

conclude that he cannot be entrusted with a new registration”). I have considered the fact that Respondent currently holds a medical license in good standing in Puerto Rico, and her sworn statement that she has never been sued for malpractice and received only one professional complaint in her 19–20 year career. Att. 1–2 to Resp. Reply; Att. 3 to Resp. Reply, at 2–4. None of these facts outweighs Respondent’s materially false application, especially given her failure to disclose extensive and serious allegations against her involving the unlawful prescribing of controlled substances. See *William M. Knarr, D.O.*, 51 FR 2772, 2773 (1986). Thus, I find that this mitigating evidence fails to diminish the gravity of her failure to reveal the alleged misconduct in her state of prior registration.

Accordingly, based upon the foregoing, I conclude that the Government was entitled to summary disposition on the allegation that Respondent materially falsified her application for a new DEA registration.

Order

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 28 CFR 0.100(b), I order that the application of Zelidah H. Cordova-Velazco, M.D., for a DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner, be, and it hereby is, denied. This Order is effective immediately.

Dated: November 20, 2018.

Uttam Dhillon,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 2018–26485 Filed 12–4–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

[F.C.S.C. Meeting and Hearing Notice No. 11–18]

Sunshine Act Meeting

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, pursuant to its regulations (45 CFR part 503.25) and the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. 552b), hereby gives notice in regard to the scheduling of open meetings as follows:

Thursday, December 13, 2018: 11:00 a.m.—Issuance of Proposed Decisions in claims against Iraq.

11:30 a.m.—Issuance of Proposed Decisions under the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act, Title XVII, Public Law 114–328.

Status: Open.

All meetings are held at the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, 601 D Street NW, Suite 10300, Washington, DC. Requests for information, or advance notices of intention to observe an open meeting, may be directed to: Patricia M. Hall, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, 601 D Street NW, Suite 10300, Washington, DC 20579. Telephone: (202) 616–6975.

Brian Simkin,
Chief Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2018–26576 Filed 12–3–18; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4410–BA–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Filing of Proposed Settlement Agreement Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

On November 21, 2018, a Notice of Settlement Agreement was filed in the Superior Court for the State of New

Hampshire, Merrimack County in the proceeding entitled *In the Matter of the Liquidation of The Home Insurance Company*, Docket No. 217–2003–EQ–00106. The Notice informs the Court that at the conclusion of a public comment period, John R. Elias, Insurance Commissioner of the State of New Hampshire, in his capacity as Liquidator (the “Liquidator”) of the Home Insurance Company (“Home”) may seek court approval of a Settlement Agreement between the Liquidator, and the United States of America on behalf of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”), the U.S. Department of the Navy, U.S. Department of the Interior (“DOI”), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce (“NOAA”) (collectively referred to as “the Federal Claimants”), acting by and through the United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”).

The Settlement Agreement would resolve seven proofs of claim the Federal Claimants’ have filed. The seven proofs of claim assert claims under Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (“CERCLA”), 42 U.S.C. 9607, against insured parties in connection with six Superfund Sites: The Sharon Steel Corporation (Farrell Works Disposal Area) Superfund Site in Hermitage, PA; the Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund Site in Seattle, WA; the San Gabriel Valley Area 2 Site in Los Angeles, CA; the U.S. Oil Recovery Site in Pasadena, TX; the Lee’s Lane Landfill Superfund Site in Louisville, KY; and the Petroleum Products Superfund Site in Pembroke Park, FL.

Under the Settlement Agreement, the United States will have an allowed Class II priority claim in the amount of \$27,044,146 allocated to the six Superfund Sites as follows:

Amount	Site	Home insured
\$16,000,000	Sharon Steel Corporation (Farrell Works Disposal Area) Superfund Site.	Sharon Steel Corporation.
6,298,630	Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund Site	Manson Construction and Engineering Company.
2,200,000	Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund Site	Duwamish Shipyard, Inc.
2,224,999	San Gabriel Valley Area 2 Site	Azusa Pipe & Tube Bending, Corp.
300,000	U.S. Oil Recovery Site	Explorer Pipeline Company.
19,609	Lee’s Lane Landfill Superfund Site	Louisville Varnish Company, Inc.
908	Petroleum Products Superfund Site	Shaw Trucking.

For each Class II priority distribution that Home makes, Home shall use the above amounts to determine the appropriate distribution for each of the six Superfund Sites. In consideration of payments made on the allowed Class II

Priority Claim, upon approval of the Settlement Agreement the Federal Claimants provide a covenant not to sue to Home and the Liquidator as described in the Agreement under CERCLA under the policies that are identified in the

Settlement Agreement and in the proofs of claim.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the Settlement Agreement. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant

Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *In the Matter of the Liquidation of The Home Insurance Company*, Docket No. 217–2003–EQ–00106, D.J. Ref. No. 90–11–3–08308. 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 Settlement Agreement may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department website: <https://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees>. 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: U.S. DOJ—ENRD, P.O. Box 7611, Washington, DC 20044–7611.

Please enclose a check or money order for \$3.50 (25 cents per page reproduction costs) payable to the United State Treasury.

