GSAR reference	OMB control No.		
537.110(a)	3090-0197		
537.110(b)			
538.203-71(a)	3090-0121		
538.203-72(b)	3090-0250		
542.1107			
546.302-70			
546.302-71			
546.570			
552.207-70			
552.210-74	3090-0203		
552.210-79	3090-0246		
552.212-1	3090-0204		
552.212-71	. 3090-0204		
552.214-75	3090-0200		
552.216-71	3090-0243		
552.216-73	. 3090-0248		
552.219-73	. 3090-0252		
552.223-71	. 3090-0205		
552.225-70			
552.225-75			
552.228-74			
552.232-74			
552.232-79			
552.237-70			
552.237~71			
552.238-70			
552.238-72			
552.242-70			
552.246-70			
552.246-72			
552.249-71			
GSA-72			
GSA-72-A			
GSA-527			
GSA-618-D			
GSA-1142			
GSA-1364			
GSA-1678			
GSA-2419			
570.802(c)	. 3090-0086		

3. Section 501.170-1 is revised to read as follows:

501.170-1 GSA orders and handbooks.

Internal agency guidance, as described in FAR 1.301(a)(2), must be issued by heads of contracting activities in the form of a GSA order or handbook. GSA orders and handbooks must not unnecessarily repeat, paraphrase, or otherwise restate the FAR and GSAR. Policies and procedures for issuing GSA orders and handbooks are in the HB, Writing GSA Internal Directives (OAD P 1832.3A).

4. Paragraph (h)(1)(ii) and (h)(1)(v) of section 501.603–70 are revised to read as follows:

501.603-70 Contracting officer warrant program (COWP).

(h) * * * * (i) * * * *

(ii) Basic level (Does not apply to realty leasing and sales personnel)

(A) Small Purchases/Schedule Contracts—40 hours;

(B) Basic Procurement or Introduction to Contracting—40 hours;

(C) Contract Administration for Program Personnel—40 hours;

(Applicable to Buildings Managers Only);

(D) Basic Fleet Management
Procurement—40 hours (Only course required for Fleet Managers).

(v) Senior level (over \$100,000). (Does not apply to realty leasing and sales personnel)

(A) Executive Seminar in Acquisition—24—40 hours;

(B) Advanced Contract Administration—40 hours.

PART 514—SEALED BIDDING

5. Section 514.406–3 is revised to read as follows:

514.406–3 Other mistakes disclosed before award.

(a) Delegations of authority by head of the agency. In accordance with FAR 14.406-3(e), the contracting directors (see 502.101) are authorized, without power of redelegation, to make the determinations regarding corrections and/or withdrawals treated in FAR 14.406-3 (a), (b), and (c), and to make the corollary determinations not to permit withdrawal or correction for reasons indicated in FAR 14.406-3(d).

(b) Format for determinations.

Determinations under FAR 14.406-3

must be prepared in the following format.

Findings and Administrative Determination Alleged Mistake in Bid ("Prior to Award" or "After Award")

Βv

(Name of Bidder)

(IFB No.

Pursuant to Federal Acquisition Regulation 14.406 and General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation 514.406, I hereby make the following findings:

Findings

(List in chronological order the information required by FAR 14.406, including a numerical list of exhibits)

Determination

Based on the above findings, I hereby determine in accordance with FAR (14.406–3 (a) or (b), (c), (d), (g) or 14.406–4) that (include an appropriate statement indicating the determination to permit withdrawal, correction, etc.).

Contracting Officer (For determinations under FAR 14.406-3(g)(5) or 14.406-4)

Date

or

Contracting Director (For determinations under FAR 14.406-3 (a), (b), (c) or (d))

Date

I reviewed the above case as to form, technical accuracy of the proposed determination, and the general accuracy of the supporting evidence and approve it as to legal sufficiency.

Assigned Counsel

Date

(c) Legal review and approval.
Assigned counsel must approve
determinations by the contracting
director and contracting officer
regarding mistakes in bid.

PART 532—CONTRACT FINANCING

532.502-3 [Removed]

- 6. Section 532.502-3 is removed.
- 7. The clause date and paragraph (b) of section 552.223–72 are revised to read as follows:

552.223-72 Nonconforming Hazardous Materials.

