

obtained, the Federal agency or applicant would be at risk of violating section 7(a)(2) of the Act if it chose to proceed without implementing the reasonable and prudent alternatives. Second, if we find that a proposed action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed animal species, we may identify reasonable and prudent measures designed to minimize the amount or extent of take and require the Federal agency or applicant to implement such measures through non-discretionary terms and conditions. However, the Act does not prohibit the take of listed plant species or require terms and conditions to minimize adverse effect on critical habitat. We may also identify discretionary conservation recommendations designed to minimize or avoid the adverse effects of a proposed action on listed species or critical habitat, help implement recovery plans, or to develop information that could contribute to the recovery of the species.

Even where the requirements of section 7 might apply due to critical habitat, based on our experience with section 7 consultations for all listed species, virtually all projects—including those that, in their initial proposed form, would result in jeopardy or adverse modification determinations under section 7—can be implemented successfully with, at most, the adoption of reasonable and prudent alternatives. These measures by definition must be economically feasible and within the scope of authority of the Federal agency involved in the consultation. As we have a very limited consultation history for these 83 species from Kauai and Niihau, we can only describe the general kinds of actions that may be identified in future reasonable and prudent alternatives. These are based on our understanding of the needs of these species and the threats they face, especially as described in the final listing rules and in this critical habitat designation, as well as our experience with similar listed plants in Hawaii. In addition, all of these species are protected under the State of Hawaii's Endangered Species Act (Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chap. 195D–4). Therefore, we have also considered the kinds of actions required under the State licensing process for these species. The kinds of actions that may be included in future reasonable and prudent alternatives include conservation set-asides; management of competing nonnative species; restoration of degraded habitat; propagation; outplanting and augmentation of existing populations;

construction of protective fencing; and periodic monitoring. These measures are not likely to result in a significant economic impact to a substantial number of small entities because any measure included as a reasonable and prudent alternative would have to be economically feasible to an individual landowner, and because as discussed above, we do not believe there will be a substantial number of small entities affected by the Act's consultation requirements.

In summary, we have considered whether this final rule would result in a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities and have concluded that it would not affect a substantial number of small entities. Approximately 70 percent of the lands designated as critical habitat are State lands. The State of Hawaii is not a small entity. Less than one percent of the lands designated as critical habitat are Federal lands. The Federal Government is not a small entity. Approximately 30 percent of the lands designated as critical habitat are private lands. Many of these parcels are located in areas where likely future land uses are not expected to result in Federal involvement or section 7 consultations. As discussed earlier, most of the private and State parcels within the designation are currently being used for recreational and agricultural purposes and, therefore, are not likely to require any Federal authorization. In the remaining areas, Federal involvement—and thus section 7 consultations, the only trigger for economic impact under this rule—would be limited to a subset of the area being designated. The most likely future section 7 consultations resulting from this rule would be for informal consultations on federally funded land and water conservation projects, species-specific surveys and research projects, and watershed management and restoration projects sponsored by NRCS and the Service. These consultations would likely occur on only a subset of the total number of parcels and therefore would not be likely to affect a substantial number of small entities. This rule would result in project modifications only when proposed Federal activities would destroy or adversely modify critical habitat. While this may occur, it is not expected frequently enough to affect a substantial number of small entities. Even when it does occur, we do not expect it to result in a significant economic impact, as the measures included in reasonable and prudent alternatives must be economically feasible and consistent with the

proposed action. Therefore, we are certifying that the designation of critical habitat for *Adenophorus periens*, *Alectryon macrococcus*, *Alsinidendron lychnoides*, *Alsinidendron viscosum*, *Bonamia menziesii*, *Brighamia insignis*, *Centaurium sebaeoides*, *Chamaesyce halemanui*, *Ctenitis squamigera*, *Cyanea asarifolia*, *Cyanea recta*, *Cyanea remyi*, *Cyanea undulata*, *Cyperus trachysanthos*, *Cyrtandra cyaneoides*, *Cyrtandra limahuliensis*, *Delissea rhytidospenna*, *Delissea rivularis*, *Delissea undulata*, *Diellia erecta*, *Diellia pallida*, *Diplazium molokaiense*, *Dubautia latifolia*, *Dubautia pauciflora*, *Euphorbia haeleeleana*, *Exocarpos luteolus*, *Flueggea neowawraea*, *Gouania meyenii*, *Hedyotis cookiana*, *Hedyotis st.-johnii*, *Hesperomannia lydgatei*, *Hibiscadelphus woodii*, *Hibiscus clayi*, *Hibiscus waimeae* ssp. *hannerae*, *Ischaemum byrone*, *Isodendron laurifolium*, *Isodendron longifolium*, *Kokia kauaiensis*, *Labordia lydgatei*, *Labordia tinifolia* var. *wahiawaensis*, *Lipochaeta fauriei*, *Lipochaeta micrantha*, *Lipochaeta waimeaensis*, *Lobelia niihauensis*, *Lysimachia filifolia*, *Mariscus pennatifolius*, *Melicope haupuensis*, *Melicope knudsenii*, *Melicope pallida*, *Munroidendron racemosum*, *Myrsine linearifolia*, *Nothoestrum peltatum*, *Panicum niihauense*, *Peucedanum sandwicense*, *Phlegmariurus nutans*, *Phyllostegia knudsenii*, *Phyllostegia waimeae*, *Phyllostegia wawrana*, *Plantago princeps*, *Platanthera holochila*, *Poa mannii*, *Poa sandwicensis*, *Poa siphonoglossa*, *Pteralyxia kauaiensis*, *Remya kauaiensis*, *Remya montgomeryi*, *Schiedea apokremnos*, *Schiedea helleri*, *Schiedea kauaiensis*, *Schiedea membranacea*, *Schiedea nuttallii*, *Schiedea spargulina* var. *leiopoda*, *Schiedea spargulina* var. *spargulina*, *Schiedea stellarioides*, *Sesbania tomentosa*, *Solanum sandwicense*, *Spermolepis hawaiiensis*, *Stenogyne campanulata*, *Viola helenae*, *Viola kauaiensis* var. *wahiawaensis*, *Wilkesia hobdyi*, *Xylosma crenatum*, and *Zanthoxylum hawaiiense* will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Therefore a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required.

Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (5 U.S.C. 804(2))

Under the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), this rule is not a major rule. Our detailed assessment of the economic effects of this designation are described in the draft economic analysis and the