

goals of the area and the purpose of the fee program. The plan provides management direction for public enjoyment of these public lands through the recreational experience of floating the river, while minimizing the potential for resource damage from authorized uses. The plan also provides a market analysis of local and comparable recreational experiences and sets the basis for the fee proposal. The plan is online at: <http://www.blm.gov/or/resources/recreation/johnday/boat-fee.php>.

The plan addresses recreation opportunities, the issuance of SRPs, and the charging of fees on a per-person per day or a per-person per launch basis. The John Day River Study and the plan, prepared pursuant to the REA and BLM recreation fee program policy, also address the establishment of a permit process and the collection of user fees. The plan articulates the rationale for charging recreation fees. In accordance with the BLM recreation fee program policy, the plan explains the fee-collection process and outlines how the fees would be used on the John Day River. The fee rates that would be charged have not yet been established, pending the mandatory review and recommendations of the John Day-Snake River Resource Advisory Committee (John Day-Snake RAC). Future adjustments in the fee amount would be made in accordance with the plan and through consultation with the John Day-Snake RAC and the public prior to a fee increase. Fee amounts will be posted onsite and online at the John Day River Web site at: <http://www.blm.gov/or/resources/recreation/johnday/>. Copies of the plan will be available at the BLM Prineville District Office and online at the John Day River site.

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: 16 U.S.C. 6803(b) and 43 CFR 2932.13.

Carol Benkosky,
Prineville District Manager.

[FR Doc. 2013-17225 Filed 7-17-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-33-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-857]

Certain Reduced Folate Nutraceutical Products and L-Methylfolate Raw Ingredients Used Therein; Commission Determination Not To Review Initial Determinations Terminating the Investigation as to Certain Respondents and Terminating the Investigation in the Entirety

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review initial determinations (“IDs”) (Order Nos. 14–15) of the presiding administrative law judge terminating the investigation as to certain respondents on the basis of settlement agreements and withdrawal of the complaint, and terminating the investigation in the entirety. The investigation is hereby terminated.

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 October 16, 2012, based on a complaint filed on September 10, 2012, on behalf of South Alabama Medical Science Foundation of Mobile, Alabama (“SASF”); Merck & Cie of Altdorf, Switzerland (“Merck”); and PamLab LLC of Covington, Louisiana (“PamLab”). 77 FR 63336 (October 16, 2012). The complaint alleged violations of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the sale for importation, importation, or sale within

the United States after importation of certain reduced folate nutraceutical products and l-methylfolate raw ingredients used therein by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 37, 39, 40, 47, 66, 67, 73, 76, 78–81, 83, 84, 86–89, 91, 92, 94–97, 99, 100, 110, 111, 113, 117, and 121 of U.S. Patent No. 5,997,915; claims 22, 26, and 32–38 of U.S. Patent No. 6,673,381; claims 1, 4–6, and 15 of U.S. Patent No. 7,172,778; and claims 1–3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11–15, and 19–22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,040. The Commission’s notice of investigation named as respondents Gnosis SpA of Desio, Italy; Gnosis BioResearch SA of Sant’Antonino, Switzerland; Gnosis USA Inc. of Doylestown, Pennsylvania (collectively, “the Gnosis Respondents”); and Macoven Pharmaceuticals LLC of Magnolia, Texas (“Macoven”).

On December 13, 2012, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review an ID adding Viva Pharmaceuticals LLC as a new respondent. On February 4, 2013, the Commission issued notice of its determination not to review an ID to identify the new respondent as Viva Pharmaceuticals Inc. (“Viva”) rather than Viva Pharmaceuticals LLC.

On May 10, 2013, complainants SASF, Merck, and PamLab filed an unopposed corrected motion for leave to add Nestle Health Science-PamLab Inc. (“NHS-PamLab”) as a complainant and change PamLab’s name to Camline LLC (“Camline”). On June 11, 2013, the administrative law judge issued an ID (Order No. 12) granting the motion.

On June 4, 2013, complainants SASF, Merck, NHS-PamLab, and Camline and respondents Macoven and Viva filed an unopposed joint motion to terminate the investigation based on two settlement agreements (*i.e.*, one settlement agreement for each of these respondents). On June 11, 2013, the administrative law judge issued an ID (Order No. 14) granting the motion and found no indication that the settlement would have an adverse impact on the public interest.

Also on June 4, 2013, complainants SASF, Merck, NHS-PamLab and Camline filed a motion to withdraw its amended complaint against the Gnosis Respondents. On June 11, 2013, the administrative law judge issued an ID (Order No. 15) granting the motion, finding good cause shown.

There were no petitions for review. Having considered the IDs (Order Nos. 14–15) and the relevant portions of the record, the Commission has determined not to review the subject IDs. The investigation is hereby terminated.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and of Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR Part 210).

Issued: July 12, 2013.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2013-17175 Filed 7-17-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-855]

Certain Sintered Rare Earth Magnets, Methods of Making Same and Products Containing Same; Commission Determination Not to Review an Initial Determination Granting an Unopposed Motion by Complainants; Termination of the Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

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. 130) granting complainants' unopposed motion to terminate the investigation as to remaining respondents Beats Electronics, LLC of Santa Monica, California ("Beat"); Bosch Security Systems, Inc. of Burnsville, Minnesota ("Bosch"); and Callaway Golf Co. of Carlsbad, California ("Callaway") based upon withdrawal of the complaint, and terminating the investigation in its entirety.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Panyin A. Hughes, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3042. 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 21, 2012, based on a complaint filed by Hitachi Metals, Ltd. of Tokyo, Japan and Hitachi Metals North Carolina, Ltd. of China Grove, North Carolina (collectively, "Hitachi Metals"). 77 FR 58578 (Sept. 21, 2012). The complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 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 certain sintered rare earth magnets, methods of making same and products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of United States Patent Nos. 6,461,565; 6,491,765; 6,527,874; and 6,537,385. The notice of investigation named several entities as respondents but only Beat, Bosch, and Callaway remain in the investigation.

On June 4, 2013, Hitachi Metals filed an unopposed motion to terminate the investigation as to respondents Beat, Bosch, and Callaway. Because Beat, Bosch, and Callaway are the only remaining respondents in the investigation, Hitachi Metals also moved for termination of the investigation in its entirety. On June 5, 2013, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response in support of the motion. No other responses to the motion were filed.

On June 13, 2013, the ALJ issued the subject ID, granting the motion and terminating the investigation in its entirety. The ALJ found that the motion complied with the requirements of Commission Rule 210.21(a) (19 CFR 210.21(a)) and that no extraordinary circumstances prohibited granting the motion. None of the parties petitioned for review of the ID.

The Commission has determined not to review the ID.

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 section 210.42 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42).

Issued: July 12, 2013.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2013-17174 Filed 7-17-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[OMB Number 1105-0086]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Renewal of Previously Approved Collection; Comments Requested: Attorney Student Loan Repayment Program Electronic Forms

ACTION: 60-Day Notice.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Office of Attorney Recruitment and Management (OARM), will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for 60 days until September 16, 2013. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in the notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC, 20530.

Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to 202-395-7285. Comments may also be submitted to the Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Suite 1600, 601 D Street NW., Washington, DC 20530. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other