

establish and administer an office on Central Valley Project water conservation best management practices (BMPs) that shall * * * develop criteria for evaluating the adequacy of all water conservation plans developed by project contractors, including those plans required by section 210 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982." Also, according to section 3405(e)(1), these Criteria must be developed "* * * with the purpose of promoting the highest level of water use efficiency reasonably achievable by project contractors using best available cost-effective technology and best management practices." These Criteria state that all parties (Contractors) that contract with Reclamation for water supplies (municipal and industrial contracts over 2,000 acre-feet and agricultural contracts over 2,000 irrigable acres) must prepare Plans that contain the following information:

1. Description of the District.
2. Inventory of Water Resources.
3. BMPs for Agricultural Contractors.
4. BMPs for Urban Contractors.
5. BMP Plan Implementation.
6. BMP Exemption Justification.

Reclamation will evaluate Plans based on these Criteria. A copy of these Plans will be available for review at Reclamation's Mid-Pacific (MP) Regional Office located in Sacramento, California, and the local area office.

Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review. Individual respondents may request that Reclamation withhold their home address from public disclosure, and we will honor such request to the extent allowable by law. There also may be circumstances in which Reclamation would elect to withhold a respondent's identity from public disclosure, as allowable by law. If you wish us to withhold your name and/or address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comments. We will make all submissions from organizations, businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses available for public disclosure in their entirety. If you wish to review a copy of these Plans, please contact Mr. White to find the office nearest you.

Dated: June 5, 2006.

Donna E. Tegelman,

Regional Resources Manager, Mid-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. E6-10262 Filed 6-28-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-566]

In the Matter of Certain Chemical Mechanical Planarization Slurries and Precursors to Same Notice of a Commission Determination Not to Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation with Respect to the Only Respondent, and Issuance of Consent Order

AGENCY: International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination ("ID") of the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") in the above-captioned investigation terminating the investigation as to the only respondent. The investigation was terminated as to the only respondent based on a consent order.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Clint Gerdine, Esq., telephone 202-708-2310, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436. Copies of all 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 the matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on April 28, 2006, based on a complaint filed by Cabot Microelectronics Corporation of Aurora, Illinois. A supplement to the complaint was filed on April 13, 2006. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain chemical mechanical planarization slurries and precursors to same by reason of infringement of claims 20, 22, 38, and 48 of U.S. Patent

No. 5,958,288; claims 11, 18-19, and 25 of the U.S. Patent No. 5,980,773; and claims 8, 12, and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,068,787. The complaint named the respondent as Cheil Industries Inc. of Korea. The complaint further alleged that an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

On May 19, 2006, the only respondent filed a motion for termination of the investigation on the basis of a consent order. The Commission investigative attorney filed a response in support of the motion on May 31, 2006.

The ALJ issued the subject ID on June 7, 2006, granting the motion for termination. No party petitioned for review of the ID pursuant to 19 CFR 210.43(a), and the Commission found no basis for ordering a review on its own initiative pursuant to 19 CFR 210.44.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in sections 210.21(c) and 210.42(h) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Issued: June 23, 2006.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E6-10218 Filed 6-28-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-561]

In the Matter of Certain Combination Motor and Transmission Systems and Devices Used Therein, and Products Containing Same; Notice of a Commission Determination Not to Review an Initial Determination Granting a Motion to Amend the Complaint and Notice of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the presiding administrative law judge's ("ALJ") initial determination ("ID") granting complainant's motion to amend the complaint and notice of investigation in the above-captioned investigation to substitute respondent Toyota Motor Manufacturing North America, Inc. with Toyota Motor Engineering & Manufacturing North America, Inc. and Toyota Motor Manufacturing Kentucky, Inc.