assignment method is used, and noted that there may be circumstances in which the guarantee of a license at or close to the market price may stimulate research such that the innovator receives certainty in obtaining financing to perform the necessary research and to pay for the license.

5. Accordingly, the Commission seeks comment on an additional showing that a pioneer's preference applicant would have to make to qualify for a preference in services in which licenses are awarded by competitive bidding. Specifically, it seeks comment on whether the applicant should have to demonstrate that the Commission's public rulemaking process inhibits the applicant from capturing the economic rewards of its innovation unless granted a pioneer's preference license; *i.e.*, whether the applicant must show that it may lose its intellectual property protection because of this public process. If this requirement were to be adopted, the applicant would have to demonstrate that it would be able to capture the rewards from its innovation only by being granted a guaranteed license.

6. With regard to determining which licenses are most reasonably comparable for purposes of the GATT legislation payment formula, the Commission proposes implementing this provision of the legislation on a case-by-case basis. However, it seeks comment on any standards for comparing licenses and excluding anomalous licenses, as well as comment on whether eligibility for installment payments should be limited to small businesses or other entities as has been done under the general auction rules.

7. In accord with the GATT legislation, the Commission proposes to sunset the pioneer's preference program on September 30, 1998. It also proposes to modify the pioneer's preference rules by limiting the award of preferences to services in which a new allocation of spectrum is required. Finally, it proposes to apply any rules adopted in response to the *Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making* to all pioneer's preference requests granted after adoption of these rules, except in proceedings in which tentative decisions have been made. The Commission stated that it will not issue final decisions in pioneer's preference proceedings that have not reached the tentative decision stage until after it has issued a Third Report and Order regarding final rules that will apply to pending requests.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 1

Administrative practice and procedure.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6080 Filed 3–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Parts 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 22, 23, 36, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49, 52, and 53

[FAR Case 94–790]

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Acquisition of Commercial Items

AGENCIES: Department of Defense (DOD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Change of date for meeting on proposed rule.

SUMMARY: At 60 FR 11198; March 1, 1995, a proposed rule was issued pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (the Act) to implement the revised statutory authorities for the acquisition of commercial items and components by Federal Government agencies as well as contractors and subcontractors at all levels. Instead of meeting on the date given in that document, the FAR Council is rescheduling its public meeting at the GSA Auditorium in Washington, DC, for April 3, 1995.

The purpose of the meeting is to enable the public to present its views on the proposed rule, FAR case 94–790—Acquisition of Commercial Items, and to exchange ideas and opinions with respect to the implementation of the Act. Interested members of the public may obtain copies of the proposed rule from the FAR Secretariat, Room 4037, GSA Building, 18th and F Sts., NW, Washington, DC 20405, (202) 501–4755. The public is encouraged to attend this meeting and must provide, to the FAR Secretariat, a written statement on the views they would like to present not later than March 29, 1995. Organizations or groups with similar views should select a representative speaker.

DATES: The meeting will be held on April 3, 1995, at 1:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the GSA Auditorium, 8th & F Streets NW., First Floor, Washington, DC 20405.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Edward Loeb, Project Deputy for the Implementation of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 at (202) 501–4547 or the FAR Secretariat, General Services Administration, (202) 501–0692.

Dated: March 7, 1995.

Edward Loeb,

Deputy Project Manager for the Implementation of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994.

[FR Doc. 95–5971 Filed 3–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–34–D

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 90-Day Finding and Initiation of Status Review for a Petition To List the Southern Population of the Walleye as Endangered

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of 90-day petition finding and initiation of status review.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) announces a 90-day finding for a petition to list the southern population of walleye (*Stizostedion vitreum vitreum*) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. The Service finds that the petition presents substantial information indicating that listing this species may be warranted. A status review is initiated.

DATES: The finding announced in this document was made on January 26, 1995. Comments and materials should be submitted to the Service by May 12, 1995, to be considered in the 12-month finding.

ADDRESSES: Data, information, comments, or questions concerning this petition should be submitted to the Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jackson Field Office, 6578 Dogwood View Parkway, Suite A, Jackson, Mississippi 39213. The petition finding, supporting data, and comments are available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul Hartfield, Biologist, at above address (601–695–4900, ext. 25).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 4(b)(3)(A) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), requires that the Service make a finding on whether a petition to list, delist, or reclassify a species presents substantial scientific or commercial information to demonstrate that the petitioned action may be warranted. This finding is to be based on all information available to the Service at the time the finding is made. To the maximum extent practicable, this finding is to be made within 90 days of the date the petition was received, and the finding is to be published promptly in the **Federal Register**. If the finding is that substantial information was presented, the Service also is required to promptly commence a review of the status of the species involved if one has not already been initiated under the Service's internal candidate assessment process.

