

Courts have greater flexibility in approving proposed consent decrees than in crafting their own decrees following a finding of liability in a litigated matter. “[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). 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; *see also InBev*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 84787, at *20 (“[T]he ‘public interest’ is not to be measured by comparing the violations alleged in the complaint against those the court believes could have, or even should have, been alleged.”). 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. *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459–60. 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). This language effectuates 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 11.⁶

VIII. Determinative Documents

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

Dated: February 22, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

For Plaintiff The United States of America

David E. Altschuler,

Jade Alice Eaton,

Trial Attorneys, United States Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Transportation, Energy & Agriculture Section, 450 5th Street, NW., Suite 8000, Washington, DC 20530, Telephone: (202) 307-6316, david.altschuler@usdoj.gov, jade.eaton@usdoj.gov.

[FR Doc. 2010-4545 Filed 3-3-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

⁶ *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 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.”).

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[Docket No. OSHA-2010-0007]

Definition and Requirements for a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (NRTL); Extension of the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) Approval of Information Collection (Paperwork) Requirements

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Labor.

ACTION: Request for comment.

SUMMARY: OSHA requests comment concerning its proposed extension of the information collection requirements specified by its Regulation on the Definition and Requirements for a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (29 CFR 1910.7). The Regulation specifies procedures that organizations must follow to apply for, and to maintain, OSHA’s recognition to test and certify equipment, products, or material.

DATES: Comments must be submitted (postmarked, sent, or received) by May 3, 2010.

ADDRESSES: *Electronically:* You may submit comments and attachments electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>, which is the Federal eRulemaking Portal. Follow the instructions online for submitting comments.

Facsimile: If your comments, including attachments, are not longer than 10 pages, you may fax them to the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693-1648.

Mail, hand delivery, express mail, messenger, or courier service: When using this method, you must submit three copies of your comments and attachments to the OSHA Docket Office, Docket No. OSHA-2010-0007, U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Room N-2625, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210. Deliveries (hand, express mail, messenger, and courier service) are accepted during the Department of Labor’s and Docket Office’s normal business hours, 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m., e.t.

Instructions: All submissions must include the Agency name and OSHA docket number for the Information Collection Request (ICR) (OSHA-2010-0007). All comments, including any personal information you provide, are placed in the public docket without change, and may be made available online at <http://www.regulations.gov>.

For further information on submitting comments *see* the “Public Participation” heading in the section of this notice titled **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

Docket: To read or download comments or other material in the docket, go to [http://www/regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) or the OSHA Docket Office at the address above. All documents in the docket (including this **Federal Register** notice) are listed in the [http://www/regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) index; however, some information (e.g., copyrighted material) is not publicly available to read or download through the Web site. All submissions, including copyrighted material, are available for inspection and copying at the OSHA Docket Office. You may contact Todd Owen at the address below to obtain a copy of the ICR.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Owen, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N-3609, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210; telephone (202) 693-2222.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent (*i.e.*, employer) burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on proposed and continuing information collection requirements in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA-95) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program ensures that information is in the desired format, reporting burden (time and costs) is minimal, collection instruments are clearly understood, and OSHA's estimate of the information collection burden is accurate. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the Act) (29 U.S.C. 651 *et seq.*) authorizes information collection by employers as necessary or appropriate for enforcement of the Act or for developing information regarding the causes and prevention of occupational injuries, illnesses and accidents (29 U.S.C. 657).

A number of standards issued by OSHA contain requirements for equipment, products, or materials. These standards often specify that employers use only equipment, products, or material tested or approved by a nationally recognized testing laboratory (NRTL); this requirement ensures that employers use safe and effective equipment, products, or materials in complying with the standards. Accordingly, OSHA promulgated the regulation titled

“Definition and Requirements for a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory” (the Regulation). The Regulation specifies procedures that organizations must follow to apply for, and to maintain, OSHA's recognition to test and certify equipment, products, or material for this purpose.

II. Special Issues for Comment

OSHA has a particular interest in comments on the following issues:

- Whether the proposed information collection requirements are necessary for the proper performance of the Agency's functions including whether the information is useful;
- The accuracy of OSHA's estimate of the burden (time and costs) of the information collection requirements, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- The quality, utility and clarity of the information collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden on employers who must comply; for example, by using automated or other technological information collection and transmission techniques.

III. Proposed Actions

OSHA is requesting that OMB extend its approval of the collection of information requirements specified by the Standard on the Definition and Requirements for a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory. The Agency is requesting to retain its current burden hour estimate of 1,340 hours. The Agency will summarize the comments submitted in response to this notice, and will include this summary in its request to OMB to extend the approval of these information collection requirements.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved information collection.

Title: Definition and Requirements for a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (29 CFR 1910.7).

OMB Control Number: 1218-0147.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profits.

Number of Respondents: 67.

Frequency of Recordkeeping: On occasion.

Total Responses: 67.

Average Time Per Response: 160 hours for an organization to prepare initial recognition applications to 16 hours for an annual site visit.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 1,340.

Estimated Cost (Operation and Maintenance): \$0.

