

c. In the definition of the term "Initiating official", add the word "either" after the word "means" and before the word "the", remove the "or" after the word "officer," and before the word "the", and remove the "or" after the word "activity," and before the word "the".

d. In the definition of the term "Suspending official", add "his/her" after the word "or" and before the word "designee".

309.404 [Amended]

5. Section 309.404 is amended by revising the title to read "Parties excluded from procurement programs.", and by revising the FAR reference in paragraph (c) to read "FAR 9.404(c)."

PART 315—[AMENDED]

315.406-5 [Amended]

6. Paragraph (a)(2) of § 315.406-5 is amended by adding the following FAR provisions in numerical order, and by renumbering the existing list of FAR references: "FAR 52.209-5, Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Proposed Debarment, and Other Responsibility Matters;"; "FAR 52.223-5, Certification Regarding a Drug-Free Workplace;"; and "FAR 52.225-12, Notice of Restrictions on Contracting With Sanctioned Persons;".

315.407 [Amended]

7. Section 315.407 is amended by adding a new paragraph (i) to read as follows:

(i) The contracting officer shall insert the provision at FAR § 52.233-2, Service of Protest, in solicitations as required by FAR 33.106(a).

PART 332—[AMENDED]

8. Section 332.905 is revised to read as follows:

332.905 Invoice payments.

(a)(1)(ii), (b)(4), (c)(5). In most instances, the contracting officer will use the seven (7) day constructive acceptance period (specified in paragraph (a)(6)(i) of the Prompt Payment clause at FAR 52.232-25, paragraph (a)(5)(i) of the Prompt Payment clause at FAR 52.232-26, and paragraph (a)(4)(i) of the Prompt Payment clause at FAR 52.232-27) for solicitations and resultant contracts as the basis for the fiscal office's computation of interest penalties. However, where the contracting officer extends the constructive acceptance period, under the conditions described in FAR 32.905, the extension shall be

coordinated with the fiscal office. A constructive acceptance period of less than seven (7) days is not authorized.

(j) When the contracting officer mistakenly receives an invoice first, or is specified in the contract as the first recipient of the invoice, and the contract requires payment with thirty (30) days from receipt of a "proper invoice" (as defined by FAR 32.902), the contracting officer shall review the invoice to determine whether or not it is proper; and, if so, shall approve the invoice and submit it to the fiscal office within sixteen (16) days from the date of receipt. When the contracting officer is the first recipient of the invoice and the contract establishes a payment due date of more than thirty (30) days after receipt, the contracting officer shall review, approve, and submit the "proper invoice" to the fiscal office at least fourteen (14) days prior to the payment due date (unless the contracting officer and fiscal office agree, prior to contract award, to a longer period).

PART 342—[AMENDED]

342.7002 [Amended]

9. Section 342.7002 is amended by adding the following as paragraph (e):

(e) Contract cost and manpower reporting shall be required on all cost-reimbursement type contracts financed under letter of credit or Departmental Federal Assistance financing System (DFAFS) methods of payment regardless of dollar value, and on all other cost-reimbursement type contracts of \$100,000 or more. Financial reporting may be required on cost-reimbursement contracts under \$100,000, when financed by other than the letter of credit of DFAFS methods, but only if it is necessary for effective contract administration. Financial and manpower information may be submitted either as a separate contract financial report or as an addendum to a public voucher, as prescribed by the contracting officer. Frequency, format (including instructions), extent, structure (including cost elements and labor categories), and distribution of reporting fall within the discretion of the contracting officer. The contracting officer shall set forth financial reporting requirements in all applicable RFPs and contracts, shall limit the requirements to those necessary for effectual cost and manpower management of the contract, and shall avoid the use of reporting requirements that are unduly burdensome on the contractor.

