the extent permitted by section 201.8 of the Commission's rules, as amended, 67

FR 68036 (Nov. 8, 2002). In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to the investigation must be served on all other parties to the investigation (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Parties are also advised to consult with 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) for provisions of general applicability concerning written submissions to the Commission.

Issued: July 12, 2011.

By order of the Commission. James R. Holbein,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2011–17937 Filed 7–15–11; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337-TA-617]

In the Matter of Certain Digital Television Products and Certain Products Containing Same and Methods of Using Same; Notice of Commission Determination to Rescind a Limited Exclusion Order and Cease and Desist Orders as to Certain Respondents

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

# ACTION: Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to rescind the limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders issued in the abovecaptioned investigation as to TPV Technology, Ltd.; TPV International (USA), Inc.; Top Victory Electronics (Taiwan) Co., Ltd.; and Envision Peripherals, Inc. (collectively, "the TPV respondents") based on a settlement agreement.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Daniel E. Valencia, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205–1999. Copies of non-confidential 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. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at *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*. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on November 15, 2007, based on a complaint filed by Funai Electric Co., Ltd. of Japan and Funai Corporation of Rutherford, New Jersey (collectively "Funai"), alleging violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337) in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain digital televisions and certain products containing same by reason of infringement of certain claims of United States Patent Nos. 5,329,369 ("the '369 patent") and 6,115,074 ("the '074 patent''). The complaint named several respondents including the TPV respondents; and Vizio, Inc. and AmTran Technology Co., Ltd. (collectively, "the Vizio respondents).

On April 10, 2009, the Commission made its final determination in the investigation finding a violation of section 337 with regard to the '074 patent and no violation with respect to the '369 patent. The Commission issued a limited exclusion order and several cease and desist orders.

On August 9, 2010, the Commission determined to rescind the limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders as to the Vizio respondents based on a joint motion regarding a settlement between Funai and the Vizio respondents.

On December 21, 2010, the Commission modified the limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders based on a decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *Vizio, Inc.* v. *Int'l Trade Comm'n,* 605 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2010). On May 31, 2011, Funai and the TPV respondents filed a joint petition to rescind the modified remedial orders as to the TPV respondents. According to the joint petition, these parties have settled their dispute.

The Commission has determined that the settlement satisfies the requirement of Commission Rule 210.76 (a)(1) (19 CFR 210.76(a)(1)) that there be changed conditions of fact or law. The Commission therefore has issued an order rescinding the limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders previously issued in this investigation as to the TPV respondents. The Commission's remedial orders remain in effect against the following respondents: Syntax-Brillian Corporation; Taiwan Kolin Co., Ltd.; Proview International Holdings, Ltd.; Proview Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.; and Proview Technology, Ltd.

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 section 210.76(a)(1) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.76(a)(1)).

By order of the Commission. Issued: July 13, 2011.

# Iames R. Holbein.

Secretary to the Commission.

soororary to the doministrom.

[FR Doc. 2011–17999 Filed 7–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

## Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on July 8, 2011, a proposed Consent Decree in United States and State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection v. Hi-Acres, LLC, d/b/a Foremost Fertilizer, Civil Action No. 5:11–cv–00389–WTH–KRS, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Ocala Division.

The Consent Decree represents the settlement of claims brought by the United States and State of Florida **Department of Environmental Protection** ("FDEP") for violations by Hi-Acres at a retail sales outlet for pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers located in Leesburg, Lake County, Florida. The Complaint alleged, *inter alia*, violations of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA") Section 3008(a), 42 U.S.C. 6928(a), and the federal regulations promulgated at 40 CFR Parts 260 through 279; the authorized hazardous waste management regulations of the State of Florida, relating to the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, handling and disposal of hazardous wastes, Fla. Admin. Code Chapter 63-740, et seq; and Fla. Stat. § 403.727; and of RCRA Section 3004(d), 42 U.S.C. 6924(d), and Fla. Stat. Chapter 403

(Environmental Control), Part IV. (Resource Recovery Management), relating to the disposal of hazardous wastes restricted from land disposal.

