hook number in the sequence, presence of hook timer, bait status when nothing is caught (bait intact, partially gone, lost, hook lost, snood entanglement), species caught, and hook location. AFDF is required by the terms of the permit to report within 24 hours the beginning and ending times of each fishing trip taken under the EFP. It is also required to provide a report to NMFS by February 2000, including all catch data and its analysis and findings, and to coordinate with the Council on presenting the results of its experiment at a Council meeting.

For the purposes of this experiment, AFDF will be allowed to catch 20,800 lb (9.45 mt) of Pacific cod and 1,100 lb (0.5 mt) of rockfish. The participants are expected to catch relatively small amounts of other species while fishing. NMFS is not including these other species as a limiting factor in the EFP.

The EFP states that, if AFDF approaches its limit on Pacific cod or rockfish, the Administrator, Alaska Region, NMFS (Regional Administrator), must be notified immediately and will make a decision on whether to stop fishing under the EFP or to modify the terms of the permit, pursuant to 50 CFR 679.6(f).

The applicant estimated a catch of up to 12,000 lb (5.44 mt) of Pacific halibut. However, the vessel is receiving no allowance of prohibited species bycatch and the halibut must be counted against the chartered vessel’s individual fishing quota (IFQ) for halibut.

Groundfish mortality associated with this experiment will not be deducted from total allowable catch (TAC) specified for the 1999 groundfish fisheries. This additional groundfish mortality will not cause a conservation problem for groundfish species because estimated total removals under the EFP are very small compared with the overall TACs for these species and would not contribute in a meaningful way to approaching overfishing levels already considered in the EA for the 1999 groundfish specifications.

Failure of the permit holder to comply with the terms and conditions of the EFP may be grounds for revocation, suspension, or modification of the EFP under 15 CFR part 904 with respect to any or all persons and vessels conducting activities under the EFP. Failure to comply with applicable laws also may result in sanctions imposed under those laws.

**Classification**

The Regional Administrator has determined that fishing activities conducted under this action will not affect endangered and threatened species or critical habitat in any manner not considered in prior consultations on the groundfish fisheries. Participating vessels must take seabird avoidance measures; in the unlikely event that a short-tailed albatross is taken, it would be counted against the four short-tailed albatrosses allowed under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s Biological Opinion on the effects of the hook-and-line groundfish fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Area, March 19, 1999. This notice is exempt from review under E.O. 12866. It is also exempt under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) because prior notice and opportunity for public comment are not required. Therefore, the analytical requirements of the RFA are inapplicable.

**Authority:** 16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.

**Date:** September 7, 1997.

Gary C. Matlock,
Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries,
National Marine Fisheries Service.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Authority:** Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Executive Order 12475 of May 9, 1984, as amended.

In a notice and letter to the Commissioner of Customs, dated July 27, 1999, and published in the Federal Register on July 30, 1999 (64 FR 41395), the Chairman of CITA directed the U.S. Customs Service to deny entry to textiles and textile products allegedly manufactured by certain listed companies; Customs had informed CITA that these companies were found to have been illegally transshipping, closed, or unable to produce records to verify production.

Based on information received since that time, CITA has determined that Macau Ltd., Fabrica de Artigos de Vestuario and Tong Heng, Fabrica de Vestuario, two of the listed companies, should not be subject to that directive. Effective on September 13, 1999, Customs should not apply the directive to shipments of textiles and textile products allegedly manufactured by these two companies. CITA expects that Customs will conduct on-site verifications of these companies’ textile and textile product production.

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

**Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements**

September 8, 1999.

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

Dear Commissioner: In the letter to the Commissioner of Customs, dated July 27, 1999 (64 FR 41395), the Chairman of CITA directed the U.S. Customs Service to deny entry to textiles and textile products allegedly manufactured by certain listed companies. CITA had informed CITA that these companies were found to have been illegally transshipping, closed, or unable to produce records to verify production.

Based on information received since that time, CITA has determined that Macau Ltd., Fabrica de Artigos de Vestuario and Tong Heng, Fabrica de Vestuario, two of the listed companies, should not be subject to that directive. Effective on September 13, 1999, Customs is directed to not apply the directive to shipments of textiles and textile products allegedly manufactured by these two companies. CITA expects that Customs will conduct on-site verifications of these companies’ textile and textile product production.

CITA 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.

**BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F**