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 A court can make its public-interest determination based on the competitive impact statement and response to public comments alone. *U.S. Airways*, 38 F. Supp. 3d at 76.

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: February 27, 2018 Respectfully submitted, FOR PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

Peter Caplan (P–30643), Assistant United States Attorney, U.S. Attorney's Office, Eastern District of Michigan, 211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001, Detroit, Michigan 48226, (313) 226–9784, peter.caplan@usdoj.gov. \\$\Katrina Rouse

Katrina Rouse (D.C. Bar No. 1013035), Garrett Liskey, Andrew Robinson, Jill Maguire, Healthcare & Consumer Products Section, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 450 Fifth St., NW, Washington, DC 20530, (415) 934–5346, Katrina.Rouse@ usdoj.gov.

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on February 27, 2018, I electronically filed the foregoing paper with the Clerk of Court using the ECF system, which will send notification of the filing to the counsel of record for all parties for civil action 5:15-cv-12311–JEL–DRG, and I hereby certify that there are no individuals entitled to notice who are non-ECF participants.

\s\Garrett Liskey

Garrett Liskey (D.C. Bar No. 1000937) Antitrust Division, Healthcare and Consumer Products Section, U.S. Department of Justice, 450 Fifth St., NW, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 598–2849, *Garrett.Liskey@usdoj.gov*. [FR Doc. 2018–04593 Filed 3–6–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liabiilty Act

On February 22, 2018, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in a lawsuit entitled *United States* v. *Steel of West Virginia*, Civil Action No. 18–1661.

In this action the United States seeks, as provided under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, recovery of response costs from Steel of West Virginia regarding the Port Refinery Superfund Site ("Site") in the Village of Rye Brook, New York. The proposed Consent Decree resolves the United States' claims and requires Steel of West Virginia to pay \$35,829 in reimbursement of the United States' past response costs regarding the Site.

The publication of this notice opens a public comment period on the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States* v. *Steel of West Virginia*, Civil Action No. 18–1661, D.J. Ref. 90–11–3–1142/4. All comments must be submitted no later than 30 days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	Send them to:
By e-mail	pubcomment-ees.enrd@
By mail	usdoj.gov. Assistant Attorney General,
·	U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC
	20044–7611.

During the public comment period, the Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department website: http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html. We will provide a paper copy of the Consent Decree upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please email your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ-ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044-7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for \$4.25 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

Robert E. Maher, Jr.,

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

[FR Doc. 2018-04570 Filed 3-6-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes Renewal Notice

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: This notice is to announce the renewal of the Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes (ACMUI) for a period of 2 years.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has determined that the renewal of the Charter for the Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes for the 2 year period commencing on March 1, 2018, is in the public interest, in connection with duties imposed on the Commission by law. This action is being taken in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, after consultation with the Committee Management Secretariat, General Services Administration.

The purpose of the ACMUI is to provide advice to NRC on policy and technical issues that arise in regulating the medical use of byproduct material for diagnosis and therapy. Responsibilities include providing guidance and comments on current and proposed NRC regulations and regulatory guidance concerning medical use; evaluating certain non-routine uses of byproduct material for medical use; and evaluating training and experience of proposed authorized users. The members are involved in preliminary discussions of major issues in determining the need for changes in NRC policy and regulation to ensure the continued safe use of byproduct material. Each member provides technical assistance in his/her specific area(s) of expertise, particularly with respect to emerging technologies. Members also provide guidance as to NRC's role in relation to the responsibilities of other Federal agencies as well as of various professional organizations and boards.

Members of this Committee have demonstrated professional

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., No. 73-CV-681-W-1, 1977-1 Trade Cas. (CCH) ¶ 61,508, at 71,980, *22 (W.D. Mo. 1977) ("Absent 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 are reasonable under the circumstances."); S. Rep. No. 93-298, 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.").