

(10) If you are a U.S. importer or a trade/business association of U.S. importers of the *Subject Merchandise* from the *Subject Country*, provide the following information on your firm's(s') operations on that product during calendar year 2011 (report quantity data in pounds and value data in U.S. dollars). If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.

(a) The quantity and value (landed, duty-paid but not including antidumping duties) of U.S. imports and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total U.S. imports of *Subject Merchandise* from the *Subject Country* accounted for by your firm's(s') imports;

(b) The quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping duties) of U.S. commercial shipments of *Subject Merchandise* imported from the *Subject Country*; and

(c) The quantity and value (f.o.b. U.S. port, including antidumping duties) of U.S. internal consumption/company transfers of *Subject Merchandise* imported from the *Subject Country*.

(11) If you are a producer, an exporter, or a trade/business association of producers or exporters of the *Subject Merchandise* in the *Subject Country*, provide the following information on your firm's(s') operations on that product during calendar year 2011 (report quantity data in pounds and value data in U.S. dollars, landed and duty-paid at the U.S. port but not including antidumping duties).

If you are a trade/business association, provide the information, on an aggregate basis, for the firms which are members of your association.

(a) Production (quantity) and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total production of *Subject Merchandise* in the *Subject Country* accounted for by your firm's(s') production;

(b) Capacity (quantity) of your firm to produce the *Subject Merchandise* in the *Subject Country* (i.e., the level of production that your establishment(s) could reasonably have expected to attain during the year, assuming normal operating conditions (using equipment and machinery in place and ready to operate), normal operating levels (hours per week/weeks per year), time for downtime, maintenance, repair, and cleanup, and a typical or representative product mix); and

(c) The quantity and value of your firm's(s') exports to the United States of *Subject Merchandise* and, if known, an estimate of the percentage of total exports to the United States of *Subject*

Merchandise from the *Subject Country* accounted for by your firm's(s') exports.

(12) Identify significant changes, if any, in the supply and demand conditions or business cycle for the *Domestic Like Product* that have occurred in the United States or in the market for the *Subject Merchandise* in the *Subject Country* since the *Order Date*, and significant changes, if any, that are likely to occur within a reasonably foreseeable time. Supply conditions to consider include technology; production methods; development efforts; ability to increase production (including the shift of production facilities used for other products and the use, cost, or availability of major inputs into production); and factors related to the ability to shift supply among different national markets (including barriers to importation in foreign markets or changes in market demand abroad). Demand conditions to consider include end uses and applications; the existence and availability of substitute products; and the level of competition among the *Domestic Like Product* produced in the United States, *Subject Merchandise* produced in the *Subject Country*, and such merchandise from other countries.

(13) (Optional) A statement of whether you agree with the above definitions of the *Domestic Like Product* and *Domestic Industry*; if you disagree with either or both of these definitions, please explain why and provide alternative definitions.

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission's rules.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 27, 2012.

James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2012-4979 Filed 2-29-12; 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 22, 2012, a proposed Partial Consent Decree in *United States et al. v. Seachrome Corp. et al*, Civil Action No. 2:02-cv-4565 ABC (RCx) ("Seachrome") was lodged with the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

In *Seachrome*, the United States of America ("United States"), on behalf of

the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control ("Department"), filed a complaint pursuant to Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9607, seeking reimbursement of response costs incurred or to be incurred for response actions taken in connection with the release or threatened release of hazardous substances at the South El Monte Operable Unit of the San Gabriel Valley Area 1 Superfund Site in South El Monte, Los Angeles County, California (the "South El Monte O.U.").

Under the proposed Partial Consent Decree, two potentially responsible parties ("PRPs") with respect to the South El Monte O.U. will pay a total of \$1.7 million plus interest. The PRPs are Linderman Living Trust A and Rush Street Properties, LLC. The settlement amount is based on the parties' ability to pay. In exchange for the ability to pay payments, the plaintiffs covenant not to sue the ability to pay settling defendants under Section 106 or 107 of CERCLA with respect to the South El Monte O.U.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the proposed 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 this case: *United States et al. v. Seachrome Corp. et al.*, Civil Action No. 2:02-cv-4565 (RCx), D.J. Ref. 90-11-2-09121/5.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html. A copy of the proposed 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 no. (202) 514-5271. In requesting a copy from the Consent Decree Library, please enclose a check 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, in the following amount (25 cents per page

reproduction cost): \$7.50 for the Partial Consent Decree (without attachments).

