

importer, and purchaser questionnaires were derived, in part, from the number of respondents to Commission questionnaires that were issued in FY1996–98. Averaged to that is the estimated number of respondents for questionnaires to be issued to 9 or fewer firms. Data for these mailings were not collected during FY1996–98 and Commission staff estimates that 4 respondents per mailing return such questionnaires. Similarly, foreign producer questionnaires are typically sent to 9 or fewer firms and Commission staff again used an estimate of 4 respondents per mailing for foreign producer questionnaires.

**Responding firm burden.**—Defined as the time required by the firm which received the questionnaire to review instructions, search data sources, and complete and review its response. Commission questionnaires do not impose the burden of developing, acquiring, installing and utilizing technology and systems, nor require adjusting existing methodology or training personnel. Current estimates of “responding firm burden” for the producer, importer, and purchaser questionnaires were derived from the actual burden reported by firms that responded to Commission questionnaires issued in FY1996–98. Current estimates of “respondent firm burden” for the foreign producer questionnaires was estimated by Commission staff based upon its review of previously returned questionnaires.

**Outside review burden.**—Time devoted by outside legal and financial advisors to reviewing questionnaires completed by the responding firms who are their clients prior to submitting them to the Commission. Commission staff conducted a survey of fewer than 10 law firms which have appeared before the Commission to derive a “petitioner” review burden estimate per party questionnaire and a “respondent” review burden estimate. Staff also reviewed a number of past investigations (33) to determine the average number of “parties” (i.e., respondent interested parties who were represented by outside counsel) per investigation and calculated the total number of review burden hours that would be incurred annually. The “petitioner/producer” review burden was applied to the producer questionnaire burden figures and the “respondent” review burden was divided among the importer and foreign producer questionnaires.

**Third party disclosure burden.**—Time required for outside legal advisors to serve their clients’ questionnaires on

other interested parties to the investigation or review under an administrative protective order. Commission staff included in its survey of law firms a request for the average third party disclosure burden and using the same methodology described above for outside review burden applied the third party disclosure burden to the hours per response figures for the producer, importer, and foreign producer questionnaires.

The Commission further estimates that it costs responding firms \$65.30 per burden hour to complete a specific questionnaire issued under the generic clearance. (This estimate is based upon actual costs reported by respondents to questionnaires issued under the current generic clearance.) More complete information concerning costs to respondents, including costs incurred for the purchase of services, and estimates of the annualized cost to the Commission are presented in the draft Supporting Statement available from the Commission. There is no known capital and start-up cost component imposed by the proposed information collections.

#### (5) Information Technology

The Commission’s collection of data through its questionnaires does not currently involve the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Completed questionnaires are almost always returned to the Commission in paper-form. While the Commission has explored the use of alternative methods of submission, it has proved most expedient to receive paper copies for a number of reasons. (The draft Supporting Statement available from the Commission addresses this issue in greater detail.) However, while there are certain impediments to the easy receipt of data in electronic form, the Commission will, and has in the past, accept electronic submissions when large amounts of “repetitive” data are being requested. Further, the Commission will make the questionnaires available to firms in electronic format to aid respondents. Likewise, it is the Commission’s experience that it is most expedient that the information provided in response to its notices of institution for the five-year reviews be submitted in document form directly to its Office of the Secretary.

Issued: January 25, 1999.

By order of the Commission.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–2045 Filed 1–27–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as Amended

Consistent with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on January 13, 1999, a proposed consent decree in *United States v. Vermont American Corporation*, Civil Action No. 2:99–CV–9, was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Vermont. This proposed consent decree resolves the United States’ claims under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (“CERCLA”), 42 U.S.C. 9601 *et seq.*, on behalf of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) against Vermont American Corporation relating to certain response costs that have been or will be incurred at or from a Site known as the Parker Landfill Superfund Site (“Site”) located in the Town of Lyndon, Vermont.

The consent decree requires the defendant to pay \$350,000 to the United States, \$150,000 to the parties constructing the cap at the Site, waive its claims against municipalities that disposed of municipal solid waste at the Site and withdraw its adverse comments to an earlier consent decree.

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. Any comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530, and should refer to *United States v. Vermont American Corporation*, D.J. Ref. 90–11–2–1120A.