IV. Public Participation—Submission of Comments on This Notice and Internet Access to Comments and Submissions

You may submit comments in response to this document as follows:

(1) Electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>, which is the Federal eRulemaking Portal; (2) by facsimile (fax); or (3) by hard copy. All comments, attachments, and other material must identify the Agency name and the OSHA docket number for the ICR (Docket No. OSHA-2010-0007). You may supplement electronic submissions by uploading document files electronically. If you wish to mail additional materials in reference to an electronic or facsimile submission, you must submit them to the OSHA Docket Office (see the section of this notice titled **ADDRESSES**). The additional materials must clearly identify your electronic comments by your name, date, and the docket number so the Agency can attach them to your comments.

Because of security procedures, the use of regular mail may cause a significant delay in the receipt of comments. For information about security procedures concerning the delivery of materials by hand, express delivery, messenger, or courier service, please contact the OSHA Docket Office at (202) 693-2350, (TTY) (877) 889-5627).

Comments and submissions are posted without change at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Therefore, OSHA cautions commenters about submitting personal information such as social security numbers and date of birth. Although all submissions are listed in the <http://www.regulations.gov> index, some information (e.g., copyrighted material) is not publicly available to read or download through this Web site. All submissions, including copyrighted material, are available for inspection and copying at the OSHA Docket Office. Information on using the <http://www.regulations.gov> Web site to submit comments and access the docket is available at the Web site's “User Tips” link. Contact the OSHA Docket Office for information about materials not available through the Web site, and for assistance in using the Internet to locate docket submissions.

V. Authority and Signature

David Michaels, PhD, MPH, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health, directed the preparation of this notice. The authority for this notice is the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3506

et seq.), and Secretary of Labor's Order No. 5-2007 (72 FR 31160).

Signed at Washington, DC, this 26th day of February 2010.

David Michaels,

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health.

[FR Doc. 2010-4555 Filed 3-3-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-26-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Labor Surplus Area Classification Under Executive Orders 12073 and 10582

AGENCY: Employment and Training Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to update the 2010 Labor Surplus Areas annual list published in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 74, No. 209, Friday, October 30, 2009, pages 56217-56239.

DATES: *Effective Date:* The update of the annual list of labor surplus areas is effective immediately for all states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Samuel Wright, Office of Workforce Investment, Employment and Training Administration, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room S-4231, Washington, DC 20210. *Telephone:* (202) 693-2870 (This is not a toll-free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For supplementary, eligibility, classification procedures and petition for exceptional circumstances procedure information refer to the original 2010 Labor Surplus Area list at <http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2009/pdf/E9-26165.pdf>.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 25th day of February 2010.

Jane Oates,

Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010-4465 Filed 3-3-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FT-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-416; NRC-2010-0082]

Entergy Operations, Inc.; Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption, pursuant to Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) section 73.5, "Specific exemptions," from the implementation date for certain new requirements of 10 CFR part 73, "Physical protection of plants and materials," for Facility Operating License No. DPR-46, issued to Entergy Operations, Inc. (Entergy, the licensee), for operation of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (GGNS), located in Claiborne County, Mississippi. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC performed an environmental assessment. Based on the results of the environmental assessment, the NRC is issuing a finding of no significant impact.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt Entergy from the required implementation date of March 31, 2010, for several new requirements of 10 CFR part 73. Specifically, Entergy would be granted an exemption from being in full compliance with certain new requirements contained in 10 CFR 73.55 by the March 31, 2010, deadline. Entergy has proposed an alternate full compliance implementation date of March 31, 2011, 1 year beyond the date required by 10 CFR part 73. The proposed action, an extension of the schedule for completion of certain actions required by the revised 10 CFR part 73, does not involve any physical changes to the reactor, fuel, plant structures, support structures, water, or land at the Entergy site.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated January 14, 2010, as supplemented by letters dated January 18 and February 4, 2010.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to provide the licensee with additional time to perform the required upgrades to the Entergy security system due to resource and logistical impacts of the spring 2010 refueling outage and other factors, such as limited vendor resources.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its environmental assessment of the proposed exemption. The staff has concluded that the proposed action to extend the implementation deadline would not significantly affect plant safety and would not have a significant adverse effect on the probability of an accident occurring.

The proposed action would not result in an increased radiological hazard beyond those previously analyzed in the environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact made by the Commission in promulgating its revisions to 10 CFR part 73 as discussed in a **Federal Register** notice dated March 27, 2009 (74 FR 13926). There will be no change to radioactive effluents that affect radiation exposures to plant workers and members of the public. Therefore, no changes or different types of radiological impacts are expected as a result of the proposed exemption.

The proposed action does not result in changes to land use or water use, or result in changes to the quality or quantity of non-radiological effluents. No changes to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit are needed. No effects on the aquatic or terrestrial habitat in the vicinity of the plant, or to threatened, endangered, or protected species under the Endangered Species Act, or impacts to essential fish habitat covered by the Magnuson-Steven's Act are expected. There are no impacts to the air or ambient air quality.

There are no impacts to historical and cultural resources. There would be no impact to socioeconomic resources. Therefore, no changes to or different types of non-radiological environmental impacts are expected as a result of the proposed exemption.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. In addition, in promulgating its revisions to 10 CFR part 73, the Commission prepared an environmental assessment and published a finding of no significant impact [Part 73, Power Reactor Security Requirements, 74 FR 13926 (March 27, 2009)].

The NRC staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the exemption that will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to the regulation, if granted.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed actions, the NRC staff considered denial