

Taylor House, (Bay St. Louis MRA) 808
N. Beach Blvd., Bay St. Louis,
86003273
Taylor School, (Bay St. Louis MRA) 116
Leonard St. Bay St. Louis, 87000209
Onward Oaks, (Bay St. Louis MRA) 972
South Beach Blvd., Bay St. Louis,
96001265

Harrison County

Brielmaier House, (Biloxi MRA) 710
Beach Blvd., Biloxi, 84002170
Fisherman's Cottage, (Biloxi MRA) 138
Lameuse St., Biloxi, 84002182
Gillis House, 590 Beach Blvd., Biloxi,
78001599
Hewes, Finley B., House, 604 E. Beach
Blvd., Gulfport, 02000852
House at 771 West Water Street, (Biloxi
MRA) 771 W. Water S., Biloxi,
84002191
Milner House, 720 E. Beach Blvd.,
Gulfport, 72000692
Reed, Pleasant House, 928 Elmer St.,
Biloxi, 79001308
Toledano-Philbrick-Tullis House, 947 E.
Beach Blvd., Biloxi, 76001095

Jackson County

Clark, Clare T., House, (Pascagoula
MPS) 1709 Beach Blvd., Pascagoula,
91001785
Cottage by the Sea Tavern, (Pascagoula
MPS) 1205 Beach Blvd., Pascagoula,
91001789
Farnsworth, R.A., Summer Home,
(Pascagoula MPS) 901 Beach Blvd.,
Pascagoula, 91001790
Halstead Place, (Ocean Springs MRA) E.
Beach Dr., Ocean Springs, 87000594
Hull, Edgar W., House, (Pascagoula
MPS) 2903 Beach Blvd., Pascagoula,
91001797
Kinne, Georgia P., House, (Pascagoula
MPS) 1101 Beach Blvd., Pascagoula,
91001798

Lauderdale County

Meridian Baptist Seminary, 16th St. and
31st Ave. Meridian, 79001326
[FR Doc. E8-14297 Filed 6-24-08; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

Notice of Proposed Information Collection for 1029-0054 and 1029- 0083

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining
Reclamation and Enforcement.

ACTION: Notice and request for
comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the
Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation
and Enforcement (OSM) is announcing
that the information collection requests
for 30 CFR 872, Abandoned mine
reclamation funds; and 30 CFR part 955
and the Form OSM-74, Certification of
Blasters in Federal program States and
on Indian lands have been forwarded to
the Office of Management and Budget
(OMB) for review and reauthorization.
The information collection packages
were previously approved and assigned
clearance numbers 1029-0054 for 30
CFR 872, and 1029-0083 for 30 CFR 955
and the OSM-74 form. This notice
describes the nature of the information
collection activities and the expected
burdens and costs.

DATES: OMB has up to 60 days to
approve or disapprove the information
collection but may respond after 30
days. Therefore, public comments
should be submitted to OMB by July 25,
2008, in order to be assured of
consideration.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments to the
Office of Information and Regulatory
Affairs, Office of Management and
Budget, Attention: Department of
Interior Desk Officer, by telefax at (202)
395-6566 or via e-mail to
OIRA_Docket@omb.eop.gov. Also,
please send a copy of your comments to
John A. Trelease, Office of Surface
Mining Reclamation and Enforcement,
1951 Constitution Ave., NW., Room
202-SIB, Washington, DC 20240, or
electronically to *jtrelease@osmre.gov*.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To
request a copy of the information
collection requests, explanatory
information and related forms, contact
John A. Trelease at (202) 208-2783, or
electronically to *jtrelease@osmre.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Office
of Management and Budget (OMB)
regulations at 5 CFR 1320, which
implement provisions of the Paperwork
Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13),
require that interested members of the
public and affected agencies have an
opportunity to comment on information
collection and recordkeeping activities
[see 5 CFR 1320.8(d)]. OSM has
submitted requests to OMB to renew its
approval for the collections of
information for 30 CFR 872, Abandoned
mine reclamation funds; and 30 CFR
955 and the Form OSM-74, Certification
of Blasters in Federal program States
and on Indian lands. OSM is requesting
a 3-year term of approval for these
information collection activities.

