(Susquehanna River—Loop 317), Asylum Township, Bradford County, Pa. Surface water withdrawal of up to 4.032 mgd.

23. Project Sponsor and Facility: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Tioga River—Loop 315), Richmond Township, Tioga County, Pa. Surface water withdrawal of up to 3.140 mgd.

24. Project Sponsor and Facility: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Unnamed Tributary of North Elk Run), Richmond Township, Tioga County, Pa. Surface water withdrawal of up to 0.144 mgd.

25. Project Sponsor and Facility: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Towanda Creek—Loop 317), Monroe Township, Bradford County, Pa. Surface water withdrawal of up to 4.032 mgd.

26. Project Sponsor and Facility: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (White Creek—Loop 319), Springville Township, Susquehanna County, Pa. Surface water withdrawal of up to 0.384 mgd.

27. Project Sponsor and Facility: Williamsport Municipal Water Authority, Williamsport City, Lycoming County, Pa. Groundwater withdrawals of up to 1.300 mgd from Well 10 and 0.700 mgd from Well 11.

Public Hearing—Projects Approved Involving a Diversion

1. Project Sponsor: Chief Oil & Gas LLC. Project Facility: Borough of Ebensburg, Cambria Township, Cambria County, Pa. Into-basin diversion of up to 0.249 mgd from the Ohio River Basin.

2. Project Sponsor: Chief Oil & Gas LLC. Project Facility: Cambria Somerset Authority, Summerhill Township, Cambria County, Pa. Into-basin diversion of up to 0.249 mgd from the Ohio River Basin.

3. Project Sponsor: Chief Oil & Gas LLC. Project Facility: Highland Sewer and Water Authority, Portage Township, Cambria County, Pa. Into-basin diversion of up to 0.249 mgd from the Ohio River Basin.

4. Project Sponsor: Nature's Way Purewater Systems, Inc. Project Facility: Nature's Way Springs Borehole 1 (BH–1), Foster Township, Luzerne County, Pa. Into-basin diversion of up to 0.099 mgd from the Delaware River Basin.

5. Project Sponsor: Penn Virginia Oil & Gas Corporation. Project Facility: Port Allegany Borough, McKean County, Pa. Into-basin diversion of up to 0.100 mgd from the Ohio River Basin.

6. Project Sponsor: Triana Energy, LLC. Project Facility: Johnson Quarry, Roulette Township, Potter County, Pa. Into-basin diversion of up to 0.500 mgd from the Ohio River Basin.

Public Hearing—Projects Tabled

1. Project Sponsor and Facility: Dunn Lake LLC (Dunn Lake), Ararat Township, Susquehanna County, Pa. Application for surface water withdrawal of up to 0.999 mgd.

2. Project Sponsor and Facility: Keystone Clearwater Solutions, LLC (Babb Creek), Morris Township, Tioga County, Pa. Application for surface water withdrawal of up to 0.950 mgd.

3. Project Sponsor: SWEPI, LP. Project Facility: Pennsylvania American Water Company—Warren District, Warren City, Warren County, Pa. Application for an into-basin diversion of up to 3.000 mgd from the Ohio River Basin.

Public Hearing—Projects Withdrawn

1. Project Sponsor and Facility: Anadarko E&P Company LP (West Branch Susquehanna River–4), Burnside Township, Centre County, Pa. Application for surface water withdrawal of up to 0.720 mgd.

2. Project Sponsor and Facility: Anadarko E&P Company LP (Wolf Run), Snow Shoe Township, Centre County, Pa. Application for surface water withdrawal of up to 0.499 mgd.

Public Hearing—Administrative Appeal

The Commission denied an administrative appeal by the Allegheny Defense Project of the March 10, 2011, Commission action approving the following projects:

1. Docket No. 20110316. Project Sponsor: Pennsylvania General Energy Company, L.L.C. Project Facility: Scaffold Lick Pond—1, Liberty Township, McKean County, Pa., authorizing an existing into-basin diversion of up to 0.500 mgd from the Ohio River Basin.

