requesting a copy, please refer to the reference case and DOJ Reference Number and enclose a check in the amount of $3.50 for the document (14 pages at 25 cents per page reproduction costs), made payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

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

[FR Doc. 00–1679 Filed 1–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Motion to Modify Final Judgment and Memorandum in Support of Motion to Modify; United States v. Baroid Corp., et al.

Notice is hereby given that Smith International, Inc. (''Smith'') has filed with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia a motion to modify the judgment in *United States* v. *Baroid Corporation, et al.,* Civil Action No. 93–2621. The Department has consented to modification of the Judgment but has reserved the right to withdraw its consent if it determines that, based upon comments filed or other information, consent to the modification is not in the public interest.

This case was filed on December 23, 1993, and alleged that the merger of Dresser Industries, Inc. (''Dresser'') and Baroid Corporation (''Baroid'') might substantially lessen competition in the United States in the manufacture and sale of two oil field service products, including drilling fluids, in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act. The Final Judgment was entered on April 12, 1994 and modified on September 19, 1996.

Under the Final Judgment, Dresser was required to divest either its 64 percent partnership interest in M–I Drilling Fluids Company or Baroid's wholly owned subsidiary, Baroid Drilling Fluids, Inc. Pursuant to the judgment, Dresser divested its partnership interest in M–I to Smith.

Paragraph IV.F. of the Final Judgment states that the purchaser of the divested drilling fluids business may not combine that business with any one of three named companies. One of those companies is Schlumberger Ltd. (''Schlumberger''). In July 1999, Smith formed a drilling fluids joint venture with Schlumberger, and the United States petitioned the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to find Smith and Schlumberger in civil and criminal contempt for violating the Final Judgment by forming the joint venture. In December 1999, the District Court found Smith and Schlumberger guilty of criminal contempt and imposed a $750,000 fine against each company. Smith and Schlumberger settled the civil contempt case, agreeing to disgorge a total of $13.1 million in joint venture profits.

Smith's motion proposes modifying the Final Judgment to remove Schlumberger from Paragraph IV.F. The United States has consented, subject to the comment period, to the modification as being in the public interest because of Schlumberger's failure to achieve more than 2 percent of the U.S. drilling fluid market in the six years since the Final Judgment was filed.

Copies of the Complaint and Judgment, the pleadings related to the 1996 modification, Smith's motion and supporting memorandum, and the United States' consent are available for inspection in Room 215, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 325 7th St., NW., Washington, DC 20530 and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Third Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20001. Copies of any of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

Comments to the Department of Justice and to the Court regarding the proposed modification of the Final Judgment are invited from members of the public. They should be addressed to Roger W. Fones, Chief, Transportation, Energy and Agriculture Section, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Suite 500, 325 7th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530 (202–307–6351.) Such comments must be received within 30 days.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations & Merger Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 00–1680 Filed 1–24–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. ICR–1218–0104(2000)]

Inorganic Arsenic; Extension of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Approval of Information Collection (Paperwork) Requirements

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA); Labor.

ACTION: Notice of an opportunity for public comment.

SUMMARY: OSHA solicits comments concerning the proposed reduction in, and extension of, the information collection requirements contained in the Inorganic arsenic standard (29 CFR 1910.1018).

REQUEST FOR COMMENT: The Agency is particularly interested in comments on the following issues:

- Whether the information collection requirements are necessary for the proper performance of the Agency's functions, including whether the information is useful;
- The accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden (time and costs) of the information collection requirements, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- The quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden on employers who must comply; for example, by using automated, electronic, mechanical, and other technological information collection and transmission techniques.

DATES: Submit written comments on or before March 27, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to the Docket Office, Docket No. ICR–1218–0104(2000), Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–2625, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693–2350. Commenters may transmit written comments of 10 pages or less in length by facsimile to (202) 693–1648.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Dorris, Directorate of Policy, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–3641, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693–2444. A copy of the Agency's Information Collection Request (ICR) supporting the need for the information collection requirements in the Inorganic arsenic standard is available for inspection and copying in the Docket Office, or you may request a mailed copy by telephoning Nancy Dorris or Todd R. Owen at (202) 693–2444. For electronic copies of the ICR on the Inorganic arsenic standard, contact OSHA on the Internet at *http://www.osha-slc.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to

provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing information collection requirements in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA–95) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program ensures that information is in the desired format, reporting burden (time and costs) is minimal, collection instruments clearly understood, and OSHA's estimate of the information burden is correct. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the Act) authorizes information collection by employers as necessary or appropriate for enforcement of the Act or for developing information regarding the causes and prevention of occupational injuries, illnesses, and accidents (29 U.S.C. 657). In this regard, the information collection requirements in the Inorganic arsenic standard provide protection for employees from the adverse health effects associated with exposure to inorganic arsenic. The Inorganic arsenic standard requires employers to: Monitor employees' exposure to inorganic arsenic; monitor employee health; develop and maintain employee exposure-monitoring and medical records; notify local OSHA area office in writing of regulated areas, and changes to these areas; and provide employees with information about their exposures and health effects of exposure to inorganic arsenic.

II. Proposed Actions

OSHA proposes to extend the OMB approval for the collection of information (paperwork) contained in the Inorganic arsenic standard (29 CFR 1910.1018). OSHA will summarize the comments submitted in response to this notice, and will include this summary in the request to OMB to extend the approval of the information collection requirements contained in the Inorganic arsenic standard (29 CFR 1910.1018).

Type of Review: Extension of currently approved information collection requirements.

Title: Inorganic arsenic standard.

OMB Number: 1218–0104.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit; Federal government; state, local or tribal government.

Number of Respondents: 42.

Frequency: On occasion.

Total Responses: 58,763.

Average Time per Response: Time per response ranges from 5 minutes to maintain records to 1.67 hours to complete a medical examination.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 7,381 hours.

Estimated Cost (Operation and Maintenance): $1,142,802.

Authority and Signature

Charles N. Jeffress, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, directed the preparation of this notice. The authority for this notice is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3506) and Secretary of Labor's Order No. 6–96 (62 FR 111).

Signed at Washington, D.C. on January 19, 2000.

Charles N. Jeffress,

Assistant Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc. 00–1722 Filed 1–24–00 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–26–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. ICR–1218–0128(2000)]

Coke Oven Emissions Standard; Extension of the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Approval of Information Collection (Paperwork) Requirements

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA); Labor.

ACTION: Notice of an opportunity for public comment.

SUMMARY: OSHA solicits comments concerning the proposed reduction in, and extension of, the information collection requirements contained in the Coke Oven Standard (29 CFR 1910.1029).

REQUEST FOR COMMENT: The Agency is particularly interested in comments on the following issues:

- Whether the information collection requirements are necessary for the proper performance of the Agency's functions, including whether the information is useful;
- The accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden (time and costs) of the information collection requirements, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- The quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden on employers who must comply; for example, by using automated, electronic, mechanical, and other technological information collection and transmission techniques.

DATES: Submit written comments on or before March 27, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to the Docket Office, Docket No. ICR–1218–0128(2000), Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–2625, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693–2350. Commenters may transmit written comments of 10 pages or less in length by facsimile to (202) 693–1648.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Owen, Directorate of Policy, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N–3641, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone: (202) 693–2444. A copy of the Agency's Information Collection request (ICR) supporting the need for the information collection requirements in the Coke oven emissions standard is available for inspection and copying in the Docket Office, or you may request a mailed copy by telephoning Todd R. Owen at (202) 693–2444. For electronic copies of the ICR on the Coke Oven Emissions Standard, contact OSHA on the Internet at http://www.osha-slc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing information collection requirements in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA–95) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program ensures that information is in the desired format, reporting burden (time and costs) is minimal, collection instruments clearly understood, and OSHA's estimate of the information burden is correct. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the Act) authorizes information collection by employers as necessary or appropriate for enforcement of the Act or for developing information regarding the causes and prevention of occupational injuries, illnesses, and accidents (29 U.S.C. 657).

The information collection requirements in the Coke Oven Emissions Standard provide protection for employees from the adverse health effects associated with exposure to coke oven emissions. In this regard, the Coke Oven Emissions Standard requires employers to monitor employees' exposure to coke oven emissions, monitor employee health, and provide employees with information about their exposures and the health effects of exposure to coke oven emissions.

II. Proposed Action

OSHA proposes to extend the OMB approval for the collection of information (paperwork) contained in