

**APPENDIX A:
STATUS OF THE SPECIES: BULL TROUT**

(This page intentionally left blank)

Appendix A

Status of the Species: Bull Trout

Listing Status

The coterminous United States population of the bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) was listed as threatened on November 1, 1999 (64 FR 58910). The threatened bull trout generally occurs in the Klamath River Basin of south-central Oregon; the Jarbidge River in Nevada; the Willamette River Basin in Oregon; Pacific Coast drainages of Washington, including Puget Sound; major rivers in Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Montana, within the Columbia River Basin; and the St. Mary-Belly River, east of the Continental Divide in northwestern Montana (Bond 1992, p. 2; Brewin and Brewin 1997, p. 215; Cavender 1978, pp. 165-166; Leary and Allendorf 1997, pp. 716-719).

Throughout its range, bull trout are threatened by the combined effects of habitat degradation, fragmentation, and alterations associated with dewatering, road construction and maintenance, mining, grazing, the blockage of migratory corridors by dams or other diversion structures, poor water quality, entrainment (a process by which aquatic organisms are pulled through a diversion or other device) into diversion channels, and introduced non-native species (64 FR 58910). Although all salmonids are likely to be affected by climate change, bull trout are especially vulnerable given that spawning and rearing are constrained by their location in upper watersheds and the requirement for cold water temperatures (Battin et al. 2007, pp. 6672-6673; Rieman et al. 2007, p. 1552). Poaching and incidental mortality of bull trout during other targeted fisheries are additional threats.

The bull trout was initially listed as three separate Distinct Population Segments (DPSs) (63 FR 31647; 64 FR 17110). The preamble to the final listing rule for the United States coterminous population of the bull trout discusses the consolidation of these DPSs with the Columbia and Klamath population segments into one listed taxon and the application of the jeopardy standard under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (Act) relative to this species (64 FR 58910):

Although this rule consolidates the five bull trout DPSs into one listed taxon, based on conformance with the DPS policy for purposes of consultation under section 7 of the Act, we intend to retain recognition of each DPS in light of available scientific information relating to their uniqueness and significance. Under this approach, these DPSs will be treated as interim recovery units with respect to application of the jeopardy standard until an approved recovery plan is developed. Formal establishment of bull trout recovery units will occur during the recovery planning process.

Current Status and Conservation Needs

In recognition of available scientific information relating to their uniqueness and significance, five segments of the coterminous United States population of bull trout are considered essential to the survival and recovery of this species and are identified as interim recovery units: 1) Jarbidge River, 2) Klamath River, 3) Columbia River, 4) Coastal-Puget Sound, and 5) St. Mary-

Belly River (USFWS 2002a, pp. iv, 2, 7, 98; 2004a, Vol. 1 & 2, p. 1; 2004b, p. 1). Each of these interim recovery units is necessary to maintain the bull trout's distribution, as well as its genetic and phenotypic diversity, all of which are important to ensure the species' resilience to changing environmental conditions.

A summary of the current status and conservation needs of the bull trout within these interim recovery units is provided below and a comprehensive discussion is found in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) draft recovery plans for the bull trout (USFWS 2002a, pp. vi-viii; 2004a, Vol. 2 p. iii-x; 2004b, pp. iii-xii).

The conservation needs of bull trout are often generally expressed as the four "Cs": cold, clean, complex, and connected habitat. Cold stream temperatures, clean water quality that is relatively free of sediment and contaminants, complex channel characteristics (including abundant large wood and undercut banks), and large patches of such habitat that are well connected by unobstructed migratory pathways are all needed to promote conservation of bull trout at multiple scales ranging from the coterminous to local populations (a local population is a group of bull trout that spawn within a particular stream or portion of a stream system). The recovery planning process for bull trout (USFWS 2002a, pp. 49-50; 2004a, Vol 1 & 2 pp. 12-18; 2004b, pp. 60-86) has also identified the following conservation needs: 1) maintenance and restoration of multiple, interconnected populations in diverse habitats across the range of each interim recovery unit, 2) preservation of the diversity of life-history strategies, 3) maintenance of genetic and phenotypic diversity across the range of each interim recovery unit, and 4) establishment of a positive population trend. Recently, it has also been recognized that bull trout populations need to be protected from catastrophic fires across the range of each interim recovery unit (Rieman et al. 2003).

Central to the survival and recovery of bull trout is the maintenance of viable core areas (USFWS 2002a, pp. 53-54; 2004a, Vol. 1 pp. 210-218, Vol. 2. pp. 61-62; 2004b, pp. 15-30, 64-67). A core area is defined as a geographic area occupied by one or more local bull trout populations that overlap in their use of rearing, foraging, migratory, and overwintering habitat. Each of the interim recovery units listed above consists of one or more core areas. There are 121 core areas recognized across the coterminous range of the bull trout (USFWS 2002a, pp. 6, 48, 98; 2004a, Vol. 1 p. vi, Vol. 2 pp. 14, 134; 2004b, pp. iv, 2; 2005, p. ii).

