at the same time, continue to meet all authorized purposes of the CRSP.

Purpose and Need for Action

Under the proposed action, Navajo Dam will be operated to avoid jeopardy and assist in recovery of the two endangered fishes, while maintaining the authorized purposes of the Navajo Unit of the CRSP. This will allow future water development to proceed in the San Juan River Basin in compliance with applicable laws, compacts, court decrees, and Indian trust responsibilities. The proposed action is needed for the following reasons:

- The operation of Navajo Dam, under its original operating criteria, adversely affected the endangered fishes in the San Juan River.
- Reclamation is required to comply with the Endangered Species Act (ESA) for the operation of facilities, including Navajo Dam. Within the exercise of its discretionary authority, Reclamation must avoid jeopardizing the continued existence of listed species or adversely modifying designated critical habitat.
- Formal consultation under the ESA on the Navajo Unit was requested by Reclamation in 1991. At that time, Reclamation committed to operate Navajo Dam in concert with ongoing research to determine hydrologic conditions beneficial to endangered fish and in a manner most consistent with endangered fish recovery. In a 1991 response to Reclamation, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurred that the consultation process should be initiated and that the consultation period for the operation of the Navajo Unit be extended while research on the San Juan River was conducted. Under the direction of the Recovery Program, Navajo Dam releases were evaluated from 1992 to 1998. At the completion of the research period, the Recovery Program completed the *Flow Recommendations for the San Juan River* (Holden, 1999). The recommendations included suggested Navajo Dam operating rules for various hydrologic conditions and levels of water development in the San Juan River Basin. Applying these rules would allow the flow recommendations to be met and would allow water development consistent with the ESA and other applicable laws.

Proposed Federal Action

Reclamation proposes to take action to protect and assist in recovery of the populations and designated critical habitat of the two endangered fishes found in the San Juan River Basin. Reclamation would implement the proposed action by modifying the operations of Navajo Dam, to the extent possible, to achieve the flow recommendations developed by the Recovery Program. Reclamation's goal is to implement the proposed action and, at the same time, maintain and continue all authorized purposes of the CRSP.

The Navajo Reservoir Operations Draft Environmental Impact Statement was issued in September 2002 and the public review process was conducted from September 4 through December 4, 2002. Over 300 written comment letters were received. In addition, three public hearings were held to provide an opportunity for interested parties and agencies to present oral and written comments on the document and the proposed Navajo Reservoir operations. Comment letters, Reclamation responses, and public hearing statements are included in Volume III of the FEIS. The majority of comments received expressed concern with adverse impacts of the preferred alternative on resources such as the trout fishery, recreation, water quality, and hydropower. Other comments indicated that the preferred alternative was the only reasonable way to meet ESA obligations and protect water development. All written and oral comments received were carefully reviewed and considered in preparing the FEIS. Where appropriate, revisions were made to the document in response to specific comments. The comments and responses, together with the final environmental impact statement, will be considered in determining whether or not to implement the proposed action.

No decision will be made on the proposed Federal action until 30 days after release of the FEIS. After the 30-day waiting period, Reclamation will complete a Record of Decision. The Record of Decision will state the action that will be implemented and discuss all factors leading to that decision.

Dated: March 9, 2006.

Rick L. Gold,

Regional Director—UC Region, Bureau of Reclamation.

[FR Doc. E6–5844 Filed 4–19–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MN–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–502]

In the Matter of Certain Automobile Tail Light Lenses and Products Incorporating Same; Notice of a Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation on the Basis of a Settlement Agreement

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review an initial determination (''ID'') of the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') granting the joint motion of complainants and respondents to terminate the above-captioned investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael K. Haldenstein, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–3115. Copies of the public version of the ID and all nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (*http://www.usitc.gov*). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *http://edis.usitc.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted the above-referenced investigation under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, as amended, on January 7, 2004, based on a complaint filed by Jens E. Sorensen of Rancho Santa Fe, California and Jens E. Sorensen, as Trustee of the Sorensen Research and Development Trust. 69 FR 937. The complaint alleged infringement of U.S. Patent No. 4,935,184 (''the '184 patent''), in the importation, sale for importation, and sale within the United States after importation of automobile tail light covers made in accordance with claims

1, 6, 8, and 10 of the '184 patent. The Commission named Daimler-Chrysler AG of Stuttgart, Baden-Wuerttemberg, Germany and Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC of Montvale, New Jersey as respondents.

