## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–472 (Third Review)]

## Silicon Metal From China; Scheduling of an Expedited Five-Year Review

**AGENCY:** United States International Trade Commission. **ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of an expedited review pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(3)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order on silicon metal from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. 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).

DATES: *Effective Date:* February 6, 2012. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barbara Elkins (202–205–2250), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearingimpaired 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 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 February 6, 2012, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (76 FR 67476, November 1, 2011) of the subject five-year review was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission did not find any other circumstances that would warrant conducting a full review.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the Commission determined that it would conduct an expedited review pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Act.<sup>2</sup>

*Staff report.*—A staff report containing information concerning the subject matter of the review will be placed in the nonpublic record on March 1, 2012, and made available to persons on the Administrative Protective Order service list for this review. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to section 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission's rules.

Written submissions.—As provided in section 207.62(d) of the Commission's rules, interested parties that are parties to the review and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution,<sup>3</sup> and any party other than an interested party to the review may file written comments with the Secretary on what determination the Commission should reach in the review. Comments are due on or before March 6, 2012 and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year review nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual information) pertinent to the review by March 6, 2012. However, should the Department of Commerce extend the time limit for its completion of the final results of its review, the deadline for comments (which may not contain new factual information) on Commerce's final results is three business days after the issuance of Commerce's results. If comments contain business proprietary information (BPI), they must conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. Please be aware that the Commission's rules with respect to electronic filing have been amended. The amendments took effect on November 7, 2011. See 76 FR 61937 (Oct. 6, 2011) and the newly revised Commission's Handbook on E-Filing, available on the Commission's Web site at *http://edis.usitc.gov*.

Also, in accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to the review must be served on all other parties to the review (as identified by either the public or APO service list as appropriate), and a certificate of service must accompany the document (if you are not a party to the review you do not need to serve your response). The

Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.62 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 17, 2012.

# James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission. [FR Doc. 2012–4197 Filed 2–22–12; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

Notice is hereby given that on February 14, 2012, the United States lodged a proposed Consent Decree with **Defendants Bradley Mining Company** ("BMC") and Frederick Bradley, Trustee for the Worthen Bradley Family Trust ("Bradley Trust"), in United States v. Bradley Mining Company, et al., Civil Action No. 3:08-CV-03968 TEH (N.D. Cal.), with respect to the Sulphur Bank Mercury Mine Superfund Site in Lake County, California ("Sulphur Bank Site"), and with Defendant BMC in a consolidated case, United States v. Bradley Mining Company, Civil Action No. 3:08-CV-05501 TEH (N.D. Cal.), with respect to the Stibnite Mine Site in Valley County, Idaho ("Stibnite Mine Site").

The proposed Consent Decree resolves the following claims: (1) on August 19, 2008, the United States, on behalf of the United States **Environmental Protection Agency** ("EPA"), filed a complaint under section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9607, against BMC and Bradley Trust, seeking recovery of response costs incurred by EPA related to releases of hazardous substances at the Sulphur Bank Site; and (2) on September 26, 2008, the United States, on behalf of EPA and the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service ("Forest Service"), filed a complaint under CERCLA section 107 against BMC seeking recovery of response costs incurred by EPA and the Forest Service related to the releases of hazardous substances at the Stibnite Mine Site. The proposed Consent Decree also resolves claims in the Sulphur Bank case brought by the Elem Tribe against BMC, the Bradley Trust, and the United States for cost recovery

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A record of the Commissioners' votes, the Commission's statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner's statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission's Web site.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Chairman Deanna Tanner Okun is not participating in this review.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Commission has found the response submitted by Globe Metallurgical Inc. to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (*see* 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).

under CERCLA section 107(a) as well as damages for injury to, destruction of, or loss of natural resources related to the Sulphur Bank Site and the costs of any natural resource damage assessments under CERCLA section 107(a)(4)(c). Finally, the Consent Decree resolves counterclaims against the United States brought by BMC and Bradley Trust in the Sulphur Bank case and by BMC in the Stibnite Mine case.

