

(NC 12) and within adjacent communities.

### Purpose and Need

The purpose of the EIS is to develop a streamlined framework for implementing sediment management at the Seashore, including the method, location, and frequency for sediment management actions that may be permitted. We have received various requests and anticipate future requests to issue special use permits for protecting roads, bridges, electrical transmission facilities, and other public transportation facilities; repairing island damages, including breaches that also affect transportation; and restoring habitat through the placement of dredged materials along eroded sections of barrier islands. A sediment management framework is needed to assist the Seashore in addressing these requests, while avoiding and minimizing impacts that may be associated with such actions conducted by NPS and other agencies to mitigate shoreline erosion. The framework is needed to limit impacts to the Seashore and provide timely response for localized beach nourishment efforts in the face of increased storm events and projected sea-level rise. Similarly, sediment management strategies may be used for specific habitat restoration projects.

### Alternatives

The NPS will evaluate alternative approaches for sediment management at the Seashore. The NPS is considering the following alternatives.

Under Alternative A, the no-action alternative, the NPS would not permit others to conduct sediment management activities at the Seashore over the next two decades. No habitat restoration projects that include the placement of sediment would occur. The NCDOT currently maintains an easement through the Seashore for NC 12. The no-action alternative would preclude NCDOT from maintaining NC 12 outside of its existing easement, potentially resulting in the loss of the highway.

Under Alternative B, the proposed action, the NPS could permit other agencies and municipalities to conduct, with conditions, sediment management in the form of ocean- and sound side-beach nourishment, filling island breaches, and dune restoration. This alternative would also recognize that NPS and others may independently or in partnership restore beach habitats or periodically protect specific facilities or resources through sediment placement in areas that have been affected by

erosion. The proposed action includes the following elements:

- Beach nourishment may be used to mitigate coastal erosion at various sites along the Seashore, including ocean and sound-side environments. Beach nourishment may occur at up to two locations per year, using between 50–250 cubic yards of sediment per foot, placed via dredge or sediment trucking. Sediment management permitted under the proposed action would fall within the general parameters of past beach nourishment projects.

- The restoration of habitat may occur in locations such as the southern end of Hatteras Island and Green Island in Oregon Inlet. Restored habitat could benefit nesting shorebirds and sea turtles. Habitat restoration projects would include the application of dredge material and moving/manipulating sand at the site with heavy machinery. Dredge material may come from the pipeline dredging operations or other sources, provided the sediment is a close match to the sediment grain size found at the proposed action site.

- Dune reconstruction and enhancement, as well as moving or regrading sediment to protect existing access and public facilities, may occur. Actions that promote natural dune building processes, such as beach grass planting and sand fencing, are included in the proposed action and may be carried out

- Emergency breach fill may occur under the proposed action. When inlets, overwash areas, or damaged roadways are caused by wave, water, and wind action during storm events, they may be closed due to roadway reconstruction activities. These projects may include trucking, staging, and pumping sediment in from other locations.

The NPS will not select an alternative for implementation until after the final EIS is completed. The NPS will analyze the impacts of the alternatives on littoral processes and barrier island morphology, benthic organisms and essential fish habitat, sea turtles, shorebirds, and structures and infrastructure. Additional alternatives may be considered during the process of preparing an EIS.

### Public Comment

*How to Provide Comments*—During the scoping period, project information will be available on the project's website at <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/CAHASediment>. Public open houses will be conducted to provide an opportunity for the public to share their comments and learn more about activities at the Seashore. Details regarding the exact times and locations

of these meetings will be announced on the project website and through local and regional media. The meetings will also be announced through email notification, press release, and social media to individuals and organizations.

If you wish to comment on the purpose, need, preliminary alternatives, additional alternatives, or on any other issues associated with development of the framework and EIS, you may submit your comments by any one of several methods. The preferred method for commenting is online at <https://parkplanning.nps.gov/CAHASediment>. You may mail or hand deliver comments to the Superintendent, Cape Hatteras National Seashore, 1401 National Park Drive, Manteo, North Carolina, 27954. Written comments will also be accepted at the public open houses. Comments will not be accepted by fax, email, or by any method other than those specified above. Bulk comments in any format (hard copy or electronic) submitted on behalf of others will not be accepted.

*Public Availability of Comments*—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 1501.7.

**Robert A. Vogel,**

*Regional Director, Interior Region 2, South Atlantic-Gulf.*

[FR Doc. 2020–07426 Filed 4–9–20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312–52–P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1140]

**Certain Multi-Stage Fuel Vapor Canister Systems and Activated Carbon Components Thereof; Commission Determination To Review in Part, Take No Position on the Issues Under Review, and Affirm in Part a Final Initial Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337; Termination of Investigation**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade

Commission (“Commission”) has determined to review in part the final initial determination (“ID”) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) on January 28, 2020, finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“section 337”), in connection with the asserted patent. The Commission has determined to take no position on the issues under review. The Commission has also determined to affirm the ID’s findings that the asserted patent claims are invalid. This investigation is terminated with a finding of no violation of section 337.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ron Traud, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–3427. 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 December 14, 2018, based on a complaint filed by Ingevity Corp. and Ingevity South Carolina, LLC, both of North Charleston, South Carolina (together, “Ingevity”). 83 FR 64356. The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain multi-stage fuel vapor canister systems and activated carbon components thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. RE38,844 (“the ‘844 patent”). *Id.* The Commission’s notice of investigation named as respondents MAHLE Filter Systems North America, Inc. of Murfreesboro, Tennessee; MAHLE Filter Systems Japan Corp. of Saitama, Japan; MAHLE Sistemas de Filtracion de Mexico de C.V. of Monterrey, Mexico; MAHLE Filter Systems Canada, ULC of Tilbury, Canada (altogether, “MAHLE”); Kuraray Co., Ltd. of Tokyo, Japan (“Kuraray”); Kuraray America, Inc. of Houston, Texas; and Nagamine Manufacture Co., Ltd. of Manno, Japan (“Nagamine”). *Id.* The Commission subsequently amended the complaint and notice of investigation to add Calgon Carbon

Corporation (“Calgon”) as a respondent and to remove Kuraray America, Inc. as a respondent. 84 FR 11555 (Mar. 27, 2019). The remaining respondents are collectively referred to herein as “Respondents.” The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not participating in this investigation. 83 FR 64356.

On January 28, 2020, the ALJ issued the final ID, which finds that Respondents did not violate section 337. More particularly, the final ID found, *inter alia*: (1) Ingevity, its customers, and operators of the domestic industry articles have been shown to practice the asserted claims of the ‘844 patent; (2) the domestic industry requirement is satisfied with respect to the ‘844 patent; (3) Respondent MAHLE directly and/or indirectly infringes the asserted claims of the ‘844 patent; (4) Respondents Kuraray and Nagamine indirectly infringe the asserted claims; (5) the asserted claims of the ‘844 patent have been shown to be invalid under 35 U.S.C. 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. 103 over the Delphi prior invention, or the combination of the Delphi prior invention with other references; (6) the asserted claims of the ‘844 patent have been shown to be invalid under 35 U.S.C. 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. 103 over Meiller and/or Park and other references; (7) independent claim 18 of the ‘844 patent, and those depending therefrom, have been shown to be invalid under 35 U.S.C. 112 for indefiniteness, but independent claims 1, 31, and 43, and those depending therefrom, have not been shown to be invalid under 35 U.S.C. 112 for indefiniteness; and (8) patent exhaustion does not bar Ingevity’s sought relief.

On February 10, 2020, the private parties filed petitions for review of the final ID, and on February 18, 2020, the private parties filed responses.

Having examined the record in this investigation, including the final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review the final ID in part. In particular, the Commission has determined to review the following issues:

(1) Whether the asserted claims are invalid under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Meiller and/or Park and other references.

(2) Whether the asserted claims are invalid under 35 U.S.C. 112 for indefiniteness related to the claim terms identified by the parties as the Volume Terms, including the final ID’s discussion of the scope of the Volume Terms.

(3) Whether the accused products infringe the asserted claims of the ‘844

patent, and whether Respondents indirectly infringe the asserted claims of the ‘844 patent.

(4) Whether Ingevity’s sale of its HCA carbons to MAHLE that are later incorporated into a subset of Accused Canisters that also contain BAX carbons exhausts Ingevity’s patent rights as to those Accused Canisters.

(5) Whether Ingevity satisfied the domestic industry requirement of section 337.

(6) Whether Ingevity demonstrated satisfaction of the importation requirement of section 337, as set forth in the final ID beginning on page 34 through the carryover paragraph on page 35.

(7) Whether Ingevity illegally tied the sales of its products to allowing its customers to practice the ‘844 patent.

The Commission has determined to not review the remainder of the final ID.

The Commission has determined to take no position on the issues under review. Accordingly, this investigation is terminated with a finding of no violation of section 337 based on the unreviewed findings of the final ID that the asserted claims have been shown to be invalid under 35 U.S.C. 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. 103 over the Delphi prior invention, or the combination of the Delphi prior invention with other references. This 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 part 210).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 7, 2020.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2020–07589 Filed 4–9–20; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

### Notice of Amended Receipt of Complaint; Solicitation of Comments Relating to the Public Interest

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has received an amended complaint entitled *Certain Spa Pumps, Jet Pump Housings, Pedicure Spas, Components Thereof, and Products Containing the Same, DN 3432*; the