

- survey and subdivision of sections, accepted August 5, 2015.
- T. 15 S., R. 3 E., dependent resurvey and metes-and-bounds survey, accepted August 5, 2015.
- T. 10 S., R. 14 E., supplemental plat of the SW 1/4 of the SW 1/4 of section 4, accepted August 20, 2015.
- T. 10 S., R. 14 E., supplemental plat of the SE 1/4 of section 15 and the NW 1/4 of the NW 1/4 of section 23, accepted August 20, 2015.

**Authority:** 43 U.S.C., Chapter 3.

Dated: August 28, 2015.

**Lance J. Bishop,**

*Chief Cadastral Surveyor, California.*

[FR Doc. 2015-23134 Filed 9-14-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-40-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

[NPS-PWR-PWRO-18359;PX.P0206452B.00.1]

#### Record of Decision for Wilderness Stewardship Plan, Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, Fresno and Tulare Counties, California

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

**SUMMARY:** The National Park Service (NPS) has prepared and approved a Record of Decision for the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Wilderness Stewardship Plan (WSP) for Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks. Approval of the WSP culminates an extensive public engagement and environmental impact analysis effort that began in 2009. The legally required thirty-day no-action "wait period" was initiated on April 3, 2015, with the Environmental Protection Agency's **Federal Register** publication of the filing of the Final EIS.

**ADDRESSES:** Those wishing to review the Record of Decision may obtain a copy by submitting their request to the Superintendent, Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, 47050 Generals Highway, Three Rivers, CA 93271.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Woody Smeck, Superintendent, (559) 565-3100.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On April 26, 2011, a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS for the WSP was published in the **Federal Register**. The NPS developed the WSP/EIS with substantial input and participation from the public. The park hosted 16 public meetings and presentations (including one webinar) and received over 1,300 written public comments throughout the public scoping period and public review of the

Draft WSP/EIS (released for sixty-day review period on July 1, 2014). The NPS consulted with park partners; traditionally associated American Indian tribes and groups; the State Historic Preservation Officer; and other federal and state agencies. The U.S. Forest Service was a cooperating agency in the planning process.

The Final WSP/EIS (released on April 3, 2015) evaluated the environmental consequences of four action alternatives and a no-action alternative. These alternatives described five different ways to provide appropriate types and levels of access for visitors and authorized users, preserve wilderness character, protect cultural and natural resources, and adhere to legally required management and preservation objectives.

Alternative 2, the management-preferred alternative, has been selected for implementation. It provides a targeted approach to preserving wilderness character by focusing on those areas where conditions warrant management actions. Alternative 2 allows for current types and levels of use, and builds on existing management practices to protect wilderness character and the natural and cultural resources in the parks. The goal of Alternative 2 is to encourage wilderness use and minimize restrictions while preserving wilderness character. Alternative 2 recommends a 691-mile designated trail system (mirrors current conditions), of which 650 miles (95 percent) are open to stock. Approximately 41 miles of trails are closed to stock for visitor safety and protection of natural and cultural resources. Meadows in areas open to stock are available for grazing under a meadow management program with limited exceptions. Seven meadows are closed to grazing along the Pacific Crest Trail and High Sierra Trail to protect scenery for public enjoyment.

Dated: September 1, 2015.

**Martha J. Lee,**

*Acting Regional Director, Pacific West Region.*

[FR Doc. 2015-23170 Filed 9-14-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312-FF-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Reclamation

[15XR5173F7, RR02142500, RX.12056050.0000004]

#### Notice of Availability for the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the North Valley Regional Recycled Water Program

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Bureau of Reclamation has made available the North Valley Regional Recycled Water Program Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The North Valley Regional Recycled Water Program would provide recycled water from the Cities of Turlock and Modesto via the Central Valley Project's Delta-Mendota Canal to Del Puerto Water District for irrigation purposes, and would further provide annual supplemental water to south of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta Central Valley Project Improvement Act-designated wildlife refuges.

**DATES:** The Bureau of Reclamation will not make a decision on the proposed action until at least 30 days after release of the Final EIS. After the 30-day waiting period, Reclamation will complete a Record of Decision (ROD). The ROD will state the action that will be implemented and will discuss all factors leading to the decision.

**ADDRESSES:** To request a compact disc of the Final EIS, please contact Ms. Rain Emerson, Bureau of Reclamation, 1243 N Street, Fresno, California 93721; telephone at (559) 487-5196; or via email at [remerson@usbr.gov](mailto:remerson@usbr.gov).

