

8,000 acres. Within this area, approximately 4,500 acres and 1 million board feet (MMBF) is presently being considered for salvage. The value to the Forest Service of 1 MMBF salvage volume is estimated at \$60,000. This figure does not include the many jobs and thousands of dollars in benefits that are realized in related service, supply and construction industries. Tulare County will share 25% of the selling value for any of the timber that is salvaged in a commercial timber sale. Rehabilitation and restoration measures will be necessary for watershed protection, erosion prevention and fuels reduction.

Delays for any reason could jeopardize chances of accomplishing recovery and rehabilitation of the damaged resources during this field season. Delays would result in volume and value losses, and increases the chances of wildfires occurring due to the large additional quantity of standing and down fuels.

Dated: June 11, 1990.

David M. Jay,

Deputy Regional Forester.

[FR Doc. 90-13905 Filed 6-14-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-815]

Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation; Gary Portland Cement (Including Cement Clinker) From Japan

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On the basis of a petition filed in proper form with the U.S. Department of Commerce (the Department), we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of gray portland cement and cement clinker (cement) from Japan are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. We are notifying the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) of this action so that it may determine whether imports of gray portland cement and cement clinker are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry. If this investigation proceeds normally, the ITC will make its preliminary determination on or before July 2, 1990. If that determination is affirmative, we will

make a preliminary determination on or before October 25, 1990.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 15, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Louis Apple, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 377-1769.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petition

On May 18, 1990, we received a petition filed in proper form by The Ad Hoc Committee of Southern California Producers of Gray Portland Cement. In compliance with the filing requirements of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.12), petitioner alleges that imports of cement are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and that these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry.

Petitioner has stated that it has standing to file the petition because it is an interested party, as defined under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, and because it has filed the petition on behalf of the U.S. industry producing the product that is subject to this investigation. If any interested party, as described under paragraphs (C), (D), (E), (F), or (G) of section 771(9) of the Act, wishes to register support for, or opposition to, this petition, please file a written notification with the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Under the Department's regulations, any producer or reseller seeking exclusion from a potential antidumping duty order must submit its request for exclusion within 30 days of the date of the publication of this notice. The procedures and requirements regarding the filing of such requests are contained in section 353.14 of the Department's regulations.

United States Price

Petitioner bases its estimate of United States Price (USP) on official Japanese export statistics, adjusted for export-related charges, and on the February, 1990 per unit Customs value for imports of gray portland cement from Japan under HTS item numbers 2523.1000, 2523.2900 and 2523.9000 as reported in the Department's IM-145 reports. Based on information in the petition, the Department increased USP to reflect the three percent Japanese consumption tax.

Foreign Market Value

Petitioner's estimate of Foreign Market Value (FMV) is based on interviews with sales representatives of cement producers, and the organizations that distribute a majority of cement sold in Japan, as well as interviews with various end-users. Petitioner's investigator determined the actual delivered prices (less estimated distributor's margins) charged by the largest cement producers for high early strength gray portland cement (bulk quantities in excess of 800 metric tons) for March 1, 1990 in the Tokyo and Osaka markets.

Petitioner averaged the delivered prices for the five largest cement producers for each of the two major metropolitan markets to construct a single average value for both markets. Petitioner reduced the average values to reflect an ex-factory price by subtracting charges for freight to the customer, loading/unloading and "other charges." Petitioner then averaged the net prices for the two markets. Based on information in the petition, the Department: 1) increased FMV to offset the three percent added to U.S. Price for the Japanese consumption tax, and 2) reduced FMV by 300 yen per metric ton for inland freight from the production facilities to the metropolitan service stations.

Based on a comparison of United States Price and Foreign Market Value, petitioner has estimated dumping margins ranging from 102 to 136 percent. The Department recalculated estimated dumping margins consistent with the narrative descriptions contained in the USP and FMV sections above, resulting in estimated dumping margins ranging from 98 to 125 percent.

Initiation of Investigation

Pursuant to section 732(c) of the Act, the Department must determine, within 20 days after a petition is filed, whether the petition sets forth allegations necessary for the initiation of an antidumping duty investigation, and whether the petition contains information reasonably available to petitioner supporting the allegations.

We have examined the petition and found that it complies with the requirements of section 732(b) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 732 of the Act, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of gray portland cement and clinker from Japan are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. If our investigation proceeds normally, we

will make our preliminary determination by October 25, 1990.

Scope of Investigation

The United States has developed a system of tariff classification based on the international harmonized system of customs nomenclature. On January 1, 1989, the U.S. tariff schedules were fully converted to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS), as provided for in section 1201 *et seq.* of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988. All merchandise entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after this date will be classified solely according to the appropriate HTS subheadings. The HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and U.S. Customs Service purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The products covered in this investigation include gray portland cement and clinker. Gray portland cement is a hydraulic cement and the primary component of concrete. Clinker is the primary raw material used in the production process. Clinker has no use other than grinding into finished cement.

