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]

# **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 coplaintiff 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, 3443 Routier 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 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 dismissed its bankruptcy appeal, and the plan of reorganization has become final. Thus, the United States will receive the original settlement amount under the plan of reorganization. In addition, however, the United States will also receive an additional \$15,000 over four years from all defendants (other than Arden Properties) without interest. Moreover, Mr. Vafadari will pay an additional \$5,000 to settle the civil penalty claims against him.

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 decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General for the Environmental and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States* v. *Vafadari*, et al., DOJ Ref.# 90–11–2–413C.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the office of the United States Attorney, District of Arizona, Room 4000, 230 First Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona and the Region 9 Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California. A copy of the proposed consent decree may be obtained by mail from the Consent Decree Library, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, D.C. 20044-7611. In requesting a copy please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of \$5.75 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library.

#### Ellen M. Mahan,

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

[FR Doc. 01–24491 Filed 9–28–01; 8:45 am]

#### **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

### Federal Bureau of Investigation

## Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comments Requested

**ACTION:** Notice of Information Collection Under Review: Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired; Violent Criminal Apprehension Program (VICAP) Crime Analysis Report.

The Department of Justice (DOJ), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has submitted the following formation collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the procedures of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. This proposed information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on July 25, 2001, Volume 65, number 143, page 38742.

The purpose of this notice is to allow for an additional 30 days for public comment until October 31, 2001. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10. Written comments and/ or suggestions regarding the items contained in this notice, especially the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to The Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC 20503. Comments may also be submitted to Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Suite 1220, Washington, DC 20530.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility:

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Överview of this information collection:

(1) Type of Information Collection: Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired.

(2) Title of the Form/Collection: Violent Criminal Apprehension Program (VICAP) Crime Analysis Report

- (3) Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection: FD–676. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Violent Criminal Apprehension Program Unit.
- (4) Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract: Primary: State, Local, or Tribal Government. Brief Abstract: Collects data at crime scenes (e.g., unsolved murders) for analysis by VICAP staff of the FBI. Law enforcement agencies reporting similar pattern crimes will be provided information to initiate a coordinated multi-agency investigation to expedite identification and apprehension of violent criminal offenders (e.g., serial murderers).

(5) An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond: 10,000 respondents at an average of one hour per response.

(6) An estimate of the annual total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection: 10,000 total burden hours

annually.

If additional information is required contact: Robert B. Briggs, Department Clearance Officer, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, United States Department of Justice, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Washington, DC 20503.

Public comment on this proposed information collection is strongly encouraged.

Dated: September 25, 2001.

### Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 01–24467 Filed 9–28–01; 8:45 am] **BILLING CODE 4410–02–M** 

#### **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

#### Office of Justice Programs

# Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**ACTION:** Notice of Information Collection Under Review; (Extension of a currently approved collection) Nomination for Young American Medal for Bravery.

The Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs has submitted the following information collection request for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. This proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected