

place until the completion of the Backcountry Management Plan Final EIS and Record of Decision. Commercial overnight backpacking would not be capped, would continue to occur in all backcountry management zones, and would be managed by commercial use authorizations. Commercial backpacking operators would continue to compete with the non-commercial public for backcountry permits which are limited by use area. River-assisted backcountry travel would continue to be managed with a rule that allows up to five miles of river travel on one backcountry permit. Under the no-action alternative, no additional campsites would be added to the corridor-zone campgrounds to address the bottleneck for overnight users. Under this alternative, overnight backpacking would continue at the level that occurred in 2012, which was 94,277 user nights (one user night is one person in the backcountry for one night). The no-action alternative is required by NEPA as a baseline against which action alternatives can be compared and evaluated.

Common to all action alternatives, NPS proposes an adaptive management process for extended day hiking and running (*i.e.* rim-to-rim day trips), human waste management, use area management, day use at Tuweep, and management of canyoneering and climbing. For example, seasonal day use permits are proposed for rim-to-rim and extended day hiking and running in the cross-canyon corridor in order to collect data and educate visitors. Future adaptive management actions could include limiting group size (*e.g.* 30), limiting overall number of people per day (*e.g.* 250), year-round day use permits, or designating specific days for these activities. Also common to all action alternatives, NPS proposes to authorize the majority of commercial overnight backpacking through longer-term concessions contracts (estimated at 3–5 contracts) instead of the commercial use authorization permits currently used. Commercial use authorizations would continue to be issued for commercial groups conducting three or less trips per year.

Alternative B, the NPS preferred alternative, focuses on providing a variety of recreational activities and a high level of protection for natural and cultural resources and wilderness character. Changes would include a reduction in group size for overnight backpacking, from a maximum of 11 to a maximum of 6, in two of the most remote wilderness zones. Alternative B would manage river-assisted backcountry travel using 31 route-based

river sections and would include development of four additional campsites at Cottonwood Campground in the cross-canyon corridor. Commercially guided services would be limited by zone and would be allowed only in less remote backcountry areas, while the most remote wilderness areas would remain free of guided activities. Commercial overnight backpacking use would be capped, and commercial guides would no longer compete with the non-commercial public for backcountry permits. Overnight use in the popular cross-canyon corridor would increase by approximately 3% (from 53,821 to a projected 55,531 user nights). Overall, overnight use in the backcountry is expected to decrease by 1% (93,116 user nights), primarily as a result of the reduction in group size in two of the wilderness zones.

Alternative C focuses on recreational activities and expanded opportunities for these activities. Group sizes for overnight backpacking would be the same as at present. Alternative C proposes to manage river-assisted backcountry travel using 11 river sections. Up to eight additional campsites would be developed at Indian Garden, Cottonwood Campground and Roaring Springs. Commercially guided services would be allowed in more use areas throughout the backcountry when compared with Alternatives B and D. Commercial overnight backpacking use would be capped. Overnight use in the cross-canyon corridor would increase by approximately 10% (from 53,821 to a projected 59,421 user nights). Overall, overnight use in the backcountry is expected to increase by 5% (99,273 user nights), primarily as a result of the increase in campsites in the corridor zone and designated campsites along backcountry road corridors.

Alternative D, the environmentally preferable alternative, would focus on resource protection and opportunities for solitude. Recreational use would be concentrated in non-wilderness areas and facility improvement would be limited. Group size for overnight backpacking would be reduced, from a maximum of 11 to a maximum of 6, in all backcountry zones except the corridor zone. Commercially guided activities would be focused in non-wilderness zones. Commercial overnight backpacking use would be capped and only allowed in the corridor zone. These actions would allow for self-exploration and increased opportunities for solitude in all wilderness zones. Overnight use in the popular cross-canyon corridor would increase by approximately 2% (from 53,821 to a projected 54,846 user nights). Overall, overnight use in the

backcountry is expected to decrease by 3% (91,405 user nights) primarily from the decrease in group size outside the corridor.

If you wish to comment, you may submit your comments by any one of several methods. You may submit comments online at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/grca>. You may also mail comments to Superintendent, Grand Canyon National Park, PO Box 129, Grand Canyon, AZ 86023. Finally, you may hand-deliver comments to Grand Canyon National Park Headquarters, 20 South Entrance Rd, Grand Canyon, AZ.

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment, including your personal identifying information, may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so. We will make all submission from organizations and businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety.

Dated: November 3, 2015.

