

minimize the burden on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Agencies must also estimate the non-hour cost burdens to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. Therefore, if you have costs to generate, maintain, and disclose this information, you should comment and provide your total capital and startup cost components or annual operation, maintenance, and purchase of service components. You should describe the methods you use to estimate major cost factors, including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, discount rate(s), and the period over which you incur costs. Capital and startup costs include, among other items, computers and software you purchase to prepare for collecting information, monitoring, and record storage facilities. You should not include estimates for equipment or services purchased: (i) Before October 1, 1995; (ii) to comply with requirements not associated with the information collection; (iii) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the Government; or (iv) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

We will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in our submission for OMB approval. As a result of your comments, we will make any necessary adjustments to the burden in our submission to OMB.

Public Comment Procedures: 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.

MMS Information Collection Clearance Officer: Arlene Bajusz (202) 208-7744.

Dated: April 6, 2010.

William S. Hauser,

Acting Chief, Office of Offshore Regulatory Programs.

[FR Doc. 2010-8195 Filed 4-9-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLCAC06900.L17100000.DR0000]

Notice of Availability of the Record of Decision for the Carrizo Plain National Monument Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) announces the availability of the Record of Decision (ROD)/Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the Carrizo Plain National Monument (CPNM), located in San Luis Obispo and Kern counties in Central California. The California State Director signed the ROD on April 10, 2010, which constitutes the final decision of the BLM and makes the Approved RMP effective immediately.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the ROD/Approved RMP are available upon request from the Field Manager, Bakersfield Field Office, Bureau of Land Management, 3801 Pegasus Drive, Bakersfield, CA 93308 or via the Internet at <http://www.ca.blm.gov/bakersfield>. Copies of the ROD/Approved RMP are available for public inspection at the above location and at the BLM California State Office, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information contact Johna Hurl, CPNM Manager, telephone (661) 391-6093; address Bakersfield Field Office, Bureau of Land Management, 3801 Pegasus Drive, Bakersfield, CA 93308; e-mail johna_hurl@ca.blm.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The CPNM encompasses 206,635 acres of BLM-administered public lands. This Approved RMP provides for the protection of the significant natural and cultural resources identified in the Presidential Proclamation establishing the CPNM. The decisions promulgated in the RMP only apply to the BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate within the Approved RMP's planning area. The RMP was developed in cooperation with the BLM's managing partners (The Nature Conservancy and California Department of Fish and Game), the CPNM Advisory Committee, and the public. The RMP process considered four alternatives including a no-action alternative. The primary issues addressed include but are not limited to recreation, protection of sensitive natural and cultural resources, livestock grazing, energy and

mineral development, and motorized vehicle routes.

The Preferred Alternative in the Draft RMP/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), published January 23, 2009, was revised to address comments received during the 90-day public comment period. The resultant alternative became the Proposed Plan in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, published on November 13, 2009, and has been carried forward as the Approved RMP. Changes made from the Draft RMP to the Final RMP in response to public comments include: An additional 13,181 acres to be managed for wilderness characteristics, in addition to the 54,464 acres proposed in the Draft RMP preferred alternative; a requirement that only street-legal vehicles, no off-highway vehicles, be allowed on designated routes; and provisions to provide access for vehicles operated by people with physical handicaps. Finally, language was clarified regarding grazing and mineral rights.

Three protests were received during the 30-day protest period following the release of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, each of which was dismissed or denied by the BLM Director. Minor clarifications and changes to the text were made between the Proposed RMP/Final EIS and the ROD/Approved RMP, including clarifications to the protection of the CPNM's vernal pool and sag pond habitats, and the application of the mitigation measures listed in Appendices O and P, as appropriate (to be performed in subsequent site-specific NEPA processes).

The California Governor's Office did not identify any inconsistencies between the Proposed RMP/Final EIS and State or local plans, policies, and programs following the 60-day Governor's Consistency Review (initiated November 13, 2009) in accordance with planning regulations at 43 CFR, Part 1610.3-2(e).

The BLM has determined that this ROD/Approved RMP provides for long-term protection of the CPNM's values, while allowing for authorized uses, recreation activities, scientific studies, and interpretive facilities.

The ROD/Approved RMP contains decisions that identify initial management treatments in particular habitats and vegetative communities, identify wildland fire objectives and appropriate response levels, limit use on routes located in areas managed for wilderness characteristics, require permits for aerial sports (e.g., hang gliding, skydiving, hobby aircraft), provide for guided tours at Painted Rock, and define the priority,

framework, and evaluation/approval process for research projects within the CPNM. These decisions, which are contained in Attachment C of the ROD/ Approved RMP, are implementation decisions and are appealable under 43 CFR part 4.

