

remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving other types of entry either are adversely affecting it or likely to do so. For background, see *Certain Devices for Connecting Computers via Telephone Lines*, Inv. No. 337-TA-360, USITC Pub. No. 2843 (December 1994) (Commission Opinion).

If the Commission contemplates some form of remedy, it must consider the effects of that remedy upon the public interest. The factors the Commission will consider include the effect that an exclusion order and/or a cease and desist order would have on (1) the public health and welfare, (2) competitive conditions in the U.S. economy, (3) U.S. production of articles that are like or directly competitive with those that are subject to investigation, and (4) U.S. consumers. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving written submissions that address the aforementioned public interest factors in the context of this investigation.

If the Commission orders some form of remedy, the U.S. Trade Representative, as delegated by the President, has 60 days to approve or disapprove the Commission's action. See Presidential Memorandum of July 21, 2005, 70 FR 43251 (July 26, 2005). During this period, the subject articles would be entitled to enter the United States under bond, in an amount determined by the Commission and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commission is therefore interested in receiving submissions concerning the amount of the bond that should be imposed if a remedy is ordered.

Written Submissions: The parties to the investigation are requested to file written submissions on the issues identified in this notice. Parties to the investigation, interested government agencies, and any other interested parties are encouraged to file written submissions on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. Such submissions should address the recommended determination by the ALJ on remedy and bonding. The complainants are also requested to submit proposed remedial orders for the Commission's consideration. The complainants are also requested to state the date that the '540 patent expires and the HTSUS numbers under which the accused products are imported. The entirety of the parties' written

submissions must not exceed 50 pages, and must be filed no later than close of business on April 22, 2014. Reply submissions must not exceed 25 pages, and must be filed no later than the close of business on April 29, 2014. No further submissions on these issues will be permitted unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

Persons filing written submissions must file the original document electronically on or before the deadlines stated above and submit 8 true paper copies to the Office of the Secretary by noon the next day pursuant to section 210.4(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 210.4(f)). Submissions should refer to the investigation number ("Inv. No. 337-TA-872") in a prominent place on the cover page and/or the first page. (See Handbook for Electronic Filing Procedures, http://www.usitc.gov/secretary/fed_reg_notices/rules/handbook_on_electronic_filing.pdf). Persons with questions regarding filing should contact the Secretary (202-205-2000).

Any person desiring to submit a document to the Commission in confidence must request confidential treatment. All such requests should be directed to the Secretary to the Commission and must include a full statement of the reasons why the Commission should grant such treatment. See 19 CFR 201.6. Documents for which confidential treatment by the Commission is properly sought will be treated accordingly. A redacted non-confidential version of the document must also be filed simultaneously with the any confidential filing. All non-confidential written submissions will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Secretary and on EDIS.

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).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: April 8, 2014.

Lisa R. Barton,

Acting Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2014-08298 Filed 4-11-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Meeting of the Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: The Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure will hold a two-day meeting. The meeting will be open to public observation but not participation.

DATES: May 29-30, 2014.

Time: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, Meacham Conference Center, One Columbus Circle NE., Washington, DC 20544.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan C. Rose, Rules Committee Secretary, Rules Committee Support Office, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, DC 20544, telephone (202) 502-1820.

Dated: April 9, 2014.

Jonathan C. Rose,

Rules Committee Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2014-08350 Filed 4-11-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Proposed Settlement Agreement Under the Federal Debt Collection Procedures Act, Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and Other Statutes

On April 3, 2014, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed settlement agreement (the "Settlement Agreement") with the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York 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 parties to the proposed Settlement Agreement are Anadarko Petroleum Corp., Kerr McGee Corporation, and six related entities (the "Defendants"), the United States, and the Anadarko Litigation Trust. The Settlement Agreement provides for \$5.15 billion dollars plus interest 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, including the Federal Debt Collection Procedures Act, the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation, and Liability Act and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and for common law claims derivative of Tronox's claims against Defendants, 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 fund clean-up or pay for past or future environmental costs or natural resource damages at numerous sites around the county. Among the sites at issue are the following:

The Mobile Pigment Complex, Mobile, AL
 The former Petroleum Terminal Site, Birmingham, AL
 The Jacksonville AgChem Site, Jacksonville, FL
 The former titanium dioxide plant in Savannah, GA
 The Soda Springs Vanadium Plant, Soda Springs, ID
 The Kress Creek and Residential Areas Sites, W. Chicago, IL
 The Rare Earths Facility, W. Chicago, IL
 The Lindsay Light Thorium Sites, Chicago, IL
 The former wood treating facility, Madison, IL
 The former wood treating facility, Indianapolis, IN
 The former wood treating facility, Bossier City, LA
 The Calhoun Gas Plant Site, Calhoun, LA
 The Fireworks Site, Hanover, MA
 The former wood treating facility, Kansas City, MO
 The former wood treating facility, Springfield, MO
 The former wood treating facility, Columbus, MS

The former wood treating facility, Hattiesburg, MS
 The Navassa wood treating Site, Wilmington, NC
 The former Federal Creosote facility, Manville, NJ
 The Welsbach Gas and Mantle Site, Camden, NJ
 The Henderson Facility, Henderson, NV
 The former wood treating facility, Rome, NY
 The Toledo Tie Site, Toledo, OH
 The former nuclear fuels facility, Cimarron, OK
 The Cleveland Refinery Site, Cleveland, OK
 The Cushing Refinery Sites, Cushing, OK
 The White King/Lucky Lass mine site, Lakeview, OR
 The former wood treating facility, Avoca, PA
 The Corpus Christi Petrol Terminal Site, CC, TX
 The former wood treating facility, Texarkana, TX
 The Riley Pass Mine Site, Harding County, SD
 More than 50 former uranium mines and mills, including Shiprock, Churchrock, and Ambrosia Lake on and in the vicinity of Navajo Nation, NM, AZ
 The former Moss American Site, Milwaukee, WI
 More than 1800 current and former service stations in twenty-four states.

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 *Tronox and United States v. Anadarko Petroleum Corp.*, D.J. Ref. No. 90-11-3-09688. 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:

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

Under section 7003(d) of RCRA, a commenter may request an opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area.

During the public comment period, the Settlement Agreement may be examined and downloaded at a Justice Department Web site: http://www.usdoj.gov/enrd/Consent_Decrees.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.

Robert E. Maher Jr.,

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

[FR Doc. 2014-08324 Filed 4-11-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Vincent G. Colosimo, D.M.D.; Decision and Order

On February 27, 2013, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, issued an Order to Show Cause to Vincent G. Colosimo, D.M.D. (hereinafter, Applicant). GX 1. The Show Cause Order proposed the denial of Applicant's application for a DEA Certificate of Registration as a practitioner, on the ground that his "registration would be inconsistent with the public interest." *Id.* at 1 (citing 21 U.S.C. 823(f)).

More specifically, the Show Cause Order alleged that on November 5, 2009, Applicant had surrendered his previous DEA registration, and that on June 20, 2012, Applicant had applied for a new registration at the proposed registered location of Dental Village, 7117 East Broadway Blvd., Tucson, Arizona.¹ *Id.* The Show Cause Order then alleged that on September 8, 2000, DEA Investigators (DIs) had conducted an inspection of Applicant's then-registered location, during which the DIs found approximately 108 dosage units of 7.5/500mg Lortab and 400 dosage units of diazepam 10mg, and that Applicant "told investigators that [he] transported the controlled substances to [his] place of practice in order to dispense [them] to [his] patients before and after procedures," as well as that he had "consumed several dosage units of [the] diazepam . . . upon the

¹ Applicant initially applied for registration at a different address. However, several weeks before the Show Cause Order was issued, he changed the address of his proposed registered location to Dental Village. GX 15.