On July 9, 2004, the presiding ALJ issued an ID granting respondents' motion for summary determination that their accused processes for making automobile tail light covers did not infringe any of the asserted claims of the '184 patent. Having found that the accused products did not infringe, he terminated the investigation. The Commission determined not to review the ID, and it thus became the Commission's final determination.

The complainants appealed the Commission's determination to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The Court disagreed with the Commission's claim construction, reversed the Commission's finding of no infringement, and remanded the investigation to the Commission so that the investigation could continue. *See Sorensen et al.* v. *International Trade Commission*, 427 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2005). On January 19, 2006, the Commission issued an order remanding the subject investigation to the ALJ for proceedings in accordance with the Federal Circuit's opinion.

On March 2, 2006, the complainants and respondents filed a joint motion for termination of the investigation based upon a settlement agreement. On March 9, 2006, the Commission investigative attorney filed a response in support of the motion. No party opposed the motion.

On March 29, 2006, the ALJ issued the subject ID which terminates the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement. The ALJ indicates in the ID that the settlement agreement complies with Commission rule 210.21(b) and that settlement will not prejudice the public interest.

No party petitioned for review of the ID pursuant to 19 CFR 210.43(a), and the Commission found no basis for ordering a review on its own initiative pursuant to 19 CFR 210.44. The ID thus has become the determination of the Commission pursuant to 19 CFR 210.42(h)(3).

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and Commission rule 210.42, 19 CFR 210.42.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 17, 2006.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E6–5950 Filed 4–19–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

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. *Richardson Constr. Co.,* No. 3:06 cv 1079, was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina on April 7, 2006.

This proposed Consent Decree concerns a complaint filed by the United States against Richardson Construction Co., pursuant to sections 301 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1311 and 1344, to obtain injunctive relief from the defendants for violating the Clean Water Act by discharging pollutants without a permit into waters of the United States. The proposed Consent Decree resolves these allegations by requiring the restoration of the impacted wetlands to their previous condition and the payment of a civil penalty. 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 R. Emery Clark, Office of the United States Attorney for the District of South Carolina, Wachovia Building, Suite 500, 1441 Main Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201 and refer to *United States* v. *Richardson Constr. Co.,* No. 3:06 cv 1079.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, United States Courthouse, 901 Richland Lane, Columbia, South Carolina. In addition, the proposed Consent Decree may be viewed at *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/open.html.*

Stephen Samuels,

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

[FR Doc. 06–3751 Filed 4–19–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

Notice is hereby given that on April 6, 2006, a proposed consent decree (''proposed decree'') in *United States* v. *The Standard Oil Co. et al.*, Civil Action No. 3:06–cv–00539–JBA, was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut.

The proposed decree resolves claims asserted by the United States, on behalf of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (''EPA''), against The Standard Oil Co. and Industrial Holdings Corp. (''Settling Defendants'') under section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9607. The claims sought to recover past response costs incurred at the Chase Brass & Copper site (''Site'') in Watertown, Connecticut. The proposed decree requires the Settling Defendants to reimburse the United States $4,000,000 in past response costs.

The Department of Justice will accept written comments relating to the proposed consent decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this notice. Please address comments to the Assistant Attorney General c/o Jerome MacLaughlin, Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, P.O. Box 7611, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, DC 20044 and refer to *United States* v. *The Standard Oil Co. et al.*, Civil Act No. 3:06–cv–00539–JBA (D. Conn.), DJ #90–11–3–08073.

Copies of the proposed decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut, 157 Church St. Floor 23, New Haven, CT 06510, or at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I, One Congress St., Boston, MA 02114. During the public comment period, the proposed Decree may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/open.html.* Copies of the proposed Decree may also be obtained by mail from the U.S. Department of Justice, Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, Ben Franklin Station, 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 $4.50 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) 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.

Ronald G. Gluck,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 06–3750 Filed 4–19–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M