to February 14, 2008. The Draft PEIS was posted on the project Web site at <http://corridoreis.anl.gov>, the DOE NEPA Web site at <http://www.gc.energy.gov/nepa>, and provided, on request, as a CD or printed document. Notice was provided to more than 2,200 individuals and organizations who registered on the project Web site to receive information about the PEIS. Approximately 14,000 individuals and organizations commented on the Draft PEIS, providing more than 3,500 substantive comments. About 57 percent of the comment documents were received via the project Web site, 21 percent were submitted by regular mail, and 22 percent were submitted at the public hearings, as oral statements, written submissions, or both.

Volume IV of the Final PEIS contains the public comments on the Draft PEIS and the agencies' responses. Public comments addressed a broad range of issues. Nearly 35 percent of the comments addressed various topics related to the alternatives presented in the PEIS, 20 percent commented on the purpose and need, and 17 percent commented on corridor location. Nearly 5 percent of the comments were concerned with ecological issues, approximately 4 percent raised concerns about multiple impact areas, 4 percent addressed cumulative impacts, and slightly more than 2 percent dealt with tribal issues.

The remaining comments were divided among a number of topics, each comprising less than 2 percent of the total. The topics (listed in decreasing order) include general impacts, land use, water resources, health and safety, cultural resources, maps, visual resources, socioeconomics, regulations, air quality, environmental justice, and noise.

Public and internal agency review comments on the Draft PEIS were incorporated into the Final PEIS. Public comments resulted in changes to the text and modifications to corridor segments. These changes have improved the analysis and clarified the discussion of important issues but did not significantly modify the Proposed Action or proposed land use plan amendments. The Final PEIS contains a number of modifications to corridor segments in response to public and agency comments. These changes are

detailed in appendix K of the Final PEIS.

Government-to-government consultation regarding potential energy transport development and land use plan amendments on DOI-, USDA-, and DOD-administered lands was conducted with federally recognized Tribes whose interests might be directly and substantially affected. The Tribes contacted are listed in appendix C of the Final PEIS.

In addition, the Agencies have initiated activities to coordinate and consult with the governors of each of the 11 Western States addressed in the PEIS and with State agencies. Prior to the Agencies' issuance of their respective RODs, the governor of each state has the opportunity to identify any inconsistencies between the proposed land use plan amendments and State or local plans and to provide recommendations, in writing, during the 60-day consistency review period required by the BLM land use planning regulations (43 CFR 1610.3-2).

The DOI Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management (AS/LM) is the responsible official for publishing the proposed plan amendments affecting public lands. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and its implementing regulations provide land use planning authority to the Secretary, which has been delegated to this Assistant Secretary. Because any decision regarding these plan amendments is being made by the AS/LM, it is the final decision for the DOI. This decision is not subject to administrative review (protest) under the BLM (DOI) land use planning regulations (43 CFR 1610.5-2).

The USDA Under Secretary of Natural Resources and Environment is the responsible official for publishing the proposed plan amendments on National Forest System lands. The Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976, and their implementing regulations provide land use planning authority to the Secretary, as delegated to this Under Secretary. Because any decision regarding these plan amendments is being made by the Under Secretary, Natural Resources and Environment, it is the final decision for the Department of Agriculture. This decision is not subject to administrative review (objection) under the FS or Departmental regulations (36 CFR 219.13(a)(2)).

Copies of the Final PEIS have been sent to the Environmental Protection Agency, DOI Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance, DOI Library,

and the governors' offices in each of the 11 Western States covered by this PEIS. Copies of the Final PEIS are available at the BLM state offices and FS regional offices in the 11 Western States, DOE Headquarters Reading Room, the BLM Washington, DC, Public Affairs office and the FS Washington, DC, offices. Those interested may also review the Final PEIS and proposed land use plan amendments online at <http://corridoreis.anl.gov>.

**Michael D. Nedd,**

*Assistant Director, Minerals and Realty Management, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.*

[FR Doc. E8-28279 Filed 11-26-08; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-84-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Reclamation

#### Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Water Management Plans

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The following Water Management Plans are available for review:

- Glide Irrigation District
- Kanawha Water District
- Panoche Water District
- Clear Creek Community Services District
- Arvin Edison Irrigation District

To meet the requirements of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act of 1992 (CVPIA) and the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) developed and published the Criteria for Evaluating Water Management Plans (Criteria). For the purpose of this announcement, Water Management Plans (Plans) are considered the same as Water Conservation Plans. The above entities have developed a Plan, which Reclamation has evaluated and preliminarily determined to meet the requirements of these Criteria. Reclamation is publishing this notice in order to allow the public to review the plans and comment on the preliminary determinations. Public comment on Reclamation's preliminary (i.e., draft) determination is invited at this time.

