

Trelease, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, 1951 Constitution Ave., NW., Room 202—SIB, Washington, DC 20240, or electronically to [jtrelease@osmre.gov](mailto:jtrelease@osmre.gov). Please refer to OMB control number 1029–0114 in your correspondence.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** To receive a copy of the information collection request contact John Trelease at (202) 208–2783, or electronically at [jtrelease@osmre.gov](mailto:jtrelease@osmre.gov). You may also review this collection by going to <http://www.reginfo.gov> (Information Collection Review, Currently Under Review, Agency is Department of the Interior, DOI–OSMRE).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regulations at 5 CFR 1320, which implement provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13), require that interested members of the public and affected agencies have an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping activities [see 5 CFR 1320.8(d)]. OSM has submitted a request to OMB to renew its approval of the collection of information contained in a series of technical evaluation customer surveys. OSM is requesting a 3-year term of approval for the information collection activity.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control number for this collection of information is 1029–0114.

As required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d), a **Federal Register** notice soliciting comments on this collection of information was published on November 5, 2010 (75 FR 68376). No comments were received. This notice provides the public with an additional 30 days in which to comment on the following information collection activity:

*Title:* Technical Evaluation Surveys.  
*OMB Control Number:* 1029–0114.

*Summary:* The series of surveys are needed to ensure that technical assistance activities, technology transfer activities and technical forums are useful for those who participate or receive the assistance. Specifically, representatives from State and Tribal regulatory and reclamation authorities are the primary respondents, although representatives of industry, environmental or citizen groups, or the public, may be recipients of the assistance or may participate in these forums. These surveys will be the primary means through which OSM evaluates its performance in meeting the

performance goals outlined in its annual plans developed pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act.

*Bureau Form Number:* None.

*Frequency of Collection:* Once.

*Description of Respondents:*

Individuals who request information or assistance, although generally States and Tribal employees.

*Total Annual Responses:* 500.

*Total Annual Burden Hours:* 42.

Send comments on the need for the collection of information for the performance of the functions of the agency; the accuracy of the agency's burden estimates; ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and ways to minimize the information collection burdens on respondents, such as use of automated means of collections of the information, to the addresses listed under **ADDRESSES**. Please refer to the appropriate OMB control number in all correspondence.

Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: February 11, 2011.

**John A. Trelease,**

*Acting Chief, Division of Regulatory Support.*

[FR Doc. 2011–3595 Filed 2–17–11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–05–M**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

**[Investigation No. 731–TA–920 (Review) (Remand)]**

### Certain Welded Large Diameter Line Pipe From Mexico

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. International Trade Commission (“Commission”) hereby gives notice of its remand proceeding with respect to its negative determination in the five-year review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded large diameter line pipe from Mexico. For further information concerning the conduct of this proceeding 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, subpart A (19 CFR part 207).

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* February 18, 2011.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Karl von Schriltz (202–205–3096), Office of General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired 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 of Investigation No. 731–TA–920 (Review) may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Background.*—In October 2007, the Commission determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order covering certain welded large diameter line pipe from Mexico would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. On April 21, 2008, six months after completion of the Commission’s review, the Mexican producer Tuberias Procarsa, S.A. de C.V. (“Procarsa”) attempted to file with the Commission a revised foreign producers’ questionnaire response which sought to revise certain aspects of its originally reported capacity, production, and shipment data. On April 24, 2008, the Commission rejected the submission on the grounds that it was untimely filed.

On November 21, 2007, the domestic producer United States Steel Corporation (“U.S. Steel”) filed a request for review of the Commission’s determination by a binational panel under Article 1904 of the North American Free Trade Agreement. The parties completed briefing in the proceeding in 2008 and 2009. The Panel held a hearing in the proceeding on July 22, 2010.

On January 18, 2011, the Panel issued an opinion in the matter. In its opinion, the Panel affirmed the Commission’s reliance on the existence of differing conditions of competition for Mexico and Japan when deciding not to exercise its discretion to cumulate the subject imports from those countries. The Panel also held that U.S. Steel was barred

from raising in this proceeding “arguments regarding the asserted discrepancy between the questionnaire responses and the staff’s finding that the Mexican producers reported theoretical capacity,” finding that U.S. Steel failed to exhaust its administrative remedies before the Commission. Panel Opinion at 25.

