



**Maricela
Constantino/CBFO/R5/FWS/D
OI**

07/17/2006 07:02 AM

To Douglas Krofta/ARL/R9/FWS/DOI@FWS

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: bald eagle 90-day finding revised

Doug,

This came later on Friday. It looks like Susan has asked Mary to work on addressing these comments (along with any we may have) on Monday. So, I'll plan on working on this as soon as I pass Thorne's on to you. Let me know if you have any questions.

Maricela

Maricela A. Constantino, Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Endangered Species, Branch of Listing
4401 N. Fairfax Drive, MS 420
Arlington, VA 22203
703/358-1871 (phone)
703/358-1735 (fax)

----- Forwarded by Maricela Constantino/CBFO/R5/FWS/DOI on 07/17/2006 10:00 AM -----



**Susan
Jacobsen/RO/R2/FWS/DOI**

07/14/2006 06:04 PM

To Mary Richardson/R2/FWS/DOI@FWS

cc Sarah Quamme/RO/R2/FWS/DOI@FWS, Maricela
Constantino/CBFO/R5/FWS/DOI@FWS, Greg
Beatty/R2/FWS/DOI@FWS

Subject Fw: bald eagle 90-day finding revised

Hi Mary, Mig Birds has some additional comments on the latest version below. Nancy (ARD-MB) surmised it and it's with the RD, but I told Bill and Nancy that I'd pass these on to you and that we would try and address those that we could. If WO has additional comments you can make all the changes necessary at that time (on Monday I assume). Janet will get any comments she has to Sarah Q so she can coordinate with you on those.

Bill also had this comment as well below from his 1st review. I switched it in the version that is in the package but not in the electronic version, since I wasn't sure if it was correct. When you work on the cites can you check it and make the correction if necessary. Thanks!

On page 5 overlapping to 6, should USFS 2004 be USFWS 2004?

sj


----- Forwarded by Susan Jacobsen/RO/R2/FWS/DOI on 07/14/2006 03:52 PM -----

Bill Howe/RO/R2/FWS/DOI

07/14/2006 02:47 PM

To Susan Jacobsen/RO/R2/FWS/DOI@FWS

cc Nancy Gloman/RO/R2/FWS/DOI@FWS

Subject Re: bald eagle 90-day finding revised 

Hi Susan,

Here are my comments on it. Found a number of editorial things. The discussion of productivity is much improved, but it's still a bit odd. Nearly all of the mention of increased productivity is from 1998 on, and especially the 3-year period 2004-2006. Productivity changes over a very short period in a desert environment may not be very meaningful. It's obvious from this document that there are productivity data going back at least to 1975. Productivity from 1975-1984 is mentioned I think more than once, but except for 2 individual years (see next sentence) there's no mention at all of what happened in the 14 years from 1984 to 1998, which would be very useful to put recent years into perspective. One wonders why those years are left blank. Then suddenly on page 40 a low productivity year is mentioned for 1994, and then on page 43 it mentions out of the blue that productivity has increased since 1996 - the only mention of 1996 anywhere in the document. I'm not saying that productivity is a problem in the Sonoran birds - it actually sounds pretty good for now. But the rationale for the way it's presented is hard to figure out, and I think it may only raise questions. Up to you what to do with it, but I think it's strange.

Bill



90_Day_FR_Notice_7_14_06_SJ Howe Comments.doc
Susan Jacobsen/RO/R2/FWS/DOI



Susan
Jacobsen/RO/R2/FWS/DOI
07/14/2006 10:42 AM

To Nancy Gloman/RO/R2/FWS/DOI@FWS, Bill
Howe/RO/R2/FWS/DOI@FWS
cc

Subject bald eagle 90-day finding revised



90_Day_FR_Notice_7_14_06_SJ clean.doc



90_Day_FR_Notice_7_14_06_SJ.doc

Nancy, as we discussed, here's a clean and marked up version so you can see the changes. I have few things to circle back to Mary on now, but I wanted to get this to you asap so you have time to review it and the changes. My plan is to have it go to the RD today, since it needs to go to Ren on Weds. Thanks again for your comments and time!

sj

Code Billing Code 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Petition to List the Sonoran desert population of the Bald Eagle as a Distinct Population Segment, List the Population as Endangered, and Designate Critical Habitat

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of 90-day petition finding.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce a 90-day finding on a petition to reclassify the Sonoran desert population of the bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) in Arizona and New Mexico as a distinct population segment, list the population segment as endangered, and designate critical habitat for the population segment under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). On the basis of a review of the information contained within the petition, we find the petition does not provide substantial scientific or commercial information indicating the

petitioned action may be warranted. Therefore, we will not be initiating a further status review in response to this petition. We ask the public to submit to us any new information that becomes available concerning the status of this population of the bald eagle or threats to it.

DATES: The finding announced in this document was made on [INSERT DATE THAT NOTICED IS PUBLISHED IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

ADDRESSES: The complete file for this finding is available for inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the Arizona Ecological Services Office, 2321 West Royal Palm Road, Suite 103, Phoenix, AZ 85021-4951. Please submit any new information, materials, comments, or questions concerning this species or this finding to the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steve Spangle (see address above), telephone, 602-242-0210; facsimile, 602-242-2513.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 4(b)(3)(A) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) (Act), requires we make a finding on whether a petition to list,

delist, or reclassify a species presents substantial scientific or commercial information to indicate the petitioned action may be warranted. We are to base this finding on information provided in the petition. To the maximum extent practicable, we are to make this finding within 90 days of our receipt of the petition, and publish our notice of this finding promptly in the Federal Register.

Our standard for substantial information within the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) with regard to a 90-day petition finding is “that amount of information that would lead a reasonable person to believe that the measure proposed in the petition may be warranted” (50 CFR 424.14(b)). If we find substantial information was presented, we are required to promptly commence a review of the status of the species, if one has not already been initiated under our internal candidate assessment process.

In making this finding, we relied on information provided by the petitioners and evaluated that information in accordance with 50 CFR 424.14(b). Our process of coming to a 90-day finding under section 4(b)(3)(A) of the Act and section 424.14(b) of our regulations is limited to a determination of whether the information in the petition meets the “substantial information” threshold.