Jarbidge River Interim Recovery Unit

This interim recovery unit currently contains a single core area with six local populations. Less than 500 resident and migratory adult bull trout, representing about 50 to 125 spawning adults, are estimated to occur in the core area. The current condition of the bull trout in this interim recovery unit is attributed to the effects of livestock grazing, roads, incidental mortalities of released bull trout from recreational angling, historic angler harvest, timber harvest, and the introduction of non-native fishes (USFWS 2004b). The draft bull trout recovery plan (USFWS 2004b) identifies the following conservation needs for this interim recovery unit: 1) maintain the current distribution of the bull trout within the core area, 2) maintain stable or increasing trends in abundance of both resident and migratory bull trout in the core area, 3) restore and maintain suitable habitat conditions for all life history stages and forms, and 4) conserve genetic diversity

and increase natural opportunities for genetic exchange between resident and migratory forms of the bull trout. An estimated 270 to 1,000 spawning bull trout per year are needed to provide for the persistence and viability of the core area and to support both resident and migratory adult bull trout (USFWS 2004b).

Klamath River Interim Recovery Unit

This interim recovery unit currently contains three core areas and seven local populations. The current abundance, distribution, and range of the bull trout in the Klamath River Basin are greatly reduced from historical levels due to habitat loss and degradation caused by reduced water quality, timber harvest, livestock grazing, water diversions, roads, and the introduction of non-native fishes (USFWS 2002a). Bull trout populations in this interim recovery unit face a high risk of extirpation (USFWS 2002a). The draft Klamath River bull trout recovery plan (USFWS 2002a) identifies the following conservation needs for this interim recovery unit: 1) maintain the current distribution of bull trout and restore distribution in previously occupied areas, 2) maintain stable or increasing trends in bull trout abundance, 3) restore and maintain suitable habitat conditions for all life history stages and strategies, 4) conserve genetic diversity and provide the opportunity for genetic exchange among appropriate core area populations. Eight to 15 new local populations and an increase in population size from about 2,400 adults currently to 8,250 adults are needed to provide for the persistence and viability of the three core areas (USFWS 2002a).

Columbia River Interim Recovery Unit

The Columbia River interim recovery unit includes bull trout residing in portions of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana. Bull trout are estimated to have occupied about 60 percent of the Columbia River Basin, and presently occur in 45 percent of the estimated historical range (Quigley and Arbelbide 1997, p. 1177). This interim recovery unit currently contains 97 core areas and 527 local populations. About 65 percent of these core areas and local populations occur in central Idaho and northwestern Montana. The Columbia River interim recovery unit has declined in overall range and numbers of fish (63 FR 31647). Although some strongholds still exist with migratory fish present, bull trout generally occur as isolated local populations in headwater lakes or tributaries where the migratory life history form has been lost. Though still widespread, there have been numerous local extirpations reported throughout the Columbia River basin. In Idaho, for example, bull trout have been extirpated from 119 reaches in 28 streams (IDFG in litt. 1995). The draft Columbia River bull trout recovery plan (USFWS 2002c) identifies the following conservation needs for this interim recovery unit: 1) maintain or expand the current distribution of the bull trout within core areas, 2) maintain stable or increasing trends in bull trout abundance, 3) restore and maintain suitable habitat conditions for all bull trout life history stages and strategies, and 4) conserve genetic diversity and provide opportunities for genetic exchange.

This interim recovery unit currently contains 97 core areas and 527 local populations. About 65 percent of these core areas and local populations occur in Idaho and northwestern Montana. The condition of the bull trout within these core areas varies from poor to good. All core areas have been subject to the combined effects of habitat degradation and fragmentation caused by the

following activities: dewatering; road construction and maintenance; mining; grazing; the blockage of migratory corridors by dams or other diversion structures; poor water quality; incidental angler harvest; entrainment into diversion channels; and introduced non-native species. The Service completed a core area conservation assessment for the 5-year status review and determined that, of the 97 core areas in this interim recovery unit, 38 are at high risk of extirpation, 35 are at risk, 20 are at potential risk, 2 are at low risk, and 2 are at unknown risk (USFWS 2005, pp. 2, Map A, pp. 73-83).

Coastal-Puget Sound Interim Recovery Unit

Bull trout in the Coastal-Puget Sound interim recovery unit exhibit anadromous¹, adfluvial, fluvial, and resident life history patterns. The anadromous life history form is unique to this interim recovery unit. This interim recovery unit currently contains 14 core areas and 67 local populations (USFWS 2004a). Bull trout are distributed throughout most of the large rivers and associated tributary systems within this interim recovery unit. Bull trout continue to be present in nearly all major watersheds where they likely occurred historically, although local extirpations have occurred throughout this interim recovery unit. Many remaining populations are isolated or fragmented and abundance has declined, especially in the southeastern portion of the interim recovery unit. The current condition of the bull trout in this interim recovery unit is attributed to the adverse effects of dams, forest management practices (e.g., timber harvest and associated road building activities), agricultural practices (e.g., diking, water control structures, draining of wetlands, channelization, and the removal of riparian vegetation), livestock grazing, roads, mining, urbanization, poaching, incidental mortality from other targeted fisheries, and the introduction of non-native species. The draft Coastal-Puget Sound bull trout recovery plan (USFWS 2004a) identifies the following conservation needs for this interim recovery unit: 1) maintain or expand the current distribution of bull trout within existing core areas, 2) increase bull trout abundance to about 16,500 adults across all core areas, and 3) maintain or increase connectivity between local populations within each core area.

