

Maricopa (Ak Chin) Indian Reservation, Arizona; Cocopah Tribe of Arizona; Colorado River Indian Tribes of the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Arizona and California; Gila River Indian Community of the Gila River Indian Reservation, Arizona; Havasupai Tribe of the Havasupai Reservation, Arizona; Hualapai Indian Tribe of the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Arizona; Hopi Tribe of Arizona; Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona; Pueblo of Laguna, New Mexico; Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation, California & Arizona; Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community of the Salt River Reservation, Arizona; Tohono O'odham Nation of Arizona; Yavapai-Apache Nation of the Camp Verde Indian Reservation, Arizona; Yavapai-Prescott Tribe of the Yavapai Reservation, Arizona; and Zuni Tribe of the Zuni Reservation, New Mexico. Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with these human remains and associated funerary objects should contact Jan I. Bernstein, Collections Manager and NAGPRA Coordinator, University of Denver Department of Anthropology and Museum of Anthropology, 2000 Asbury, Sturm Hall S-146, Denver, CO 80208-2406, e-mail [jbernste@du.edu](mailto:jbernste@du.edu), telephone (303) 871-2543, before December 5, 2001. Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects to the Ak Chin Indian Community of the Maricopa (Ak Chin) Indian Reservation, Arizona; Gila River Indian Community of the Gila River Indian Reservation, Arizona; Hopi Tribe of Arizona; Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community of the Salt River Reservation, Arizona; Tohono O'odham Nation of Arizona; and Zuni Tribe of the Zuni Reservation, New Mexico may begin after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

Dated: August 31, 2001.

**John Robbins,**

*Assistant Director, Cultural Resources Stewardship and Partnerships.*

[FR Doc. 01-27703 Filed 11-2-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-70-S**

## **INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**

[Inv. No. 337-TA-451]

### **Certain CMOS Active Pixel Image Sensors and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation on the Basis of 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's") initial determination ("ID") terminating the investigation in its entirety based on a settlement agreement.

**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. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). Copies 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.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission ordered the institution of this investigation on March 5, 2001, based on a complaint filed by Photobit Corp. (Photobit) and the California Institute of Technology (Caltech), both of Pasadena, CA, against respondents OmniVision Technologies, Inc. of Sunnyvale, CA (OmniVision), Creative Labs, Inc. of Milpitas, CA (Creative Labs), and X10 Wireless Technology Inc. of Seattle, WA (X10). 66 FR 14421 (2001). The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation into the United States, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain CMOS active pixel image sensors and products containing same by reason of infringement of claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Letters Patent 5,841,126; claims 15-19 of U.S. Letters Patent

5,990,506; and claims 6-8 and 31 of U.S. Letters Patent 6,005,619.

On September 24, 2001, complainants Photobit and Caltech and respondents Creative Labs, OmniVision, and X10 filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation in its entirety based on settlement agreements. On October 2, 2001, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response supporting the joint motion. On October 9, 2001, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 10) granting the joint motion. No petitions for review of the ID were filed.

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

Issued: October 30, 2001.

By order of the Commission.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 01-27636 Filed 11-2-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## **INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**

[Inv. No. 337-TA-441]

### **Certain Field Programmable Gate Arrays and Products Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation on the Basis of 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's") initial determination ("ID") terminating the investigation in its entirety based on a settlement agreement.

**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. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). Copies 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.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission instituted this investigation on December 21, 2000, based on a complaint filed by Xilinx, Inc. of San Jose, CA. 65 FR 80454 (2000). The complaint named Altera Corp. of San Jose, CA as the only respondent. Id. The complaint, as supplemented, alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation into the United States, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of certain field programmable gate arrays and products containing same by reason of infringement of claims 1-3 and 5 of U.S. Letters Patent 5,343,406; claims 1 and 3 U.S. Letters Patent 5,432,719 ("the '719 patent"); and claim 16 of U.S. Letters Patent 5,861,761. On July 11, 2001, the ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 6) amending the notice of investigation to add claim 2 of the '719 patent. 66 FR 39790 (2001). The Commission determined not to review that ID.

A tutorial was held on June 22, 2001, and an evidentiary hearing was held from June 25 through July 5, 2001.

On July 25, 2001, complainant Xilinx, Inc. and respondent Altera Corp. filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation by settlement. On July 31, 2001, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response supporting the joint motion. On October 2, 2001, the presiding ALJ issued an ID (Order No. 8) granting the joint motion. No party petitioned for review of the ID.

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

Issued: October 30, 2001.

By order of the Commission.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-27635 Filed 11-2-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

[OJP (OJJDP)-1339]

#### Meeting of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

**AGENCY:** Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice of Meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Announcement of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention meeting.

**DATES:** A meeting of this advisory committee, chartered as the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, will take place in the District of Columbia, beginning at 10 a.m. on Friday, November 30, 2001, and ending at noon, ET.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will take place at the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Main Conference Room, 3rd Floor, 810 Seventh Street, NW., Washington, DC 20531.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bob Altman, Program Manager, Juvenile Justice Resource Center at (301) 519-5721. [This is not a toll-free number.]

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Coordinating Council, established pursuant to section 3(2)A of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.2), will meet to carry out its advisory functions under section 206 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.). The topic of this meeting is Supporting Community and Faith-based Initiatives. This meeting will be open to the public. Members of the public who wish to attend the meeting should notify the Juvenile Justice Resource Center at the number listed above by 5 p.m., ET, on Friday, November 16, 2001. For security purposes, picture identification will be required.

Dated: October 31, 2001.

**Terrence S. Donahue,**

Acting Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

[FR Doc. 01-27667 Filed 11-2-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-18-P**

## MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

### Opportunity To File Amicus Briefs in *Gerald Michaud v. Department of the Army*, MSPB Docket No. BN-3443-00-0167-I-1

**AGENCY:** Merit Systems Protection Board.

**SUMMARY:** The Merit Systems Protection Board has requested an advisory opinion from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) concerning the interpretation of regulations promulgated by OPM governing the Reemployment Priority List (RPL) at 5 CFR part 330, subpart B. The Board is providing interested parties with an opportunity to submit amicus briefs on the same questions raised in the request to OPM. The Board's request to OPM is reproduced below:

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(e)(1)(A), the members of the Merit Systems Protection Board request that you provide an advisory opinion concerning the interpretation of regulations promulgated by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This request for an advisory opinion is related to our previous request for an advisory opinion in *Sturdy v. Department of the Army*, 88 M.S.P.R. 502 (2001). There, we requested an advisory opinion on whether the Board has jurisdiction, under 5 CFR 330.209, over an alleged violation of reemployment priority rights when the employee received a Certification of Expected Separation by reduction in force (RIF) and/or a specific notice of RIF separation but was reassigned in lieu of his expected RIF separation. (For ease of reference, the term "notice of RIF separation" will be used hereinafter to refer to either type of notice.)

In response to our request in *Sturdy*, OPM's General Counsel provided an advisory opinion stating that separation by RIF is not a jurisdictional requirement for a "reemployment priority rights" appeal under 5 CFR 330.209 because employees are entitled to enroll in the Reemployment Priority List (RPL) as soon as they receive a notice of RIF separation. We deferred to OPM's advisory opinion and held in *Sturdy*, 88 M.S.P.R. 502, ¶¶ 18-19, that separation by RIF is not a jurisdictional requirement for "reemployment priority rights" appeal.

In *Michaud v. Department of the Army*, MSPB Docket No. BN-3443-00-0167-I-1, the appellant initially received a notice of RIF separation, but subsequently received an amended RIF