Nonconforming Hazardous Materials (MAR 1992)

(b) "Hazardous materials," as used in this clause, includes any material defined as hazardous under the latest version of Federal Standard No. 313 (including revisions adopted during the term of the contract).

* * * * * * * * 552.232-74 [Removed]

8. Section 552,232-74 is removed.

Dated: April 13, 1992.

Richard H. Hopf III,

Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy.

[FR Doc. 92–9313 Filed 4–21–92; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6829-61-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018-AB

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for Sedum integrifolium ssp. leedyl (Leedy's roseroot)

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Service determines Sedum integrifolium ssp. leedyi (Leedy's

roseroot) to be a threatened species under the authority of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). This rare inhabitant of algific talus cliffs occurs in only six locations (four sites in Minnesota and two sites in New York). The species is threatened by the rarity of its fragile and unique "cliff-side" habitat. This action will implement Federal protection provided by the Act for Leedy's roseroot. Critical habitat is not being designated.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 22, 1992.

ADDRESSES: The complete file for this rule is available for inspection during normal business hours at the Division of Endangered Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Federal Building, Fort Snelling, Twin Cities, Minnesota 55111.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Craig Johnson, Chief, Division of Endangered Species (See ADDRESS section), at 612 725–3276 or FTS 725–3276.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Leedy's roseroot, Sedum integrifolium, spp. leedyi (Rosendahl et Moore) Clausen, was discovered by John L. Leedy in 1936 growing high on a limestone cliff along the Root River in Olmsted County, Minnesota (Clausen 1975). Leedy's roseroot is an isolated subspecies of a common western United States species. The range of the western subspecies and Leedy's roseroot do not overlap and they appear to have been isolated for a long time (approximately 10,000 years). Leedy's roseroot is more robust than most other Sedum species and it is characterized by tall floral stems. Its leaves are glaucous, oblong, and blue-green, averaging 30mm long, with irregularly dentate to entire margins. The plant is dioecious and the flowers are small, arranged in corymobose cymes. The petals are usually dark red with varying shades of yellowish white at the base. Some populations from Minnesota have petals that are dark red to the base and others have petals with greenish white bases. Observations at one Minnesota site (Wayne Ostlie, The Nature Conservancy, Iowa Chapter, in litt., 1991) reveal that entire flower heads are sometimes yellow or green/yellow and occur with red flowered plants. Leedy's roseroot plants at another Minnesota location have been noted to have orange flower heads (Frest 1986). Some plants in New York have petals with yellow or greenish yellow at the base. The subspecies has a thick, scaly rhizome that is usually conspicuous in the crevices of rock cliffs where it grows

(Rosendahl and Moore 1947; Coffin and Pfannmuller 1988).

Leedy's roseroot grows on cliffs that have cold water dripping into the soil in Minnesota (limestone cliffs with bands of bentonite) and on limestone and shale cliffs in New York. The plant is limited to those areas on the cliffs where ground water seeps through the cracks in the rock. As a result, the local environment remains cool and wet throughout the summer, a condition probably similar to the climate of the last ice age. Leedy's roseroot is believed to be a remnant of the Pleistocene flora and it may have once ranged across most of the continent before the last period of glaciation (Coffin and Pfannmuller 1988).

Leedy's roseroot was added to the Plant Notice of Review in 1990 as a Category 2 species. Receipt of subsequent additional information indicates that the species warrants the protection of the Act because of its rarity and threats of habitat alteration. At present, it is known to occur in only six sites; five of these sites are viable. Four locations occur in Minnesota and two in New York. In Minnesota, the population at each site contains 1000 to 3000 individuals and occupies over 100 yards of cliff face. The four Minnesota locations include Deer Creek and Bear Creek (in Fillmore County), Simpson Cliff and the Whitewater Wildlife Management Area (in Olmsted County) (Ostlie, in litt., 1988, Coffin and Pfannmuller 1988, Refsnider, pers. comm.). The New York population on the western edge of Seneca Lake, with approximately 10,000 individuals in an area 1 to 2 miles long (Rosendahl and Moore 1947). A population count in 1991 by the New York Natural Heritage Program staff indicates that this population may now number approximately 6,000-10,000 individual plants (Stephen Young, New York Heritage Botanist, pers. comm. 1991). A single robust individual plant occurs at Watkins Glen, but is thought to have been introduced (Clausen 1975).