PART 352—[AMENDED]

352.242-80 [Removed]

10. Section 352.242-80 is removed.
[FR Doc. 89-25427 Filed 10-27-89; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4150-04-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018-AB26

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Experimental Population Status for an Introduced Population of Guam Rails on Rota in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) determines that the Rota population of the Guam rail (*Rallus owstoni*), an endangered species endemic to Guam, be designated a nonessential experimental population according to section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). The introduction is being made on the island of Rota, which is outside the probable historical range of the species, because its primary habitat on Guam has been "indefinitely altered" through establishment of the introduced, predatory brown tree snake (*Boiga irregularis*). Extirpation of virtually the entire avifauna of Guam has been attributed to predation by the brown tree snake. No effective control methods have been developed as yet; none are anticipated in the foreseeable future. "Indefinitely altered" is thus tantamount to the "unsuitable and irreversible alteration or destruction" of the primary habitat of the Guam rail. The releases on Rota will be made in suitable habitat types identical to that formerly occupied by the rail on Guam. Since captive-held rails are known to become tame over time and lose their ability to survive in the wild, establishment and maintenance of a free-roaming, self-sustaining population on Rota can be expected to provide a source of "wild" rails for future re-establishment on Guam. Analysis of experimental release programs indicates that the most successful examples used "wild" (wild-caught) birds rather than animals propagated in captivity specifically for release purposes. There is no alternative to the establishment of

the proposed experimental population on Rota which would be as effective for promoting conservation of the Guam rail. This population would be treated as a threatened species, rather than an endangered species for the purposes of sections 4(d) and 9 of the Act. The species is currently protected at 13 different captive propagation facilities, and release of progeny excess to the needs of the captive flock would not be detrimental to the long term survival of this species. The nonessential status will provide flexibility in managing the Rota population.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 30, 1989.

ADDRESSES: The complete file for this final rule is available for inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the Pacific Islands Office (Environmental Services), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 6307, Honolulu, HI 96813.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ernest Kosaka, Field Office Supervisor, at the above address. Telephone: (808) 541-2749 or FTS 551-2749.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Guam, with an area of approximately 550 square km (212 square miles), is the largest and most developed island in Micronesia. It is generally divided into a northern, fairly level limestone plateau, and a southern, mountainous area of volcanic origin. Vegetation on the island has been vastly altered by humans and much of the original forest has been removed.

The endemic flightless Guam rail was formerly abundant and occurred island-wide. The population declined drastically between 1963 and 1973, and by the mid-1970's had disappeared from southern Guam. A 1981 survey indicated that about 2,000 rails still persisted in northern Guam. By 1986, however, the species was considered virtually extirpated from the wild.

Although several inimical factors were believed to have caused the demise of the Guam rail, the most important was predation on eggs and young by the introduced brown tree snake. This exotic predator has caused virtual extinction of the entire avifauna of Guam. Individual rails and kingfishers were all that remained by the early to mid-1980's.

When it was evident that the rail faced imminent extinction, a consortium of zoos under the auspices of the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums (AAZPA) in cooperation with the Guam Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources

(GDAWR) embarked on a captive propagation program by capturing as many rails as possible. Agreements were entered into whereby cooperating zoos agreed to develop techniques for propagating the rail in captivity as well as maintaining a viable population with maximum genetic diversity. In fact, the rail has demonstrated extraordinary fecundity in captivity, making it necessary to curtail breeding to avoid production of excessive progeny. The cooperating agencies proposing this project have been assured by knowledgeable geneticists and breeders of the AAZPA that it is possible to attempt to establish a nonessential experimental population of the Guam rail with progeny excess to the needs of the captive propagation program, and without harm to the captive flock.

Because existing habitat on Guam had been rendered unsuitable by the presence of the brown tree snake, it was necessary to look at alternative sites for establishing an experimental population of this species. After evaluating habitats on Guam and other islands in the Marianas Archipelago, and consulting with knowledgeable scientists and individuals, analysis of all the data available indicated that the island of Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (Commonwealth) was the best alternative release site. Although Rota is outside the known historical range of the Guam rail, it has suitable habitat identical to that formerly occupied by the rail. Most important, the brown tree snake is not known to occur on Rota.

