

Effective interest rate	On or after	Prior to
9 ¹ / ₈	Jan. 1, 1988	July 1, 1988.
9 ³ / ₈	July 1, 1988	Jan. 1, 1989.
9 ¹ / ₄	Jan. 1, 1989	July 1, 1989.
9	July 1, 1989	Jan. 1, 1990.
8 ¹ / ₈	Jan. 1, 1990	July 1, 1990.
9	July 1, 1990	Jan. 1, 1991.
8 ³ / ₄	Jan. 1, 1991	July 1, 1991.
8 ¹ / ₂	July 1, 1991	Jan. 1, 1992.
8	Jan. 1, 1992	July 1, 1992.
8	July 1, 1992	Jan. 1, 1993.
7 ³ / ₄	Jan. 1, 1993	July 1, 1993.
7	July 1, 1993	Jan. 1, 1994.
6 ⁵ / ₈	Jan. 1, 1994	July 1, 1994.
7 ³ / ₄	July 1, 1994	Jan. 1, 1995.
8 ³ / ₈	Jan. 1, 1995	July 1, 1995.
7 ¹ / ₄	July 1, 1995	Jan. 1, 1996.
6 ¹ / ₂	Jan. 1, 1996	July 1, 1996.
7 ¹ / ₄	July 1, 1996	Jan. 1, 1997.
6 ³ / ₄	Jan. 1, 1997	July 1, 1997.
7 ¹ / ₈	July 1, 1997	Jan. 1, 1998.
6 ³ / ₈	Jan. 1, 1998	July 1, 1998.
6 ¹ / ₈	July 1, 1998	Jan. 1, 1999.
5 ¹ / ₂	Jan. 1, 1999	July 1, 1999.
6 ¹ / ₈	July 1, 1999	Jan. 1, 2000.
6 ¹ / ₂	Jan. 1, 2000	July 1, 2000.
6 ¹ / ₂	July 1, 2000	Jan. 1, 2001.
6	Jan. 1, 2001	July 1, 2001.
5 ⁷ / ₈	July 1, 2001	Jan. 1, 2002.

Section 221(g)(4) of the Act provides that debentures issued pursuant to that paragraph (with respect to the assignment of an insured mortgage to the Secretary) will bear interest at the "going Federal rate" of interest in effect at the time the debentures are issued. The term "going Federal rate" is defined to mean the interest rate that the Secretary of the Treasury determines, pursuant to a statutory formula based on the average yield on all outstanding marketable Treasury obligations of 8- to 12-year maturities, for the 6-month periods of January through June and July through December of each year. Section 221(g)(4) is implemented in the HUD regulations at 24 CFR 221.790.

The Secretary of the Treasury has determined that the interest rate to be borne by debentures issued pursuant to Section 221(g)(4) during the 6-month period beginning July 1, 2001, is 6³/₄ percent.

HUD expects to publish its next notice of change in debenture interest rates in December 2001.

The subject matter of this notice falls within the categorical exemption from HUD's environmental clearance procedures set forth in 24 CFR 50.19(c)(6). For that reason, no environmental finding has been prepared for this notice.

(Sections 211, 221, 224, National Housing Act, 12 U.S.C. 1715b, 1715l, 1715o; Section 7(d), Department of HUD Act, 42 U.S.C. 3535(d))

Dated: August 27, 2001.

John C. Weicher,

Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 01-22565 Filed 9-7-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-27-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Notice of Availability of Draft Recovery Goals for Four Endangered Fishes of the Colorado River Basin

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of document availability.

SUMMARY: To further the recovery of humpback chub (*Gila cypha*), bonytail (*Gila elegans*), Colorado pikeminnow (formerly named Colorado squawfish; *Ptychocheilus lucius*), and razorback sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*), we, the Fish and Wildlife Service announce the availability of draft recovery goals for these endangered fishes of the Colorado River Basin. This information will serve as a supplement and amendment to the respective existing recovery plans for each species. The draft recovery goals for each species provide objective, measurable recovery criteria for downlisting and delisting that identify levels of demographic and genetic viability needed for self-sustaining populations and site-specific

management actions/tasks needed to minimize or remove threats. We solicit review and comment from agencies and the public on these draft recovery goals. Reviewers should pay particular attention to the application of existing demographic and genetic data in the development of minimum viable population (MVP) standards and the downlisting and delisting monitoring periods associated with each species.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of these supplements and amendments are to describe site-specific management actions/tasks; provide objective, measurable recovery criteria; and provide estimates of the time required to achieve recovery of each of the four endangered fish species. The recovery goals for the humpback chub, razorback sucker, and bonytail are identified by two recovery units, upper basin (above Glen Canyon Dam, Arizona) and lower basin. Recovery of the Colorado pikeminnow is currently considered only for the upper basin. Downlisting and delisting criteria by listing factors and management actions, as well as demographic criteria, are presented for populations of each species within recovery units. In addition, updated life-history information, statistical criteria for monitoring, and estimated time to achieve downlisting and delisting requirements are also identified. These serve as supplements and amendments to the recovery plans by providing more

specific objective and measurable criteria to recover each of the four fish species.

