

section, delete the following phrase: “to conduct site characterization studies to determine a suitable location for disposal of uranium mill site tailings”

**Kent Hoffman,**

*Deputy State Director, Division of Land and Minerals.*

[FR Doc. E6-6682 Filed 5-2-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450-01-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Minerals Management Service

#### Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Policy Committee—Notice of Renewal

**AGENCY:** Minerals Management Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of renewal of the OCS Policy Committee.

**SUMMARY:** Following consultation with the General Services Administration, notice is hereby given that the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) is renewing the OCS Policy Committee.

The OCS Policy Committee will provide advice to the Secretary, through the Director of the Minerals Management Service, related to the discretionary functions of the Bureau under the OCS Lands Act and related statutes. The Committee will review and comment on all aspects of leasing, exploration, development and protection of OCS resources and provide a forum to convey views representative of coastal states, local government, offshore mineral industries, environmental community, and other users of the offshore and the interested public.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jeryne Bryant, Minerals Management Service, Offshore Minerals Management, Herndon, Virginia 20170-4817, telephone (703) 787-1213.

#### Certification

I hereby certify that the renewal of the OCS Policy Committee is in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the Department of the Interior by 43 U.S.C. 1331 *et seq.*, 30 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*, and 30 U.S.C. 1001 *et seq.*

Dated: April 26, 2006.

**P. Lynn Scarlett,**

*Acting Secretary of the Interior.*

[FR Doc. 06-4133 Filed 5-2-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-MR-M**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-851 (Review)]

### Synthetic Indigo From China

#### Determination

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act), that revocation of the antidumping duty order on synthetic indigo from China 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.

#### Background

The Commission instituted this review on May 2, 2005 (70 FR 22701) and determined on August 5, 2005 that it would conduct a full review (70 FR 48588, August 18, 2005). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's review and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on September 27, 2005 (70 FR 56489). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on February 9, 2006, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on April 27, 2006. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3846 (April 2006), entitled *Synthetic Indigo from China: Investigation No. 731-TA-851 (Review)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 27, 2006.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. E6-6698 Filed 5-2-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Partial Consent Decree Pursuant to the Clean Air Act

Under 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on April 24, 2006, the United States lodged a proposed partial

<sup>1</sup> The record is defined in § 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

Consent Decree (“Consent Decree”) in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama in the matter captioned *United States, et al. v. Alabama Power Company*, (Civil Action No. 2:01-cv-00152-VEH).

The Consent Decree would resolve the liability of Alabama Power Company (“APC”) relating to the Fifth Claim for Relief included in the United States’ Amended Complaint in this action, which the United States brought pursuant to Sections 113 and 167 of the Clean Air Act (“the Act”), 42 U.S.C. 7413, 7477. The United States’ Fifth Claim for Relief concerned the construction of Units 3 and 4 at Alabama Power Company’s James H. Miller, Jr. coal-fired electric power plant, located near the town of West Jefferson, in Jefferson County, Alabama (“Plant Miller”). The United States alleged in its Fifth Claim for Relief that APC violated the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (“PSD”) requirements of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 7470-92, and regulations promulgated thereunder, including the State Implementation Plan (“SIP”) approved under the Act for the State of Alabama, by failing to obtain a PSD permit from EPA for Plant Miller Unit 3, or the appropriate PSD permit for Plant Miller Unit 4, incorporating Best Available Control Technology (“BACT”) requirements. The United States alleged that these PSD permit requirements became applicable, *inter alia*, by virtue of APC’s failure to undertake and implement a continuous program of on-site construction and/or to complete construction of Plant Miller Units 3 and 4 within a reasonable time. In the alternative, the United States alleged that APC violated Section 111(e) of the Act by operating Plant Miller Units 3 and 4 without complying with an applicable standard of performance—40 CFR part 60, Subpart Da—promulgated by EPA pursuant to the New Source Performance Standards (“NSPS”) provisions of the Act. The United States alleged that the NSPS Subpart Da regulations became applicable by virtue of APC’s failure to commence a continuous program of on-site construction of the boilers for Plant Miller Units 3 and 4 until after September 19, 1978.

Plaintiff-Intervenor Alabama Environmental Council, Inc., which is also a party to the Consent Decree, alleged similar PSD violations concerning the Plant Miller Units 3 and 4 in its Ninth and Tenth Claims for Relief included in its complaint in intervention in this action.

Under the terms of the proposed Consent Decree, the civil claims for