22. Contra Costa WD, CVP, California: Title transfer of lands and features of the Contra Costa Canal System of the CVP.

23. Title transfer agreements; California, Nevada, and Oregon: Potential title transfers agreements pursuant to the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act of March 12, 2019 (Pub. L. 116–9).

24. CVP, California: Operational agreements, exchange agreements, and contract amendments with non-federal project entities as required for federal participation in non-federal storage projects pursuant to the WIIN Act.

25. Shasta County Water Agency, CVP, California: Proposed partial assignment of 400 acre-feet of the Shasta County Water Agency's CVP water supply to the Shasta Community Services District for M&I use.

26. Solano County Water Agency, Solano Project, California: Renewal of water service and OM&R contracts.

27. San Luis Canal Company, Central California ID, Firebaugh Canal WD, Columbia Canal Company (collectively San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors), CVP, California: Amend 1968 Second Amended Contract for Exchange of Waters.

28. Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Solano Project, California: Renewal of long-term water service contract for up to 1,500 acre-feet from Lake Berryessa.

29. San Juan WD, CVP, California: Long-term Warren Act contract for up to 25,000 acre-feet annually for conveyance through Folsom Reservoir and associated facilities.

30. Klamath County Drainage Services District, Klamath Project, Oregon: Agreement for interim O&M of the 1–C Canal.

31. Fresno Slough WD, CVP, California: Proposed full assignment of up to 4,000 acre-feet of Fresno Slough WD's CVP supply to Angiola WD.

32. Mercy Springs WD, CVP, California: Proposed partial assignment of up to 1,300 acre-feet of Mercy Springs WD's CVP water supply to Angiola WD.

33. Water user entities responsible for payment of reimbursable costs for Reclamation projects in California, Nevada, and Oregon: Contracts to be executed pursuant to title IX of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of November 15, 2021 (Pub. L. 117–58), and/or contracts for XM pursuant to Title IX, Subtitle G of Omnibus Public Land Management Act of March 30, 2009 (Pub. L. 111–11). For more information regarding the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law go to *https://www.usbr.gov/bil/.*

34. Cachuma Project, California: Negotiation and execution of a repayment contract with the Cachuma Operation and Maintenance Board for SOD projects.

35. Klamath Project, Oregon: Negotiation and execution of repayment contract for Lost River Improvement Channel Pipe Replacement Project.

36. CVP, California: Negotiation and execution of repayment contract with San Luis and Delta-Mendota Water Authority for procurement and installation of two additional pumps at the Delta-Mendota Canal Intertie.

Christopher Beardsley,

Director, Mission Assurance and Protection Organization.

[FR Doc. 2024–05123 Filed 3–8–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4332–90–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

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 regarding *Certain Dynamic Random Access Memory Device and Product Containing Same,* DN 3729; the Commission is soliciting comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or complainant's filing pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lisa R. Barton, 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 Document Information System (EDIS) at *https://edis.usitc.gov.* For help accessing EDIS, please email *EDIS3Help@usitc.gov.*

General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at United States International Trade Commission (USITC) at *https://www.usitc.gov*. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (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 has received a complaint and a submission pursuant to § 210.8(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure filed on behalf of Complainant Wen T. Lin on March 4, 2024. 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 certain dynamic random access memory device and product containing same. The complaint names as a respondent: Etron Technology, Inc. of Taiwan. The complainant requests that the Commission issue an exclusion order and a cease and desist order.

Proposed respondents, other interested parties, and members of the public are invited to file comments on any public interest issues raised by the complaint or § 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 on the public interest 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. Any

written submissions on other issues must also be filed by no later than the close of business, eight calendar days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Complainant may file replies to any written submissions no later than three calendar days after the date on which any initial submissions were due, notwithstanding § 201.14(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. No other submissions will be accepted, unless requested by the Commission. Any submissions and replies filed in response to this Notice are limited to five (5) pages in length, inclusive of attachments.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above. Submissions should refer to the docket number (''Docket No. 3729'') in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (*See* Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, Electronic Filing Procedures [1]).

Please note the Secretary's Office will accept only electronic filings during this time. Filings must be made through the Commission's Electronic Document Information System (EDIS, *https://edis.usitc.gov.*) No in-person paper-based filings or paper copies of any electronic filings will be accepted until further notice. Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary at *EDIS3Help@usitc.gov.*

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 information, including confidential business information and documents for which confidential treatment is properly sought, submitted to the Commission for purposes of this Investigation may be disclosed to and used: (i) by the Commission, its employees and Offices, and contract personnel (a) for developing or maintaining the records of this or a related proceeding, or (b) in internal investigations, audits, reviews, and evaluations relating to the programs, personnel, and operations of the Commission including under 5 U.S.C. Appendix 3; or (ii) by U.S. government employees and contract personnel,[2] solely for cybersecurity purposes. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.[3]

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 §§ 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: March 5, 2024.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2024–05041 Filed 3–8–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[1] Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures: *https://www.usitc.gov/documents/handbook_on_filing_procedures.pdf.*

[2] All contract personnel will sign appropriate nondisclosure agreements.

