

**BULL TROUT CORE AREA TEMPLATES**  
**INTRODUCTION AND METHODS**

Compiled by: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, February 2005

Primary Editors: Wade Fredenberg  
Creston Fish and Wildlife Center  
Kalispell, MT

Jeff Chan  
Olympia ES Field Office  
Olympia, WA

Contributors: John Bowerman  
Klamath Falls (Oregon) Fish and Wildlife Office

Wade Fredenberg  
(Kalispell) Montana ES Field Office

Bianca Streif, Chris Allen and Brad Goehring  
(Portland) Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office

Peter Lickwar, Jennifer O'Reilly, and Alan Mauer  
Bend (Oregon) Field Office

Paul Bridges  
Roseburg (Oregon) Field Office

John Stephenson and Gretchen Sausen  
LaGrande (Oregon) Field Office

Cary Myler, Chris Reighn, Jeri Wood and Marilyn Hemker  
Snake River (Idaho) Fish and Wildlife Office

Scott Deeds  
Upper Columbia (Spokane, Washington) Fish and Wildlife Office

Jeff Chan and Shelly Spalding  
Western Washington (Lacey ) Fish and Wildlife Office

Judy De La Vergne  
Central Wahington (Wenatchee) Field Office

Selena Werdon  
(Reno) Nevada Fish and Wildlife Office

## **INTRODUCTION**

In order to fully document and support our development of the **TEMPLATE FOR FEDERALLY LISTED ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES**, required by the Washington Office for a Five-Year Review, we determined that an updated core area by core area analysis of 121 bull trout core areas would be most useful. We also wished to provide a single source of updated information for referral in conducting the core area conservation Status Assessment.

We began the process by assembling existing documentation of the population status, threats, regulatory framework, and conservation actions that have occurred in all 121 bull trout core areas both prior to and since the time of listing (1998 and 1999). We relied heavily on the bull trout listing documents, the supporting documentation prepared at the time of listing, and the **DRAFT Bull Trout Recovery Plan** for summary of these actions prior to October, 2002 (publication date of the **DRAFT Recovery Plan**).

To update with the most recent information (October, 2002 through February, 2005), we developed an abbreviated template (see Appendix A) that outlines, in narrative form, current information with analysis. Those templates were based on the Service **DRAFT** guidance for 5-year reviews (Appendix B), but were tailored to provide core-area specific responses for bull trout, with the idea that those responses could then be “rolled up” into other broader assessments for the entire species.

Service Field staff from throughout the range of bull trout (see list of contributors on cover of this report) provided the updated templates to the 5-year review staff, per the directions in Appendix A. In total, over 650 pages of updated information were provided for the administrative file, with each of the 121 core areas constituting a separate assessment. This was supported by a compendium of literature and references.

This report contains the instructions and methods used to compile the templates for the 121 core areas.

**Appendix A**

**5-YEAR REVIEW**  
*DRAFT* TEMPLATE FOR BULL TROUT CORE AREA

**NOTE:** For additional instructions on completing the Template, see the file called *TEMPLATE INSTRUCTIONS.doc* attached to the assignment e-mail. Please note that questions are not necessarily in numerical order because some questions have been removed that, in the original template, are intended to be answered species or DPS-wide. This assignment is focused at the individual Core Area level.

**Core Area:** COMPLETE A SEPARATE TEMPLATE FOR EACH CORE AREA. The updated list of Core Areas is attached to the Assignment e-mail (filename: *Comprehensive Local Pop List Final.Doc*).

**Name and Field Office of Reviewer(s):** *Provide your name, phone number, and Field Office name.*

**3. New Information: Biology and Habitat**

**3. A. Is there relevant new information regarding the species' abundance, population trends (e.g. increasing, decreasing, stable), demographic features (e.g. age structure, sex ratio, family size, birth rate, age at mortality, mortality rate, etc.), or demographic trends *in this Core Area*?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**3. B. Is there relevant new information regarding the species' genetics, genetic variation, or trends in genetic variation (e.g. loss of genetic variation, genetic drift, inbreeding, etc.) *in this Core Area*?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**3. D. Is there relevant new information regarding the species' spatial distribution, trends in spatial distribution (e.g. increasingly fragmented, increased numbers of corridors, etc.), or historic range (e.g. corrections to the historical range, change in distribution of the species' within its historic range, etc.) *in this Core Area*?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**3. E. Is there relevant new information addressing habitat or ecosystem conditions (e.g. amount, distribution, and suitability of the habitat or ecosystem) in this Core Area?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**3. F. Is there relevant new information addressing disease, predation, or competition in this Core Area?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**3.G. Is there any other relevant new biological information (e.g. hybridization) in this Core Area?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**4. New Information: Threats**

