

a particular practice or whether it mandates certainty of 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 even if it fall 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.'" ³

Moreover, the court's role under the Tunney Act 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. Since "[t]he 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 might have but did not pursue. *Id.*

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: August 15, 2000.

Respectfully submitted,

David R. Bickel,
DC Bar #393409.

Arthur A. Feiveson,
IL Bar #3125793.

U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Litigation II Section, 1401 H Street, NW, Suite 3000, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 307-0924.

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing has been served upon Allied Waste Industries, Inc. and Republic Services, Inc. by placing a copy of this Competitive Impact Statement in the U.S. mail, postage prepaid directed to each of the above-named parties at the addresses given below, this 15 day of August, 2000.

Counsel for Defendant Allied Waste Industries, Inc.

Tom D. Smith,

Jones Day Reavis & Pogue, 51 Louisiana Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20001-2113
Counsel for Defendant Republic Services, Inc.

Paul B. Hewitt,

Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, L.L.P., 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036

David R. Bickel,

DC Bar #393409, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Suite 3000, 1401 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20530.

[FR Doc. 00-22137 Filed 9-7-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Justice Programs; Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice of Information Collection Under Review; (Revision of a currently approved collection); Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program Request for Drawdown.

The Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, has submitted the following information collection request for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. This proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for "sixty days" until November 7, 2000.

If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Lluana McCann, 202-305-1772, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 810 7th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20531.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the function of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate

automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this information:

(1) *Type of information collection:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

(2) *The title of the form/collection:* Local Law Enforcement Block Grants Program—Request for Drawdown (RFD).

(3) *The agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department sponsoring the collection:* None.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: State, Local or Tribal Government. Other: None.

The Local Law Enforcement Block Grants (LLEGB) Act of 1996 authorizes the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance to make funds available to local units of government in order to reduce crime and improve public safety.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond/reply:* It is estimated that 3,500 respondents will request the one lump-sum draw down of their annual LLEGB grant funds by completing the no more than sixty minutes on-line process.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* The total hour burden to complete the application is 3,500.

If additional information is required contact: Mrs. Brenda E. Dyer, Deputy Clearance Office, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 1220, National Place Building, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: September 1, 2000.

Brenda E. Dyer,

Department Deputy Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 00-23068 Filed 9-7-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Justice Programs; Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice of Information Collection Under Review; (Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired); Juvenile Residential Facility Census.

³ *United States v. American Tel. and Tel. Co.*, 552 F. Supp. 131, 150 (D.D.C. 1982) (citations omitted), quoting *United States v. Gillette Co.*, supra, 406 F. Supp. at 716 aff'd sub nom. *Maryland v. United States*, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983); *United States v. Alcan Aluminum, Ltd.*, 605 F. Supp. 619, 622 (W.D. Ky. 1985).