Gray portland cement is currently classifiable under HTS item number 2523.2900 and cement clinker is classifiable under item number 2523.1000. Gray portland cement has also been entered under item number 2523.9000 as "other hydraulic cements".

ITC Notification

Section 732(d) of the Act requires us to notify the ITC of this action and to provide it with the information we used to arrive at this determination. We will notify the ITC and make available to it all nonprivileged and nonproprietary information. We will allow the ITC access to all privileged and business proprietary information in the Department's files, provided the ITC confirms in writing that it will not disclose such information either publicly or under administrative protective order without the written consent of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Investigations, Import Administration.

Preliminary Determination by ITC

The ITC will determine by July 2, 1990, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of Gray Portland Cement and Cement Clinker From Japan are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry. If its determination is negative, the investigation will be terminated; otherwise, the investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is published pursuant to section 732(c)(2) of the Act.

Dated: June 7, 1990.

Eric I. Garfinkel,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 90-13878 Filed 6-14-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[Docket No. 71015-0067]

Endangered and Threatened Species; Listing and Recovery Priority Guidelines

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries), NOAA, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: NOAA Fisheries issues guidelines for assigning priorities to species for listing, delisting, and reclassification as endangered and threatened under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Act) and for developing and implementing recovery plans for species that are listed under the Act.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Patricia Montanio, Protected Species Management Division, Office of Protected Resources and Habitat Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, 1335 East West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910, (301/427-2322).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

For those species under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, section 4(a) of the Act requires NOAA Fisheries to determine whether any species of wildlife or plant should be: (1) Listed as an endangered or threatened species (listing); (2) changed in status from threatened to endangered or changed in status from endangered to threatened (reclassification); or (3) removed from the list (delisting). Section 4(h) of the Act requires that NOAA Fisheries establish agency guidelines which include a priority ranking system for listing, reclassification, or delisting.

Section 4(f) of the Act requires NOAA Fisheries to develop and implement recovery plans for the conservation and survival of all endangered or threatened species, unless such a plan will not promote the conservation of the species. In general, listed species which occur entirely outside U.S. jurisdiction are not likely to benefit from recovery plans. Foreign species are more likely to benefit from bilateral or multilateral agreements under section 8 of the Act

and other forms of international cooperative efforts. Section 4(f) of the Act also requires NOAA Fisheries to give priority to those endangered or threatened species (without regard to taxonomic classification) most likely to benefit from such plans, particularly those species that are, or may be, in conflict with construction or other developmental projects or other forms of economic activity. Section 4(h) of the Act requires that NOAA Fisheries establish a system for developing and implementing recovery plans on a priority basis.

The assignment of priorities to listing, reclassification, delisting, and recovery actions will allow NOAA Fisheries to use the limited resources available to implement the Act in the most effective way. On May 30, 1989, NOAA Fisheries published proposed guidelines in the *Federal Register* (54 FR 22925) and requested comments. No comments were received from the public. NOAA Fisheries issues these final guidelines with only slight modifications from the proposal based on internal reviews.

These guidelines are based primarily on guidelines published by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) on September 21, 1983 (48 FR 43098). NOAA Fisheries believes that, to the extent practical, both agencies should follow similar priority guidelines for listing, reclassification, delisting and recovery. To the extent possible, NOAA Fisheries has adopted the priority guidelines in use by FWS. However, due to the smaller number of listed species and the anticipated smaller number of candidate species under NOAA Fisheries jurisdiction, NOAA Fisheries believes that fewer priority categories are necessary and the FWS guidelines have been modified accordingly.

These priority systems are guidelines and should not be interpreted as inflexible frameworks for making final decisions on funding or on performance of tasks. They will be given considerable weight by the agency in making decisions; however, the agency will also evaluate the cost-effectiveness of funding and tasks and take advantage of opportunities. For example, the agency may be able to conduct a relatively low priority item in conjunction with an ongoing activity at little cost.

A. Listing, Reclassification, and Delisting Priorities

1. Listing and Reclassification From Threatened to Endangered

In considering species to be listed or reclassified from threatened to

endangered, two criteria will be evaluated to establish four priority categories as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1.—PRIORITIES FOR LISTING OR RECLASSIFICATION FROM THREATENED TO ENDANGERED

Magnitude of threat	Immediacy of threat	Priority
High.....	Imminent.....	1
	Non-Imminent.....	2
Low to Moderate.....	Imminent.....	3
	Non-Imminent.....	4

The first criterion, magnitude of threat, gives a higher listing priority to species facing the greatest threats to their continued existence. Species facing threats of low to moderate magnitude will be given a lower priority. The second criterion, immediacy of threat, gives a higher listing priority to species facing actual threats than to those species facing threats to which they are intrinsically vulnerable, but which are not currently active.

