

occupation of eastern Colorado from the Late Archaic through Protohistoric periods. In consultations with potentially affiliated groups, the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming; Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, Colorado; and Ute Mountain Ute Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, New Mexico & Utah, all offered information from histories and oral traditions to place their tribes prehistorically along the Front Range and adjacent plains of eastern Colorado. The Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Reservation, South Dakota; Comanche Nation, Oklahoma; Crow Tribe of Montana; Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma; Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of North & South Dakota; and Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, North Dakota offered traditional information that substantiated that they had occupied this area of the Plains prior to European settlement.

Officials of the University of Colorado Museum have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(9–10), the human remains described above represent the physical remains of a minimum of 47 individuals of Native American ancestry. Officials of the University of Colorado Museum also have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(3)(A), the 79 objects described above are reasonably believed to have been placed with or near individual human remains at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony. Lastly, officials of the University of Colorado Museum have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(2), there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between the Native American human remains and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming; Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Reservation, South Dakota; Comanche Nation, Oklahoma; Crow Tribe of Montana; Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma; Jicarilla Apache Tribe of New Mexico; Kiowa Indian Tribe of Oklahoma; Northern Cheyenne Tribe of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Montana; Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, South Dakota; Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma; Rosebud Sioux Tribe of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, South Dakota; Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, South Dakota; Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, Colorado; Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of North & South Dakota; Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort

Berthold Reservation, North Dakota; Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah & Ouray Reservation, Utah; and Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, New Mexico & Utah.

Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with the human remains and associated funerary objects should contact Steve Lekson, Curator of Anthropology, University of Colorado Museum, Henderson Building, Campus Box 218, Boulder, CO 80309–0218, telephone (303) 492–6671, before March 3, 2006. Repatriation of the human remains and associated funerary objects to the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming; Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Reservation, South Dakota; Comanche Nation, Oklahoma; Crow Tribe of Montana; Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma; Jicarilla Apache Tribe of New Mexico; Kiowa Indian Tribe of Oklahoma; Northern Cheyenne Tribe of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Montana; Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, South Dakota; Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma; Rosebud Sioux Tribe of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, South Dakota; Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, Colorado; Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of North & South Dakota; Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, North Dakota; Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah & Ouray Reservation, Utah; and Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, New Mexico & Utah may proceed after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

University of Colorado Museum is responsible for notifying the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming; Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Reservation, South Dakota; Comanche Nation, Oklahoma; Crow Tribe of Montana; Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma; Jicarilla Apache Tribe of New Mexico; Kiowa Indian Tribe of Oklahoma; Northern Cheyenne Tribe of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Montana; Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, South Dakota; Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma; Rosebud Sioux Tribe of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, South Dakota; Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, Colorado; Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of North & South Dakota; Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, North Dakota; Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah & Ouray Reservation, Utah; and Ute Mountain

Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation, Colorado, New Mexico & Utah.

Dated: January 11, 2006.

Sherry Hutt,

Manager, National NAGPRA Program.

[FR Doc. E6–1273 Filed 1–31–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–50–S

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701–TA–302 and 731–TA–454 (Second Review)]

Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon From Norway

Determinations

On the basis of the record¹ 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 and countervailing duty orders on fresh and chilled Atlantic salmon from Norway 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 February 2, 2005 (70 FR 5471) and determined on May 9, 2005 that it would conduct a full review (70 FR 29364, May 20, 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 June 27, 2005 (70 FR 36947).² The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on October 20, 2005, 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 January 27, 2006. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3835 (January 2006), entitled *Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway: Investigation Nos. 701–TA–302 and 731–TA–454 (Second Review)*.

Issued: January 27, 2006.

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

² Revisions to the schedule were published in the **Federal Register** on August 30, 2005 (70 FR 51365) and September 29, 2005 (70 FR 56930).

