

In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of \$7.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

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

[FR Doc. 98-17499 Filed 6-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a consent decree in *United States v. Reynolds*, Civ. A. No 96-0014-C, was lodged on June 12, 1998 with the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia. The consent decree resolves the claims of the United States under Section 106(b), 107(a), and 107(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended ("CERCLA"), for reimbursement of response costs incurred at the Singleton Drum Site in Castleton, Rappahannock County, Virginia, as well as civil penalties for failure to comply with a Unilateral Administrative Order issued by EPA. The consent decree obligates Settling Defendants to pay \$277,500 in reimbursement of response costs incurred by EPA in responding to contamination at the Site, and civil penalties. Of this amount, approximately \$144,000 will be paid in full reimbursement of EPA's response costs at the Site.

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, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States v. Reynolds*, DOJ Ref. 190-11-2-1072.

The consent decree may be examined at the office of the United States Attorney, 616 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106; the Region III Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 841 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20005 (202) 624-0892. A copy of the consent decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G

Street, NW., 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20005. In requesting a copy please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of \$4.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost), payable to the Consent Decree library.

Joel M. Gross,

*Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,
Environmental & Natural Resources Division.*

[FR Doc. 98-17500 Filed 6-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4110-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

[Civil Action No. 98-1497]

Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement; United States v. Aluminum Company of America, et al.

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. section 16(b)-(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Hold Separate Stipulation and Order, Stipulation and Order, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *United States v. Aluminum of America, et al.*, Civil No. 1:98CV01497. The proposed Final Judgment is subject to approval by the Court after the expiration of the statutory 60-day public comment period and compliance with the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. section 16(b)-(h).

On June 15, 1998, the United States filed a Complaint seeking to enjoin a transaction in which Aluminum Company of America ("Alcoa") would acquire Alumax, Inc. ("Alumax"). Alcoa and Alumax are the two largest of three producers of aluminum cast plate ("cast plate") in the world. Cast plate is used for applications that require precise dimensions and flatness, such as jigs, fixtures, and numerous tooling, mold, machinery, and equipment applications. Alcoa's proposed acquisition of Alumax would have combined under single ownership almost 90% of the cast plate manufacturing business in the world. The Complaint alleged that the proposed acquisition would substantially lessen competition in the manufacture and sale of cast plate worldwide in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. section 18.

The proposal Final Judgment, filed at the same time as the Complaint, orders Alcoa to sell its cast plate division to a purchaser who has the capability to compete effectively in the manufacture and sale of cast plate. The proposed Final Judgment also requires Alcoa to

abide by the Hold Separate Stipulation and Order, which requires Alcoa to ensure that, until the divestiture mandated by the Final Judgment has been accomplished, Alcoa's cast plate division will be held separate and apart from, and operated independently of, any of Alcoa's other assets and businesses. A Competitive Impact Statement filed by the United States describes the Complaint, the proposed Final Judgment, and remedies to private litigants.

Public comment is invited within the statutory 60-day comment period. Such comments, and responses thereto, will be published in the **Federal Register** and filed with the Court. Written comments should be directed to Roger W. Fones, Chief, Transportation, Energy, and Agriculture Section, Antitrust Division, 325 Seventh Street, NW., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: (202) 307-6351).

Copies of the Complaint, Hold Separate Stipulation and Order, Stipulation and Order, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection in Room 215 of the U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 325 Seventh Street, NW, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: (202) 514-2481) and at the office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 333 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20001. Copies of any of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

Constance K. Robinson,

*Director of Operations & Merger Enforcement,
Antitrust Division.*

Stipulation and Order

It is hereby *Stipulated* by and between the undersigned parties, by their respective attorneys, as follows:

1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and over each of the parties hereto, and venue of this action is proper in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

2. The parties stipulate that a Final Judgment in the form hereto attached may be filed and entered by the Court, upon the motion of any party or upon the Court's own motion, at any time after compliance with the requirements of the Antitrust Procedure and Penalties Act (15 U.S.C. 16), and without further notice to any party or other proceedings, provided that plaintiff has not withdrawn its consent, which it may do at any time before the entry of the proposed Final Judgment by serving notice thereof on defendants and by filing that notice with the Court.