

*Demand Charge:* None.

*Energy Charge:* 12.55 mills per kilowatt-hour for all energy use; subject to ability-to-pay but not less than 2.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

*Seasonal Minimum Bill:* \$2.75 per kilowatt of the maximum 30-minute integrated demand established during service months of each year specified in the contract.

*Adjustments:*

*For Power Factor:* The customer will normally be required to maintain a power factor at a point of delivery of not less than 95 percent lagging or leading.

*Penalties for Exceeding the Contract Rate of Delivery (CROD):* Energy usage in excess of the CROD will be billed at a rate 10 times the current project use power rate. This will be calculated on a prorated basis. The customer will also be billed for any increased capacity and transmission charges incurred as a result of exceeding the CROD.

*Approval of Project Use Power Rate by Commissioner of Bureau of Reclamation:* The Commissioner approved the rate of 12.55 mills/kWh by memorandum dated December 5, 2005.

Dated: December 16, 2005.

Michael J. Ryan,

Regional Director.

[FR Doc. 05-24352 Filed 12-21-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731-TA-639 and 640 (Second Review)]

### Forged Stainless Steel Flanges from India and Taiwan

#### Determinations

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines,<sup>2</sup> pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act), that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on forged stainless steel flanges from India and Taiwan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

#### Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on July 1, 2005 (70 FR 38195)

<sup>1</sup> The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

<sup>2</sup> Commissioner Daniel R. Pearson dissenting with respect to forged stainless steel flanges from Taiwan.

and determined on October 4, 2005, that it would conduct expedited reviews (70 FR 60558, October 18, 2005).

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these investigations to the Secretary of Commerce on December 16, 2005. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3827 (December 2005), entitled *Forged Stainless Steel Flanges from India and Taiwan: Investigation Nos. 731-TA-639 and 640 (Second Review)*.

Issued: December 16, 2005.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E5-7678 Filed 12-21-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-523]

### Certain Optical Disk Controller Chips and Chipsets and Products Containing Same, Including DVD Players and PC Optical Storage Devices II; Notice of Commission Decision To Review Portions of an Initial Determination Finding No Violation of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930; Grant of Motion To File Corrected Petition for Review; Denial of Motion To File Reply Brief; Extension of Target Date for Completion of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review certain portions of a final initial determination ("ID") of the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") finding no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in the above-captioned investigation. The Commission has also granted a motion for leave to file a corrected petition, denied a motion for leave to file a reply brief, and has extended the target date for completion of the investigation by 30 days, *i.e.*, until March 1, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Clara Kuehn, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3012. Copies of the public version of the ALJ's ID and all other nonconfidential 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 (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS-ON-LINE) 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 instituted this investigation on August 31, 2004, based on a complaint filed on behalf of MediaTek Corporation ("complainant") of Hsin-Chu City, Taiwan. 69 FR 53089 (Aug. 31, 2004). The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 in the importation into the United States, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain optical disk controller chips and chipsets by reason of infringement of claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 5,970,031 ("the '031 patent") and claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,773 ("the '773 patent"). *Id.* The notice of investigation named two respondents: Zoran Corporation ("Zoran") of Sunnyvale, CA and Oak Technology, Inc. ("Oak") of Sunnyvale, CA. *Id.*

On October 7, 2004, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 5) granting complainant's motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation to add Sunext Technology Co., Ltd. ("Sunext") of Hsin-Chu City, Taiwan, as a respondent and to add another patent, *viz.*, claims 1-2, 5-6, 15-19, 21, and 22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,170,043 ("the '043 patent") to the scope of the investigation. 69 FR 64588. That ID was not reviewed by the Commission. *Id.*

A tutorial was held on June 24, 2005, and an eight-day evidentiary hearing was held from June 27, 2005, through July 7, 2005.

On September 30, 2005, the ALJ issued his final ID and recommended determination on remedy and bonding. The ALJ concluded that there was no violation of section 337. Although he found that respondent Oak infringes claims 1, 2, and 3 of the '773 patent, he found that those claims are invalid as anticipated by Japanese patent application number 08-015834 (RX-518) ("the Okuda prior art reference"). He found no infringement of claim 4 of the '773 patent, and no infringement of any asserted claim of the '031 or '043 patents. The ALJ concluded that the