Loveland, and Ski Cooper in the same market. They are fun little areas, but these niche areas are already much cheaper than the biggies and do not have a major effect on pricing.

Vail Associates has been advertising their good intentions in supporting the local skier. It looks good in print. Then one should take a look at what happened at Arrowhead lift prices once VA purchased them. Prices went up * * * way up. Imagine what happens when Vail introduces the *All VA* ticket for Beaver Creek, Breckenridge, Vail, and Keystone. Ski Keystone for the price of a Vail ticket!

I do believe Breckenridge and Vail Associates makes a good fit—I'm not anti everything. I just believe the entire package cannot help but increase lift prices. Please prevent it.

Regards,

Dick Thompson,

Front Range skier.

Thomas J. Tomazin, P.C.

Attorney at Law, 5655 South Yosemite, Suite 200, Englewood, Colorado 80111

January 17, 1997.

Craig W. Conrath,

Chief, Merger Task Force, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 1401 H Street, N.W., Room 4000, Washington, D.C. 20530.

Re: *Vail/Ralcorp Merger*

Dear Mr. Conrath: I am a life-long resident of the State of Colorado. While I was born in the rural part of Colorado, I have lived in the Denver metropolitan area for the past thirty-one years. Both myself and my five children have enjoyed skiing in Colorado since 1969.

I am writing regarding the proposed merger between Vail and Ralcorp. I have skied at all of the ski areas that are involved. Overall, I am in favor of the merger and do not believe that there is any risk of a monopoly being created by permitting the merger. To the contrary, all of the Colorado ski areas cater tremendously to the Colorado skier. All of the ski areas are well-aware that their customer base and profit are to a large extent dependent upon the Colorado skier rather than the out-of-state skier.

My only objection to the merger as proposed is that Vail and Ralcorp must divest Arapahoe Basin. From comments I have read in the newspaper, it is conceded that the requirement for the divestiture of Arapahoe Basin makes no sense. Rather, the reasons assigned in the newspaper was that it was a negotiated settlement. One account I read indicated that by taking out the annual number of Arapahoe Basin skiers, approximately 258,000, it would reduce the percentage share of Vail/Ralcorp from approximately thirty-eight percent to approximately thirty-four percent.

Regardless of the rationalizations, reasons or negotiations, as a practical matter, the requirement that Arapahoe Basin be divested spells a death knell for Arapahoe Basin. Any proposed purchaser will essentially be unable to maintain the area in the manner in which Ralcorp has done to date nor will the purchaser be able to compete effectively. Arapahoe Basin will surely deteriorate and, I am fearful, cease to exist.

In an era where Keystone, Breckenridge and Vail continue to grow and become more technologically advanced, it was always refreshing to have Arapahoe Basin as a throwback to an era long since past.

I would strongly request that reconsideration be given in this matter and that as part of the merger, Vail and Ralcorp *not* be required to divest Arapahoe Basin.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance in this regard.

Very truly yours,

Thomas J. Tomazin, P.C.

Town of Montezumza

P.O. Box 1476 Dillon, Colo. 80435

Hon. Lewis T. Rebcock,

District Judge, United States District Court for the District of Colorado, 1961 Stout Street, Denver, Colo. 80202.

Re: U.S. v. Vail Resorts, 97B–10

Dear Judge Babcock, The Town of Montezumz opposes Vail's acquisition of the Ralston Resorts ski areas of Breckenridge, Keystone, and Arapahoe Basin. We apologize for not submitting our comments earlier, but likemost people in Summit County we believe the merger was a done deal and had closed without the opportunity for public comment. Our apparent misconception was corrected by a recent article in our local newspaper, The Summit Daily, indicating that the City of Denver had recently opposed the merger.

Montezuma is an incorporated Town (1862) 6 miles from the Keystone ski area at 10,400's in the center of 5 major Forest Service trailheads and by their 1996 count 15,000 persons pass through here annually. One concern is the increased vehicle traffic that will impact the Town with the obvious growth expected from the merger. The additional recreational users in the area can only harm the delicate surrounding forest. This 100 year old growth is very susceptible to fire. The only road to Montezuma and these trailheads off Hwy 6 is narrow and winding causing additional concern of the increased traffic.

Hwy 6 is the main artery for trucks carrying hazardous material crosscountry East and West. They must, at the bottom of Loveland Pass, drive through the already congested skier traffic. This situation with the additional development can only create further dangers to the public safety.

We are a working class population proud of the modest homes we live in, but fearful the rising taxes the merger will create could prohibit local ownership as has happened in other communities. We realize we are only a very small voice in this vast expansion but we are the voice of people and ask you to consider the far reaching effects this "monopoly will have on our communities, the work force, the skiers, and the State of Colorado. Adam Arron of Vail Resorts has acknowledged the present problems and has said new problems could be on the horizon if the company's plans for increased growth are realized.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Town Trustee,

Town of Montezuma.

[FR Doc. 97–19164 Filed 7–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

National Institute of Corrections

NIC Service Plan for Fiscal Year 1998

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC), U.S. Department of Justice, has published the NIC Service Plan for Fiscal Year 1998. The document describes the technical assistance, training, and information services to be available to the corrections field during the next fiscal year, which begins October 1, 1997, and ends September 30, 1998.

The Service Plan combines two previously issued annual NIC documents: the Annual Program Plan and the Schedule of Training Services. It describes all NIC seminars and videoconferences to be available for state and local practitioners in adult corrections and contains application requirements and forms. A separate Schedule of Training Services will not be issued this year.

The Service Plan is available on the Internet at www.bop.gov. From the menu, select the National Institute of Corrections, then Publications. The document may also be obtained by contacting NIC at 320 First Street, NW. Washington DC 20534; telephone 800–995–6423; fax 202–307–3361; or the NIC Longmont, Colorado, offices at 800–995–6429; fax 303–682–0469.

Morris L. Thigpen,

Director.

[FR Doc. 97–19165 Filed 7–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–36–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

July 17, 1997.

The Department of Labor (DOL) has submitted the following public information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). A copy of the ICR, with applicable supporting documentation,