that facility. We will amend this guidance in the future if this level of law enforcement improves or is insufficient. Factors that may influence the law enforcement level may include: Watercraft-related mortality numbers and trends; manatee population trends; law enforcement events, amount and extent of speed zones; and designation of sanctuaries. The Service will ensure that any change to the recommended law enforcement level is based on the most current scientific information available.

If the proposed conservation measure in a high mortality risk county involves providing equipment or training to law enforcement officers, the amount of equipment or training to be provided must be equal in conservation value to 1.65 hours of enforcement per watercraft that is provided access per year over a ten-year period.

Medium risk areas, based on manatee mortality data, experience approximately ten percent of the total manatee mortality that is measured in high risk areas. Given the reduced degree of risk associated with medium risk areas, ten percent of the high risk area law enforcement effort is needed to reduce indirect effects to the point that the facility is unlikely to cause incidental take of manatees or adversely effect critical habitat. Based on this percentage, a project should incorporate, for each watercraft that is provided access, 0.16 hour of enforcement per year over a ten-year period. This ten percent change applies equally to funds contributed to a conservation entity, i.e., the contribution amount from single family applicants must be sufficient to provide 0.16 hour of enforcement per year for the ten-year period necessary to ensure that incidental take is unlikely to occur.

If it is determined that means other than increasing law enforcement hours on the water may be an appropriate conservation measure in a medium risk county, the alternate means should be comparable in value to 0.16 hours of enforcement per year over the ten-year period.

Low risk areas represent the extended summer, or warm season, manatee range. In low risk areas, there is no documented watercraft-related mortality and, at this time, we believe that the potential for incidental take from watercraft is unlikely to occur. Thus, we do not believe that in these areas conservation measures included as part of a proposed watercraft access facility will be necessary to come to a not likely to adversely affect determination. However, any project that would incorporate such conservation efforts would contribute to overall manatee recovery and such incorporation of measures is encouraged.

**Program Monitoring and Evaluation**

The effectiveness of this guidance will be evaluated on a continuing basis by comparing watercraft-related manatee mortality data in areas where law enforcement has been increased to previous rates of mortality. Although review of program implementation and evaluation of manatee mortality and injury are continuous processes, the manatee mortality risk areas will be assessed at one-year intervals after implementation of this guidance. If the Service determines at any time that this interim strategy is not meeting its intended objectives, then it will be altered, suspended, or revoked until corrections can be made to rectify the situation. Monitoring implementation and effectiveness will determine the need to continue, to extend the scope of, to change elements of, and/or to add new components to the guidance. The Service will have a lead position that will be responsible for monitoring and accounting in coordination with the Manatee Recovery Team and all facilities that implement this guidance. Records and databases maintained by the Service can be reviewed by the public upon request. Table One of the Guidance, which reflects the high, medium, and low risk areas, will be revised based annually on current mortality data.

**Long-Term Conservation Strategy**

Enforcement continues to be validated as an effective means of conserving the manatee by reduction in adult mortality. However, a larger program than that provided by this interim strategy is necessary to address existing watercraft-related mortality. Such a program has not been developed and we are currently working with various entities to accomplish this goal through an incidental take regulation under the MMPA. Concurrently, we are working with all partners to ensure speed zone placement and enforcement is both appropriate and adequate.

We encourage the State of Florida, Corps of Engineers, or other Federal, tribal, local, and private entities to seek incidental take authorization for their activities that are likely to cause the incidental take of manatees as defined under the ESA and MMPA, instead of addressing access developments one by one through the use of this interim strategy. Incidental take may be authorized under the MMPA if the Service finds that incidental take associated with the requester's activity, after taking into account all measures committed to by the requester to reduce the affect of the activity, will have a negligible impact on manatees. Incidental take can be exempted under the ESA only upon completion of authorization under the MMPA. The MMPA incidental take regulation process requires compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and public comment and review. The result of this rulemaking process would be to address incidental take under the MMPA and the ESA in the process of recovering the manatee. The final Manatee Recovery Plan is expected to support both the interim strategy and this long term rulemaking process and provide additional guidance if deemed appropriate by the Service and the Manatee Recovery Team.

*Public Comments Solicited*

We are seeking information, views, and opinions from the public related to this interim strategy, the supporting analyses, and proposed implementation. We will consider all comments received by the date specified above.

**Authority:** The authority for this action is section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*)

Dated: December 18, 2001.

