

occurred in the United States or in the market for the Subject Merchandise in the Subject Country since the Order Date, and significant changes, if any, that are likely to occur within a reasonably foreseeable time. Supply conditions to consider include technology; production methods; development efforts; ability to increase production (including the shift of production facilities used for other products and the use, cost, or availability of major inputs into production); and factors related to the ability to shift supply among different national markets (including barriers to importation in foreign markets or changes in market demand abroad). Demand conditions to consider include end uses and applications; the existence and availability of substitute products; and the level of competition among the Domestic Like Product produced in the United States, Subject Merchandise produced in the Subject Country, and such merchandise from other countries.

(11) (Optional) A statement of whether you agree with the above definitions of the Domestic Like Product and Domestic Industry; if you disagree with either or both of these definitions, please explain why and provide alternative definitions.

Authority: This review is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.61 of the Commission's rules.

Issued: September 25, 2001.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-24509 Filed 9-28-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Stipulation and Order Modifying Partial Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980

Under 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on September 25, 2001, a proposed Stipulation and Order Modifying Partial Consent Decree ("Stipulation") in *United States v. Aerojet-General Corp., et al.*, Civil Action Nos. CIVS-86-0063-EJG and CIVS-86-0064-EJG, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

In this action originally brought in 1986 the United States sought recovery under both Sections 106 and 107 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9606 and 9607, for cost recovery and injunctive relief

relating to the Aerojet Superfund Site (the "Site") located near Sacramento, California. The State of California is co-plaintiff in this action. A Partial Consent Decree was entered in 1989 that resolved past costs and provided that Aerojet would perform the remedial investigation/feasibility study at the Site. The Stipulation will (1) speed up the pace of cleanup by dividing the Site into operable units; and (2) remove certain areas from the ambit of the Partial Consent Decree and clarify that EPA does not consider these areas to be part of the Site, while retaining contaminated groundwater and associated contaminated media as part of the Site and subject to the Partial Consent Decree.

The Department of Justice and the State of California will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the Stipulation. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611, and should refer to *United States v. Aerojet-General Corp., et al.*, D.J. Ref. No. 90-7-1-74. Send comments simultaneously to Alex MacDonald, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, 3443ROUTIER Road, Sacramento, California 94822.

The Stipulation may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, 501 I Street, Suite 10-100, Sacramento, California, 95814, and at U.S. EPA Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California, 94105. A copy of the Stipulation may also be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20044-7611. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of \$32.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library. In requesting a copy exclusive of exhibits, please enclose a check in the amount of \$17.50 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Ellen Mahan,

Assistant Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.
[FR Doc. 01-24492 Filed 9-28-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed consent decree in *United States v. Vafadari, et al.*, No. 96-143 PHX EHC (D. Ariz.) was lodged on September 7, 2001, with the United States District Court for the District of Arizona. The consent decree settles claims under Sections 104, 107 and 113 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. 9604, 9607 and 9613, for past and future response costs incurred and to be incurred in connection with the DCE Circuits Site ("DCE Site"), a subsite of the Indian Bend Wash Superfund NPL Site (the "Indian Bend Wash site" or the "IBW site"), on the eastern and southern borders of Phoenix, Arizona. The consent decree will also resolve the United States claims pursuant to Section 3304 and 3306 of the Federal Debt Collection Procedures Act of 1990, 28 U.S.C. 3304 and 3306 with regard to certain allegedly fraudulent conveyances of real property.

In 1998, the United States and Defendants entered into a Consent Decree providing that Defendants Rudi Vafadari (individually and as trustee of the Vafco Trust), Vafoc Trust, Arden Properties, Inc., Sohrab and Parvin Najmi would pay \$328,500 to the United States in installments. Mr. Vafadari was also to pay a civil penalty of \$10,000. On September 28, 1998, National Mortgage Co., a nonparty, sued Settling Defendants Arden Properties, Inc. and Vafadai in Arizona Superior Court to foreclose on a mortgage on the Site. See *National Mortgage Co. v. Vafadari, et al.*, No. CV98-17608 (Az. Sup. Ct. filed Sept. 28, 1998.). On September 29, 1998m Arden Properties, Inc. filed a petition for bankruptcy under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. See *In re Arden Properties, Inc.*, No. 98-12312-PHX-RGM (Bankr. D. Ariz.). Pursuant to Arden Properties, Inc.'s plan of reorganization, Arden was to pay National Mortgage \$480,000 in installments over fifteen years and the United States the original Consent Decree amount of \$338,500 in installments over eight years. Due to Arden Properties' bankruptcy and the automatic stay, the United States never sought entry of the first decree.

The proposed consent decree replaces the previously lodged decree. As part of the settlement, National Mortgage has