

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regulations at 5 CFR part 1320, this notice announces the intent of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) to request approval for an extension of the currently approved information collection for the CSREES proposal review process.

DATES: Written comments on this notice must be received by October 11, 2005, to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, by any of the following methods: Mail: CSREES, USDA, STOP 2216, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20250-2216; Hand Delivery/Courier: 800 9th Street, SW., Waterfront Centre, Room 4217, Washington, DC 20024; Fax: 202-720-0857; or e-mail: jhitchcock@csrees.usda.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jason Hitchcock, (202) 720-4343.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: CSREES Proposal Review Process.

OMB Number: 0524-0041.

Expiration Date of Current Approval: 06/30/2006.

Type of Request: Intent to seek approval for the revision of a currently approved information collection for three years.

Abstract: CSREES is responsible for performing a review of proposals submitted to CSREES competitive award programs in accordance with section 103(a) of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, 7 U.S.C. 7613(a). Reviews are undertaken to ensure that projects supported by CSREES are of high quality and are consistent with the goals and requirements of the funding program.

Proposals submitted to CSREES undergo a programmatic evaluation to determine worthiness of Federal support. The evaluations consist of a peer panel review and may also entail an assessment by Federal employees and mail-in (ad-hoc) reviews.

Need and Use of the Information: The information collected from the evaluations is used to support CSREES grant programs. CSREES uses the results of each proposal evaluation to determine whether a proposal should be declined or recommended for award. When CSREES has rendered a decision, copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers and summaries of review panel deliberations, if any, are

provided to the submitting Project Director.

Given the highly technical nature of many of these proposals, the quality of the peer review greatly depends on the appropriate matching of the subject matter of the proposal with the technical expertise of the potential reviewer. In order to obtain this information, an electronic questionnaire is used to collect information about potential panel and ad-hoc reviewers. If the reviewer is already in our database, the questionnaire asks potential reviewers to update their basic biographical information including address, contact information, professional expertise, and their availability to review for CSREES in the future. New reviewers are prompted to complete the questionnaire. This information has been invaluable in the CSREES review process, which has been recognized by the grantee and grantor community for its quality.

The applications and associated materials made available to reviewers, as well as the discussions that take place during panel review meetings are strictly confidential and are not to be disclosed to or discussed with anyone who has not officially been designated to participate in the review process. While each panelist certifies when preparing a review that they do not have a conflict of interest with a particular application and will maintain its confidentiality in the Peer Review System, CSREES collects a certification of the panelist intent at the time of the panel review proceedings to emphasize and reinforce confidentiality not only of applications and reviews but also panel discussions. On the Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Certification Form, the panelists affirm they understand the conflict of interest guidelines and will not be involved in the review of the application(s) where a conflict exists. Panelists also affirm their intent to maintain the confidentiality of the panel process and not disclose to another individual any information related to the peer review or use any information for personal benefit.

Estimate of Burden: CSREES estimates that anywhere from one hour to twenty hours may be required to review a proposal. Approximately five hours are required to review an average proposal. Each proposal receives an average of four reviews, accounting for an annual burden of 20 hours per proposal. CSREES estimates it receives 4,600 proposals each year. The total annual burden in reviewing proposals is 92,000 hours. CSREES estimates that the potential reviewer questionnaire takes 10 minutes to complete. The database

consists of approximately 50,000 reviewers. The total annual burden on reviewers completing the questionnaire is 8,330 hours. CSREES estimates that the potential Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Certification Form takes 10 minutes to complete. The agency has approximately 1,000 panelists each year. The total annual burden of the certification form is 167 hours. The total annual burden of these components of the entire review process is 100,497 hours.

Comments: Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agency estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to 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.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request to OMB for approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Done in Washington, DC, this 1st day of August, 2005.

Merle D. Pierson,

Deputy Under Secretary, Research, Education, and Economics.

[FR Doc. 05-15768 Filed 8-9-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Utilities Service

Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Notice of Intent To Hold Public Scoping Meetings and Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: Rural Utilities Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent to hold public scoping meetings and prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: The Rural Utilities Service (RUS) intends to hold public scoping meetings and prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) in connection with possible impacts related to a project proposed by Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc. (AECI), with headquarters in Springfield, Missouri. The proposal consists of the construction and operation of a nominal 660 megawatt coal-based electrical

generating plant and associated transmission facilities. A proposed and an alternate site both near the Missouri River in the northwest quadrant of Missouri have been identified by AECL. AECL is requesting RUS to provide financing for the proposed project.

DATES: RUS will conduct four public scoping meetings in an open-house format followed by a discussion period: August 22, 2005, Oregon, Missouri, at T.J. Hall Community Center, 104 S. Main; August 23, 2005, Sedalia, Missouri, at Missouri Electric Cooperatives Building, State Fair Grounds, 2503 W. 16th St.; August 24, 2005, Salisbury, Missouri, at Knights of Columbus Building, 311 E. Patterson Ave.; August 25, 2005, Norborne, Missouri, at Goppert Community Building, 201 S. Pine. The open house will be held from 4–6 p.m. with the discussion period from 6:30–7:30 p.m.

