the staff each provide a submission, with appropriate affidavits, setting forth their respective costs, including attorneys fees (hours, tasks, rates), incurred (1) to establish conclusively the inaccuracy of Reblewski Exhibit A after Respondents' Supplemental Response to Interrogatories 77 and 79, dated October 22, 1996, (2) for complainant's attempts to read the database tape produced pursuant to Order No. 7, and (3) for filing and pursuing Motion No. 383–117 and such other relief permitted under that portion of Order No. 96 granting Motion No. 383–117. Complainant further proposed that respondents and the Brobeck law firm and its individual member parties be directed to respond by May 15, 1998, to complainant's and the staff's submissions, raising any and all objections to the dollar amounts asserted, including objections to the relationship of the costs asserted by complainant and the staff to the Commission's monetary sanctions award. It also proposed that complainant and the staff then be permitted to file a rebuttal submissions by May 26, 1998, and that respondents and the Brobeck law firm and its individual member parties be permitted to file a sur-rebuttal submission by June 5. It further proposed a one-day oral argument for June 18, 1998, if deemed necessary by the administrative law judge, after his review of the submissions.

Mentor, in its response, represented that because complainant has yet to provide Mentor with the dollar amount of sanctions sought or the basis for the amount sought, Mentor is not currently able to answer the question posed by the administrative law judge in Order No. 99 regarding whether any or all of the sanctions awarded can be agreed upon without the need for further proceeding and that Mentor is awaiting the information from complainant so that the parties can conduct meaningful discussions on this issue. Mentor also proposed that complainant be required to submit briefing setting out the amount of sanctions demanded and justification for that demand, including full disclosure of supporting documentation such as attorney time records and backup documentation; that then Mentor assess whether further discovery is needed to probe whether the amount demanded was ''actually caused by'' and ''specifically related to expenses incurred by'' the alleged conduct; that if Mentor determined that additional discovery is necessary, it will then serve document requests and deposition notices on Quickturn, and after this discovery, Mentor and the staff will submit their briefs in response to complainant's original briefing; and that if disputed issues of fact remain, an evidentiary hearing should be held.

The staff, in its response, waived any claims for monetary sanctions. The staff argued that the Commission's March 6, 1998 Order requires the administrative law judge to identify specifically by name those counsel who are liable for payment of monetary sanctions, but that it does not obligate the administrative law judge to determine any allocation of monetary sanction liability among counsel and their clients. Accordingly, it argued that respondents' counsel should be able to ''stipulate'' the identification of counsel to be held liable for payment of any monetary sanctions, and recommended that respondents' counsel be ordered to state no later than April 17, 1998 whether they will submit such a stipulation. The staff argued that while all parties are entitled to due process in this proceeding, it is presently unaware of any automatic entitlement to formal discovery or a live evidentiary hearing on the issues and argued that discovery, a hearing, and an opportunity to submit proposed briefs and proposed findings of fact would be appropriate only if the substantive issues are not resolved by stipulation. The staff represented that it will only seek such procedures if the administrative law judge grants the private litigants those opportunities. The staff further argued that the private parties should be able to provide a submission to the administrative law judge on April 17, 1998 indicating whether the dollar value of the sanctions has been resolved by agreement.

Based on the submissions of the parties:

1. Mentor is ordered no later than April 15, 1998 to identify counsel it believes should be held liable for any payment of monetary sanctions;

2. Complainant is ordered to file no later than April 17, 1998 sufficiently *detailed* affidavits, including any documentation and explanation in any supporting memorandum with authority, to enable this administrative law judge to consider all the factors necessary in setting the precise dollar amount of sanctions to be awarded pursuant to those portions of Order No. 96 adopted by the Commission and shall specifically identify those counsel it believes are liable for payment of the sanctions to be awarded;

3. Each of complainant and respondents, identified by the Commission in its March 6 Order, should provide to the administrative law judge no later than May 5, 1998 a statement whether the dollar value of any sanctions imposed by the Commission had been resolved by agreement;

4. Each of respondents, identified by the Commission in its March 6 Order, and the staff is ordered no later than Tuesday May 12, 1998 to respond to complainant's filing, referred to in 1 *supra*, raising any and all objections to the dollar amounts, including objection to the relationship of the costs asserted by complainant to the Commission's monetary sanctions award. Also they should file then supporting memoranda and authorities;

5. Complainant is ordered no later than May 22, 1998 to file a rebuttal submission; and

6. Each of respondents, identified by the Commission in its March 6, Order, and the staff is ordered to file a sur-rebuttal by Friday May 29.

At this time no further proceedings, in this sanctions proceeding, will be ordered. The parties will be notified, at a later date, on whether the administrative law judge will provide the parties with an opportunity for any additional proceedings.

On April 7, 1998, each of complainant, Mentor and the staff was notified about the issuance of this order. Also this order is being published in the **Federal Register** for notification of any other respondents.

Issued: April 7, 1998.

Paul J. Luckern,

Administrative Law Judge.

