

Consortium, Inc., Wayland, MA; Management and Engineering Technologies International, Inc., El Paso, TX; Gallium Software Inc., Ottawa, Ontario, Canada; and SPARTA, Inc., Arlington, VA have been added as parties to this venture. Also, West Virginia High Technology Consortium Foundation, Fairmont, WV; MBL International, Ltd., Annandale, VA; Crystal Group, Inc., Hiawatha, IA; and FlightSafety International, Flushing, NY have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Network Centric Operations Industry Consortium, Inc. intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On November 19, 2004, Network Centric Operations Industry Consortium, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 2, 2005 (70 FR 5486).

The last notification was filed with the Department on April 10, 2006. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 10, 2006 (71 FR 27280).

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 06-6360 Filed 7-19-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Semiconductor Test Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on May 10, 2006, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Semiconductor Test Consortium, Inc. has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, BitifEye, Boeblingen, Germany; ERS Electronic, Munich, Germany; Q-Star Test, Brugge, Belgium;

and Sept Europe, Munich, Germany have been added as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Semiconductor Test Consortium, Inc. intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 27, 2003, Semiconductor Test Consortium, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on June 17, 2003 (68 FR 35913).

The last notification was filed with the Department on February 21, 2006. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on March 7, 2006 (71 FR 13866).

Dorothy B. Fountain,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 06-6358 Filed 7-19-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

MORRIS K. UDALL SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY FOUNDATION

[Docket No. FHWA-2006-25031]

U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution; Request for Public Participation in National Outdoor Advertising Control Program Assessment

AGENCIES: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT and United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute).

ACTION: Notice; request for public input on program assessment.

SUMMARY: The FHWA and the U.S. Institute have initiated an assessment of the national outdoor advertising control (OAC) program, which implements the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 131. The goal of the assessment is to reach out, through a neutral entity, to parties interested in OAC to identify issues that cause controversy, perspectives of the various stakeholders, and appropriate methods for addressing conflicts and improving program results. The U.S. Institute, operating under an interagency

agreement with the FHWA, is responsible for carrying out the neutral conflict assessment process. This notice describes the first of several opportunities for public participation in the assessment process. At this time, the public is invited to identify any OAC issues that should be considered during the assessment. The public also is invited to suggest persons or entities with particular interests or expertise in outdoor advertising and the OAC program, that the assessors should consider contacting as a part of the assessment proceedings.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 21, 2006.

ADDRESSES:

Comments on OAC Issues

Mail or hand deliver comments about OAC issues that should be considered in the assessment to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Dockets Management Facility, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590, or submit electronically at <http://dms.dot.gov> or fax comments to (202) 493-2251. All comments should include the docket number that appears in the heading of this document.

All comments received will be available for examination and copying at the above address from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Those desiring notification of receipt of comments must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard or may print the acknowledgement page that appears after submitting comments electronically. Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of DOT's dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.)

Names of Persons or Entities To Be Contacted as Part of the Assessment

Mail or hand deliver suggested names of persons or entities to be contacted as part of the assessment to the Morris K. Udall Foundation, U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, attn: Ms. Gail Brooks, 130 South Scott Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85701, or submit electronically by e-mail to oac@ecr.gov, or fax to (510) 670-5530. Contact information for such persons or entities, if available to the submitter, should be included in the submission.

Names and contact information for such persons or entities should be provided only to the U.S. Institute as directed above in order to protect the privacy of the persons or entities

suggested. Do not include name and contact information with comments about OAC issues to be filed with the DOT Document Management Facility. Persons making comments may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published April 11, 2000 (Volume 65, Number 70, Pages 19477-78), or may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For the FHWA: Mr. Gerald Solomon, Office of Real Estate Services (HEPR), (202) 366-2019, gerald.solomon@dot.gov; for legal questions, Mr. Robert Black, Office of Chief Counsel (HCC), (202) 366-1359, robert.black@dot.gov; Federal Highway Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. For the U.S. Institute: Dale Keyes, Senior Program Manager, keyes@ecr.gov, (520) 670-5653 or Gail Brooks, Program Associate, brooks@ecr.gov, (520) 670-5299; U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, 130 South Scott Avenue, Tucson, AZ 85701. Business hours for the Federal Highway Administration are 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. (e.t.), Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Electronic Access

You may submit or retrieve comments online through the Docket Management System (DMS) at <http://dms.dot.gov/submit>. The DMS is available 24 hours each day, 365 days a year. Electronic submission and retrieval help and guidelines are available under the help section of the Web site.

