livestock depredations continue. ODFW requests authorization for employees to conduct lethal control of wolves. Under the ODFW proposal, young-of-the-year (juveniles) captured before October 1, and any lactating females, would be released or relocated rather than killed. No lethal take by private landowners would be authorized by this permit.

Currently, the ODFW is authorized through their section 6 Cooperative Agreement under the ESA to conduct non-lethal gray wolf management actions in Oregon for this species, which is Federally listed as endangered. These actions include trapping, collaring, taking blood and hair samples, harassing, and other forms of take that are not reasonably expected to result in the death or permanent disabling of a wolf.

A practical, responsive management program is essential to enhancing survival of the wolf in the wild (Service 1987; Service 1994; Service 1999). The program must respond to wolf-livestock conflicts, while promoting wolf recovery objectives. If issued, Oregon’s permit would provide standards for: (a) Determining problem wolf status (including investigative procedures and criteria), (b) conducting wolf control actions, and (c) disposition of problem wolves.

In addition to evaluation under the ESA, we are analyzing issuance of this permit under NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). Some environmental impacts of wolf management were analyzed in our 1988 Environmental Action Memorandum on the Interim Wolf Control Plan for the Northern Rocky Mountains and the 1999 Evaluation and Recommended Modifications to it. Our environmental analysis for ODFW’s permit application will include changes in the gray wolf’s population status since 1999 and other issues specific to Oregon.

Under NEPA, a reasonable range of alternatives to a proposed project must be developed and considered in our environmental review, along with a no-action alternative. Our NEPA evaluation will evaluate the potential impacts of alternatives for wolf conservation actions in Oregon. Management actions would be developed to conserve wolf populations and to protect livestock and pets. An alternative will be selected and a permit decision made after completion of all required analyses and consideration of all comments received in response to this Notice.

Any wolves existing in Oregon would likely be due to range expansion of the northern Rocky Mountains wolf population. However, the State of Oregon has established its own wolf population objectives. These population objectives are documented in the Oregon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan, which can be found at: http://www.dfw.state.or.us/wolves/. The ODFW permit application can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/pacific/ecoservices/endangered/recovery/default.htm.

Additional information about wolf recovery and conservation in the northwestern United States, including control of problem wolves, can be found in various reports at: http://westerngraywolf.fws.gov/.

Public Comments Solicited

We solicit public review and comment on this ESA recovery permit application and related NEPA environmental review. Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review during regular business hours. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their home addresses from the record, which we will honor to the extent allowable by law. If you wish to withhold your name and/or address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment, but you should be aware that we may be required to disclose your name and address pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act. Moreover, we will not consider anonymous comments. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety. Comments and materials received will be available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the above address.

Authority

This document is published under the authority of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).


David J. Wesley, Regional Director, Region 1, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. E6–13132 Filed 8–10–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P
unsuitable for all or certain types of surface coal mining operations and for termination of previous designations; and (3) 30 CFR 874.16 and the Abandoned Mine Land Contractor Information form. OSM will request a 3-year term of approval for each information collection activity.

Comments are invited on: (1) The need for the collection of information for the performance of the functions of the agency; (2) the accuracy of the agency’s burden estimates; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (4) ways to minimize the information collection burden on respondents, such as use of automated means of collection of the information. A summary of the public comments will accompany OSM’s submission of the information collection requests to OMB.

The following information is provided for the information collection: (1) Title of the information collection; (2) OMB control number; (3) summary of the information collection activity; and (4) frequency of collection, description of the respondents, estimated total annual responses, and the total annual reporting and recordkeeping burden for the collection of information.

Title: General, 30 CFR part 700.
OMB Control Number: 1029–0094.
Summary: This Part establishes procedures and requirements for terminating jurisdiction of surface coal mining and reclamation operations, petitions for rulemaking, and citizen suits filed under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977.
Bureau Form Number: None.
Frequency of Collection: Once.
Description of Respondents: State and tribal regulatory authorities, private citizens and citizen groups, and surface coal mining companies.
Total Annual Responses: 6.
Total Annual Burden Hours: 84.

Title: Petition process for designation of Federal lands as unsuitable for all or certain types of surface coal mining operations and for termination of previous designations, 30 CFR part 769.
OMB Control Number: 1029–0098.
Summary: This Part establishes the minimum procedures and standards for designating Federal lands unsuitable for certain types of surface mining operations and for terminating designations pursuant to a petition. The information requested will aid the regulatory authority in the decision making process to approve or disapprove a request.

Bureau Form Number: None.
Frequency of Collection: Once.

Description of Respondents: People who may be adversely affected by surface mining on Federal lands.
Total Annual Responses: 1.
Total Annual Burden Hours: 1,067.
Title: Contractor eligibility requirements for general reclamation, 30 CFR 874.16 and the AML Contractor Information Form.
OMB Control Number: 1029–0119.
Summary: 30 CFR 874.16 requires that every successful bidder for an AML contract must be eligible under 30 CFR 773.15(b)(1) at the time of contract award to receive a permit or conditional permit to conduct surface coal mining operations. Further, the regulation requires the eligibility to be confirmed by OSM’s automated AVS and the contractor must be eligible under the regulations implementing Section 510(c) of the Surface Mining Act to receive permits to conduct mining operations. The AML Contractor Information form provides a tool for OSM and the States/Indian tribes to help them prevent persons with outstanding violations from conducting further mining of AML reclamation activities in the State.
Bureau Form Number: None.
Frequency of Collection: Once per contract.
Description of Respondents: AML contract applicants and State and tribal regulatory authorities.
Total Annual Responses: 420 bidders and 8 State responses.
Total Annual Burden Hours: 161.
John R. Craynon,
Chief, Division of Regulatory Support.
[FR Doc. 06–6855 Filed 8–10–06; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–05–M

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

INVESTIGATION NO. 731–TA–1104
Preliminary

SOME POLYESTER STAPLE FIBER FROM CHINA

On June 23, 2006, a petition was filed with the Commission and Commerce by DAK Americas, LLC, Charlotte, NC; Nan Ya Plastics Corporation America, Lacke City, SC; and Wellman, Inc., Shrewsbury, NJ alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of dumping imports of certain PSF from China.

Accordingly, effective June 23, 2006, the Commission instituted antidumping duty investigation No. 731–TA–1104 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission’s investigation and of a public conference to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the Federal Register of June 29, 2006 (71 FR 37097, June 29, 2006). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on July 14, 2006, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to