

BURDEN TABLE—Continued

Citation 30 CFR 582	Reporting or recordkeeping requirement	Hour burden	Average number of annual responses	Annual burden hours
29(g)	Maintain original data and information and navigation tapes as long as lease is in effect and make available upon request.	1	1	1
29(h)	Maintain hard mineral records and make available upon request.	1	1	1
Subtotal	9	17
Subpart D—Payments				
40	Submit surety, personal bond, or approved alternative	2	1	2
Subpart E—Appeals				
50; 15	File an appeal	Burden exempt under 5 CFR 1320.4(a)(2), (c).		0
TOTAL BURDEN	20	212

Estimated Reporting and Recordkeeping Non-Hour Cost Burden: There are no non-hour cost burdens associated with this collection.

Public Disclosure Statement: The PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501, et seq.) provides that an agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Until OMB approves a collection of information, you are not obligated to respond.

Comments: We invite comments concerning this information collection on:

- Whether or not the collection of information is necessary, including whether or not the information will have practical utility;
- The accuracy of our burden estimates;
- Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden on respondents.

To comply with the public consultation process, on February 26, 2014, BOEM published a **Federal Register** notice (79 FR 10838) announcing that we would submit this ICR to OMB for approval. This notice provided the required 60-day comment period. We received no comments.

Public Availability of Comments: Before including your address, phone 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 can 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: May 6, 2014.

Deanna Meyer-Pietruszka,
Chief, Office of Policy, Regulations, and Analysis.

[FR Doc. 2014-11093 Filed 5-13-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-MR-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Extension of Comment Period for Proposed Settlement Agreement Under the Federal Debt Collection Procedure Act, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and Other Statutes

Notice is hereby given of an extension of the period for public comment with respect to the Columbus, Mississippi site under the proposed settlement agreement (“Settlement Agreement”) entered into by Anadarko Petroleum Corp. and seven of its affiliates (the “Defendants”), the United States, and the Anadarko Litigation Trust in the matter entitled *Tronox Inc., et al., and United States v. Anadarko Petroleum Corp., et al.*, Bankruptcy Adversary Proceeding No. 09–1198. This matter is part of the bankruptcy case of Tronox Inc. and its affiliates (collectively “Tronox”), *In re Tronox Inc., et al.*, No. 09–10156, in the same court. The Settlement Agreement was lodged with the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York on April 3, 2014, in *Tronox Inc., et al., and United States v. Anadarko Petroleum*

Corp., et al., Bankruptcy Adversary Proceeding No. 09–1198.

The Settlement Agreement provides for \$5.15 billion dollars to be paid to the Anadarko Litigation Trust. These proceeds will then be distributed to the United States, certain environmental response trusts, a tort claims trust, and certain state and tribal governments as provided by the Plan of Reorganization, Litigation Trust Agreement, Environmental Settlement Agreement, and other documents (collectively, the “Bankruptcy Documents”) previously approved by the bankruptcy court in Tronox’s bankruptcy.

The Settlement Agreement resolves fraudulent conveyance claims brought by the United States and the Anadarko Litigation Trust against Defendants. As part of the Settlement Agreements, Defendants will receive covenants not to sue from the United States under various statutes, included the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and for certain common law claims, all as and to the extent specified in the Settlement Agreement. Pursuant to this Settlement Agreement and the Bankruptcy Documents, portions of the Defendants’ payment under the Settlement Agreement will either fund clean-up or provide compensation for past or future environmental costs at numerous sites around the county.

Notice of lodging of the Settlement Agreement was published in the **Federal Register** on April 14, 2014. See 79 FR 20910. The public comment period for the Settlement Agreement is scheduled to close on May 14, 2014.

However, in response to requests for an extension of the public comment period relating to the Columbus, Mississippi site, the United States has elected to extend the comment period with respect to the Columbus, Mississippi site and to accept public comments received no later than May 21, 2014.

Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *Tronox and United States v. Anadarko Petroleum Corp.*, D.J. Ref. No. 90–11–3–09688. All comments must be received no later than May 21, 2014. Comments may be submitted either by email or by mail:

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

During the public comment period, the Settlement Agreement may be examined and downloaded at a Justice Department Web site: <http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/ConsentDecrees.html>. We will provide a paper copy of the Settlement Agreement 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 \$32.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury. For a paper copy without exhibits or notice of lodging, the cost is \$14.75.

Maureen M. Katz,

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

[FR Doc. 2014–11063 Filed 5–13–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. Ebay Inc.; 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 United States District Court for the Northern District

of California in *United States of America v. eBay Inc.*, Civil Action No. 12–5869. On November 16, 2012, the United States filed a Complaint alleging that eBay Inc. entered into an agreement with Intuit, Inc., that restrained the recruiting and hiring of high technology workers, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. The proposed Final Judgment prevents eBay from maintaining or entering into similar agreements.

Copies of the Complaint, as amended, Stipulation, proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection at the Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, Antitrust Documents Group, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 1010, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–514–2481), on the Department of Justice’s Web site at <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr>, and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the copying fee set by Department of Justice regulations.

Public comment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, including the name of the submitter, and responses thereto, will be posted on the U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division’s internet Web site, filed with the Court and, under certain circumstances, published in the **Federal Register**. Comments should be directed to James J. Tierney, Chief, Networks and Technology Enforcement Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530, (telephone: 202–307–6640).

Patricia Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement.

N. Scott Sacks, Attorney (D.C. Bar No. 913087)

Jessica N. Butler-Arkow, Attorney (D.C. Bar No. 430022)

Adam T. Severt, Attorney (Member, Maryland Bar, Numbers not assigned)
Ryan Struve, Attorney (D.C. Bar No. 495406)

Anna T. Pletcher, Attorney (California State Bar No. 239730)

United States Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 450 Fifth Street NW., Suite 7100, Washington, DC 20530, Telephone: 202–307–6200, Facsimile: 202–616–8544, Email: scott.sacks@usdoj.gov

[Additional counsel listed on signature page]

Attorneys for Plaintiff United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. EBAY, INC., Defendant.

Case No. 12–CV–05869 EJD

Amended Complaint

The United States of America, acting under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, brings this civil antitrust action to obtain equitable relief against Defendant eBay, Inc. (“eBay”), alleging as follows:

Nature of the Action

1. This action challenges under Section 1 of the Sherman Act a no-solicitation and no-hiring agreement between eBay and Intuit, Inc. (“Intuit”), pursuant to which eBay and Intuit agreed not to recruit each other’s employees and eBay agreed not to hire Intuit employees, even those that approached eBay for a job. This agreement harmed employees by lowering the salaries and benefits they might otherwise have commanded, and deprived these employees of better job opportunities at the other company. Meg Whitman, then the CEO of eBay, and Scott Cook, Founder and Chairman of the Executive Committee at Intuit, were intimately involved in forming, monitoring, and enforcing this anticompetitive agreement.

2. Senior executives at eBay and Intuit entered into an evolving “handshake” agreement to restrict their ability to recruit and hire employees of the other company. The agreement, which was entered into no later than 2006, prohibited either company from soliciting one another’s employees for employment opportunities, and, for over a year, prevented at least eBay from hiring any employees from Intuit at all. The agreement was enforced at the highest levels of each company.

3. The agreement reduced eBay’s and Intuit’s incentives and ability to compete for employees and restricted employees’ mobility. This agreement thus harmed employees by lowering the salaries and benefits they otherwise would have commanded, and deprived these employees of better job opportunities at the other company.

4. This agreement between eBay and Intuit is a naked restraint of trade that is per se unlawful under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1. The United States seeks an order prohibiting any such agreement and other relief.

Jurisdiction and Venue

5. eBay hires specialized computer engineers, scientists, and other employees throughout the United