Because of its unique habitat, the subspecies is often associated with other globally rare and endangered species. For example, several species of rare landsnails are often found in conjunction with Leedyi's roseroot including Novisuccinea ssp. A and N. ssp., and Vertigo hubrichti. In addition, several rare plants are known to occur at the Minnesota sites including Draba arabisans, Arabis laevigata (smooth rock cress), and Poa wolfii (Wolf's spear grass) (Ostilie in litt., 1988).

Summary of comments and Recommendations

In the June 18, 1991, proposed rule and associated notifications, all interested parties were requested to submit factual reports or information that might contribute to the development of a final rule. Appropriate state agencies, county governments, Federal agencies, scientific organizations, and other interested parties were contacted and requested to comment. Newspaper notices inviting general public comment were published in the Ithaca Journal (Ithaca, New York) on July 23, 1991, the Watkins Review and Express (Watkins Glen, New York) on July 24, 1991, and the Post-Bulletin (Rochester, Minnesota) on July 20, 1991. Several New York landowners responded via telephone and were provided information that explained the listing process. New York Congressman Alfonse D'Amato's office called in response to an inquiry from a constituent. A letter was sent to the Congressman's office explaining the status of Sedum integrifolium ssp. leedyi and how Federal and state rare plant laws would affect landowners. Eleven written comments were received from the following and are discussed below: the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, the Olmstead County Minnesota Planning Department, the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, six private individuals (five of whom are landowners), and the Iowa Chapter of The Nature Conservancy. Comments supporting the proposal were received from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, The Iowa Nature Conservancy, and one New York landowner. Six commenters offered additional information and thoughts about the species but did not take a position on the listing. Two private individuals opposed the action and raised the following issues:

Issue 1

Although rare, the species has survived since the ice age, adapted to current conditions, and does not appear to have difficulty in surviving. Why protect the plant? The Fish and Wildlife Service should spend time doing something about the zebra mussel.

Service response

The Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, requires that the Service take actions necessary to protect the ecosystems upon which endangered and threatened species depend and recover them to the point where protection of the Act is no longer necessary. Although Leedy's roseroot has survived since the

last ice age and has adapted to current conditions, its continued survival is threatened by habitat loss and degradation. Based on the best biological data available for Leedy's roseroot, the Service believes it is prudent to place the species under the protection of the Act. This action will enable the Service, state conservation agencies, interested individuals, and private organizations to initiate actions to prevent further decline of the species and chart a course to recovery. This is particularly important, since we are at a stage with this species where its survival can be assured with some specific protection actions. Alerting landowners and the public to the biology of the species and the need for habitat protection are some of the initial actions.

The Service has begun to address the impacts of the zebra mussel on native freshwater mussel species by evaluating the effects of chemicals proposed for zebra mussel control on non-target organisms. We have also identified the need for baseline information on various physiological and biochemical characteristics of native mussels in various river systems before zebra mussels become established (Diane Waller, Aquatic Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, in litt. 1991).

Issue 2

Residential development along Seneca Lake (New York) is not proceeding at a pace with other areas. Current New York State watershed regulations and rare species legislation offer protection for Leedy's roseroot, and citizens are "environmentally aware," so why are we spending time on this?

Service response

The Service recognizes the importance of state and local legislation and other protection efforts to protect and recover rare species. Placing species under the protection of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, strengthens local protection positions and provides additional resources for the recovery of species. It is important to note that Leedy's roseroot is not restricted to New York, but occurs in Minnesota, where protection is not provided to the same degree. Placing this species under the protection of the Act insures protection and recovery range-wide. The Service will be in a position to devote resources for research and habitat protection.

Issue 3

If the Fish and Wildlife Service would search similar areas in Ohio, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania, we would probably discover additional populations.

Service response

Extensive surveys have been conducted for this species, based on historical records; botanists have searched for rare plant species since early settlement times. Range-wide surveys within New York and Minnesota have been completed, and the Service believes the records for this species are complete. Status surveys were not conducted in areas outside of the species' historical range. The Service does not believe that additional surveys will reveal appreciably more occurrences of this species.

