the Attorney General'' (citations omitted)).

Moreover, the United States is entitled to ''due respect'' concerning its ''prediction as to the effect of proposed remedies, its perception of the market structure, and its view of the nature of the case.'' Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., 272 F. Supp. 2d at 6 (citing Microsoft, 56 F.3d at 1461).

III. Summary of Public Comment

Although it is unclear whether the author intended it as a comment in this proceeding, the United States received one anonymous letter related to this case during the relevant 30-day time period. The letter made a number of allegations about the conduct of Defendant EMMC and various unidentified mushroom grower/packers. These allegations are not comments on the proposed Final Judgment and therefore are not relevant here. In any event, the United States investigated each of these or similar allegations and concluded that they were unsubstantiated or did not constitute violations of the Federal antitrust laws.

The letter also commented on the relief contained in the proposed Final Judgment, claiming that the EMMC had sold or removed specialized equipment from the farms, and questioned the value of removing the deed restrictions the EMMC had placed on the properties.

IV. The Response of the United States to the Comment

In filing this case, the United States was concerned that the EMMC had collectively removed 8 percent of the mushroom production capacity in the East region of the United States. This was done primarily by placing deed restriction on former farms, restrictions that erected an absolute barrier to new entry on these farms. By removing these restrictions, the proposed Final Judgment assures that new entry can occur wherever economically justified.

There are a number of factors in addition to the presence of specialized equipment that make a farm attractive to potential mushroom entrants, including suitable buildings, an available trained labor force in the area, and existing zoning approvals. Specialized equipment, though potentially valuable, is not unique and can be replaced. Accordingly, the United States determined that the crucial element of relief was the removal of the deed restrictions. The proposed final Judgment accomplishes this.

V. Conclusion

The Competitive Impact Statement and this Response to Comments demonstrate that the proposed Final Judgment serves the public interest. Accordingly, after the publication of this Response in the **Federal Register** pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 16(b) and (d), the United States will move this Court to enter the Final Judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Alexander Hewes, Tracey D. Chambers, David McDowell,

Trial Attorneys, United States Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Transportation, Energy & Agriculture Section, 325 7th Street, NW., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20530, Telephone: (202) 305–8519, Facsimile: (202) 616–2441.

Laura Heiser, Anne Spiegelman,

Trial Attorneys, Antitrust Division, Philadelphia Field Office.

[FR Doc. 05–13354 Filed 7–6–05; 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—Microcontaminant Reduction Venture

Notice is hereby given that, on June 8, 2005, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Microcontaminant Reduction Venture (''MRV'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its project 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. The change in its project status is: The parties to MRV, KMG–Bernuth, Inc., Houston, TX and Vulcan Materials Company, Birmingham, AL, have extended the term of the venture from four to five years.

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 MRV intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On June 13, 2001, MRV filed its original notification pursuant to Section 69(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 19, 2001 (66 FR 37709).

The last notification was filed with the Department on June 15, 2004. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 69(b) of the Act on July 14, 2004 (69 FR 42212).

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 05–13353 Filed 7–6–05; 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—Mobile Enterprise Alliance, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on June 13, 2005, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Mobile Enterprise Alliance, Inc. has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. 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, Appear Networks, Stockholm, Sweden has been added as a party 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 Mobile Enterprise Alliance, Inc. intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On June 24, 2004, Mobile Enterprise Alliance, Inc. 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 23, 2004 (69 FR 44062).

The last notification was filed with the Department on March 17, 2005. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on April 1, 2005 (70 FR 16944).

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 05–13351 Filed 7–6–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M