St. Mary-Belly River Interim Recovery Unit

This interim recovery unit currently contains six core areas and nine local populations (USFWS 2002b). Currently, bull trout are widely distributed in the St. Mary-Belly River drainage and occur in nearly all of the waters that it inhabited historically. Bull trout are found only in a 1.2-mile reach of the North Fork Belly River within the United States. Redd count surveys of the North Fork Belly River documented an increase from 27 redds in 1995 to 119 redds in 1999. This increase was attributed primarily to protection from angler harvest (USFWS 2002b). The current condition of the bull trout in this interim recovery unit is primarily attributed to the effects of dams, water diversions, roads, mining, and the introduction of non-native fishes (USFWS 2002b). The draft St. Mary-Belly River bull trout recovery plan (USFWS 2002b)

¹ Bull trout migrate from saltwater to freshwater to reproduce are commonly referred to as anadromous. However, bull trout and some other species that enter the marine environment are more properly termed amphidromous. Unlike strictly anadromous species, such as Pacific salmon, amphidromous species often return seasonally to fresh water as subadults, sometimes for several years, before returning to spawn (Brenkman and Corbett 2005, p. 1075; Wilson 1997, p. 5). Due to its more common usage, we will refer to bull trout as exhibiting anadromous rather than amphidromous life history patterns in this document.

identifies the following conservation needs for this interim recovery unit: 1) maintain the current distribution of the bull trout and restore distribution in previously occupied areas, 2) maintain stable or increasing trends in bull trout abundance, 3) restore and maintain suitable habitat conditions for all life history stages and forms, 4) conserve genetic diversity and provide the opportunity for genetic exchange, and 5) establish good working relations with Canadian interests because local bull trout populations in this interim recovery unit are comprised mostly of migratory fish, whose habitat is mostly in Canada.

Life History

Bull trout exhibit both resident and migratory life history strategies. Both resident and migratory forms may be found together, and either form may produce offspring exhibiting either resident or migratory behavior (Rieman and McIntyre 1993, pp. 1-18). Resident bull trout complete their entire life cycle in the tributary (or nearby) streams in which they spawn and rear. The resident form tends to be smaller than the migratory form at maturity and also produces fewer eggs (Fraley and Shepard 1989, p. 1; Goetz 1989, pp. 15-16). Migratory bull trout spawn in tributary streams where juvenile fish rear 1 to 4 years before migrating to either a lake (adfluvial form), river (fluvial form) (Fraley and Shepard 1989, pp. 135-137; Goetz 1989, pp. 22-25), or saltwater (anadromous form) to rear as subadults and to live as adults (Cavender 1978, pp. 139, 165-68; McPhail and Baxter 1996, p. 14; WDFW et al. 1997, pp. 17-18, 22-26). Bull trout normally reach sexual maturity in 4 to 7 years and may live longer than 12 years. They are iteroparous (they spawn more than once in a lifetime). Repeat- and alternate-year spawning has been reported, although repeat-spawning frequency and post-spawning mortality are not well documented (Fraley and Shepard 1989, pp. 135-137; Leathe and Graham 1982, p. 95; Pratt 1992, p. 6; Rieman and McIntyre 1996, p. 133).

The iteroparous reproductive strategy of bull trout has important repercussions for the management of this species. Bull trout require passage both upstream and downstream, not only for repeat spawning but also for foraging. Most fish ladders, however, were designed specifically for anadromous semelparous salmonids (fishes that spawn once and then die, and require only one-way passage upstream). Therefore, even dams or other barriers with fish passage facilities may be a factor in isolating bull trout populations if they do not provide a downstream passage route. Additionally, in some core areas, bull trout that migrate to marine waters must pass both upstream and downstream through areas with net fisheries at river mouths. This can increase the likelihood of mortality to bull trout during these spawning and foraging migrations.

Growth varies depending upon life-history strategy. Resident adults range from 6 to 12 inches total length, and migratory adults commonly reach 24 inches or more (Goetz 1989, pp. 29-32; Pratt 1984, p. 13). The largest verified bull trout is a 32-pound specimen caught in Lake Pend Oreille, Idaho, in 1949 (Simpson and Wallace 1982).

Habitat Characteristics

Bull trout have more specific habitat requirements than most other salmonids (Rieman and McIntyre 1993, p. 7). Habitat components that influence bull trout distribution and abundance include water temperature, cover, channel form and stability, valley form, spawning and rearing substrate, and migratory corridors (Fraley and Shepard 1989, pp. 137, 141; Goetz 1989, pp. 19-26; Bond in Hoelscher and Bjornn 1989, p. 57; Howell and Buchanan 1992, p. 1; Pratt 1992, p. 6; Rich 1996, pp. 35-38; Rieman and McIntyre 1993, pp. 4-7; Rieman and McIntyre 1995, pp. 293-294; Sedell and Everest 1991, p. 1; Watson and Hillman 1997, pp. 246-250). Watson and Hillman (1997, pp. 247-249) concluded that watersheds must have specific physical characteristics to provide the habitat requirements necessary for bull trout to successfully spawn and rear and that these specific characteristics are not necessarily present throughout these watersheds. Because bull trout exhibit a patchy distribution, even in pristine habitats (Rieman and McIntyre 1993, p. 7), bull trout should not be expected to simultaneously occupy all available habitats (Rieman et al. 1997, p. 1560).