Issue 4

Shouldn't the Service attempt to stimulate interest for this plant as a commercial product, which would encourage people to plant the species as an addition to rock gardens?

Service Response

The purpose of the Act is to preserve ecosystems upon which endangered and threatened species depend and recover species to the point where they are no longer in danger of extinction. Affording coverage of the Act to a species is not for the purpose of utilizing them for commercial endeavors. Due to the plant's unique habitat needs it may not be feasible for the plant to be utilized for commercial product. The Service is not aware of any commercial interest in this species.

The Service has considered all eleven comments received and has incorporated them into this final rule as appropriate.

Summary of Factors Affecting the Species

After a thorough review and consideration of all available information, the Service has determined that Sedum integrifolium ssp. leedyi (Rosend. and Moore) Clausen should be classified as a threatened species. Section 4(a)(1) of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and regulations (50 CFR part 424) promulgated to implement the listing provisions of the Act, set forth the procedures for adding species to the Federal lists. A species may be determined to be an endangered or threatened species due to one or more of the five factors described in section 4(a)(1). These factors and their application to Sedum integrifolium spp. leedyi (Leedy's roseroot) are as follows:

A. The Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of its Habitat or Range

In Minnesota, ground water contamination and change are the greatest threat to this subspecies. Contamination of ground water is likely through filling or dumping in sink holes adjacent to the cliffs. Sink holes are highly vulnerable because they provide direct access to the ground water and are the main source of seepage on the cliffs. One of the largest sink holes behind Simpson Cliff in Minnesota has already been used for dumping.

In New York, the Glenora Cliff site is threatened by residential development along Seneca Lake. The uplands adjacent to the cliff are primarily wooded and the homes are being built away from the cliff edge along Glenora Road. However, many homeowners have built stairs down to the lake shore and some have cleared vegetation from the cliff to enhance their view of the lake. In some areas, trees have been cut and dumped over the cliff edge onto the areas where the roseroot grows. These changes can directly affect the plants, as well as affect the microhabitat of the area, which can make it less suitable for a roseroot population.

The use of agricultural pesticides in adjacent upland farmland (cropland in Minnesota and vineyards in New York) may directly affect the quality of the ground water. However, in Minnesota, if Leedy's roseroot is affected as a result of chemical use on adjacent agricultural lands, no violation will result as long as reasonable care was taken during the chemical application process. Road building and quarrying within karst formations of the Minnesota region pose additional threats. This type of disruption would affect the subsurface water flow in an area and change the ground water seepage at a cliff face. Since the plants require this seepage, any change in ground water flow could affect them. Residential development and alteration of the cliff-face and clifftop habitat around Seneca Lake in New York could also affect ground water quality and flow.

Erosion of the cliffs is another major threat. The slopes are unstable and, in places, overlying vegetation sloughs off to leave behind bare talus and soil. Natural erosion and rock slides often result in the loss of individual plants. In 1990, runoff from heavy rains dislodged many individual plants from the cliff face at Deer Creek in Minnesota. Uncontrolled cropland runoff has cut gullies into at least one of the sites in Minnesota. Grazing is a threat at one

Minnesota site, especially where the cliff gives way to a more gentle slope where Leedy's roseroot plants that may have been dislodged from higher elevations have again taken root. The talus slope below the Deer Creek cliff in Minnesota was extensively damaged by grazing in 1990. The grazing completely extirpated another rare plant population, Chrysosplenium iowense, from the site. Logging in the hardwood forests above some of the Minnesota sites may cause problems with erosion in the future (Coffin and Pfannmuller 1988, Ostlie 1988).

B. Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes

Commercial trade in this species is not known to occur. It seems unlikely that commercial trade will develop because the species is difficult to propagate or cultivate.

C. Disease or Predation

None that is known to affect this taxon.

D. The Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

Sedum integrifolium ssp. leedyi is legally protected in New York, where it is listed as endangered. State law prohibits removal or destruction of the plant without permission of the landowner. The largest population at Seneca Lake in New York is privately owned. A one-acre parcel of land containing Leedy's roseroot along 289 feet of Seneca Lake is legally protected by the Finger Lakes Land Trust with a conservation easement through The Nature Conservancy. The subspecies is listed as endangered in the State of Minnesota where the state Endangered Species Act prohibits the taking, transport, or sale of any endangered or threatened plant or animal (or parts thereof). However, the Minnesota law has numerous exceptions that weaken its coverage in agricultural areas. Three of the four areas in Minnesota with Leedy's roseroot are in agricultural areas and are owned privately, and the fourth site is owned and protected by the State of Minnesota (plans are needed for the specific protection of Leedy's roseroot at this site). Two of the privately-owned sites have been registered in the Minnesota Registry of Natural Areas with The Nature Conservancy, but the registry does not confer legally binding protection. The Federal Endangered Species Act offers possibilities for additional protection of this taxon through section 6 cooperation between the states and the Service and

through section 7 (interagency cooperation) requirements.

E. Other Natural or Manmade Factors Affecting its Continued Existence

In addition to the dangers of development, ground water contamination, erosion, and grazing, the subspecies is highly vulnerable because the areas where it is located are isolated, disjunct, few in number, and, for the most part, they are privately owned and vulnerable. It is unlikely that more populations will be found in Minnesota because extensive surveys of approximately 400 algific slopes have been undertaken during the last 10 years with only one new location for Leedy's roseroot found in 1989.

The Service has carefully assessed the best scientific and commercial information available regarding the past, present, and future threats faced by this species in determining to propose this rule. Based on this evaluation, the preferred action is to list Sedum integrifolium spp. leedyi as threatened.

Critical Habitat

Section 4(a)(3) of the Act, as amended, requires that, to the maximum extent prudent and determinable, the Secretary designate any habitat of a species which is considered to be critical habitat at the time the species is determined to be endangered or threatened. The Service finds that designation of critical habitat is not prudent for this species at this time. This determination is based on the premise that such a designation would not be beneficial to the species (50 CFR 424.12). The limited number of populations and individuals of Leedy's roseroot make this plant vulnerable to taking, an activity difficult to enforce against and only regulated by the Act with respect to plants in cases of (1) removal and reduction to possession of listed plants from lands under Federal jurisdiction, or their malicious damage or destruction on such lands; and (2) removal, cutting, digging up, or damaging or destroying in knowing violation of any state law or regulation, including state criminal trespass laws. Such provisions are difficult to enforce. Even though this species has not proven to be easily cultivated, collectors might be attracted to the locale of known populations by the publication of maps and other specific location information. One of the landowners who commented urged us not to draw attention to the plants' location, because increased activity would affect the cliff ecosystem. The cliffs and slopes where these populations are located are unstable and trespass could increase erosion at the sites. No benefit from critical habitat designation has been identified that outweighs the threat of trespass and collection. The principal landowners have been notified of the location and importance of protecting this species' habitat. Protection of this species' habitat will be addressed through the recovery process and through Section 7 consultation procedures. The Service finds that designation of critical habitat is not presently prudent for this species.

Available Conservation Measures

Conservation measures provided to species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act include recognition, recovery actions, requirements for Federal protection, and prohibitions against certain practices. Recognition through listing encourages and results in conservation actions by Federal, State, and private agencies, groups, and individuals. The Endangered Species Act provides for possible land acquisition and cooperation with the States and requires that recovery actions be carried out for all listed species. The protection required of Federal agencies and the prohibitions against certain activities involving listed plants are discussed, in part, below. The Minnesota Department of Resources Natural Heritage program continues an ongoing field inventory to gather biological data and distributional records for this species. Several private landowners in New York are attempting to preserve the wooded uplands above the shores of Seneca Lake in order to reduce the chance for groundwater contamination. The Olmsted County General Land Use Plan addresses the preservation of "open space" that includes areas around two Leedy's roseroot sites in that county. The county has also adopted a Comprehensive Water Management Plan that should provide additional protection against groundwater contamination.

Section 7(a) of the Act, as amended, requires Federal agencies to evaluate their actions with respect to any species that is proposed or listed as endangered or threatened and with respect to its critical habitat, if any is being designated. Regulations implementing this interagency cooperation provision of the Act are codified at 50 CFR part 402. Section 7(a)(4) requires Federal agencies to confer informally with the Service on any action that is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a proposed species or result in destruction or adverse modification of proposed critical habitat. If a species is listed subsequently, section 7(a)(2) requires Federal agencies to ensure that

activities they authorize, fund, or carry out are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of such a species or to destroy or adversely modify its critical habitat. If a Federal action may affect a listed species or its critical habitat, the responsible Federal agency must enter into formal consultation with the Service.

The Act and its implementing regulations found at 50 CFR 17.71 and 17.72 for threatened species set forth a series of general trade prohibitions and exceptions that apply to all threatened plants. All trade prohibitions of section 9(a)(2) of the Act, implemented by 50 CFR 17.71, apply. These prohibitions, in part, make it illegal for any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to import or export, transport in interstate or foreign commerce in the course of a commercial activity, sell or offer for sale, this species in interstate or foreign commerce, or to remove and reduce the possession of the species from areas under Federal jurisdiction. In addition, for listed plants the 1988 amendments (Pub. L. 100-478) to the Act prohibit the malicious damage or destruction on Federal lands and the removal, cutting, digging up, or damaging or destroying of listed plants in knowing violation of any State law or regulation, including State criminal trespass laws. Certain exceptions apply to agents of the Service and State conservation agencies. The Act and 50 CFR 17.72 also provide for the issuance of permits to carry out otherwise prohibited activities involving threatened species under certain circumstances.

It is anticipated that few trade permits would ever be sought or issued because the species is not common in cultivation or in the wild. Requests for copies of the regulations on plants and inquiries regarding them may be addressed to the Office of Management Authority, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, P.O. Box 3507, Arlington, Virginia 22203, telephone (703/358–2093).

National Environmental Policy Act

The Fish and Wildlife Service has determined that an Environmental Assessment, as defined under the authority of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, need not be prepared in connection with regulations adopted pursuant to section 4(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. A notice outlining the Service's reasons for this determination was published in the Federal Register on October 25, 1983 (48 FR 49244).

References Cited

Clausen, R.T. 1975. Sedum of North America north of the Mexican Plateau. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Coffin, B. and L. Pfannmuller (Ed.s). 1988. Minnesota's endangered flora and fauna. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN. 474 pp.

Frest, T.J. 1986. Final Report: Minnesota "Succinea chittenangoensis" Survey. Report for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 27 pp.

Ostlie. W. 1988. Simpson Maderitic Cliffs: Preserve Design. Report for The Nature Conservancy, Minnesota Field Office.

1988. Bear Creek Maderitic Cliff: Preserve Design. Report for The Nature Conservancy, Minnesota Field Office. ______1988. Deer Creek Maderitic Cliff: Preserve Design. Report for The Nature Conservancy, Minnesota Field Office.

Rosendahl, C.O. and J.W. Moore. 1947. A new variety of Sedum rosea from southeastern Minnesota and additional notes on the flora of the region. Rhodora 49: 197–202.

Author

The primary author of this final rule is William F. Harrison, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Federal Building, Fort Snelling, Twin Cities, Minnesota 55111.

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and threatened species, Exports, Imports, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, and Transportation.

Regulation Promulgation

PART 17-[AMENDED]

Accordingly, part 17, subchapter B of chapter I, title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations, is amended as set forth below:

1. The authority citation for part 17 continues to read as follows

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1361-1407; 16 U.S.C. 1531-1544, 16 U.S.C. 4201-4245; Pub. L. 99-625, 100 Stat. 3500, unless otherwise noted.

2. Amend § 17.12(h) by adding the following, in alphabetical order under Crassulaceae, to the List of Endangered and Threatened Plants:

§ 17.12 Endangered and threatened plants.

(h) * * *

Species				. Nichoria accord	Status	When listed	Critical habitat	Special rules
Scientific name		Common name		Historic range	Status			
Crassulaceae—Stone Family	Crop			•				
Sedum integrifolium ssp. le	edyi	Leedy's roserool	•	U.S.A. (MN, NY)DT	460	• N/A	. N/A	

(Final: Sedum integrifolium ssp. leedyi (Rosend. and Moore) Clausen, Leedy's roseroot—Threatened).

Dated: April 7, 1992.

Richard N. Smith,

Acting Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 92-9174 Filed 4-21-92; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4310-55-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 227

[Docket No. 910647-2043]

Endangered and Threatened Species; Threatened Status for Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook Salmon, Threatened Status for Snake River Fall Chinook Salmon

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

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: NMFS has determined that Snake River spring/summer chinook