

ADDRESSES: Persons wishing to review the application, HCP, and EA may obtain a copy by writing the Service's Southeast Regional Office, Atlanta, Georgia. Documents will also be available for public inspection by appointment during normal business hours at the Regional Office, 1875 Century Boulevard, Suite 200, Atlanta, Georgia 30345 (Attn: Endangered Species Permits), or Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Field Office, 6620 Southpoint Drive, South, Suite 310, Jacksonville, Florida 32216-0192. Written data or comments concerning the ITP renewal or HCP should be submitted to the Regional Office. Please reference permit number TE791244-2 in requests of the documents discussed herein.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. David Dell, Regional HCP Coordinator, (see **ADDRESSES** above), telephone: 404/679-7313, facsimile: 404/679-7081; or Ms. Jane Monaghan, Fish and Wildlife Biologist, Jacksonville Field Office, Florida (see **ADDRESSES** above), telephone: 904/232-2580.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Florida scrub-jay (scrub-jay) is geographically isolated from other subspecies of scrub-jays found in Mexico and the western United States. The scrub-jay is found exclusively in peninsular Florida and is restricted to xeric uplands (predominately in oak-dominated scrub). Increasing urban and agricultural development have resulted in habitat loss and fragmentation which has adversely affected the distribution and numbers of scrub-jays. The total estimated population is between 7,000 and 11,000 individuals.

The decline in the number and distribution of scrub-jays in southwestern Florida has been exacerbated by tremendous urban growth in the past 50 years. Much of the historic commercial and residential development has occurred on the dry soils which previously supported scrub-jay habitat. Based on existing soils data, much of the historic and current scrub-jay habitat of coastal southwest Florida occurs proximal to the current shoreline and larger river basins. Much of this area of Florida was settled early because few wetlands restricted urban and agricultural development. Due to the effects of urban and agricultural development over the past 100 years, much of the remaining scrub-jay habitat is now relatively small and isolated. What remains is largely degraded due to the exclusion of fire which is needed to maintain xeric uplands in conditions suitable for scrub-jays.

The scrub-jay survey provided by the Permittee during project planning indicated that one family used the site and surrounding suitable habitat areas. The Applicant proposed to impact a portion of the territories of this family. Initial construction of roads and utilities and subsequent development of individual home sites was expected to result in death of, or injury to, scrub-jays incidental to the carrying out of these otherwise lawful activities. Habitat alteration associated with property development may have reduced the availability of feeding, shelter, and nesting habitat.

To minimize and mitigate the impacts of the loss of 1.35 acres of scrub-jay habitat, the Permittee purchased 3.0 acres of scrub habitat known to support the scrub-jay, deeded the property to Brevard County, and provided a management endowment of \$3,000 to ensure management of the site in perpetuity. Other measures proposed by the Applicant include siting of individual building footprints to minimize additional scrub habitat alteration, and protection of active nests, if discovered, during the nesting season. No additional mitigation measures are proposed for the renewal.

Under section 9 of the Act and its implementing regulations, "taking" of endangered and threatened wildlife is prohibited. However, the Service, under limited circumstances, may issue permits to take such wildlife if the taking is incidental to and not the purpose of otherwise lawful activities. The Permittee has implemented an HCP as required by previous issuance of the incidental take permit application.

As stated above, the Service has made a preliminary determination that renewal of the ITP is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of section 102(2)(C) of NEPA. This preliminary information may be revised due to public comment received in response to this notice and is based on information contained in the EA and HCP.

The Service will also evaluate whether the renewal of the section 10(a)(1)(B) ITP complies with section 7 of the Act by conducting an intra-Service section 7 consultation. The results of this consultation, in combination with the above findings, will be used in the final analysis to determine whether or not to reissue the ITP.

Dated: March 27, 2001.

H. Dale Hall,

Acting Regional Director.

[FR Doc. 01-8415 Filed 4-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Designation of Critical Habitat for the Rio Grande Silvery Minnow and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: We, the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), are providing this notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared in conjunction with a new proposed rule, designating critical habitat for the endangered Rio Grande silvery minnow (*Hybognathus amarus*). On November 21, 2000, the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, in *Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District v. Bruce Babbitt et al.*, *State of New Mexico Engineer ex rel the State Engineer, New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission, and the New Mexico Attorney General v. Bruce Babbitt et al.*, and *Forest Guardians et al. v. Bruce Babbitt et al.*, CIV 99-870, 99-872 and 99-1445M/RLP (Consolidated) ordered us to issue within 120 days both an EIS and a new proposed rule designating critical habitat for the Rio Grande silvery minnow. Public scoping meetings will be held on April 17, 2001, at the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico, on April 23, 2001, at the New Mexico State University Instructional Building, Carlsbad, New Mexico and on April 24, 2001, at the Pecos County Commission, Fort Stockton, Texas.