**DATES:** All public comments must be received by December 29, 2008.

**ADDRESSES:** Please mail comments to Ms. Laurie Sharp, Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, California 95825, or contact at 916-978-5232 (TDD 978-5608), or e-mail at [Isharp@mp.usbr.gov](mailto:Isharp@mp.usbr.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** To be placed on a mailing list for any subsequent information, please contact Ms. Laurie Sharp at the e-mail address or telephone number above.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** We are inviting the public to comment on our preliminary (i.e., draft) determination of Plan adequacy. Section 3405(e) of the CVPIA (Title 34 Pub. L. 102-575), requires the Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer an office on Central Valley Project water conservation best management practices that shall “\* \* \* develop criteria for evaluating the adequacy of all water conservation plans developed by project contractors, including those plans required by section 210 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982.” Also, according to Section 3405(e)(1), these criteria must be developed “\* \* \* with the purpose of promoting the highest level of water use efficiency reasonably achievable by project contractors using best available cost-effective technology and best management practices.” These criteria state that all parties (Contractors) that contract with Reclamation for water supplies (municipal and industrial contracts over 2,000 acre-feet and agricultural contracts over 2,000 irrigable acres) must prepare Plans that contain the following information:

1. Description of the District.
  2. Inventory of Water Resources.
  3. Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Agricultural Contractors.
  4. BMPs for Urban Contractors.
  5. Plan Implementation.
  6. Exemption Process.
  7. Regional Criteria.
  8. Five-Year Revisions.
- Reclamation will evaluate Plans based on these criteria. A copy of these Plans will be available for review at Reclamation’s Mid-Pacific (MP) Regional Office located in Sacramento, California, and the local area office. Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review.

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.

If you wish to review a copy of these Plans, please contact Ms. Laurie Sharp to find the office nearest you.

Dated: October 23, 2008.

**Richard J. Woodley,**  
Regional Resources Manager, Mid-Pacific  
Region, Bureau of Reclamation.  
[FR Doc. E8-28271 Filed 11-26-08; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-604]

### In the Matter of Certain Sucralose, Sweeteners Containing Sucralose, and Related Intermediate Compounds Thereof; Notice of Commission Determination to Review a Final Initial Determination of the Administrative Law Judge

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review the final initial determination (“ID”) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) in the above-captioned investigation under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337 (“section 337”). The ALJ found no violation of section 337 except with respect to certain non-participating and defaulted respondents.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** James A. Worth, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3065. 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 (<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 May 10, 2007, based upon a complaint filed on behalf of Tate & Lyle Technology Ltd. of London, United Kingdom, and Tate & Lyle Sucralose, Inc. of Decatur, Illinois (collectively,

“Tate & Lyle”). The complaint alleged violations of section 337(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of sucralose, sweeteners containing sucralose, and related intermediate compounds thereof by reason of infringement of various claims of United States Patent Nos. 4,980,463 (“the ‘463 patent’”); 5,470,969 (“the ‘969 patent’”); 5,034,551 (“the ‘551 patent’”); 5,498,709; and 7,049,435. The notice of investigation named twenty-five respondents.

On August 15, 2007, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review an ID allowing JK Sucralose, Inc. to intervene as a respondent to the investigation. On August 30, 2007, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review an ID terminating the investigation with respect to ProFood International Inc. on the basis of a consent order. On October 3, 2007, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review an ID adding Heartland Sweeteners, LLC as a respondent to the investigation.

On September 22, 2008, the presiding administrative law judge issued a final initial determination (“final ID”) finding no violation of section 337 in the above-identified investigation (with the exception of certain non-participating and defaulted respondents).

On October 6, 2008, Tate & Lyle, four sets of respondents, and the Commission investigative each filed a petition for review. On October 14, 2008, each filed a response.

Having examined the final ID, the petitions for review, the responses thereto, and the relevant portions of the record in this investigation, the Commission has determined to review the final ID in its entirety.

The Commission requests briefing based on the evidentiary record on the issues on review. The Commission is particularly interested in responses to the following questions:

(1) Regarding the issue of whether 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(1)(B)(ii) extends to the ‘551, ‘969, and ‘463 patents: Is this issue a matter of jurisdiction or does it go to the merits of whether there is a violation of section 337? Does the exclusion order in the investigation which was the subject of *In re Northern Pigment Co.*, 71 F.2d 447, 22 CCPA 166 (1934) suggest that § 1337(a)(1)(B)(ii) has the same scope as 35 U.S.C. 271(g)?

(2) Would a sucralose product containing the tin catalyst that is addressed by the process claimed in the ‘551 patent be safe for human consumption and otherwise salable as a