2. Delisting and Reclassification From Endangered to Threatened

NOAA Fisheries currently reviews listed species at least every five years in accordance with section 4(c)(2) of the Act to determine whether any listed species qualify for reclassification or removal from the list. When a species warrants reclassification or delisting, priority for developing regulations will be assigned according to the guidelines given in Table 2. Two criteria will be evaluated to establish six priority categories.

TABLE 2.—PRIORITIES FOR DELISTING AND RECLASSIFICATION FROM ENDANGERED TO THREATENED

Management impact	Petition status	Priority
High.....	Petitioned action ..	1
	Unpetitioned action.	2
Moderate.....	Petitioned action ..	3
	Unpetitioned action.	4
Low.....	Petitioned action ..	5
	Unpetitioned action.	6

The priorities established in Table 2 are not intended to direct or mandate decisions regarding a species' reclassification or removal from the list. The priority system is intended only to set priorities for developing rules for species that no longer satisfy the listing criteria for their particular designation under the Act. The decision regarding whether a species will be retained on

the list, and in which category, will be based on the factors contained in section 4(a)(1) of the Act and 50 CFR 424.11.

The first consideration of the system outlined in Table 2 accounts for the management impact entailed by a species' inclusion on the list. Management impact is the extent of protective actions, including restrictions on human activities, which must be taken to protect and recover a listed species. If the current listing is no longer accurate, continuing protective management actions could divert resources from species more in need of conservation and recovery efforts, or impose an unnecessary restriction on the public. Because the Act mandates timely response to petitions, the system also considers whether NOAA Fisheries has been petitioned to remove a species from the list or to reclassify a species from endangered to threatened. Higher priority will be given to petitioned actions than to unpetitioned actions that are classified at the same level of management impact.

There is no direct relationship between the systems outlined in Tables 1 and 2. Although the same statutory criteria apply in making listing and delisting determinations, the considerations for setting listing and delisting priorities are quite different. Candidate species facing immediate, critical threats will be given a higher priority for listing than species being considered for delisting. Likewise, a delisting proposal for a recovered species that would eliminate unwarranted utilization of limited resources may, in appropriate instances, take precedence over listing proposals for species not facing immediate, critical threats.

B. Recovery Plan Preparation and Implementation Priorities

The recovery priority system will be used as a guide for recovery plan development, recovery task implementation and resource allocation. It consists of two parts—species recovery priority and recovery task priority. Species recovery priority will be used for recovery plan development. Recovery task priority, together with species recovery priority, will be used to set priorities for funding and performance of individual recovery tasks as explained below.

1. Species Recovery Priority

Species recovery priority is based on three criteria—magnitude of threat, recovery potential and conflict. These criteria are arranged in a matrix yielding

twelve species recovery priority numbers (Table 3).

TABLE 3.—SPECIES RECOVERY PRIORITY

Magnitude of threat	Recovery potential	Conflict	Priority	
High.....	High.....	Conflict.....	1	
		No conflict.....	2	
		Conflict.....	3	
	Low to moderate.	No conflict.....	4
			Conflict.....	5
		No conflict.....	6
			Conflict.....	7
Low.....	High.....	No conflict.....	8	
		Conflict.....	9	
		No conflict.....	10	
	Low to moderate.	Conflict.....	11	
		No conflict.....	12	

The first criterion, magnitude of threat, is divided into three categories: High, moderate, and low. The high category means extinction is almost certain in the immediate future because of a rapid population decline or habitat destruction. Moderate means the species will not face extinction if recovery is temporarily held off, although there is a continuing population decline or threat to its habitat. Taxa in the low category are rare, or are facing a population decline which may be a short-term, self-correcting fluctuation, or the impacts of threats to the species' habitat are not fully known.

The second criterion, recovery potential, assures that resources are used in the most cost effective manner within each magnitude of threat ranking. Priority for preparing and implementing recovery plans would go to species with the greatest potential for success. Recovery potential is based on how well biological and ecological limiting factors and threats to the species' existence are understood, and the extent of management actions needed. A species has a high recovery potential if the limiting factors and threats to the species are well understood and the needed management actions are known and have a high probability of success. A species has a low to moderate recovery potential if the limiting factors or threats to the species are poorly understood or if the needed management actions are not known, are cost-prohibitive or are experimental with an uncertain probability of success.