Migratory corridors link seasonal habitats for all bull trout life histories. The ability to migrate is important to the persistence of bull trout (Gilpin, in litt. 1997, pp. 4-5; Rieman and McIntyre 1993, p. 7; Rieman et al. 1997, p. 1114). Migrations facilitate gene flow among local populations when individuals from different local populations interbreed or stray to nonnatal streams. Local populations that are extirpated by catastrophic events may also become reestablished by bull trout migrants. However, it is important to note that the genetic structuring of bull trout indicates there is limited gene flow among bull trout populations, which may encourage local adaptation within individual populations, and that reestablishment of extirpated populations may take a long time (Rieman and McIntyre 1993, p. 7; Spruell et al. 1999, pp. 118-120). Migration also allows bull trout to access more abundant or larger prey, which facilitates growth and reproduction. Additional benefits of migration and its relationship to foraging are discussed below under "Diet."

Cold water temperatures play an important role in determining bull trout habitat quality, as these fish are primarily found in colder streams (below 15 °C or 59 °F), and spawning habitats are generally characterized by temperatures that drop below 9 °C (48 °F) in the fall (Fraley and Shepard 1989, p. 133; Pratt 1992, p. 6; Rieman and McIntyre 1993, p. 7).

Thermal requirements for bull trout appear to differ at different life stages. Spawning areas are often associated with cold-water springs, groundwater infiltration, and the coldest streams in a given watershed (Baxter et al. 1997, pp. 426-427; Pratt 1992, p. 6; Rieman and McIntyre 1993, p. 7; Rieman et al. 1997, p. 1117). Optimum incubation temperatures for bull trout eggs range from 2 °C to 6 °C (35 °F to 39 °F) whereas optimum water temperatures for rearing range from about 6 °C to 10 °C (46 °F to 50 °F) (Buchanan and Gregory 1997, pp. 121-122; Goetz 1989, pp. 22-24; McPhail and Murray 1979, pp. 41, 50, 53, 55). In Granite Creek, Idaho, Bonneau and Scarnecchia (1996) observed that juvenile bull trout selected the coldest water available in a plunge pool, 8 °C to 9 °C (46 °F to 48 °F), within a temperature gradient of 8 °C to 15 °C (4 °F to 60 °F). In a landscape study relating bull trout distribution to maximum water temperatures,

Dunham et al. (2003) found that the probability of juvenile bull trout occurrence does not become high (i.e., greater than 0.75) until maximum temperatures decline to 11 °C to 12 °C (52 °F to 54 °F).

Although bull trout are found primarily in cold streams, occasionally these fish are found in larger, warmer river systems throughout the Columbia River basin (Buchanan and Gregory 1997, pp. 121-122; Fraley and Shepard 1989, pp. 135-137; Rieman and McIntyre 1993, p. 2; Rieman and McIntyre 1995, p. 288; Rieman et al. 1997, p. 1114). Availability and proximity of cold water patches and food productivity can influence bull trout ability to survive in warmer rivers (Myrick et al. 2002). For example, in a study in the Little Lost River of Idaho where bull trout were found at temperatures ranging from 8 °C to 20 °C (46 °F to 68 °F), most sites that had high densities of bull trout were in areas where primary productivity in streams had increased following a fire (Gamett, pers. comm. 2002).

All life history stages of bull trout are associated with complex forms of cover, including large woody debris, undercut banks, boulders, and pools (Fraley and Shepard 1989, pp. 135-137; Goetz 1989, pp. 22-25; Hoelscher and Bjornn 1989, p. 54; Pratt 1992, p. 6; Rich 1996, pp. 35-38; Sedell and Everest 1991, p. 1; Sexauer and James 1997, pp. 367-369; Thomas 1992, pp. 4-5; Watson and Hillman 1997, pp. 247-249). Maintaining bull trout habitat requires stability of stream channels and maintenance of natural flow patterns (Rieman and McIntyre 1993, p. 7). Juvenile and adult bull trout frequently inhabit side channels, stream margins, and pools with suitable cover (Sexauer and James 1997, pp. 367-369). These areas are sensitive to activities that directly or indirectly affect stream channel stability and alter natural flow patterns. For example, altered stream flow in the fall may disrupt bull trout during the spawning period, and channel instability may decrease survival of eggs and young juveniles in the gravel from winter through spring (Fraley and Shepard 1989, pp. 135-137; Pratt 1992, p. 6; Pratt and Huston 1993, pp. 70-72). Pratt (1992, p. 6) indicated that increases in fine sediment reduce egg survival and emergence.

Bull trout typically spawn from August through November during periods of increasing flows and decreasing water temperatures. Preferred spawning habitat consists of low-gradient stream reaches with loose, clean gravel (Fraley and Shepard 1989, p. 135). Redds are often constructed in stream reaches fed by springs or near other sources of cold groundwater (Goetz 1989, p. 15; Pratt 1992, p. 8; Rieman and McIntyre 1996, p. 133). Depending on water temperature, incubation is normally 100 to 145 days (Pratt 1992, p. 8). After hatching, fry remain in the substrate, and time from egg deposition to emergence may surpass 200 days. Fry normally emerge from early April through May, depending on water temperatures and increasing stream flows (Ratliff and Howell 1992 in Howell and Buchanan 1992, pp. 10, 15; Pratt 1992, pp. 5-6).

Early life stages of fish, specifically the developing embryo, require the highest inter-gravel dissolved oxygen (IGDO) levels, and are the most sensitive life stage to reduced oxygen levels. The oxygen demand of embryos depends on temperature and on stage of development, with the greatest IGDO required just prior to hatching.