On October 6, 2004, we received a formal petition, dated October 6, 2004, from the Center for Biological Diversity (Center), the Maricopa Audubon Society, and the Arizona Audubon Council requesting the bald eagle population found in the Sonoran Desert riparian areas of central Arizona and northwestern Mexico be classified as a

distinct population segment (DPS) and reclassified as an endangered species, in accordance with the Act. The petition also requested critical habitat be concurrently designated for the DPS.

On February 11, 2005, the Service requested clarification on the boundaries of the Sonoran population, as defined by the petitioners. The petitioners responded with that clarification on March 5, 2005, requesting we consider in the DPS analysis those bald eagles nesting along riparian areas in the Sonoran desert. At that time, further action on this petition was precluded by higher listing priorities. On January 19, 2006, we received from the Center a 60-day Notice of Intent (NOI) to sue the Service for failure to respond to the petition within the statutory timeframe. On March 27, 2006, the Center and the Maricopa Audubon Society filed a lawsuit against the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) and the Service for failure to make a finding on the petition within 90 days.

Species Information

The bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) is the only species of sea eagle native to North America. Literally translated, H. leucocephalus means white-headed sea eagle (USFWS 1995). Bald eagles are birds of prey of the Order Falconiformes and Family Accipitridae. Bald eagles vary in length from 28 to 38 inches (71 to 97 centimeters), weigh between 6.5 to 14 pounds (2.9 to 6.4 kilograms), and have a 66 to 96 inch (1.8-2.6 meter) wingspan (Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD) 1999, p. 3). Distinguishing features include a yellow hooked bill and yellow unfeathered legs and

feet. Adults of the species have a dark brownish-black body color, black talons, with a white head, neck, and tail. Immature bald eagles are mostly dark brown and lack a white head and tail until they reach approximately five years of age (AGFD 2006a, pg. 1).

Gerrard and Bartolotti (1988, p. 2) note bald eagles are believed to have nested on both coasts, along all major rivers and large lakes in the interior from Florida to Baja California in the south, and north to Labrador and Alaska. The species is known to have bred in every state and province in the United States and Canada except Hawaii (Hunt et al. 1992, p. A-9).

Hunt et al. (1992, p. A-11 to A-12) summarized the earliest records from the literature for bald eagles in Arizona. Coues noted bald eagles in the vicinity of Fort Whipple in 1866 (now Prescott), and Henshaw reported bald eagles south of Fort Apache in 1875. The first bald eagle breeding information was recorded in 1890 near Stoneman Lake by S.A. Mearns. Additionally, Bent reported breeding eagles at Fort Whipple in 1866 and on the Salt River Bird Reservation (since inundated by Roosevelt Lake) in 1911. Additionally, there are reports of bald eagles along rivers in the White Mountains from 1937, and reports of nesting bald eagles along the Salt and Verde Rivers as early as 1930.

The bald eagle population of the southwest recovery region as identified in the final recovery plan for the species reaches throughout Oklahoma and Texas west of the 100th meridian, all of New Mexico and Arizona, and the area of California bordering the

Lower Colorado River (USFWS 1982, p. 1). The vast majority of these breeding bald eagles are found within the state of Arizona. The occurrence of breeding bald eagles in the state of New Mexico is very limited (USFS 2004, p. 153). In 2001, the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (NMDGF) reported the occurrence of four bald eagle nest sites in New Mexico, all on private lands. Bald eagles wintering in New Mexico are often found in upland habitats.

Nationwide, bald eagles are known to nest primarily along seacoasts and lakeshores, as well as along banks of rivers and streams (Stalmaster 1987, p. 120). In the Southwest, bald eagle **BAs** (BA) are located in close proximity to a variety of aquatic sites, including reservoirs, regulated river systems, and free-flowing rivers and creeks. The term “BA” is used to define eagle nesting sites and the area where they forage. In the southwest, nests are placed mostly on cliff edges, rock pinnacles, and in cottonwood trees. However, artificial structures, junipers, pinyon pines, sycamores, willows, ponderosa pines, and snags of these trees also have supported eagle nests (AGFD 1999, p. 7).

In Arizona, the majority of nests are located in the Upper and Lower Sonoran Life Zones, (zones of plant and animal life associated with the a given elevation) including the riparian habitats and transition areas of both zones (Hunt et al. 1992, p. A-17). Representative vegetation of these life zones includes Arizona sycamore (Platanus wrightii), blue paloverde (Parkinsonia florida), cholla (Opuntia spp.), Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii), Gooding willow (Salix gooddingii), mesquite (Prosopis

spp.), saguaro (Carnegiea gigantea), and tamarisk or salt cedar (Tamarix pentandra; an exotic species) (Brown 1994, p. 200).

Historical evidence to document bald eagles nesting in New Mexico is lacking, although unverified reports suggest one or two pairs may have nested in southwestern New Mexico prior to 1928. In the mid-1980s, a pair established a territory in Colfax County in an area where bald eagles concentrated in winter, and in 1987 an active nest was discovered nearby which produced two fledglings that year. In 1988, an active nest was discovered in Sierra County, also in an area of wintering eagle concentration; the nest fledged one young that year. Through 1999, those two nests together fledged a minimum of 31 young, with Colfax County being one of the more productive nests in North America. Additional nesting activity was recorded elsewhere after the mid-1980s, always in areas of wintering concentrations, including in San Juan, Rio Arriba, Quay, and Sierra counties. However, in each instance eagles built nests only to abandon the effort prior to egg laying; such “practice” nests are not uncommon among inexperienced adults. In 1998, two additional nests were discovered in Colfax County, and each fledged young in both 1998 and 1999 (five young total) (Williams 2000, abstract).