The Final EIS may be viewed at the Bureau of Reclamation's Web site at [http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa\\_projdetails.cfm?Project\\_ID=17241](http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa_projdetails.cfm?Project_ID=17241), or at the following locations:

1. Bureau of Reclamation, South-Central California Area Office, 1243 N Street, Fresno, CA 93721.
2. Natural Resources Library, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1849 C Street NW., Main Interior Building, Washington, DC 20240-0001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Rain Emerson, Supervisory Natural Resources Specialist, Bureau of Reclamation, via email at [remerson@usbr.gov](mailto:remerson@usbr.gov), or at (559) 487-5196; or Mr. Scott Taylor, Repayment Specialist, Bureau of Reclamation, via email at [staylor@usbr.gov](mailto:staylor@usbr.gov), or at (559) 487-5504.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Del Puerto Water District (Del Puerto WD) and the Cities of Turlock and Modesto

propose to implement a regional solution to address water supply shortages within Del Puerto WD's service area on the west side of the San Joaquin River in San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Merced Counties. Specifically, the project proposes to deliver up to 59,000 acre-feet per year by 2045 of recycled water produced by the cities to the Delta Mendota Canal (DMC). After introduction to the DMC, the recycled water would be conveyed to Del Puerto WD customers, to the Central Valley Project Improvement Act-designated refuges or to San Luis Reservoir for storage, depending on time of year and water demand. The Final EIS assesses the environmental effects of four alternatives being considered, which are described below. In each case (except for the No Action Alternative), operational exchanges with the Bureau of Reclamation may be necessary in order to balance seasonal supply and demand.

Under Alternative 1, the Combined Alignment Alternative, a new pipe would be constructed to deliver treated water from Turlock's facilities to the city of Modesto's pumping plant. From there, a pipeline would be constructed to deliver the combined water from both cities west, underneath the San Joaquin River. The pipeline would end at a new discharge structure on the DMC. The DMC would then be used to convey water to downstream users.

Alternative 2, the Separate Alignment Alternative, is similar to Alternative 1, except that separate pipelines would be constructed from the Modesto and Turlock water treatment facilities. There would be two crossings underneath the San Joaquin River, and two new discharge structures on the DMC.

Under Alternative 3, the Patterson Irrigation District (PID) Conveyance Alternative, Modesto and Turlock would continue to discharge their treated water to the San Joaquin River. The water would be diverted by PID at their existing intake on the river, which would need to be expanded, delivered to the DMC by way of an expanded PID conveyance system, and discharged to the DMC by way of a new outfall structure. From there, the water would be conveyed to downstream users. This alternative would require an expansion of PID's fish screen facility and a pipeline parallel to PID's main canal to accommodate increased water volume, but no new river crossings.

Alternative 4, the No Action Alternative, represents the state of the environment without implementation of any action alternatives. Modesto and Turlock would continue to discharge their treated municipal water to the San

Joaquin River, and no additional water would be supplied to Del Puerto WD or the Central Valley Project Improvement Act refuges.

A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS/EIR was published in the **Federal Register** on January 9, 2015 (80 FR 1432). The comment period on the Draft EIS/EIR ended on March 10, 2015. The Final EIS contains responses to all comments received and reflects comments and any additional information received during the review period.

#### Public Disclosure

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in any communication, you should be aware that your entire communication—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your communication to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: June 18, 2015.

**Pablo R. Arroyave,**

*Deputy Regional Director, Mid-Pacific Region.*

**Editorial Note:** This document was received for publication by the Office of **Federal Register** on September 10, 2015.

[FR Doc. 2015-23138 Filed 9-14-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4332-90-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decree Under the Clean Air Act

On September 10, 2015, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed Consent Decree with the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina in the lawsuit entitled *United States, et al. v. Duke Energy Corporation*, Civil Case No. 1:00-cv-1262 (M.D.N.C.). Environmental Defense, the North Carolina Sierra Club, and Environment North Carolina (formerly the North Carolina Public Interest Research Group) are co-plaintiffs in the case.

In this civil enforcement action under the federal Clean Air Act ("Act"), the United States and its co-plaintiffs allege that Duke Energy Corporation ("Defendant"), failed to comply with certain requirements of the Act intended to protect air quality at power plants in North Carolina. The complaint seeks injunctive relief and civil penalties for violations of the Clean Air Act's Prevention of Significant Deterioration

("PSD") provisions, 42 U.S.C. 7470-92, and various Clean Air Act implementing regulations. Specifically, the complaint alleges that Defendant failed to obtain appropriate permits and failed to install and operate required pollution control devices to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide ("SO<sub>2</sub>") nitrogen oxides ("NO<sub>x</sub>"), and/or particulate matter ("PM") at electricity generating units at the following North Carolina plants: the Allen and Riverbend plants in Gaston County, the Buck plant in Rowan County, the Cliffside plant in Cleveland and Rutherford Counties, and the Dan River plant in Rockingham County.

The proposed Consent Decree would resolve violations for certain provisions of the Act at Allen Units 1 and 2, Riverbend Units 4, 6, and 7, Buck Units 3, 4, and 5, Cliffside Units 1, 2, 3, and 4, and Dan River Unit 3. Eleven of these thirteen units have been recently shut down, and the proposed settlement would render those retirements a permanent obligation under the Consent Decree. At the remaining units (Allen Units 1 and 2), the proposed Consent Decree requires Defendant to operate pollution controls and meet interim emission limitations prior to permanently retiring the units in 2024. In addition, Duke will retire an additional unit at the Allen plant, and spend \$4,400,000 to fund environmental mitigation projects that will further reduce emissions and benefit communities adversely affected by the pollution from the plants, and pay a civil penalty of \$975,000.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States, et al. v. Duke Energy Corporation*, Civil Case No. 1:00-cv-1262 (M.D.N.C.), D.J. Ref. No. 90-5-2-1-07155. 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 e-mail .....	<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 proposed Consent Decree may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: <http://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees>.