[3] Electronic Document Information System (EDIS): *https://edis.usitc.gov.*

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 22–51]

Mark Fenzl, D.O.; Decision and Order

On August 11, 2022, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA or Government) issued an Order to Show Cause (OSC) and Immediate Suspension Order (ISO) to Mark Fenzl, M.D. (Respondent), of Florida immediately suspending and seeking to revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, Control No. FF7471840, and alleging that his ''continued registration is inconsistent with the public interest.'' OSC, at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1) [1]).

A hearing was held before DEA Administrative Law Judge Teresa A. Wallbaum (the ALJ). On April 10, 2023, the ALJ issued her Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision (RD), which recommended that the Agency revoke Respondent's registration. RD, at 40. Respondent did not timely file exceptions to the RD.[2] Having reviewed the entire record, the Agency, except as noted below,[3] adopts and hereby incorporates by reference the entirety of the ALJ's rulings, credibility findings,[4] findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended sanction in the RD and summarizes, expands upon, and clarifies portions thereof herein.

I. Findings of Fact

The Agency finds from clear, unequivocal, and convincing evidence that Respondent committed numerous failures in his prescribing conduct that fell below the standard of care in Florida. Specifically, the Agency finds that from June 2020 through April 2022, Respondent issued controlled substances to Patients J.H., C.K., G.K., and J.K. without a legitimate medical purpose, outside the usual course of professional practice, and beneath the standard of care in Florida. *See* RD, at 17–30.

Florida Standard of Care

Dr. Lynch provided expert testimony on the applicable standard of care for prescribing controlled substances in Florida.[5] RD, at 6–7, 11–17; Tr. 141–

[1] Effective December 2, 2022, the Medical Marijuana and Cannabidiol Research Expansion Act, Public Law 117–215, 136 Stat. 2257 (2022) (Marijuana Research Amendments or MRA), amended the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) and other statutes. Relevant to this matter, the MRA redesignated 21 U.S.C. 823(f), cited in the OSC, as 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1). Accordingly, this Decision cites to the current designation, 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1), and to the MRA-amended CSA throughout.

[2] On May 8, 2023, after the deadline to file exceptions passed and the ALJ certified the record to the Administrator, Respondent submitted a document entitled ''Appeal to the Drug Enforcement Agency Administrator.'' Respondent's document appears to be an untimely attempt to file exceptions to the RD. *See* 21 CFR 1316.66(a), 1316.67. On that basis, they were not considered in this Decision. Further, even if these exceptions had been timely submitted, they contain arguments raised by Respondent in earlier filings that were addressed by the ALJ, lack the required specific and complete citations to the record, are contradicted or unsupported by the record, and/or otherwise lack merit. Accordingly, the Agency finds these untimely exceptions to be unpersuasive. *See Yogeshwar Gill, M.D.,* 88 FR 55,076, 55,076 n.3 (2023).

[3] See footnote 14, *infra.*

[4] The Agency adopts the ALJ's summary of each of the witnesses' testimonies as well as the ALJ's assessment of each of the witnesses' credibility. *See* RD, at 3–11. The Agency agrees with the ALJ that the testimony by the Diversion Investigator (DI), which focused on the investigative steps completed in the case and establishing the foundations for many of the exhibits received into the record, was sufficiently detailed, plausible, and internally consistent to be afforded full credibility. *See id.* at 5–6. The Agency also agrees with the ALJ's assessment that Dr. Paul Lynch, M.D., the Government's expert witness, was reliable and persuasive. *See id.* at 6. His testimony was based on extensive relevant experience and consistent with applicable Florida law, and Respondent was unpersuasive in his efforts to challenge Dr. Lynch's objectivity and reliability. *See id.* at 7. Regarding Respondent's testimony, the Agency adopts the ALJ's assessment that although Respondent testified candidly, his recollection was unreliable and at times contradicted by documentary evidence. *See id.* at 11. Therefore, the ALJ appropriately gave his testimony limited weight. *See id.* at 11. As the ALJ noted, Respondent's testimony on Florida's standard of care was vague, and he characterized pain management as an ''area of weakness'' for him. *See id.* at 11 (quoting Tr. 516–17). Accordingly, consistent with the ALJ's findings, to the extent that Respondent disagreed with Dr. Lynch's testimony regarding the Florida standard of care governing pain management, the Agency gives controlling weight to Dr. Lynch's testimony. *See id.* at 11.

[5] The Agency adopts and incorporates by reference the entirety of the ALJ's findings regarding the standard of care in Florida and the related summary of Dr. Lynch's expert testimony.