Bald eagles are long-lived bird species. Southwestern bald eagles are known to exceed 12 years of age (USFWS 1999, p. 36454; Hunt et al. 1992, p. A-v). Bald eagles primarily eat fish, but they will also eat amphibians, reptiles, birds, small mammals, carrion (dead animals), and carcasses of large mammals (cows, elk, deer, etc.). Their food habits can change daily or seasonally, but when a choice is available, bald eagles

invariably select fish over other prey. Bald eagles will scavenge, steal, or actively hunt to acquire food. Carrion constitutes a higher proportion of the diet for juveniles and subadults than it does for adult eagles. Bald eagles are primarily a perch and wait hunter in order to detect carrion or passively detect available live prey (Stalmaster 1987, p. 93).

Eagles in the southwest frequently construct nests on cliffs. By 1992, of the 111 nest sites known, 46 were in trees, 36 on cliffs, 17 on pinnacles, 11 in snags, and one on an artificial platform (Hunt et al. 1992, p. A-17). However, while there were more nests in trees, one study found cliff nests were selected 73 percent of the time, while tree nests were selected 27 percent of the time. Additionally, eagles nesting on cliffs were found to be slightly more successful in raising young to fledgling, though the difference was not significant. Nests may be used year after year. Hunt et al. (1992, p. A-20) determined the mean diameter of nests was five feet (156 centimeters).

Food strongly influences bald eagle productivity (Newton 1979, Hansen 1987). A female's health in the months preceding egg laying can affect egg production, and the prey availability during the breeding cycle affects the survivorship of nestlings and post-fledging juveniles. Thus, any factor affecting the adults' ability to acquire food can influence productivity and adult survivorship (Newton 1979). The most common fish eaten in the southwest are Sonora and desert suckers; channel and flathead catfish; common carp; largemouth, smallmouth, yellow, and white bass; and black crappie. Less common are roundtail chub, green sunfish, bluegill, tilapia, and rainbow trout (USFWS 1982, p. 11, AGFD 1999, p. 6). Prey availability has decreased on the upper Salt River in

Arizona. The introduction of predatory flathead catfish in the late 1970s nearly extirpated native fish populations. Flathead catfish, while available as bald eagle prey when smaller, grow to large sizes (up to 50 pounds, or 22.6 kilograms) making them too large for a prey item. In turn, flathead catfish populations have increased while other fish species have decreased. Productivity for the four bald eagle BAs on the upper Salt River decreased from 1.12 young per year per occupied BA in the 1980s to 0.29 young per occupied breeding area (BA) in the 1990s.

Bald eagles in the southwest establish their breeding territories in December or January and lay eggs in January or February, which is early compared with bald eagles in more northerly areas (Stalmaster 1987, p. 63). It is believed this is a behavioral adaptation so chicks can avoid the extreme desert heat of midsummer and adults can take advantage of food resources for the rearing of eaglets. Young fledgling eagles can remain in their nest area through June learning how to fly and land, while still being primarily fed by adult eagles (Hunt et al. 1992, p. C-6 – C-7).

About 45 days after leaving the nest, young bald eagles migrate to Canada, Northern California, Idaho, Montana, North and South Dakota, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming (Hunt et al. 1992, p. A-104 – A-114), where they remain for approximately one to three years. Resident adult bald eagles often stay in their BAs year-round, although local short-term migrations are common (AGFD 1999, p. 6).

The first major decline in bald eagle populations began in the mid- to late-1800s

when widespread shooting for feathers and trophies led to extirpation of eagles in some areas. Carrion treated with strychnine, thallium sulfate, and other poisons were used as bait to kill livestock predators and ultimately killed many eagles as well. These and other factors contributed to a reduction in bald eagle numbers through the 1940s (USFWS 1999, p. 36455). In the late 1940s, the use of dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT) and other organochlorine compounds became widespread. While DDT was initially sprayed along coastal and other wetland areas for mosquito control, it later was used as a general crop insecticide. DDT accumulated in individual bald eagles that had [ingested](#) contaminated prey, and reproductive success plummeted (USFWS 1999, p. 36455). In the late 1960s and early 1970s, it was determined that dichlorophenyl-dichloroethylene (DDE), a breakdown product of DDT, accumulated in fatty tissues of adult female eagles and impaired the calcium release needed for normal egg shell formation.

On March 11, 1967 (32 FR 4001), the Secretary of the Interior listed bald eagles south of the 40th parallel as endangered under the Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668aa-668cc). On December 31, 1972, DDT was banned from use in the United States by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Nationwide bald eagle surveys conducted in 1973 and 1974 revealed the declining trend of bald eagle population numbers throughout the lower 48 states. We responded by listing the bald eagle throughout the lower 48 States as endangered except in Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Washington, and Oregon, where it was designated as threatened (43 FR 6233, February 14, 1978). Nesting populations of bald eagles have more recently

been increasing throughout the U.S. Data from surveys conducted between 1963 and 1998 show active nest sites in the lower 48 states have grown from 417 to over 5,748 occupied BAs (USFWS 1995, p. 36001; USFWS 1999, p. 36457). Today, the Service estimates the population nationwide to be at approximately 7,066 breeding pairs (USFWS 2006, p. 8239).

The 1982 recovery plan for the Southwestern Recovery Region states when the total reproduction for the eagles within the Southwestern Recovery Region has effectively doubled to 10-12 young per year over a 5-year period, and the population range has expanded to include one or more river drainages in addition to the Salt and Verde River Systems, the southwestern bald eagle should be reclassified to threatened. The 1982 recovery plan indicated Arizona was the only State in the recovery region containing nesting bald eagles, with 42 unverified historical nesting territories in the Salt and Verde River systems, and one occupied territory along the Colorado River. As discussed in the February 16, 2006 (71 FR 8238), Federal Register notice reopening the comment period on the proposed delisting rule, the downlisting goal established in the recovery plan for the southwestern bald eagle has been exceeded and on July 12, 1995, we reclassified the bald eagle from endangered to threatened in the lower 48 states (60 FR 36000).

