

rights with respect to certain other claims.

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, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to *United States v. Industrial Excess Landfill, Inc.*, DOJ Ref. # 90-11-3-247/2.

Each Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Northern District of Ohio, 801 West Superior Avenue, Suite 400, Cleveland, Ohio 44113, and the Region Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60604. During the public comment period, each Consent Decree may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site: <http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/open.html>.

A copy of each 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 e-mailing a request to Tonia Fleetwood, tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov, Fax No. (202) 514-0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514-1547. In requesting a copy from the Consent Decree library, please specify whether requesting the PPG Consent Decree, the Morgan Consent Decree, or both, and please enclose a check payable to the U.S. Treasury in the amount of \$5.50 for the PPG Consent Decree, \$6.25 for the Morgan Consent Decree, or \$11.75 for both Consent Decrees (for reproduction costs of 25 cents per page).

William D. Brighton,

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

[FR Doc. 06-5191 Filed 6-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging Proposed Consent Decree

In accordance with Departmental Policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed consent decree in *United States v. Jerome Purze, et al.*, Case No. 04 C 7697, was lodged with the United States District Court for the northern District of Illinois on May 31, 2006. This proposed Consent Decree concerns a complaint filed by the United States against the Defendants pursuant to Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act ("CWA"), 33 U.S.C. 1311(a),

to obtain injunctive relief from and impose civil penalties against the Defendants for filling wetlands without a permit.

The proposed Consent Decree requires the defendants to pay a civil penalty, donate funds to a wetland restoration fund, and restore the impacted wetland. The Department of Justice will accept written comments relating to this proposed Consent Decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this notice. Please address comments to Kurt Lindland, Assistant United States Attorney, United States Attorney's Office, 5th Floor, 219 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604 and refer to *United States v. Jerome Purze, et al.* Case No. 04 C 7697, including the USAO #2004V01553.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, 219 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois. In addition, the proposed Consent Decree may be viewed on the World Wide Web at <http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/open.html>.

Kurt N. Lindland,

Assistant United States Attorney

[FR Doc. 06-5190 Filed 6-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-59,052]

Array-Hartland, Hartland, WI; Notice of Termination of Certification

On April 19, 2006, the Department issued a Notice of Intent to Terminate the Certification of Eligibility For Workers of Array-Hartland, Hartland, Wisconsin, to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance issued in accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273), and Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (26 U.S.C. 2813). The notice of the intent to terminate the certification was published in the **Federal Register** on May 5, 2006 (71 FR 26563-26564).

The Department's notice requested that any persons showing a substantial interest in the termination of the certification to submit comments by May 15, 2006.

No comments were received. Accordingly, this certification is hereby terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 18th day of May, 2006.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E6-8770 Filed 6-6-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-58,948]

Carolina Mills, Inc., Plant #3, Newton, NC; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated April 19, 2006, a company official requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on March 27, 2006 and published in the **Federal Register** on April 17, 2006 (71 FR 19755).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The petition for the workers of Carolina Mills, Inc., Plant #3, Newton, North Carolina engaged in production of woven textile fabrics was denied because the "contributed importantly" group eligibility requirement of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met, nor was there a shift in production from that firm to a foreign country. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. The survey revealed no imports of woven textile fabrics during the relevant period. The subject firm did not import woven textile fabrics nor did it shift production to a foreign country during the relevant period.

The petitioner states that the affected workers lost their jobs as a result of the negative impact of increased imports of gloves on U.S. glove manufacturing. The