

District of Columbia Circuit has held, under the APPA a court considers, among other things, the relationship between the remedy secured and the specific allegations set forth in the government's complaint, whether the decree is sufficiently clear, whether enforcement mechanisms are sufficient, and whether the decree may positively harm third parties. See *United States v. Microsoft Corp.*, 56 F.3d 1448, 1458–62 (D.C. Cir. 1995).

With respect to the adequacy of the relief secured by the decree, a court may not “engage in an unrestricted evaluation of what relief would best serve the public.” *United States v. BNS, Inc.*, 858 F.2d 456, 462 (9th Cir. 1988) (citing *United States v. Bechtel Corp.*, 648 F.2d 660, 666 (9th Cir. 1981)); see also *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1460–62. Courts have held that:

[t]he balancing of competing social and political interests affected by a proposed antitrust consent decree must be left, in the first instance, to the discretion of the Attorney General. The court's role in protecting the public interest is one of insuring that the government has not breached its duty to the public in consenting to the decree. The court is required to determine not whether a particular decree is the one that will best serve society, but whether the settlement is “within the reaches of the public interest.” More elaborate requirements might undermine the effectiveness of antitrust enforcement by consent decree.

Bechtel, 1648 F.2d at 666 (emphasis added) (citations omitted).⁵ In making its public interest determination, a district court must accord due respect to the government's prediction as to the effect of proposed remedies, its perception of the market structure, and its views of the nature of the case. *United States v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co.*, 272 F.Supp.2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2003).

of relevant factors when making a public interest determination. Compare 15 U.S.C. 16(e) (2004) with 15 U.S.C. § 16(e)(1) (2006) (substituting “shall” for “may” in directing relevant factors for court to consider and amending list of factors to focus on competitive considerations and to address potentially ambiguous judgment terms). This amendment does not affect the substantial precedent in this and other Circuits analyzing the scope and standard of review for Tunney Act proceedings.

⁵ Cf. *BNS*, 858 F.2d at 464 (holding that the court's “ultimate authority under the [APPA] is limited to approving or disapproving the consent decree”); *United States v. Gillette Co.*, 406 F. Supp. 713, 716 (D. Mass. 1975) (noting that, in this way, the court is constrained to “look at the overall picture not hypercritically, nor with a microscope, but with an artist's reducing glass”); see generally *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (discussing whether “the remedies [obtained in the decree are] so inconsonant with the allegations charged as to fall outside of the ‘reaches of the public interest’”).

Court approval of a final judgment requires a standard more flexible and less strict than the standard required for a finding of liability. “[A] proposed decree must be approved even if it falls short of the remedy the court would impose on its own, as long as it falls within the range of acceptability or is ‘within the reaches of public interest.’” *United States v. Am. Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 552 F. Supp. 131, 151 (D.D.C. 1982) (citations omitted) (quoting *United States v. Gillette Co.*, 406 F. Supp. 713, 716 (D. Mass. 1975)), *aff'd sub nom. Maryland v. United States*, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983); see also *United States v. Alcan Aluminum Ltd.*, 605 F.Supp. 619, 622 (W.D. Ky. 1985) (approving the consent decree even though the court would have imposed a greater remedy).

Moreover, the Court's role under the APPA is limited to reviewing the remedy in relationship to the violations that the United States has alleged in its Complaint, and does not authorize the Court to “construct [its] own hypothetical case and then evaluate the decree against that case.” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459. Because the “court's authority to review the decree depends entirely on the government's exercising its prosecutorial discretion by bringing a case in the first place,” it follows that “the court is only authorized to review the decree itself,” and not to “effectively redraft the complaint” to inquire into other matters that the United States did not pursue. *Id.* at 1459–60.

In its 2004 amendments to the Tunney Act, Congress made clear its intent to preserve the practical benefits of utilizing consent decrees in antitrust enforcement, adding the unambiguous instruction “[n]othing in this section shall be construed to require the court to conduct an evidentiary hearing or to require the court to permit anyone to intervene.” 15 U.S.C. 16(e)(2). This language codified the intent of the original 1974 statute, expressed by Senator Tunney in the legislative history: “[t]he court is nowhere compelled to go to trial or to engage in extended proceedings which might have the effect of vitiating the benefits of prompt and less costly settlement through the consent decree process.” 119 Cong. Rec. 24,598 (1973) (statement of Senator Tunney). Rather:

[a]bsent a showing of corrupt failure of the government to discharge its duty, the Court, in making its public interest finding, should * * * carefully consider the explanations of the government in the competitive impact statement and its responses to comments in order to determine whether those explanations a reasonable under the circumstances.

United States v. Mid-America Dairymen, Inc., 1977–1 Trade Cas. (CCH) ¶ 61,508, at 71,980 (W.D. Mo. 1977).

IX. Determinative Documents

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APPA that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment.

Dated: August 10, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark J. Niefer (DC Bar #470370),
Jade Alice Eaton (DC Bar #939629),
Tracy Lynn Fisher (MN Bar #315837).