Recent information for bald eagles in Arizona indicates increases in productivity parameters between 1998 and 2006. The number of BAs has increased from a low of 36 in 1998 to a high of 50 in 2006, while the number of occupied BAs increased from a low

of 34 in 1998 to a high of 43 in 2006. The number of successful breeding attempts has doubled in that time, from a low of 14 in 1998 and 2000 to a high of 28 in 2006. The number of young hatched increased from a low of 27 in 1998 to a high of 55 in 2006, while the number of young successfully fledged doubled from a low of 21 in 1998 to a high of 42 in 2006. Productivity increased from a low of 0.6 young produced per occupied BA in 2003 to 1.05 in 2004, with productivity remaining high at 0.95 for 2005 and 0.96 for 2006. Increases in each of these categories was not linear, meaning there was not a steady increase from 1998 to 2006. Instead, there is some fluctuation. The year with the lowest value in most categories was consistently 1998, except for the number of successful breeding attempts, in which 1998 and 2000 were tied at 14. While the increases in BAs, productivity, and successful breeding attempts have not been completely linear, generally, the progression has been a fairly steady increase in all categories (AGFD 2006c, AGFD unpubl. data, 2006). These data take into account productivity for BAs that are not within the Sonoran population of bald eagles evaluated under the petition.

Excluding those BAs not considered within the area of analysis under this action (i.e., outside of the Sonoran desert life zone), the number of BAs increased from a low of 32 in 1994 to a high of 41 in 2006, with occupied BAs increasing from a low of 26 in 1994 to a high of 34 in 2006. For this same time period, productivity increased from a low of 0.58 young per occupied BA in 1998 to a high of 1.06 young per occupied BA in 2004. Productivity remained high at 1.01 young per occupied BA for 2005 (AGFD 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006b).

Previous Federal Action

On March 11, 1967 (32 FR 4001), bald eagles south of 40 degrees north latitude were federally listed as an endangered species. Bald eagles north of this line were not listed at that time because those populations had not experienced the same threats and population declines as of 1967. On February 14, 1978, we listed the bald eagle as endangered in 43 states, and threatened in five others (43 FR 6233). Bald eagles were not listed in Alaska, and are not found in Hawaii. On July 12, 1995, we reclassified the bald eagle from endangered to threatened in the lower 48 states (60 FR 36000), under the Act. The bald eagle remained classified as threatened in Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Oregon, and Washington where it was originally listed as threatened.

On July 6, 1999, we proposed to remove the bald eagle from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife in the lower 48 states of the United States, including the southwest recovery region. The comment period on that proposal was re-opened on February 16, 2006 (71 FR 8238), and subsequently on May 16, 2006, through June 19, 2006.

Distinct Vertebrate Population Segment

We must consider a species for listing under the Act if available information indicates such an action might be warranted. “Species” is defined by the Act as including

any species or subspecies of fish and wildlife or plants, and any distinct vertebrate population segment of fish or wildlife that interbreeds when mature (16 U.S.C. 1532(16)). We, along with the National Marine Fisheries Service (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - Fisheries), developed the Policy Regarding the Recognition of Distinct Vertebrate Population Segments (DPS Policy) (61 FR 4722, February 7, 1996), to help us in determining what constitutes a DPS. Under this policy, we use three criteria to assess whether a population under consideration for listing may be recognized as a DPS: (1) Discreteness of the population in relation to the remainder of the species to which it belongs; (2) the significance of the population segment to the species to which it belongs; and (3) the population segment's conservation status in relation to the Act's standards for listing. In the Service's final rule reclassifying the bald eagle from endangered to threatened (July 12, 1995; 60 FR 36000), we determined the southwestern recovery region was part of the same bald eagle population as that of the lower 48 States, and we determined it was appropriate to include it in the reclassification. Since the time of the July 12, 1995, rule, new information is available that could further inform this decision; however, we are not making a DPS determination at this time. Based on our analysis below, we find the third prong of the DPS policy is dispositive and it is not necessary for us to reach a conclusion on the other two prongs.

Threats Analysis

Pursuant to section (4) of the Act, we may list a species, subspecies, or DPS of vertebrate taxa on the basis of any of the following five factors: (A) present or threatened

destruction, modification, or curtailment of habitat or range; (B) overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes; (C) disease or predation; (D) inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; or (E) other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence. The Act identifies the five factors to be considered, either singly or in combination, to determine whether a species may be threatened or endangered. Our evaluation of these threats in terms of the petitioned action to reclassify the Sonoran desert bald eagle from threatened to endangered, based on information provided in the petition and available in our files, is presented below. Throughout this finding we refer to the Sonoran desert population of the bald eagle, since that is the petitioned action; however, as noted above, this reference does not imply that we have determined pursuant to our DPS policy that it is a listable entity. Furthermore, although we have proposed the bald eagle in the lower 48 States for delisting, our petition finding does not address the proposed delisting or conditions that may occur if the delisting is finalized.

A. Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of the Species'
Habitat or Range

Development, Recreation, and Water Use

The petition notes the southwest has already lost more than 90 percent of its historical riparian communities (AGFD 1993, Krueper 1993, Lofgren et al. 1990) and the loss of riparian communities is continuing due to increasing development, dewatering via

groundwater pumping and diversions, destructive cattle grazing, and lack of vegetation-rejuvenating floods. The petition contends the Sonoran desert bald eagle population faces imminent and accelerating loss of increasing amounts of habitat vital to their long-term survival. Specifically, the petition notes most of the BAs are located along the Salt and Verde rivers near the Phoenix metropolitan area and the towns of Cottonwood and Camp Verde in Yavapai County, where habitat loss is occurring due to the increasing human population in central Arizona. The petition notes, in Maricopa County, the human population is expected to double to more than six million people over the next 30 years (Arizona Republic 1998). Growth in Cottonwood, on the Verde River, is projected to increase by 148 percent and in Camp Verde by 158 percent between 1994 and 2040 (Arizona Department of Economic Security 1994). The petition notes increases in human populations of this magnitude will result in increased housing development, water demands, and recreational use.

The petitioners contend development will affect the suitability of many BAs due to their proximity to areas with large human populations and projected population growth rates. The petition notes increased recreational use, development, and water use will follow increasing population sizes, and cites examples of past consultations addressing these issues.