Financial information provided by the Settling Defendants indicated an inability to pay. However, pursuant to the proposed Consent Decree, the United States will receive a payment of \$505,000 from BMC's insurer, a percentage of future insurance recoveries and future income, and the proceeds from the future sale of parcels of land. In addition, Defendant Bradley Trust will transfer property to the Elem Tribe. In exchange, the proposed Consent Decree provides Bradley Trust with a covenant not to sue and contribution protection for the Sulphur Bank Site, and provides BMC with a covenant not to sue and contribution protection for the Sulphur Bank Site, the Stibnite Mine Site, and five additional mining sites: the Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine in Contra Costa County, California; the Springfield Scheelite Mine in Valley County, Idaho; the IMA Mine in Lemhi County, Idaho; the Bretz Mine in Malheur County, Oregon; and the Opalite Mine in Malheur County. Oregon. Finally, settling federal agencies will pay \$7.2 million for EPA's response costs at the Sulphur Bank Site and will receive a covenant not to sue and contribution protection for the Sulphur Bank Site and the Stibnite Mine Site.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either emailed to *pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov* or mailed to P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611, and should refer to United States v. Bradley Mining Company, et al., D.J. Ref. 90–11–3–07593.

The Consent Decree may be examined at U.S. EPA Region IX at 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105. During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site: http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/ Consent\_Decrees.html. A copy of the Consent Decree may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044–7611 or by faxing or emailing a request to "Consent Decree Copy"

(*EESCDCopy.ENRD@usdoj.gov*), fax no. (202) 514–0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514–5271. In requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library, please enclose a check in the amount of \$17.75 (without appendices) or \$32.50 (with appendices) (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury or, if by email or fax, forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the stated address.

#### Henry Friedman,

Assistant Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2012–4114 Filed 2–22–12; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

# DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### **Antitrust Division**

### United States v. SG Interests I LTD., et al.; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Colorado in United States of America v. SG Interests I, Ltd. et al., Civil Action No. 12-CV-00395-RPM-MEH. On February 15, 2012, the United States filed a civil antitrust Complaint alleging that the SG Interests I Ltd. and SG Interests VII Ltd. (SGI) and Gunnison Energy Corporation (GEC) agreed to jointly bid for natural gas leases in the Ragged Mountain Area of Western Colorado, which were auctioned by the United States Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management in February and May 2005, thereby violating Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. The proposed Final Judgment, filed the same day as the Complaint, requires SGI and GEC to each pay \$275,000 to the United States to settle the antitrust action and a related qui tam case also filed in United States District Court for the District of Colorado, United States of America ex rel. Anthony B. Gale v. Gunnison Energy Corporation, Civil Action No. 09-CV-02471-RBJ-KLM.

Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection at the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Antitrust Documents Group, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 1010, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202– 514–2481), on the Department of Justice's Web site at *http:// www.usdoj.gov/atr*, and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Colorado. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, and responses thereto, will be published in the **Federal Register** and filed with the Court. Comments should be directed to William H. Stallings, Chief, Transportation, Energy and Agriculture Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20530, (telephone: 202–514–9323).

## Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement.

### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. No. 12–cv–00395–RPM– MEH

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 5th Street NW., Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20530, Plaintiff, v. SG INTERESTS I, LTD., SG INTERESTS VII, LTD., 2 Houston Center, 909 Fannin, Suite 2600, Houston, TX 77010, and GUNNISON ENERGY CORPORATION, 1801 Broadway, Suite 1200, Denver, CO 80202, Defendants.

#### COMPLAINT

The United States of America, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action under Section 4 of the Sherman Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 4, and Section 4A of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 15a, to obtain equitable and legal remedies against Defendants Gunnison Energy Corporation ("GEC"), and SG Interests I, Ltd. and SG Interests VII, Ltd. (collectively, "SGI") for their violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 1.

Prior to 2005, GEC and SGI were separately engaged in exploration and development of natural gas resources in the Ragged Mountain Area (or "RMA") of Western Colorado.<sup>1</sup> Recognizing that they would be the primary competitors to acquire three natural gas leases for exploration and development on federal lands in the RMA that were to be auctioned by the Bureau of Land Management ("BLM") in February 2005, GEC and SGI executed a Memorandum of Understanding (the "MOU") on the eve of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>For purposes of this Complaint, we define the Ragged Mountain Area as covering roughly a region encompassed by the Townships 10S through 12S and Ranges 89W through 91W, as designated by the Public Land Survey System, comprising portions of Delta, Gunnison, Mesa and Pitkin Counties.