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, 11 Elmwood Ave., Burlington, Vt. 05401, at the Region I office of the Environmental Protection Agency, JFK Federal Building, Boston, MA., 02203–2211, and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW, 3rd Floor, Washington, DC 20005 (202) 624–0892. A copy of the proposed consent decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW, 3rd Floor, Washington, DC 20005. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check (there is a 25 cent per page reproduction cost) in

the amount of \$7.00 payable to the Consent Decree Library.

**Joel Gross,**

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

[FR Doc. 99-2033 Filed 1-27-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—The Asymmetrical Digital Subscriber Line Forum

Notice is hereby given that, on March 20, 1998, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), the Asymmetrical Digital Subscriber Line Forum ("ADSL") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Accelerated Networks, Westlake Village, CA; Advanced Hardware Architectures, Pullman, WA; Advanced Micro Devices, Sunnyvale, CA; Aware, Bedford, MA; Atlas Communication Engines, Inc., Santa Barbara, CA; Bell Canada, Montreal, Quebec, CANADA; Bellcore, Morristown, NJ; Bosch Telecom, Backnang, Baden-Wuerttemberg, GERMANY; Broadband Technologies, Research Triangle Park, NC; Cable & Wireless, London, ENGLAND; CopperCom, Cupertino, CA; Diamond Multimedia, St. Ingbert, Saarland, GERMANY; Fluke Corporation, Everett, WA; General Signal Networks, Westford, MA; Globaloop, Kfar Sava, ISRAEL; FORE Systems, Warrendale, PA; Harris Corporation, Melbourne, FL; Intel, Santa Clara, CA; Interspeed, Lawrence, MA; Jetstream, San Jose, CA; MCI Telecommunications, Richardson, TX; New Information Technologies, Inc. (NITECH), Freehold, NJ; PMC-Sierra, Burnaby, British Columbia, CANADA; Philips Multimedia & Network Systems GmbH, Bautzen, GERMANY; Pulse, San Diego, CA; OKI America, Merrifield, VA; Robertson, Stephens & Co., San Francisco, CA; RouterWare, Newport Beach, CA; Shasta Networks, Menlo Park, CA; Siecor, Keller, TX; Sprint, Westwood, KS; Starnet, San Jose, CA; TTC, Germantown, MD; Tele Danmark, Aarhus, DENMARK; Tollgrade,

Cheswick, PA; Tut Systems, Pleasant Hill, CA; Transwitch, Shelton, CT; and VTT Electronics, Oulu, FINLAND have been added as parties to this venture. SMC, Irvine, CA has changed its name to Escalate Networks, Irvine, CA. SouthWestern Bell, Austin, TX has changed its name to SBC Technology Resources, Austin, TX. Ericsson Austria AG, Vienna, AUSTRIA has changed its name to LM Ericsson, Vienna, AUSTRIA.

Amati, San Jose, CA has merged with Texas Instruments, Dallas, TX.

Also, Sourcecom, Santa Clarita, CA; and Interphase, Dallas, TX have been dropped as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and ADSL intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 15, 1995, ADSL filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on July 25, 1995 (60 FR 38058).

The last notification was filed with the Department on December 16, 1997. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 69b) of the Act on April 8, 1998 (63 FR 17214).

**Constance K. Robinson,**

*Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 99-2035 Filed 1-27-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Cable Television Laboratories, Inc. ("CableLabs")

Notice is hereby given that, on May 5, 1998, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Cable Television Laboratories, Inc. ("CableLabs") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Monarch Cablesystems Ltd., Medicine Hat, Alberta, CANADA; and TV Cable Bogota, Bogota,

COLUMBIA have been added as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Cable Television Laboratories, Inc. ("CableLabs") intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On August 8, 1988, Cable Television Laboratories, Inc. ("CableLabs") filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on September 7, 1988 (53 FR 34593).

The last notification was filed with the Department on January 30, 1998. A notice has not yet been published in the **Federal Register**.

**Constance K. Robinson,**

*Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 99-2040 Filed 1-27-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant To the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Cable Television Laboratories, Inc. ("CableLabs")

Notice is hereby given that, on January 30, 1998, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Cable Television Laboratories, Inc. ("CableLabs") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Globocabo S.A., Sao Paulo, BRAZIL; and Seaview Communications, Maple Ridge, British Columbia, CANADA have been added as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Cable Television Laboratories, Inc. ("CableLabs") intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On August 8, 1988, Cable Television Laboratories, Inc. ("CableLabs") filed its