

having potential for disposal. Lease and conveyance of the land for recreational or public purposes would be in the public interest.

Lease and conveyance, when issued, will contain the following reservations to the United States:

1. Rights-of-way for ditches and canals constructed by the authority of the United States.
2. All minerals shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove such deposits from the same under applicable law and regulations to be established by the Secretary of the Interior.

And will be subject to:

1. The provisions of the R&PP Act and all applicable regulations of the Secretary of the Interior.

2. Those rights for a public road granted to the Arizona Department of Transportation (AZPHX 78756) under the Act of July 26, 1866, Revised Statute 2477 (43 U.S.C. 932).

Upon publication of this notice in the Federal Register, the land will be segregated from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the general mining laws, except for lease and conveyance under the R&PP Act, leasing under the mineral leasing laws, and material disposal laws.

**CLASSIFICATION COMMENTS:** For a period of 45 days from the date of publication of this Notice in the Federal Register, interested parties may submit comments to the Area Manager, Yuma Resource Area Office, 2555 East Gila Ridge Road, Yuma, Arizona 85365. Comments may address the suitability of the land for a library, a school, a water treatment facility, and a park. Comments on the classification are restricted to whether the land is physically suited for the above mentioned uses, whether the use will maximize the future use or uses of the land, whether the use is consistent with local planning and zoning, or if the use is consistent with State and Federal programs.

**APPLICATION COMMENTS:** Interested parties may submit comments regarding the specific use proposed in the application and plan of development, whether the Bureau of Land Management followed proper administrative procedures in reaching the decision, or any other factor not directly related to the suitability of the land for a library, a school, a water treatment facility, and a park.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** Any adverse comments will be reviewed by the District Manager, Yuma District Office. In the absence of any adverse comments, the

classification of the land described in this Notice will become effective 60 days from the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register. The lands will not be offered for lease and conveyance until after the classification becomes effective.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dave Curtis, Realty Specialist, Yuma Resource Area Office, 2555 E. Gila Ridge Road, Yuma, AZ 85365, telephone (520) 317-3237.

Dated: June 14, 1996.  
Maureen A. Merrell,  
ADM, Administration.  
[FR Doc. 96-16443 Filed 6-26-96; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4310-32-P

[UT-060-06-1430-001, UTU-74116]

#### Notice of Realty Action; Grand County, UT

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Proposed Residential Occupancy Lease.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 302 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2762; 43 USC 1932), the Bureau of Land Management, Moab District, will consider leasing a parcel of public land in Grand County, Utah. Leasing of the federal land will authorize existing residential uses and improvements, and will allow the government to collect fair market rental. The land and prospective lessee area as follows:

T. 23 S., R. 24 E. Sec 18: Lot 2 (fractional)  
0.5 acres  
Salt Lake Base Meridian

Prospective Lessees: Merrel and Jan Herod  
**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The parcel would be offered to the present occupant for direct, noncompetitive lease, at no less than fair market rental. The size, configuration and location of the parcel limits the uses and users. The age and financial status of the prospective lessees are such that failure to issue the lease will pose significant financial hardship on the occupants.

The general terms and conditions for the lease are found at 43 CFR 2920.7. Additional terms and conditions would be added in accordance with mitigation stipulations identified in draft Environmental Assessment UT-068-95-107.

For a period of 30 days from publication of this notice, interested parties may submit comments to the Moab District Manager, 82 East Dogwood, Moab, Utah 84532. Comments will be evaluated, and the

decision to issue, modify or reject the lease will be made.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lynn Jackson, Moab District Office, 82 East Dogwood, Moab, Utah 84532, (801) 259-6111.

Dated: June 19, 1996.  
Brad D. Palmer,  
(Acting) District Manager.  
[FR Doc. 96-16441 Filed 6-26-96; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4310-DQ-P

[ID-957-1430-00]

#### Idaho: Filing of Plats of Survey; Idaho

The plat of the following described land was officially filed in the Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, Boise, Idaho, effective 9:00 a.m. June 19, 1996.