**4. A. Is there relevant new information regarding the magnitude or imminence of previously identified threats to the species in this Core Area?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**4. B. Is there relevant new information regarding new threats to the species in this Core Area?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**5. New Information: Management**

**5.A. Is there relevant new information regarding regulatory mechanisms in this Core Area?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

*This question may include a discussion of experimental populations.*

**5. B. Is there relevant new information regarding implementation of conservation measures (e.g., HCPs, SHAs, experimental populations, etc.) that benefit the species in this Core Area?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary. Include a discussion of any new information on the effectiveness of the conservation measures being implemented. Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents. This question may include a discussion of experimental populations.*

**5. C. Is there relevant new information regarding overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes in this Core Area?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**7. New Information: Other. Is there any additional, relevant, new information not addressed in questions 3.A. -5.A. in this Core Area?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary. Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**9. Synthesis**

**9. A. Biological Assessment:** Given the updated information, particularly information presented in question 3, summarize the biological status of the species.

*Provide a synthesis of the information summarized in question 3 and, if applicable, questions 4 and 5.*

**9. B. Describe any interactions, additive effects, and/or synergistic effects of the threats *in this Core Area*.**

**9. C. Conservation Efforts:** Given the updated information, particularly information presented in question 5, summarize the conservation efforts (e.g., HCPs, SHAs, experimental populations, etc. that are in effect *in this Core Area*.

## ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE CORE AREA TEMPLATE FOR BULL TROUT 5-YEAR REVIEW

Most of the instructions needed to complete the write-ups for each Core Area are printed on the template. There are a few items that we felt would provide additional guidance to the staff completing the write-ups, but that would create undesirable repetition if they appeared in each copy of the template.

### **Introduction to the template**

The template is designed to encourage the use of summary documents when available and to focus the reviewer's efforts on providing summary statements that document the deliberative process. The result should not be an exhaustive report; rather, the review should be a concise and well-researched document in which the writing reflects the decision making process (i.e. critical writing). Because this template records a deliberative process, please complete the template in order. Wherever this document refers to "relevant new information", this means information gathered **since the time of listing**: June 10, 1998, for Columbia and Klamath; August 11, 1998, for Jarbidge; November 1, 1999, for the rest of the coterminous population. To be considered relevant, such information must be supported by the record, including scientific data, signed agreements, new laws, etc. Do not report on untested hypotheses, undocumented observations, or other theoretical information.

**NOTE:** The questions below are not necessarily in numerical order because some questions in the original template are intended to be answered species or DPS-wide, and this assignment focuses at the individual Core Area level.

**Core Area:** List the name of the Core Area being reviewed. You will need to complete a separate template for each Core Area. The updated list of Core Areas is attached to the Assignment e-mail (filename: Comprehensive Local Pop List Final.Doc).

**Name and Field Office of Reviewer(s):** Please provide your name, phone number, and name of your field office so we can contact you if we have questions. This will also serve as documentation that the sources of information in the templates are from Service professional field biological staff.

For each of the questions and sub-questions in 3-7, please first answer Yes or No. If your answer is "No", please move on to the next question. If your answer is "Yes", please provide a narrative response in support of your "Yes" answer. When drafting narrative responses, please be as concise as possible and avoid the temptation to dive into fine-scale details. The 5-Year Review Team will be creating a single summary overview of all the Core Area template write-ups. While each individual write up you do will be part of the Administrative Record, it is unlikely we will be able to carry forward to our Science and Manager Panelists any lengthy narratives for individual Core Areas. Typical narrative responses for each question should range from one paragraph to no more than a single page. See the example narratives provided in the e-mailed assignment.

