relief from and impose civil penalties against the Defendants for violating the Clean Water Act by discharging pollutants without a permit into waters of the United States. The propsoed Consent Decree resolves these allegations by requiring the Defendants to restore the impacted areas and perform mitigation and to pay 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 Edmund F. Brennan, Assistant United States Attorney, and refer to *United States of America* v. *County of Sacramento*, Case Number 2:06–CV–00908–GEB–GGH.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, 501 I Street, Sacramento, California. In addition, the proposed Consent Decree may be viewed at *http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/open.html*.

Edmund F. Brennan,

Assistant U.S. Attorney.

[FR Doc. 06–4376 Filed 5–10–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Judgment Pursuant to Federal Water Pollution Control Act

Notice is hereby given that on April 28, 2006, a proposed Consent Judgment in *United States and State of New York* v. *County of Suffolk, et al.,* Civil Action No. CV–06–1978, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

The United States and the State of New York sued the County of Suffolk, Suffolk County Department of Public Works, and Charles J. Bartha, Commissioner of the Suffolk County Department of Public Works (collectively, ''Suffolk'') under seciton 309(b) and (d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 1319(b) and (d), and under State law for alleged violations of Suffolk's Industrial Waste Pretreatment Program (IPP) and its State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) Permits. The Consent Judgment resolves these claims and requires Suffolk to pay a civil penalty of $300,000, to fund a supplemental environmental project in the amount of $700,000, and to comply with its IPP and SPDES Permits.

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 Judgment. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530, and should refer to *United States, et al* v. *County of Suffolk., et al.*, DJ No. 90–5–1–1–5065/1.

The proposed Consent Judgment may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Eastern District of New York, One Pierrepont Plaza, 14th Fl., Brooklyn, New York 11201, and at the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region II, 290 Broadway, New York, New York 10007–1866. During the public comment period, the proposed Consent Judgment may also be examined on the following Department of Justice Web site, *http://www.usdoj.gov./enrd/open.html*. A copy of the proposed Consent Judgment may 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. If requesting a copy of the proposed Consent Judgment, please so note and enclose a check in the amount of $17.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the U.S. Treasury.

Ronald Gluck,

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

[FR Doc. 06–4373 Filed 5–10–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–59,063]

McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services; A Subsidiary of McLeodUSA, Inc.; Springfield, MO; Dismissal of Application for Reconsideration

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(C) an application for administrative reconsideration was filed with the Director of the Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance for workers at McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, a subsidiary of McLeodUSA, Inc., Springfield, Missouri. The application did not contain new information supporting a conclusion that the determination was erroneous, and also did not provide a justification for reconsideration of the determination that was based on either mistaken facts or a misinterpretation of facts or of the law. Therefore, dismissal of the application was issued.

TA–W–59,063; McLeodUSA Telecommunications Service, A Subsidiary of McLeodUSA, Inc., Springfield, Missouri. (May 3, 2006).

Signed at Washington, DC this 4th day of May 2006.

Erica R. Cantor,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 06–4416 Filed 5–10–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice of Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, (19 U.S.C. 2273), the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers (TA–W) number and alternative trade adjustment assistance (ATAA) by (TA–W) number issued during the periods of April 2006.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for directly-impacted (primary) worker adjustment assistance to be issued, each of the group eligibility requirements of section 222(a) of the Act must be met.

I. Section (a)(2)(A) all of the following must be satisfied:

A. A significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision of the firm, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

B. The sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely; and

C. Increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have contributed importantly to such workers' separation or threat of separation and to the decline in sales or production of such firm or subdivision; or

II. Section (a)(2)(B) both of the following must be satisfied:

A. A significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision of the firm,