decree even though the court would have imposed a greater remedy). To meet this standard, the United States "need only provide a factual basis for concluding that the settlements are reasonably adequate remedies for the alleged harms." *SBC Commc'ns*, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 17.

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. As this Court recently confirmed in SBC

Communications, courts "cannot look beyond the complaint in making the public interest determination unless the complaint is drafted so narrowly as to make a mockery of judicial power." SBC Commc'ns, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 15.

In its 2004 amendments, Congress made clear its intent to preserve the practical benefits of utilizing consent decrees in antitrust enforcement, adding the unambiguous instruction that "[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). The language wrote into the statute what Congress intended when it enacted the Tunney Act in 1974, as Senator Tunney explained: "[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, the procedure for the public interest determination is left to the discretion of the court, with the recognition that the court's "scope of review remains sharply proscribed by precedent and the nature of Tunney Act proceedings.' SBC Commc'ns, 489 F. Supp. 2d at 11.3

VIII. 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: December 3, 2008

Dated: December 3, 2008 Respectfully submitted,

Lowell R. Stern,

DC Bar No. 440487, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Litigation II Section, 1401 H Street, NW., Suite 3000, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 307–0924

[FR Doc. E8–29603 Filed 12–15–08; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4410–11–P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (08-097)]

NASA Advisory Council; Science Committee; Earth Science Subcommittee; Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) announces a meeting of the Earth Science Subcommittee of the NASA Advisory Council (NAC). This Subcommittee reports to the Science Committee of the NAC. The Meeting will be held for the purpose of soliciting from the scientific community and other persons scientific and technical information relevant to program planning.

DATES: Wednesday, January 7, 2009, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and Thursday, January 8, 2009, 8:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time.

ADDRESSES: NASA Headquarters, Room 3H46, 300 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20546.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms.

Marian Norris, Science Mission Directorate, NASA Headquarters, Washington, DC 20546, (202) 358–4452, fax (202) 358–4118, or mnorris@nasa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will be open to the public up

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 are reasonable under the circumstances."); S. Rep. No. 93–298, 93d Cong., 1st Sess., at 6 (1973) ("Where the public interest can be meaningfully evaluated simply on the basis of briefs and oral arguments, that is the approach that should be utilized.").

to the capacity of the room. The agenda for the meeting includes the following topics:

- -Earth Science Division Update
- -NASA's Modeling Program
- —Decadal Survey Mission Implementation and Comparative Cost Analysis of Earth and Space Science Missions

It is imperative that the meeting be held on these dates to accommodate the scheduling priorities of the key participants. Attendees will be requested to sign a register and to comply with NASA security requirements, including the presentation of a valid picture ID, before receiving an access badge. Foreign nationals attending this meeting will be required to provide the following information no less than 7 working days prior to the meeting: full name; gender; date/place of birth; citizenship; visa/ green card information (number, type, expiration date); passport information (number, country, expiration date); employer/affiliation information (name of institution, address, country, telephone); title/position of attendee. To expedite admittance, attendees with U.S. citizenship can provide identifying information 3 working days in advance by contacting Marian Norris via e-mail at mnorris@nasa.gov or by telephone at (202) 358-4452.

Dated: December 10, 2008.

P. Diane Rausch,

Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

[FR Doc. E8–29757 Filed 12–15–08; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7510–13–P

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Sunshine Act; Notice of Agency Meeting

TIME AND DATE: 10 a.m., Thursday, December 18, 2008.

PLACE: Board Room, 7th Floor, Room 7047, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314–3428.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: 1. Final Rule—Parts 712 and 741 of NCUA Rules and Regulations, Credit Union Service Organizations.

- 2. Final Rule—Part 706 of NCUA Rules and Regulations, Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices.
 - Insurance Fund Report.

³ See United States v. Enova Corp., 107 F. Supp. 2d 10, 17 (D.D.C. 2000) (noting that the "Tunney Act expressly allows the court to make its public interest determination on the basis of the competitive impact statement and response to comments alone"); United States v. Mid-Am. Dairymen, Inc., 1977–1 Trade Cas. (CCH) '61,508, at 71,980 (W.D. Mo. 1977) ("Absent a showing of