United States v. Mid-America Dairymen. Inc., 977–1 Trade Cas. ¶ 61,508, at 71,980 (W.D. Mo. 1977).

Accordingly, 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.), cert. denied, 454 U.S. 11083 (1981); see also Microsoft, 56 F.3d at 1460–62. Precedent requires that:

The 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 reach of the public interest." More elaborate requirements might undermine the effectiveness of antitrust enforcement by consent decree.2

Bechtel, 648 F .2d at 666 (citations omitted) (emphasis added).

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. American Tel. and Tel. Co., 552 F. Supp. 131, 151 (D.D.C. 1982), aff'd. sub nom. Maryland v. United States, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983), quoting Gillette Co., 406 F. Supp. at 716 (citations omitted); *United* States v. Alcan Aluminum, Ltd., 605 F. Supp. 619, 622 (W.D. Ky. 1985). 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.

#### **VIII. Determinative Document**

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APPA that were considered by the plaintiff in formulating the proposed Final Judgment. Dated: June 27, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregg I. Malawer (D.C. Bar #481685), U.S. Department of Justice Antitrust Division, 3257th Street, NW., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 514–0230, Attorney for Plaintiff the United States.

# Exhibit A—Definition of HHI and Calculations for Market

"HHI" means the Herfindahl-Hirschm Index, a commonly accepted measure of market concentration. It is calculated by squaring the market share of each firm competing in the market and then summing the resulting numbers. For example, for a market consisting of four firms with shares of thirty, thirty, twenty and twenty percent, the HHI is  $2600 (30^2 + 30^2 + 20^2 + 20^2 = 2600)$ . The HHI takes into account the relative size and distribution of the firms in a market and approaches zero when a market consists of a large number of firms of relatively equal size. The HHI increases both as the number of firms in the market decreases and as the disparity in size between those firms increases

Markets in which the HHI is between 1000 and 1800 points are considered to be moderately concentrated, and those in which the HHI is in excess of 1800 points are considered to be concentrated. Transactions that increase the HHI by more than 100 points in concentrated markets presumptively raise antitrust concerns under the Merger Guidelines. See Merger Guidelines § 1.51.

[FR Doc. 06–6362 Filed 7–19–06; 8:45 am]

# **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

## **Antitrust Division**

## Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—DVD Copy Control Association

Notice is hereby given that, on June 22, 2006, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 et seq. ("the Act"), DVD Copy Control Association ("DVD CCA") 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, BeyondWiz Co., Ltd., Seongnam, Republic of Korea; CD Video Manufacturing, Inc., Santa Ana, CA;

Hong Kong KONKA Ltd., Hong Kong, Hong Kong-China; Kawai Musical Instruments Mfg. Co., Ltd., Shizuoka, Japan; Shenzhen Mizuda AV Co., Ltd., Shenzhen, People's Republic of China; Teltron S.A., Buenos Aires, Argentina; and Toyo Recording Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, CIS Technology, Inc., Taipei Hsien, Taiwan; and Encentrus Systems Inc., Pointe-Claire, Quebec, Canada have withdrawn as parties to this venture. In addition, Favor Digital Technology Co., Ltd. has changed its name to Major Digital Technology Co., Ltd., Jiang Xi, People's Republic of China.

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

On April 11, 2001, DVD CCA 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 August 3, 2001 (66 FR 40727).

The last notification was filed with the Department on March 16, 2006. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on April 12, 2006 (71 FR 18769).

# Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 06–6359 Filed 7–19–06; 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—Network Centric Operations Industry Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on June 20, 2006, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 et seq. ("Act"), Network Centric Operations Industry Consortium, 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, American Red Cross, Washington, DC; Open Geospatial

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Cf. BNS. 858 F.2d at 464; 858 F.2d at 64 (bolding that the court's "ultimate authority under the [APP A] is limited to approving or disapproving the consent decree"); Gillette, 406 F. Supp. at 716 (noting that, in this way, the court s constrained to "look at the overall picture not hypercritically, nor with a microscope, but with 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'").

Consortium, Inc., Wayland, MA;
Management and Engineering
Technologies International, Inc., El
Paso, TX; Gallium Software Inc.,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada; and SPARTA,
Inc., Arlington, VA have been added as
parties to this venture. Also, West
Virginia High Technology Consortium
Foundation, Fairmont, WV; MBL
International, Ltd., Annandale, VA;
Crystal Group, Inc., Hiawatha, IA; and
FlightSafety International, Flushing, NY
have withdrawn 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 Network Centric Operations Industry Consortium, Inc. intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On November 19, 2004, Network Centric Operations Industry Consortium, 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 February 2, 2005 (70 FR 5486).

The last notification was filed with the Department on April 10, 2006. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 10, 2006 (71 FR 27280).

## Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 06–6360 Filed 7–19–06; 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—Semiconductor Test Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on May 10, 2006, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 et seq. ("the Act"), Semiconductor Test Consortium, 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, BitifEye, Boeblingen, Germany; ERS Electronic, Munich, Germany; Q-Star Test, Brugge, Belgium;

and Sept Europe, Munich, Germany 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 Semiconductor Test Consortium, Inc. intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 27, 2003, Semiconductor Test Consortium, 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 June 17, 2003 (68 FR 35913).

The last notification was filed with the Department on February 21, 2006. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on March 7, 2006 (71 FR 13866).

## Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 06–6358 Filed 7–19–06; 8:45 am]

## **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

#### **Federal Highway Administration**

MORRIS K. UDALL SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY FOUNDATION

[Docket No. FHWA-2006-25031]

U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution; Request for Public Participation in National Outdoor Advertising Control Program Assessment

AGENCIES: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT and United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute).

**ACTION:** Notice; request for public input on program assessment.

**SUMMARY:** The FHWA and the U.S. Institute have initiated an assessment of the national outdoor advertising control (OAC) program, which implements the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 131. The goal of the assessment is to reach out, through a neutral entity, to parties interested in OAC to identify issues that cause controversy, perspectives of the various stakeholders, and appropriate methods for addressing conflicts and improving program results. The U.S. Institute, operating under an interagency

agreement with the FHWA, is responsible for carrying out the neutral conflict assessment process. This notice describes the first of several opportunities for public participation in the assessment process. At this time, the public is invited to identify any OAC issues that should be considered during the assessment. The public also is invited to suggest persons or entities with particular interests or expertise in outdoor advertising and the OAC program, that the assessors should consider contacting as a part of the assessment proceedings.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before August 21, 2006.

## ADDRESSES:

## Comments on OAC Issues

Mail or hand deliver comments about OAC issues that should be considered in the assessment to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Dockets Management Facility, Room PL–401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590, or submit electronically at <a href="http://dms.dot.gov">http://dms.dot.gov</a> or fax comments to (202) 493–2251. All comments should include the docket number that appears in the heading of this document.

All comments received will be available for examination and copying at the above address from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of comments must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard or may print the acknowledgement page that appears after submitting comments electronically. Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of DOT's dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.)

Names of Persons or Entities To Be Contacted as Part of the Assessment

Mail or hand deliver suggested names of persons or entities to be contacted as part of the assessment to the Morris K. Udall Foundation, U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, attn: Ms. Gail Brooks, 130 South Scott Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85701, or submit electronically by e-mail to oac@ecr.gov, or fax to (510) 670–5530. Contact information for such persons or entities, if available to the submitter, should be included in the submission.

Names and contact information for such persons or entities should be provided only to the U.S. Institute as directed above in order to protect the privacy of the persons or entities