

cooling water needed, and continued operation of intake screens and fish return systems when associated water pumps are in operation. CHGE proposed to provide an annual count of the number of shortnose sturgeon impinged at each facility based on sampling during one 24-hour period each week of operation. CHGE will conduct a mark-recapture study designed to estimate the size of the adult shortnose sturgeon population in the Hudson River twice during the 15-year term of the permit (permit years 7 and 14).

On May 19, 2000, NMFS' Office of Protected Resources received a complete application from CHGC requesting an ESA section 10(a)(1)(A) scientific research permit for the conduct of monitoring associated with the operation of the Roseton and Danskammer power plants. As required by 50 CFR 222.24 (a), NMFS published a notice of receipt in the **Federal Register** on June 19, 2000 (65 FR 39869). CHGC has requested approval for the collection of larvae, juvenile, and adult shortnose sturgeon in various location in the Hudson River. The comment period for this research permit application closed on July 23, 2000, and NMFS is currently compiling comments that were received on the application. Details of the research permit application are provided in the Conservation Plan prepared for CHGE's application for an ESA section 10(a)(1)(B) incidental take permit which is announced by this notice.

This notice is provided pursuant to section 10(a) of the ESA and NEPA regulations. The NMFS will evaluate the application, associated documents, and comments submitted to determine whether the application meets the requirements of the Act and NEPA. If it is determined that the requirements are met, permits will be issued for the incidental take of shortnose sturgeon. The final permit decision will be made no sooner than 30 days from the date of this notice.

Authority

Issuance of permits and permit modifications, as required by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531–1543) (ESA), is based on a finding that such permits/modifications: (1) Are applied for in good faith; (2) would not operate to the disadvantage of the listed species which are the subject of the permits; and (3) are consistent with the purposes and policies set forth in section 2 of the ESA. Authority to take listed species is subject to conditions set forth in the permits. Permits and modifications are issued in accordance with and are

subject to the ESA and NMFS regulations governing listed fish and wildlife permits (50 CFR parts 222–226).

Dated: August 3, 2000.

Margaret Lorenz,

*Acting Chief, Endangered Species Division,
Office of Protected Resources, National
Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 00–20160 Filed 8–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 072600C]

Marine Mammals; Photography Permit (File No. 986–1592)

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

ACTION: Receipt of application.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that Mr. Bruce Reitherman Pandion Enterprises, P.O. Box 545, Summerland, California 93067, has applied in due form for a permit to take elephant seals (*Mirounga angustirostris*) for purposes of commercial photography.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before September 8, 2000.

ADDRESSES: The application and related documents are available for review upon written request or by appointment in the following office(s):

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

Regional Administrator, Southwest Region, NMFS, 501 West Ocean Boulevard, Suite 4200, Long Beach, California 90802, (562/980–4021).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The subject permit is requested under the authority of § 104(c)(6) 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). Section 104(c)(6) provides for photography for educational or commercial purposes involving non-endangered and non-threatened marine mammals in the wild. NMFS is currently working on proposed regulations to implement this provision. However, in the meantime, NMFS has received and is processing this request as a “pilot” application for Level B Harassment of non-listed and non-

depleted marine mammals for photographic purposes.

The applicant seeks authorization to inadvertently harass up to 50 elephant seals (*Mirounga angustirostris*) during the course of filming activities in Piedras Blancas and Ano Nuevo, California over a 1-year period.

Written comments or requests for a public hearing on this application should be mailed to the Chief, Permits and Documentation Division, F/PR1, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, 1315 East-West Highway, Room 13705, Silver Spring, MD 20910. Those individuals requesting a hearing should set forth the specific reasons why a hearing on this particular request would be appropriate.

Comments may also be submitted by facsimile at (301) 713–0376, provided the facsimile is confirmed by hard copy submitted by mail and postmarked no later than the closing date of the comment period. Please note that comments will not be accepted by e-mail or by other electronic media.

Concurrent with the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, NMFS is forwarding copies of this application to the Marine Mammal Commission and its Committee of Scientific Advisors.

Dated: August 4, 2000.

Ann D. Terbush,

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

[FR Doc. 00–20161 Filed 8–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Adjustment of Import Limits for Certain Wool Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

August 4, 2000.

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

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 9, 2000.

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, call (202) 482-3715.

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 Categories 434 and 443 are being adjusted for swing and carryforward.

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 64 FR 71982, published on December 22, 1999). Also see 64 FR 71115, published on December 20, 1999.

