

TYPE OF DISABILITY

No. of residents	Physical and/or developmental	Chronic mental illness
2	\$166,022	\$160,262
3	178,533	172,340
4	191,045	183,069
5	203,556	193,798
6	216,054	204,527
7	221,547	209,653
8	227,040	214,778
9	236,972	223,212
10	248,013	232,616
11	256,835	240,065
12	266,766	248,498
13	277,308	257,140
14	287,836	265,782
15	298,365	274,409

These cost limits reflect those costs reasonable and necessary to develop a project of modest design that complies with HUD minimum property standards; the accessibility requirements of § 891.120(b); and the project design and cost standards of § 891.120 and § 891.210.

Increased development cost limits.

(1) HUD may increase the development cost limits by up to 140 percent in any geographic area where the cost levels require, and may increase the development cost limits by up to 160 percent on a project-by-project basis. This increase may include covering additional costs to make dwelling units accessible through rehabilitation.

(2) If HUD finds that high construction costs in Alaska, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or Hawaii make it infeasible to construct dwellings, without the sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability, within the development cost limits provided above, the amount of the capital advances may be increased to compensate for such costs. The increase may not exceed the limits established above (including any high cost area adjustment) by more than 50 percent.

HUD expects to publish its next notice of change in the development cost limits in October 2001.

Dated: January 12, 2001.

William C. Apgar,

Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 01-1839 Filed 1-19-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-27-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Information Collection Renewal Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Approval Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has submitted the collection of information from applicants who wish to obtain a permit to conduct activities under a number of wildlife conservation laws, treaties and regulations. A copy of the information collection requirement is included in this notice. If you wish to obtain copies of the proposed information collection requirement, related forms, and explanatory material, contact the Collection Clearance Officer at the address listed below.

DATES: OMB has up to 60 days to approve or disapprove information collection but may respond after 30 days. Therefore, to ensure maximum consideration you must submit comments on or before February 21, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Send your comments and suggestions on specific requirements to the Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Department of the Interior Desk Officer, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503, and to Rebecca Mullin, Collection Clearance Officer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, MS-222-ARLSQ; 4401 N. Fairfax Drive, Arlington, VA 22203.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request a copy of the information collection request, explanatory information and related forms, contact Rebecca A. Mullin, Collection Clearance Officer at 703-358-2287, or electronically to rmullin@fws.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regulations at 5 CFR 1320, which implement provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13), require that interested members of the public and affected agencies have an opportunity to comment on information collection and record keeping activities [see 5 CFR 1320.8(d)]. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (We) has submitted a request to OMB to renew its approval of the collection of information for the Service's license/permit application form number 3-200-19 through 3-200-25 and 3-200-27 through 3-200-53. We are requesting a 3-year term of approval for this information collection activity.

A previous 60-day notice on this information collection requirement was published in the July 6, 2000 (65 FR 41716) **Federal Register** inviting public comment. No comments on the previous notice were received. This notice provides an additional 30 days in which to comment on the following information.

We invite comments concerning this renewal on: (1) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and, (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond. The information collections in this program are part of a system of record covered by the Privacy Act [5 U.S.C. 552 (a)].

Federal agencies may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB number. The OMB control number for this collection is 1018-0093.

The information collection requirements in this submission implement the regulatory requirements of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1539), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (TIAS 8249), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (15 U.S.C. 704), the Lacey Act (18 U.S.C. 42-44), the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361-1407), and Wild Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4901-4916), and are contained in Service regulations in Chapter I, Subchapter B of Title 50 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Parts 15, 16, 17 and 23. Common permit applications and record keeping requirements have been consolidated in 50 CFR 13, and unique requirements of the various statutes in the applicable Part.

OMB Control Number: 1018-0093.

Service Form Numbers: 3-200-19 through 3-200-25 and 3-200-27 through 3-200-53

Frequency of Collection: On Occasion.

Description of Respondents:

Individuals, biomedical companies, circuses, zoological parks, botanical gardens, nurseries, museums, universities, scientists, antique dealers, exotic pet industry, hunters, taxidermists, commercial importers/exporters of wildlife and plants, freight forwarders/brokers, local, State, tribal and Federal governments.

Total Annual Burden Hours: 4500.

Total Annual Responses: 5959.
Total Annual Non-Hour Cost Burden:
\$149,000.

Dated: January 16, 2001.

Mark Phillips,

Service Information Collection Officer.

[FR Doc. 01-1705 Filed 1-19-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Notice of Policy Regarding Capture and Removal of Southern Sea Otters in a Designated Management Zone

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Statement of policy.

SUMMARY: This notice advises the public that we, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), have determined that we will not capture and remove southern sea otters from the southern California sea otter management zone pending completion of our ongoing reevaluation of the southern sea otter translocation program including the preparation of a supplemental environmental impact statement (EIS) and release of a final evaluation of the translocation program.

On July 19, 2000, we finalized a biological opinion in accordance with section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA), evaluating containment of southern sea otters, including the capture and removal of otters from a designated management zone. That biological opinion is based on substantial new information on the population status, behavior, and ecology of the southern sea otter, and concludes that continued containment of southern sea otters will likely jeopardize the continued existence of the southern sea otter. On July 27, 2000 (65 FR 46172), we published a notice of intent to prepare a supplemental EIS on the southern sea otter translocation plan.

We have determined, based on our recent biological opinion, that containment of southern sea otters, at present, is not consistent with the requirement under the Act to avoid jeopardy to the species. We are in the process of reevaluating the translocation program and expect to complete a supplemental EIS and finalize our evaluation of the translocation program, including evaluation of the failure criteria developed for the program, by December 2002. We have provided and will continue to provide for public participation during that process. Upon

completion of these documents, we will determine whether the southern sea otter translocation plan needs to be modified (including under what circumstances containment of southern sea otters can resume) or terminated to make it consistent with the survival and recovery needs of the species.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Greg Sanders, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office, 2493 Portola Road, Suite B, Ventura, California, 93003-7726, (telephone: 805/644-1766; facsimile: 805/644-3958).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 14, 1977 (42 FR 2968), we listed the southern sea otter (*Enhydra lutris nereis*) as a threatened species under the ESA on the basis of its small population size, greatly reduced range, and the potential risk from oil spills. We established a recovery team for the species in 1980 and approved a recovery plan on February 3, 1982. In the recovery plan, we identified the translocation of southern sea otters to a remote location in order to establish a second colony of otters as an effective and reasonable recovery action, although we acknowledged that a translocated southern sea otter population could impact shellfish fisheries that had developed in areas formerly occupied by southern sea otters. Goals cited in the recovery plan included: minimizing risk from potential oil spills; establishing at least one additional breeding colony outside the then-current southern sea otter range; and compiling and evaluating information on historical distribution and abundance, available but unoccupied habitat, and potential fishery conflicts.

The purpose of the translocation program was to establish southern sea otters in one or more areas outside the otters' then-current range to minimize the possibility of a single natural or human-caused catastrophe, such as an oil spill, adversely affecting a significant portion of the population. Ultimately, it was anticipated that translocation would result in a larger population size and a more continuous distribution of animals throughout the southern sea otter's former historical range. We viewed translocation as important to achieve recovery and to identify the optimum sustainable population (OSP) level for the southern sea otter as required under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA).

Translocation of a listed species to establish experimental populations is

specifically authorized under section 10(j) of the ESA. However, the southern sea otter is protected under both the ESA and the MMPA, and the MMPA contains no similar translocation provisions. For southern sea otters, this dilemma was resolved by the passage of Public Law (P.L.) 99-625 (Fish and Wildlife Programs: Improvement; Section 1. Translocation of California Sea Otters) on November 7, 1986, which specifically authorized development of a translocation plan for southern sea otters administered in cooperation with the affected State.

If the Secretary of the Interior chose to develop a translocation plan under P.L. 99-625, the plan was to include: the number, age, and sex of sea otters proposed to be relocated; the manner in which sea otters were to be captured, translocated, released, monitored, and protected; specification of a zone into which the experimental population would be introduced (translocation zone); specification of a zone surrounding the translocation zone that did not include range of the parent population or adjacent range necessary for the recovery of the species (management zone); measures, including an adequate funding mechanism, to isolate and contain the experimental population; and a description of the relationship of the implementation of the plan to the status of the species under the ESA and determinations under section 7 of the ESA. The purposes of the management zone were to facilitate the management of southern sea otters and containment of the experimental population within the translocation zone and to prevent, to the maximum extent feasible, conflicts between the experimental population and other fishery resources within the management zone. Any sea otter found within the management zone was to be treated as a member of the experimental population. The Service was required to use all feasible non-lethal means to capture sea otters in the management zone and return them to the translocation zone or to the range of the parent population.

On March 6, 1987, we completed an intra-Service biological opinion that evaluated translocation of southern sea otters to San Nicolas Island, our preferred translocation site. That biological opinion analyzed effects on the parent population caused by removal of southern sea otters from the population for translocation and the effects on the species of containment (removal) of otters from the management zone. The proposed translocation plan was found to be a well-designed recovery action that maximized the