

Commission's public service list were not labeled as containing BPI.

In determining the appropriate action in response to the breach, the Commission considered mitigating factors, including that (1) the breach was unintentional and due to a technical oversight; (2) the attorney had not been found to have breached an APO over the past two years; (3) the attorney took immediate corrective measures upon learning of the disclosure by immediately contacting the Secretary's Office and the recipients of the brief; and (4) the attorney promptly reported the violation to the Commission. The Commission determined that no aggravating factors were present. The Commission issued a private warning letter to the attorney.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 14, 2018.

**Lisa Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2018-17848 Filed 8-17-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—National Fire Protection Association

Notice is hereby given that, on July 31, 2018, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), National Fire Protection Association ("NFPA") has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing additions or changes to its standards development activities. 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, NFPA has provided an updated and current list of its standards development activities, related technical committee and conformity assessment activities. Information concerning NFPA regulations, technical committees, current standards, standards development and conformity assessment activities are publicly available at [nfpa.org](http://nfpa.org).

On September 20, 2004, NFPA 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 October 21, 2004 (69 FR 61869).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 8, 2018. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 25, 2018 (83 FR 24348).

**Suzanne Morris**

*Chief, Premerger and Division Statistics Unit, Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 2018-17899 Filed 8-17-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-11-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—National Spectrum Consortium

Notice is hereby given that, on August 3, 2018, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* ("the Act"), National Spectrum Consortium ("NSC") 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, Numerati Partners, LLC, New York, NY; Avionics Test & Analysis Corporation, Niceville, FL; George Mason University, Fairfax, VA; Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), Reston, VA; Southern Research, Birmingham, AL; Parsons Government Services Inc., Pasadena, CA; Dell Federal Systems, L.P., Round Rock, TX; Sentar, Inc., Huntsville, AL; SCI Technology, Inc., Huntsville, AL; Pacific Star Communications, Inc., Portland, OR; COMINT Consulting LLC, Golden, CO; C6I Services Corp., Chesterfield, NJ; Comtech EF Data, Tempe, AZ; Vision Engineering Solutions, Inc., Merritt Island, FL; Vision Engineering Solutions, Inc., Merritt Island, FL; Comtech Mobile Datacom Corporation, Germantown, MD.; and EFW, Inc., Fort Worth, TX, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Fibertek, Inc., Herndon, VA; and University of Nevada, Reno, VA, have withdrawn 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 NSC intends

to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 24, 2014, NSC 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 November 4, 2014 (72 FR 65424).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 14, 2018. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on June 19, 2018 (83 FR 28449).

**Suzanne Morris,**

*Chief, Premerger and Division Statistics Unit Antitrust Division.*

[FR Doc. 2018-17900 Filed 8-17-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410-11-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

#### Houston Maintenance Clinic; Decision and Order

On September 30, 2016, Administrative Law Judge Charles Wm. Dorman (hereinafter, ALJ) issued Recommended Rulings, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision (hereinafter, R.D.). Only Houston Maintenance Clinic (hereinafter, Respondent) filed exceptions (hereinafter, Resp. Exceptions), and its filing was timely. Having reviewed the entire record, including Resp. Exceptions, and modified the ALJ's R.D., I adopt the modified R.D. and find that none of Resp. Exceptions has merit.

#### Respondent's First Exception

Respondent's first exception states that R.D. "Finding of Fact 40 should be amended to include the first sentence in . . . [Respondent's owner's] letter, GE 27[,] that states as follows[,] 'The facility has kept a systematic ongoing accurate daily dispensing record as required by title 21 C.F.R. 1304.03.'" <sup>1</sup> Resp. Exceptions, at 1. The support Respondent provided for this exception is that, "The daily dosing records . . . are required and these were kept without disruption." *Id.*

First, R.D. Finding of Fact 30, citing GE-27, already states that, "Around the time of the [2006] inspection, . . . [Respondent] kept ongoing, systematic daily dispensing records" [footnote omitted]. Thus, much of the content of the sentence that Respondent's first exception proposes is already found in Finding of Fact 30. Only the assertions that Respondent "has kept . . .

<sup>1</sup> Finding of Fact 40 and, presumably, Respondent's first exception concern the 2006 inspection.