The third criterion, conflict, reflects the Act's requirement that recovery priority be given to those species that are, or may be, in conflict with construction or other developmental projects or other forms of economic

activity. Thus, species judged as being in conflict with such activities will be given higher priority for recovery plan development and implementation than non-conflict species within the same magnitude of threat/recovery potential ranking. Species in conflict with construction or other developmental projects or other forms of economic activity would be identified in large part through consultations conducted with Federal agencies under section 7 of the Act.

2. Recovery Task Priority

Recovery plans will identify specific tasks that are needed for the recovery of a listed species. NOAA Fisheries will assign tasks priorities of 1 to 3 based on the criteria set forth in Table 4.

TABLE 4.—RECOVERY TASK PRIORITY.

Priority	Type of task
1.....	An action that must be taken to prevent extinction or to identify those actions necessary to prevent extinction.
2.....	An action that must be taken to prevent a significant decline in population numbers, habitat quality, or other significant negative impacts short of extinction.
3.....	All other actions necessary to provide for full recovery of the species.

It should be noted that even the highest priority tasks within a plan are not given a Priority 1 ranking unless they are actions necessary to prevent a species from becoming extinct or to identify those actions necessary to prevent extinction. Therefore, some plans will not have any Priority 1 tasks. In general, Priority 1 tasks only apply to a species facing a high magnitude of threat (species recovery priority 1-4).

When the task priorities (Table 4) are combined with the species recovery priority (Table 3), the most critical activities for each listed species can be identified and evaluated against other species recovery actions. This system recognizes the need to work toward the recovery of all listed species, not simply those facing the highest magnitude of threat. In general, NOAA Fisheries intends that Priority 1 tasks will be addressed before Priority 2 tasks and Priority 2 tasks before Priority 3 tasks. Within each task priority, species recovery priority will be used to further rank tasks. For example, a Priority 1 task for a species with a recovery priority of 4 would rank higher than a Priority 2 task for a species with a

recovery priority of 1; and, a Priority 1 task for a species with a recovery priority of 2 would rank higher than a Priority 1 task for a species with a recovery priority of 4. For tasks with the same priority ranking, the Assistant Administrator will determine the appropriate allocation of available resources.

C. Recovery Plans

As recovery plans are developed for each species, specific recovery tasks are identified and prioritized according to the criteria discussed above. As new information warrants, these plans, including tasks and priorities, will be reviewed and revised. In addition, funding and implementation of the tasks identified in recovery plans will be tracked in order to aid in effective management of the recovery program.

NOAA Fisheries believes that periodic review and updating of plans and tracking of recovery efforts are important elements of a successful recovery program. Information from tracking and implementing recovery actions and other sources will be used to review plans and revise them as necessary. These and other elements of NOAA's recovery planning process will be discussed in more detail in Recovery Planning Guidelines that the agency is developing.

Classification

The General Counsel of the Department of Commerce certified to the Small Business Administration that these guidelines would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because they do not direct or mandate decisions on a species' listing, reclassification or delisting. Rather, they set up priorities for later decisions as to agency review of species, recovery plan development and recovery task implementation. As a result, a regulatory flexibility analysis was not prepared.

Dated: June 8, 1990.

William W. Fox, Jr.,

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries,
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration.

[FR Doc. 90-13895 Filed 6-14-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-M

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM THE BLIND AND OTHER SEVERELY HANDICAPPED

Procurement List 1990; Additions

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped.

ACTION: Additions to procurement list.

SUMMARY: This action adds to Procurement List 1990 commodities to be produced and a service to be provided by workshops for the blind or other severely handicapped.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 16, 1990.

ADDRESS: Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, Crystal Square 5, Suite 1107, 1755 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202-3509.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Beverly Milkman (703) 557-1145.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 6 and 27, 1990, the Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped published notices (55 FR 12878 and 17804) of proposed additions to Procurement List 1990, which was published on November 3, 1989 (54 FR 46540). After consideration of the material presented to it concerning capability of qualified workshops to produce the commodities and provide the service at a fair market price and impact of the addition on the current or most recent contractors, the Committee has determined that the commodities and service listed below are suitable for procurement by the Federal Government under 41 U.S.C. 46-48c and 41 CFR 51-2.6.

I certify that the following actions will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. The major factors considered for this certification were:

- The actions will not result in any additional reporting, recordkeeping or other compliance requirements.
- The actions will not have a serious economic impact on any contractors for the commodities and service listed.
- The actions will result in authorizing small entities to produce the commodities and provide the service procured by the Government.

Accordingly, the following commodities and service are hereby added to Procurement List 1990:

Commodities

Igniter Assembly, Empty
1330-01-M00-0103

(Requirements for Pine Bluff Arsenal,
Pine Bluff, Arkansas only)

Starter Rope, Engine
2990-00-961-3692

Apron, Protective
6532-00-935-9765

Tray, Fiberboard, Three-Sided
P.S. Item 136