

channel. This alternative would result in the same significant and unavoidable project-related and cumulative impacts discussed above for Alternative 1.

Alternative 3 would allow natural processes to dictate the flow path(s), bed and bank elevations, and capacities of the channel(s) through portions of the study area and would result in the same significant and unavoidable project-related and cumulative impacts discussed above for Alternative 1, as well as potentially resulting in long-term disruption of fish passage and migration patterns as the channel adjusts.

Implementing Alternative 4 would require excavating an inset floodplain along much of the river channel. This alternative would result in the same significant and unavoidable project-related and cumulative impacts discussed above for Alternative 1. Alternative 5 (No-Project/No-Action) would allow, but not facilitate the long-term, passive recovery of the river system by natural processes; therefore, this alternative would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

#### Beneficial Effects

Implementing Alternative 1 would result in long-term enhancement and creation of jurisdictional wetlands, riparian vegetation, and Stream Environment Zone habitats resulting from restoration and enhancement elements. Alternative 1 would have beneficial project related and cumulative effects on hydrologic/hydraulic processes from reconfiguration of stream channels and lagoon surface water features. Project and cumulative beneficial effects would include decreased erosion along the Upper Truckee River, increased overbank flooding for small streamflow events and associated retention of fine sediment and nutrients, and groundwater level improvements within the study area.

Alternative 2 would result in the same project-related and cumulative beneficial effects as discussed above for Alternative 1. In addition, implementing Alternative 2 would result in long-term beneficial effects on common or special-status wildlife resources and a decrease in recreational conflicts in the core habitat area. Alternative 1 would also have these benefits, however to a lesser extent than other action alternatives.

Implementation of Alternative 3 would result in the same project-related and cumulative beneficial effects as discussed above for Alternative 2.

Alternative 4 would result in the same project-related and cumulative

beneficial effects as discussed above for Alternative 2.

Alternative 5 (No-Project/No-Action) would allow, but not facilitate the long-term, passive recovery of the river system by natural processes; therefore, this alternative would not directly result in any beneficial effects.

A preferred or proposed alternative has not yet been defined. Following receipt and evaluation of public comments on the draft EIR/EIS/EIS, the lead agencies will determine which alternative or combinations of features from multiple alternatives will become the proposed action. A discussion of the decision will be included in the final EIR/EIS/EIS. A summary description of the alternatives is presented below. The detailed description of each alternative is presented in Chapter 2 of the draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

The draft EIR/EIS/EIS is being distributed to interested agencies, stakeholder organizations, and individuals. This distribution ensures that interested parties have an opportunity to express their views regarding the environmental effects of the Project, and to ensure that information pertinent to permits and approvals is provided to decision makers for the lead agencies.

For comments provided via email, please utilize the following format:

Email to: [scarroll@tahoe.ca.gov](mailto:scarroll@tahoe.ca.gov)

Subject Line: Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project draft EIR/EIS/EIS directions:

(1) Attach comments in an MS Word document.

(2) Include commenter's U.S. Postal Service mailing address in MS Word.

All comments will be distributed by the California Tahoe Conservancy to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Bureau of Reclamation.

#### Hearing Process and Distribution Information

The California Tahoe Conservancy, Bureau of Reclamation, and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct a public hearing on the draft EIR/EIS/EIS. It is not necessary to provide testimony during the public hearing; comments on the draft EIR/EIS/EIS will be accepted throughout the meeting and will be recorded at the public comment table. Comments may also be submitted throughout the comment period as described above. Once all comments have been assembled and reviewed, responses will be prepared to address significant environmental issues that have been raised in the comments.

Copies of the draft EIR/EIS/EIS are available for public review at the following locations:

- State of California, California Tahoe Conservancy, 1061 Third Street, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency front desk, 128 Market Street, Stateline, NV 89449.

- Mid-Pacific Regional Library, Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825.

- Natural Resources Library, Department of the Interior, 1849 C Street NW., Main Interior Building, Washington, DC 20240-0001.