The petition cites recent examples of recreational impacts to Sonoran desert bald eagle BAs, including river tubing on the Salt River, which increases the human presence near the Blue Point BA, as well as campground development at Roosevelt Lake, which

could affect the Sheep and Tonto BAs. The petition cites, as development examples, a 360-home development and golf course within 1.0 mile (1.6 kilometers (km)) of the Box Bar BA; the development of lakeside resorts at Lake Pleasant near the Pleasant BA; and continued housing, road, and business developments along lower Tonto Creek near the Sheep and Tonto BAs (AGFD 1999a, 2000).

The petition notes dewatering of the middle portion of the Verde River is accelerating so that flows have at times been reduced to 12 cubic feet per second (0.3 cubic meters per second) in summer months near the Camp Verde White Bridge gage (Verde Natural Resources Conservation District 1999). The petition contends this dewatering is resulting in a reduction in base flows, and increased populations in Cottonwood and Camp Verde are leading to increased groundwater pumping. The petition indicates groundwater pumping in Arizona has repeatedly been demonstrated to result in a depletion of surface flows, degradation and loss of riparian communities, and adverse impacts and local extirpation of aquatic flora and fauna (ADWR 1994, Ewing et al. 1994, Glennon 1995, Glennon and Maddock 1994, Hendrickson and Minckley 1984, McGavock 1996, Miller 1961, Owen-Joyce and bell 1983, Stromberg 1993, Tellman et al. 1997).

The petition notes increased water demand is expected to have adverse effects on flows within rivers and resulting impacts on riparian communities. The petition further notes 59.5 percent of all known desert bald eagle nests in Arizona have been in riparian trees and snags (Driscoll 1999, E. Gardner, AGFD, pers. comm. 2006). The petition

notes bald eagles at 11 BAs, including the Box Bar, Coolidge, Doka, Fort McDowell, Perkinsville, Pinto, 76, Sheep, Sycamore, Tonto, and Winkelman BAs, nest solely in riparian trees, and the cottonwood trees used for nesting in these BAs have become overmature, are dying, and are not being replaced (AGFD 1991a, 2000). The petition contends the loss of habitat in these BAs is particularly damaging to the future stability of the Sonoran desert bald eagle population, as they have collectively contributed 22 percent of all recorded fledglings since 1971. The petition notes the Fort McDowell BA has fledged 34 young, second only to the Blue Point BA, which has fledged 35 young (AGFD 1999a, 2000).

Substantial detail is provided in the petition regarding specific development activities and resulting effects to Sonoran desert bald eagle BAs. The petition notes pressures associated with human population growth are increasing and will continue to do so as the human population increases.

Response to the Petition

The information provided by the petitioner indicating human population growth is expected to continue in areas in close proximity or used by the Sonoran desert bald eagle population appears accurate and reliable. Human population growth is an on-going concern, and many of the bald eagle BAs in the Sonoran population are within close proximity to this anticipated growth, including the Granite Reef, Orme, Rodeo, Sycamore, Doka, Fort McDowell, Box Bar, Needle Rock, and Bartlett BAs on the Verde

River, and the Bull Dog, Blue Point, and Horse Mesa BAs on the Salt River, as well as the Pleasant BA at Lake Pleasant. As noted in the petition, recreation, development, and water use activities are on-going and have increased since the bald eagle was listed. We have consulted on many of these actions through section 7 of the Act (including USFWS 1990b, 1996b, 1997b, 1998, 2001a and 2003b on water developments and USFWS 1993a for recreation, as cited in the petition). In addition, the AGFD's Projects Evaluation Program is available for Federal agencies or companies with a Federal nexus. This program can be used to evaluate the impacts of planned or future projects in areas where there may be a species of concern. The AGFD believes the program will help to ensure bald eagles and their habitat are considered and evaluated for possible effects from development projects (AGFD 2006c, p. 14).

While we generally anticipate effects and assess take under section 7 of the Act, we have concluded to date that these actions would not jeopardize the continued existence of the bald eagle. The AGFD (2006c, p. 13) acknowledges the need to accommodate human populations in proximity to a major metropolitan area like Phoenix will require ongoing management. However, they conclude the species can be managed even under this scenario through the "...awareness, collaboration, flexibility, planning, and willingness of all wildlife, land, and recreation managers (AGFD 2006c, p. 13)."

We work cooperatively with the AGFD and Federal land managers to minimize the potential threats to bald eagle BAs in close proximity to the major human population growth areas in Arizona by establishing BA closures and providing adequate monitoring.

In 2006, the Bartlett, Box Bar, Granite Reef, Orme, and Tonto BAs were monitored through the Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program. The program not only interacts with members of the public to provide education, but can intervene if individuals approach the nests too closely. Similarly, the Southwest Bald Eagle Management Committee, comprised of State, Tribal, Federal, private, and military agencies, meet twice each year to address ongoing and new threats, funding for needed efforts, and general issues affecting the bald eagle.

With the exception of the Pleasant BA and Bull Dog BAs, all of the BAs in close proximity to Phoenix successfully fledged young in 2006. One bird from the Bull Dog BA was successfully fledged following fostering in the Granite Reef BA. Orme, Rodeo, Doka, Fort McDowell, Box Bar, Blue Point, and Horse Mesa fledged one young each, while Sycamore, Needle Rock, and Bartlett produced two young each. Additionally, many of these BAs have successfully produced young for many years and, while nest failures do occur, their overall productivity remains high. For example, the Bartlett BA has fledged 28 young in 20 separate years between 1971 and 2002; the Blue Point BA has fledged 38 young in 18 separate years between 1971 and 2002; and the Fort McDowell BA has fledged 41 young in 23 years between 1971 and 2002 (AGFD 2006b).

The petitioners presented reliable and accurate data on the use of riparian areas for bald eagles, and on the potential loss of nest trees. In the 11 BAs referenced by the petitioners, existing trees have become over-mature, are dying, and are not being replaced (AGFD 2006c, p. 12). Doka, Fort McDowell, Granite Reef, Rodeo, 76, and Sheep BAs

currently nest in overmature live trees or snags with few available replacements. Trees may be lost to floodwaters, as at Fort McDowell in 1995 and 2005, or inundated due to reservoir level increases, as at the Pinto and Tonto BAs at Roosevelt Lake. In some case, alternate trees are not available, as is the case at the Pinto BA. Housing communities and water table reductions limit the available trees at the Tonto BA (AGFD 2006c, p. 13).