Prior to the establishment of an experimental population outside of its probable historic range, the Service must determine that the primary habitat of the species has been unsuitably and irreversibly altered or destroyed. Although the basic habitat components required by the rail on Guam have not been "irreversibly" altered or destroyed in the strict sense, they have essentially been made unavailable to the rail for the indefinite future due to the pervasive threat of the brown tree snake. There is hope that it will eventually be possible to control or eradicate the brown tree snake on Guam, but there is no assurance that this will be possible in the foreseeable future. This indefinite alteration of the rail's primary habitat is tantamount to the unsuitable and irreversible alteration or destruction of its primary habitat.

There are reasons to believe that an experimental population of the Guam rail will become established on Rota in the foreseeable future. Rails will be released in habitats similar or identical to that in which the species thrived on

Guam before introduction and establishment of the brown tree snake. Birds destined for release comprise individuals with maximum genetic diversity. There is a comprehensive release and follow-up plan to be implemented by personnel from the University of Tennessee and also monitored by biologists from cooperating agencies. The Commonwealth has indicated that it will utilize its resources (Conservation Officer, Wildlife Technician, and Wildlife Biologists) to enhance protection for the rails released. The Mayor of Rota has also given his assurances that he will use the municipality's resources to promote protection of the experimental population.

Establishment of Guam rails on Rota should provide a source of "wild" rails for reestablishment on Guam when the brown tree snake can be eliminated or controlled. For this reason the Service finds that the release and establishment of an experimental population of Guam rails on Rota will further the conservation of this species. (See section 10(j)(2)(A) of the Act; 50 CFR 17.81(b). Analysis of release programs by scientists from the University of Idaho has shown that those releases using "wild" (wild-caught) birds have been significantly more successful in establishing a population than releases comprised of captive propagated birds. This difference has been attributed to a loss of ability to survive in the wild over time by captive-held birds. Their managed environment diminishes their ability to survive the rigors of the wild. This project is believed to be the most effective means for promoting long-term conservation and recovery of the rail.

The introduced population is not expected to be affected by existing or anticipated Federal, Commonwealth, or private actions within or adjacent to the experimental population area. Scrubby, second-growth habitats away from urban development and human activities have been selected as release sites.

The Service has consulted extensively with appropriate Commonwealth, Territorial, and Municipal (Rota) agencies in developing and implementing the experimental population project and rules. Local public participation was conducted by the Mayor of Rota, the Commonwealth, and Guam in their respective jurisdictions. A Memorandum of Agreement was developed and executed among the Service, the Commonwealth, and Guam to enhance this project.

Designating the Rota population as a nonessential experimental population will enable the Service to promulgate a special rule that will authorize considerable discretion in managing the population. The protective regulations are necessary and advisable to provide for the conservation of the rail, particularly during the initial stages of the translocation program. The special rule will stipulate that agents of the Commonwealth Division of Fish and Wildlife, the Guam Division, and the Service will be authorized to take animals that need special care or that are causing depredation problems. No taking of "problem" rails would be countenanced except as a last resort. Live capture and release into other suitable, remote habitats will be the preferred course of action whenever possible.

The special rule also has a provision to allow for special take by private individuals if the nonessential experimental population becomes well established on Rota. This special take would be allowed under regulations promulgated by the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands once the Service has determined that the rail has become well established and occupies all suitable habitat on Rota. These flexible rules will help gain and maintain public support for the project.

The nonessential status is appropriate for the following reasons: (1) Although the Guam rail is virtually extinct in the wild, robust captive propagation flocks have been established on Guam and in twelve cooperating zoos and aviaries on the mainland (this captive flock presently consists of some 112 rails); (2) care and maintenance of the captive flocks are of the highest order (consequently, the Service does not believe that disease or any other natural phenomenon is likely to eliminate this flock and threaten the survival of the species); and (3) the Guam rail breeds readily in captivity, resulting in the availability of rails that can be made available for release and that are excess to the needs of the captive flock. The taking of approximately 500 rails over the 5-year duration of this project from these sources of captive propagated progeny would not threaten the survival of this species even if all of the animals released into the wild were to succumb to natural or man-caused mortality.

The Commonwealth Division has the statutory authority to protect and conserve listed species. It has agreed to protect the Guam rails proposed for establishment on Rota by promulgating its own regulations to prohibit the taking of rails in the Commonwealth. It also

has two staff members, a Conservation Officer and a Wildlife Technician, residing on Rota who can enforce those regulations. The Service is satisfied that the Commonwealth's regulatory mechanisms and staff presence are sufficient to provide for conservation of the rail.

Since the Service proposes that the Rota population of Guam rails be designated as a nonessential experimental population, no critical habitat will be proposed or designated.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Service finds that good cause exists to have this rule take effect upon publication. It is essential to the success of this year's translocation that it commence during the rainy season, when habitat conditions are most favorable for survival of the rails that are released.

Summary of Comments and Recommendations

The proposed rule was published in the *Federal Register* on June 19, 1989 (54 FR 25744), at which time all interested parties were invited to comment on the proposal during the comment period, which extended through July 19, 1989. Many newspaper articles were published in the *Pacific Daily News*, the newspaper of general circulation in the Mariana Islands, immediately after the proposed rule was published. Publication of the proposed rule for this translocation project was a long-awaited event by many residents of Guam and the Commonwealth.

Written comments were received from a total of 41 persons representing a wide gamut of interests ranging from local governments (2), private organizations (23), universities (8), companies (3), and individuals (5). A partial listing of commenters includes: GDAWR, Commonwealth Division of Fish and Wildlife, Marianas Audubon Society, International Crane Foundation, Los Angeles Zoo, Houston Zoological Society, Zoological Society of Philadelphia, International Council for Bird Preservation—U.S. Section, National Zoological Park, University of Minnesota, Edison Electric Institute, Peregrine Fund, Inc., and the Guam Board of Realtors. All commenters supported the translocation project.

While supporting the establishment of an experimental population, several commenters also made recommendations concerning various aspects of the undertaking. Service response to these recommendations are presented below.

Comment 1: Expedient implementation of the release program is needed.

Response: The Service concurs with the 14 commenters who expressed this opinion. The two primary reasons given for this comment were: (1) To prevent abundance of the captive rail flock from becoming a hindrance to propagation efforts (14 commenters), and (2) to alleviate the problem of limited space in captive propagation facilities due to the unique requirements of the Guam rail (11 comments). Service concurrence is also based on the necessity of releasing rails on Rota during the rainy season, when environmental conditions are most favorable for survival of the birds.

Comment 2: While supporting introduction of the rail to Rota, one person expressed concern that the introduced rails may adversely affect relict native reptile, arthropod, and snail populations on Rota. Notwithstanding the surveys conducted by entomologists from the University of Guam, this commenter believed it likely that there are relict native arthropods on Rota that may be affected by an aggressive predator like the rail. This commenter recommended continuing assessment of the effects of the experimental population on native fauna. Another expressed the opinion that the rail would not be a serious competitor or problem on Rota. Two commenters noted that the fauna and flora of Rota have been extensively altered and thought that the release of rails would not pose a problem.

Response: The Service recognizes the potential threats to native species posed by the introduction of Guam rails to Rota, but believes the potential negative consequences in this instance to be minimal and greatly outweighed by the probable benefits to conservation of the rail. Nevertheless, due attention will be paid to any evidence of adverse effects on native species, and the project will be re-evaluated if such evidence arises.

Comment 3: Rigorous disease screening of all birds to be released on Rota is essential.

Response: The Service agrees and shares the concern expressed by 12 commenters. Veterinarians have been consulted on this matter and the release plan provides for—(1) screening for hematozoans and viral diseases, (2) screening of birds shipped from mainland zoos to Guam; and (3) disease screening of all birds prior to their shipment to Rota. In consideration of the strict disease surveillance at all participating captive propagation facilities, and the disease screening of all birds before they are released on Rota, the Service believes that this concern will not become a problem.

Comment 4: While supporting the establishment of an experimental population, two commenters noted that translocation of Guam rails to Rota would be a falsification of the fauna on that island.

Response: The Service concurs with the 2 commenters who expressed this sentiment. It should be noted, however, that one commenter expressed the opinion that there was most likely a species of Rallidae on Rota in the past, citing fossil evidence from other tropical islands. He also stated that translocations outside a species' historical range may be essential to prevent extinction. The other commenter favored introduction of the rail, in spite of falsification of the fauna, because many other domesticated and wild species have already been introduced on Rota and he thought it would probably have little additional negative impact.

National Environmental Policy Act

A Final Environmental Assessment and a Finding of No Significant Impact pertaining to this proposal have been prepared and are available for inspection at the Office of Environmental Services (see ADDRESSES above). It has been determined that this is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of Section 1022) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Author

The primary author of this final rule is Ernest Kosaka, Office of Environmental Services (see ADDRESSES, above).

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and threatened wildlife, Fish, Marine mammals, Plants (agriculture).

Final 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. 1531-1543; 16 U.S.C. 4201-4245; Pub. L. 99-625, 100 Stat. 3500; unless otherwise noted.

2. Amend § 17.11(h) by revising the existing entry for "Rail, Guam," under BIRDS as shown below:

§ 17.11 Endangered and threatened wildlife.

* * * * *
(h) * * *

Species		Historic range				Vertebrate population where endangered or threatened	Status	When listed	Critical habitat	Special rules
Common name	Scientific name									
BIRDS										
Rail, Guam.....	<i>Rallus owstoni</i>	Western Pacific Ocean, USA			Entire, except Rota.....	E	146E, 156.....	NA	NA	
Do	do	(Guam).			Rota	XN	146E, 156, 371.	NA	§ 17.84(f)	

3. 50 CFR 17.84 is amended by adding new paragraph (f) as follows:

§ 17.84 Special rules—vertebrates.

- (f) Guam Rail (*Rallus owstoni*).
 - (1) The Guam rail population identified in paragraph (f)(7) of this section is a nonessential experimental population.
 - (2) No person shall take this species, except:
 - (i) In accordance with a valid permit issued by the Service under § 17.32 for educational purposes, scientific purposes, the enhancement of propagation or survival of the species, zoological exhibition, and other conservation purposes consistent with the Act; or
 - (ii) As authorized by the laws and regulations of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, after the Service has made the determination that the experimental population has become well established and occupies all suitable habitat island-wide.
 - (3) Any employee of the Service, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife, or the Guam Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources who is designated

- for such purposes, may, when acting in the course of official duties, take a Guam rail without a permit if such action is necessary to:
 - (i) Aid a sick, injured, or orphaned specimen;
 - (ii) Dispose of a dead specimen;
 - (iii) Salvage a dead specimen that may be useful for scientific study; or
 - (iv) Take an animal that is responsible for depredations to personal property if it has not been possible to otherwise eliminate such depredations and/or loss of personal property, provided that such taking must be done in a humane manner and may involve injuring or killing the bird only if it has not been possible to eliminate depredations by live capturing and releasing the specimen unharmed in other suitable habitats.
- (4) Any violation of applicable commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands fish and wildlife conservation laws or regulations with respect to the taking of this species (other than taking as described in paragraph (f)(2)(ii) of this section) will also be a violation of the Endangered Species Act.
- (5) No person shall possess, sell, deliver, carry, transport, ship, import, or