Copies of the Draft Recovery Goals will be mailed to interested parties upon request. The documents are also available (in *.pdf format) for viewing and downloading at: <http://www.r6.fws.gov/crrip/rg.htm>. Make requests and mail comments to the Director at the address below. You may submit comments by sending electronic mail (e-mail) to: colorivgoals@fws.gov.

DATES: The agency must receive comments on or before October 25, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Mail comments and requests to Dr. Robert Muth, Director, Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Post Office Box 25486, DFC, Denver, Colorado, 80225. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for information about electronic filing.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Robert Muth, Director (extension 268), Dr. Thomas Czapla (extension 228) or Ms. Debra Felker (extension 227), Coordinators (see **ADDRESSES** above), at telephone (303) 969-7322.

Dated: August 20, 2001.

Ralph O. Morgenweck,

Regional Director, Denver, CO.

[FR Doc. 01-22602 Filed 9-7-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Status of the Wasatch Front Population of the Spotted Frog

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) announce our intent to prepare a status review and a revised 12-month finding for the Wasatch Front population of the spotted frog (*Rana luteiventris*).

DATES: Comments and information for our use in preparing the status review and revised 12-month finding will be accepted until November 9, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Questions and comments concerning this status review should be sent to Henry Maddux, Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 145 East 1300 South, Suite 404, Salt Lake City, Utah 84115. Written comments and materials also should be directed to the same address. Copies of our 1995 status review and 12-month finding are available on the web at

<<http://mountain-prairie.fws.gov/spottedfrog>>. Comments can be provided via e-mail to

<fw6_spottedfrog@fws.gov>. Comments and materials received will be available on request for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jessica L. Gourley, Fish and Wildlife Biologist (see **ADDRESSES** section), telephone (801) 524-5001, e-mail <jess_gourley@fws.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 1, 1989, we received a petition from the Board of Directors of the Utah Nature Study Society requesting that the Service add the spotted frog (then referred to as *Rana pretiosa*) to the List of Threatened and Endangered Species. The petition addressed the range-wide distribution of the spotted frog that included a main population in southeast Alaska, Alberta, British Columbia, eastern Washington, northeastern Oregon, northern and central Idaho, and western Montana and Wyoming, Utah, and additional disjunct populations in northeastern California, southern Idaho, Nevada, and western Washington and Oregon. The disjunct populations in Utah occur along the Wasatch Front and West Desert. The petition specifically requested that we consider the status of the Wasatch Front population.

The spotted frog belongs to the family of true frogs, the Ranidae. Adult frogs have large, dark spots on their backs and pigmentation on their abdomens varying from yellow to red (Turner 1957). Spotted frogs along the Wasatch Front generally possess a salmon color ventrally, while West Desert and Sanpete County, Utah, populations [[Page 16219]] generally have a yellow to yellow-orange color ventrally. Spotted frogs in Utah are reported to have fewer and lighter colored spots (Colburn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, pers. comm. 1992) than other populations. The spotted frog is closely associated with water (Dumas 1966, Nussbaum et al. 1983). Habitat includes the marshy edges of ponds, lakes, slow-moving cool water streams and springs (Licht 1974; Nussbaum et al. 1983; Morris and Tanner 1969; Hovingh 1987).

Section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), requires that we make a finding on whether a petition to list, delist or reclassify a species presents substantial scientific or commercial information indicating that

the petitioned action is—(a) not warranted; (b) warranted; or (c) warranted but precluded from immediate proposal by other pending listing proposals of higher priority. We subsequently published a notice of a 90-day finding in the **Federal Register** (54 FR 42529) on October 17, 1989, and a notice of the 12-month petition finding in the **Federal Register** (58 FR 27260) on May 7, 1993. In the 12-month petition finding we concluded that listing of the spotted frog as threatened in some portions of its range was warranted but precluded by other higher priority listing actions. Both distinct populations in Utah, the Wasatch Front and West Desert populations, were found to be warranted but precluded and were designated as candidates for listing. The Wasatch Front population was assigned a listing priority number of 3 because the magnitude of the threats were high and imminent, while the West Desert population was assigned a listing priority of 9 because of moderate to low threats.

Our warranted but precluded finding identified that habitat loss and modification from reservoir construction and from urban and agricultural developments was a primary cause of the decline in the Wasatch Front population (Dennis Shirley, pers. comm. 1992). Degradation of spring habitats and water quality from cattle grazing and other agricultural activities in these limited habitats were identified as potential threats to the spotted frog of the West Desert population (Hovingh 1987; Peter Hovingh, pers. comm. 1992; Dennis Shirley, pers. comm. 1992).

On November 28, 1997, we announced the availability of a Draft Conservation Agreement for the Wasatch Front and West Desert populations (Utah) of spotted frog for review and comment (62 FR 63375). We subsequently signed the Conservation Agreement on February 13, 1998. The goal of this agreement developed by the Utah Department of Natural Resources in cooperation with the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission, Central Utah Water Conservancy District, the Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Federation, and the Service, was to ensure the long-term conservation of the spotted frog within its historical range in Utah. Due to numerous activities and studies in addition to and pursuant with the Conservation Agreement, we determined that the status of the species in Utah had improved and issued a new 12-month petition finding of “not