#### **Oneida County**

Camroden Presbyterian Church, 8049 E. Floyd Rd., Floyd, 06001204

#### **Onondaga County**

Borodino District School #8, 1845 Rose Hill Rd., Borodino, 06001206

## **Schenectady County**

Swart House and Tavern, 130 Johnson Rd., Glenville, 06001211

## **Suffolk County**

Wereholme, 5500 S. Bay Ave., Islip, 06001208

## TENNESSEE

#### **Obion County**

Whitesell, Jesse Farm (Boundary Increase), KY 116 W of Purchase Pkwy., Fulton, 06001199

## VIRGINIA

#### **Richmond Independent City**

Lee, Robert E., Monument, 1700 Monument Ave., jct. of Monument and Allen Aves., Richmond (Independent City), 06001213

#### WASHINGTON

#### **Clark County**

Vancouver National Historic Reserve Historic District, Roughly bounded by an alley N of Officers' Row, East Reserve St., Columbia River, and I–5, Vancouver, 06001216

#### King County

YWCA Building—Seattle, 1118 Fifth Ave., Seattle, 06001215

### **Pierce County**

Balfour Dock Building, 705 Dock St., Tacoma, 06001214

To assist in the preservation of this historic property the comment period has been shortened to five (5) days:

# KENTUCKY

#### **Jefferson County**

Bannon, Martin Jeff (M.J.), House, 5112 Bannon Crossing, Louisville, 06001196

[FR Doc. E6–20926 Filed 12–8–06; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4312–51–P

# INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–491; Inv. No. 337–TA–481 (consolidated) Enforcement Proceeding]

In the Matter of Certain Display
Controllers and Products Containing
Same and Certain Display Controllers
With Upscaling Functionality and
Products Containing Same; Notice of
Commission Decision Not To Review
an Initial Determination of the
Administrative Law Judge Terminating
the Enforcement Proceeding Based on
a Settlement Agreement

**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") (Order No. 46) terminating the above-captioned enforcement proceeding based on a settlement agreement.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Liberman, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-3061. 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) 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: On August 20, 2004, the Commission terminated the above-captioned investigation and issued a limited exclusion order ("the Order") which denies entry to certain display controllers manufactured, inter alia, by respondent MStar Semiconductor, Inc. ("MStar") and covered by claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 17, 33–36, 38, and 39 of U.S. Patent 5,739,867. On April 24, 2006, complainant Genesis Microchip (Delaware) Inc. ("Genesis") filed a complaint for enforcement of the

Commission's Order under Commission Rule 210.75. Genesis asserted that respondent MStar had violated the Commission's Order by importing its allegedly infringing Tsunami display controllers into the United States.

On June 23, 2006, the Commission issued a "Notice of Institution of Formal Enforcement Proceeding." See 71 Fed. Reg. 37096 (June 29, 2006). On October 25, 2006, complainant Genesis and respondent MStar filed a joint motion to terminate the enforcement proceeding on the basis of a settlement agreement pursuant to Commission Rule 210.21. See 19 CFR. 210.21. On November 6, 2006, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response in support of the motion.

On November 8, 2006, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 46) granting the motion. No party petitioned for review of Order No. 46.

The Commission has determined not to review Order No. 46.

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 210.42(h) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42(h)).

By order of the Commission. Dated: December 6, 2006.

# Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E6–21008 Filed 12–8–06; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

# INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731–TA–471 and 472 (Second Review)]

# Silicon Metal From Brazil and China

#### **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 antidumping duty order on silicon metal from Brazil 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. The Commission also determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from China would be likely to lead to continuation

<sup>&</sup>lt;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)).