A literature review conducted by the Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE 2002) indicates that adverse effects of lower oxygen concentrations on embryo survival are magnified as temperatures increase above optimal (for incubation). In a laboratory study conducted in Canada, researchers found that low oxygen levels retarded embryonic development in bull trout (Giles and Van der Zweep 1996, pp. 54-55). Normal oxygen levels seen in rivers used by bull trout during spawning ranged from 8 to 12 mg/L (in the gravel), with corresponding instream levels of 10 to 11.5 mg/L (Stewart et al. 2007). In addition, IGDO concentrations, water velocities in the water column, and especially the intergravel flow rate, are interrelated variables that affect the survival of incubating embryos (ODEQ 1995). Due to a long incubation period of 220+ days, bull trout are particularly sensitive to adequate IGDO levels. An IGDO level below 8 mg/L is likely to result in mortality of eggs, embryos, and fry.

Migratory forms of bull trout may develop when habitat conditions allow movement between spawning and rearing streams and larger rivers, lakes or nearshore marine habitat where foraging opportunities may be enhanced (Brenkman and Corbett 2005, pp. 1073, 1079-1080; Frissell 1993, p. 350; Goetz et al. 2004, pp. 45, 55, 60, 68, 77, 113-114, 123, 125-126). For example, multiple life history forms (e.g., resident and fluvial) and multiple migration patterns have been noted in the Grande Ronde River (Baxter 2002). Parts of this river system have retained habitat conditions that allow free movement between spawning and rearing areas and the mainstem Snake River. Such multiple life history strategies help to maintain the stability and persistence of bull trout populations to environmental changes. Benefits to migratory bull trout include greater growth in the more productive waters of larger streams, lakes, and marine waters; greater fecundity resulting in increased reproductive potential; and dispersing the population across space and time so that spawning streams may be recolonized should local populations suffer a catastrophic loss (Frissell 1999, pp. 15-16; MBTSG 1998, pp. iv, 48-50; Rieman and McIntyre 1993, pp. 18-19; USFWS 2004a, Vol. 2, p. 63). In the absence of the migratory bull trout life form, isolated populations cannot be replenished when disturbances make local habitats temporarily unsuitable. Therefore, the range of the species is diminished, and the potential for a greater reproductive contribution from larger fish with higher fecundity is lost (Rieman and McIntyre 1993, pp. 1-18).

Diet

Bull trout are opportunistic feeders, with food habits primarily a function of size and life-history strategy. A single optimal foraging strategy is not necessarily a consistent feature in the life of a fish, because this strategy can change as the fish progresses from one life stage to another (i.e., juvenile to subadult). Fish growth depends on the quantity and quality of food that is eaten (Gerking 1994), and as fish grow, their foraging strategy changes as their food changes, in quantity, size, or other characteristics. Resident and juvenile migratory bull trout prey on terrestrial and aquatic insects, macrozooplankton, and small fish (Boag 1987, p. 58; Donald and Alger 1993, pp. 239-243; Goetz 1989, pp. 33-34). Subadult and adult migratory bull trout feed on various fish species (Brown 1994, p. 21; Donald and Alger 1993, p. 242; Fraley and Shepard 1989, p. 135; Leathe and Graham 1982, p. 95). Bull trout of all sizes other than fry have been

found to eat fish up to half their length (Beauchamp and VanTassell 2001). In nearshore marine areas of western Washington, bull trout feed on Pacific herring (*Clupea pallasii*), Pacific sand lance (*Ammodytes hexapterus*), and surf smelt (*Hypomesus pretiosus*) (Goetz et al. 2004, p. 114; WDFW et al. 1997, p. 23).

Bull trout migration and life history strategies are closely related to their feeding and foraging strategies. Migration allows bull trout to access optimal foraging areas and exploit a wider variety of prey resources. Optimal foraging theory can be used to describe strategies fish use to choose between alternative sources of food by weighing the benefits and costs of capturing one source of food over another. For example, prey often occur in concentrated patches of abundance ("patch model") (Gerking 1994). As the predator feeds in one patch, the prey population is reduced, and it becomes more profitable for the predator to seek a new patch rather than continue feeding on the original one. This can be explained in terms of balancing energy acquired versus energy expended. For example, in the Skagit River system, anadromous bull trout make migrations as long as 121 miles between marine foraging areas in Puget Sound and headwater spawning grounds, foraging on salmon eggs and juvenile salmon along their migration route (WDFW et al. 1997). Anadromous bull trout also use marine waters as migration corridors to reach seasonal habitats in non-natal watersheds to forage and possibly overwinter (Brenkman and Corbett 2005, p. 1079; Goetz et al. 2004, pp. 36, 60).

Changes in Status of the Coastal-Puget Sound Interim Recovery Unit

Although the status of bull trout in Coastal-Puget Sound interim recovery unit has been improved by certain actions, it continues to be degraded by other actions, and it is likely that the overall status of the bull trout in this population segment has not improved since its listing on November 1, 1999. Improvement has occurred largely through changes in fishing regulations and habitat-restoration projects. Fishing regulations enacted in 1994 either eliminated harvest of bull trout or restricted the amount of harvest allowed, and this likely has had a positive influence on the abundance of bull trout. Improvement in habitat has occurred following restoration projects intended to benefit either bull trout or salmon, although monitoring the effectiveness of these projects seldom occurs. On the other hand, the status of this population segment has been adversely affected by a number of Federal and non-Federal actions, some of which were addressed under section 7 of the Act. Most of these actions degraded the environmental baseline; all of those addressed through formal consultation under section 7 of the Act permitted the incidental take of bull trout.

