

to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, should refer to *United States v. Mack Trucks, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 98-1495 (HHK), D.J. Ref. 90-5-2-1-2251 and *United States v. Renault Vehicules Industriels*, Civil Action No. 98-2543 (HHK), D.J. Ref. 90-5-2-1-2251/1, and should be received by January 12, 1999.

Joel M. Gross,

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,
Environment and Natural Resources Division.
[FR Doc. 98-32220 Filed 12-2-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Extension of Comment Period on Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

Under 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that the comment period for the proposed Consent Decree lodged on October 22, 1998, with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *United States v. Navistar International Corp.*, Civil Action No. 98-2545 (HHK), is being extended through January 12, 1999. The original notice of this proposed settlement, which summarizes the settlement and identifies where copies of the Consent Decree may be obtained, was published in the **Federal Register** on November 3, 1998, Vol. 63, No. 212, Pg. 59333-59334. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, should refer to *United States v. Navistar International Corp.*, Civil Action No. 98-2545 (HHK), D.J. Ref. 90-5-2-1-2252, and should be received by January 12, 1999.

Joel M. Gross,

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,
Environment and Natural Resources Division.
[FR Doc. 98-32221 Filed 12-2-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Extension of Comment Period on Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

Under 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that the comment period for the proposed Consent Decree lodged on October 22, 1998, with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in *United States v. Volvo Truck Corporation*, Civil Action No. 98-2547 (HHK), is being extended through

January 12, 1999. The original notice of this proposed settlement, which summarizes the settlement and identifies where copies of the Consent Decree may be obtained, was published in the **Federal Register** on November 3, 1998, Vol. 63, No. 212, Pg. 59334. Comments shall be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, shall refer to *United States v. Volvo Truck Corporation*, Civil Action No. 98-2457 (HHK), D.J. Ref. 90-5-2-1-2256, and shall be received by January 12, 1999.

Joel M. Gross,

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section,
Environment and Natural Resources Division.
[FR Doc. 98-32218 Filed 12-2-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement; United States of America v. Chancellor Media Corp. and Kunz & Co.

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 District of Columbia in *United States of America v. Chancellor Media Corporation and Kunz & Company*, Case No. 1:98CV0273. The proposed Final Judgment is subject to approval by the Court after the expiration of the statutory 60-day public comment period and compliance with the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act. 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h).

The United States filed a civil antitrust Complaint on November 12, 1998, alleging that the proposed acquisition of Kunz & Company ("Kunz") by Chancellor Media Corporation ("Chancellor") would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The Complaint alleges that Chancellor and Kunz compete head-to-head to sell outdoor advertising in four counties: (1) Kern County, California; (2) Kings County, California; (3) Inyo County, California; and (4) Mojave County, Arizona (collectively "the Four Counties"). Outdoor advertising companies sell advertising space, such as on billboards, to local and national customers. The outdoor advertising business in the Four Counties is highly concentrated. Chancellor and Kunz have

a combined share of revenue ranging from about 60 percent to a virtual monopoly in the Four Counties. Unless the acquisition is blocked, competition would be substantially lessened in the Four Counties, and advertisers would pay higher prices.

The prayer for relief seeks: (a) an adjudication that the proposed transaction described in the Complaint would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act; (b) preliminary and permanent injunctive relief preventing the consummation of the transaction; (c) an award to the United States of the costs of his action; and (d) such other relief as is proper.

Shortly before this suit was filed, a proposed settlement was reached that permits Chancellor to complete its acquisition of Kunz, yet preserves competition in the Four Counties where the transaction raises significant competitive concerns. A Stipulation and proposed Final Judgment embodying the settlement were filed at the same time the Complaint was filed.

The proposed settlement requires Chancellor to divest all of the outdoor advertising assets of:

- (1) Kunz in Kern County and Inyo County, California; and in Mojave County, Arizona; and
- (2) Chancellor in Kings County, California.

Unless the plaintiff grants a time extension, Chancellor must divest these outdoor advertising assets within four (4) months after the filing of the Complaint in this action. Finally, in the event that the Court does not, for any reason, enter the Final Judgment within that four-month period, the divestitures are to occur within five (5) business days after notice of entry of the Final Judgment.

If Chancellor does not divest the advertising assets in the specified counties within the divestiture period, the Court, upon plaintiff's application, is to appoint a trustee to sell the assets. The proposed Final Judgment also requires that, until the divestitures mandated by the Final Judgment have been accomplished, Chancellor shall take all steps necessary to maintain and operate the advertising assets as active competitors; maintain the management, staffing, sales and marketing of the advertising assets; and maintain the advertising assets in operable condition at current capacity configurations. Further, the proposed Final Judgment requires Chancellor to give the United States prior notice regarding certain future outdoor advertising acquisitions