deterioration on global performance) at all stages of deterioration, and (3) integrated assessment and rehabilitation that will be nondestructive, rapid, cost effective and implementable at all stages of deterioration.

Patricia A. Brink,
Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2010–6260 Filed 3–23–10; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Joint Venture Under Tip Award No. 70NANB10H014 To Perform Project Entitled: Automated Nondestructive Evaluation and Rehabilitation System (ANDERS) for Bridge Decks

Notice is hereby given that, on January 28, 2010, 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 Joint Venture under TIP Award No. 70NANB10H014 to Perform Project Entitled: Automated Nondestructive Evaluation and Rehabilitation System (“ANDERS”) for Bridge Decks has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties to the venture and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the parties to the venture are: Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ; Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA; PD–LD, INC., Pennington, NJ; Mala GeoScience USA, Inc., Charleston, SC; and Pennoni Associates Inc., Philadelphia, PA. The general area of ANDERS’ planned activity is to provide a uniquely comprehensive tool that will transform the manner in which bridge decks are assessed and rehabilitated, and to provide a unique tool that enables the sustainable management of aging bridge stock through (1) a much higher evaluation detail and comprehensiveness of detection at an early stage 2 deterioration for far less cost and time than traditional approaches or fragmented NDE, (2) comprehensive condition and structural assessment (including the understanding of effects of local deterioration on global performance) at all stages of deterioration, and (3) integrated assessment and rehabilitation that will be nondestructive, rapid, cost effective and implementable at all stages of deterioration.

Patricia A. Brink,
Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2010–6260 Filed 3–23–10; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Cooperative Research Group on High-Efficiency Dilute Gasoline Engine II

Notice is hereby given that, on February 18, 2010, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 et seq. (“the Act”), Southwest Research Institute—Cooperative Research Group on High-Efficiency Dilute Gasoline Engine II (“HEDE II”) 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, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, MI: Valeo Systemes de Controle Moteur, Cergy Pontoise, FRANCE; and Navistar, Melrose Park, IL 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 HEDGE II intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On February 19, 2009, HEDGE II 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 April 2, 2009 (74 FR 15003).

The last notification was filed with the Department of Justice on December 10, 2009. A notice was published in the Federal Register pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on January 27, 2010 (75 FR 4423).

Patricia A. Brink,
Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 2010–6257 Filed 3–23–10; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employee Benefits Security Administration

[Prohibited Transaction Exemption 2010–08; Exemption Application No. L–11575]

Grant of Individual Exemption Involving Ford Motor Company, Located in Detroit, MI

AGENCY: Employee Benefits Security Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

ACTION: Grant of individual exemption.

This document contains a final exemption issued by the Department of Labor (the Department) from certain prohibited transaction restrictions of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (the Act or ERISA). The transactions involve the UAW Ford Retirees Medical Benefits Plan (the Ford Veba Plan) and its funding vehicle, the UAW Retirees Medical Benefits Trust (the Veba Trust), (collectively the Veba).1

DATES: Effective Date: This exemption is effective as of December 31, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Warren Blinder, Office of Exemption Determinations, Employee Benefits Security Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, telephone (202) 693–8553. (This is not a toll-free number.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 8, 2009, the Department published a notice of proposed individual exemption in the Federal Register at 74 FR 64716 from the restrictions of sections 406(a)(1)(A), 406(a)(1)(B), 406(a)(1)(D), 406(a)(1)(E), 406(a)(2), 406(b)(1), 406(b)(2), and 407(a) of ERISA. The proposed exemption was requested in an application filed by the Ford Motor Company (Ford or the Applicant) pursuant to section 408(a) of ERISA and in accordance with the procedures set forth in 29 CFR 2570, Subpart B (55 FR 14192).

Because the Ford Veba Plan will not be qualified under section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the Code), there is no jurisdiction under Title II of the Act pursuant to section 4975 of the Code. However, there is jurisdiction under Title I of the Act.