

SUMMARY: The Minerals Management Service (MMS) has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed annual Lease Sale 174 for the Western Planning Area of the Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf.

In this EA, MMS has reexamined the potential environmental effects of the proposed action and alternatives based on any new information regarding potential impacts and issues that were not available at the time the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Lease Sales 171, 174, 177, and 180 was prepared.

In summary, no new significant impacts were identified for proposed Lease Sale 174 that were not already assessed in the FEIS for Lease Sales 171, 174, 177, and 180. As a result, MMS determined that a supplemental EIS is not required and prepared a Finding of No New Significant Impact.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Public Information Unit, Information Services Section at number below. You may obtain single copies of the EA from the Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, Attention: Public Information Office (MS 5034), 1201 Elmwood Park Boulevard, Room 114, New Orleans, LA 70123-2394 or by calling 1-800-200-GULF.

Dated: April 23, 1999.

Chris C. Oynes,

Regional Director, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region.
[FR Doc. 99-10670 Filed 4-28-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-M

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-380 Enforcement Proceeding]

Certain Agricultural Tractors Under 50 Power Take-Off Horsepower; Notice of Schedule for the Submission of Petitions for Review and Comments on Remedy

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission will permit parties in the above-captioned enforcement proceeding to submit petitions for review of the initial determination to be issued by the administrative law judge on or before April 28, 1999. In addition, parties, interested government agencies, and other interested persons are invited to submit comments on the appropriate remedy.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shara L. Aranoff, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202-205-3090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 25, 1997, at the conclusion of the original investigation, the Commission issued, inter alia, cease and desist orders directed to respondents Gamut Trading Co., Inc. and Gamut Imports. The cease and desist orders prohibit Gamut Trading Co., Inc. and Gamut Imports, as well as their "principals, stockholders, officers, directors, employees, agents, licensees, distributors, controlled (whether by stock ownership or otherwise) and/or majority-owned business entities, successors and assigns," from importing or selling for importation in to the United States, or selling, marketing, distributing, offering for sale, or otherwise transferring (except for exportation) in the United States agricultural tractors under 50 power take-off horsepower manufactured by Kubota Corporation of Japan that infringe the KUBOTA trademark.

On July 16, 1998, Kubota Corporation, Kubota Tractor Corporation, and Kubota Manufacturing of America Inc. (collectively "Kubota"), complainants in the original investigation, filed a complaint seeking institution of a formal enforcement proceeding against Gamut Trading Co., Inc., Gamut Imports, Ronald A. DePue (Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board of Directors of Gamut Trading), and Darrell J. DuPuy (Chief Financial Officer, President, and member of the Board of Directors of Gamut Trading) (collectively "the Gamut respondents"), alleging that they are violating the cease and desist orders directed to them. Kubota supplemented its complaint on August 26, 1998. On September 28, 1998, the Commission issued an order instituting a formal enforcement proceeding and instructing the Secretary to transmit the enforcement proceeding complaint to the Gamut respondents and their counsel for a response. On October 19, 1998, the Gamut respondents filed a joint response to the enforcement complaint denying violation of any of the Commission's remedial orders and infringement of the KUBOTA trademark, and asserting that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to address the enforcement complaint.

On October 28, 1998, the Commission issued an order referring the formal enforcement proceeding to the presiding administrative law judge (ALJ) for discovery, a hearing, and issuance of an initial determination (ID) concerning

whether any of the Gamut respondents are in violation of the Commission's cease and desist orders. In the event that he found a violation, the order also directed the ALJ to issue a recommended determination (RD) on remedy. The ALJ is due to issue his ID and RD, if any, on or before April 28, 1999.

In order to allow the parties to express their views concerning whether the Commission should review the ID, the Commission is providing parties with the opportunity to file petitions for review of the ID and responses thereto. If the Commission finds a violation of one of more of its cease and desist orders, it will also consider the appropriate remedy (i.e., civil penalty). The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the appropriate remedy.