An agency may not conduct or
sponsor, and a person is not required to
respond to, a collection of information
unless it displays a currently valid OMB
control number. The OMB control

numbers for these collections of
information are listed in 30 CFR 872.10,
which is 1029-0054; and on the form
OSM-74 and in 30 CFR 955.10, which
is 1029 0083.

As required under 5 CFR 1320.8(d),
Federal Register notices soliciting
comments on these collections of
information were published on March
19, 2008 (73 FR 14838), for 30 CFR 872,
and on March 31, 2008 (73 FR 16908),
for the form OSM-74 and 30 CFR 955.
No comments were received from either
notice. This notice provides the public
with an additional 30 days in which to
comment on the following information
collection activities:

Title: 30 CFR Part 872—Abandoned
mine reclamation funds.

OMB Control Number: 1029-0054.

Summary: 30 CFR part 872 establishes
a procedure whereby States and Indian
tribes submit written statements
announcing the State/Tribe's decision
not to submit reclamation plans, and
therefore, will not be granted AML
funds.

Bureau Form Number: None.

Frequency of Collection: Once.

Description of Respondents: State and
Tribal abandoned mine land
reclamation agencies.

Total Annual Responses: 1.

Total Annual Burden Hours: 1.

Title: 30 CFR Part 955 and Form
OSM-74—Certification of blasters in
Federal program States and on Indian
lands.

OMB Control Number: 1029-0083.

Summary: This information is being
collected to ensure that the applicants
for blaster certification are qualified.
This information, with blasting tests,
will be used to determine the eligibility
of the applicant. The affected public
will be blasters who want to be certified
by the Office of Surface Mining
Reclamation and Enforcement to
conduct blasting on Indian lands or in
Federal primacy States.

Bureau Form Number: OSM-74.

Frequency of Collection: On occasion.

Description of Respondents:

Individuals intent on being certified as
blasters in Federal program States and
on Indian lands.

Total Annual Responses: 8.

Total Annual Burden Hours: 18.

Total Annual Non-Wage Burden Cost:
\$549.

Send comments on the need for the
collection of information for the
performance of the functions of the
agency; the accuracy of the agency's
burden estimates; ways to enhance the
quality, utility and clarity of the
information collection; and ways to
minimize the information collection

burden on respondents, such as use of automated means of collection of the information, to the addresses listed under **ADDRESSES**. Please refer to the appropriate OMB control number in all correspondence, 1029-0054 for 30 CFR part 872 and 1029-0083 for 30 CFR part 955 and the OSM-74 form.

Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: June 5, 2008.

John R. Craynon,

Chief, Division of Regulatory Support.

[FR Doc. E8-14212 Filed 6-24-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-05-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. National Association of Realtors®; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois in *United States of America v. National Association of Realtors®*, No. 05-C-5140. On September 8, 2005, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that the National Association of Realtors® (“NAR”) violated section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1, by adopting policies that suppress competition from real estate brokers who use password-protected “virtual office Web sites” or “VOWs” to deliver high-quality brokerage services to their customers. The proposed Final Judgment, filed on May 27, 2008, requires NAR to repeal the challenged policies and to adopt new rules that do not discriminate against brokers who use VOWs.

Copies of the Amended Complaint, proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection at the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Antitrust Documents Group, 450 5th Street, NW., Room 1010, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202

514-2481), on the Department of Justice’s Web site at <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr>, and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust I Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, and responses thereto, will be published in the **Federal Register** and filed with the Court. Comments should be addressed to John R. Read, Chief, Litigation III section, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 450 5th Street, NW., Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 307-0468.

