

collection approved under OMB Control Number 1024-0216.

DATES: Public comments on this Information Collection Request (ICR) will be accepted on or before December 29, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Please send your comments and suggestions on this ICR to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior at OMB-OIRA at (202) 395-5806 (fax) or OIRA_DOCKET@OMB.eop.gov (e-mail). Please also send a copy of your comments on the ICR to Dr. Bruce Peacock, NPS Social Science Division, 1201 Oakridge Drive, Fort Collins, CO 80525; or at Bruce_Peacock@nps.gov (e-mail).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Hoyer-Russell, Park Studies Unit, College of Natural Resources, University of Idaho, P.O. Box 441139, Moscow, ID 83844-1139; *Phone:* (208) 885-4806; *Fax:* (208) 885-4216; jhoyer@uidaho.edu (e-mail).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The National Park Service Act of 1916, 38 Stat 535, 16 U.S.C. 1, *et seq.*, requires that the NPS preserve national parks for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. At the field level, this means resource preservation, public education, facility maintenance and operation, and physical developments as are necessary for public use, health, and safety. Other Federal mandates (National Environmental Policy Act and NPS Management Policies) require visitor use data in the impact assessment of development on users and resources as part of each park's general management plan. The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 (Pub. L. 103-62) requires that the NPS develop goals to improve program effectiveness and public accountability and to measure performance related to these goals. The Visitor Survey Card (VSC) project measures performance toward those goals through a short visitor survey card. The project is an element of the NPS Strategic Plan and the Department of the Interior (DOI) Strategic Plan.

The NPS has used the VSC to conduct surveys at approximately 330 National Park Service units annually since 1998. The purpose of the VSC is to measure visitors' opinions about park facilities, services, and recreational opportunities in each park unit and System-wide. This effort is required by GPRA and other NPS and DOI strategic planning efforts. Data from the proposed survey is

needed to assess performance regarding NPS GPRA goals IIa1A and IIb1.

In addition, the survey collects data to support the DOI Strategic Plan goal on visitor satisfaction with the value for entrance fees paid to access public lands managed by the DOI. NPS performance on all goals measured in this study will contribute to DOI Department-wide performance reports. Results of the VSC will also be used by park managers to improve visitor services at the approximately 330 units of the National Park System where the survey is administered.

The VSC is a component of the Visitor Services Project, which is funded by the NPS through a cooperative agreement with the Park Studies Unit at the University of Idaho, and has been in use since 1998.

II. Data

OMB Number: 1024-0216.

Title: National Park Service Visitor Survey Card.

Type of Request: This is a renewal of a currently approved collection.

Respondent Obligation: Voluntary.

Frequency of Collection: One-time per respondent.

Description of respondents: Visitors to approximately 330 NPS units.

Estimated average number of respondents: 132,000 visitors who accept the survey card (92,400 non-respondents and 39,600 respondents) and 1,188 visitors who refuse to take the survey card but are willing to answer the two demographic questions and the overall satisfaction question.

Estimated average burden hours per response: 1 minute for non-respondents, 3 minutes for respondents, and 2 minutes for visitors who refuse to take the survey card but are willing to answer the two demographic questions and the overall satisfaction question.

Estimated annual reporting burden: 3,540 hours.

III. Request for Comments

We are inviting comments concerning this ICR on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the agency to perform its duties, including whether the information is useful; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of

public record. Before including your 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.

Dated: November 23, 2010.

Robert Gordon,

*Information Collection Clearance Officer,
National Park Service.*

[FR Doc. 2010-29974 Filed 11-26-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-52-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-687]