- export by any means whatsoever, any such species taken in violation of these regulations or in violation of applicable Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands fish and wildlife laws or regulations or the Endangered Species Act.
- (6) It is unlawful for any person to attempt to commit, solicit another to commit, or cause to be committed, any offense defined in paragraphs (f) (2) through (5) of this section.
- (7) The sites for introduction of Guam rails on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, are on an island separated from Guam by 50 kilometers of ocean. The last known observation of an individual of this species occurred near the northern tip of Guam, which is closest to the island of Rota. No intermingling of these populations will occur since this species has been extirpated in the wild on Guam. The Rota release sites are of necessity outside the historic range of the Guam rail, as described in this regulation, because its primary range has been unsuitably and irreversibly destroyed by the brown tree snake.
- (8) The nonessential experimental population on Rota will be checked

periodically by staff of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife and cooperating staff from the University of Tennessee to determine dispersal patterns, mortality, and reproductive success. The overall success of the releases and general health of the population will also be assessed.

* * * * *
Dated: October 16, 1989.

Richard N. Smith,
Acting Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 89-25439 Filed 10-27-89; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310-55-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 642

[Docket No. 90637-9166]

Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic

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

ACTION: Notice of closure.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) closes the commercial fishery in the Exclusive Economic Zone for king mackerel from the western zone of the Gulf migratory group. The Secretary has determined that the commercial quota for Gulf group king mackerel from the western zone was reached on October 24, 1989. This

closure is necessary to protect the overfished Gulf king mackerel resource.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Closure is effective at 12:01 a.m., local time, October 25, 1989, until 12:00 p.m. (midnight) local time, June 30, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark F. Godcharles, 813-893-3722.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Fishery Management Plan for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources for the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic, as amended, was developed by the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Councils (Councils) under authority of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act, 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*, and is implemented by regulations at 50 CFR part 642. Regulations effective July 1, 1989, through June 30, 1990. Those regulations set the commercial allocation at 1.36 million pounds divided into quotas of 0.94 million pounds for the eastern zone and 0.42 million pounds for the western zone (54 FR 30554, July 21, 1989). The boundary between the eastern and western zones is a line directly south from the Florida/Alabama boundary (87°31'06" W. longitude) to the outer limit of the Exclusive Economic Zone.

Under § 642.22(a), the Secretary is required to close any segment of the king mackerel commercial fishery when its allocation or quota has been reached, or is projected to be reached, by publishing a notice in the **Federal Register**. The Secretary has determined that the commercial quota of 0.42 million pounds for the western zone of the Gulf migratory group king mackerel was reached on October 24, 1989. Hence, the commercial fishery of Gulf group king mackerel from the western zone is

closed effective 12:01 a.m., October 25, 1989, through June 30, 1990, the end of the fishing year.

Except for a person on a charter vessel, during the closure, no person aboard a vessel permitted to fish under a commercial allocation may fish for, retain, or have in possession in the Exclusive Economic Zone king mackerel from the western zone. A person aboard a charter vessel may continue to fish for king mackerel in the western zone under the bag limit set forth in § 642.28(a)(1), provided the vessel is under charter, i.e., there are more than three persons aboard, including captain and crew. During the closure, king mackerel from the western zone taken in the Exclusive Economic Zone, including those harvested under the bag limit, may not be purchased, bartered, traded, or sold. This prohibition does not apply to trade in king mackerel from the western zone that were harvested, landed, and bartered, traded, or sold prior to the closure and held in cold storage by a dealer or processor.

Other Matters

This action is required by 50 CFR 642.22(2) and complies with Executive Order 12291.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 642

Fisheries, Fishing, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: October 24, 1989.

Richard H. Schaefer,
Director of Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 89-25438 Filed 10-24-89; 4:51 pm]
BILLING CODE 3510-22-M