94415

for annual reporting and (2) other requested relief, as industry proposed and ONRR and the affected State approved. The regulations require ONRR to publish by December 1 of each year a list of the States and their decisions regarding marginal property relief.

To qualify for the first relief option (notification-based relief) for calendar year 2016, properties must produce less than 1,000 barrels-of-oil-equivalent (BOE) per year for the base period (July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015). Annual reporting relief will begin January 1, 2017, with the annual report and payment due February 28, 2018, or March 31, 2018, if you have an estimated payment on file. To qualify for the second relief option (other requested relief), the combined equivalent production of the marginal properties during the base period must equal an average daily well production of less than 15 BOE per well, per day calculated under 30 CFR 1204.4(c).

The following table shows the States that have qualifying marginal properties and the States' decisions to allow one or both forms of relief.

State	Notification-based relief (less than 1,000 BOE per year)	Request-based relief (less than 15 BOE per well per day)
Alabama Arkansas California Colorado Kansas Louisiana Michigan Mississippi Montana Nebraska New Mexico North Dakota Oklahoma South Dakota Utah	No	No. Yes. No. No. Yes. Yes. No. No. No. No. Yes. No. Yes. No. No. Yes. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No
Wyoming	Yes	No.

Federal oil and gas properties located in all other States where ONRR does not share a portion of Federal royalties with the State are eligible for relief if they qualify as marginal under the regulations (*see* section 117(c) of RSFA, 30 U.S.C. 1726(c)). For information on how to obtain relief, please refer to 30 CFR 1204.205 or to the published rule, which you may view at *http:// www.onrr.gov/Laws_R_D/FRNotices/ PDFDocs/55076.pdf.*

Unless the information that ONRR received is proprietary data, all correspondence, records, or information that we receive in response to this notice may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (5 U.S.C. 552 et seq.). If applicable, please highlight the proprietary portions, including any supporting documentation, or mark the page(s) that contain proprietary data. We protect the proprietary information under the Trade Secrets Act (18 U.S.C. 1905), FOIA Exemption 4 (5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4)), and the Department of the Interior's FOIA regulations (43 CFR part 2).

Dated: December 13, 2016.

Gregory J. Gould,

Director, Office of Natural Resources Revenue.

[FR Doc. 2016–30925 Filed 12–22–16; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4335–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

[Docket No. BOEM-2014-0001]

Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Cook Inlet Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Lease Sale 244; MMAA104000

AGENCY: Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM), Interior. **ACTION:** Notice of availability of a final environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: BOEM is announcing the availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) for the Cook Inlet Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Lease Sale 244 (Cook Inlet Lease Sale 244). The Final EIS offers a discussion of potential impacts of the proposed action, provides an analysis of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, and identifies the Bureau's preferred alternative.

The Final EIS is available on the agency Web site at *http://www.boem.gov/Sale-244/*. BOEM will primarily distribute digital copies of the Final EIS on compact discs. You may request a paper copy or the location of a library with a digital copy of the Final EIS from BOEM, Alaska OCS Region, 3801 Centerpoint Drive, Suite 500, Anchorage, Alaska 99503–5823, (907) 334–5200.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For more information on the Cook Inlet Lease Sale 244 Final EIS, you may

Contact Sharon Randall, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Alaska OCS Region, 3801 Centerpoint Drive, Suite 500, Anchorage, Alaska 99503–5823; (907) 334–5200.

Authority: This Notice of Availability for the Final EIS is in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4231 *et seq.*), and is published pursuant to 40 CFR 1502.19.

Abigail Ross Hopper,

Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. [FR Doc. 2016–30930 Filed 12–22–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-16-044]

Government in the Sunshine Act Meeting Notice

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission. **TIME AND DATE:** January 6, 2017 at 11:00 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205–2000.

STATUS: Open to the public. **MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

- 1. Agendas for future meetings: None
- 2. Minutes
- 3. Ratification List
- 4. Vote in Inv. Nos. 701–TA–566 and 731–TA–1342 (Preliminary) (Softwood Lumber Products from Canada). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determinations on January 9, 2017; views of the Commission are currently scheduled to be completed and filed on January 17, 2017.
- 5. Vote in Inv. Nos. 701–TA–560 and 731–TA–1319, 1326, and 1328 (Final) (Carbon and Alloy Steel Cutto-Length Plate from Brazil, South Africa, and Turkey). The Commission is currently scheduled to complete and file its determinations and views of the Commission by January 18, 2017.
- 6. Outstanding action jackets: None In accordance with Commission

policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission. Issued: December 20, 2016.

