

viability analysis and risk assessments in the FMEPs indicate the extinction risk for listed steelhead under the proposed fishery impact levels to be low. A variety of monitoring and evaluation tasks are specified in the FMEPs to assess the abundance of steelhead, determine fishery effort and catch of steelhead and angler compliance. A review of compliance with the provisions of the FMEP will be conducted by ODFW annually and a comprehensive review to evaluate the effectiveness of the FMEPs will occur at a minimum every 5 years.

ODFW has provided NMFS a draft of the *Conservation Assessment of Steelhead Populations in Oregon* (Assessment) as part of the FMEP submittal. The Assessment provides the population viability analysis and risk assessment developed for ODFW's FMEPs. This Assessment is also available for review and comment.

As specified in the July 10, 2000 ESA 4(d) rule for salmon and steelhead (65 FR 42422), NMFS may approve an FMEP if it meets criteria set forth in § 223.203 (b)(4)(i)(A) through (I). Prior to final approval of an FMEP, NMFS must publish notification announcing its availability for public review and comment.

Authority

Under section 4 of the ESA, the Secretary of Commerce is required to adopt such regulations as he deems necessary and advisable for the conservation of species listed as threatened. The ESA salmon and steelhead 4(d) rule (65 FR 42422, July 10, 2000) specifies categories of activities that contribute to the conservation of listed salmonids and sets out the criteria for such activities. The rule further provides that the prohibitions of paragraph (a) of the rule do not apply to activities associated with fishery harvest provided that an FMEP has been approved by NMFS to be in accordance with the salmon and steelhead ESA 4(d) rule (65 FR 42422, July 10, 2000).

Dated: April 30, 2001.

Margaret Lorenz,

*Acting Chief, Endangered Species Division,
Office of Protected Resources, National
Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 01-11322 Filed 5-3-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Adjustment of Import Limits for Certain Cotton, Man-Made Fiber, Silk Blend and Other Vegetable Fiber Textiles and Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Sri Lanka

April 30, 2001.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs adjusting limits.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 4, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy Unger, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-4212. For information on the quota status of these limits, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port, call (202) 927-5850, or refer to the U.S. Customs website at <http://www.customs.gov>. For information on embargoes and quota reopenings, refer to the Office of Textiles and Apparel website at <http://www.otexa.ita.doc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended.

The current limit for Categories 347/348/847 is being increased for carryforward, and for swing and special shift from Category 359-C/659-C and 647/648.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the CORRELATION: Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see **Federal Register** notice 65 FR 82328, published on December 28, 2000). Also see 65 FR 69503, published on November 17, 2000.

D. Michael Hutchinson,

*Acting Chairman, Committee for the
Implementation of Textile Agreements.*

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

April 30, 2001.

Commissioner of Customs,
*Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC
20229.*

Dear Commissioner: This directive amends, but does not cancel, the directive issued to you on November 13, 2000, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain cotton, wool,

man-made fiber, silk blend and other vegetable fiber textiles and textile products, produced or manufactured in Sri Lanka and exported during the twelve-month period which began on January 1, 2001 and extends through December 31, 2001.

Effective on May 4, 2001, you are directed to adjust the limits for the following categories, as provided for under the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing:

Category	Adjusted twelve-month limit ¹
347/348/847	2,129,138 dozen.
359-C/659-C ²	1,282,727 kilograms.
647/648	1,209,265 dozen.

¹The limits have not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 2000.

²Category 359-C: only HTS numbers 6103.42.2025, 6103.49.8034, 6104.62.1020, 6104.69.8010, 6114.20.0048, 6114.20.0052, 6203.42.2010, 6203.42.2090, 6204.62.2010, 6211.32.0010, 6211.32.0025 and 6211.42.0010; Category 659-C: only HTS numbers 6103.23.0055, 6103.43.2020, 6103.43.2025, 6103.49.2000, 6103.49.8038, 6104.63.1020, 6104.63.1030, 6104.69.1000, 6104.69.8014, 6114.30.3044, 6114.30.3054, 6203.43.2010, 6203.43.2090, 6203.49.1010, 6203.49.1090, 6204.63.1510, 6204.69.1010, 6210.10.9010, 6211.33.0010, 6211.33.0017 and 6211.43.0010.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that these actions fall within the foreign affairs exception of the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

*D. Michael Hutchinson,
Acting Chairman, Committee for the
Implementation of Textile Agreements.*

[FR Doc. 01-11212 Filed 5-3-01; 8:45 a.m.]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (FPEIS) on Transportable Treatment Systems for Non-Stockpile Chemical Warfare Materiel

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: This FPEIS has been prepared by the Army in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, regulations of the President's Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1500-1508), and Army Regulation 200-2. As the Executive Agent for the DoD, the Army is responsible for destroying that portion of the nation's chemical warfare materiel referred to as "non-stockpile" chemical warfare materiel. This non-stockpile chemical warfare materiel must be destroyed in order to protect human health and

safety and the environment, comply with an international treaty, and carry out the mandate of the Congress. Non-stockpile chemical warfare materiel covered under this FPEIS includes: (1) Munitions containing chemical warfare agent or industrial chemicals, (2) chemical warfare agents or industrial chemicals contained in other than munitions configurations, and (3) chemical agent identification set items containing small quantities of pure or diluted agent used for training purposes. These items are currently buried and have the potential to be recovered at a number of locations in the United States and its territories and possessions. In addition, materiel has been recovered and is currently stored at several military installations throughout the United States.

