

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 where 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.