Section 10(a)(1)(B) permits have been issued for Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP) completed in the Coastal-Puget Sound population segment. These include: 1) the City of Seattle's Cedar River Watershed HCP, 2) Simpson Timber HCP (now Green Diamond Resources), 3) Tacoma Public Utilities Green River HCP, 4) Plum Creek Cascades HCP, 5) Washington State Department of Natural Resources (WSDNR) State Trust Lands HCP, 6) West Fork Timber HCP, and 7) WSDNR Forest Practices HCP. These HCPs provide landscape-scale conservation for fish, including bull trout. Many of the covered activities associated with these HCPs will contribute to conserving bull trout over the long-term; however, some covered activities will result in short-term degradation of the baseline. All HCPs permit the incidental take of bull trout.

Changes in Status of the Columbia River Interim Recovery Unit

The overall status of the Columbia River interim recovery unit has not changed appreciably since its listing on June 10, 1998. Populations of bull trout and their habitat in this area have been affected by a number of actions addressed under section 7 of the Act. Most of these actions resulted in degradation of the environmental baseline of bull trout habitat, and all permitted or analyzed the potential for incidental take of bull trout. The Plum Creek Cascades HCP, Plum Creek Native Fish HCP, Storedahl Daybreak Mine HCP, and WSDNR Forest Practices HCP addressed portions of the Columbia River population segment of bull trout.

Changes in Status of the Klamath River Interim Recovery Unit

Improvements in the Threemile, Sun, and Long Creek local populations have occurred through efforts to remove or reduce competition and hybridization with non-native salmonids, changes in fishing regulations, and habitat-restoration projects. Population status in the remaining local populations (Boulder-Dixon, Deming, Brownsworth, and Leonard Creeks) remains relatively unchanged. Grazing within bull trout watersheds throughout the recovery unit has been curtailed. Efforts at removal of non-native species of salmonids appear to have stabilized the Threemile and positively influenced the Sun Creek local populations. The results of similar efforts in Long Creek are inconclusive. Mark and recapture studies of bull trout in Long Creek indicate a larger migratory component than previously expected.

Although the status of specific local populations has been slightly improved by recovery actions, the overall status of Klamath River bull trout continues to be depressed. Factors considered threats to bull trout in the Klamath Basin at the time of listing – habitat loss and degradation caused by reduced water quality, past and present land use management practices, water diversions, roads, and non-native fishes – continue to be threats today.

Changes in Status of the Saint Mary-Belly River Interim Recovery Unit

The overall status of bull trout in the Saint Mary-Belly River interim recovery unit has not changed appreciably since its listing on November 1, 1999. Extensive research efforts have been conducted since listing, to better quantify populations of bull trout and their movement patterns. Limited efforts in the way of active recovery actions have occurred. Habitat occurs mostly on Federal and Tribal lands (Glacier National Park and the Blackfoot Nation). Known problems due to instream flow depletion, entrainment, and fish passage barriers resulting from operations of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Milk River Irrigation Project (which transfers Saint Mary-Belly River water to the Missouri River Basin) and similar projects downstream in Canada constitute the primary threats to bull trout and to date they have not been adequately addressed under section 7 of the Act. Plans to upgrade the aging irrigation delivery system are being pursued, which has potential to mitigate some of these concerns but also the potential to intensify dewatering. A major fire in August 2006 severely burned the forested habitat in Red Eagle and Divide Creeks, potentially affecting three of nine local populations and degrading the baseline.

LITERATURE CITED

- Battin, J., M.W. Wiley, M.H. Ruckelshaus, R.N. Palmer, E. Korb, K.K. Bartz, and H. Imaki. 2007. Projected impacts of climate change on salmon habitat restoration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 104(16):6720-6725.
- Baxter, C.V. 2002. Fish movement and assemblage dynamics in a Pacific Northwest riverscape. Doctoral dissertation. Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR. 174 pp.
- Baxter, J.S., E.B. Taylor, and R.H. Devlin. 1997. Evidence for natural hybridization between dolly varden (*Salvelinus malma*) and bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) in a northcentral British Columbia watershed. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 54:421-429.
- Beauchamp, D.A., and J.J. VanTassell. 2001. Modeling seasonal trophic interactions of adfluvial bull trout in Lake Billy Chinook, Oregon. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 130:204-216.
- Boag, T.D. 1987. Food habits of bull char (*Salvelinus confluentus*), and rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri*), coexisting in a foothills stream in northern Alberta. *Canadian Field-Naturalist* 101(1):56-62.
- Bond, C.E. 1992. Notes on the nomenclature and distribution of the bull trout and the effects of human activity on the species. Pages 1-4 *In* P.J. Howell, and D.V. Buchanan, eds. *Proceedings of the Gearhart Mountain bull trout workshop, Oregon Chapter of the American Fisheries Society, Corvallis, OR.*
- Bonneau, J.L., and D.L. Scarnecchia. 1996. Distribution of juvenile bull trout in a thermal gradient of a plunge pool in Granite Creek, Idaho. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 125(4):628-630.
- Brenkman, S.J., and S.C. Corbett. 2005. Extent of anadromy in bull trout and implications for conservation of a threatened species. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 25:1073-1081.
- Brewin, P.A., and M.K. Brewin. 1997. Distribution maps for bull trout in Alberta. Pages 209-216 *In* W.C. Mackay, M.K. Brewin, and M. Monita, eds. *Friends of the Bull Trout Conference Proceedings, Bull Trout Task Force (Alberta), c/o Trout Unlimited, Calgary.*
- Brown, L.G. 1994. The zoogeography and life history of Washington native charr. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fisheries Management Division, Report # 94-04, Olympia, WA, November, 1992. 47 pp.
- Buchanan, D.V., and S.V. Gregory. 1997. Development of water temperature standards to protect and restore habitat for bull trout and other cold water species in Oregon. Pages 119-126 *In* W.C. Mackay, M.K. Brewin, and M. Monita, eds. *Friends of the Bull Trout Conference Proceedings, , Alberta, Canada.*

- Cavender, T.M. 1978. Taxonomy and distribution of the bull trout, *Salvelinus confluentus* (Suckley), from the American Northwest. California Fish and Game 64(3):139-174.
- Donald, D.B., and D.J. Alger. 1993. Geographic distribution, species displacement, and niche overlap for lake trout and bull trout in mountain lakes. Canadian Journal of Zoology 71:238-247.
- Dunham, J., B. Rieman, and G. Chandler. 2003. Influences of temperature and environmental variables on the distribution of bull trout within streams at the southern margin of its range. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 23:894-905.
- Fraleigh, J.J., and B.B. Shepard. 1989. Life history, ecology and population status of migratory bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) in the Flathead Lake and river system, Montana. Northwest Science 63(4):133-143.
- Frissell, C.A. 1993. Topology of extinction and endangerment of native fishes in the Pacific Northwest and California. Conservation Biology 7(2):342-354.
- Frissell, C.A. 1999. An ecosystem approach to habitat conservation for bull trout: groundwater and surface water protection. Flathead Lake Biological Station, University of Montana, Open File Report Number 156-99, Polson, MT, January 07, 1999. 46 pp.
- Gamett, B.L. 2002. Telephone conversation between Bart L. Gamett, Salmon-Challis National Forest, and Shelley Spalding, USFWS, re: relationship between water temperature and bull trout distribution and abundance in the Little Lost River, Idaho. June 20, 2002.
- Gerking, S.D. 1994. Feeding ecology of fish. Academic Press, San Diego, California. 51 pp.
- Giles, M.A., and M. Van der Zweep. 1996. Dissolved oxygen requirements for fish of the Peace, Athabasca and Slave River Basins: a laboratory study of bull trout (*Salvelinus Confluentus*) and mountain whitefish (*Prosopium Williamsoni*), Northern River Basins Study Technical Report No. 120 ed.
- Gilpin, M. 1997. Memo to Shelly Spalding, Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks. Connectivity on the Clark Fork River: The Bigger Picture. August 27, 1997.
- Goetz, F. 1989. Biology of the bull trout, *Salvelinus confluentus*, a literature review. Willamette National Forest, Eugene, Oregon, February 1989. 53 pp.
- Goetz, F., E.D. Jeanes, and E.M. Beamer. 2004. Bull trout in the nearshore. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Preliminary draft, Seattle, Washington, June 2004. 396 pp.
- Hoelscher, B., and T.C. Bjornn. 1989. Habitat, density, and potential production of trout and char in Pend Oreille Lake tributaries. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Project F-710R-10, Subproject III, Job No. 8., Boise, Idaho, January 1989. 60 pp.
- Howell, P.J., and D.V. Buchanan. 1992. Proceedings of the Gearhart Mountain bull trout workshop. Oregon Chapter of the American Fisheries Society, Corvallis, Oregon. 67 pp.

- IDFG (Idaho Department of Fish and Game). 1995. Fax from Bill Horton, IDFG, to Trish Klahr, UWFWS, Boise, Idaho, re: List of streams compiled by IDFG where bull trout have been extirpated.
- Leary, R.F., and F.W. Allendorf. 1997. Genetic confirmation of sympatric bull trout and Dolly Varden in western Washington. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 126:715-720.
- Leathe, S.A., and P.J. Graham. 1982. Flathead Lake fish food habits study. US EPA, Region VIII, Water Division, Contract R008224-01-4, Denver, Colorado, October, 1982. 209 pp.
- MBTSG. 1998. The relationship between land management activities and habitat requirements of bull trout. *Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks*, Helena, MT, May 1998. 77 pp.
- McPhail, J.D., and J.S. Baxter. 1996. A review of bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) life-history and habitat use in relation to compensation and improvement opportunities. Department of Zoology, University of British Columbia, Fisheries Management Report Number 104, Vancouver, BC. 31 pp.
- McPhail, J.D., and C.B. Murray. 1979. The early life-history and ecology of dolly varden (*Salvelinus Malma*) in the upper Arrow Lakes. Department of Zoology and Institute of Animal Resource Ecology, Fort Steele, British Columbia. 113 pp.
- Myrick, C.A., F.T. Barrow, J. Dunham, B.L. Gamett, G.R. Haas, J.T. Peterson, B. Rieman, L.A. Weber, and A.V. Zale. 2002. Bull trout temperature thresholds: peer review summary. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Lacey, Washington, September 19, 2002. 13 pp.
- ODEQ (Oregon Department of Environmental Quality). 1995. 1992-1994 water quality standards review: dissolved oxygen - final issue paper. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Portland, OR.
- Pratt, K.L. 1984. Habitat use and species interactions of juvenile cutthroat, *Salmo clarki*, and bull trout, *Salvelinus confluentus*, in the upper Flathead River basin. Master's Thesis. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.
- Pratt, K.L. 1992. A review of bull trout life history. Pages 5-9 *In* P.J. Howell, and D.V. Buchanan, eds. *Proceedings of the Gearhart Mountain bull trout workshop*, Oregon Chapter of the American Fisheries Society, Corvallis, OR.
- Pratt, K.L., and J.E. Huston. 1993. Status of bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) in Lake Pend Oreille and the lower Clark Fork River. Washington Water Power Company, Spokane, WA, December 1993. 200 pp.
- Quigley, T.M., and S.J. Arbelbide. 1997. An assessment of ecosystem components in the interior Columbia Basin and portions of the Klamath and Great Basins: Volume 3. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station 3:1174-1185.