We anticipate that public interest in the proposal to designate critical habitat will be high. Thus, we have scheduled three public scoping meetings to be held in Albuquerque and Carlsbad, New Mexico, and Fort Stockton, Texas (see **DATES** and **ADDRESSES** section). This notice and public scoping meetings will allow all interested parties to submit comments and/or relevant information to be considered in the preparation of a draft EIS for the new proposed designation. We are seeking comments or suggestions from the public, other concerned governmental agencies,

tribes, the scientific community, industry, or any other interested parties concerning the scope of the analysis and preparation of an EIS. We also identify the Service Official to whom questions and comments should be directed concerning the development of a new proposed rule and the EIS.

DATES: We will hold public scoping meetings to solicit comments and suggestions on the scope of the EIS analysis and proposed alternatives. We will hold scoping meetings from 6 to 9 p.m. on April 17, 2001, at the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico; on April 23, 2001, at the New Mexico State University Instructional Building, Carlsbad, New Mexico; and on April 24, 2001, at the Pecos County Commission, Fort Stockton, Texas. We encourage your written comments which we must receive for consideration on or before June 4, 2001.

We will give notice for the draft EIS (DEIS) once it's prepared. We will solicit comments on the DEIS for a minimum 45-day public comment period so that interested and affected people may participate and contribute to the preparation of a final EIS. In addition, we intend to develop a new proposed rule designating critical habitat for the Rio Grande silvery minnow and solicit comments or suggestions on reasons why any particular area should or should not be designated as critical habitat, information on the distribution and quality of habitat for the silvery minnow, land or water use practices and current or planned activities in areas that may be affected by a redesignation of critical habitat, and any other pertinent issues of concern.

ADDRESSES: Information, comments, or questions related to preparation of the EIS and the National Environmental Policy Act process should be submitted to Joy Nicholopoulos, Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office, 2105 Osuna NE, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87113. Written comments may also be sent by facsimile to (505) 346-2542 or by email to FW2 ES NewMexico@fws.gov. All comments, including names and addresses, will become part of the administrative record and may be released.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Questions regarding the scoping process, preparation of the EIS, or development of a new proposed rule designating critical habitat may be directed to Joy Nicholopoulos (see **ADDRESSES** section).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Fish and Wildlife Service proposed to list the Rio Grande silvery minnow as an endangered species with critical habitat on March 1, 1993 (58 FR 11821). The public comment period, originally scheduled to close on April 30, 1993, was extended until August 25, 1993 (58 FR 19220), to conduct public hearings and allow submission of additional comments. We held public hearings in Albuquerque and Socorro, New Mexico, on the evenings of April 27 and 28, 1993, respectively.

We published the final rule to list the Rio Grande silvery minnow on July 20, 1994 (59 FR 36988). At that time, we found that critical habitat was not determinable because there was insufficient information to perform required analyses of the potential impacts of the designation. An economic analysis was conducted by a contractor to determine the economic effects of the designation in September 1994; the draft analysis was provided to us in February 1996 and transmitted to all interested individuals on April 26, 1996. We notified the public that, because of the moratorium on final listing actions and determinations of critical habitat imposed by Public Law 104-6, no work would be conducted on the analysis or on the final decision concerning critical habitat. However, we solicited comments from the public and agencies for use when such work resumed. On February 22, 1999, the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, in *Forest Guardians and Defenders of Wildlife v. Bruce Babbitt*, CIV 97-0453 JC/DIS, ordered us to publish a final determination with regard to critical habitat for the Rio Grande silvery minnow within 30 days of that order. Subsequently, on March 22, 1999, the Court ordered that we would be allowed an additional 90 days for the final designation. We published a final determination of critical habitat for the Rio Grande silvery minnow on July 6, 1999 (64 FR 36274). On July 8, 1999, we finalized the Rio Grande silvery minnow recovery plan (USFWS 1999). On November 21, 2000, the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico ordered the Service to issue a new proposed rule designating critical habitat for the Rio Grande silvery minnow within 120 days, and to simultaneously issue an EIS.

A new proposal to designate critical habitat for the Rio Grande Silvery minnow may be substantially different from the previously designated critical habitat. The process to propose critical habitat will include at least the

following elements: (1) Compile and analyze all new biological information on the species; (2) review and update the administrative record; (3) review the overall approach to the conservation of the Rio Grande silvery minnow undertaken by the local, State, Tribal, and Federal agencies operating within the Middle Rio Grande Valley and other areas where the species historically occurred; (4) review available information that pertains to the habitat requirements of this species, including material received during the public comment period from this notice and comments on the listing and previous designation; (5) review actions identified in the Rio Grande silvery minnow recovery plan (USFWS 1999); (6) determine what areas might require "special management considerations or protections" pursuant to the definition of critical habitat in section 3 of the Act; (7) develop a precise definition of the primary constituent elements, including a discussion of the specific biological and physical features essential to the survival of the silvery minnow; (8) precisely map critical habitat within river reaches; (9) analyze the potential economic consequences of designating critical habitat; and (10) analyze the potential consequences through NEPA.

