## Minerals Management Service

### Alaska Outer Continental Shelf Region, Beaufort Sea Natural Gas and Oil Lease Sale 144

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

**ACTION:** Technical Corrections to Final Notice of Sale.

**SUMMARY:** This Notice corrects errors in the Final Notice of Sale for Alaska Outer Continental Shelf Region, Beaufort Sea Natural Gas and Oil Lease Sale 144. In Notice document 96–20863, beginning on page 46282 in the issue of August 16, 1996, the following corrections are made:

On page 42682, paragraph 3, the second sentence is corrected to read ''The sealed envelope and the bid should contain the following information; the company name, MMS qualification number, map number and name (abbreviations acceptable), and the block number of the block bid upon.''

On page 42683, paragraph 5, the last sentence is corrected to read ''See paragraph 14(t).''

On page 42692,under DISPUTED BIDDING UNITS of the continued listing for Official Protraction Diagram NR 06–03, Beechey Point (approved February 1, 1996), the first Bidding Unit listed at the top of the second portion of the page, as listed below, should be deleted:

| Blocks | Hectares | Total hectares |
|---|---|---|
| 6668 Area E | 62.970317 D | |
| 6669 Area D | 47.853006 D | 110.823323 D |

On page 42693, under SPLIT BLOCKS of the continued listing for Official Protraction Diagram NR 06–04, Flaxman Island (approved February 1, 1996), the following hectare amounts are corrected for the following SPLIT BLOCKS:

*Blocks Hectares*

6804 Area B 1124.318130, and

6805 Area B 1250.376133

Corrected OCS Composite Block Diagrams for these blocks are available from the Minerals Management Service, Alaska OCS Region, 949 E. 36th Avenue (Third Floor), Anchorage, Alaska 99508–4302.

On page 42699, under Eastern Fall Migration, August 1 through October 31, delete all blocks listed for OPD's NR 07–04, Mackenzie Canyon North; NR 07–05, Demarcation Point; and NR 07–06, Mackenzie Canyon.

Dated: September 9, 1996.

Lucy R. Querques,

*Acting Associate Director for Offshore Minerals Management.*

[FR Doc. 96–23510 Filed 9–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to The Clean Water Act

In accordance with departmental Policy, 28 C.F.R. § 50.7, notice is hereby given that a consent decree in *United States of America* versus *Frederick T. Cline et al.*, No. C 96–0760 EFL (N.D. Cal.), was lodged with the United States District Court for the Northern District of California on September 5, 1996. The proposed decree concerns alleged violations of sections 301(a) and 404 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(a) and 1344, and section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, 33 U.S.C. § 4023, as a result of the discharge of dredged and fill materials into wetlands located in Sonoma County, California by Frederic Cline and Cline Cellars, Inc (''Cline'').

The Consent Decree provides for restoration of the wetlands in accord with a restoration plan approved by the United States Army Corps of Engineers and payment of a $20,000.00 civil penalty to the United States.

The Department of Justice will receive written comments relating to the consent decree for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this notice. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, United States Department of Justice, Attention: Sylvia Quast, Trail Attorney, Environmental Defense Section, P.O. Box 23986, Washington, DC 20026–3986, and should refer to *United States of America* versus *Frederick T. Cline et al.*, DJ Reference No. 90–5–1–6–623.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the Offices of the United States Attorney for the Northern District of California, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Tenth Floor, San Francisco, California 94102; and the office of District Counsel, United States Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District, 333 Market Street, Suite 804, San Francisco, California 94105, (415) 977–8644.

Letitia J. Grishaw,

*Chief, Environmental Defense Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division, United States Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 96–23529 Filed 9–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

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

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 C.F.R. § 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed consent decree in *United States* v. *Merck & Co., Inc.*, Civil Action No. 96–1537–E (S.D. Cal.), was lodged on September 5, 1996 with the United States District Court for the Southern District of California. In the complaint in that action, the United States seeks from defendants Merck & Co., Inc. and Monsanto Company civil penalties and injunctive relief under Section 113(b) of the Clean Air Act (the ''Act''), 42 U.S.C. 7413(b), for their violations of the California State Implementation Plan by failing to: obtain authority to construct permits, apply lowest achievable emissions rates, and provide offsets for increased emissions, relating to modifications of the Kelco facility in San Diego, California.

The proposed consent decree requires the defendants to perform specified injunctive relief by installing new emissions control equipment at two portions of the facility to control volatile organic compounds, to perform two supplemental environmental projects to further control fugitive emissions at one portion of the facility, and a monitoring project at another portion of the facility, and to pay a civil penalty of $1,857,395.