The plat representing the dependent resurvey of portions of the subdivisional lines and subdivision of section 18, and the further subdivision of section 18, and a metes-and-bounds survey within section 18, T. 6 N., R. 34 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group No. 914, was accepted, June 19, 1996.

This survey was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management. All inquiries concerning the survey of the above described land must be sent to the Chief, Cadastral Survey, Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 3380 Americana Terrace, Boise, Idaho, 83706-2500.

Dated: June 19, 1996.  
Duane E. Olsen,  
Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Idaho.  
[FR Doc. 96-16444 Filed 6-26-96; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4310-GG-M

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

##### Sunshine Act Meeting

[USITC SE-96-13]

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** United States International Trade Commission.

**TIME AND DATES:** July 2, 1996 at 9:30 a.m.

**PLACE:** Room 101, 500 E Street S.W., Washington, DC 20436.

**STATUS:** Open to the public.

##### MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agenda for future meeting
2. Minutes
3. Ratification List
4. Inv. Nos. TA-201-65 and NAFTA-302-1 (Injury) (Broom Corn Brooms)—briefing and vote.
5. Inv. No. TA-201-66 (Injury) (Fresh Tomatoes and Bell Peppers)—briefing and vote.
6. Outstanding action jackets:

1. GC-96-031, Notice of amendments to Parts 201 and 207 of Rules of Practice and Procedure (Title VII matters).

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: June 25, 1996.

Donna R. Koehnke,  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-16612 Filed 6-25-96; 2:43 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### United States v. Georgia-Pacific Corp.; Proposed Consent Judgments

Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(c)-(h), the United States publishes below the comment received on the proposed final judgment in *United States v. Georgia-Pacific Corp.*, Civil Action No. 96-164, filed in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware, together with the United States' response to that comment.

Copies of the comment and response to comment are available for inspection and copying in Room 207 of the U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 325 7th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530 (telephone: (202) 514-2481), and at the office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Delaware. Copies of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

Constance K. Robinson,  
Director of Operations.

June 7, 1996.

Morgan A. Chivers,  
Chairman of the Board and Chief Operating Officer, Continental Gypsum Company,  
265 Distribution Street, Port Newark,  
New Jersey 07114

Re: United States v. Georgia-Pacific Corporation, Civil Action No. 96-164 (D. Del., March 29, 1996)

Dear Mr. Chivers: This letter responds to your letters dated April 30, 1996 and May 21, 1996 commenting on the proposed Final Judgment in the above-referenced antitrust case, which challenges the acquisition of the gypsum business of Domtar Inc. ("Domtar") by Georgia-Pacific Corporation ("GP"). The Complaint alleges that the acquisition violates Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18, because its effects may be to lessen substantially competition in the production and sale of gypsum board in the Northeast Region of the United States. As defined in the Complaint, the Northeast

Region encompasses the twelve eastern seaboard states from Maine through Virginia and Washington, D.C. Under the proposed Final Judgment, GP is required to divest to one or more purchasers its Buchanan, New York and Wilmington, Delaware gypsum board plants and related tangible and intangible assets. GP must accomplish the divestitures within 150 calendar days after the date on which the proposed Final Judgment was filed (March 29, 1996).

In your April 30 letter, you noted that Continental Gypsum Company is a small independent gypsum board manufacturer which commenced production on August 23, 1995 and did not obtain expected levels of production and sales until April 1996. You expressed two concerns about the provisions on the proposed Final Judgment. One concern arises from the requirement that GP "use all reasonable efforts to maintain and increase sales of gypsum board" at the Buchanan and Wilmington plants until the divestitures of these facilities have been accomplished. GP also is required to "maintain at 1995 or previously approved levels, whichever are higher, promotional, advertising, sales, marketing and merchandising support" for gypsum board sales at these two plants. You believe that complying with these provisions could have a "predatory" effect on Continental and possibly force Continental out of the market, particularly if demand stays the same or falls in 1996.

