first page of the questionnaire to the Commission); (2) the respondent may only produce, import, or purchase the products during a short time period or handle only one of the products reviewed; and (3) the questionnaires include the maximum number of reporting categories to ensure that meaningful data will be obtained from firms with complex business operations, and some sections of the questionnaires will not apply to smaller-sized firms.

In addition to variation in hourly burden among firms completing a specific questionnaire, there is also variation in hourly burden among questionnaires prepared for different investigations. The Tariff Act of 1930 identifies certain economic factors that the Commission is to take into account in arriving at determinations in countervailing duty and antidumping investigations; the Commission is also provided with guidelines concerning the relevant economic factors it is to assess in escape clause investigations. In some investigations, questionnaires will solicit data pertaining to other economic factors not listed in the statutes (e.g., channels of distribution) because such data have been found to be particularly useful in past Commission determinations or are relevant to the case in question. A key factor which leads to variation in hourly burden among investigations is the number of product categories for which data must be collected.

Description of Efforts to Reduce Burden

To facilitate the preparation of its questionnaires, the Commission has proposed to amend its rules to require that the petition identify the proposed domestic like product(s) and further identify each product on which the Commission should seek information in its questionnaires (see Notice of Proposed Amendments to Rules of Practice and Procedure, 60 FR 51748, Oct. 3, 1995). Further, the Commission has issued proposals to formalize the process for parties to comment on data collection in final phase countervailing and antidumping duty investigations. The Commission has also adopted a new format and otherwise revised the basic content of Commission questionnaires (60 FR 51748, Oct. 3, 1995). The content of the new generic forms are described above and are available from the Commission; they are much shorter in length than those used in the past and facilitate the development of a less burdensome questionnaire for use in specific investigations. Finally, the Commission may utilize a ''short form'' for use in cases were numerous small businesses must be surveyed. This form is a simplified and abbreviated version of the questionnaire sent to larger firms. To further reduce respondent burden, the Commission permits the submission of carefully prepared data estimates and will accept information in electronic format.

Issued: February 9, 1996.
By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–3334 Filed 2–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[Inv. No. 337–TA–370]

Certain Salinomycin Biomass and Preparations Containing Same; Notice of Commission Decision Not To Review a Final Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation Based on a Finding of No Violation of Section 337

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the final initial determination (ID) issued on November 6, 1995, by the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) in the above-captioned investigation, thereby terminating the investigation with a finding of no violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jean H. Jackson, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202–205–3104.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation, which concerns allegations of violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation, sale for importation, and sale after importation of certain salinomycin biomass and preparations containing same on February 6, 1995. The Commission named the following firms as respondents: Hoechst Aktiengesellschaft, Hoechst Veterinar GmbH, and Hoechst-Roussel Agri-Vet Co. (collectively, Hoechst), and Merck & Co. Inc. (Merck).

An evidentiary hearing was held commencing June 5, 1995, and continuing through June 20, 1995, in which Kaken, Hoechst, and the Commission investigative attorney (IA) participated. On September 18, 1995, the ALJ issued an ID finding that Merck's activities did not violate section 337 and terminated Merck from the investigation. That ID became the Commission's final determination on October 10, 1995.

On November 6, 1995, the ALJ issued his final ID in which he found no violation of section 337. His decision was based on his finding that the patent at issue was invalid due to concealment of best mode and unenforceable due to inequitable conduct in its procurement. Petitions for review were filed by complainant Kaken and respondent Hoechst on November 21, 1995. Responses to the petitions were filed on December 1, 1995, by Kaken, Hoechst, and the IA.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. § 1337, and section 210.42(h)(3) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 C.F.R. § 210.42(h)(3).

Copies of the nonconfidential version of the ID and all other nonconfidential 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 S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810.