#### Special Assistance for the Public Hearing

If special assistance is required to participate in the public hearing, please contact Marja Ambler at 775-589-5287, or via email at [mambler@trpa.org](mailto:mambler@trpa.org). Please notify Marja Ambler as far in advance as possible to enable the Bureau of Reclamation to secure the needed services. If a request cannot be honored, the requestor will be notified. A telephone device for the hearing impaired (TDD) is available at 916-978-5608.

#### Public Disclosure

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 may 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: February 12, 2013.

**Pablo R. Arroyave,**

*Deputy Regional Director, Mid-Pacific Region.*

[FR Doc. 2013-04334 Filed 2-25-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Docket No. 2940]

#### Products Having Laminated Packaging, Laminated Packaging, and Components Thereof; Notice of Receipt of Complaint; Solicitation of Comments Relating to the Public Interest

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has received a complaint entitled *Products Having Laminated*

*Packaging, Laminated Packaging, and Components Thereof*, DN 2940; the Commission is soliciting comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or complainant's filing under section 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.8(b)).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lisa R. Barton, Acting Secretary to the Commission, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. The public version of the complaint can be accessed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>, and 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 has received a complaint and a submission pursuant to section 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of Lamina Packaging Innovations LLC on February 20, 2013. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (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 products having laminated packaging, laminated packaging, and components thereof. The complaint names as respondents Remy Cointreau USA Inc. of New York, NY; Pernod Ricard USA LLC of New York, NY; John Jameson Import Company of Purchase, NY; Moët Hennessy USA of New York, NY; Champagne Louis Roederer of France; Maisons Marqués & Domaines USA Inc. of Oakland, CA; Freixenet USA of Sonoma, CA; L'Oreal USA of New York, NY; Hasbro, Inc. of Pawtucket, RI; Cognac Ferrand USA, Inc. of New York, NY; WJ Deutsch & Son of White Plains, NY; Diageo North America Inc. of Norwalk, CT; Sidney Frank Importing Co., Inc. of New Rochelle, NY; Beats Electronics LLC of Santa Monica, CA and Camus Wines & Spirits Group of France.

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments, not to exceed five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments, on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or section 210.8(b) filing. Comments should address whether issuance of the relief specifically requested by the complainant in this investigation would affect the public health and welfare in the United States, competitive conditions in the United States economy, the production of like or directly competitive articles in the United States, or United States consumers.

In particular, the Commission is interested in comments that:

- (i) Explain how the articles potentially subject to the requested remedial orders are used in the United States;
- (ii) Identify any public health, safety, or welfare concerns in the United States relating to the requested remedial orders;
- (iii) Identify like or directly competitive articles that complainant, its licensees, or third parties make in the United States which could replace the subject articles if they were to be excluded;
- (iv) Indicate whether complainant, complainant's licensees, and/or third party suppliers have the capacity to replace the volume of articles potentially subject to the requested exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order within a commercially reasonable time; and
- (v) Explain how the requested remedial orders would impact United States consumers.

Written submissions must be filed no later than by close of business, eight calendar days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. There will be further opportunities for comment on the public interest after the issuance of any final initial determination in this investigation.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above and submit 8 true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary by noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the docket number ("Docket No. 2940") in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, [http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed\\_reg\\_notices/rules/handbook\\_on\\_electronic\\_filing.pdf](http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf)).

Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202-205-2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.

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 sections 201.10 and 210.8(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.10, 210.8(c)).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 21, 2013.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Acting Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2013-04314 Filed 2-25-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

On February 20, 2013, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana in the lawsuit entitled *United States v. Westlake Petrochemicals LLC*, Civil Action No. 2:13-cv-00364.

This is a civil action against Westlake Petrochemicals LLC, WPT LLC, and Westlake Polymers LLC (collectively "Defendants") for civil penalties and injunctive relief as a result of alleged violations of the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), as amended, 42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq., and its implementing regulations including the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants ("NESHAPs") (40 CFR Part 63). This action is based on violations that occurred at petrochemical production units, known as Petro I and Petro II, owned and operated by one or more Defendants and their predecessors-in-interest and located in Sulfur, Louisiana (the "Facilities"). The proposed Consent Decree would resolve the civil claims alleged in the Complaint through March 22, 2007. The proposed Consent Decree includes a certification by Defendants that since March 22, 2007 they have