*DRAFT*

In your narrative responses, if a given factor, threat, or item of new information applies to multiple Core Areas (e.g., State Harvest Regulations), please copy and paste your narrative into each Core Area affected, as appropriate. The goal is to have each Core Area write-up be a valid, stand-alone document that our Science and Manager Panelists can refer to for further information as needed. Please **DO NOT USE** cross references (e.g., don't say: "See narrative for Swan Lake Core Area").

**LITERATURE CITED** - Please list complete citations for all information sources cited above. If you cite newer documents not likely to have been included in prior bull trout administrative records (e.g., Recovery Plan or Critical Habitat administrative records), please send a copy of the source document to Rollie White. Electronic or hardcopy are both acceptable.

**Appendix B**

**5-YEAR REVIEW**  
*DRAFT* TEMPLATE FOR FEDERALLY LISTED  
ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES

**Introduction to the template**

The template is designed to encourage the use of summative documents when available and to focus the reviewer's efforts on providing summary statements that document the deliberative process. The result should not be an exhaustive report; rather, the review should be a concise and well-researched document in which the writing reflects the decision making process (i.e. critical writing). Because this template records a deliberative process, the reviewer is asked to complete the template in order. Guidance on conducting a 5-year review is available in the Recovery Handbook (in preparation) or on the sii. The on-line template (on the sii and on NOAA Fisheries' PR intranet site) provides easy access to additional instructions, information, and direct links to relevant Federal Register notices. Note that the term "species" is used throughout this document as it is defined in Section 3 of the ESA (i.e., a species, subspecies, or a distinct population segment). Ensure that any detailed information that might imperil a species (e.g. locations of narrow endemics) or identify ownership of private lands does not appear in this review.

For FWS, the information requested regarding species priority number, species status (declining, stable, improving, uncertain), and percent recovery achieved is available from TESS. Provide updated information and any corrections so that changes can be made in TESS.

For further guidance on determining the species recovery priority number should a change be considered warranted as a result of this review, refer to *55 FR 24296* (NOAA) or *48 FR 43098* (FWS) and to Chapter 3 of the Draft Recovery Planning Guidance ("Preliminary Recovery Strategy") available on the sii (for FWS).

## 5-YEAR REVIEW

**Species reviewed:** common name / *scientific name*

**Date completed:**

### METHODOLOGY USED TO COMPLETE THIS 5-YEAR REVIEW

*Briefly provide information that describes the method or process used in conducting this review. For example, provide information regarding whether the review was a team or an individual effort, whether a certain portion of the review was contracted out, whether certain documents and data were relied on more heavily than others, was a structured decision-making process used, was the analysis of data peer reviewed, etc.*

### GENERAL INFORMATION

**FR Notice announcing initiation of this review:** *Provide citation for notice that announces the active review of the species*

**Lead Region:** *Also provide contact name(s) and phone number(s)*

**Lead Field Office:** *Also provide contact name(s) and phone number(s)*

**Name of Reviewer(s):** *Provide name(s) and phone number(s)*

**Cooperating Field Office(s):** *Also provide contact name(s) and phone number(s)*

**Cooperating Region(s):** *Also provide contact names(s) and phone number(s)*

### BACKGROUND

**Species Existing Recovery Priority Number:** (i.e. 1 – 18 or 1C – 18C)

*Summarize rationale and cite original justification, if available*

**Most recent Species Status as reported in the Biennial Recovery Report to Congress:**

**Species Status:** (i.e., I, D, S, etc.)

**Recovery Achieved:** (i.e., 1, 2, 3, or 4; FWS only)

**Listing History**

**Original Listing:**

*Provide FR notice, date, entity listed (i.e., species, subspecies, DPS), and classification as threatened or endangered. If listed as a DPS, note whether it was listed prior to the DPS policy of February 7, 1996.*

**Revised Listing:**

*If applicable, provide FR notice, date, entity listed (i.e., species, subspecies, DPS), classification as threatened or endangered, and indication if the revision was as a result of a petition, etc.*

