

effectiveness of pingers (the one mortality observed in 1997 was in a pingered net). It was also recommended that this stock be reviewed on an annual basis until the effectiveness of pingers can be fully evaluated.

*Response:* Because the annual level of human-caused mortality remains below PBR, this stock is defined as non-strategic. NMFS will continue to review the incidental mortality of all stocks each year and will revise stock assessment reports if a change in status is justified by new data.

*Comment 7:* One commenter recommended the inclusion of information on the recent concerns over the potential impacts of low frequency active sonar (LFAS) on beaked whales.

*Response:* NMFS has inserted language reflecting recent concerns over LFAS for beaked whale stocks.

*Comment 8:* One commenter expressed concern that the PBR for Blainville's beaked whale, Hawaiian stock, is only 0.4 per year, with at least two fishery interactions observed (extrapolated to an average of nine per year), with the caveat that it is not clear whether other hooked odontocetes may have been Blainville's beaked whales. The commenter also questioned whether or not Blainville's beaked whales should be a non-strategic stock.

*Response:* The entanglement of two unidentified cetaceans was mentioned in the stock assessment report for completeness, but they were not identified as Blainville's beaked whales. In the absence of confirmed fishery-related mortality of Blainville's beaked whales, this stock will remain non-strategic. NMFS will continue to review the incidental mortality of all stocks each year and will revise stock assessment reports if a change in status is justified by new data.

#### Harbor Seals

*Comment 1:* One commenter requested an explanation of the validity of using 1990–94 kill rates from the set gillnet fishery to estimate harbor seal (California stock) mortality during 1995–1998 when the fishery was not observed.

*Response:* The lack of an observer program in this fishery did not allow for the estimation of kill rates during 1995–98. In the absence of an observer program, the most conservative method to estimate 1995–98 mortality is to use 1990–94 kill rates from the time when the fishery was permitted to operate within 3 nautical miles of shore and interactions with harbor seals were more likely. Although this approach is not ideal, it does use the best available information in this case.

*Comment 2:* One commenter suggested that a method for estimating harbor seal mortality from “unmonitored hauls” be developed for the groundfish trawl fishery.

*Response:* NMFS has established a sampling protocol, which is based on monitored hauls, for estimating incidental mortality and serious injury for the groundfish trawl fishery. In most years, NMFS uses the estimated mortality calculated from this sampling protocol. The observed mortality rate (observed kills per haul) is very low, and occasionally there is no observed mortality in the monitored hauls and one or more recorded kills in unmonitored hauls. When this situation occurs, NMFS uses the total number of observed mortalities as a minimum level of mortality for the affected year.

*Comment 3:* One commenter requested a clarification regarding changes within the Washington and Oregon lower Columbia River drift gillnet fishery and their impact on incidental mortality levels.

*Response:* The appropriate text in the report has been edited in an attempt to make the meaning clearer.

*Comment 4:* One commenter requested that the language stating that the Oregon component of the harbor seal stock is within its Optimum Sustainable Population be removed, citing a lack of quantitative support for this statement.

*Response:* The statement has been revised.

*Comment 5:* One commenter requested a clarification on whether self-reports of harbor seal (Inland Washington stock) mortalities in salmon net pens represented entanglements or animals being shot by pen operators.

*Response:* The reported harbor seal mortalities in salmon net pens in 1997 and 1998 were caused by entanglements.

#### Killer Whales

*Comment 1:* One commenter expressed concerns that unmonitored hauls in the longline fishery are not used to estimate mortality levels for the eastern north Pacific transient stock.

*Response:* NMFS has established a sampling protocol, which is based on monitored hauls, for estimating incidental mortality and serious injury for the longline fishery. In most years, NMFS uses the estimated mortality calculated from this sampling protocol. The observed mortality rate (observed kills per haul) is very low, and occasionally there are no or very few observed mortalities in the monitored hauls and one or more recorded kills in unmonitored hauls. When this situation

occurs, NMFS uses the total number of observed mortalities as a minimum level of mortality for the affected year.

*Comment 2:* One commenter noted that the eastern north Pacific southern resident stock of killer whales appears to be in decline and requested that NMFS speculate on possible causes.

*Response:* NMFS sponsored a Southern Resident Killer Whale Workshop in Seattle, WA, on 1–2 April 2000. Workshop participants discussed possible factors influencing killer whale populations, including contaminant levels, whale-watching activities, and the availability of prey resources. Text and references pertaining to this meeting have been added to the report.

#### Electronic Access

All stock assessment reports and the guidelines for preparing them are available via the Internet at <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/prot-res/PR2/Stock-Assessment-Program/sars.html>

Dated: March 7, 2001.