A Site Selection Study and Macro Corridor Study Report, prepared by Associated Electric Cooperative, will be presented at the public scoping meeting.

The Report is available for public review at RUS at the address provided in this notice, at Associated Electric Cooperative, 2814 S. Golden, Springfield, Missouri 65807 and at: Cameron Public Library

312 N. Chestnut St.

Cameron, MO 64429

Phone: 816/632–2311

Concordia Library

709 S. Main St.

Concordia, MO 64020

Phone: 660/463–2277

Hale Library & Museum

321 Main St.

Hale, MO 64643

Phone: 660/565–2617

Mid-Continent Public Library, Kearney Branch

100 S. Platte-Clay Way

Kearney, MO 64060–7640

Phone: 816/628–5055

Macon Public Library

210 N. Rutherford St.

Macon, MO 63552

Phone: 660/385–3314

Carrollton Public Library

1 N. Folger St.

Carrollton, MO 64633

Phone: 660/542–0183

Mid-Continent Public Library, Excelsior Springs Branch

1460 Kearney Road

Excelsior Springs, MO 64024–1746

Phone: 816/630–6721

Robertson Memorial Library

19 W. 20th St.

Higginsville, MO 64037

Phone: 660/584–2880

Lexington Library

1008 Main St.

Lexington, MO 64067

Phone: 660/259–3071

Marshall Public Library

214 N. Lafayette

Marshall, MO 65340

Phone: 660/886–3391

Maryville Public Library

509 N. Main St.

Maryville, MO 64468

Phone: 660/582–5281

Little Dixie Regional Library

111 N. 4th St.

Moberly, MO 65270

Phone: 660/263–4426

Oregon Public Library

103 S. Washington St.

Oregon, MO 64473

Phone: 660/446–3586

Dulany Memorial Library

501 S. Broadway

Salisbury, MO 65281

Phone: 660/388–5712

Boonslick Regional Library, Sedalia Branch

219 W. 3rd St.

Sedalia, MO 65301

Phone: 660/827–7323

Carnegie Library

316 Massachusetts St.

St. Joseph, MO 64504

Phone: 816/238–0526

East Hills Library

502 N. Woodbine Road, Suite A

St. Joseph, MO 64506

Phone: 816/236–2136

Washington Park Library

1821 N. Third St.

St. Joseph, MO 64505

Phone: 816/232–2052

Boonslick Regional Library

950 E. Main St.

Warsaw, MO 65355

Phone: 660/438–5211

DeKalb County Public Library

201 N. Polk St.

Maysville, MO 64469

Phone: 816/449–5695

Mound City Public Library

205 E. 6th St.

Mound City, MO 64470

Phone: 660/442–5700

Ray County Library

219 S. College St.

Richmond, MO 64085

Phone: 816/470–3291

Rolling Hills Consolidated Library:

Savannah

514 W. Main St.

Savannah, MO 64485

Phone: 816/324–4569

Sedalia Public Library

311 W. Third St.

Sedalia, MO 65301

Phone: 660/826–1314

Downtown Library

927 Felix St.

St. Joseph, MO 64501

Phone: 816/232–7729

Rolling Hills Consolidated Library:

Eastside

1904 N. Belt Highway

St. Joseph, MO 64506

Phone: 816/232–5479

Sweet Springs Public Library

323 Spring St.

Sweet Springs, MO 65351

Phone: 660/335–4314

Norborne Public Library

109 East 2nd Street

Norborne, MO 64668

Voice: 816/594–3514

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Stephanie Strength, Environmental Protection Specialist, RUS, Engineering and Environmental Staff, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW., Stop 1571, Washington, DC 20250–1571, telephone: (202) 720–0468 or e-mail: stephanie.strength@usda.gov, or Charles Means, Senior Regulatory Policy Analyst, Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc., P.O. Box 754, Springfield, Missouri 65801 or e-mail: cmeans@aeci.org.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: AECL proposes to construct and operate a nominal 660-megawatt coal-based electric generating facility at one of two sites in northwest Missouri. Its proposed site is just west of Norborne, Missouri, in Carroll County. The alternate site is west of Big Lake, Missouri, along the Missouri River and just south of U.S. Highway 159 in Holt County. Fuel will be supplied to the plant at either site by rail; competing rail options will be evaluated.

Construction of the project at either site will require the construction of new transmission facilities. Substation upgrades and approximately 135 miles of 345-kV transmission line would be required to connect the new plant to AECL's transmission system. For the proposed Norborne site, one line would go east to the existing Thomas Hill Substation, and one line would go south to Sedalia and then to a new substation in eastern Benton County. For the Holt County site, a double circuit 345-kV line would be required from the plant to the Fairport Substation in DeKalb County and a single circuit 345-kV line from the Fairport Substation to a new substation near Orrick, Missouri, in southwest Ray County. AECL's schedule calls for these facilities to be in commercial operation by May 2011.

Alternatives to be considered by RUS include no action, purchased power, renewable energy sources, distributed generation, and alternative site locations. Comments regarding the proposed project may be submitted (orally or in writing) at the public scoping meetings or in writing no later than September 26, 2005 to RUS at the address provided in this notice.