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on August 10, 2006, I caused a copy of the foregoing Competitive Impact Statement to be served on counsel for Defendants in this matter in the manner set forth below:

By electronic mail and hand delivery:
Counsel for Defendant Exelon Corporation, John M. Nannes, Esq. (DC Bar #195966), Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP and Affiliates, 1440 New York Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20005–2111. Tel: (202) 371–7090. Fax: (202) 661–9191.
Counsel for Defendant Public Service Enterprise Group, Inc., Douglas G. Green, Esq. (DC Bar #183343), Steptoe & Johnson, LLP, 1330 Connecticut Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20036–1795. Tel: (202) 429–6264. Fax: (202) 429–3902.

Mark J. Niefer (DC Bar #470370),
Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 325 Seventh Street, NW., Suite 500,
Washington, DC 20530. Tel: (202) 307–6318. Fax: (202) 307–2784.

[FR Doc. 06–7043 Filed 8–22–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: NARA is giving public notice that the agency proposes to request extension of an information collection currently in use. The information collection is NA Form 6045, Volunteer Service Application Form, used by individuals who wish to volunteer at the National Archives Building, the National Archives at College Park, regional records services facilities, and

Presidential Libraries. The public is invited to comment on the proposed information collection pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before October 23, 2006 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to: Paperwork Reduction Act Comments (NHP), Room 4400, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Rd, College Park, MD 20740-6001; or faxed to 301-837-3213; or electronically mailed to tamee.fechhelm@nara.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Requests for additional information or copies of the proposed information collection and supporting statement should be directed to Tamee Fechhelm at telephone number 301-837-1694, or fax number 301-837-3213.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-13), NARA invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed information collections. The comments and suggestions should address one or more of the following points: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NARA; (b) the accuracy of NARA's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways, including the use of information technology, to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents; and (e) whether small businesses are affected by this collection. The comments that are submitted will be summarized and included in the NARA request for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. In this notice, NARA is soliciting comments concerning the following information collection:

Title: Volunteer Service Application.
OMB number: 3095-0060.

Agency form number: NA Form 6045.

Type of review: Regular.

Affected public: Individuals or households.

Estimated number of respondents: 2,300.

Estimated time per response: 25 minutes.

Frequency of response: On occasion.

Estimated total annual burden hours: 958 hours.

Abstract: NARA uses volunteer resources to enhance its services to the public and to further its mission of

providing ready access to essential evidence. Volunteers assist in outreach and public programs and provide technical and research support for administrative, archival, library, and curatorial staff. NARA uses a standard way to recruit volunteers and assess the qualifications of potential volunteers. The NA Form 6045, Volunteer Service Application Form, is used by members of the public to signal their interest in being a NARA volunteer and to identify their qualifications for this work.

Dated: August 17, 2006.

Martha Morphy,

Assistant Archivist for Information Services.

[FR Doc. E6-13926 Filed 8-22-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-259]

Tennessee Valley Authority; Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of the Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee), to withdraw its application for proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. 50-259 issued to the licensee for operation of the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, located in Limestone County, Alabama.

The proposed amendment would have revised the Technical Specifications to increase the emergency diesel generator allowed outage time.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on January 18, 2005 (70 FR 2898). However, by letter dated August 4, 2006, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated December 6, 2004, as supplemented October 28, 2005, and the licensee's letter dated August 4, 2006, which withdrew the application for license amendment. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management Systems (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet

at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737 or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 17th day of August, 2006.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Margaret H. Chernoff,

Project Manager, Plant Licensing Branch II-2, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. E6-13940 Filed 8-22-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Identification of Countries Under Section 182 of the Trade Act of 1974: Request for Public Comment

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Request for written submissions from the public.

SUMMARY: Section 182 of the Trade Act of 1974 (Trade Act) (19 U.S.C. 2242), requires the United States Trade Representative (USTR) to identify countries that deny adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights or deny fair and equitable market access to U.S. persons who rely on intellectual property protection. Section 182 is commonly referred to as the "Special 301" provision of the Trade Act. In addition, USTR is required to determine which of those countries should be identified as Priority Foreign Countries. In its Special 301 Report issued on April 28, 2006, USTR announced the results of the 2006 Special 301 review and stated that Out-of-Cycle Reviews (OCRs) would be conducted for Indonesia, Canada, Chile, Latvia and Saudi Arabia. USTR requests written comments from the public concerning the acts, policies, and practices relevant for this review under Section 182 of the Trade Act.

DATES: Submissions for Indonesia and Chile must be received on or before 5 p.m. on Friday, September 15, 2006. Submissions for Canada, Latvia and Saudi Arabia must be received on or before 5 p.m. on Monday, October 2, 2006.

ADDRESSES: All comments should be addressed to Sybia Harrison, Special Assistant to the Section 301 Committee, and sent (i) Electronically, to the