Nonetheless, the Panel remanded the Commission’s determination so that the Commission could take into account Procarsa’s revised foreign producers’ questionnaire response and re-consider its cumulation and likely injury analysis for Mexico in light of the revised response. Specifically, the Panel indicated that the Commission should consider the revised data in light of its potential impact on the Commission’s analysis of the Mexican industry’s home market orientation, its capacity trends, and the presence of Mexican imports in the U.S. market. The Panel noted that the revised data did not affect the Commission’s finding concerning Procarsa’s product range during the period.

**Participation in the proceeding.**— Only those persons who were interested parties that participated in the review (*i.e.*, persons listed on the Commission Secretary’s service list) and also parties to the NAFTA panel proceeding may participate in the remand proceeding. Such persons need not make any additional filings with the Commission to participate in the remand proceeding, unless they are adding new individuals to the list of persons entitled to receive business proprietary information under administrative protective order. Business proprietary information (“BPI”) referred to during the remand proceeding will be governed, as appropriate, by the administrative protective order issued in the review.

**Written Submissions.**—The Commission is reopening the record in this proceeding for the sole purpose of accepting Procarsa’s revised foreign producers’ questionnaire response into the record. It will not otherwise accept the submission of new factual information for the record. The Commission will permit the parties to file comments concerning the new factual information submitted on the record during the remand proceeding. Those comments should be limited solely to the issue of whether and how the data contained in Procarsa’s revised foreign producer’s questionnaire will affect the Commission’s cumulation and likely injury findings for Mexico, including its findings relating to the Mexican industry’s home market orientation, its capacity trends, and the presence of Mexican imports in the U.S.

market. The parties may not use this opportunity to comment on any other issue, including any “asserted discrepancy between the questionnaire responses and the staff’s finding that the Mexican producers reported theoretical capacity.” Panel Opinion at 25.

The comments must be based solely on the information in the Commission’s record. The Commission will reject submissions containing additional factual information or arguments pertaining to issues other than those on which the Panel has remanded this matter. The deadline for filing comments is March 8, 2011. Comments shall be limited to no more than twenty (20) double-spaced and single-sided pages of textual material.

All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission’s rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission’s rules. The Commission’s rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means, except to the extent permitted by section 201.8 of the Commission’s rules, as amended, 67 FR 68036 (November 8, 2002).

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission’s rules, each document filed by a party to this proceeding must be served on all other such parties, and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: February 15, 2011.

**William R. Bishop,**

*Hearings and Meetings Coordinator.*

[FR Doc. 2011-3766 Filed 2-17-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

Notice is hereby given that on February 14, 2011, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States et al. v. Merced Power LLC*, Civil Action No. 1:11-cv-00241, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

The Consent Decree in this Clean Air Act enforcement action resolves allegations by the Environmental Protection Agency and the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (“District”), asserted in a complaint filed together with the Consent Decree, under Section 113(b) of

the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7413(b), for alleged environmental violations at defendant’s biomass electric generating facilities in Merced, California. The violations include, among others, a failure to: Comply with numerous conditions contained in Federally enforceable permits issued for the facility, including those related to emissions of pollutants; install and operate required pollution control technology; undertake periodic equipment testing; and to submit required reports. The proposed Consent Decree would require defendant to install additional emissions monitoring equipment at their facility, pay a total of \$492,000 in civil penalties to the United States and the District, and comply with permit conditions or face stipulated penalties during approximately two years following court approval of the consent decree.

The Department of Justice will receive comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and either e-mailed to [pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov](mailto: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 the matter as *United States et al. v. Merced Power LLC*, DOJ Ref. No. 90-5-2-1-09903.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the following Regional Office of the United States Environmental Protection Agency: Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105. The Consent Decree may also be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, 501 I Street, Suite 10-100, Sacramento, California 95814.

During the public comment period, the proposed agreement may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site: [http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent\\_Decrees.html](http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html). Copies of the proposed 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](mailto:tonia.fleetwood@usdoj.gov)), fax no. (202) 514-0097, phone confirmation number (202) 514-1547. In requesting from the Consent Decree Library a copy of the consent decree, please enclose a check payable to the U.S. Treasury in the amount of \$14.50 (25 cents per page