

Pursuant to section 60.13 of 36 CFR part 60, written comments are being accepted concerning the significance of the nominated properties under the National Register criteria for evaluation. Comments may be forwarded by United States Postal Service, to the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, 1849 C St. NW., MS 2280, Washington, DC 20240; by all other carriers, National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, 1201 Eye St. NW., 8th floor, Washington, DC 20005; or by fax, 202-371-6447. Written or faxed comments should be submitted by September 2, 2014. 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.

Dated: July 25, 2014.

Paul Lusignan,

Acting Chief, National Register of Historic Places/, National Historic Landmarks Program.

DELAWARE

Sussex County

Adams Home Farm, 15293 Adams Rd., Greenwood, 14000532

GEORGIA

Chatham County

Kensington Park—Groveland Historic District, Roughly bounded by DeRenne & Waters Aves., Abercorn & Johnston Sts., Chatham, 14000533

NEW JERSEY

Burlington County

Bordentown Historic District (Boundary Increase), 1 Spring St., Bordentown, 14000534

Hudson County

Hoboken Free Public Library and Manual Training School, 500 Park Ave., Hoboken, 14000535

Monmouth County

Asbury Park Commercial Historic District, Roughly bounded by 500, 600, 700 blks., of Bond St., Cookman & Mattison Aves. between Lake & Bangs Aves., Asbury Park, 14000536

NEW YORK

Monroe County

First Unitarian Church, 220 Winton Rd. S., Rochester, 14000537

Nassau County

Barstow, William, Mansion, 300 Steamboat Rd., Kings Point, 14000539
United States Merchant Marine Academy, 300 Steamboat Rd., Kings Point, 14000538

Suffolk County

Mollenhauer, John, House, 60 Awixa Ave., Bay Shore, 14000540

Wayne County

Lapham, Ambrose S., House, 352 W. Jackson St., Palmyra, 14000541

Westchester County

Glenwolde Park Historic District, Glenwolde Park, Walter St. & Willowbrook Ave., Tarrytown, 14000542
Metropolitan Life Insurance Company Hall of Records, 759 Palmer Rd., Yonkers, 14000543

NORTH CAROLINA

Buncombe County

West Asheville—Aycok School Historic District (Boundary Increase), 444 Haywood Rd., Asheville, 14000544

Jackson County

Downtown Sylva Historic District, Roughly bounded by Southern RR., Main, Landis & Jackson Sts., Sylva, 14000545

OHIO

Lucas County

St. Clair Street Historic District (Boundary Increase—Decrease), 28 N. St Clair, 23-29 & 31 Summit, Toledo, 14000546

Montgomery County

Weustoff and Getz Company, 210 Wayne Ave., Dayton, 14000547

Summit County

Longwood Manor, 1634 E. Aurora Rd., Macedonia, 14000548

SOUTH CAROLINA

Greenville County

Brandon Mill, 25 Draper St., Greenville, 14000317

TEXAS

Travis County

Rosewood Courts Historic District, Roughly bounded by Rosewood Ave., Chicon & Poquito Sts., Austin, 14000549

VIRGINIA

Staunton Independent city

Washington, Booker T., High School, 1114 W. Johnson St., Staunton (Independent City), 14000550

[FR Doc. 2014-19325 Filed 8-14-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-51-P

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

United States Section; Notice of Availability of a Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for Flood Control Improvements to the Rio Grande Canalization Project in Vado, New Mexico

AGENCY: United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC), United States and Mexico.

ACTION: Notice of Availability of Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; the Council on Environmental Quality Final Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500 through 1508); and the USIBWC's Operational Procedures for Implementing Section 102 of NEPA, published in the **Federal Register** September 2, 1981, (46 FR 44083); the USIBWC hereby gives notice that the Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for *Flood Control Improvements to the Rio Grande Canalization Project in Vado, New Mexico* are available.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gilbert Anaya, Environmental Management Division; United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission; 4171 N. Mesa, C-100; El Paso, Texas 79902. Telephone: (915) 832-4703, email: gilbert.anaya@ibwc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Proposed Action

The USIBWC is considering relocating the Rio Grande river channel in the Canalization Project Levee System in a 1.08 mile stretch in Vado, New Mexico and create new levees where no flood control measures exist in an effort to meet current flood control requirements. The Preferred Alternative would relocate the river channel approximately 100 feet west due to the river channel moving east against the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad. The preferred alternative would then create a new levee that would tie into existing levee structures to the north and south of the project area. These improvements will be subject to availability of funds.