The Service announces a 90-day finding on a petition requesting the Service to list as endangered the southern population of the walleye (*Stizostedion vitreum vitreum*). The petition, dated August 20, 1994, was submitted by Robert R. Reid, Jr. of Birmingham, Alabama, and was received by the Service on August 22, 1994. The petition requested that the southern population of the walleye be emergency listed as endangered. The petitioner stated that the southern population of the walleye is a genetically distinct population, deserving of specific or subspecific rank, which merits listing because: (1) It has declined in the Tombigbee River drainage, (2) remaining populations in the Tombigbee River drainage are threatened by existing and proposed water projects, and (3) it is rare in other Mobile River Basin drainages in Alabama.

The Service has reviewed the petition, the literature cited in the petition, other literature, information available in the Service's files, and has consulted with knowledgeable fisheries biologists. On the basis of the best scientific and commercial information available, the Service finds the petition presents substantial information that listing this species may be warranted. Emergency listing is allowed under the Act whenever immediate protection is needed to prevent extirpation of a species. Based on currently available information, emergency listing is not needed for the southern population of walleye.

Electrophoretic analyses (Murphy 1990) and mitochondrial DNA comparisons (Billington *et al.* 1992) have confirmed the genetic uniqueness of the upper Tombigbee River population of walleye. Ongoing studies of walleye populations in the Mobile River basin drainages of Alabama have indicated that this distinct Gulf Coast strain of walleye extends into that State (Mike Mecina, University of Auburn, Alabama, pers. comm. 1994). The relationship of other Gulf Coast drainage populations of walleye (e.g., Apalachicola River, Florida, Georgia; Pearl River, Mississippi) to the Mobile River Basin population is unknown and needs further investigation.

Populations of walleye appear to be low in the Tombigbee River drainage of Mississippi. Recent reports of walleye are documented in several Tombigbee River tributaries in Mississippi, including the Buttahatchee River, Sipsey, Bull Mountain, Yellow, Luxapalila, Sucarnoochee, and Hashuqua Creeks (Dennis Riecke, Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks, pers. comm. 1994). Current information on the distribution of walleye in the Mobile Basin drainages of Alabama is limited. Walleye collection localities within the past 10 years in Alabama include the Black Warrior, Alabama, Little Cahaba, Locust Fork, and lower Tallapoosa Rivers, and Euphappee, Oakmulgee, and Hatchet Creeks (Fred Harders, Alabama Department of Conservation, pers. comm. 1994; Malcolm Pierson, Alabama Power Company, pers. comm. 1994).

Service records indicate that potential walleye habitat throughout the Mobile River Basin may have been affected or eliminated due to impoundment of approximately 1,000 miles of river habitat, and/or by extensive stream channelization. Erosion due to headcutting, a proposed channelization project, and proposed impoundments pose additional threats to the population. Walleye appear to require clean, relatively swift streams for reproduction (Schultz 1971). Potential threats to stream habitat quality in the Mobile River Basin include various point source effluents (e.g. coal surface mining and sand/gravel mining), as well as sediments, nutrients, and toxicants from non-point runoff.

The Service solicits further information regarding occurrence and distribution of the species, threats to its continued existence, and any additional comments and suggestions from the public, other concerned governmental agencies, the scientific community, industry, or any other interested parties concerning the status of the southern population of the walleye. Of particular interest is information regarding:

(1) Genetic composition of other walleye populations in Gulf Coast drainages;

(2) Additional historic and current population data that may assist in determining range and long-term population trends;

(3) Pertinent information on biology and life history; and,

(4) Biological, commercial trade, or other relevant data concerning any threat (or lack thereof) to populations of the southern walleye.

After consideration of additional information, submitted during the indicated time period (see **DATES** section), the Service will prepare a 12-month finding.

References Cited

Billington, N., R.J. Barrette, and P.D.N. Hebert. 1992. Management implications of mitochondrial DNA variation in walleye stocks. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 12:276–284.

Murphy, B.R. 1990. Evidence for a genetically unique walleye population in the upper Tombigee River system of northeastern Mississippi. SFC Proceedings (22):14–16.

Schultz, C.A. 1971. Survey of the walleye population and related parameters in the Tombigee River system in Mississippi. Mississippi Game and Fish Commission Final Report, Project F–23.

Author: The primary author of this document is Paul Hartfield, Jackson, Mississippi, Field Office (see **ADDRESSES** section).

Authority: The authority for this action is the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Dated: January 26, 1995.

Mollie H. Beattie,

Director, Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 95–6143 Filed 3–10–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–M