

validation of legitimate actors. These standards will be voluntary and auditable.

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2015-16026 Filed 6-29-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 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 May 20, 2015, 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Specifically, since August 16, 2013 ASME has published four new standards and initiated one new standard activity, and withdrawn three published standards within the general nature and scope of ASME's standards development activities, as specified in its original notification.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 November 6, 2014. A notice was published in the Federal Register pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on December 16, 2014 (79 FR 74767).

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2015-16025 Filed 6-29-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. DEA-392]

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances Registration: Insys Therapeutics, Inc.

ACTION: Notice of registration.

SUMMARY: Insys Therapeutics, Inc. applied to be registered as a manufacturer of certain basic classes of controlled substances. The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) grants Insys Therapeutics, Inc. registration as a manufacturer of those controlled substances.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: By notice dated February 5, 2015, and published in the Federal Register on February 11, 2015, 80 FR 7635, Insys Therapeutics, Inc., 2700 Oakmont, Round Rock, Texas 78665 applied to be registered as a manufacturer of certain basic classes of controlled substances. No comments or objections were submitted to this notice.

The DEA has considered the factors in 21 U.S.C. 823(a) and determined that the registration of Insys Therapeutics, Inc. to manufacture the basic classes of controlled substances is consistent with the public interest and with United States obligations under international treaties, conventions, or protocols in effect on May 1, 1971. The DEA investigated the company's maintenance of effective controls against diversion by inspecting and testing the company's physical security systems, verifying the company's compliance with state and local laws, and reviewing the company's background and history.

Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(a), and in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.33, the above-named company is granted registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed:

Controlled substance	Schedule
Marihuana (7360) .....	I
Tetrahydrocannabinols (7370) .....	I

The company plans to manufacture bulk synthetic active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) for product development and distribution to its customers. No other activity for this drug code is authorized for this registration.

Dated: June 24, 2015.

Joseph T. Rannazzisi, Deputy Assistant Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2015-16030 Filed 6-29-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

On June 24, 2015, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico in the lawsuit entitled United States v. Arizona Public Service Company, et al., Civil Case No. 1:15-cv-00537 (D. N.M.).

In this civil enforcement action under the federal Clean Air Act ("Act"), the United States alleges that Arizona Public Service Company, El Paso Electric Company, Public Service Company of New Mexico, Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District, Tucson Electric Power Company, and Southern California Edison Company (collectively the "Defendants"), failed to comply with certain requirements of the Act intended to protect air quality at the Four Corners Power Plant located near Shiprock, New Mexico. The complaint seeks injunctive relief and civil penalties for violations of the Clean Air Act's Prevention of Significant Deterioration ("PSD") provisions, 42 U.S.C. 7470-92, and various Clean Air Act implementing regulations. The complaint alleges that Defendants failed to obtain appropriate permits and failed to install and operate required pollution control devices to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide ("SO2") and/or nitrogen oxides ("NOx") at the Four Corners Power Plant.

The proposed Consent Decree would resolve violations for certain provisions of the Act at the Four Corners Power Plant, and would require the Defendants to reduce harmful SO2, NOx, and particulate matter emissions through the installation and operation of pollution controls. The Defendants will also spend \$6,700,000 to fund environmental mitigation projects that will further reduce emissions and benefit communities adversely affected by the pollution from the plant, and pay a civil penalty of \$1,500,000.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to United States v. Arizona Public Service Company, et al., Civil Case No. 1:15-cv-00537 (D. N.M.), D.J. Ref. No. 90-5-2-1-10300. 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:

<i>To submit comments:</i>	<i>Send them to:</i>
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, the proposed Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: <http://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees>.

We will provide a paper copy of the proposed 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 \$23.50 (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. 2015–15952 Filed 6–29–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–15–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Notice Lodging of Proposed Joint Stipulation To Modify Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act**

On June 25, 2015, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Joint Stipulation to Modify Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama in the lawsuit entitled *United States v. Alabama Power Company*, Civil Action No. 2:01–cv–00152–VEH.

In this civil enforcement action under the federal Clean Air Act (“Act”), the United States alleged that Alabama Power Company failed to comply with certain requirements of the Act intended to protect air quality at coal-fired electric generating stations located in Alabama. Specifically, the complaint requested injunctive relief and civil penalties for violations of the Clean Air Act’s Prevention of Significant Deterioration provisions, 42 U.S.C. 7470–92, and various Clean Air Act implementing regulations. On April 25, 2006, the District Court entered a partial consent decree settling some of the claims alleged in the complaint. The proposed Joint Stipulation to Modify Consent Decree would modify the partial consent decree to settle the remaining claims in the litigation to secure additional reductions in

emissions of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides through the operation of emissions controls and unit retirements and conversions to natural gas operation. Alabama Power will also pay a civil penalty of \$100,000 and pay \$1,500,000 to fund environmental mitigation projects that will further reduce emissions and benefit communities in Alabama.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed Joint Stipulation to Modify Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States v. Alabama Power Company*, D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–2–1–06994. All comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) days after the publication date of this notice. Comments may be submitted by email or by mail:

<i>To submit comments:</i>	<i>Send them to:</i>
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, the proposed Joint Stipulation to Modify Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: <http://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees>. We will provide a paper copy of the proposed modification 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 \$ 6.25 (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. 2015–16021 Filed 6–29–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–19–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

**Employment and Training Administration**

[TA–W–85,562]

**Unimin Corporation, Gleason, Tennessee; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated December 3, 2014, a worker requested administrative reconsideration of the negative determination regarding workers’ eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance applicable to workers and former workers of Unimin Corporation, Gleason, Tennessee (subject firm). The determination was issued on November 7, 2014. The Department’s Notice of Determination was published in the **Federal Register** on November 21, 2014 (79 FR 69535).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

- (1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;
- (2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or
- (3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The initial investigation resulted in a negative determination based on the findings that the subject firm did not increase imports or shift production abroad.

The request for reconsideration asserts that increased imports of articles directly competitive with the “slurry” articles produced at the subject firm contributed to worker separations and, consequently, that the Department’s initial investigation was too limited in scope.

The Department of Labor has carefully reviewed the request for reconsideration and the existing record, and has determined that the Department will conduct further investigation to determine if the workers meet the eligibility requirements of the Trade Act of 1974.

**Conclusion**

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the U.S. Department of Labor’s prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.