The Supplemental Environmental Assessment assesses potential environmental impacts of the No Action Alternative and the Preferred

Alternative. Two additional alternatives were considered but were not evaluated as they were determined to be more costly, more difficult to achieve, less reliable, and more difficult to maintain. Potential impacts on natural, cultural, and other resources were evaluated. A Finding of No Significant Impact was issued for the Preferred Alternative based on a review of the facts and analyses contained in the Supplemental Environmental Assessment when taking the proposed mitigation into account.

Alternatives Considered

A No Action Alternative was evaluated for the flood control improvements to the Rio Grande Canalization Project Levee System. This alternative would retain the existing configuration of the system, and the level of protection currently associated with this system. Under severe storm events, current containment capacity may be insufficient to fully control Rio Grande flooding, with risks to personal safety and potential property damage, as well as risks to the railroad system.

Design alternatives were conducted and evaluated in the final design memorandum entitled “*Rehabilitation Improvements for the Vado East Levee, Doña Ana County, New Mexico*,” dated July 29, 2011. The final design memorandum evaluated three alternatives as described below.

Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would allow the levees to meet the design criteria to contain flood flows and to comply with FEMA specifications for the levees in the Rio Grande Canalization Project Levee System. This would be accomplished by creating a flood containment levee 1.08 miles in length that would continue from the current levee system to the north and south of the project area. Fill material, obtained from commercial sources would be used to create a levee to meet the 3 foot freeboard criterion established by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). In order to create the levee in this area, the river channel would have to be relocated 100 feet to the west and the floodplain would have to be re-established on the eastern side of the river.

Flood Wall Alternative. This alternative would construct a flood wall that would tie into the existing levee system to the north and south of the project. The flood wall would require dredging the river channel along the section that is currently against the railroad easement and construction of a concrete or metal wall that would extend 888 feet along the river and existing flood plain to the current levees. The wall would be 8 feet tall

above the flood plain and require pilings to be driven 40 feet in the ground.

Sheet Pile Wall Alternative. This alternative would construct a sheet pile wall instead of the flood wall. This wall would follow the same requirements but would consist of interlocked metal sheets driven into the ground instead of a concrete wall. Therefore, the pilings would also have to be driven 40 feet into the ground but would instead of a few like in the flood wall; all of the pilings across the entire length would have to be driven down to bedrock.

Availability

Single hard copies of the Final Supplemental Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact may be obtained by request at the above address. Electronic copies may also be obtained from the USIBWC Web page: www.ibwc.gov/Organization/Environmental/EIS_EA_Public_Comment.html.

Rebecca Rizutti,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2014–19373 Filed 8–14–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7010-01-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–1022 (Second Review)]

Refined Brown Aluminum Oxide From China; Scheduling of an Expedited Five-Year Review

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of an expedited review pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(3)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty order on refined brown aluminum oxide from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. For further information concerning the conduct of this review and rules of general application, consult the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

DATES: Effective Date: May 9, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Messer (202–205–3193), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW.,

Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter 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 (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this review may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background.—On May 9, 2014, the Commission determined that the domestic interested party group response to its notice of institution (79 FR 6225, February 3, 2014) of the subject five-year review was adequate and that the respondent interested party group response was inadequate. The Commission did not find any other circumstances that would warrant conducting a full review.¹ Accordingly, the Commission determined that it would conduct an expedited review pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Act.

Staff report.—A staff report containing information concerning the subject matter of the review will be placed in the nonpublic record on August 29, 2014, and made available to persons on the Administrative Protective Order service list for this review. A public version will be issued thereafter, pursuant to section 207.62(d)(4) of the Commission’s rules.

Written submissions.—As provided in section 207.62(d) of the Commission’s rules, interested parties that are parties to the review and that have provided individually adequate responses to the notice of institution,² and any party other than an interested party to the review may file written comments with the Secretary on what determination the Commission should reach in the review. Comments are due on or before September 4, 2014, and may not contain new factual information. Any person that is neither a party to the five-year review nor an interested party may submit a brief written statement (which shall not contain any new factual

¹ A record of the Commissioners’ votes, the Commission’s statement on adequacy, and any individual Commissioner’s statements will be available from the Office of the Secretary and at the Commission’s Web site.

² The Commission has found the responses submitted by C–E Minerals, Inc.; Imerys Fused Minerals Niagara Falls, Inc.; US Electrofused Minerals, Inc.; and Washington Mills Co., Inc. to be individually adequate. Comments from other interested parties will not be accepted (*see* 19 CFR 207.62(d)(2)).