Robert Maher,

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

[FR Doc. 2018–26417 Filed 12–4–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–P

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Copyright Royalty Board

[Docket Nos. 2012–6 CRB CD 2004–2009 (Phase II) and 2012–7 CRB SD 1999–2009 (Phase II)]

Distribution of Cable and Satellite Royalty Funds

AGENCY: Copyright Royalty Board, Library of Congress.

ACTION: Final distribution determination.

SUMMARY: The Copyright Royalty Judges (Judges) announce the final distribution of satellite royalty funds for the year 2000. The distribution determination results from a contested motion by the Settling Devotional Claimants (SDC) requesting that the Judges order a final distribution to the SDC of 100% of the Devotional Claimants’ share of the 2000 satellite royalties.

DATES: *Applicable date:* December 5, 2018.

ADDRESSES: The final distribution order is also published in eCRB at <https://app.crb.gov/>. Docket: For access to the docket to read submitted background documents, go to eCRB, the Copyright Royalty Board’s electronic filing and case management system, at <https://app.crb.gov/> and search for docket number 2012–6 CRB CD 2004–2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anita Blaine, CRB Program Specialist, by telephone at (202) 707–7658 or email at crb@loc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

On October 1, 2018, the Judges issued an initial determination relating to the requested distribution. The Register of Copyrights concluded her statutory review and issued no opinion. The Order is now before the Librarian of Congress for final review and publication. The essence of the initial determination follows.

On November 21, 2017, the Settling Devotional Claimants (SDC) filed a motion seeking final distribution of the 2000 satellite royalty fund in the Devotional category (Motion). In the Motion, the SDC contended that there is no controversy with respect to the subject satellite royalties. The SDC argued that the direct cases filed by the SDC and Independent Producers Group (IPG) in this consolidated proceeding confirm that both parties agree to the allocation of 100% of the 2000 satellite royalties to the SDC. As a result, the SDC asked the Copyright Royalty Judges (Judges) to order a final distribution to SDC in an amount equal to the Devotional Claimants’ share of the 2000 satellite royalty fund. Motion at 1–2.

On December 1, 2017, IPG filed an opposition to the SDC’s motion (IPG Opposition). IPG conceded that the written testimony of both IPG and the SDC conclude that “subject to the current rulings of the Judges,” IPG has no valid claim to satellite royalties for the year 2000. *See* IPG Opposition at 1. Nevertheless, IPG noted that it disputes and will appeal the Judges’ claims rulings. *Id.* at 2. IPG continued:

[I]f appellate review of the Judges’ dismissal of 51 claims held by IPG–represented claimants is reversed as an excessive discovery sanction, as IPG contends, then the relative value of the previously-dismissed claims will require reconsideration for any award to IPG of 2000 satellite royalties. Under such circumstance, IPG will likely be awarded a substantial portion of the 2000 satellite royalties, and final distribution of 2000 satellite royalties will necessarily require repayment from the SDC of royalties with an attributed interest rate. *Id.* at 3.

In light of the value IPG projected for its dismissed claims should they be reinstated, IPG maintained that distribution to SDC would be “imprudent.” *Id.* at 3–4.

In their response (Response), the SDC noted that the Judges have twice rejected IPG’s requests for rehearing of the order in which the Judges dismissed IPG’s claims to 2000 satellite royalties. Response at 2. In the SDC’s estimation, IPG has had full and fair opportunities to state its case to the Judges, and an appeal to the Court of Appeals is unlikely to succeed. *Id.*

Moreover, the SDC noted that the Judges addressed the identical situation with respect to the 2008 satellite royalties, and the Judges ordered a final distribution of the Devotional Claimants’ share to the SDC. *Id.*, citing *Order Granting Final Distribution of 2008 Satellite Royalties for the Devotional Category*, Dkt. No. 2012–7 CRB SD 1999–2009 (Phase II) (Dec. 22, 2015). In response to IPG’s concerns regarding the SDC’s repayment of royalties should IPG prevail on appeal, the SDC noted that they have executed the royalty repayment agreement required by the Library of Congress prior to any partial distribution of royalty funds. Response at 3. The SDC added:

All devotional ministries that are members of the SDC in the relevant period are bound by that obligation. How the remission might be accomplished is the responsibility of the SDC, which are among the largest religious ministries in the United States. Collectively, they would be fully capable of meeting any obligation to the Library To suggest otherwise is without foundation.

Response at 3.

Section 801(b)(3)(A) of the Copyright Act states that the Judges may authorize distribution of royalty fees deposited pursuant to Section 119 of the Copyright Act if they find that the distribution is not subject to controversy. 17 U.S.C. 801(b)(3)(A). In the current proceeding, the parties agree that the Judges have dismissed all claims that IPG–represented claimants had to satellite royalties for 2000 in the Devotional category. As a result, the SDC are the only claimants in the proceeding with valid claims to satellite royalties for 2000 in the Devotional category. Therefore, in the current circumstances, satellite royalties for 2000 in the Devotional category are no longer in controversy.

In November 2008, the parties to this proceeding filed a motion seeking partial distribution of 98% of the satellite royalty funds deposited for royalty years 1999 through 2003. In that motion, the parties designated specific