- Rich, C.F. 1996. Influence of abiotic and biotic factors on occurrence of resident bull trout in fragmented habitats, Western Montana. Master's Thesis. Montana State University, Bozeman, MT. 54 pp.
- Rieman, B.E., D. Isaak, S. Adams, D. Horan, D. Nagel, C.H. Luce, and D. Myers. 2007. Anticipated climate warming effects on bull trout habitats and populations across the interior Columbia River Basin. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 136(6):1552-1565.
- Rieman, B.E., D. Lee, D. Burns, R.E. Gresswell, M.K. Young, R. Stowell, and P. Howell. 2003. Status of native fishes in western United States and issues for fire and fuels management. *Forest Ecology and Management* 178(1-2):197-211.
- Rieman, B.E., D.C. Lee, and R.F. Thurow. 1997. Distribution, status, and likely future trends of bull trout within the Columbia River and Klamath River basins. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 7:1111-1125.
- Rieman, B.E., and J.D. McIntyre. 1993. Demographic and habitat requirements for conservation of bull trout. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, General Technical Report INT-302, Ogden, Utah, September 1993. 38 pp.
- Rieman, B.E., and J.D. McIntyre. 1995. Occurrence of bull trout in naturally fragmented habitat patches of varied size. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 124(3):285-296.
- Rieman, B.E., and J.D. McIntyre. 1996. Spatial and temporal variability in bull trout redd counts. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 16:132-141.
- Sedell, J.R., and F.H. Everest. 1991. Historic changes in pool habitat for Columbia River Basin salmon under study for TES listing. Pacific Northwest Research Station, Draft U.S. Department of Agriculture Report, Corvallis, Oregon. 6 pp.
- Sexauer, H.M., and P.W. James. 1997. Microhabitat use by juvenile bull trout in four streams located in the eastern Cascades, Washington. Pages 361-370 *In* W.C. McKay, M.K. Brewin, and M. Monita, eds. Friends of the Bull Trout Conference Proceedings, Bull Trout Task Force (Alberta), c/o Trout Unlimited, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.
- Simpson, J.C., and R.L. Wallace. 1982. *Fishes of Idaho*. University of Idaho Press, Moscow, ID. 93 pp.
- Spruell, P., B.E. Rieman, K.L. Knudsen, F.M. Utter, and F.W. Allendorf. 1999. Genetic population structure within streams: microsatellite analysis of bull trout populations. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish* 8:114-121.
- Stewart, D.B., N.J. Mochnac, C.D. Sawatzky, T.J. Carmichael, and J.D. Reist. 2007. Fish life history and habitat use in the Northwest territories: Bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*). Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canadian Manuscript Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 2801, Winnipeg, MB, Canada, 2007. 54 pp.

- Thomas, G. 1992. Status of bull trout in Montana. Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Helena, MT, August 1992. 83 pp.
- USFWS. 2002a. Bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) draft recovery plan - Chapter 2: Klamath River. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. 82 pp.
- USFWS. 2002b. Bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) draft recovery plan - Chapter 25: Saint Mary-Belly River. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. 134 pp.
- USFWS. 2002c. Chapter 20 of the bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) draft recovery plan: Lower Columbia Recovery Unit, Washington. USFWS, Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 102 pp.
- USFWS. 2004a. Draft Recovery Plan for the Coastal-Puget Sound distinct population segment of bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*). Volume I: Puget Sound Management Unit, 389+xvii pp and Volume II: Olympic Peninsula Management Unit, 277+xvi pp, Portland, Oregon.
- USFWS. 2004b. Draft recovery plan for the Jarbridge River distinct population segment of the bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon, May 2004. 132 pp.
- USFWS. 2005. Bull trout core area template - complete core area by core area analysis. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon. 662 pp.
- Watson, G., and T.W. Hillman. 1997. Factors affecting the distribution and abundance of bull trout: an investigation at hierarchical scales. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 17(2):237-252.
- WDFW, FishPro Inc., and Beak Consultants. 1997. Grandy Creek trout hatchery biological assessment. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA, March 1997. 47 pp.
- WDOE. 2002. Evaluating criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life in Washington's surface water quality standards - dissolved oxygen: Draft discussion paper and literature summary. Washington Department of Ecology, Publication Number 00-10-071, Olympia, WA, December 2002. 90 pp.
- Wilson, M.F. 1997. Variation in salmonid life histories: patterns and perspectives. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Research Paper PNW-RP-498, Portland, Oregon, February 1997. 50 pp.

