

Tudor Rd., MS-231, Anchorage, Alaska 99503, or by e-mail to [ken\\_w\\_rice@fws.gov](mailto:ken_w_rice@fws.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT:** Ken Rice, Planning Team Leader, (907) 786-3502; or e-mail: [ken\\_w\\_rice@fws.gov](mailto:ken_w_rice@fws.gov). Additional information concerning the comprehensive conservation planning process can be found at <http://www.r7.fws.gov/nwr/planning/plans.htm>.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This notice revises the NOIs previously published by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) for the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge (May 13, 1999, 64 FR 25899), Izembek National Wildlife Refuge (November 26, 2003, 68 FR 66474), Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge (November 26, 2003, 68 FR 66475), and Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge (December 7, 2004, 69 FR 70704), all in Alaska. We furnish this notice in compliance with the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (Administration Act) (16 U.S.C. 668dd-667ee), and with Service planning policy. Previous notices stated our intent to document decisions in these plan revisions with EISs. Based on input from the public, from other agencies, and from within the Service, and the level of complexity and controversy anticipated, we believe that an EA is the appropriate level of NEPA compliance. Should an EA show that potential impacts of actions in these plans are significant, we will produce an EIS.

By Federal law, all lands within the National Wildlife Refuge System are to be managed in accordance with an approved CCP. Section 304(g) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (PL 96-487, 94 Stat. 2371) directs how CCPs in Alaska are prepared. The Plans guide management decisions and identify refuge goals, long-range objectives, and strategies for achieving refuge purposes. CCPs were developed for each of these Refuges in the 1980's. EISs were prepared in conjunction with those plans. The original notices of intent for the Izembek, Togiak, Tetlin, Kenai, and Kanuti National Wildlife Refuges identified our intent to revise the CCPs developed in the 1980s, and to prepare EISs in conjunction with the revised plans.

The Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA direct Federal agencies to prepare EAs under procedures adopted by individual agencies (40 CFR 1501.3). The Fish and Wildlife Service planning policy (602

FW 1-3) requires that CCPs be prepared with an EIS or EA. At the time we prepared the NOIs for the revisions of these plans, we anticipated that new decisions may have significant impacts on the human environment and therefore an EIS was the appropriate NEPA document. We have conducted scoping activities, both internally and with the public, on all of these CCP revisions. Scoping information, together with preliminary alternative development, has not revealed any potentially significant impacts. Revisions to these plans center on the development of vision statements and management goals and objectives, as well as updating policy information and compatibility determinations. Therefore we will prepare EAs for these CCP revisions in accordance with procedures for implementing the NEPA. If at any stage in developing the revised CCPs and associated EAs, we find that new information comes to light that would indicate the need to prepare an EIS we will publish a new NOI and allow the public additional opportunity to provide comment.

Dated: June 30, 2006.

**Gary Edwards,**

*Acting Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, Alaska.*

[FR Doc. E6-11801 Filed 7-24-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

## **INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**

[Inv. No. 337-TA-519]

### **In the Matter of Certain Personal Computers, Monitors, and Components Thereof; Notice of Commission Decision To Terminate the Investigation in Its Entirety Based on a Settlement Agreement Between the Parties**

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to terminate this investigation based on a settlement agreement between the parties.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Steven Crabb, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-5432. 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, D.C. 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:** This investigation was instituted by the Commission on August 6, 2004, based on a complaint filed by Gateway, Inc. of Poway, California ("Gateway") under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337. 69 FR 47956. The complainant alleged violations of section 337 in the importation and sale of certain personal computers, monitors, and components thereof, by reason of infringement of three U.S. patents. The complainant named Hewlett-Packard Company ("HP") of Palo Alto, California as a respondent. Claims 9-11 and 15-19 of U.S. Patent No. 5,192,999 ("the '999 patent") remain at issue in this investigation.