RUS will use input provided by government agencies, private organizations, and the public in the preparation of a Draft EIS. The Draft EIS will be available for review and comment for 45 days. A Final EIS will then be prepared that considers all comments received. The Final EIS will be available for review and comment for 30 days. Following the 30-day comment period, RUS will prepare a Record of Decision (ROD). Notices announcing the availability of the Draft and Final EIS and the ROD will be published in the **Federal Register** and in local newspapers.

Any final action by RUS related to the proposed project will be subject to, and contingent upon, compliance with all relevant Federal, State and local environmental laws and regulations and completion of the environmental review requirements as prescribed in the RUS Environmental Policies and Procedures (7 CFR part 1794).

Dated: August 4, 2005.

Glendon D. Deal,

Director, Engineering and Environmental Staff, Water and Environmental Programs, Rural Utilities Service.

[FR Doc. 05-15766 Filed 8-9-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-15-P

ANTITRUST MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

Request for Public Comment

AGENCY: Antitrust Modernization Commission.

ACTION: Request for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Antitrust Modernization Commission requests comments from the public regarding specific questions relating to the issues selected for Commission study.

DATES: Comments are due by September 30, 2005.

ADDRESSES: By electronic mail: comments@amc.gov. By mail: Antitrust Modernization Commission, Attn: Public Comments, 1120 G Street, NW., Suite 810, Washington, DC 20005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew J. Heimert, Executive Director & General Counsel, Antitrust Modernization Commission. Telephone: (202) 233-0701; e-mail: info@amc.gov. Internet: <http://www.amc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Antitrust Modernization Commission was established to "examine whether the need exists to modernize the antitrust laws and to identify and study related issues." Antitrust Modernization Commission Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-

273, § 11053, 116 Stat. 1856. In conducting its review of the antitrust laws, the Commission is required to "solicit the views of all parties concerned with the operation of the antitrust laws." *Id.* By this request for comments, the Commission seeks to provide a full opportunity for interested members of the public to provide input regarding certain issues selected for Commission study. From time to time, the Commission may issue additional requests for comment on issues selected for study.

Comments should be submitted in written form. Comments should identify the topic to which it relates. Comments need not address every question within the topic. Comments exceeding 1500 words should include a brief (less than 250 word) summary. Commenters may submit additional background materials (such as articles, data, or other information) relating to the topic by separate attachment.

Comments should identify the person or organization submitting the comments. If comments are submitted by an organization, the submission should identify a contact person within the organization. Comments should include the following contact information for the submitter: an address, telephone number, and e-mail address (if available). Comments submitted to the Commission will be made available to the public in accordance with federal laws.

Comments may be submitted either in hard copy or electronic form. Electronic submissions may be sent by electronic mail to comments@amc.gov. Comments submitted in hard copy should be delivered to the address specified above, and should enclose, if possible, a CD-ROM or a 3½-inch computer diskette containing an electronic copy of the comment. The Commission prefers to receive electronic documents (whether by e-mail or on CD-ROM/diskette) in portable document format (.pdf), but also will accept comments in Microsoft Word format.

The AMC has issued this request for comments pursuant to its authorizing statute and the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Antitrust Modernization Commission Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-273, § 11053, 116 Stat. 1758, 1856; Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App., § 10(a)(3).

Topic for Comment

The Commission requests comment on the following topic.

Criminal Remedies

1. In setting corporate fines for criminal Sherman Act violations,

should there be a means for differentiation based on differences in the severity or culpability of the behavior?

A. Do the Sentencing Guidelines provide an adequate method of distinguishing between violations with differing degrees of culpability? For example, should the Sentencing Guidelines provide distinctions between different types of antitrust crimes (e.g., price fixing versus monopolization)?

B. The Sentencing Guidelines use 20% of the volume of commerce affected as the starting point for computation of corporate antitrust fines. See United States Sentencing Commission, Guidelines Manual § 2R1.1 (2004). Does the volume of commerce provide an adequate measure for setting fines? If not, what other measure(s) or methods would provide a more appropriate way for the Guidelines to establish fine levels?

2. The Sherman Act provides for a maximum fine of \$100 million (or, previously, \$10 million). The government may seek criminal fines in excess of that maximum pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3571(d).

A. Should "twice the gross gain or twice the gross loss" as provided in Section 3571(d) be calculated based on the gain or loss from all coconspirator sales or on only the defendant's sales?

B. Should fines above the statutory maximum, and thus limited by Section 3571(d), be based on 20% of gross sales as provided for in the Sentencing Guidelines, as they are for fines below the statutory maximum, or should they be calculated differently? If differently, how should they be calculated?

Dated: August 4, 2005.

By direction of the Antitrust Modernization Commission.

Andrew J. Heimert,

Executive Director & General Counsel, Antitrust Modernization Commission.

[FR Doc. 05-15806 Filed 8-9-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-YM-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

(Docket 37-2005)

Foreign-Trade Zone 123 Denver, Colorado, Application For Subzone, the Eastman Kodak Company, (X-ray film, Color Paper, Digital Media, Inkjet Paper, and Entertainment Imaging), Windsor, Colorado

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the City and County of