We do not believe these provisions will have an adverse effect on competition in the gypsum wallboard market. The provision were intended to prevent GP from taking any actions that might jeopardize the competitive viability of the Buchanan and Wilmington plants pending divestiture. To ensure continued viability, GP must use all "reasonable efforts" to maintain sales at existing levels or to increase sales during the divestiture period. This requirement imposes no greater obligation on GP than could reasonably be expected if the plants were not candidates for divestiture. Moreover, Continental could reasonably anticipate that any prospective purchaser would operate the Buchanan and Wilmington plants in a similar manner after the divestiture period. Thus, any loss of sales by Continental from operating the plants in the manner required by the proposed Final Judgment would result from competitive, not anticompetitive, forces.

Your second concern arises from the requirement that GP, at the option of the purchaser or purchasers, enter into a supply contract for gypsum rock and/or gypsum linerboard paper sufficient to meet all or part of the capacity requirements of the Buchanan and Wilmington plants over a period up to ten (10) years. The proposed final Judgment expressly provides that the terms and conditions of any such supply contract "must be related reasonably to market conditions for gypsum rock and/or gypsum linerboard paper." You noted that Continental currently purchases some of its paper requirements from GP and that it views GP as a potential source of its gypsum rock requirements. You are concerned that the supply contracts provided for in the Final Judgment will "seriously restrict" Continental's ability to source these vital raw materials.

We do not believe that the supply contracts mandated in the Final Judgment would have any adverse competitive effect on Continental, should a purchaser or purchasers elect to negotiate such contracts with GP. As an initial matter, it should be noted that GP currently is supplying the Buchanan and Wilmington plants with gypsum rock and linerboard paper and (presumably) would continue to do so in the absence of the Department's challenge to the Domtar acquisition. Thus, allowing the purchaser or purchasers of these facilities to contract for a long-term source of these raw materials from GP would not mean that the amount of such materials GP has available to sell to others in the industry would be any less than would otherwise be the case. Moreover, should GP decide to sue its own resources to supply gypsum rock and paper to the two Domtar facilities that it is acquiring in the Northeast Region—Domtar's Newington, New Hampshire and Camden, New Jersey plants—the gypsum rock and paper that presently are being supplied to these facilities from third party sources would become available on the market. Accordingly, there is no net reduction in gypsum rock or paper available to the industry as a result of GP entering into supply contracts for the Buchanan and/or Wilmington plants, and the ability to enter into these contracts, if needed, should greatly facilitate the divestiture of the two plants. In addition, it is important to recognize that the supply contracts provided for in the Final Judgment will be the result of arms-length negotiations reflecting market conditions; it is unlikely, in these circumstances, that the purchaser or purchasers will gain undue advantage over other market participants as a result of these contracts.

We appreciate you bringing your concerns about the proposed Final Judgment to our attention and hope that the foregoing analysis has helped to alleviate them. While we understand your position, we believe that the proposed Final Judgment offers the best feasible solution to the anticompetitive effects posed by GP's acquisition of Domtar's gypsum business in the Northeast Region. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, a copy of your letters and this response will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court.

Sincerely,

J. Robert Kramer, II  
Chief, Litigation II Section.

May 21, 1996.

Mr. J. Robert Kramer,  
Litigation II Section, Antitrust Division, U.S.  
Department of Justice, 1401 H St., N.W.,  
Suite 3000, Washington D.C. 20530.

Re: U.S.A. v. Georgia Pacific Corporation  
Civil Action No.: 96-164.

Dear Mr. Kramer: This letter shall serve as additional comments of the Continental Gypsum Company comment letter to you of April 30, 1996:

In the April 30, 1996 letter we expressed our fear that the Final Judgment mandate that Georgia Pacific maintain or increase sales and production to 1995 levels would cause predatory actions by Georgia Pacific against