Richard B. Steinkamp,
Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

August 4, 2000.

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 December 14, 1999, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain wool textile products, produced or manufactured in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and exported during the twelve-month period beginning on January 1, 2000 and extending through December 31, 2000.

Effective on August 9, 2000, you are directed to adjust the current limits for the following categories, as provided for in the agreement between the Governments of the United States and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia dated November 7, 1997:

Category	Adjusted twelve-month limit ¹
434	11,764 dozen.
443	185,811 numbers.

¹ The limits have not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1999.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that these actions fall within the foreign affairs exception to the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,
Richard B. Steinkamp,
Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.
[FR Doc. 00-20141 Filed 8-8-00; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[CPSC Docket No. 00-C0011]

In the Matter of Royal Sovereign Corp., a Corporation; Settlement Agreement and Order

1. This Settlement Agreement and Order between Royal Sovereign Corporation (“Royal Sovereign”), a New Jersey corporation, and the staff of the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission (“the CPSC”), pursuant to 16 CFR 1118.20 of the Commission’s Procedures for Investigations, Inspections, and Inquiries under the Consumer Product Safety Act (“CPSA”), reflects a compromise resolution of the matter described herein, entered without a hearing or determination of issues of law and fact.

I. The Parties

2. The staff is the staff of the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission, an independent federal regulatory agency responsible for the enforcement of the Consumer Product Safety Act. 15 U.S.C. 2051-2084.

3. Royal Sovereign is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey. Its principal corporate offices are located at 100 West Sheffield Ave., Englewood, NJ 07631. Royal Sovereign is an importer and distributor of small electronic appliances, including portable ceramic heaters.

II. Staff Allegations

4. Section 15(b) of the CPSA, 15 U.S.C. 2064(b) requires a manufacturer of a consumer product who, *inter alia*, obtains information that reasonably supports the conclusion that the product contains a defect which could create a substantial product hazard or creates an unreasonable risk of serious injury or death, to immediately inform the Commission of the defect or risk.

5. Between 1992 and 1996, Royal Sovereign imported and distributed within the United States approximately 39,300 model RST1200 oscillating ceramic portable heaters (“RST 1200 heaters”). The portable heaters are “consumer products” and Royal Sovereign is a “distributor” of “consumer products” that are

“distributed in commerce” as those terms are defined in sections 3(a)(1), (4), (11) of the CPSA, 15 U.S.C. 2052(a)(1), (4), (11).

6. The RST 1200 heaters are defective because the mechanism that rotates the heater side-to-side can wear through the insulation of electrical wiring inside the heater’s base. In addition, some of the connections between the electrical wires and other components inside the heater are faulty. Either of these conditions can cause a fire.

7. Between 1994 and 1997, Royal Sovereign received at least thirteen reports of fires involving RST 1200 heaters. The fires resulted in property damage claims in excess of \$70,000.

8. On October 24, 1995, CPSC field investigator William Robinson inspected the facilities of Royal Sovereign, and interviewed firm officials, seeking information about a fire involving an RST 1200 heater that had been reported to the Commission by the consumer. Mr. Robinson shared the staff’s engineering evaluation of the unit involved in the fire, which concluded that faulty crimp connections may have led to arcing and overheating within the unit that caused ignition of the plastic housing. Firm officials informed Mr. Robinson at that time that they believed the RST 1200 heater involved in the fire had been tampered with, and that the faulty crimps were not of Royal Sovereign’s manufacture.

9. Royal Sovereign also informed Mr. Robinson on October 24, 1995, that Royal Sovereign had received reports of two additional fires involving RST 1200 heaters. Firm officials stated that one of those fires resulted from the heater being placed too close to combustibles, and that they believed the other fire had been deliberately set. Mr. Robinson was told that the other complaints the firm had received concerning the RST 1200 related to mechanical failures or product dissatisfaction.

10. At the conclusion of his inspection, Mr. Robinson left with Royal Sovereign copies of the CPSC statutes and regulations setting forth a distributor’s obligations to report potential safety hazards to the Commission.

11. In 1996, Royal Sovereign undertook an “upgrade” program, pursuant to which it contacted those consumers of RST 1200 heaters from whom the firm had received warranty cards and informed them that they could return their heaters for “reconfiguration to 1996 standards.” The “upgrade” involved opening the units to evaluate the crimp connections and the installation of a sleeve over the power cord, which entered the unit in