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, U.S. Department of Justice, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, D.C. 20044; and refer to *United States* v. *Merck & Co., Inc.*, DOJ Ref. # 90–5–2–1–1982.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the office of the United States Attorney, Southern District of California, 880 Front Street, San Diego, California 92101; at the Region IX office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California 94105; 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 $17.00 (25 cents

per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Walker Smith,

*Deputy Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.*

[FR Doc. 96–23492 Filed 9–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

## Notice of Lodging of Revised Amended Work Plan, Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (''CERCLA'')

In accordance with Departmental policy, notice is hereby given that a proposed revised Amended Work Plan was lodged on August 29, 1996, with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (''District Court''), in *United States* v. *Raymark Industries, Inc., et al.,* C.A. No. 85–3073 (E.D. Pa.). Pursuant to a Stipulation between the parties in *Raymark Industries,* the revised Amended Work Plan has been substituted for the Amended Work Plan (''1993 Plan'') attached to a Modification to Consent Decree that was lodged with the District Court on June 29, 1994 (''1994 Modification'').

The 1993 Plan conformed the remedy for certain groundwater contamination affecting municipal drinking water wells in Hatboro Borough, Pennsylvania to the remedy chosen by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (''EPA'') in its Record of Decision (''ROD'') to abate groundwater contamination at and under the Raymark Site, located at 220 Jacksonville Road, Hatboro, Pennsylvania. This was necessary because the original Consent Decree, entered in 1989 prior to EPA's publication of the ROD, had required the Hatboro Borough Municipal Authority (''Hatboro'') to pump and treat water at a location different than that later set forth in the ROD. Under the Decree, the defendants paid Hatboro, an intervening plaintiff in the *Raymark Industries* case, the sum of $612,500. In return, Hatboro was to pump and treat groundwater originating at the Site at an off-Site location.

Prior to the expiration of the public comment period on the 1994 Modification and the 1993 Plan attached to it, Hatboro asked that the 1994 Modification not be entered pending further revisions to the 1993 Plan needed to accommodate changes in the operation of its water supply and distribution system (''System'') and a potential sale of its System. Following extensive negotiations, the United States, Hatboro, and the defendants are in agreement on a proposed revised Amended Work Plan containing three major revisions to the 1993 Plan. First, because Hatboro does not anticipate needing well H–16 as a water supply well, Hatboro need only recover and treat groundwater at well H–16 if Hatboro elects in the future to operate that well as a water supply well. (Under the 1993 Plan, Hatboro was unconditionally required to construct a recovery and treatment system at well H–16.) Second, Hatboro is to take over certain operation and maintenance functions at the existing groundwater recovery system at the Raymark Site which are now being performed by EPA. Third, the revised Amended Work Plan contains extensive sampling and monitoring requirements which Hatboro must perform at its wellfield, regardless of whether the Hatboro System is sold or not.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the 1994 Modification and the proposed revised Amended Work Plan. 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. *Raymark Industries, Inc.,* DOJ Ref. #90–11–2–12. The 1994 Modification and revised Amended Work Plan may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 615 Chestnut Street, 12th Floor, Suite 1200, Philadelphia Life Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106, and the Region III Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107. A copy of the 1994 Modification and the revised Amended Work Plan may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202) 624–0892. In requesting a copy of the proposed Modification and revised Amended Work Plan (Appendix A to the Modification), please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of $7.25 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library. Please enclose an additional $19.25 should you wish to order a copy of the ROD (Appendix B).

Joel M. Gross

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

[FR Doc. 96–23493 Filed 9–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

# DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

## Employment and Training Administration

## Notice of Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers (TA–W) issued during the period of August, 1996.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance to be issued, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Act must be met.

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated,

(2) that sales or production, or both, of the firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely, and

(3) that increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm or appropriate subdivision have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the absolute decline in sales or production.

Negative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criterion (3) has not been met. A survey of customers indicated that increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

*TA–W–32,467; Rissler & McMurry Co., Welding Div., Casper, WY*

*TA–W–32,452; Spartan Mills, Beaumont Plant, Spartanburg, SC*

*TA–W–32,517; International Paper Co., Veneta, OR*

*TA–W–32,480; Beaufab Mills, Inc., Stroudsburg, PA*

*TA–W–32,518; Lloyd Smith Co., Inc., Bradford, PA*

*TA–W–32,490; Tempered Spring, Inc., Jackson, MI*

*TA–W–32,402; Fluid Pack Pump, Woodward, OK*

*TA–W–32,577; Uniroyal Technology Corp., Ensolite Div., Mishawaka, IN*

*TA–W–32,295; Mariners-Astubeco, Inc., Edgewater, NJ*

*TA–W–32,583; Greenfield Research, Inc., Hermann, MO*

*TA–W–32,541; Prentiss Manufacturing Co., Iuka, MS*