

- Bureau of Reclamation, Tucson Field Office, 4257 W. Ina Road, Suite 101, Tucson, AZ 85742; telephone (520) 744-5180

**Libraries:** Copies of the FEIS are also available for inspection at the following libraries: County Courthouse Law Library, University of Arizona Main Library, City Hall Annex Library, and the City Hall Government Reference Library (9th Floor), in Tucson, AZ; Arizona State University Hayden Library, (Arizona Collection), in Tempe, AZ; and the Phoenix (Burton Barr) Public Library in Phoenix, AZ.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Mike Pryor, TASRI Project Manager, PXAO-2500, or Ms. Sandra Eto, NEPA Compliance Specialist, PXAO-1500, Reclamation, PO Box 81169, Phoenix AZ 85069-1169; telephone (602) 216-3931, or 216-3857, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The CAP, authorized as part of the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968, is a multipurpose water project which develops water for municipal and industrial use, as well as for Indian uses and non-Indian agricultural uses in central and southern Arizona. Because of Tucson's greater exposure to water service interruptions, the TASRI was initiated in 1986 to study alternatives that would provide as "reasonably reliable" a supply of CAP water to the Tucson area as is available to Phoenix area cities. The FEIS analyzes the environmental consequences of the construction and operation of a 15,000 acre-foot surface storage reservoir (the Agency proposed action), two additional alternatives, and a no Federal action alternative. The FEIS describes environmental consequences to the following resources: Biological, cultural, geologic, air, water, land, recreational, socio-economic, and Indian trust assets. Construction and operation of a surface storage reservoir would provide opportunities for incorporating recreational facilities. A local sponsor(s) would need to agree to be responsible for at least 50 percent of the capital costs to construct the recreational developments, as well as accept responsibility for recreation-related operating and maintenance costs. Reclamation estimates 214 Pima pineapple cacti would be impacted from the proposed action. The Pima pineapple cactus is a federally endangered plant that occurs on the proposed surface storage reservoir site. Fish and Wildlife Service's Biological Opinion for this project indicates implementation of a Reasonable and Prudent Alternative (RPA) will avoid jeopardizing the continued existence of

the Pima pineapple cactus. One of the RPA actions directs Reclamation to establish a refugium for the Pima pineapple cactus that is of similar acreage, cactus population, and of similar or better habitat of the project area, if this proposed action is implemented. Recreational development within the project area is not precluded by the Opinion.

The draft EIS was issued April 18, 1995. Responses to comments received from interested organizations and individuals, both in writing and during two public hearings held in June 1995, are addressed in the FEIS.

Reclamation's development and evaluation of the alternatives described in the FEIS, and selection of the proposed action, were based upon the assumption that the great majority of CAP water allocated to the Tucson metropolitan area would be treated at Tucson Water's Hayden-Udall Water Treatment Plant and delivered for direct use through Tucson Water's delivery system. Many changes have occurred, since the draft EIS was issued for public review and comment in April 1995, related to water management in the Tucson area. Consequently, assumptions that were used in developing and sizing the systems considered under the action alternatives discussed in the FEIS may no longer be valid. In light of the uncertainty regarding future use of CAP water in the region, Reclamation does not intend to issue a Record of Decision in the immediate future regarding implementation of the project. However, the fiscal year 1997 Appropriations Act specifically directed Reclamation to finalize the EIS; therefore, this FEIS is being filed with the Environmental Protection Agency.

Dated: April 10, 1998.

**Robert W. Johnson,**

*Regional Director.*

[FR Doc. 98-9943 Filed 4-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-94-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-383 Sanctions Proceeding]

### Certain Hardware Logic Emulation Systems and Components Thereof; Order No. 100: Setting Procedural Schedule

This sanctions proceeding was instituted, and an Order issued on March 6, 1998. The notice of institution was published in the **Federal Register** on March 12, 1998 (63 FR 12113-4).

Order No. 99, which issued on March 10, ordered each of the parties, no later than March 17, to state its positions on certain points. A telephone conference initiated by the administrative law judge was held on March 17. The reasons for the conference were telephone calls to the attorney-adviser on March 13 from complainant's counsel and on March 16, from counsel for certain respondents and from the staff, requesting that the due date of March 17 be deferred until April 3 (Tr. at 18). During the telephone conference counsel for complainant proposed reply briefs be filed on April 10. Counsel for certain respondents and the staff had no objection to that proposal (Tr. at 37, 38). The administrative law judge thereafter set March 27 for submissions, pursuant to Order No. 99 and April 3 for the filing of reply submissions, by *all* parties named in the Order of March 6 (Tr. at 46, 47). Also the staff was required to report to the administrative law judge on March 27 with respect to any negotiations on settlement (Tr. at 47).

On March 27 responses to Order No. 99 were received from complainant and the staff. Also a response was received from respondents Mentor Graphics Corporation and Meta Systems and certain of their present and former counsel (Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison LLP, Robert DeBerardine, and William Anthony) (Mentor). On April 3, replies were received from complainant and Mentor.