On October 6, 2005, the presiding administrative law judge ("ALJ") issued a final initial determination ("ID") finding no violation of section 337. On December 1, 2005, the Commission issued notice that it had determined to: (1) Review the ALJ's determination regarding induced infringement of claim 19 of the '999 patent and remand the issue to him for further factual findings and analysis; (2) review the ALJ's determination on obviousness solely for the purpose of clarifying the ID's discussion of *Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc.*, 425 U.S. 273 (1976); (3) review the ALJ's determination on enablement; and (4) review the issue of inequitable conduct and remand the issue to him for further factual findings and analysis. The Commission did not review, and therefore adopted, the remainder of the ID. On January 12, 2006, the ALJ issued his findings on remand.

On June 2, 2006, Gateway and HP filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation based on a settlement agreement. On June 13, 2006, the IA filed a response in support of the joint motion to terminate the investigation.

The Commission has determined that termination of the investigation would not have an adverse impact on the public interest and that termination based on a settlement agreement is

generally in the public interest. Accordingly, the Commission has granted the joint motion to terminate the investigation based on the settlement agreement.

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 section 210.21 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR. 210.21).

Issued: July 19, 2006.

By order of the Commission.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. E6-11753 Filed 7-24-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701-TA-253 and 731-TA-132, 252, 271, 273, 409, 410, 532-534, and 536 (Second Review)]

**Certain Pipe and Tube From Argentina, Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan, Thailand, and Turkey**

### 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, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act), that revocation of the countervailing duty order on circular welded pipe and tube from Turkey; the antidumping duty orders on circular welded pipe and tube from Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan, Thailand, and Turkey; and the antidumping duty order on light-walled rectangular pipe and tube from 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. The Commission further determines that revocation of the antidumping duty order on light-walled rectangular pipe and tube from Argentina would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.<sup>2</sup>

### Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on July 1, 2005 (65 FR 38204) and determined on October 4, 2005 that

<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> Commissioners Stephen Koplan and Charlotte R. Lane dissenting.

it would conduct full reviews (70 FR 60367, October 17, 2005). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's reviews and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on December 5, 2005 (70 FR 72467).<sup>3</sup> The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on May 9, 2006, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these reviews to the Secretary of Commerce on July 18, 2006. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3867 (July 2006), entitled *Certain Pipe and Tube from Argentina, Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan, Thailand, and Turkey (Inv. Nos. 701-TA-253 and 731-TA-132, 252, 271, 409, 410, 532-534, and 536 (Second Review))*.

Issued: July 18, 2006.

By order of the Commission.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. E6-11755 Filed 7-24-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731-TA-636-638 (Second Review)]

**Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Brazil, France, and India**

### Determination

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in these subject five-year reviews, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, 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 stainless steel wire rod from Brazil and France would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.<sup>2</sup> The Commission further determines that revocation of the antidumping duty

<sup>3</sup> The Commission revised its schedule in these reviews on June 2, 2006 (71 FR 33484, June 9, 2006).

<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> Commissioners Stephen Koplan and Charlotte R. Lane dissenting with respect to Brazil; Commissioner Lane dissenting with respect to France.

order on stainless steel wire rod from India 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 38207) and determined on October 4, 2005 that it would conduct full reviews (70 FR 60109, October 14, 2005). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's reviews and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on January 23, 2006 (71 FR 3541). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on May 18, 2006, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these reviews to the Secretary of Commerce on July 19, 2006. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3866 (July 2006), entitled *Stainless Steel Wire Rod from Brazil, France, and India: Investigation Nos. 731-TA-636-638 (Second Review)*.

Issued: July 20, 2006.

By order of the Commission.

**Marilyn R. Abbott**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. E6-11836 Filed 7-24-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[AAG/A Order No. 011-2006]

### Privacy Act of 1974; System of Records

**AGENCY:** Executive Office for United States Attorneys, Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice of modifications to system of records.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a) and Circular A-130 of the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB"), the Executive Office for United States Attorneys ("EOUSA"), Department of Justice ("DOJ"), proposes to update its system of records entitled JUSTICE/USA-015—"Debt Collection Enforcement System," last substantively revised on November 12, 1993 (58 FR 60055)—to reflect subsequent legal and administrative developments.

**DATES:** These actions will be effective September 5, 2006.