

and Training Board of the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training (NCPTT) will meet on March 31, 2014, and April 1, 2014.

DATES: The Board will meet on the following dates:

Monday, March 31, 2014, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (CDT)

Tuesday, April 1, 2014, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. (CDT)

ADDRESSES: The Board will meet at the NCPTT Headquarters, 645 University Parkway, Natchitoches, Louisiana, 71457.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Persons wishing more information concerning this meeting, or who wish to submit written statements, may contact: Kirk A. Cordell, Executive Director, National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, National Park Service, 645 University Parkway, Natchitoches, LA 71457, by telephone (318) 356-7444. In addition to U.S. mail or commercial delivery, written comments may be sent by fax to Mr. Cordell at (318) 356-9119, or submitted electronically on the center Web site: ncptt@nps.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Board was established to provide leadership, policy advice, and professional oversight to the NCPTT in compliance with Section 404 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, (16 U.S.C. 470x-2(e)).

The meeting agenda will include:

1. Review and Comment on NCPTT FY2013 Accomplishments, and Operational Priorities for FY 2014
2. FY 2014 and FY 2015 NCPTT Budget and Initiatives
3. Recent Research
4. Training Programs

Minutes of the meeting will be available for public inspection no later than 90 days after the meeting at the Office of the Executive Director, NCPTT, National Park Service, 645 University Parkway, Natchitoches, LA 71457, by telephone (318) 356-7444.

The Board meeting is open to the public. Facilities and space for accommodating members of the public are limited; however, visitors will be accommodated on a first-come, first-served basis. Any member of the public may file a written statement concerning any of the matters to be discussed by the Board. Before including your address, telephone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your

comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: March 7, 2014.

Alma Ripps,
Chief, Office of Policy.

[FR Doc. 2014-05492 Filed 3-12-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-52-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-847]

Certain Mobile Phones and Tablet Computers, and Components Thereof; Notice of the Commission's Determination To Grant the Parties' Joint Motion To Terminate the Investigation Based on a Settlement Agreement; Termination of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to grant the parties' joint motion to terminate the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert Needham, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-5468. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on June 8, 2012, based on a complaint filed by Nokia Corp., Nokia Inc., and Intellisync Corp. (collectively, "Nokia"). 77 FR 34063-64. The Commission's notice of investigation named as respondents HTC Corporation; HTC

America, Inc. (together, "HTC"); and Exedea, Inc. ("Exedea"). *Id.* at 34064. On June 19, 2012, counsel for Exedea announced that Exedea had dissolved as a corporate entity. The complaint and notice of investigation sent to Exedea were returned as undeliverable, and no further action was taken to serve Exedea. On July 16, 2012, Google Inc. ("Google") moved to intervene in this investigation with respect to certain patents, and was granted intervenor status on August 7, 2012. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations did not participate in this investigation.

Originally, Nokia asserted numerous claims from nine patents against HTC. Throughout the course of the investigation, several IDs partially terminated the investigation with respect to various patents and claims. *See* Order No. 7 (Feb. 7, 2013) (terminating the investigation with respect to U.S. Patent No. 7,366,529 because the patent was covered by an arbitration agreement), *not reviewed* (Mar. 11, 2013); Order No. 10 (Apr. 12, 2013) (terminating the investigation with respect to U.S. Patent Nos. 7,106,293; 6,141,664; and 7,209,911 based on Nokia's motion to withdraw the patents), *not reviewed* (Apr. 30, 2013); Order No. 14 (May 14, 2013) (terminating the investigation with respect to U.S. Patent No. 6,728,530 based on Nokia's motion to withdraw the patent), *not reviewed* (May 29, 2013); Order No. 33 (June 13, 2013) (terminating the investigation with respect to U.S. Patent No. 5,570,369 based on Nokia's motion to withdraw the patent), *not reviewed* (July 12, 2013). By the time of the final ID, Nokia asserted only claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,190; claims 6, 8, 10, and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,260; and claims 2, 18, 19, 21, and 23 of U.S. Patent No. 7,415,247.

On September 23, 2013, the presiding ALJ issued his final ID, finding a violation of section 337. On October 23, 2013, HTC filed a petition for review of the ID. On December 9, 2013, the Commission determined to review the final ID in part. 78 FR 75942-43 (Dec. 13, 2013).