Written Submissions

Any party of record to this enforcement proceeding may file a petition for review of the ID and/or comments on the appropriate remedy with the Commission no later than fourteen (14) days after service of the ID. A reply to any such petition for review or comments may be filed within seven (7) days after service of the petition or comments. Any other interested person, including any interested government agency, may file comments on the appropriate remedy with the Commission no later than twenty-one (21) days after the date of issuance of the ID. No further submissions will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document and 14 true copies thereof with the Office of the Secretary on or before the deadlines stated above. Any person desiring to submit a document (or portion thereof) to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment unless the information has already been granted such treatment during the proceedings. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary of the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment is granted by the Commission will be treated accordingly. All nonconfidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and section 210.75 of the Commission's

Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.75).

Copies of the Commission's Order, public versions of the ID and RD, and all other nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this enforcement proceeding 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, SW, Washington, DC 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. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

Issued: April 26, 1999.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-10781 Filed 4-28-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

[Civil No. 99-0715]

United States v. SBC Communications Inc. and Ameritech Corporation; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Filed: March 23, 1999.

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, Stipulation, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *United States v. SBC Communications Inc. and Ameritech Corporation*, Civil No. 99-0715 (D.D.C.). 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 March 23, 1999, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that the proposed acquisition of Ameritech Corporation by SBC Communications Inc. would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The Complaint alleges that if this merger is consummated, competition in the markets for wireless mobile telephone services in seventeen areas in Illinois, Indiana and Missouri would be lessened substantially. The areas affected include

fourteen markets where SBC and Ameritech are the two providers of cellular mobile telephone services, including Chicago and St. Louis, and three markets where Ameritech is one of the providers of cellular mobile telephone services and Comcast Cellular Corporation, which SBC has entered into an agreement to acquire, owns the other cellular telephone system. The Complaint also alleges that competition would be lessened in the St. Louis area because, as a result of this merger, Ameritech would not provide local exchange and long distance telephone services bundled with its cellular mobile telephone services, as it had planned to do in St. Louis before agreeing to merge with SBC.

The proposed Final Judgment, filed at the same time as the Complaint, requires SBC and Ameritech to divest one of the two overlapping cellular telephone systems in each of the seventeen market areas. In the areas presently served by Comcast, and in the areas in Missouri, the Ameritech cellular systems must be divested, while in the other SBC and Ameritech may choose which of the two systems will be divested. The assets Ameritech planned to use to provide local exchange and long distance telephone services together with its cellular mobile telephone services in the St. Louis area must also be divested. The proposed Final Judgment requires that the assets of these cellular telephone systems be divested no later than 180 days following the earlier of: (1) all final regulatory approvals needed for SBC and Ameritech to consummate their merger; or (2) the consummation of the merger of SBC and Ameritech. Before the merger can be consummated, any assets required to be divested that have not been sold must be transferred to a trustee, who will complete the divestiture during whatever part of the 180-day period remains.

On April 7, 1999, SBC and Ameritech notified the Department of Justice, pursuant to the provisions of the proposed Final Judgment, that they have entered into an agreement to sell all of the assets of these cellular telephone systems required to be divested to a venture owned 93% by GTE and 7% by Georgetown Partners. This agreement is contingent on the consummation of the merger between SBC and Ameritech.

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. Comments should be directed to Donald J. Russell, Chief, Telecommunications Task Force, Antitrust Division, Department of

Justice, 1401 H St, NW, Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: (202) 514-5621).

The Competitive Impact Statement, filed by the United States on April 16, 1999, describes the Complaint, the proposed Final Judgment, the alleged violations, and the remedies available to private litigants. Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection in Room 215 of the United States Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 325 7th St, NW, Washington DC 20530 (telephone (202) 514-2841) and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Copies of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations and Merger Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

Stipulation

It is 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 this Court.

(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 Procedures 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 entry of the proposed Final Judgment by serving notice thereof on defendants and by filing that notice with the Court.

(3) Defendants shall abide by and comply with the provisions of the proposed Final Judgment pending entry of the Final Judgment by the Court, or until expiration of time for all appeals of any Court ruling declining entry of the proposed Final Judgment, and shall, from the date of the signing of this Stipulation, comply with all the terms and provisions of the proposed Final Judgment as though the same were in full force and effect as an order of the Court.

(4) This Stipulation shall apply with equal force and effect to any amended proposed Final Judgment agreed upon in writing by the parties and submitted in the Court.

(5) In the event plaintiff withdraws its consent, as provided in paragraph (2) above, or in the event that the Court declines to enter the proposed Final