

federal entities for the take of endangered and threatened species, provided the following criteria are met:

1. The taking will be incidental;
2. The applicant will, to the maximum extent practicable, minimize and mitigate the impacts of such taking;
3. The applicant will develop a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and ensure that adequate funding for the HCP will be provided;
4. The taking will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of the survival and recovery of the species in the wild; and
5. Any other measures that the Service may require as being necessary or appropriate for the purposes of the HCP to be met.

Proposed Action

The proposed action is the issuance of an ITP for listed and sensitive species for SRP's operation of Roosevelt, pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. SRP will develop and implement the RHCP, as required by section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act. The RHCP will provide measures to minimize and mitigate the effects of the proposed taking on listed and sensitive species and their habitats. The biological goal of the RHCP is to ensure that any take of listed species will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of the survival and recovery of the species.

As proposed, the ITP would enable SRP to continue the operation of Roosevelt to store and release water and to generate power.

SRP is expected to apply for an ITP for the following federally listed and candidate species: southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), and the yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*).

SRP also is seeking to address and cover any other rare and/or sensitive species that may be affected by SRP's operation of Roosevelt. Unlisted species that are addressed as if they were listed, and that are found to be adequately conserved by the RHCP, will be automatically encompassed by the ITP should they be listed as federally threatened or endangered species at some time in the future. Other listed species for which SRP is not seeking permit coverage also may benefit from the conservation measures provided in the RHCP.

Alternatives

Alternatives currently being considered by the Service include the following:

1. *Proposed Action by the Service*—Issuance of an ITP by the Service authorizing the continued operation of Roosevelt by SRP with implementation of the RHCP involving measures to minimize and mitigate the potential take of federally listed species.

2. *No Action by the Service*—No issuance of an ITP by the Service; this would require SRP to do everything within its control to avoid any take of federally listed species associated with its continued operation of Roosevelt.

3. *Other Section 10 Alternatives*—Issuance of an ITP by the Service for the RHCP involving modifications to operation of Roosevelt and SRP's other reservoirs on the Salt and Verde Rivers along with additional measures to minimize and mitigate the potential take of federally listed species. It is anticipated that the EIS will include one or two reservoir operation alternatives that fall in the range between the Proposed Action and the No Action by the Service.

4. *Section 7 Consultation*—This alternative would involve reinitiation of consultation on Roosevelt under Section 7 of the Act. The Service completed a consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation in 1996 involving the additional reservoir capacity created by construction at Roosevelt.

Additional Information

It is anticipated that SRP will request a permit duration of 50 years. Implementation of the RHCP will result in the establishment of measures that will provide for the conservation of covered species and their habitats in perpetuity. Research and monitoring, in combination with adaptive management, will be used to facilitate accomplishment of these goals.

The Service will conduct an environmental review that analyzes the proposed action, as well as a range of reasonable alternatives and the associated impact of each. The EIS will be the basis for the Service's evaluation of impacts to the species and to the environment, and the range of alternatives to be evaluated. The EIS is expected to provide biological descriptions of species and habitats and the effects of the proposed action on: vegetation, wetlands, wildlife, threatened or endangered species and species of concern, geology and soils, visual resources, air quality, water resources, flood control, water quality, archaeology, historic structures, traditional cultural properties, land use, recreation, hydropower, water use, local economy, and environmental justice.

Comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties to ensure that

a range of issues and alternatives related to the proposed action are identified. The review of this project will be conducted according to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), National Environmental Policy Act Regulations (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), and other appropriate federal laws, regulations, policies and guidance.

Related Project Documentation

It is anticipated that the EIS process will make full use (including incorporation by reference, as appropriate, pursuant to NEPA) of documents prepared by other entities regarding the environmental and socioeconomic issues in the project area, copies of which will be available for public inspection at the office of Mr. John Keane, Executive Environmental Policy Analyst, Salt River Project, P.O. Box 52025, PAB355, Phoenix, AZ 85072–2025 at 602/236–5087.

After the environmental review is completed, the Service will publish a notice of availability and a request for comment on the draft EIS and SRP's permit application, which will include the RHCP.

The draft EIS is expected to be completed by January 2002.

Dated: August 21, 2001.