Issued: February 9, 1996.
By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–3335 Filed 2–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601 to 9675

Notice is hereby given that a proposed consent decree in *United States* v. *Amtel, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 91–CV–10366–BC, was lodged on December 18, 1995 with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Northern Division. The proposed consent decree resolves the United States' claims against Frank Barber for unreimbursed past costs incurred in connection with the Hedblum Superfund Site located in Oscoda, Michigan in return for a payment of $50,000.

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 Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States* v. *Amtel, Inc., et al.,* DOJ Ref. #90–11–2–475.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the office of the United States Attorney, 1000 Washington Street, 203 Federal Building, Bay City, Michigan 48707; the Region 5 Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202) 624–0892. A copy of the proposed consent decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of $4.75 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

Chief, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 96–3395 Filed 2–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980

Notice is hereby given that on February 1, 1996, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States* v. *Estate of Richard R. Christopherson,* Civil Action No. C96–0166C (W.D. Washington), was lodged with the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. This Consent Decree resolves the United States' claims in this action against the Estate of Richard R. Christopherson (''Estate'') regarding its liability under Section 107(a) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a), for response costs incurred or to be incurred by the United States in connection with the Advance Electroplating Site in Seattle, Washington.

The Decree requires, *inter alia,* that the Estate reimburse the United States' response costs in the amount of $100,000 plus interest through the date of payment. In addition, the Decree requires the Estate to take certain steps in an effort to market and sell specified real property and to pay to the United States, for deposit in the Superfund, eighty percent of the proceeds of any such sale. The Decree grants to the Estate the contribution protection afforded by Section 113(f)(2) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9613(f)(2). The Decree also contains a reopener that permits the United States, in certain situations, to institute additional proceedings to require that this defendant perform further response actions or to reimburse the United States for additional costs of response.

The Department of Justice will receive comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States* v. *Estate of Richard R. Christopherson,* D.O.J. No. 90–11–2–1116A.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington, 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3600, Seattle, Washington, 98104–3190; the Region 10 Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005 (Tel: 202–624–0892). A copy of the proposed Consent Decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of $7.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to Consent Decree Library.

Joel Gross,

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment & Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 96–3397 Filed 2–14–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Antitrust Division

United States v. Computer Associates International, Inc. and Legent Corporation, Civ. No. 1:95CV01398 (TPJ) (D. D.C.); Response of the United States to Public Comments Concerning the Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to section 2(d) of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), the United States publishes below the written comments received on the proposed Final Judgment in *United States* v. *Computer Associates International, Inc. and Legent Corporation,* Civil Action No. 1:95CV01398 (TPJ), United States District Court for the District of Columbia, together with its response thereto.

Copies of the written comments and the response are available for inspection and copying in Suite 200 of the Antitrust Division, United States Department of Justice, 325 Seventh Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530 (telephone 202/514–2481) and for inspection at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Third Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations.

Response of the United States to Public Comments

Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act (''APPA'' or ''TUNNEY Act''), 15 U.S.C. § 16(b)–(h), the United States is filing this Response to public comments it has received relating to the proposed Final Judgment in this civil antitrust proceeding. The United States has carefully reviewed the public comments on the proposed Final Judgment and continues to believe that entry of the proposed Final Judgment will be in the public interest. After the comments and this Response have been published in the Federal Register, under 15 U.S.C. § 16(d), the United States will move the Court to enter the proposed Final Judgment.

This action began on July 28, 1995, when the United States filed a Complaint charging that the acquisition of Legent Corporation (''Legent'') by Computer Associates International, Inc. (''CA'') would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18. The Complaint alleges that the acquisition would eliminate significant competition between CA and Legent in five markets for systems management software used with mainframe computers that work with the VSE operating system: VSE tape management software; VSE disk management software; VSE security software; VSE job scheduling software; and VSE automated operations software. In addition, the Complaint alleges that the transaction would substantially lessen competition in the market for ''cross-platform'' systems management software, used in computer installations where a mainframe computer is linked together with other types of computer ''platforms'' (such as midrange computers or networks of workstations or personal computers).

Simultaneously with filing the Complaint, the United States filed a