

on private lands and Bureau of Land Management lands leased to the City of Santa Fe. The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management are joint lead agencies for this project; the Department of Interior Bureau of Reclamation (contributing funds), City of Santa Fe, and Santa Fe County are cooperating agencies. The City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, and Las Companas Limited Partnership are the "Project Applicants." The proposed Buckman Water Diversion Project is designed to address the immediate need for a sustainable means of accessing water supplies for the Project Applicants. Most of the water would be derived from the San Juan-Chama Project, a U.S. Bureau of Reclamation inter-basin transfer project. The remainder would be "native" water rights owned by the Project Applicants, and diverted from the Rio Grande. The Project Applicants propose to construct and operate a surface water diversion facility at the Rio Grande near the western terminus of Buckman Road located within the Santa Fe National Forest, near the existing Buckman Well Field. The water would be pumped to the Santa Fe vicinity, where it would serve municipal and community water supply customers. The Buckman Water Diversion is proposed to be constructed with the capacity necessary to meet the near-term need for water, based on physical, technical, and environmental limitations. The proposed project has an independent use from the long-term water management strategy being undertaken by the City and the County.

On July 22, 2002, the BLM and Forest Service published a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS for the Buckman Water Diversion Project in the **Federal Register**. Scoping meetings were held in August and September 2002. Issues and concerns identified during scoping and throughout the NEPA process were addressed in the Draft EIS. On December 17, 2004, the BLM and Forest Service published the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS for this project in the **Federal Register**. The 60-day comment period ended on February 14, 2005. Thirteen (13) comments were received from individuals, organizations, and agencies. Specific comment responses are provided in the FEIS, and issues and concerns raised during the review and prior to completion of the FEIS are addressed in the FEIS.

The Buckman Water Diversion Project FEIS provides detailed analyses of the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action, and several alternatives. The No Action Alternative would result in the agencies not authorizing permits for the

construction and operation of a water diversion and associated infrastructure. The Proposed Action includes a diversion structure at the Rio Grande; water transmission facilities, including pumps and booster station buildings, water tanks, settling ponds and pipes; water treatment facilities; electric power improvements; and road improvements necessary to build and operate the facilities. While analyzing the Proposed Action, it was determined that there were alternatives for different infrastructure, and the effects of these alternatives were analyzed for possible inclusion in a composite preferred alternative. Therefore, three sediment facility alternatives, two raw water pipeline alternatives, three treated water pipeline alternatives, and two power upgrade alternatives were analyzed in detail. The FEIS discloses details of these infrastructural alternatives and the environmental consequences of implementing them.

The BLM's and Forest Service's Preferred Alternative is to authorize rights-of-way and easements to the Applicants so that they may construct, operate, and maintain the road improvements and major facilities and their locations as described in the Proposed Action, plus one of the alternatives for each of the following: the sediment facility, the raw water pipeline, the treated water pipeline, and the power upgrade facility. The Preferred Alternative also includes mitigation and monitoring requirements to protect resources. The Preferred Alternative will avoid disturbance to the historic Buckman town site, minimize visual impacts on viewers from White Rock Overlook and along Buckman Road, and avoid creating new utility corridors. The alternatives, including the agencies' Preferred Alternative, conform to existing laws and regulations, and provide for resource protection.

In compliance with Section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act, as amended, the FEIS includes a biological assessment for the purpose of identifying endangered or threatened species, which may be affected by the Preferred Alternative. A Biological Opinion is forthcoming and will be included in the formulation of the final decision.

Dated: March 12, 2007.

**Sam Des Georges,**

*BLM-Taos Field Office Manager.*

**Daniel J. Jiron,**

*Santa Fe National Forest, Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 07-2303 Filed 5-9-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-FB-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[AZ-910-0777-XP-241A]

### State of Arizona Resource Advisory Council Meeting

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

**ACTION:** Arizona Resource Advisory Council Meeting notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Arizona Resource Advisory Council (RAC), will meet on June 8, 2007, in Phoenix, Arizona, at the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) National Training Center located at 9828 North 31st Avenue in Phoenix from 8 a.m. and conclude at 4:30 p.m. Morning agenda items include: Review of the March 8, 2007, Meeting Minutes for RAC and RRAC business; BLM State Director's Update on Statewide Issues; Presentations on Proposed Tri-State Shooting Range and Arizona Water Rights; RAC Questions on BLM Field Managers Rangeland Resource Team Proposals; and, Reports by RAC Working Groups. A public comment period will be provided at 11:30 a.m. on June 8, 2007, for any interested publics who wish to address the Council on BLM programs and business.

Under the Federal Recreation Enhancement Act, the RAC has been designated the Recreation Resource Advisory Council (RRAC), and has the authority to review all BLM and Forest Service (FS) recreation fee proposals in Arizona. The afternoon meeting agenda on June 8, will include discussion and review of the Recreation Enhancement Act (REA) Working Group Report, updated 4th Quarter Schedule of Fiscal Year 2007 BLM and FS recreation fee proposals, and two FS fee proposals in Arizona:

(1) Alto Pit OHV Use Area (Prescott National Forest): Ten minutes from downtown Prescott, and 2 hours from Phoenix and Flagstaff, this fee proposal would add a campground fee at a rate of \$10 per night per campsite for single sites and \$20 per night for a double site. Improvements include 10 single family sites and one double family site, three toilets, picnic tables, fire rings, loading and unloading area, 9 miles of internal designated trail system, additional external connection trails, 20 acres of designated cross county area, children's OHV play area, and year-round on site host.

(2) Haigler Canyon Campground and Day Use Area (Tonto National Forest): Proposed \$6 per vehicle fee for overnight camping and day-use at Haigler Canyon Recreation Site near Young, Arizona. Major improvements will increase facilities and services available to the public. Fee revenues will be used for the continued operation and maintenance. A quality, water-based recreational experience will be provided for day-users, campers, hikers, and anglers. The site will include developed campsites and day-use areas plus space for campground hosts. Fourteen campsites will be provided with a picnic table, fire ring with cooking surface, and a tent pad. Campsites will offer hardened sites for tent trailers and tents. Walk-in campsites will be part of developed campsites. Day-use facilities will provide parking for 10–15 vehicles, picnic tables, and barbecue grills.

Following the FS and BLM proposals, the RRAC will open the meeting to public comments on the fee proposals. After completing their RRAC business, the BLM RAC will reconvene to provide recommendations to the RAC. Designated Federal Official on the fee proposals and discuss future RAC meetings and locations.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* May 8, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Deborah Stevens, Bureau of Land Management, Arizona State Office, One North Central Avenue, Suite 800, Phoenix, Arizona 85004–4427, 602–417–9215.

**Michael Taylor,**

*Acting State Director.*

[FR Doc. 07–2316 Filed 5–9–07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE** 4310–32–M

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–604]

### In the Matter of Certain Sucralose, Sweeteners Containing Sucralose, and Related Intermediate Compounds Thereof; Notice of Investigation

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

**ACTION:** Institution of investigation pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1337.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on April 6, 2007, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Tate & Lyle Technology Limited of London, United

Kingdom and Tate & Lyle Sucralose, Inc. of Decatur, Illinois. Supplemental letters were filed on April 13, April 18, April 23, and April 25, 2007. The complaint, as supplemented, alleges 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 sucralose, sweeteners containing sucralose, and related intermediate compounds thereof by reason of infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,470,969, 5,034,551, 4,980,463, 5,498,709, and 7,049,435. The complaint, as supplemented, further alleges that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

The complainants request that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue a general exclusion order and permanent cease and desist orders.

**ADDRESSES:** The complaint and supplement, except for any confidential information contained therein, are 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., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 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://www.usitc.gov/secretary/edis.htm>.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Anne M. Goalwin, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205–2574.

**Authority:** The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2006).

**Scope of Investigation:** Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on May 7, 2007, *ordered that—*

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as

amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain sucralose, sweeteners containing sucralose, and related intermediate compounds thereof by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 20–26, 28, and 29 of U.S. Patent No. 5,470,969; claims 1–4 and 11–22 of U.S. Patent No. 5,034,551; claims 1–3 and 16–18 of U.S. Patent No. 4,980,463; claims 8, 9, and 13 of U.S. Patent No. 5,498,709; and claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,049,435; and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainants are—Tate & Lyle Technology Limited, Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, London EC3R 6DQ, United Kingdom.

Tate & Lyle Sucralose, Inc., 2200 East Eldorado Street, Decatur, IL 62525.

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint, as supplemented, is to be served:

AIDP, Inc., 17920 East Ajax Circle, City of Industry, California 91748.

Beijing Forbest Chemical Co., Ltd, Room 2 1801, Building 2, Yard 3, District 1, Fangqunyan, Fangzhuang, Fengtai District, Beijing 100078, People's Republic of China.

Beijing Forbest Trade Co., Ltd., Room 2 1801, Building 2, Yard 3, District 1, Fangqunyan, Fangzhuang, Fengtai District, Beijing 100078, People's Republic of China.

Forbest International USA, LLC, 131 Fieldcrest Avenue, Suite B, Edison, New Jersey 08873.

Changzhou Niutang Chemical Plant Co., Ltd., No. 51 Yanzhang Road, Niutang Town, Changzhong, Jiangsu 213263, People's Republic of China.

U.S. Niutang Chemical, Inc., 2913 Saturn Street, Unit G, Brea, California 92821.

CJ America, Inc., 3470 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 930, Los Angeles, California 90010.

Fortune Bridge Co. Inc., 137 Meacham Ave, Elmont, New York 11003.

Garuda International, Inc., 638 Industrial Drive, Exeter, California 93221.

Gremount International Co., Ltd., Rm. 2107, Plaza A, Freetown Center, No.