DATES: Written public comments received within 30 days of the publication of the Environmental Protection Agency's Notice of Availability will be considered by the Army during final decision making.

ADDRESSES: Questions on the FPEIS or requests for copies of the document should be directed to: Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization, ATTN: SFAE-CD-NP (Mr. John K. Giesecking/PEIS), Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21010-4005 or via e-mail at john.giesecking@pmcd.apgea.army.mil.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John Giesecking at (410) 436-3768 or by fax at (410) 436-8737.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Army has to decide whether it wants to complete development of transportable treatment systems and make the systems available for deployment in the field. The purpose of the FPEIS is to help the Army make this program-level decision with input from the public. The Army's Product Manager for Non-Stockpile Chemical Materiel has analyzed the potential environmental and socioeconomic consequences of two alternative courses of action in the FPEIS with respect to the Army's chemical demilitarization responsibilities. These alternatives are: (1) Completing development and testing of the transportable chemical treatment systems and making them available to be used where needed and appropriate to process non-stockpile chemical warfare materiel. Part of this alternative includes continuing to assess and evaluate the treatment potential of other technologies, methods, and processes, and (2) the no-action alternative, under which the Army would discontinue the development of the transportable treatment systems and continue to the

storage of non-stockpile chemical warfare materiel until other suitable technologies are developed.

The Army's preferred alternative based on information in this FPEIS is to complete development of transportable chemical treatment systems and make them available for deployment. Subsequent environmental reviews by the appropriate DoD authorities would address the impacts of actual deployment to specific locations before a decision to deploy would be made. While the no-action alternative was evaluated, it could lead to the United States violating the Chemical Weapons Convention timetable requirements for destroying currently stored non-stockpile chemical warfare materiel.

A series of public meetings were held at nine locations during the public comment period on the Draft PEIS to afford the public the opportunity to provide oral and written comments. These meetings were held in Alexandria, Louisiana; Anchorage, Alaska; Edgewood, Maryland; Huntsville, Alabama; Indianapolis, Indiana; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Antonio, Texas; Santa Rosa, California; and Tampa, Florida. Comments made at these meetings and written comments received during the comment period were used in preparing the FPEIS.

The most frequent concern expressed in public comments was in regard to the possible treatment of secondary wastes from the transportable systems in commercial incinerators. The Army is presently looking into possible options other than commercial incineration for treating wastes from the transportable systems. Implementing the preferred alternative does not preclude developing these non-incineration options.

Copies of the FPEIS can be obtained by calling the Public Outreach and Information Office of the Office of the Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization at 1-800-488-0648 or (410) 436-3445; fax (410) 436-8737; or e-mail at john.giesecking@pmcd.apgea.army.mil. The FPEIS may be accessed at the following web site: <http://www-pmcd.apgea.army.mil/nscmp/index.html>.

Dated: April 30, 2001.

Raymond J. Fatz,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health), OASA(I&E).

[FR Doc. 01-11293 Filed 5-3-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Record of Decision for the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Shock Trial of WINSTON S. CHURCHILL (DDG 81)

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy (Navy), pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*; the regulations implementing NEPA issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 1500-1508; Navy regulations implementing NEPA procedures (31 CFR 775); and Executive Order 12114, "Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions"; hereby announces its selection of the area of the Atlantic Ocean offshore of Mayport Naval Station, Jacksonville, Florida for the WINSTON S. CHURCHILL shock trial. NEPA sets out the procedures Federal agencies must follow in analyzing environmental impacts of major Federal actions within U.S. territory. Executive Order 12114 sets out the procedures Federal agencies must follow in analyzing environmental impacts of major Federal actions occurring outside U.S. territory in the global commons or within the territory of another nation. The Navy was the lead agency and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) was a cooperating agency for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The WINSTON S. CHURCHILL will be shock tested in a manner consistent with the alternative "Shock Trial At An Offshore Location," described in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) as the proposed action. The FEIS analyzed in detail three alternative offshore areas—Mayport, Florida; Norfolk, Virginia; and Pascagoula, Mississippi. The WINSTON S. CHURCHILL will be subjected to a series of up to four 10,000-pound explosive charge detonations sometime between May 1, 2001 and September 30, 2001, conducted at a rate of one per week to allow time to perform detailed inspections of the ship's systems.

The preferred alternative is to conduct a shock trial offshore of Mayport with mitigation to minimize risk to marine mammals and turtles. Although all three test areas meet minimum operational requirements, the Norfolk and Mayport test areas rank higher operationally, whereas the Pascagoula test area is significantly less suitable for supporting the shock trial. Environmentally, the risk of impacts to marine mammals and turtles is higher in the Norfolk test area,