Certain Video Displays, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Determination to Review a Final Initial Determination in Part and Set a Schedule for Filing Written Submissions on the Issues Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review in part the final initial determination ("ID") issued by the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") on September 17, 2010, in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Liberman, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3116. 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: This investigation was instituted on September 16, 2009, based on a complaint filed by LG Electronics, Inc. ("LG"), alleging a violation of section 337 in the importation, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain video displays, components thereof, or products containing same that infringe one or more of claims 24 and 25 of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,096; claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 5,537,612; claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,459,522; claims 1-5 and 7-16 of U.S. Patent No. 7,154,564. 74 FR 47616 (2009) Complainant named Funai Electric Company, Ltd. of Osaka, Japan, Funai Corporation, Inc. of Rutherford, New Jersey, P&F USA, Inc. of Alpharetta, Georgia (collectively, "Funai"), and Vizio, Inc. of Irvine, California ("Vizio") as respondents. On January 8, 2010, the presiding ALJ issued an ID granting Complainant's motion for leave to file a second amended complaint and amend the Notice of Investigation to, *inter alia*, add AmTran Technology Co. Ltd. and AmTran Logistics, Inc. as respondents to the investigation. Order No. 12 (unreviewed by the Commission). Subsequently, respondents Funai Electric Company, Ltd., Funai Corporation, Inc., and P&F USA, Inc. were terminated from the investigation based on a settlement agreement.

The evidentiary hearing on violation of Section 337 was held from June 9, 2010 through June 21, 2010. On September 17, 2010, the ALJ issued his final ID finding a violation of section 337. All the parties to the investigation, including the Commission investigative attorney (IA), filed timely petitions for review of various portions of the final ID, as well as timely responses to the petitions.

Having examined the record in this investigation, including the ALJ's final ID, the petitions for review, and the responses thereto, the Commission has determined to review the ID in part. In particular, the Commission has determined to review: (1) The ID's finding that dependent claims 4, 6, and 7 of the '612 patent are not invalid as anticipated or obvious; (2) the ID's findings and conclusions with respect to independent claim 5 of the '564 patent. The Commission has determined not to review the remainder of the final ID.

On review, the Commission requests briefing on the above-listed issues based on the evidentiary record. The

Commission is particularly interested in responses to the following questions:

(1) With respect to the '612 patent: (a) Does the record evidence show, clearly and convincingly, that claim 4 is anticipated by: (i) The CableData HTU device (RPX-4); (ii) U.S. Patent No. 4,896,354 ("the '354 patent"); and (iii) U.S. Patent No. 4,930,160 ("the '160 patent")?

(b) Does the record evidence show, clearly and convincingly, that claim 4 is obvious in view of any of the above prior art references alleged to anticipate claim 4?

(c) Does the record evidence show, clearly and convincingly, that claim 6 is anticipated by: (i) the '160 patent; (ii) U.S. Patent No. 4,510,623 ("the '623 patent"); (iii) U.S. Patent No. 5,033,085 ("the '085 patent"); and (iv) the '354 patent?

(d) Does the record evidence show, clearly and convincingly, that claim 6 is obvious in view of any of the above prior art references alleged to anticipate claim 6?

(e) Does the record evidence show, clearly and convincingly, that claim 7 is anticipated by: (i) The '160 patent; (ii) the '623 patent; (iii) the '085 patent; and (iv) the '354 patent?

(f) Does the record evidence show, clearly and convincingly, that claim 7 is obvious in view of any of the above prior art references alleged to anticipate claim 7?

(2) With respect to the '564 patent:

(a) Does the record evidence show that claim 5 is infringed?

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the Commission may (1) issue an order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States, and/or (2) issue one or more cease and desist orders that could result in the respondent being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or are likely to do so. For background, see *In the Matter of Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843 (Dec. 1994) (Commission Opinion).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the

effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or cease and desist orders would have on (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade Representative, as delegated by the President, has 60 days to approve or disapprove the Commission's action. See Presidential Memorandum of July 21, 2005. 70 FR 43251 (July 26, 2005). During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed.

Written Submissions: The parties to the investigation are requested to file written submissions on the issues under review. The submissions should be concise and thoroughly referenced to the record in this investigation. Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the recommended determination by the ALJ on remedy and bonding. Complainant and the Commission investigative attorney are also requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. Complainant is further requested to provide the expiration date of the involved patents and state the HTSUS numbers under which the accused articles are imported. The written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than the close of business on December 3, 2010. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on December 10, 2010. No further submissions on these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document and 12 true copies thereof on or before the deadlines stated above with the Office of the Secretary. Any person desiring to submit a document (or portion thereof) to the Commission in confidence must

request confidential treatment unless the information has already been granted such treatment during the proceedings. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary of the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See section 201.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

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 sections 210.42-46 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42-46).

