

magnitudes to reduce sediment transport and erosion given the reduced sand supply downstream of the dam. Peak flows would be provided in May and June, which corresponds well with the timing of the pre-dam peak. The overall peak flow in an 8.23 maf year would be 20,000 cfs (scaled proportionately in drier and wetter years), and would include a 24 hour 45,000 cfs flow at the beginning of the spring peak period (e.g., on May 1) if there was no triggered spring HFE in same year, and a 168 hour (7 day) 25,000 cfs flow at the end of June. Following this peak, there would be a rapid drop to the summer base flow. The initial annual 45,000 cfs flow would serve to store sediment above the flows of the remainder of the peak, thus limiting sand transport further downstream and helping to conserve sandbars. The variability in flows within the peak would also serve to water higher elevation vegetation. There would be no within-day fluctuations in flow under Alternative F.

Low base flows would be provided from July through January. These low flows would provide for warmer water temperatures, especially in years when releases are warm, and would also serve to reduce overall sand transport during the remainder of the year.

Other than testing the effectiveness of sediment-triggered HFEs, which would continue through the entire LTEMP period, there would be no explicit experimental or condition-dependent triggered actions under Alternative F.

### Alternative G

The objective of Alternative G is to maximize the conservation of sediment, in order to maintain and increase sandbar size. Under Alternative G, flows would be delivered in a steady pattern throughout the year with no monthly differences in flow other than those needed to adjust operations in response to changes in forecast and other operating requirements such as equalization. In an 8.23 maf year, steady flow would be approximately 11,400 cfs.

Experimentation under Alternative G includes testing the effects of the following actions: (1) Sediment-triggered spring and fall HFEs through the entire 20-year LTEMP period, (2) 24-hour proactive spring HFEs in high volume years ( $\geq 10$  maf release volume), (3) extension of the duration of up to 45,000 cfs fall HFEs for as many as 250 hours depending on sediment availability, (4) mechanical removal of trout near the Little Colorado River confluence, and (5) trout management flows.

### Locations To Inspect Copies of the FEIS

Compact disc copies of the FEIS are available for public inspection at the following locations:

- J. Willard Marriott Library, University of Utah, 295 South 1500 East, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112.
- Cline Library, Northern Arizona University, 1001 S. Knoles Drive, Flagstaff, Arizona 86011-6022.
- Burton Barr Central Library, 1221 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.
- Page Public Library, 479 South Lake Powell Boulevard, Page, Arizona 86040.
- Grand County Library, Moab Branch, 257 East Center Street, Moab, Utah 84532.
- Sunrise Library, 5400 East Harris Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89110.
- Denver Public Library, 10 West 14th Avenue Parkway, Denver, Colorado 80204.
- Natural Resources Library, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1849 C Street NW., Main Interior Building, Washington, DC 20240-0001.

Dated: October 3, 2016.

**Thomas M. Iseman,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Water and Science.*

**Michael J. Bean,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks.*

[FR Doc. 2016-24338 Filed 10-6-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4332-90-P; 4312-CB-P**

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337-TA-1023]

#### Certain Memory Modules and Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same; Institution of Investigation

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that a complaint was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission on September 1, 2016, under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, on behalf of Netlist, Inc. of Irvine, California. Supplements to the Complaint were filed on September 22, 2016 and September 23, 2016. The complaint alleges violations of section 337 based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain memory modules and components thereof, and products containing same by reason of

infringement of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,756,364 (“the ‘364 patent”); U.S. Patent No. 8,516,185 (“the ‘185 patent”); U.S. Patent No. 8,001,434 (“the ‘434 patent”); U.S. Patent 8,359,501 (“the ‘501 patent”); U.S. Patent No. 8,689,064 (“the ‘064 patent”); and U.S. Patent 8,489,837 (“the ‘837 patent”). The complaint further alleges that an industry in the United States exists or is in the process of being established as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

The complainant requests that the Commission institute an investigation and, after the investigation, issue a limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders.