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E6-1360 Filed 1-31-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-683 (Second Review)]

Fresh Garlic From China

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of a five-year review concerning the antidumping duty order on fresh garlic from China.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice that it has instituted a review pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order on fresh garlic from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act, interested parties are requested to respond to this notice by submitting the information specified below to the Commission;¹ to be assured of consideration, the deadline for responses is March 23, 2006. Comments on the adequacy of responses may be filed with the Commission by April 17, 2006. For further information concerning the conduct of this review and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 1, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Messer (202-205-3193), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office

¹ No response to this request for information is required if a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) number is not displayed; the OMB number is 3117-0016/USITC No. 06-5-146, expiration date June 30, 2008. Public reporting burden for the request is estimated to average 10 hours per response. Please send comments regarding the accuracy of this burden estimate to the Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436.

of the Secretary at 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 review may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—On November 16, 1994, the Department of Commerce issued an antidumping duty order on imports of fresh garlic from China (59 FR 59209). Following five-year reviews by Commerce and the Commission, effective March 13, 2001, Commerce issued a continuation of the antidumping duty order on imports of fresh garlic from China (66 FR 14544). The Commission is now conducting a second review to determine whether revocation of the order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry within a reasonably foreseeable time. It will assess the adequacy of interested party responses to this notice of institution to determine whether to conduct a full review or an expedited review. The Commission's determination in any expedited review will be based on the facts available, which may include information provided in response to this notice.

Definitions.—The following definitions apply to this review:

(1) *Subject Merchandise* is the class or kind of merchandise that is within the scope of the five-year review, as defined by the Department of Commerce.

(2) The *Subject Country* in this review is China.

(3) The *Domestic Like Product* is the domestically produced product or products which are like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the Subject Merchandise. In its original determination, the Commission found three separate Domestic Like Products consisting of fresh garlic, dehydrated garlic, and seed garlic corresponding with the broader scope of the original investigation. However, the Commission found that the domestic industries producing garlic for dehydration and seed garlic were neither materially injured nor threatened with material injury by reason of the subject imports from China. One Commissioner defined the Domestic Like Product differently in the original determination. In its full five-year review determination, the Commission defined the Domestic Like Product as all fresh garlic.

(4) The *Domestic Industry* is the U.S. producers as a whole of the Domestic Like Product, or those producers whose

collective output of the Domestic Like Product constitutes a major proportion of the total domestic production of the product. In its original determination, the Commission found three domestic industries consisting of the domestic producers of fresh garlic, the domestic producers of dehydrated garlic, and the domestic producers of seed garlic to coincide with the three Domestic Like Products. The Commission also found that crop tenders were not members of the Domestic Industry. One Commissioner defined the Domestic Industry differently in the original determination. In its full five-year review determination, the Commission defined the Domestic Industry as all producers of fresh garlic.

(5) An *Importer* is any person or firm engaged, either directly or through a parent company or subsidiary, in importing the Subject Merchandise into the United States from a foreign manufacturer or through its selling agent.

Participation in the review and public service list.—Persons, including industrial users of the Subject Merchandise and, if the merchandise is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations, wishing to participate in the review as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in section 201.11(b)(4) of the Commission's rules, no later than 21 days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The Secretary will maintain a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the review.

Former Commission employees who are seeking to appear in Commission five-year reviews are reminded that they are required, pursuant to 19 CFR 201.15, to seek Commission approval if the matter in which they are seeking to appear was pending in any manner or form during their Commission employment. The Commission is seeking guidance as to whether a second transition five-year review is the "same particular matter" as the underlying original investigation for purposes of 19 CFR 201.15 and 18 U.S.C. 207, the post employment statute for Federal employees. Former employees may seek informal advice from Commission ethics officials with respect to this and the related issue of whether the employee's participation was "personal and substantial." However, any informal consultation will not relieve former employees of the obligation to seek approval to appear from the Commission under its rule 201.15. For ethics advice, contact Carol McCue