[FR Doc. 98–9949 Filed 4–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 731–TA–761 and 762 (Final)]

Static Random Access Memory Semiconductors from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan

Determinations

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission determines, pursuant to section 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)) (the Act), that an industry in the United States is not materially injured or threatened with material injury, and the establishment of an industry in the United States is not

[1] The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

materially retarded, by reason of imports from the Republic of Korea of static random access memory semiconductors (SRAMs)[2] that have been found by the Department of Commerce (Commerce) to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV). The Commission also determines,[3] pursuant to section 735(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)), that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports from Taiwan of SRAMs that have been found by Commerce to be sold in the United States at LTFV.

Background

The Commission instituted these investigations effective February 25, 1997, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission and Commerce by Micron Technology Inc., Boise, ID. The final phase of the investigations was scheduled by the Commission following notification of preliminary determinations by Commerce that imports of SRAMs from Korea and Taiwan were being sold at LTFV within the meaning of section 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's investigations and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** of October 16, 1997 (62 FR 53800). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on February 18, 1998, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these investigations to the Secretary of Commerce on April 8, 1998. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3098 (April 1998), entitled ''Static Random Access Memory Semiconductors From The Republic of Korea and Taiwan: Investigations Nos. 731–TA–761 and 762 (Final).''

Issued: April 9, 1998.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–9948 Filed 4–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[2] The products covered by these investigations are synchronous, asynchronous, and specialty SRAMs from Korea and Taiwan, whether assembled or unassembled. Assembled SRAMs include all package types. Unassembled SRAMs include processed wafers or die, uncut die, and cut die. Processed wafers produced in Korea or Taiwan, but packaged, or assembled into memory modules, in a third country, are included in the scope; processed wafers produced in a third country and assembled or packaged in Korea or Taiwan are not included in the scope.

The scope of these investigations includes modules containing SRAMs. Such modules include single in-line processing modules (SIPs), single in-line memory modules (SIMMs), dual in-line memory modules (DIMMs), memory cards, or other collections of SRAMs, whether unmounted or mounted on a circuit board. The scope of these investigations does not include SRAMs that are physically integrated with other components of a motherboard in such a manner as to constitute one inseparable amalgam (i.e., SRAMs soldered onto motherboards).

The SRAMs within the scope of these investigations are classified in statistical reporting numbers 8542.13.8037 through 8542.13.8049, 8473.30.1000 through 8473.30.9000, and 8542.13.8005 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS).

[3] Vice Chairman Bragg voted in the affirmative, Chairman Miller voted in the negative, and Commissioner Crawford did not participate.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

In accordance with Department of Justice policy and 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on March 26, 1998, a proposed consent decree in *United States* v. *J&L Specialty Steel, Inc.* Civil Action No. 5:96CV 0456, was lodged in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio. The Complaint filed by the United States in this action asserted claims for injunctive relief and the assessment of civil penalties against J&L Specialty Steel, Inc. (''J&L'') under Section 309 (b) and (d) of the Clean Water Act (''the Act''), 33 U.S.C. § 1319 (b) and (d), for: violating certain terms and conditions of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (''NPDES'') permit issued in 1983 for J&L's Louisville, Ohio facility; submitting inaccurate information in an application for a new NPDES permit; and failing to provide information requested by U.S. EPA pursuant to Section 308 of the Act.

The proposed consent decree requires J&L to comply with the Act and certain terms and conditions of its current NPDES permit. The proposed decree specifies various measures to be implemented by J&L to assure such compliance, including: (1) Elimination of process contact water flow and non-contact cooling water flow from one outfall at the facility; (2) demonstration of compliance with Foam and Sheen provisions of J&L's NPDES permit or development and implementation of a plan to control such discharges from J&L's facility; (3) installation of means to accurately monitor flow from a specified outfall at J&L's facility; and (4) a requirement to achieve and certify compliance with the information requests that EPA previously issued to J&L. In addition, the proposed Consent Decree requires J&L to pay the United States $200,000.00 in civil penalties and to implement three Supplemental Environmental Projects, with estimated costs to J&L of approximately $370,000.00.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments concerning the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice, P.O. Box 7611, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044, and should refer to *United States* v. *J&L Specialty Steel, Inc.*, D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–1–1–4212.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at any of the following offices: (1) the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, 1800 Bank One Center, 600 Superior Avenue, East, Cleveland, OH 44114–2600 (contact Assistant United States Attorney Arthur I. Harris); (2) the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604–3590 (contact Associate Regional Counsel Joseph Williams); and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, 202–624–0892. Copies 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, telephone (202) 624–0892. For a copy of the Consent Decree please enclose a check in the amount of $8.25 (25 cents per page reproduction costs) payable to Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

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

[FR Doc. 98–9970 Filed 4–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Justice Programs

Office for Victims of Crime: Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice of Information Collection Under Review; New Collection; OVC Preliminary Questionnaire to Determine Hate/Bias Crime Record-keeping Practices.

The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from