**Sam D. Hamilton,**

*Regional Director.*

[FR Doc. 01–6040 Filed 3–13–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Reclamation

### Arrowrock Dam Outlet Works Rehabilitation, INT-FES 01–12

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Impact Statement.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) has prepared a final environmental impact statement (Final EIS) to examine the impacts of alternatives to rehabilitate the outlet works at Arrowrock Dam. The Bureau of Reclamation proposes to remove 10 lower level Ensign valves and replace them with clamshell gates. Two action alternatives were identified that differed only in the timing of reservoir drawdown, and the elevation of Arrowrock Reservoir and Lucky Peak Lake in the third construction season. The preferred alternative requires a

longer period of drawdown of Arrowrock Reservoir, but both Arrowrock Reservoir and Lucky Peak Lake would remain at a higher elevation than with the other action alternative. Based upon comments received on the Draft EIS concerning impacts to water quality and bull trout, the preferred alternative was modified so that the probability of use of the sluice gates was reduced to approximately 15%. The No Action Alternative is also evaluated. The No Action Alternative is defined as the most likely future without the proposed project, and includes actions that would be required for an intensive maintenance program if the Ensign valves were not replaced.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be addressed to Mr. John Tiedeman, Bureau of Reclamation, 1150 N. Curtis Road, Suite 100, Boise ID 83706–1234.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. John Tiedeman, (208) 378–5034.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Arrowrock Dam and Reservoir, completed in 1915, were constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). The dam is located on the main stem Boise River about 17 river miles upstream from the city of Boise. Anderson Ranch Dam and Reservoir, located on the South Fork Boise River and generally east of Arrowrock Dam, were completed by Reclamation in 1950. Lucky Peak Dam and Lake, located to the southwest and about 11 river miles downstream of Arrowrock Dam, were completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) in 1957. Reclamation and the Corps operate the three storage dams in a coordinated method for irrigation water supply (Reclamation markets the water supply in Lucky Peak Lake for irrigation), flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

Reclamation began considering modification of Arrowrock Dam outlet works in 1982; some conceptual designs for replacement of some of the Ensign valves were developed in 1983. Over several years, various possible designs were identified and evaluated, and in 1987 a conceptual design using clamshell gates was developed. Increasing maintenance problems resulted in the current effort to identify and evaluate solutions to the maintenance problems associated with the now 85-year old Ensign valves. The scope of this study was limited to valve replacement to retain and improve operational flexibility of Arrowrock Dam and Reservoir. Environmental effects of the action and No Action alternatives were analyzed for the stream reaches and reservoirs upstream and downstream from Arrowrock Dam and Reservoir. Potential environmental effects are generally limited to those associated with construction and the reservoir drawdowns necessary for maintenance and replacement of the lower outlets. One of the major concerns is about impacts to bull trout which are found in Arrowrock Reservoir and upstream; bull trout were listed as a threatened species in June, 1998.

Reclamation's scoping process included numerous meetings with state and Federal agencies, local groups, and interested individuals. Notices of intent to prepare an EIS and to hold public scoping meetings were published and two public scoping meetings were held on November 20, 1998. Public comments received during scoping were considered in the development of alternatives. Following release of the Draft EIS, two Public Hearings were held on December 12, 2000. Based upon comments received concerning water quality and impacts to bull trout during the Draft EIS review period, the preferred alternative was modified by reducing the probability of use of the sluice gates to15%.

The Final EIS is available for viewing on the internet at: http://www.pn.usbr.gov/project/arrowrock/arrowrock.shtml

Dated: March 9, 2001.

**Kenneth R Pedde,**

*ActingRegional Director, Pacific Northwest Region.*

[FR Doc. 01–6308 Filed 3–13–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–MN–P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

**[Investigation No. 731–TA–894 (Final)]**

## Certain Ammonium Nitrate From Ukraine

**AGENCY:** United States International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Scheduling of the final phase of an antidumping investigation.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of the final phase of antidumping investigation No. 731–TA–894 (Final) under section 735(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1673d(b)) (the Act) to determine whether 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 less-than-fair-value imports from Ukraine of certain ammonium nitrate, provided for in subheading 3102.30.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.[1]

For further information concerning the conduct of this phase of the investigation, hearing procedures, 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 C (19 CFR part 207).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 5, 2001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Karen Taylor (202–708–4101), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (*http://www.usitc.gov*). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS-ON-LINE) at *http://dockets.usitc.gov/eol/public*.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Background.*—The final phase of this investigation is being scheduled as a result of an affirmative preliminary determination by the Department of Commerce that imports of certain ammonium nitrate from Ukraine are being sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 733 of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673b). The investigation was requested in a petition filed on October 13, 2000, by the Committee For Fair Ammonium Nitrate Trade (''COFANT'') whose members include Air Products & Chemicals, Inc., Allentown, PA; Mississippi Chemical Corp., Yazoo City, MS; El Dorado Chemical Co., Oklahoma City, OK; La Roche Industries, Inc., Atlanta, GA; and Nitram, Inc., Tampa, FL.

*Participation in the investigation and public service list.*—Persons, including industrial users of the subject merchandise and, if the merchandise is sold at the retail level, representative

[1] For purposes of this investigation, Commerce has defined the subject merchandise as ''solid, fertilizer grade ammonium nitrate ('ammonium nitrate') products, whether prilled, granular or in other solid form, with or without additives or coating, and with a bulk density equal to or greater than 53 pounds per cubic foot. Specifically excluded from this scope is solid ammonium nitrate with a bulk density less than 53 pounds per cubic foot (commonly referred to as industrial or explosive grade ammonium nitrate).''