

phases of the project is due upon the 2024 completion date for Phase II. KC has requested this Amendment because some or all of this additional capacity may become unnecessary. In exchange for deferring Phase I of this project, KC has agreed to accelerate implementation of several other components of the injunctive relief required by the Consent Decree.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States v. Kansas City*, Civil Action No. 4:10-cv-0497-GAF. DJ Reference Number 90-5-1-1-06438/1.

All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

To submit comments:	Send them to:
By email	<i>pubcomment-ees.enrd@usdoj.gov</i> .
By mail	Assistant Attorney General, U.S. DOJ-ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044-7611.

During the public comment period, Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html. We will provide a paper copy of the Consent Decree upon written request and payment of reproduction costs. Please mail your request and payment to: Consent Decree Library, U.S. DOJ-ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044-7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for \$ 2.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

Susan M. Akers,

Assistant Section Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 2014-27957 Filed 11-25-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—PXI Systems Alliance, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on October 28, 2014, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative

Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), PXI Systems Alliance, 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, Alazar Technologies, Inc., Pointe-Claire, Quebec City, CANADA, has been added as a party 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 PXI Systems Alliance, Inc. intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On November 22, 2000, PXI Systems Alliance, 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 March 8, 2001 (66 FR 13971).

The last notification was filed with the Department on August 8, 2014. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on September 12, 2014 (79 FR 54745).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2014-27988 Filed 11-25-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Sematech, Inc. D/B/A International Sematech

Notice is hereby given that, on October 30, 2014, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), Sematech, Inc. d/b/a International Sematech ("SEMATECH") 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, TowerJazz Panasonic Semiconductor

Co., Ltd., Uozo City, JAPAN, has been added as a party 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 SEMATECH intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 22, 1988, SEMATECH 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 May 19, 1988 (53 FR 17987).

The last notification was filed with the Department on August 1, 2014. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on September 3, 2014 (79 FR 52364).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2014-27986 Filed 11-25-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States V. Flakeboard America Limited, Celulosa Arauco Y Constitución, S.A., Inversiones Angelini Y Compañía, Limitada, and Sierrapine; 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 U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California in United States of America v. Flakeboard America Limited, Celulosa Arauco y Constitución, S.A., Inversiones Angelini y Compañía, Limitada and SierraPine, Civil Action No. 3:14-cv-04949. On November 7, 2014, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that Flakeboard, Arauco, and SierraPine coordinated to close SierraPine's Springfield, Oregon particleboard mill and move the mill's customers to Flakeboard before receiving federal antitrust approval under Section 7A of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18a, also commonly known as the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 ("Section 7A" or "HSR Act"). The Complaint alleges that this coordination constituted a *per se* unlawful agreement between competitors to reduce output and allocate customers in violation of