An electronic copy of this notice may be downloaded using a computer, modem and suitable communications software from the Government Printing Office's Electronic Bulletin Board Service at (202) 512-1661. Internet users may reach the Office of the Federal Register's home page at <http://www.archives.gov> and the Government Printing Office's Web site at <http://www.access.gpo.gov>.

Background

The U.S. Congress adopted the first Federal legislation pertaining to the control of outdoor advertising signs (signs) near Federal-aid highways in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958. That legislation established the voluntary Bonus Program to control outdoor advertising signs within 660 feet of the Interstate System. The Bonus Program provided a monetary incentive to the States to adopt programs that controlled outdoor advertising in accordance with national standards specified in the legislation.

In 1965, Congress passed the Highway Beautification Act (HBA), 23 U.S.C. 131, which substantially amended the original law and today governs the Federal outdoor advertising control program. Unlike the Bonus Program, States are required to comply with the HBA. The first section of the HBA sets forth the basic program objectives: "The erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices in areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system should be controlled in order to protect the public investment in such highways, to promote the safety and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve natural beauty." The FHWA promulgated regulations in 1973, which appear in parts 180 and 750 of title 23, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Most provisions of the HBA and the regulations have remained largely unchanged since their original adoption.

Under the HBA, States are responsible for implementing the OAC program in a manner consistent with the Federal law and regulations. Failure by a State to maintain effective control can result in the withholding of a portion of the State's Federal-aid highway funds. Most States have assigned administrative responsibility for OAC to their transportation agencies.

The HBA requires States to develop standards governing various aspects of the program, and mandates compensation to sign owners when a State's action in removing a sign constitutes a regulatory taking. Pursuant to the HBA, there are areas in which signs can be legally erected, areas where they cannot be erected, and limitations on the size, lighting, and spacing of signs. Signs erected legally prior to the adoption of the regulatory controls with which they do not conform were given limited "grandfathering" protection as non-conforming signs. The law affirmatively requires States to remove illegal signs, which do not comply with applicable laws and regulations and are not grandfathered.

Since the adoption of the HBA and the implementing regulations, there have been substantial changes in relevant practices, technologies, and local conditions. As a result, many of those affected by the OAC program see an increasing gap between current Federal law and regulations and the needs of States, local communities, advertisers, sign owners, owners of properties on which signs are located, interest groups, and the traveling public. Enforcement of Federal and State laws, and the interface between OAC and local zoning laws, create challenges across the country. These difficulties

raise questions about the effectiveness of the current national OAC program.

The FHWA wishes to better understand the nature and complexity of the conflicts that have developed in connection with the HBA, and what paths toward resolution are available. The FHWA requested assistance with this effort from the U.S. Institute, which specializes in environmental conflict assessment and resolution.

In accordance with its statutory authority, the 1998 Environmental Policy and Conflict Resolution Act (Pub. L. 105-156, codified at 20 U.S.C. 5601 *et seq.*), the U.S. Institute will conduct a comprehensive and neutral conflict assessment of the OAC program. The U.S. Institute will serve an independent and impartial role, accountable to all the interested parties and participants. Confidentiality of all private conversations will be protected. The U.S. Institute will oversee the assessment process, and has contracted with the Osprey Group, a private conflict resolution company, to gather information and conduct other aspects of the assessment, and to prepare the assessment report. For more information on the U.S. Institute, please visit <http://www.ecr.gov>.

The goal of the OAC program neutral conflict assessment is to identify areas of conflict, stakeholders affected by or interested in the issues, the stakeholders' positions and proposed solutions, and their willingness to engage in efforts to address and resolve the issues. The assessment will be accomplished through discussions with key stakeholders (individually or in groups) and public listening sessions.

The assessment report prepared by the U.S. Institute and the Osprey Group will convey findings and identify options for future action, including whether a future collaborative problem-solving process would be appropriate. The final product will contain a set of recommendations from the assessors for actions by the FHWA and others to address OAC program conflicts. After the U.S. Institute submits its assessment report, the FHWA will place a copy of the report in the docket. Additionally, the FHWA will announce in the **Federal Register** availability of this report and ask for public comments on the report.

The OAC program assessment process will offer public participation opportunities in several ways. The first is this request for public comments about which issues the assessment should consider and who should be considered for inclusion in discussion activities. There also will be public listening sessions in several cities around the country, at which any

member of the public may attend and provide information. An announcement of the dates, times, and locations of those sessions will be posted in the docket, available as described above. After consideration of the assessment report and public comments on it, the FHWA will file in the same docket a summary of its review of the results of the OAC program neutral conflict assessment.

Information on the FHWA OAC program is available online at http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/realstate/out_ad.htm or by contacting the FHWA at the address listed above. Additional OAC resources include: National Alliance of Highway Beautification Agencies, <http://www.nahba.org/>; Outdoor Advertising Association of America, <http://www.oaaa.org/>; and Scenic America, <http://www.scenic.org/>.