Any party adversely affected by an implementation decision may appeal within 30 days of publication of this Notice of Availability pursuant to 43 CFR, part 4, subpart E. The appeal must be filed with the Bakersfield Field Manager at the above listed address. Please consult the appropriate regulations (43 CFR, part 4, subpart E) for further appeal requirements.

Timothy Z. Smith,

Field Manager, Bakersfield Field Office.

Authority: 40 CFR 1506.6.

[FR Doc. 2010-8434 Filed 4-8-10; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4310-40-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-568]

In the Matter of Certain Products and Pharmaceutical Compositions Containing Recombinant Human Erythropoietin;

Notice of Commission Decision to Grant Amgen Inc.'s Motion for Partial Termination; Notice of Request for Written Submissions Relating to Summary Determination and to 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 grant Amgen Inc.'s motion for partial termination of the above-referenced investigation and that the Commission is requesting briefing on issues relating to summary determination and to remedy, the public interest, and bonding.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michelle Walters Klancnik, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-5468. 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: On May 12, 2006, the Commission instituted an investigation under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) based on a complaint filed by Amgen, Inc. ("Amgen") of Thousand Oaks, California. 71 FR 27742 (May 12, 2006). The complaint asserted a violation of section 337 in the importation into the United States, sale for importation, or sale within the United States after importation of certain products and pharmaceutical compositions containing recombinant human erythropoietin by reason of infringement of claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 5,441,868 ("the '868 patent"), claims 3, 4, 5, and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 5,547,933 ("the '933 patent"), claims 4-9 of U.S. Patent No. 5,618,698 ("the '698 patent"), claims 4 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,621,080 ("the '080 patent"), claim 7 of U.S. Patent No. 5,756,349 ("the '349 patent"), and claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,955,422 ("the '422 patent"). The notice of investigation named Roche Holding Ltd. of Basel, Switzerland; F. Hoffman-La Roche, Ltd. of Basel, Switzerland; Roche Diagnostics GmbH of Mannheim, Germany; and Hoffman La Roche, Inc. of Nutley, New Jersey (collectively, "Roche") as respondents.

On August 31, 2009, after a remand of the original investigation from the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, Amgen moved for summary determination that Roche violated section 337 by importing and using a pegylated erythropoietin product, which according to Amgen infringes claims 1 and 2 of the '868 patent, claim 3 of the '933 patent, claims 6-9 of the '698 patent, and claim 1 of the '422 patent. Amgen also requested a limited exclusion order that would preclude importation of Roche's product regardless of the party seeking to import such product. Roche does not oppose Amgen's motion for purposes of this investigation. The Commission investigative attorney ("IA") also does not oppose Amgen's motion, but indicated that the motion does not resolve asserted claim 7 of the '349 patent or asserted claims 4, 5, and 11 of the '933 patent.

On December 22, 2009, Amgen moved to terminate the investigation with respect to claims 4, 5, and 11 of the '933 patent, claims 4 and 6 of the '080 patent, and claims 4 and 5 of the '698 patent. In addition, on December 31, 2009, Amgen filed a supplemental motion for summary determination with respect to claim 7 of the '349 patent. Roche does not oppose these motions. The IA also does not oppose Amgen's motion to terminate the investigation in part, but does oppose Amgen's supplemental motion for summary determination.

The Commission has determined to grant Amgen's motion to terminate the investigation with respect to claims 4, 5, and 11 of the '933 patent, claims 4 and 6 of the '080 patent, and claims 4 and 5 of the '698 patent. The Commission has determined that further briefing is necessary to decide the motion for summary determination.

The parties are requested to brief their positions on the following issues with reference to the applicable law and evidence:

1. How does the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit's decision in *Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffman-La Roche Ltd.*, 580 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2009), vacating certain aspects of the decision by the United States District Court of Massachusetts in *Amgen Inc. v. F. Hoffman-La Roche, Ltd.*, No. 05-12237-WGY (D. Mass. Oct. 2, 2008), affect Amgen's original motion for summary determination filed on August 31, 2009, for each asserted claim? Please address the Commission's February 3, 2009 opinion in *Certain Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Using Tungsten Metallization and Products Containing Same*, Inv. No. 337-TA-648.

2. If the Commission can proceed with respect to any claim(s), please explain whether the Commission should apply the principles of claim or issue preclusion to the district court case and what standard the Commission should apply.

3. Can the Commission apply claim or issue preclusion to the permanent injunction order issued by the district court on December 22, 2009, and if so, to what effect? Does the stipulation, which is signed by the parties and which appears before the permanent injunction, form part of the district court's judgment? If so, does Amgen rely on the stipulation for claim or issue preclusion? Please provide case law supporting your positions.

4. If the Commission denies Amgen's motions for summary determination with respect to any claims, how should the Commission proceed with respect to those claims?