William R. Bishop,

Supervisory Hearings and Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 2016–31126 Filed 12–21–16; 11:15 am] BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1002]

Certain Carbon and Alloy Steel Products; Commission Determination To Review an Initial Determination Granting Respondents' Motion To Terminate Complainant's Antitrust Claim; Request for Written Submissions and Setting of Date for Possible Oral Argument

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

ACTION. NOLICE.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review an initial determination ("ID") (Order No. 38) of the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") granting Respondents' motion to terminate Complainant's antitrust claim and sets the date of March 14, 2017, for possible oral argument.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Houda Morad, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW.,

Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-4716. 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 *https://www.usitc.gov.* The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at https:// 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 Investigation No. 337-TA-1002 on June 2, 2016, based on a complaint filed by Complainant United States Steel Corporation of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania ("U.S. Steel"), alleging a violation of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337. See 81 FR 35381 (June 2, 2016). The complaint alleges violations of Section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, or in the sale of certain carbon and alloy steel products by reason of: (1) A conspiracy to fix prices and control output and export volumes, the threat or effect of which is to restrain or monopolize trade and commerce in the United States; (2) misappropriation and use of trade secrets, the threat or effect of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry in the United States; and (3) false designation of origin or manufacturer, the threat or effect of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry in the United States. *Id.* The notice of investigation identified forty (40) respondents that are Chinese steel manufacturers or distributors, as well as some of their Hong Kong and United States affiliates. Id. In addition, the Office of Unfair Import Investigations is a party in this investigation. Id.

On July 6, 2016, the presiding ALJ issued, *sua sponte*, an initial determination (Order No. 19) suspending the investigation pursuant to Section 337(b)(3). On August 5, 2016, the Commission reversed and vacated the suspension. *See Certain Carbon and Alloy Steel Products*, USITC Inv. No. 337–TA–1002, Comm'n Notice (Aug. 5, 2016).

On August 26, 2016, Respondents filed a motion to terminate U.S. Steel's antitrust claim under 19 CFR 210.21. On September 6, 2016, U.S. Steel filed a response in opposition to Respondents' motion to terminate. On September 9, 2016, the Commission Investigative Attorney ("IA") filed a response in opposition to Respondents' motion to terminate. On November 14, 2016, the ALJ issued the subject ID, granting Respondents' motion to terminate Complainant's antitrust claim under 19 CFR 210.21 and, in the alternative, under 19 CFR 210.18. On November 23, 2016, Complainant and the IA filed petitions for review of the ID. Complainant also requested oral argument before the Commission. On December 1, 2016, Respondents filed a response to the petitions for review. Also on December 1, 2016, Complainant filed a response to the IA's petition for review.

The Commission has determined to review the ID. In connection with its review, the Commission requests written responses regarding the following questions:

1. Please explain the policies that underlie the injury requirement under Section 337(a)(1)(A)(iii), including an analysis of any relevant statutory language, legislative history, Commission determinations, case law, or other authority. In discussing this question, please also explain how the injury requirement under Section 337(a)(1)(A)(iii) is different from, or relates to, the injury requirement that applies under Section 337(a)(1)(A)(i).

2. Please explain what Complainant must prove to satisfy the injury requirement under Section 337(a)(1)(A)(iii), where the alleged unfair act in violation of Section 337 is based on a claim alleging a conspiracy to fix prices and control output and export volumes ("antitrust claim"). Please include an analysis of any relevant statutory language, legislative history, Commission determinations, case law, or other authority.

3. Please explain how "antitrust injury" standing, as required for private litigants in federal district courts asserting antitrust claims, see, e.g., Atl. Richfield Co. v. USA Petroleum Co., 495 U.S. 328, 335 (1990), compares to, or differs from, the injury requirement under Section 337(a)(1)(A). Please include an analysis of any relevant statutory language, legislative history, Commission determinations, case law, or other authority. In discussing this question, please explain the chronology of the adoption of the ''antitrust injury standing requirement in relation to the injury requirement under Section 337(a)(1)(A).

4. Please explain whether "antitrust injury" standing is, or should be,