Bryan Arroyo,

Acting Regional Director, Southwest Region, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

[FR Doc. 01–21743 Filed 8–28–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Notice of Issuance of Permit for Marine Mammals

On May 22, 2001, a notice was published in the **Federal Register** [volume 66] FR (28196), that an application had been filed with the Fish and Wildlife Service by John L. Van Horn, for a permit (PRT–042638) to import one polar bear taken from the McClintock Channel population, Canada in April 2000 for personal use.

Notice is hereby given that on August 2, 2001, as authorized by the provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) the Fish and Wildlife Service authorized the requested permit subject to certain conditions set forth therein.

On May 22, 2001, a notice was published in the **Federal Register** [volume 66] FR (28196), that an application had been filed with the Fish

and Wildlife Service by Danny M. Spindler for a permit (PRT-042635) to import one polar bear taken from the Lancaster Sound population, Canada for personal use.

Notice is hereby given that on August 7, 2001, as authorized by the provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) the Fish and Wildlife Service authorized the requested permit subject to certain conditions set forth therein.

On June 6, 2001, a notice was published in the **Federal Register** [volume 66] FR (30476), that an application had been filed with the Fish and Wildlife Service by Charles F. Mervar for a permit (PRT-043244) to import one polar bear taken from the Lancaster Sound population, Canada for personal use.

Notice is hereby given that July 30, 2001, as authorized by the provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) the Fish and Wildlife Service authorized the requested permit subject to certain conditions set forth therein.

Documents and other information submitted for these applications are available for review by any party who submits a written request to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Management Authority, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 700, Arlington, Virginia 22203, telephone (703) 358-2104 or fax (703) 358-2281.

Dated: August 17, 2001.

Anna Barry,

Senior Permit Biologist, Branch of Permits, Division of Management Authority.

[FR Doc. 01-21767 Filed 8-28-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 731-TA-951-952 (Preliminary)]

Blast Furnace Coke From China and Japan

Determinations

On the basis of the record¹ developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines,² pursuant to section 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673b(a)) (the Act), that there is no reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is

materially injured or threatened with material injury, or that the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports from China and Japan of blast furnace coke, provided for in subheading 2704.00.0025 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV).

Background

On June 29, 2001, a petition was filed with the Commission and the United States Department of Commerce (Commerce) by the Committee for Fair Coke Trade,³ and the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, Pittsburgh, PA, alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of LTFV imports of blast furnace coke from China and Japan. Accordingly, effective June 29, 2001, the Commission instituted antidumping duty investigations Nos. 731-TA-951-952 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigations and of a public conference 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** of July 6, 2001 (66 FR 35669). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on July 20, 2001, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these investigations to the Secretary of Commerce on August 13, 2001. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3444 (August 2001), entitled *Blast Furnace Coke From China and Japan: Investigations Nos. 731-TA-951-952 (Preliminary)*.

Issued: August 24, 2001.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-21801 Filed 8-28-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. NAFTA-312-1]

Certain Steel Wire Rod

Determination

On the basis of the information in the investigation, the Commission determines¹ that a surge in imports of certain steel wire rod from Canada and Mexico, respectively, undermines the effectiveness of the import relief on wire rod provided for in Presidential Proclamation 7273 of February 16, 2000.

Background

Following receipt of a request filed on July 24, 2001, on behalf of Co-Steel Raritan, GS Industries, Inc., Keystone Steel & Wire Company, and North Star Steel Texas Inc., the Commission instituted investigation No. NAFTA-312-1 under section 312(c)(2) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3372(c)(2)) to determine whether a surge in U.S. imports of certain steel wire rod from Canada and/or Mexico undermines the effectiveness of the import relief on wire rod provided for in Presidential Proclamation 7273 of February 16, 2000 (65 FR 8624, February 18, 2000).

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigation and of the scheduling of a staff conference 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** of August 3, 2001 (66 F.R. 40722). The staff conference was held in Washington, DC, on August 8, 2001; all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission submitted its findings to the President on August 23, 2001, and will transmit its written views to the President on September 7, 2001.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: August 24, 2001.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 01-21800 Filed 8-28-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

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

² Commissioners Lynn M. Bragg and Marcia E. Miller dissenting. Vice Chairman Deanna Tanner Okun not participating.

³ Members of the committee are: Acme Steel Co., Chicago, IL; DTE Energy Services Inc., Ann Arbor, MI; Koppers Industries, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA; and Shenango Inc., Pittsburgh, PA.

¹ Vice Chairman Okun and Commissioner Hillman dissenting.