**Associated Actions:**

*If applicable, identify any experimental populations, similarity of appearance cases, protective regulations, 4(d) rules, or critical habitat.*

**Review History:**

*List all previously conducted Service reviews (e.g., status review(s), 5-year review(s), candidate species status review(s), date(s), results, and any resulting action(s)), as well as any reviews conducted by other entities if appropriate.*

**Existing Recovery Plan or Outline:**

*Provide the name of plan or outline, date issued, and revision history*

**Reference Point Documents:**

*List the document(s) that individually or together represent the most recent comprehensive analyses of the species.*

“Link” [Further explanation of Reference Point Documents.doc](#)

**REVIEW ANALYSIS**

**1. Application of the 1996 Distinct Population Segment (DPS) Policy to DPS-listings made prior to enactment of the policy**

“Link” [Bolded list of species needing DPS review.xls](#)

**1. A. Prior to this 5-year review was the DPS classification reviewed to ensure it meets the 1996 policy standards?**

*If the listed entity has already been reviewed for compliance with the 1996 policy provide the citation and continue to question 2. If not, proceed to question 1. B.*

**1. B. Does the original listing meet the DPS policy with regards to the Discreteness and Significance elements of the 1996 policy?**

“Link” [FR notice of DPS Policy](#)      “Link” [Appendix C - DPS.doc](#)

*Discuss how the original listing meets the DPS policy with regard to the discreteness and significance elements.*

*Questions 2 - 7 integrate relevant new information to produce the updated species information needed for use in Questions 8 - 10. Please consider each question and indicate cases in which there is no new information.*

**2. New Information: Improved Analyses. Have any improved analytic methods resulted in relevant new information?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of improved analytic methods and a brief summary. Note that the review may need to incorporate data and information that predate the original listing document.*

“Link” [Further guidance on Improved Analytical Methods.doc](#)

**3. New Information: Biology and Habitat**

**3. A. Is there relevant new information regarding the species’ abundance, population trends (e.g. increasing, decreasing, stable), demographic features (e.g. age structure, sex ratio, family size, birth rate, age at mortality, mortality rate, etc.), or demographic trends?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

“Link” [Further guidance on Role of Experimental Populations.doc](#)

**3. B. Is there relevant new information regarding the species’ genetics, genetic variation, or trends in genetic variation (e.g. loss of genetic variation, genetic drift, inbreeding, etc.)?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**3. C. Is there relevant new information regarding taxonomic classification or changes in nomenclature?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**3. D. Is there relevant new information regarding the species' spatial distribution, trends in spatial distribution (e.g. increasingly fragmented, increased numbers of corridors, etc.), or historic range (e.g. corrections to the historical range, change in distribution of the species' within its historic range, etc.)?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**3. E. Is there relevant new information addressing habitat or ecosystem conditions (e.g. amount, distribution, and suitability of the habitat or ecosystem)?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**3. F. Is there relevant new information addressing disease, predation, or competition?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**3. G. Is there any other relevant new biological information (e.g. hybridization)?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

#### **4. New Information: Threats**

##### **4. A. Is there relevant new information regarding the magnitude or imminence of previously identified threats to the species?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**“Link”** [Further guidance on Role of Similarity of Appearance Listings.doc](#)

##### **4. B. Is there relevant new information regarding new threats to the species?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

#### **5. New Information: Management**

##### **5. A. Is there relevant new information regarding regulatory mechanisms?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

*This question may include a discussion of experimental populations.*

##### **5. B. Is there relevant new information regarding implementation of conservation measures (e.g., HCPs, SHAs, experimental populations, etc.) that benefit the species?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary. Include a discussion of any new information on the*

*effectiveness of the conservation measures being implemented. Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents. This question may include a discussion of experimental populations.*

“Link” [Further guidance on Role of Experimental Populations.doc](#)

**5. C. Is there relevant new information regarding overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents.*

**6. New Information: Application of the DPS policy**

**6. A. Is there relevant new information with respect to the appropriate application of the DPS policy to the listed entity under review?**

“Link” [FR notice of DPS Policy](#)      “Link” [Appendix C - DPS.doc](#)

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents, and then continue on to question 6. B. If no, then continue on to question 7.*

**6. B. Given the updated information, is the listed entity consistent with the DPS policy with regards to the Discreteness and Significance elements?**

“Link” [FR notice of DPS Policy](#)      “Link” [Appendix C - DPS.doc](#)

*If yes, provide a brief summary of how the updated species information shows that the discreteness and significance elements of a DPS have or have not been met; then, continue to Question 7. Conservation status will be addressed later in the threats assessment.*

*If no, go to Question 10 (Result), and complete the recommendation for future actions section.*

**7. New Information: Other. Is there any additional, relevant, new information not addressed in questions 3.A. -6.A.?**

*If yes, then provide the citation(s) of new information and a brief summary.*

*Also provide a brief summary of how this new information affects our understanding of the species as described in the reference point documents. QUESTIONS*

## **8. Using Recovery Criteria**

**8. A. Does the species have a recovery plan that was written in accordance with Recovery Planning Guidance and that has up-to-date recovery criteria (with downlisting and/or delisting criteria, and in some cases uplisting criteria) that address biological factors, conservation measures and the threats to the species?**

*If yes, please list these criteria then go to 8.B. If no, then continue on to question 9.*

**8. B. Does the updated information on the species indicate that any or all of the recovery criteria for downlisting, delisting or uplisting have been met?**

*If all criteria for downlisting, delisting, or uplisting have been met, describe how each of the criteria has been met, then go to question 10.*

*If not all criteria for downlisting, delisting, or uplisting have been met, describe how the criteria have not been met; then,*

- 1) If species is currently listed as endangered, go to question 10.*
- 2) If the species is currently listed as threatened and the updated information does not suggest a significant decline in the species status, go to 10.*
- 3) If the species is currently listed as threatened and the updated information suggests a significant decline, or there is uncertainty regarding the level of significance in the decline, go on to question 9.*

## **9. Synthesis**

**9. A. Biological Assessment: Given the updated information, particularly information presented in question 3, summarize the biological status of the species.**

*Provide a synthesis of the information summarized in question 3 and, if applicable, questions 5, 7, and 8.*

**9. B. 1. Threats Assessment (5-Factor Analysis):** Given the updated information, particularly information presented in question 4, provide an analysis of the threats to the species in the context of the 5 listing factors.

*Discuss the effects of each threat on the status of the species. Under each threat, address magnitude, severity, intensity, and management feasibility. Note if the species is not affected by a certain threat. See Appendix F (in preparation) for additional guidance.*

“Link” [Further guidance on the 5 Listing Factors.doc](#) “Link” Appendix F (in preparation).

- a) the present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range;
- b) overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific or educational purposes;
- c) disease or predation;
- d) the inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; and
- e) other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence.

**9. B. 2.** Describe any interactions, additive effects, and/or synergistic effects of these threats.

**9. C. Conservation Efforts:** Given the updated information, particularly information presented in question 5, summarize the conservation efforts (e.g., HCPs, SHAs, experimental populations, etc.).

*Discuss the effectiveness of these conservation efforts in recovering the species and how these efforts may be affecting the status of the species.*

## 10. Result

**10. A.** Given your responses to questions 8 B., and/or 9.A. - 9.C., does the 5-year review indicate that a change in classification is warranted?

*Summarize the reasons for this result and recommend the appropriate change in classification, if warranted (i.e. delist, reclassify from threatened to endangered, or endangered to threatened).*

“Link” [Definitions of Threatened and Endangered and Reasons for Delisting.doc](#)

**10. B. Based on this review, indicate the appropriate Recovery Priority Number for the species.**

“Link” [55 FR 24296](#) “Link” [48 FR 43098](#)

*The 5-year review should substantiate this change, so provide only a brief rationale. Notify the Washington Office of the change during the annual Recovery Data Call.*

**10. C. If applicable, indicate the Listing and Reclassification Priority Number (FWS only).**

“Link” [FWS Listing and Recovery Priority Guidelines FR.pdf](#)

*The priority number will assist in prioritizing staffing, funding, and development of proposed rules to reclassify or delist a species.*

**Reclassification (from Threatened to Endangered) Priority Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reclassification (from Endangered to Threatened) Priority Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Delisting (Removal from list regardless of current classification) Priority Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

The Field Office may want to use this space for comments on current staffing or funding levels.