The AGFD (2006c, p. 13) notes the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation (FMYN) and Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) have submitted proposals to the Arizona Water Protection Fund and Wetlands Protection Fund to plant riparian trees. The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation is analyzing ground water levels in the Pinto BA for possible cottonwood pole plantings, and has helped to implement riparian restoration strategies within the Tonto Creek Riparian Unit. Salt River Project has purchased property for riparian enhancements on Roosevelt Lakes. The exact impacts of increased human population growth and riparian losses, as well as the success of planting efforts in riparian areas, are speculative at this point. Through these management efforts, however, managing agencies can begin to minimize the factors impairing riparian regeneration.

We agree with the petitioner that human population growth, particularly in Maricopa and Yavapai counties, will continue. While we can anticipate the types of impacts that might occur, the exact results of those impacts on occupancy and productivity are speculative at this point. We remain concerned for BAs such as Bartlett, Blue Point, and Fort McDowell, which have contributed much to the productivity of bald eagles in the southwest. However, we find productivity remains high despite the on-

going nature of this threat. While this is an on-going threat, bald eagles have continued to survive and reproduce, as evidenced by the increased number of BAs throughout Arizona, and as evidenced by the productivity of the BAs outlined above. We therefore find the petitioners did not provide substantial information to lead us to conclude this threat has increased the likelihood of extinction for the Sonoran bald eagle population.

B. Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes

No specific threats were identified in the petition for this category.

C. Disease or Predation

No specific threats were identified in the petition for this category.

D. Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

Management

The petition states the Sonoran desert population's survival is dependent, in good part, on heroic human support and management by the Arizona Bald Eagle Nestwatch Program (ABENWP). The petition notes, over a two-year period in 1996 and 1997, 13,999 human activities and 4,000 gunshots were recorded within 0.5 mile (0.8 km) of 13 nests. The petition contends signs, education, and the threat of fines are insufficient

deterrents to people, and monitoring by nestwatchers has been, and continues to be, a crucial component of Sonoran desert bald eagle management (AGFD 1999a, 2000).

The petition additionally notes, since 1983, 16 percent of all Sonoran desert bald eagle fledglings have been saved by direct intervention of the ABENWP, with that intervention directly responsible for saving up to 60 percent of a single year's nestlings in some cases (USFWS 1992b). The petition notes BAs such as Bartlett, Cliff, and 76 would rarely produce young without the aid of nestwatchers (Hunt et al. 1992).

The petition further notes the ABENWP could become inadequate in the future as its funding is not secure. The funding comes from State grants such as AGFD's Heritage Fund, mandatory Federal agency contributions as mitigation for takings of the bald eagle under the Act, and volunteer funding. The petition finds Heritage funding is insecure because it is derived from the state lottery, and income from the lottery has been decreasing. Additionally, the petition notes there have been legislative attempts to divert lottery funds from protective wildlife activities. The petition contends removal of the bald eagle from the Federal endangered species list will terminate mandatory Federal agency funding as well; and provide an example where the Bureau of Reclamation has asked us for clarification on terminating funding for one of its projects (USFWS 1996c). The petition provides additional examples of the tenuous nature of funding for the ABENWP (AGFD 1994a, Arizona Republic 2003a, 2004c, 2004f) and states there are few binding consultations for any agency to commit funding to existing bald eagle programs; funding assistance by agencies is primarily based upon available funds and

where the agencies choose to allocate them. The petition notes approximately 63 percent of all funds spent on bald eagles comes from agencies other than AGFD.

Response to Petition

Information in our files indicates funding for the ABENWP comes from a variety of sources, including State Wildlife Grants, donations, AGFD Heritage Funds (State lottery), and matching funds for Federal grants. As a federally threatened species we anticipate funding from these sources will continue. Funding through section 7 consultations under the Act would continue since section 7 consultations are required for threatened species.

With regard to management and existing regulatory mechanisms, we evaluated whether a difference exists between the regulatory mechanisms protecting the Sonoran desert bald eagle as a threatened species versus an endangered species (i.e., the petitioned action). As a threatened species with no special rule, the Sonoran desert bald eagle is provided full protection under the Act. The prohibitions of the Act make it illegal for any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to take (includes harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, or collect, or to attempt any of these), import or export, ship in interstate commerce in the course of commercial activity, or sell or offer for sale in interstate or foreign commerce any listed species. It is also illegal to possess, sell, deliver, carry, transport, or ship any such wildlife that has been taken illegally. With regard to other existing protections afforded the Sonoran bald eagle, we incorporate by

reference the February 16, 2006 (71 FR 8238), notice reopening the comment period on the proposed rule to delist the bald eagle. Within this notice we provide a thorough discussion of the protections afforded the bald eagle by other Federal wildlife laws including the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) (16 U.S.C. 688-668d) and the Migratory Bird Treat Act (MBTA) (16 U.S.C. 703-712) and why we believe these protections are adequate to protect the bald eagle and maintain recovered population levels. In summary, the BGEPA prohibits taking or possession of and commerce in bald and golden eagles. The MBTA implements various treaties and conventions between the U.S. and other countries and, unless permitted by regulations, it provides that it is unlawful to pursue, hunt, take, capture or kill; possess, offer to sell, barter, purchase, deliver or cause to be shipped, exported, imported, transported, carried, or received any migratory bird, part, nest, egg or product, manufactured or not. Based on information provided by the petitioner and noted above, we find no measurable difference exists between the regulatory protections provided the Sonoran desert bald eagle in its current status as threatened versus endangered status (i.e., the petitioned action). Thus, we find the petitioner did not provide substantial information to lead us to believe that existing regulatory mechanisms are inadequate to protect the Sonoran desert bald eagle.

Habitual Violation of Law and Lack of Agency Resolve

The petition states the Service has been engaged in efforts to downlist the bald eagle since at least 1989. The petition notes an attitudinal change accompanied downlisting efforts and this change contributes to the increasing threats to the continued

existence of the Sonoran desert bald eagle. Specifically, the petition contends the attitudinal shift perpetuates: (a) cattle grazing within riparian habitat critical to the Sonoran desert bald eagles; (b) dam operations with water releases that are improperly timed for replenishment of riparian nest trees; (c) dewatering of remnant free-flowing rivers; (d) introduction of exotic fishes in native fish habitat; (e) continuing and increasing low-flying aircraft; and (f) approval of excessive amounts of take of Sonoran desert bald eagles. The petition provides detailed information for each of these categories, which is summarized below.

(a). Cattle Grazing Within Riparian Communities – The petition notes cattle grazing in riparian areas is known to impede growth of replacement cottonwood nest trees (AGFD 1999a, 2000). The petition cites numerous biological opinions by the Service as stating that riparian community loss is due, in part, to livestock grazing, that overgrazing continues as a threat and disturbance to bald eagles, and that overgrazing exacerbates adverse effects to riparian growth as well as to existing eagle nesting, perching, and foraging habitat (USFWS 2001a, 2002a, 2002b, 2003b).

(b). Dam Operations Result in Improperly Timed Water Releases – The petition notes poorly timed water releases are a threat to riparian communities (Stromberg et al. 1991). The petition further notes loss of riparian communities continues on the lower Verde and Salt rivers as a result of dam operations, and maintenance of existing water development features such as dams or diversion structures is a continuing threat and disturbance to bald eagles (USFWS 2001a, 2003b). The petition contends dam

operations degrade existing eagle tree nesting and perching habitat and retard riparian regeneration; alter the hydrological regime of the lower Verde River by reducing the magnitude, frequency, and duration of high flow events; and restrict the flow of sediment, decreasing recruitment of early successional riparian species. The petition indicates the effects of dams and their operation are the most important limiting factors in shaping the riparian plant community (Beauchamp 2002).

(c). Dewatering of Remnant, Free-flowing Rivers – The petition notes flows in the Verde River have decreased to as low as 12 cubic feet per second (cfs) (3 cubic meters/second) during the month of June in some years (Verde Natural Resources Conservation District 1999). The petition also notes increasing groundwater pumping by the growing population of Cottonwood and Camp Verde threatens to render sections of the Verde River intermittent (USFWS 1998), and ADWR found the Verde River baseflow is provided by groundwater discharge from the alluvium and Verde Formation, so any withdrawal from this aquifer is expected to eventually deplete Verde River flows (ADWR 1994). The petition again notes the human population in Cottonwood and Camp Verde is expected to grow by 148 and 158 percent, respectively, between 1994 and 2040 (ADES 1994). The petition also notes Prescott and Prescott Valley are developing a plan to use water from the Big Chino Basin, which may affect groundwater discharge into the upper Verde River (Arizona Republic 2000, 2001).

(d). Exotic Fish Introductions – The petition notes one study found native fish populations to be a crucial component to suitable breeding habitat (Hunt et al. 1992).

The petition indicates at least 50 species of nonnative fish have been introduced into the Gila River basin (USFWS 2001a), with potentially another 10 to 15 incidental occurrences of other nonnative species. They note nonnative species are considered to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to remove once established (Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force 1994). They also note, in order to manage for native species, fish barriers are planned in areas like the upper Verde River, and that construction and maintenance of those barriers may result in take of bald eagles through harassment or harm due to the use of mechanized equipment, dredging of river channels to remove excess sediment, completion of required repairs, and added human activity to the area. A discussion under Factor E below indicates the petition's concern on the decline of native species, especially Sonora sucker and desert sucker and their use by bald eagles as a prey base.

(e). Continued and Increasing Low Flying Aircraft – The petition notes there have been increases in low-flying aircraft, including private, military, and emergency aircraft, and these aircraft are a concern for BAs on the lower Salt and Verde rivers and for those BAs under military training routes (AGFD 1999a, 2000). The petition cites examples of aircraft recorded less than 150 feet (45.7 m) over active nests. The noise disturbance and sonic booms produced by military aircraft can flush incubating adults from the nest. The petition notes the AGFD has worked with the Federal Aviation Administration and the Arizona Department of Transportation to establish a 2000-foot (610-meters) above ground level advisory along the Salt and Verde rivers, but although marked on Arizona aeronautical maps, this advisory is generally disregarded.

The petition notes a biological opinion evaluated the Department of the Air Force proposal to widen and/or realign segments of military training routes in Arizona in 1994 (USFWS 1994c). According to the petition, the Service acknowledged the loss of nine eagles or eggs and 18 disturbances per breeding season each year over the 50-year life of the project. Disturbances in the biological opinion are defined as aircraft use that results in the interruption of breeding or foraging activities, including the flushing or displacing of eagles engaged in breeding or foraging activities (USFWS 1994c).

(f). Excessive Service Approval of Sonoran Desert Bald Eagle Deaths - The petition contends the Service has approved Federal activities responsible for the deaths of at least 29 Sonoran desert bald eagles in the last decade, noting these activities will result in a cumulative 491 taking deaths over the next 50 years (USFWS 1992d, 1993a, 1994c, 1996b, 1997b). The petition contends 30 percent of occupied eagle nesting territories in Arizona may be adversely affected by these planned projects (AGFD 1994b).

Response to the Petition

As required by section 7 of the Act, we have consulted on the potential impacts of cattle grazing, dam operations, dewatering of rivers, introduction of exotic fishes in native fish habitat, and low-flying aircraft to eagles and their habitat. Such analyses within biological opinions do not indicate a lack of agency resolve. It is our responsibility, under the Act, to enter into consultation with Federal action agencies when

activities they authorize, fund, or carry out may affect a listed species or its critical habitat. During this process we evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on listed species and determine how such impacts may be minimized and whether or not the project will jeopardize the continued existence of the species. If the project does not result in a jeopardy determination, we are responsible for developing reasonable and prudent measures that will minimize adverse impacts of the action on the species under consultation. Reasonable and prudent measures are restricted to actions that result in only minor changes to the proposed project and are within the legal authority and jurisdiction of the agency or applicant to carry out.