Issued: November 19, 2010.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010-29911 Filed 11-26-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-690]

Certain Printing and Imaging Devices and Components Thereof; Notice of Commission Determination To Review-in-Part a Final Determination Finding a Violation of Section 337; Schedule for Filing Written Submissions on the Issues Under Review and on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review a portion of the final initial determination ("ID") issued by the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") on September 23, 2010 finding a violation of section 337 and to request briefing on the issues under review and on remedy, the public interest, and bonding.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel E. Valencia, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-1999. 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 October 26, 2009, based on a complaint filed by Ricoh Company, Ltd. of Tokyo, Japan; Ricoh Americas Corporation of West Caldwell, New Jersey; and Ricoh Electronics, Inc. of Tustin, California (collectively "Ricoch"). 74 FR 55065 (Oct. 26, 2009). The complaint alleged, *inter alia*, 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 printing and imaging devices and components thereof by reason of infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,209,048 ("the '048 patent"); 6,212,343 ("the '343 patent"); 6,388,771 ("the '771 patent"); 5,764,866 ("the '866 patent"); and 5,863,690 ("the '690 patent"). The complaint named Oki Data Corporation of Tokyo, Japan and Oki Data Americas, Inc. of Mount Laurel, New Jersey (collectively "Oki") as respondents.

On September 23, 2010, the ALJ issued his final ID finding that Oki violated section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain printing and imaging devices and components thereof by reason of infringement of several claims in the '690 patent. The ALJ found that Oki has not violated section 337 with respect to the '048, '343, '771, and '866 patents. Along with the ID, the ALJ issued a recommended determination on remedy and bonding ("RD"). Complainant Ricoh, respondent Oki, and the Commission investigative attorney ("IA") filed petitions for review of the ID on October 6, 2010. Ricoh, Oki, and the IA each filed responses to the petitions for review on October 14, 2010.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the ALJ's 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 all findings and

conclusions relating to whether a violation of section 337 has occurred with respect to the '343 and '690 patents.

The parties are requested to brief their positions on the issues under review with reference to the applicable law and the evidentiary record. In connection with its review, the Commission is particularly interested in responses to the following questions:

The '343 Patent

(1) The Commission has determined to review all findings relating to the limitation "a direction orthogonal to a longitudinal direction of the developing roller," as recited in the asserted claims of the '343 patent.

(a) Please state your position on the meaning of "a longitudinal direction of the developing roller," as recited in the asserted claims. How does your position differ from the ALJ's construction?

(b) Specifically, does "a longitudinal direction" include any line extending parallel to the central axis of the roller? Or, does this refer to the central axis itself?

(c) Please state your position on the meaning of "a direction orthogonal to a longitudinal direction of the developing roller." Please take into account that the planar blade is bent along its entire width, and do not confine your analysis to two-dimensional cross-sections.

(d) Assuming "a longitudinal direction" can include any line extending parallel to the central axis of the roller, can "a direction orthogonal" refer to a direction that is not perpendicular to the surface of the roller, *i.e.*, a tangent extending through the surface of the roller?

(e) Given the planar shape of the blade contacts the roller in three dimensions along the entire width of the blade, and is bent along the entire width of the blade, is there any bend that would not meet the "direction orthogonal" limitation?

(f) How does your answer to (d) comport with the preferred embodiment of the '343 patent shown in Figures 8A and 8B? Is the blade 17 shown in Figures 8A and 8B bent in "a direction orthogonal to a longitudinal direction of the developing roller?"

(g) How do your answers to (a) through (e) affect the ALJ's findings regarding infringement, validity, and domestic industry?

(2) The Commission has determined to review the ALJ's construction of "a lower edge," as recited in the asserted claims of the '343 patent. The asserted claims of the '343 patent recite, among other things: