

**Template for FY'12 Report pursuant to the  
Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review**

**II. Agency Report**

GENERAL INFORMATION

Agency U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Agency Contact for Implementation of the Peer Review Bulletin

Name and title: Richard A. Coleman, Senior Science Advisor

Email address: rick\_colemana@fws.gov

Phone number: (303) 236-4443

URL for Agency's Peer Review Agenda

www.fws.gov/informationquality/peer\_review/index.html

**\*\* ensure link is working**

What pathway(s) can a member of the public use to find the Agency's peer review agenda if she/he did not have this URL?

- Link from Department or Agency home page,
- Link from Agency Information Quality home page,
- Link from science, research, or regulatory pages (please specify)
- Other (please describe) \_\_\_\_\_

Does the agenda provide links to peer review reports for all completed peer reviews?

\_\_\_\_\_

**Have you checked to make sure all of the information and links on the agency's peer review home page to are current?** Yes, I have checked and the home page is current. Links to all 8 regions are functioning.

Continue to Next Page

INFORMATION ABOUT REVIEWS CONDUCTED

Number of peer reviews conducted subject to the Bulletin in FY' 12. (see instructions for what should and should not be included here).

Number of influential scientific information peer reviews (ISI) (not including highly influential scientific assessments)     19    

List the title of each ISI. Indicate whether the Peer Review Report has been completed (Y/N) *add more lines as needed* **NOTE:** It is acceptable to provide a screen shot of your peer review agenda as an attachment.

(1) Listing 23 Species as Endangered and Designating Critical Habitat for 122 Species on Oahu. (Y)

---

(2) Proposed rule to Designate Critical for Southern Selkirk Mountain Caribou (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*) under the Endangered Species Act. (Y)

---

(3) Proposed rule to List and Designate Critical for *Eriogonum codium* (Umtanum desert buckwheat) and *Physaria douglasii* ssp. *tuplashensis* (White Bluffs bladderpod) under the Endangered Species Act. (Y)

---

(4) Critical Habitat Determination for the Jaguar (*Panthera onca*) (Y)

---

(5) Listing Decision for Four Central Texas Salamanders (Y)

---

(6) Listing Decision for the Texas Golden Gladecress and Neches River Rose-mallow (Y)

---

(7) Listing Decision for the Jemez Mountains Salamander (*Plethodon neomexicanus*) (Y)

---

(8) Listing Decision for the Lesser Prairie-Chicken (*Tympanuchus pallidicinctus*) (Y)

---

(9) Listing Decision for the Gierisch Mallow (*Spharalcea gierischii*) (Y)

---

(10) Listing Decision for the acuña cactus (*Echinomastus erectocentrus* var. *acunensis*), the Fickeisen plains cactus (*Pediocactus peeblesianus* var. *fickeiseniae*), and the Lemmon fleabane (*Erigeron lemmonii*) (Y)

---

(11) Proposed Listing for Grotto Sculpin and Designation of Critical Habitat (Y)

---

(12) Endangered Species Act (ESA) Listing Decision for Diamond Darter (*Crystallaria cincotta*). (Y)

---

(13) Proposed Removal of the Gray Wolf in Wyoming from the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife (Y)

---

(14) Joint Biological and Conference Opinion on the Proposed Removal of Four Dams on the Klamath River (Y)

(15) Designation of Revised Critical Habitat for *Allium munzii* (Munz's onion) and *Atriplex coronata* var. *notatior* (San Jacinto Valley crownscale); Proposed Rule (Y)

(16) Proposed Critical Habitat for Lost River Sucker and Shortnose Sucker (Y)

- (17) Draft Recovery Plan Revision for the Lost River Sucker and Shortnose Sucker (Y)
- (18) 12-Month Finding on a Petition To Downlist Three San Clemente Island Plant Species; Proposed Rule To Reclassify Two San Clemente Island Plant Species; Taxonomic Correction (Y)
- (19) Draft Recovery Plan for Four Subspecies of Island Fox (*Urocyon littoralis*) (Y)

Number of highly influential scientific assessments (HISA)   0  

List the title of each HISA. Indicate whether the Peer Review Report has been Completed (Y/N) *add more lines as needed*

(1) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Provide the titles of ISIs and HISIs for which Waivers (W), Deferrals (D), or Exemptions (E) were invoked or Alternative Procedures used (A). *If deferral is marked, please indicate the duration of the deferral.*

<b><i>Title of Document</i></b>	<b><i>Type of Document ISI or HISA</i></b>	<b><i>W, D, E, or A (and duration)</i></b>
i) Waterfowl Population Status Report 2012	(HISA)	W (annual)
ii) Adaptive Harvest Management 2012 Hunting Season Report (HISA)		W (annual)
iii) American Woodcock Population Status 2012	(ISI)	W (annual)
iv) Mourning Dove, White-winged Dove, and Band-tailed Pigeon Population Status 2012 (HISA)	W (annual)	
v) 2012 Update to the Federal Falconry Regulations (E)		
vi) Proposed New Approvals Related to Non-toxic Shot for Waterfowl Hunting (E)		
vii) 2012 Status and Harvests of Sandhill Cranes	W (annual)	
viii) Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2012–13 Early Season; Final rule (E)		
ix) Proposed New Approvals Related to Non-toxic Shot for Waterfowl Hunting (E)		

Number of peer reviews that included at least one peer reviewer appointed pursuant to any exception to the applicable independence or conflict of interest standards of the Bulletin, including determinations by the Secretary or Deputy Secretary pursuant to Section III (3) (c)?

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments)   0

List titles

---

---

---

Number of HISAs   0  

List titles

---

---

---

Number of peer review panels that held public meetings:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments)   0  

Number of HISAs   0  

Number of peer review panels that allowed public comment:

Number of ISIs (not including highly influential scientific assessments)   0  

Number of HISAs   0  

Number of public comments provided on the agency's peer review plans during FY' 12, regardless of whether the peer review was actually completed during FY' 12   0  

Number of times agency specifically solicited peer reviewer nominations from professional societies.   1  

If such nominations were solicited, were any recommendations provided? Yes   x   No