2. Docket No. 20110317. Project Sponsor: Pennsylvania General Energy Company, L.L.C. Project Facility: Scaffold Lick Pond—2, Liberty Township, McKean County, Pa., authorizing an existing into-basin diversion of up to 0.500 mgd from the Ohio River Basin.

3. Docket No. 20110318. Project Sponsor: Ultra Resources, Inc. Project Facility: Wayne Gravel Products, Ceres Township, McKean County, Pa., authorizing an existing into-basin diversion of up to 1.170 mgd from the Ohio River Basin.

Public Hearing—Amendments to Regulatory Program Fee Schedule

The Commission approved amendments to its Regulatory Program Fee Schedule intended to help defray the cost of its Regulatory Program for water resource projects as well as to establish a special rate for multiple transfer of approvals in a single transaction and to make clarifications regarding the application of compliance monitoring fees to administratively approved projects, refunds on withdrawn or terminated applications, and the interest rate on installment payments. The amended fee schedule, which can be accessed at the Commission's web site www.srbc.net, became effective on July 1, 2011.

Public Hearing—Comprehensive Plan Amendments

The Commission amended its comprehensive plan to include the newly adopted Water Resources Program (FY 2012/2013), the Migratory Fish Management and Restoration Plan for the Susquehanna River Basin, and all projects approved by the Commission since the last revision of the Comprehensive Plan.

Authority: Pub. L. 91–575, 84 Stat. 1509 *et seq.,* 18 CFR parts 806, 807, and 808.

Dated: July 6, 2011.

Thomas W. Beauduy,

Deputy Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 2011–17922 Filed 7–14–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7040–01–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Petition Under Section 302 on Alleged Expropriations by the Dominican Republic; Decision Not To Initiate Investigation

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Decision not to initiate investigation.

SUMMARY: On May 24, 2011, the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) received a petition under Section 302 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (''Trade Act''), requesting that the United States Trade Representative (''Trade Representative'') initiate an investigation under sections 301–309 of the Trade Act (''Section 301'') with respect to alleged expropriations without adequate compensation by the Government of the Dominican Republic, resulting in an alleged breach of the Dominican Republic's obligations under the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA–DR), as well as being otherwise unreasonable and discriminatory. In accordance with the advice of the interagency Section 301 Committee, the Trade Representative has determined

not to initiate a Section 301 investigation.

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 8, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan Weinberger, Associate General Counsel, (202) 395–0317; Leslie O'Connor, Deputy Assistant USTR for Central America and the Dominican Republic, (202) 395–5190; Kimberley Claman, Senior Director for Investment Affairs & Financial Services, (202) 395–4510; and William Busis, Deputy Assistant USTR for Monitoring and Enforcement and Chair of the Section 301 Committee, (202) 395–3150.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 24, 2011, representatives of two individuals—Mauricio Gadala Maria and Carolina Maratos Gadala Maria—filed a petition requesting that the Trade Representative initiate a Section 301 investigation with respect to alleged expropriations without adequate compensation by the Government of the Dominican Republic. The petition states that Elias Gadala Maria—the father of the two petitioners—was a national of El Salvador who invested in the Dominican Republic in the early 1950s, during the Trujillo regime. The property of Mr. Gadala Maria, according to the petition, was nationalized in 1961 and 1962 following the end of the Trujillo regime. The two petitioners—U.S. nationals who reside in Florida—allege to be heirs of Mr. Gadala Maria, and thus claim a property interest in having the Dominican Republic provide adequate compensation for the alleged expropriations. The petition also alleges that the Government of the Dominican Republic has continued to take actions—as recently as March 2011—that infringe petitioners' property rights.

Petitioners allege that the Government of the Dominican Republic breached its CAFTA–DR obligations to accord ''fair and equitable treatment and full protection and security,'' and to provide ''prompt, adequate and, effective compensation,'' with respect to investments covered by the CAFTA–DR. Petitioners also contend that the Government of the Dominican Republic has acted unreasonably in denying compensation for the alleged expropriations. Petitioners further claim that the government of the Dominican Republic acted in a ''discriminatory'' manner because Mr. Gadala Maria allegedly received less favorable treatment than other investors whose property allegedly was expropriated in 1961/62 at the end of the Trujillo regime.

Pursuant to the advice of the interagency Section 301 Committee, the Trade Representative has determined not to initiate a Section 301 investigation in response to the petition on three separate grounds. First, to the extent that the petition is alleging the expropriation of the property of the petitioners' father—Mr. Gadala Maria—the petition does not allege the expropriation of any property of a U.S. investor because, according to the petition, Mr. Gadala Maria was not a U.S. national. Second, USTR is not in a position to investigate events that occurred five decades ago—well before both the enactment of the Trade Act and the entry into force of the CAFTA–DR—and thus a Section 301 investigation would not be effective in addressing the matters raised in the petition. Third, with regard to more recent acts, policies, and practices of the Dominican Republic that petitioners allege to breach the Dominican Republic's investment obligations under the CAFTA–DR, such allegations can be addressed more effectively and directly through Investor-State dispute resolution under Chapter Ten of the CAFTA–DR, which affords U.S. investors the right to pursue claims for resolution of Investor-State disputes without requiring intervention by the U.S. Government. The merits of any such claims would be determined by an international arbitration panel formed to hear the dispute.

William Busis,

Chair, Section 301 Committee.

[FR Doc. 2011–17807 Filed 7–14–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–W1–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Petition Under Section 302 on the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Agreement; Decision Not To Initiate Investigation

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Decision not to initiate investigation.

SUMMARY: On May 24, 2011, the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) received a petition pursuant to section 302 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (''Trade Act''), requesting that the United States Trade Representative (''Trade Representative'') initiate an investigation under sections 301–309 of the Trade Act (''Section 301'') with respect to alleged conduct of the Government of Israel during the negotiation in the 1980s of the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Agreement (U.S.-Israel FTA). In accordance with the advice of the interagency Section 301 Committee, the Trade Representative has determined not to initiate an investigation in response to the petition.

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 8, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan Weinberger, Associate General Counsel, (202) 395–0317; Sonia Franceski, Director for Middle East Affairs, (202) 395–4620; or William Busis, Deputy Assistant USTR for Monitoring and Enforcement and Chair of the Section 301 Committee, (202) 395–3150.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 24, 2011, an organization entitled the ''Institute for Research: Middle Eastern Policy'' (''IRMEP'') filed a petition pursuant to section 302 of the Trade Act alleging that in 1984, during the negotiation of the U.S.-Israel FTA, the Government of Israel misappropriated business confidential information provided to USTR and the U.S. International Trade Commission by U.S. trade associations, companies, and industries. The petition alleges that the Government of Israel used this information to gain a systemic advantage in the U.S. market, and that this is the cause of the bilateral U.S. trade deficit with Israel. The petition further claims that the alleged misappropriation has diminished the profits of U.S. industry. The petition seeks a $6.64 billion settlement from the Government of Israel, to be divided among U.S. industry groups.

Upon the advice of the interagency Section 301 Committee, the Trade Representative has determined on two separate grounds not to initiate a Section 301 investigation in response to the petition. First, IRMEP—which describes itself as an organization involved in Middle East policy formation—lacks standing to file a petition addressed to an alleged loss of revenue by U.S. companies. The petition provides a diverse list of 76 corporations and industry associations that purportedly opposed the U.S.-Israel FTA in the mid-1980s, and the petition alleges that IRMEP represents ''some'' of those corporations and industry associations. USTR regulations, however, require that a petition affirmatively ''identify the * * * firm or association * * * which petitioner represents and describe briefly the economic interest of the petitioner which is directly affected by'' the matter addressed in the petition. 15 CFR 2006.1(a)(1). The petition fails to do so.

Second, the petition fails to allege the existence of any act, policy, or practice of the Government of Israel that might be actionable under Section 301. Rather, the petition is addressed to an alleged