Several considerations may influence the alternatives we are considering. For example, we will be evaluating reintroduction sites within the historic range of the Rio Grande silvery minnow to determine whether these areas require "special management considerations or protections." Similarly, we know that we must give careful consideration to the compatibility of Rio Grande silvery minnow management with the existing purposes and uses of such lands and waters. This issue, in particular, is one for which we are seeking public input. We welcome information on historically or currently occupied areas that may contain the physical and biological features essential to the conservation of the Rio Grande silvery minnow and that may warrant "special management considerations or protections" and should be designated critical habitat (i.e., stream reaches).

The DEIS will consider all reasonable alternatives for the designation of critical habitat for the Rio Grande silvery minnow. Potential alternatives to designate critical habitat for the Rio Grande silvery minnow may include one or more of the following: (1) No action; (2) examining the entire Middle Rio Grande reach by reach; (3) designating the Pecos River in New Mexico; (4) designating the Pecos River in Texas; (5) designating the entire Rio

Grande in New Mexico and Texas; and (6) designating the entire historic range in the Pecos River in New Mexico and Texas, and the Rio Grande in New Mexico and Texas. Because we have not completed the elements in the critical habitat process identified above (e.g., compiled and analyzed all new biological information on the species; determined what areas might require "special management considerations or protections"; etc.) we do not know what the preferred alternative (the proposed action) or other alternatives might entail. Once identified, the alternatives will be carried forward into detailed analyses pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 432 *et seq.*).

The Service is the lead Federal agency for compliance with NEPA for this action. The DEIS will incorporate public concerns in the analysis of impacts associated with the proposed action and associated project alternatives. The DEIS will be sent out for a minimum 45-day public review period, during which time comments will be solicited on the adequacy of the document. The Final EIS will address the comments received on the DEIS during public review, and will be furnished to all who commented on the DEIS, and made available to anyone who requests a copy.

This notice is provided pursuant to regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (40 CFR 1506.6).

Dated: March 26, 2001.

Frank S. Shoemaker, Jr.,

Acting Regional Director, Region 2.

[FR Doc. 01-8465 Filed 4-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Meeting of the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-management Council

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Alaska Migratory Bird Co-management Council has scheduled a public meeting to continue development of recommendations for regulations for the spring/summer migratory bird subsistence harvest for the period between March 10 and September 1, 2002.

DATES: The co-management Council will meet April 26-27, 2001.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be conducted at the Hawthorn Suites Hotel

at 1110 W. 8th Avenue in Anchorage, Alaska.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information call Mimi Hogan at 907/786-3673 or Bob Stevens at 907/786-3499. Individuals with a disability who may need special accommodations in order to participate in the public comment portion of the meeting should call one of the above numbers.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service formed the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-management Council, which includes Native, State, and Federal representatives as equals, by means of a Notice of Decision published in the **Federal Register**, 65 FR 16405-16409, March 28, 2000. The amended Migratory Bird Treaty with Canada required the formation of such a management body. The Co-management Council will make recommendations for, among other things, regulations for spring/summer harvesting of migratory birds in Alaska. In addition to creation of the Co-management Council, the Notice of Decision identified seven geographic regions. Each region will submit to the Co-management Council requests for specific regulations for its area. The Co-management Council will then develop recommendations for statewide regulations and submit them to the Fish and Wildlife Service for approval.

The meeting of the Co-management Council will begin Thursday, April 26 at 8:30 a.m. Sessions on April 27 will also begin at 8:30 a.m. The primary agenda item will be deliberation of recommendations for regulations. The public is invited to attend. The Co-management Council will provide opportunities for public comment on agenda items at the beginning of each day and at the close of the session on April 27. Additional opportunities may be provided at the discretion of the Co-management Council. Agendas will be available at the door.

Dated: March 22, 2001.

Gary Edwards,

Deputy Regional Director, Anchorage, Alaska.

[FR Doc. 01-8407 Filed 4-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-U

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[CA-930-5410-EQ-B139; CACA 42646]

Conveyance of Mineral Interests in California

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Correction.

SUMMARY: In **Federal Register** notice document 01-7309 beginning on page 16487 in the issue of Monday, March 26, 2001, make the following correction:

On page 16487 in the second column the legal description reads, "sec. 6, NW¹/₄ NE¹/₄". This should read, "sec. 6, SE¹/₄NW¹/₄, SW¹/₄NE¹/₄".

Dated: March 28, 2001.

Tom Gey,

Acting Chief, Branch of Lands.

[FR Doc. 01-8406 Filed 4-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-40-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 731-TA-926 and 927 (Preliminary)]

Spring Table Grapes From Chile and Mexico

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of antidumping investigations and scheduling of preliminary phase investigations.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the institution of investigations and commencement of preliminary phase antidumping investigations Nos. 731-TA-926 and 927 (Preliminary) under section 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673b(a)) (the Act) to determine whether there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury, or the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports from Chile and Mexico of spring table grapes, provided for in subheading 0806.10.40 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless the Department of Commerce extends the time for initiation pursuant to section 732(c)(1)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673a(c)(1)(B)), the Commission must reach a preliminary determination in antidumping investigations in 45 days, or in this case by May 14, 2001. The Commission's views are due at the Department of Commerce within five business days thereafter, or by May 21, 2001.

For further information concerning the conduct of these investigations 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 and B (19 CFR part 207).