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

[FR Doc. 2012-4866 Filed 2-29-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States et al. v. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Montana, Inc., et al.; Public Comments and Response on Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h), the United States hereby publishes below the comments received on the proposed Final Judgment in *United States et al. v. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Montana, Inc. et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:11-CV-00123-RFC, which were filed in the United States District Court for the District of Montana on February 21, 2012, together with the response of the United States to the comments.

Copies of the comments and the response are available for inspection at the Department of Justice Antitrust Division, 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 Montana, 316 N. 26th Street, Billings, MT 59101. Copies of any of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

Patricia A. Brink,
Director of Civil Enforcement.

In the United States District Court for the District of Montana; Billings Division

United States of America and State of Montana, Plaintiffs, v. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Montana, Inc., et al., Defendants.

Case No. 1:11-cv-00123-RFC.

Response of Plaintiff United States to Public Comment on the Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h) ("APPA" or "Tunney Act"), the United States hereby responds to the public comment received regarding the proposed Final Judgment in this case. The single comment received agrees that the

proposed Final Judgment will provide an effective and appropriate remedy for the antitrust violations alleged in the Complaint. The United States will move the Court for entry of the proposed Final Judgment after the public comment and this response have been published in the **Federal Register**, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 16(d).

I. Procedural History

On November 8, 2011, the United States and the State of Montana filed a civil antitrust lawsuit challenging an agreement (the "Agreement") between defendant Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Montana, Inc. ("Blue Cross") and defendants Billings Clinic; Bozeman Deaconess Health Services, Inc.; Community Medical Center, Inc.; Northern Montana Health Care, Inc.; and St. Peter's Hospital (collectively, the "hospital defendants").

The hospital defendants are five of the six hospitals that own defendant New West Health Services, Inc. ("New West"), a health insurer that competes against Blue Cross to provide commercial health insurance to Montana consumers. In the Agreement, Blue Cross agreed to pay \$26.3 million to the hospital defendants in exchange for their collectively agreeing to stop purchasing health insurance for their own employees from New West and instead buy insurance for their employees from Blue Cross exclusively for six years. Blue Cross also agreed to provide the hospital defendants with two seats on Blue Cross's board of directors as long as the hospitals do not compete with Blue Cross in the sale of commercial health insurance.

The Complaint alleged that the Agreement would likely cause New West to exit the markets for commercial health insurance, eliminating an important competitor to Blue Cross and ultimately leading to higher prices and lower-quality service for consumers. Consequently, the Complaint alleged that the Agreement unreasonably restrained trade in the sale of commercial health insurance within Montana in the Billings Metropolitan Statistical Area ("MSA"), Bozeman Micropolitan Statistical Area ("MiSA"), Helena MiSA, and Missoula MSA, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1; and that the Agreement substantially lessened competition in the sale of commercial health insurance in those same areas, and would likely continue to do so, in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18, and the Montana Unfair Trade Practices Act, Mont. Code Ann. § 30-14-205.

Simultaneously with the filing of the Complaint, the United States and the State of Montana filed a proposed Final Judgment and Stipulation signed by the plaintiffs and the defendants consenting to entry of the proposed Final Judgment after compliance with the requirements of the Tunney Act, 15 U.S.C. 16. Pursuant to those requirements, the United States also filed its Competitive Impact Statement ("CIS") with the Court on November 8, 2011; published the proposed Final Judgment and CIS in the **Federal Register** on November 18, 2011, see 76 FR 71355; and had summaries of the terms of the proposed Final Judgment and CIS, together with directions for the submission of written comments relating to the proposed Final Judgment, published in The Washington Post on alternating days from November 17 to November 29, 2011, and in the Billings Gazette on November 14, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, and 28. The sixty-day period for public comment ended on January 28, 2012. One comment was received, as described below and attached hereto.

II. The Investigation and Proposed Resolution

The proposed Final Judgment is the culmination of an investigation by the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice ("Department") of the Agreement among defendants described above. As part of its investigation, the Department issued eight Civil Investigative Demands and conducted more than 30 interviews of health-insurance competitors, brokers, customers, and other individuals with knowledge of the health-insurance industry in Montana. The Department carefully analyzed the information obtained and thoroughly considered all of the issues presented.

The Department found that the Agreement would effectively eliminate New West as a viable competitor in the sale of commercial health insurance for several reasons. First, news that none of New West's owners would buy health insurance for their own employees from New West created a perception that New West was exiting the commercial health-insurance market, likely causing many existing and potential customers to stop purchasing (or decline to purchase) insurance from New West. Second, the Agreement would have led New West and its hospital owners to significantly reduce their support for and efforts to win commercial health-insurance customers, further hindering its ability to compete. Furthermore, because the hospital defendants agreed to act collectively, the Agreement with Blue Cross ensured that New West would lose the support of all its owners