J. Robert Kramer II,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division

United States of America, Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 325 7th Street, NW., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20530.
Plaintiff,

v.

National Association of Realtors, 430 North Michigan Ave., Chicago, IL 60611,
Defendant.

Civil Action No. 05C-5140,
Judge Filip,
Magistrate Judge Denlow,
Filed: October 4, 2005.

Amended Complaint

The United States of America, by its attorneys acting under the direction of the Attorney General, brings this civil action pursuant to section 4 of the Sherman Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 4, to obtain equitable and other relief to prevent and restrain violations of section 1 of the Sherman Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 1. The United States alleges:

1. The United States brings this action to enjoin the defendant a national association of real estate brokers—from maintaining or enforcing policies that restrain competition from brokers who use the Internet to more efficiently and cost effectively serve home sellers and buyers, and from adopting other related anticompetitive rules.

2. The brokers against whom the policies discriminate operate secure, password-protected Internet sites that enable the brokers’ customers to search for and receive real estate listings over the Internet. These Web sites thus replace or augment the traditional practice by which the broker conducts a search of properties for sale and then provides information to the customer by hand, mail, fax, or e-mail. Since these Web sites were first developed in the late 1990s, brokers’ use of the Internet in connection with their delivery of brokerage services has become an important competitive alternative to traditional “brick-and-mortar” business models.

3. Defendant’s members include traditional brokers who are concerned about

competition from Internet-savvy brokers. Before defendant adopted its policies, several of its members voiced opposition to brokers’ delivery of listings to customers through their Web sites—sites that defendant referred to as “virtual office Web sites,” or “VOWs.” The head of the working group created by defendant to develop regulations for VOWs argued that defendant should act quickly in adopting regulations for the use of these Web sites because brokers operating VOWs were “scooping up market share just below the radar.” The chairman of the board of RE/MAX, the nation’s second-largest real estate franchisor, publicly expressed his concern that these Internet sites would inevitably place downward pressure on brokers’ commission rates. One broker complained that because of the lower cost structure of brokers who provide listings to their customers over the Internet, “they are able to kick-back 1% of the sales price to the buyer.” And defendant, the nation’s largest real estate franchisor and owner of the nation’s largest real estate brokerage, asserted in a widely circulated white paper that it was “not feasible” for even the largest traditional brokers to compete with large Internet companies that operated or affiliated with brokers operating VOWs.

4. In response to such concerns, defendant, through its members, adopted a policy (the “Initial VOW Policy”) limiting this new competition. The Initial VOW Policy has been implemented in many markets. After plaintiff informed NAR of its intention to bring this action, NAR announced that it had modified this policy (the “Modified VOW Policy”). Plaintiff challenges both policies in this action as part of a single, ongoing contract, combination, or conspiracy.

5. These policies significantly alter the governing multiple listing services (“MLSs”). MLSs collect detailed information about nearly all properties for sale through brokers and are indispensable tools for brokers serving buyers and sellers in each MLS’s market area. Defendant’s local Realtor associations (“member boards”) control a majority of the MLSs in the United States.

6. Defendant’s VOW Policies permit brokers to withhold their clients’ listings from VOW operators by means of an “opt-out” right. In essence, the policies allow traditional brokers to block the customers of web-based competitors from using the Internet to review the same set of MLS listings that the traditional brokers provide to their customers.

7. The working group that formulated defendant’s Initial VOW Policy understood that the opt-out right was fundamentally anticompetitive and harmful to consumers. Two members of the working group wrote that the opt-out right would be “abused beyond belief” as traditional brokers selectively withhold listings from particular VOW-based competitors. The chairman of the working group admitted that the opt-out right was likely to be exercised by brokers notwithstanding the fact that “it may not be in the seller[']s best interest to opt out.” But he took comfort in the fact that the rule did not require brokers to disclose to clients that their listings would be withheld from some prospective purchasers as a result of the