Comments received after the comment closing date will be filed in the docket and will be considered to the extent practicable. In addition to late comments, the FHWA also will continue to file in the docket relevant information that becomes available after the closing date, and interested persons should continue to examine the docket for new material. Names of persons or entities that the assessors should consider contacting as part of the assessment that are received by the U.S. Institute after the comment closing date also will be considered to the extent practicable.

(Authority: 23 U.S.C. 131; 20 U.S.C. 5601 *et seq.*)

Issued on: July 13, 2006.

Christopher L. Helms,

Executive Director, Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation.

Frederick G. Wright, Jr.,

Federal Highway Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 06-6355 Filed 7-19-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-22-P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 06-046]

National Environmental Policy Act; Crew Exploration Vehicle

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of availability of the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Development of the Crew Exploration Vehicle (CEV).

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as

amended (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), and NASA policy and procedures (14 CFR part 1216 subpart 1216.3), NASA has prepared and issued a Draft EA for the Development of the CEV. The Proposed Action is to develop a new human-rated space vehicle, the CEV, which would be the U.S. vehicle to transport humans to Low-Earth Orbit and to the International Space Station, Moon, Mars, and to destinations beyond. The Draft EA addresses the potential environmental impacts associated with the development of the CEV, including its design, component fabrication, and assembly. However, it does not cover flight testing and operation of the CEV, which will be the subject of future NEPA documentation. The only alternative to the Proposed Action discussed in detail is the No Action Alternative where NASA would not develop the CEV.

The CEV would be able to transport up to six humans and cargo to space after the Space Shuttle is retired, which is currently scheduled to occur no later than 2010. First human flight involving the CEV is planned for no later than 2014 with initial access to Low-Earth Orbit and to the International Space Station. Human missions to the Moon are planned for no later than 2020 with missions to Mars and other destinations in the following decades. The CEV would likely be launched from NASA's Kennedy Space Center in Florida.

DATES: Written comments on the Draft EA must be received by NASA on or before August 21, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Mr. Mario Busacca, Mail Stop: TA-C3, Lead, Planning and Special Projects, Environmental Program Office, NASA, Kennedy Space Center, FL 32899. Although hardcopy comments are preferred, comments may be sent by electronic mail to Mario Busacca at mario.busacca-1@nasa.gov or by facsimile at 321-867-8040.

The Draft EA can be reviewed at the following NASA locations:

(a) NASA Headquarters, Library, Room 1J20, 300 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20546-0001;

(b) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Visitors Lobby, Building 249, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, CA 91109.

Hard copies of the Draft EA also may be reviewed at other NASA Centers (see **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** below).

Limited hard copies of the Draft EA are available, on a first request basis, by contacting Mr. Mario Busacca at the

address or telephone number indicated below. The Draft EA is also available at http://exploration.nasa.gov/documents/cev_draftea.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mario Busacca, Mail Stop: TA-C3, Lead, Planning and Special Projects Environmental Program Office, NASA, Kennedy Space Center, FL 32899; telephone 321-867-8456, electronic mail mario.busacca-1@nasa.gov, or facsimile 321-867-8040.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In his January 14, 2004 address to the Nation, President George W. Bush announced a new vision for space exploration. In pursuing this new vision, NASA has been tasked with developing the spacecraft, launch vehicles, and related technologies necessary to travel and explore the solar system. The CEV represents an important building block in this future exploration architecture.

The CEV, an Apollo-like capsule, would consist of a Crew Module, a Service Module, and a Launch Escape System. If NASA proceeds with CEV development, the Agency would contract with a commercial firm to serve as the prime contractor, with specific design, component fabrication, and assembly activities to be clarified as the CEV Project matures. CEV development activities would occur at multiple NASA facilities including, but not necessarily limited to, Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas; Ames Research Center in Mountain View, California; Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Alabama; Glenn Research Center in Cleveland, Ohio; Langley Research Center in Hampton, Virginia; and Kennedy Space Center; and at yet to be named commercial facilities throughout the United States. These activities would be expected to be consistent with each facility's mission statement and scope of normal operations.

Environmental impacts associated with the development of the CEV would be expected to be minor (i.e., within the permitted quantities of airborne emissions, waterborne effluents, and waste disposal at each of the involved facilities) and consequently both the short- and long-term environmental impacts are expected to be within the limits of all applicable environmental statutes, regulations, permits, and licenses. No adverse impact on the local infrastructure (e.g., utilities, roadways) near the involved facilities is anticipated. There should be little incremental impact on employment levels at the facilities involved in CEV development. Thus little or no