**Wanda Cain,**

*Acting Deputy Director, Office of Protected Resources National Marine Fisheries Service.*  
[FR Doc. 01–6452 Filed 3–14–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–22–S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 080300G]

#### Marine Mammals; File No. 909-1465-01

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Issuance of permit amendment.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that Permit No. 909-1465-00, issued to Dan Engelhaupt, Biological Sciences Department, University of Durham, Science Laboratories, South Road, Durham, DH1 3LEQ, UNITED KINGDOM, was amended.

**ADDRESSES:** The amendment and related documents are available for review upon written request or by appointment in the following offices:

Permits and Documentation Division, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, 1315 East-West Highway, Room 13130 Silver Spring, MD 20910 (301/713–2289); and

Regional Administrator, Southeast Region, NMFS, 9721 Executive Center Drive, St. Petersburg, Florida 33702–2432, (727/570–5312).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jill Lewandowski, 301/713–2289.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On June 14, 2000, notice was published in the **Federal Register** (65 FR 37361) that an amendment of Permit No. 909-1465-00, issued September 17, 1999 (64 FR 50494), had been requested by the above-named person. The requested amendment has been issued under the authority of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*), the Regulations Governing the Taking and Importing of Marine Mammals (50 CFR part 216), the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), and the Regulations Governing the Taking, Importing, and Exporting of Endangered Fish and Wildlife (50 CFR part 222).

The amendment authorizes the extension of the study for sperm whales only to waters of the Caribbean Sea and mid-western Atlantic with an increase in takes of 250 individuals by biopsy and 750 individuals by incidental harassment over the course of the permit. The amendment also allows for biopsy sampling of female sperm whales with calves present as long as calves are longer than 4.5 meters in length.

Issuance of this permit amendment, as required by the ESA, was based on a finding that such permit amendment (1) was applied for in good faith, (2) will not operate to the disadvantage of the endangered species which is the subject of this permit amendment, and (3) is consistent with the purposes and policies set forth in section 2 of the ESA.

Dated: March 9, 2001.

**Ann D. Terbush,**

*Chief, Permits and Documentation Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 01-6453 Filed 3-14-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-S**

**COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS**

**Adjustment of Import Limits for Certain Cotton, Wool and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in the Dominican Republic**

March 9, 2001.

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

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 16, 2001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Naomi Freeman, 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 re-openings, refer to the Office of Textiles and Apparel website at <http://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 limits for certain categories are being adjusted for carryover and carryforward used.

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 75671, published on December 4, 2000.

**D. Michael Hutchinson,**

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

**Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements**

March 9, 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 28, 2000, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain cotton, wool and man-made fiber textile products, produced or manufactured in the Dominican Republic and exported during the twelve-month period which began on January 1, 2001 and extends through December 31, 2001.

Effective on March 16, 2001, you are directed to adjust the current limits for the following categories, as provided for under the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing:

Category	Adjusted twelve-month limit <sup>1</sup>
340/640 .....	1,303,925 dozen.
342/642 .....	917,601 dozen.
347/348/647/648 .....	2,632,294 dozen of which not more than 1,485,592 dozen shall be in Categories 647/648.
351/651 .....	1,563,182 dozen.
433 .....	22,945 dozen.

Category	Adjusted twelve-month limit <sup>1</sup>
442 .....	85,894 dozen.
443 .....	145,822 numbers.
444 .....	85,894 numbers.
448 .....	44,249 dozen.
633 .....	191,324 dozen.

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

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. 01-6412 Filed 3-14-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F**

**CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION**

**Notification of Request for Reinstatement of Approval of Information Collection Requirements—Cellulose Insulation**

**AGENCY:** Consumer Product Safety Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In the **Federal Register** of August 15, 2000 (65 FR 49788), The Consumer Product Safety Commission published a notice in accordance with provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) to announce the agency's intention to seek extension of approval of the collection of information in regulations implementing the Amended Interim Safety Standard for Cellulose Insulation (16 CFR Part 1209). One comment, discussed below, was received from the North American Insulation Manufacturers Association (NAIMA). The Commission now announces that it has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget a request for reinstatement of approval of that collection of information without change for a period of three years from the date of approval.

The cellulose insulation standard prescribes requirements for flammability and corrosiveness of cellulose insulation produced for sale to or use by consumers. The standard requires manufacturers and importers of cellulose insulation to test insulation for resistance to smoldering and small open-flame ignition, and for corrosiveness, and to maintain records of that testing.