**ADDRESSES:** The complaint, except for any confidential information contained therein, is available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Room 112, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at (202) 205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at <https://www.usitc.gov>. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone (202) 205-2560.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

**Authority:** The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in section 210.10 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2016).

*Scope of Investigation:* Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on September 30, 2016, ordered that—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain memory modules and components thereof, and products

containing same by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1–4, 6, 7, 10, 13, 17, and 23 of the '364 patent; claims 1–3, 7, 8, and 10–12 of the '185 patent; claims 2, 3, and 5–7 of the '434 patent; claim 4 of the '501 patent; claim 16 of the '064 patent; and claims 1–3, 5, and 6 of the '837 patent, and whether an industry in the United States exists or is in the process of being established as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337;

(2) Pursuant to Commission Rule 210.50(b)(1), 19 CFR 210.50(b)(1), the presiding administrative law judge shall take evidence or other information and hear arguments from the parties or other interested persons with respect to the public interest in this investigation, as appropriate, and provide the Commission with findings of fact and a recommended determination on this issue, which shall be limited to the statutory public interest factors set forth in 19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(1), (f)(1), (g)(1);

(3) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is:

Netlist, Inc., 175 Technology Drive,  
Suite 150, Irvine, CA 92618

(b) The respondents are the following entities alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

SK hynix Inc., 2091, Gyeongchung-daero, Bupal-eub, Icheon-si,

Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea

SK hynix America Inc., 3101 N. First Street, San Jose, CA 95134

SK hynix memory solutions Inc., 3103 N. First Street, San Jose, CA 95134

(c) The Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436; and

(4) For the investigation so instituted, the Chief Administrative Law Judge, U.S. International Trade Commission, shall designate the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with section 210.13 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(e) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received not later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint and the notice of

investigation will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and this notice, and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to the respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of an exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against the respondent.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: October 3, 2016.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2016–24247 Filed 10–6–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Proposed Agreement and Order Regarding Modification of the Consent Decree With Respect to TESI Under the Clean Water Act

On September 30, 2016, the Department of Justice lodged a proposed *Agreement and Order Regarding Modification of the Consent Decree With Respect to TESI* (“Consent Decree Modification”) with the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana in the lawsuit entitled *United States and the State of Louisiana v. Acadia Woods Add. #2 Sewer Co., et al.*, Civil Action No. 6:98–cv–0687.

In its Second Amended Complaint, the United States alleged claims related to violations of the Clean Water Act and applicable discharge permits at sewage treatment plants in Louisiana owned and operated by Johnson Properties, Inc. and its subsidiaries. Subsequently, the sewage treatment plants were sold to Intervening Defendant Total Environmental Solutions, Inc. (“TESI”). The United States, Louisiana, and TESI agreed to the Consent Decree with Respect to TESI (“the Consent Decree”) which was entered by the Court on December 21, 2000. In the Consent Decree, TESI committed to operate the sewage treatment plants without service interruption and implement compliance measures intended to cause the sewage treatment plants to achieve compliance with the requirements of the CWA and the applicable discharge permits. The

proposed Consent Decree Modification would modify the Consent Decree by requiring TESI to achieve compliance with the requirements of the Clean Water Act and the applicable discharge permits by implementing additional compliance measures. The Modified Consent Decree also specifies procedures and a schedule pursuant to which TESI, after it implements the additional compliance measures, will request removal of STPs from the Modified Consent Decree. Finally, the proposed Consent Decree Modification would revised the stipulated penalty provisions.

The publication of this notice opens a period for public comment on the proposed Consent Decree Modification. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, and should refer to *United States and the State of Louisiana v. Acadia Woods Add. #2 Sewer Co.*, D.J. Ref. No. 90–5–1–1–4375. 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 proposed Consent Decree Modification may be examined and downloaded at this Justice Department Web site: <https://www.justice.gov/enrd/consent-decrees>. We will provide a paper copy of the proposed Consent Decree Modification 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 \$62.75 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the United States Treasury. For a paper copy of the proposed Consent Decree Modification without appendices, the cost is \$8.75.

**Thomas P. Carroll,**

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

[FR Doc. 2016–24258 Filed 10–6–16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4410–15–P**