During the public comment period, the 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 \$8.50 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury.

#### Maureen Katz,

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

[FR Doc. 2013–07701 Filed 4–2–13; 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 — American Society of Mechanical Engineers

Notice is hereby given that, on March 5, 2013, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 et seq. ("the Act"), the American Society of Mechanical Engineers ("ASME") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing additions or changes to its standards development activities. 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, since August 22, 2012, ASME has published one new standard, initiated six new standards activities, established two new consensus committees, revised the charter of one consensus committee, withdrawn one published standard, and withdrawn one proposed standard from consideration within the general nature and scope of ASME's standards development activities, as specified in its original notification. More detail regarding these changes can be found at www.asme.org.

On September 15, 2004, ASME 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 October 13, 2004 (69 FR 60895).

The last notification was filed with the Department on August 27, 2012. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on September 20, 2012 (77 FR 58412).

### Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2013–07705 Filed 4–2–13; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE P

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### **Antitrust Division**

# Notice Pursuant To the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Pistoia Alliance, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on March 8, 2013, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 et seq. ("the Act"), Pistoia 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, Novartis Institutes for BioMedical Research. Inc., Cambridge, MA; Wolfram Teetz (individual), Planegg, GERMANY; Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH, Frankfurt, GERMANY; Robert E. Schwartz (individual), Seaside Park, NJ; and Harsha K. Rajasimha (individual), Derwood, MD, 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 Pistoia Alliance, Inc. intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 28, 2009, Pistoia 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 July 15, 2009 (74 FR 34364).

The last notification was filed with the Department on September 20, 2012. A notice was published in the **Federal**  **Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on October 26, 2012 (77 FR 65413).

## Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement Antitrust Division. [FR Doc. 2013–07706 Filed 4–2–13; 8:45 am]

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

**Drug Enforcement Administration** 

[OMB Number 1117-0052]

# Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comments Requested: National Drug Threat Survey; Extension With Change of a Previously Approved Collection

# ACTION: 60-Day Notice.

The United States Department of Justice (DOJ), Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until June 3, 2013. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

If you have comments especially on the estimated public burden or associated response time, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions or additional information, please contact Richard L. Nagy, Unit Chief, Domestic Strategic Intelligence Unit, Office of Intelligence, Warning, Plans and Programs, Drug Enforcement Administration, 8701 Morrissette Drive, Springfield, VA 22152.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information are encouraged. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

• Evaluate 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;

• Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies' estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

• Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and