extended the release of augmentation flows on an emergency basis for a longer duration (and higher magnitude) than in prior years based on the emergency criteria established for the releases. In 2014 the total volume released was 64 TAF. As in prior years of implementing flow augmentation, and despite the unprecedented high incidence of infection, no significant mortalities of fish occurred. In 2014 due to the rapid worsening of conditions in the lower Klamath River and the documented occurrence of disease, NEPA compliance was implemented through the ''Emergency'' provisions as identified by the Council of Environmental Quality.

In response to the need to provide augmentation flows in several of the past years, and the indication that such flows will be needed in future years, Reclamation committed to developing a long-term plan to address this need along with the appropriate NEPA compliance. Reclamation has determined an EIS is the appropriate level of NEPA compliance for the Long-Term Plan, and will serve as the Lead Agency.

**Additional Information**

The purpose of the scoping process is to solicit early input from the public regarding the development of reasonable alternatives and potential environmental impacts to be addressed in the EIS for the lower Klamath River Long-Term Plan. Written comments are requested to help identify alternatives and issues that should be analyzed in the EIS. Federal, State and local agencies, Tribes, and the general public are invited to participate in the environmental review process.

**Special Assistance for Public Scoping Meetings**

Requests for sign language interpretation for the hearing impaired and all other special assistance needs to participate in the meetings may be submitted by any of the following methods at least five working days before the meeting:

- *Email to:* Mr. Paul Zedonis, *sha-slo-klamath-LTP@usbr.gov*.
- *U.S. Mail to:* Mr. Paul Zedonis, Northern California Area Office, Bureau of Reclamation, 16349 Shasta Dam Boulevard, Shasta Lake, CA 96019.
- *Telephone:* Mr. Paul Zedonis, 530–275–1554.

**Public Disclosure**

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: June 12, 2015.

**Pablo R. Arroyave,**

*Deputy Regional Director, Mid-Pacific Region.*

[FR Doc. 2015–17208 Filed 7–13–15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4332–90–P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

**[USITC SE–15–021]**

### Government in the Sunshine Act Meeting Notice; Change of Time to Government in the Sunshine Meeting

**AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING:** United States International Trade Commission.

**DATE:** July 16, 2015.

**ORIGINAL TIME:** 2 p.m.

**NEW TIME:** 3 p.m.

**PLACE:** Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205–2000.

**STATUS:** Open to the public.

In accordance with 19 CFR 201.35(d)(2)(i), the Commission hereby gives notice that the Commission has determined to change the time of the meeting of July 16, 2015, from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting. Earlier notification of this change was not possible.

By order of the Commission.
Issued: July 10, 2015.

**Lisa R. Barton,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2015–17378 Filed 7–10–15; 4:30 pm]

**BILLING CODE 7020–02–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

**[Docket No. 09–62]**

### Odette L. Campbell, M.D.; Decision and Order

On October 26, 2010, an Agency Administrative Law Judge issued the attached Recommended Decision.[1] Therein, the ALJ rejected, as unsupported by substantial evidence, the Government's allegations that: (1) Respondent had unlawfully prescribed methadone to a patient for the purpose of treating the patient's opioid addiction; (2) Respondent had issued a controlled substance prescription to an employee for the purpose of obtaining the controlled substance for her own use; and (3) Respondent could not account for 13 bottles or 390 dosage units of Suboxone. R.D., at 32–43.

However, the ALJ also found that the Government had proved several allegations. These included that: (1) Respondent possessed controlled substances at an unregistered location when she moved her office without obtaining a modification of her registration; (2) Respondent occasionally allowed patients to return controlled substances to her if they did not like the medication or had an adverse reaction to it; and (3) Respondent failed to keep required records (including DEA Form-222s) for her receipts of Demerol, a schedule II controlled substance, as well as both inventories and dispensing logs for Ambien (zolpidem) and Provigil (modafinil), both being schedule IV controlled substances.[2] *Id.* at 30–32; 44; 46–49.

With respect to the latter finding, the ALJ noted that while recordkeeping violations alone can support an order of revocation, Respondent's violations ''occurred over a comparatively short period of time, with substantially fewer controlled substances [than in those cases where revocation was ordered], and with no evidence of actual diversion of any controlled substances.'' *Id.* at 52. The ALJ thus concluded that while ''Respondent's errors and conduct clearly were neglectful and serious during the relevant time period,'' he then reasoned that they were ''likely due in part to ongoing issues including eviction from her registered office, employee problems, and an office break-in and theft'' and that an order of revocation would be disproportionate to the misconduct which was proved. *Id.*

[1] All citations to the Recommended Decision are to the slip opinion as issued by the ALJ.

[2] The ALJ also noted that ''the evidence indicates that Respondent did not follow adequate security procedures'' in that the controlled substance were not stored ''in a securely locked, substantially constructed cabinet'' and ''Respondent did not maintain control over the key.'' R.D. at 45. However, the ALJ declined to consider the evidence on the ground that the Government did not provide adequate notice in either the Show Cause Order or its Prehearing Statement, notwithstanding that Respondent did not object to the testimony. While the record arguably support a finding that the issue was litigated by consent, *see CBS Wholesale Distributors,* 74 FR 36746, 36750 (2009), the Government did not take exception to the ALJ's ruling. I therefore do not consider the evidence.