interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, *see In the Matter of Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines,* Inv. No. 337–TA–360, USITC Pub. No. 2843 (December 1994) (Commission Opinion).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or cease and desist orders would have on (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade Representative, as delegated by the President, has 60 days to approve or disapprove the Commission's action. *See* Presidential Memorandum of July 21, 2005, 70 FR 43251 (July 26, 2005). During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed if a remedy is ordered.

Written Submissions: The parties to the investigation are requested to file written submissions on the issues identified in this notice. Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the ALJ's recommendation on remedy and bonding set forth in the RD. Complainants and the IA are also requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. Complainants are also requested to state the date that the '690 and '343 patents expire and the HTSUS numbers under which the accused products are imported. The written submissions and proposed remedial orders must be filed no later than close of business on Thursday December 9, 2010. Reply submissions must be filed no later than the close of business on Friday December 17, 2010. No further submissions on these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document and 12 true copies thereof on or before the deadlines stated above with the Office of the Secretary. Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment unless the information has already been granted such treatment during the proceedings. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary of the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. *See* 19 CFR 210.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is sought will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

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 sections 210.42–46 and 210.50 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.42–46 and 210.50).

Issued: November 22, 2010.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010–29910 Filed 11–26–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree and Environmental Settlement under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

Notice is hereby given that on November 23, 2010, a proposed Consent Decree and Environmental Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement") in the matter of In re: Tronox Incorporated, *et al.,* Case No.09–10156 (ALG) (Jointly Administered), was lodged with the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York.

The parties to the proposed Settlement Agreement are Tronox Incorporated, and fourteen of its affiliates (collectively, "Tronox" or "Debtors"), the United States, the Navajo Nation, twenty-two states, and several municipalities (collectively, the "Governmental Environmental Claimants"). The proposed Settlement Agreement creates five environmental response trusts and provides for Tronox to pay $270 million and certain other consideration to the environmental response trusts and Governmental Environmental Claimants. Additionally, Tronox is to assign its rights in a pending fraudulent conveyance lawsuit against its former parent, Kerr-McGee Corporation, and Anadarko Petroleum Corporation, which purchased Kerr-McGee, to a litigation trust that will pay 88% of its net recoveries to the environmental response trusts and Governmental Environmental Claimaints. The fraudulent conveyance lawsuit alleges that Kerr-McGee and Anadarko defrauded Tronox and its creditors, including the United States, by imposing on Tronox all of Kerr-McGee's environmental liabilities without sufficient means to satisfy those liabilities.

The Settlement Agreement resolves certain environmental liabilities of the Debtors to the Governmental Environmental Claimants at more than 2000 sites and indicates the amount of cash and percentage of net recoveries from the fraudulent conveyance action that will be provided by site. Among the sites included in the settlement are:

The Mobile Pigment Complex, Mobile, AL
The former Petroleum Terminal Site, Birmingham, AL
The Jacksonville AgChem Site, Jacksonville, FL
The former titanium dioxide Plant, Savannah, GA
The Rare Earths Facility, W. Chicago, IL
The Kress Creek and Residential Areas Sites, W. Chicago, IL
The Lindsay Light Thorium Sites, Chicago, IL
The former wood treating facility, Madison, IL
The Soda Springs Vanadium Plant, Soda Springs, ID
The former wood treating facility, Columbus, MS
The former wood treating facility, Hattiesburg, MS
The Navassa wood treating Site, Wilmington, NC
The Henderson Facility, Henderson, NV
The former wood treating facility, Bossier City, LA
The Calhoun Gas Plant Site, Calhoun, LA
The Fireworks Site, Hanover, MA
The former nuclear fuels facility, Cimarron, OK
The Cleveland Refinery Site, Cleveland, OK