Sue E. Masica,

*Regional Director, Intermountain Region,
National Park Service.*

[FR Doc. 2015–30162 Filed 11–25–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–CB–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

[RR02054000, 15XR0687NA,
RX.18527901.3000000]

Central Valley Project Improvement Act Water Management Plans

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation,
Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Reclamation has made available to the public the Water Management Plans for seven entities. For the purpose of this announcement, Water Management Plans (Plans) are considered the same as Water Conservation Plans. Reclamation is publishing this notice in order to allow the public an opportunity to review the Plans and comment on the preliminary determinations.

DATES: Submit written comments on the preliminary determinations on or before December 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Ms. Shanna Hines, Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage Way, MP-410, Sacramento, CA 95825; or via email at shines@usbr.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To be placed on a mailing list for any subsequent information, please contact Ms. Shanna Hines at the email address above or at 916-978-5281 (TDD 978-5608).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: To meet the requirements of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act of 1992 and the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982, the Bureau of Reclamation developed and published the Criteria for Evaluating Water Management Plans (Criteria). Each of the eight entities listed below has developed a Plan that has been evaluated and preliminarily determined to meet the requirements of these Criteria. The following Plans are available for review:

- Bella Vista Water District
- Clear Creek Community Services District
- City of Shasta Lake
- Fresno Irrigation District
- Orland Artois Water District
- Santa Barbara County Water Agency
- Santa Ynez River Community District, Improvement District No. 1

We are inviting the public to comment on our preliminary (*i.e.*, draft) determination of Plan adequacy. Section 3405(e) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (Title 34 Pub. L. 102-575), requires the Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer an office on Central Valley Project water conservation best management practices that shall “develop criteria for evaluating the adequacy of all water conservation plans developed by project contractors, including those plans required by Section 210 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982.” Also, according to Section 3405(e)(1), these criteria must be developed “with the purpose of promoting the highest level of water use efficiency reasonably achievable by project contractors using best available cost-effective technology and best management practices.” These criteria state that all parties (Contractors) that contract with Reclamation for water supplies (municipal and industrial contracts over 2,000 acre-feet and agricultural contracts over 2,000 irrigable acres) must prepare a Plan that contains the following information:

1. Description of the District;
2. Inventory of Water Resources;
3. Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Agricultural Contractors;
4. BMPs for Urban Contractors;

5. Plan Implementation;
6. Exemption Process;
7. Regional Criteria; and
8. Five-Year Revisions

Reclamation evaluates Plans based on these criteria. A copy of these Plans will be available for review at Reclamation’s Mid-Pacific Regional Office, 2800 Cottage Way, MP-410, Sacramento, CA 95825. Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review. If you wish to review a copy of these Plans, please contact Ms. Hines.

Public Disclosure

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

Dated: November 2, 2015.

Richard J. Woodley,
Regional Resources Manager, Mid-Pacific Region, Bureau of Reclamation.

[FR Doc. 2015-30227 Filed 11-25-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4332-90-P-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 701-TA-525 and 731-TA-1260-1261 (Final)]

Certain Welded Line Pipe From Korea and Turkey

Determinations

On the basis of the record ¹ developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (“Commission”) determines, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930 (“the Act”), that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of certain welded line pipe from Korea and Turkey, provided for in subheadings 7305.11, 7305.12, 7305.19, and 7306.19, that have been found by the Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (“LTFV”), and that have been found by Commerce to be subsidized by the government of Turkey.

¹ The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

Background

The Commission, pursuant to sections 705(b) and 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b) and 19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)), instituted these investigations effective October 16, 2014, following receipt of a petition filed with the Commission and Commerce by American Cast Iron Pipe Company, Birmingham, Alabama; EnergeX, a division of JMC Steel Group, Chicago, Illinois; Maverick Tube Corporation, Houston, Texas; Northwest Pipe Company, Vancouver, Washington; Stupp Corporation, Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Tex-Tube Company, Houston, Texas; TMK IPSCO, Houston, Texas; and Welspun Tubular LLC USA, Little Rock, Arkansas. The final phase of the investigations was scheduled by the Commission following notification of preliminary determinations by Commerce that imports of certain welded line pipe from Korea and Turkey were dumped within the meaning of 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b(b)) and preliminary determination by Commerce that imports of certain welded line pipe from Turkey were subsidized within the meaning of section 703(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1671b(b)). Notice of the scheduling of the final phase of the Commission’s investigations and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** on June 12, 2015 (80 FR 33554). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on October 6, 2015, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission made these determinations pursuant to sections 705(b) and 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671d(b) and 19 U.S.C. 1673d(b)). It completed and filed its determinations in these investigations on November 20, 2015. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 4580 (November 2015), entitled *Certain Welded Line Pipe from Korea and Turkey: Investigation Nos. 701-TA-525 and 731-TA-1260-1261 (Final)*.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: November 20, 2015.

Lisa R. Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2015-30113 Filed 11-25-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P