Under the Consent Decree, Hi-Acres must commence site rehabilitation in accordance with State of Florida rules and regulations for all solid waste management units and areas of contamination that are identified on the appendix to the Consent Decree. Hi-Acres is required to provide any necessary revisions to its Contamination Assessment Protection Plan, along with any proposed alternate schedules for completing the required work. Hi-Acres will be required under the Consent Decree to submit periodic status reports to FDEP. Once the site is cleaned up, Hi-Acres shall submit to FDEP a site rehabilitation completion report. Hi-Acres will further be required to submit a plan for all necessary environmental monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of the on-going cleanup, including groundwater monitoring. Hi-Acres will be required to pay a penalty of \$400,000, evenly split between EPA and the FDEP, along with interest, per the terms of the Consent Decree.

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, 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 United States and State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection v. Hi-Acres, LLC, d/b/a Foremost Fertilizer, Inc. D.J. Ref. 90-7-1-09265.

The Consent Decree may be examined at U.S. EPA Region 4, Atlanta Federal Center, 61 Forsyth Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30303. During the public comment period, the Consent Decree, 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 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 \$9.75 (for the Consent Decree only) and \$17.00 for the Consent Decree and all exhibits thereto) (25 cents per page reproduction cost)

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.

#### Henry Friedman,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division. [FR Doc. 2011–17927 Filed 7–15–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

#### Office of the Secretary

Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request; Evaluation of the Adult and Dislocated Worker Program in the Workforce Investment Act

#### **ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Labor (DOL) is submitting the proposed Employment and Training Administration (ETA) sponsored information collection request (ICR) titled, "Evaluation of the Adult and Dislocated Worker Program in the Workforce Investment Act," to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval for use in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before August 17, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** A copy of this ICR with applicable supporting documentation; including a description of the likely respondents, proposed frequency of response, and estimated total burden may be obtained from the RegInfo.gov Web site, *http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain,* on the day following publication of this notice or by contacting Michel Smyth by telephone at 202–693–4129 (this is not a toll-free number) or sending an e-mail to *DOL\_PRA\_PUBLIC@dol.gov.* 

Submit comments about this request to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for the Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration (ETA), Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, Telephone: 202–395–6929/Fax: 202–395–6881 (these are not toll-free numbers), e-mail: *OIRA\_submission@omb.eop.gov.* 

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michel Smyth by telephone at 202–693–4129 (this is not a toll-free number) or

# by e-mail at *DOL\_PRA\_PUBLIC@dol.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** To determine whether the adult and dislocated worker services funded by Title I of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) are effective, the ETA is undertaking the WIA Random Assignment Impact Evaluation of the Adult and Dislocated Worker Programs. The evaluation will address the following research questions:

• Does access to WIA intensive and training services-both individually and combined-lead adults and dislocated workers to achieve better educational, employment, earnings, and selfsufficiency outcomes than they would achieve in the absence of access to those services?

• Does the effectiveness of the WIA vary by population subgroup? Is there variation by sex, age, race/ethnicity, unemployment insurance receipt, education level, previous employment history, adult and dislocated worker status, and veteran and disability status?

• How does the implementation of the WIA vary by Local Workforce Investment Area? Does the effectiveness of the WIA vary by how it is implemented? To what extent do implementation differences explain variations in the WIA's effectiveness?

• Do the benefits from WIA services exceed program costs? Do the benefits of intensive services exceed their costs? Do the benefits of training exceed its costs? Do the benefits exceed the costs for adults? Do they for dislocated workers?

This information collection is subject to the PRA. A Federal agency generally cannot conduct or sponsor a collection of information, and the public is generally not required to respond to an information collection, unless it is approved by the OMB under the PRA and displays a currently valid OMB Control Number. In addition, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no person shall generally be subject to penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if the collection of information does not display a valid OMB control number. See 5 CFR 1320.5(a) and 1320.6. For additional information, see the related notice published in the Federal Register on November 10, 2010 (75 FR 69126).

Interested parties are encouraged to send comments to the OMB, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the address shown in the **ADDRESSES** section within 30 days of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. In order to help ensure appropriate consideration, comments should reference OMB Control Number