The Cushing Refinery Sites, Cushing, OK
The Corpus Christi Petrol Terminal Site, CC, TX
The former wood treating facility, Texarkana, TX
The former wood treating facility, Kansas City, MO
The former wood treating facility, Springfield, MO
The former wood treating facility, Rome, NY
The former wood treating facility, Avoca, PA
The Riley Pass Mine Site, Harding County, SD
The former wood treating facility, Indianapolis, IN more than 50 former uranium mines and mills, including Shiprock, Churchrock, and Ambrosia Lake on and in the vicinity of Navajo Nation, NM, AZ
The White King/Lucky Lass mine site, Lakeview, OR
The Toledo Tie Site, Toledo, OH
The Welsbach Gas and Mantle Site, Camden, NJ
The former Federal Creosote facility, Manville, NJ
The former Moss American Site, Milwaukee, WI more than 1800 current and former service stations in twenty-four states

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 and Settlement Agreement. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either e-mailed 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 In re Tronox, Incorporated *et al.,* D.J. Ref. 90–11–3–09688. Commenters may request an opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area, in accordance with section 7003(d) of RCRA,42 U.S.C. 6973(d).

The Consent Decree and Settlement Agreement may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, 86 Chambers Street—3rd Floor, New York, New York 10007. During the public comment period, the Consent Decree and Settlement Agreement 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 and Settlement Agreement 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 enclose a check in the amount of $53.25 (213 pages, exclusive of signature pages and attachments; 25 cents per page reproduction cost) or $123.75 (495 pages, including signatures and attachments) payable to the U.S. Treasury or, if by e-mail or fax, forward a check in that amount to the Consent Decree Library at the stated address.

Maureen M. Katz,

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

[FR Doc. 2010–30027 Filed 11–26–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–CW–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–70,599]

Innovion Corporation, Gresham, OR; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On March 31, 2010, the Department of Labor issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of Innovion Corporation, Gresham, Oregon (subject firm). The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 19, 2010 (75 FR 20382). The workers supply ion implantation services for firms in the semiconductor industry.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the finding that there was no shift to/acquisition from a foreign country by the workers' firm of services like or directly competitive with the ion implantation services supplied by the subject firm and no increased import by either the subject firm or its major declining customers of services like or directly competitive with the ion implantation services supplied by the subject firm [Section 222(a)]. Further, the workers are not eligible to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) as adversely affected secondary workers [Section 222(c)] or workers of a firm identified by the International Trade Commission as a member of a domestic industry injured under a provision of the Tariff Act of 1930 [Section 222(f)].

The initial investigation concluded that worker separations were attributable to a customer's decision to perform ion implantation services in-house instead of using the subject firm.

During the reconsideration investigation, the Department sought clarification from the subject firm's headquarters and conducted an expanded customer survey of the subject firm's major declining customers, including those identified in the request for reconsideration.

Information provided during the reconsideration investigation confirmed no shift to/acquisition from another country by the subject firm in the supply of ion implantation services, and no increased imports of ion implantation services, or like or directly competitive services, by the subject firm during the relevant period.

The customer survey conducted during the reconsideration investigation showed that, during the relevant time period, the three largest declining customers of the subject firm did not import services like or directly competitive with the ion implantation services provided by the subject workers.

Together, the surveyed customers accounted for 92 percent of subject firm sales in 2007, 89 percent of subject firm sales in 2008, and 84 percent of subject firm sales during the first four months of 2009. Those customers also accounted for 109 percent of the sales decline of the subject firm from 2007 to 2008 and 97 percent of the subject firm's sales decline during the first four months of 2009 as compared with the same period of 2009.

The assertion that the subject firm should be certified as a result of the certification of customer LSI Logic (TA–W–55,958; certified on November 3, 2003) was not investigated on reconsideration because a shift to a foreign country by a customer cannot be a basis of certification absent under Section 222(a), which requires that there has been a shift to a foreign country by the subject firm. Further, the certification of the Chandler, Arizona facility (TA–W–71,648) cannot be the basis of certification of workers of the Gresham, Oregon facility as adversely affected secondary workers because the certification of the Chandler, Arizona facility was based on the satisfaction of Section 222(c) and Section 222(c) requires that the primary firm be certified under Section 222(a).

Conclusion

After reconsideration, I affirm the original notice of negative determination of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance for workers and former workers of Innovion Corporation, Gresham, Oregon.