**11. Recommendations for Future Actions**

Provide recommendations for future actions that stem from this review and that focus on the highest priority actions needed prior to the next 5-year review. Recommendations may address, but are not limited to, the following topics: data needs for future 5-year reviews, possible actions on DPS-related issues identified in questions 6. A. and B., development or modification of special rules, or revisions, amendments, or updates to recovery plans. Completion of these recommendations is not required, and subsequent reviews will not be precluded should recommended actions remain incomplete.

*For assistance in deciding whether the species recovery plan needs modification see “Link” [Criteria for determining if a Recovery Plan needs modification](#)*

*For recommendations on modifications to recovery plans see “Link” [Further guidance on Keeping the Plan Useful](#)*

*For species where little to no new relevant information was available, make specific recommendations to address data and information needs.*

*For recommendations on DPS related issues see Appendix D, “Consideration of the DPS Policy during the 5-year review”. “Link” ” [Appendix C - DPS.doc](#)*

*See recovery implementation guidance (in preparation) for guidance on recommendations related to similarity of appearance cases and experimental populations.*

## **REFERENCES**

- 12. List all information and data sources used in this review, and provide file locations if these sources will not be filed with the review. Include on this list any experts used and their affiliations and note whether they provided information or if they acted as peer-reviewers, or both.**

*Documenting references and any peer reviewers or other sources in the administrative record is essential in supporting any recommendations resulting from this review and in subsequent reviews. Sources may be listed here, which may be very useful in the case where the documents are located in various files or separate offices. If this section of the template is not completed, then all reference materials should be placed in the administrative record for the review.*

DRAFT

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
SIGNATURE PAGE for 5-YEAR REVIEW on *SPECIES X*

CURRENT CLASSIFICATION \_\_\_\_\_

RECOMMENDATION RESULTING FROM THE 5-YEAR REVIEW

- \_\_\_\_\_ Delist
- \_\_\_\_\_ Endangered to Threatened
- \_\_\_\_\_ Threatened to Endangered
- \_\_\_\_\_ No Change

APPROPRIATE LISTING/RECLASSIFICATION PRIORITY  
NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

REVIEW CONDUCTED BY \_\_\_\_\_

Lead Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service

Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Do not Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

*Lead Field Offices must ensure that all other Field Offices within the range of the species have been provided an adequate opportunity to review and comment prior to the review's completion. If it is concluded that a change in classification is warranted, written concurrence from other Field Offices is required.*

Cooperating Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service

Concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Not concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Lead Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service

Concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Not concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

*The Regional Director must sign all 5-year reviews, unless the authority has been delegated by the Regional Director to the ARD of Ecological Services.*

Cooperating Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service

Concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Not concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

*The Lead Region must ensure that any other Regions within the range of the species have been provided an adequate opportunity to review and comment prior to the review's completion. If it is concluded that a change in classification is warranted, written concurrence from other Regional Directors is required.*

DRAFT

U.S. NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION (NOAA)-  
FISHERIES

SIGNATURE PAGE for 5-YEAR REVIEW RESULT

*SPECIES X*

CURRENT CLASSIFICATION \_\_\_\_\_

RECOMMENDATION RESULTING FROM THE 5-YEAR REVIEW

- \_\_\_\_\_ Delist
- \_\_\_\_\_ Endangered to Threatened
- \_\_\_\_\_ Threatened to Endangered
- \_\_\_\_\_ No Change

REVIEW CONDUCTED BY \_\_\_\_\_

Lead Regional Administrator, NOAA Fisheries

Concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Not concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Cooperating Regional Administrator, NOAA Fisheries

Concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Not concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

*The Lead Region must ensure that any other Regions within the range of the species have been provided an adequate opportunity to review and comment prior to the review's completion. If it is concluded that a change in classification is warranted, written concurrence from other Regional Directors is required.*

Assistant Administrator, NOAA Fisheries

Concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Not concur \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_