Complainant, in its response, represented that complainant, the staff, respondents Mentor Graphics Corporation and Meta Systems, and the law firm of Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison, LLP (Brobeck law firm) and its individual member parties have not been able to reach agreement on the precise dollar amount of sanctions to be awarded for any or all portions of Order No. 96 in issue and that while the staff has suggested a procedure to follow to arrive at an agreed amount for sanctions among all parties to this proceeding, and the parties are pursuing such procedure to see if agreement is possible, whether agreement will be reached as a result of this procedure will probably not be known until the latter part of April 1998. It was represented that with respect to the issue of making an adequate record for the determination of the sanction amount, complainant does not request nor believe any formal discovery is necessary, not is any evidentiary hearing believed necessary or requested because complainant intends to submit detailed affidavits in support of requested sanctions award. Complainant proposed that by April 17, 1998, it and

the staff each provide a submission, with appropriate affidavits, setting forth their respective costs, including attorneys fees (hours, tasks, rates), incurred (1) to establish conclusively the inaccuracy of Reblewski Exhibit A after Respondents' Supplemental Response to Interrogatories 77 and 79, dated October 22, 1996, (2) for complainant's attempts to read the database tape produced pursuant to Order No. 7, and (3) for filing and pursuing Motion No. 383-117 and such other relief permitted under that portion of Order No. 96 granting Motion No. 383-117. Complainant further proposed that respondents and the Brobeck law firm and its individual member parties be directed to respond by May 15, 1998, to complainant's and the staff's submissions, raising any and all objections to the dollar amounts asserted, including objections to the relationship of the costs asserted by complainant and the staff to the Commission's monetary sanctions award. It also proposed that complainant and the staff then be permitted to file a rebuttal submissions by May 26, 1998, and that respondents and the Brobeck law firm and its individual member parties be permitted to file a sur-rebuttal submission by June 5. It further proposed a one-day oral argument for June 18, 1998, if deemed necessary by the administrative law judge, after his review of the submissions.

Mentor, in its response, represented that because complainant has yet to provide Mentor with the dollar amount of sanctions sought or the basis for the amount sought, Mentor is not currently able to answer the question posed by the administrative law judge in Order No. 99 regarding whether any or all of the sanctions awarded can be agreed upon without the need for further proceeding and that Mentor is awaiting the information from complainant so that the parties can conduct meaningful discussions on this issue. Mentor also proposed that complainant be required to submit briefing setting out the amount of sanctions demanded and justification for that demand, including full disclosure of supporting documentation such as attorney time records and backup documentation; that then Mentor assess whether further discovery is needed to probe whether the amount demanded was "actually caused by" and "specifically related to expenses incurred by" the alleged conduct; that if Mentor determined that additional discovery is necessary, it will then serve document requests and deposition notices on Quickturn, and

after this discovery, Mentor and the staff will submit their briefs in response to complainant's original briefing; and that if disputed issues of fact remain, an evidentiary hearing should be held.

The staff, in its response, waived any claims for monetary sanctions. The staff argued that the Commission's March 6, 1998 Order requires the administrative law judge to identify specifically by name those counsel who are liable for payment of monetary sanctions, but that it does not obligate the administrative law judge to determine any allocation of monetary sanction liability among counsel and their clients. Accordingly, it argued that respondents' counsel should be able to "stipulate" the identification of counsel to be held liable for payment of any monetary sanctions, and recommended that respondents' counsel be ordered to state no later than April 17, 1998 whether they will submit such a stipulation. The staff argued that while all parties are entitled to due process in this proceeding, it is presently unaware of any automatic entitlement to formal discovery or a live evidentiary hearing on the issues and argued that discovery, a hearing, and an opportunity to submit proposed briefs and proposed findings of fact would be appropriate only if the substantive issues are not resolved by stipulation. The staff represented that it will only seek such procedures if the administrative law judge grants the private litigants those opportunities. The staff further argued that the private parties should be able to provide a submission to the administrative law judge on April 17, 1998 indicating whether the dollar value of the sanctions has been resolved by agreement.

Based on the submissions of the parties:

1. Mentor is ordered no later than April 15, 1998 to identify counsel it believes should be held liable for any payment of monetary sanctions;

2. Complainant is ordered to file no later than April 17, 1998 sufficiently *detailed* affidavits, including any documentation and explanation in any supporting memorandum with authority, to enable this administrative law judge to consider all the factors necessary in setting the precise dollar amount of sanctions to be awarded pursuant to those portions of Order No. 96 adopted by the Commission and shall specifically identify those counsel it believes are liable for payment of the sanctions to be awarded;

3. Each of complainant and respondents, identified by the Commission in its March 6 Order, should provide to the administrative

law judge no later than May 5, 1998 a statement whether the dollar value of any sanctions imposed by the Commission had been resolved by agreement;

4. Each of respondents, identified by the Commission in its March 6 Order, and the staff is ordered no later than Tuesday May 12, 1998 to respond to complainant's filing, referred to in 1 *supra*, raising any and all objections to the dollar amounts, including objection to the relationship of the costs asserted by complainant to the Commission's monetary sanctions award. Also they should file then supporting memoranda and authorities;

5. Complainant is ordered no later than May 22, 1998 to file a rebuttal submission; and

6. Each of respondents, identified by the Commission in its March 6, Order, and the staff is ordered to file a sur-rebuttal by Friday May 29.

At this time no further proceedings, in this sanctions proceeding, will be ordered. The parties will be notified, at a later date, on whether the administrative law judge will provide the parties with an opportunity for any additional proceedings.

On April 7, 1998, each of complainant, Mentor and the staff was notified about the issuance of this order. Also this order is being published in the **Federal Register** for notification of any other respondents.

Issued: April 7, 1998.

**Paul J. Luckern,**

*Administrative Law Judge.*

[FR Doc. 98-9949 Filed 4-14-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 731-TA-761 and 762 (Final)]

### Static Random Access Memory Semiconductors from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan

#### Determinations

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission determines, pursuant to section 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)) (the Act), that an industry in the United States is not materially injured or threatened with material injury, and the establishment of an industry in the United States is not

<sup>1</sup> The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).