On February 7, 2014, Nokia and HTC jointly moved to terminate the investigation based on a settlement agreement ("Motion"). The Motion contains two confidential settlement document attachments, and states there are no other agreements, written or oral, express or implied, between Nokia and HTC regarding the subject matter of this investigation. The Motion further states that the termination of this investigation pursuant to a settlement agreement poses no threat to the public interest

and that it is in the interest of the public and administrative economy to grant the Motion. The Motion also requests that the Commission limit service of the confidential settlement documents to the settling parties because the disclosure of the documents will prejudice Nokia's ongoing discussions with Google and its customers.

On February 12, 2014, Google stated that it has no position on the Motion because none of the patents upon which it had intervened were currently before the Commission.

The Commission finds that the Motion complies with the Commission Rules, and there is no evidence that the proposed settlement will be contrary to the public interest. The Commission therefore determines to grant the Motion, and to terminate the investigation. The Commission also finds that good cause exists to limit the service of the confidential settlement documents to the settling parties, and grants the request to limit service of the confidential settlement documents to the settling parties.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

Issued: March 7, 2014.

By order of the Commission.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2014-05468 Filed 3-12-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging Proposed Consent Decree

In accordance with Departmental Policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed Consent Decree in *United States v. A. Derek Hoyte, et al.*,

Case No. C10-2044BHS, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington on February 28, 2014.

This proposed Consent Decree concerns a complaint filed by the United States against Defendants Derek A. Hoyte, Columbia Pacific Enterprises, Inc., and Columbia Crest Partners LLC, in part pursuant to Section 309 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1319, to obtain injunctive relief from and impose civil penalties against the Defendants for violating the Clean Water Act by discharging pollutants without a permit into waters of the United States. The proposed Consent Decree resolves these allegations by requiring the Defendants to restore the impacted areas and to pay a civil penalty.

The Department of Justice will accept written comments relating to the Clean Water Act aspects of this proposed Consent Decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this Notice. Please address comments to Brian C. Kipnis, Assistant United States Attorney, Office of the United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington, 5220 United States Courthouse, 700 Stewart Street, Seattle, Washington 98101 and refer to *United States v. Derek A. Hoyte, et al.*, Case No. C10-2044BHS, U.S.A.O. #2010V00667.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the Western District of Washington in Seattle, located at 700 Stewart Street, Suite 2310, Seattle, Washington 98101, or in Tacoma, located at 1717 Pacific Avenue, Room 3100, Tacoma, Washington 98402. In addition, the proposed Consent Decree may be examined electronically at http://www.justice.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.html.

Cherie L. Rogers,

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

[FR Doc. 2014-05439 Filed 3-12-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States, et al., v. US Airways Group, Inc., et al.; Public Comments and Response on Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), the United States hereby publishes below the Response of the United States to Public Comments on the proposed Final Judgment in *United States, et al., v. US Airways Group, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 1:13–CV–1236–CKK (D.D.C. 2013).

Copies of the 14 Public Comments and the Response of the United States to Public Comments are available for inspection at the Department of Justice Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 1010, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–514–2481); on the Department of Justice's Web site at <http://www.justice.gov/atr/cases/usairways/index.html>; and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 333 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20001. Copies of any of these materials may also be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al. Plaintiffs, v. US AIRWAYS GROUP, INC. and AMR CORPORATION DEFENDANTS.

Case No. 1:13–cv–1236 (CKK)

RESPONSE OF PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED FINAL JUDGMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
I. Procedural History	5
II. The Complaint and the Proposed Settlement	7
A. The Complaint	7
B. The Proposed Final Judgment	10
1. Terms of the Proposed Final Judgment and Status of the Divestitures	10
2. Explanation of the Proposed Final Judgment	11
a. Consumer Benefits from LCC Entry	12
b. The Importance of the Remedy Assets to Enhancing LCC Competition	14
III. Standard of Judicial Review	19
IV. Public Comments and the United States' Response	23
A. Any Challenge to the Merits of the Complaint Is Beyond the Scope of Tunney Act Review	25
B. The Proposed Settlement Will Counteract Competitive Harm From the Merger by Enhancing LCC Competition	27
1. LCCs Provide Meaningful Competition	27
2. The Remedy Adequately Addresses the Harms Alleged in the Complaint	31
C. The Remedy Does Not Mandate Changes in Service Patterns at Reagan National	36