United States v. Microsoft, 56 F.3d 1448 (D.C. Cir. 1995).

In conducting this inquiry, "the Court is nowhere compelled to go to trial or to engage in extending proceedings which with have the effect of vitiating the benefits of prompt and less costly settlement through the consent decree process." <sup>1</sup> Rather,

absent a showing to 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 statements and its responses to comments in order to determine whether those explanations are reasonable under the circumstances.

United States v. Mid-America Dairymen, Inc., 1977–1 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, 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); quoting United States v. Bechtel Corp., 648 F.2d 660, 666 (9th Cir. 1981); see also, Microsoft, 56 F.3d 1448 (D.C. Cir. 1995). Precedent requires that

[t]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 reaches of the public interest.' More elaborate requirements might undermine the effectiveness of antitrust enforcement by consent decree.2

The proposed Final Judgment, therefore, should not be reviewed under a standard of whether it is certain to eliminate every anticompetitive competitive effect of a particular practice or whether it mandates certainty of the free competition in the future. 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 on even if it falls short of the remedy the court impose on its own, as long as it falls within the range of acceptability or is 'within the reaches of public interest' (citations omitted)."

### **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 6, 1999. For Plaintiff United States of America: Respectfully submitted,

Nina B. Hale,

Washington Bar #18776.

Laura M. Scott.

Virginia Bar #36587.

Trial Attorneys, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 325 Seventh Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20004, 202–307– 0892 202–307–2441 (Facsimile).

[FR Doc. 99–33410 Filed 12–28–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

## **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

### **Drug Enforcement Administration**

## Manufacturer of Controlled Substances Notice of Registration

By Notice dated June 8, 1999, and published in the **Federal Register** on July 7, 1999, (64 FR 36718), Roche Diagnostics Corporation, 9115 Hague Road, Indianapolis, Indiana 46250, made application by letter to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Sched- ule
Lysergic acid diethylamide (7315) Tetrahydrocannabinols (7370) Phencyclidine (7471) Benzoylecgonine (9180) Methadone (9250) Morphine	  - 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> United States v. American Tel & Tel., Co., 552 F. Supp. 131, 150 (D.C.C. 1982), aff'd sub nom. Maryland v. United States, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983), quoting Gillette, 406 F. Supp. at 716; United States v. Alcan Aluminum, Ltd., 605 F. Supp. 619 (W.D. Kv. 1985).

Roche Diagnostics Corporation plans to manufacture small quantities of the above listed controlled substances for incorporation in drug of abuse detection kits

DEA has considered the factors in Title 21, United States Code, Section 823(a) and determined that the registration of Roche Diagnostics Corporation to manufacture the listed controlled substances is consistent with the public interest at this time. DEA has investigated Roche Diagnostics Corporation to ensure that the company's continued registration is consistent with the public interest. These investigations have included inspection and testing of the company's physical security systems, verification of the company's compliance with state and local laws, and review of the company's background and history. Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823 and 28 CFR 0.100 and 0.104, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, hereby orders that the application submitted by the above firm for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed above is granted.

Dated: December 9, 1999.

### John H. King,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–33817 Filed 12–28–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

# FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

## **Sunshine Act Meeting**

December 21, 1999.

TIME AND DATE: 10:00 a.m., Thursday, January 6, 2000.

**PLACE:** Room 6005, 6th Floor, 1730 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC.

STATUS: Open.

# MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: The Commission will consider and act upon the following:

1. Martin Marietta Aggregates, Docket No. SE 98–156–M (Issues include whether the judge erred in finding that a miner's negligence was not imputable to the operator for penalty assessment and unwarrantable failure purposes because the miner was not an agent of the operator.)

Any person attending an open meeting who requires special accessibility features and/or auxiliary aids, such as sign language interpreters, must inform the Commission in advance

<sup>1119</sup> Cong. Rec. 244598 (1973). See also United States v. Gillette Co., 406 F. Supp. 713, 715 (D. Mass. 1975). A "public interest" determination can be made properly on the basis of the Competitive Impact Statement and Response to Comments filed pursuant to the APPA. Although the APPA authorizes the use of additional procedures, 15 U.S.C. § 16(f), those procedures are discretionary. A court need not invoke any of them unless it believes that the comments have raised significant issues and that further proceedings would aid the court in resolving those issues. See H.R. 93—1463, 93rd Cong. 2d Sess. 8—9, reprinted in (1974) U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 6535, 6538.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> United States v. Bechtel, 648 F.2d at 666 (internal citations omitted) (emphasis added); see United States v. BNS, Inc., 858 F.2d at 463; United States v. National Broadcasting Co., 449 F. Supp. 1127, 1143 (C.D. Cal. 1978); Gillette, 406 F. Supp. at 716. See also United States. v. American Cyanamid Co., 719 F.2d 558, 565 (2d Cir. 1983).

of those needs. Subject to 29 C.F.R. §§ 2706.150(a)(3) and 2706.160(d).

**CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:** Jean Ellen (202) 653–5629/(202) 708–9300 for TDD Relay/1–800–877–8339 for toll free.

Jean H. Ellen,

Chief Docket Clerk.

[FR Doc. 99–33928 Filed 12–27–99; 10:04

BILLING CODE 6735-01-M

# NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

**ACTION:** Notice.

SUMMARY: NARA is giving public notice that the agency proposes to conduct a Survey of Customer Satisfaction at the National Personnel Records Center (Military Personnel Records [MPR] facility) of the National Archives and Records Administration. The public is invited to comment on the proposed information collection pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before February 28, 2000 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to: Paperwork Reduction Act Comments (NHP), Room 3200, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Rd, College Park, MD 20740–6001; or faxed to 301–713–6913; or electronically mailed to tamee.fechhelm@arch2.nara.gov.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Requests for additional information or copies of the proposed information collection and supporting statement should be directed to Tamee Fechhelm at telephone number 301–713–6730, or fax number 301–713–6913.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant** to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-13), NARA invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed information collections. The comments and suggestions should address one or more of the following points: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NARA; (b) the accuracy of NARA's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d)

ways, including the use of information technology, to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents. The comments that are submitted will be summarized and included in the NARA request for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. In this notice, NARA is soliciting comments concerning the following information collection:

*Title:* National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) Survey of Customer Satisfaction.

OMB number: 3095–00XX. Agency form number: N/A. Type of review: Regular.

Affected public: Federal, state and local government agencies, veterans, and individuals who write the Military Personnel Records (MPR) facility for information from or copies of official military personnel files.

Estimated number of respondents: 7,800.

Estimated time per response: 10 minutes.

Frequency of response: On occasion (when respondent writes to MPR requesting information from official military personnel files).

Estimated total annual burden hours: 1,300 hours.

Abstract: The information collection is prescribed by EO 12862 issued September 11, 1993, which requires Federal agencies to survey their customers concerning customer service. The general purpose of this data collection is to initially support the business process reengineering (BPR) of the MPR reference service process and then provide MPR management with an ongoing mechanism for monitoring customer satisfaction. In particular, the purpose of the proposed National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) Survey of Customer Satisfaction is to (1) provide baseline data concerning customer satisfaction with MPR's reference service process, (2) identify areas within the reference service process for improvement, and (3) provide MPR management with customer feedback on the effectiveness of BPR initiatives designed to improve customer service as they are implemented. In addition to supporting the BPR effort, the proposed National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) Survey of Customer Satisfaction will help NARA in responding to performance planning and reporting requirements contained in the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

Dated: December 21, 1999.

#### L. Reynolds Cahoon,

Assistant Archivist for Human Resources and Information Services.

[FR Doc. 99–33813 Filed 12–28–99; 8:45 am] **BILLING CODE 7515–01–P** 

# NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

# Records Schedules; Availability and Request for Comments

**AGENCY:** National Archives and Records Administration, Office of Records Services—Washington, DC.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of proposed records schedules; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) publishes notice at least once monthly of certain Federal agency requests for records disposition authority (records schedules). Once approved by NARA, records schedules provide mandatory instructions on what happens to records when no longer needed for current Government business. They authorize the preservation of records of continuing value in the National Archives of the United States and the destruction, after a specified period, of records lacking administrative, legal, research, or other value. Notice is published for records schedules in which agencies propose to destroy records not previously authorized for disposal or reduce the retention period of records already authorized for disposal. NARA invites public comments on such records schedules, as required by 44 U.S.C. 3303a(a).

DATES: Requests for copies must be received in writing on or before February 14, 2000. Once the appraisal of the records is completed, NARA will send a copy of the schedule. NARA staff usually prepare appraisal memorandums that contain additional information concerning the records covered by a proposed schedule. These, too, may be requested and will be provided once the appraisal is completed. Requesters will be given 30 days to submit comments.

ADDRESSES: To request a copy of any records schedule identified in this notice, write to the Life Cycle Management Division (NWML), National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), 8601 Adelphi Road, College Park, MD 20740–6001. Requests also may be transmitted by FAX to 301–713–6852 or by e-mail to records.mgt@arch2.nara.gov. Requesters must cite the control number, which