The biological opinions cited within the petition analyze the impacts of various activities on the bald eagle and its habitat, assess whether incidental take will occur, make a jeopardy/no jeopardy determination, and provide reasonable and prudent measures to minimize incidental take, when appropriate. In addition, each consultation includes sections on environmental baseline and cumulative effects which are used to evaluate the effects of the current action against the background of previous impacts and total expected take for the species. For each of these opinions, we provided a take statement and determined the level of take authorized would not jeopardize the continued existence of the species, indicating that, although there may be some level of adverse effect, we do not believe the threats imposed by the various actions, when considered cumulatively with previous actions, were likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the species.

We do not believe, based on the above discussion, we have authorized excessive

levels of take for bald eagles in the southwest. It is important to note we believe the high level of take described in the petition with respect to the items E and F above is a misinterpretation on the part of the petitioners. The petition indicates that, for one consultation regarding expansion of military training routes, we allowed for the loss of 9 eagles or eggs and 18 nest disturbances annually over the 50-year life of the project (USFWS 1994c). We provided a take statement for overhead flights that allows for take in the form of direct mortality of one adult or immature bald eagle, bald eagle nestling, or bald eagle egg, or two instances of disturbance per active nest per nest season. Incidental take in the form of harm of more than one eagle, nestling, or egg would require the Air Force to reconsult immediately. Further, the reasonable and prudent measures require the Air Force to avoid active bald eagle BAs during the breeding season. The total take for this opinion was therefore 1 bald eagle mortality over the life of the project and 18 disturbance events per year (2 at each of 9 BAs) outside of the breeding season each year for the life of the project. The total mortality associated with this particular project is therefore 1 bald eagle, rather than the 450 attributed to it in the petition (USFWS 1994c).

With regard to existing protections afforded the bald eagle, we incorporate by reference the February 16, 2006 (71 FR 8238), notice reopening the comment period on the proposed rule to delist the bald eagle. We provide a discussion above of the protections afforded the bald eagle by the Act as a threatened species and other Federal wildlife laws including the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEA) (16 U.S.C. 668-668d) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S.C. 703-712) and why we believe these protections are adequate to protect the bald eagle and maintain recovered

population levels.

We find the petitioner did not provide substantial information to lead us to believe existing regulatory mechanisms are inadequate to protect the Sonoran desert bald eagle. We find portions of the information provided by the petitioner are not reliable (e.g., approval of excessive take) or are not relevant (e.g., reduced funding as a result of delisting) to the petitioned action. Additional information provided by the petitioner with regard to cattle grazing, dam operations, dewatering, introduction of exotic fishes, and low-flying aircraft does not establish a connection to the petitioned action to indicate they are occurring at a level that is affecting the status of the Sonoran desert bald eagle to a point at which renders the population in danger of extinction within the foreseeable future. As noted above in the Species Description, the numbers of occupied BAs and productivity of the Sonoran population of bald eagles have continued to increase, reaching a total of 34 occupied BAs in 2006, with productivity of 1.01 young per occupied BA.

E. Other Natural or Manmade Factors Affecting Its Continued Existence

Small Population Size

The petition notes bald eagles once nested along every major river and large lake in the continental United States, and that they are no longer found in all areas of their historical range (Gerard and Bartolotti 1988). The petition further notes the Sonoran

desert population of the bald eagle is extremely small, without prospect for significant expansion. The petition notes there are fewer than 60 nesting pairs of bald eagles in the population, and the population occupying BAs may be overestimated. Their concern for overestimation of the population is based on the fact that members of breeding pairs recorded as occupying, but not breeding in a BA, may also occupy adjacent BAs. They note two males were observed to move between BAs, and it is possible that adults recorded as occupying one BA may have come from an adjacent occupied BA.

The petition notes BAs may have been occupied in years prior to their discovery, and that, if this is the case, the continued increase in the number of BAs represents an increase in the number of discovered BAs, rather than an increase in the actual number of breeding birds. Undercounting of the population in previous years results in a greater discrepancy between past and current known numbers of breeding birds, which reflects as a greater increase in the population than that which might actually have occurred.

The petition further notes ~~that~~ there is not enough surviving suitable habitat available to allow for the population to increase substantially or expand its distribution. They note the AGFD has concluded riparian community improvement and prey base modifications will be necessary before population sizes increase in Arizona (AGFD 1999, 2000). Thus, the petitioners believe the Sonoran desert population will likely continue to remain small into the foreseeable future.

The petition notes the small size of the Sonoran desert bald eagle population is, in

and of itself, problematic. Using AGFD survival estimates of juveniles and nestlings, they estimate there are approximately 166 individual eagles in the Sonoran desert population. The petition maintains the population dynamics of such a population are essentially similar to those of an isolated metapopulation. The petition references a study on the examination of the effects of widespread habitat destruction on regional metapopulations of raptor populations, noting the study found most species persist regionally as metapopulations or as sets of populations which are linked by dispersing individuals. This allows for recolonization of unoccupied habitat patches following local extinction events. However, the petition states the loss of suitable habitat patches, or disturbances in the surrounding landscape, can disrupt this process and lead to the regional extinction of a species. The study cited found the persistence of the species is at risk in significant portions of its range due to continued destruction and concomitant fragmentation of its habitat. As this pattern continues, a previously continuous population is separated into smaller, isolated demographic units that are at higher risk of local extinction due to demographic factors and/or environmental phenomena.

The petition contends four “categories of analysis” are applicable to the question of the long-term survivability for raptors in general, including demographics, genetics, patch dynamics, and environmental change. The petition indicates that, based on population biology principles, if a typical vertebrate species such as a raptor is reduced to a genetically effective size of 50, it may suffer from inbreeding depression (Barrowclough and Coats 1985, Franklin 1980, Soule 1980), and further, that demographic stochasticity and inbreeding depression may interact, with the effects of one

exacerbating the other, and hasten the decline of a population (Gilpin and Soule 1980). The petition states populations that are reduced in size tend to lose genetic variability through genetic drift, reduced average individual heterozygosity, and a reduced pool of allelic variation. The petition contends a population size of roughly 1,000 or larger is required to maintain all of the genetic variation of that population (Soule 1986). Below that size, the population will lose genetic variation at a rate proportional to the size of the population. The petition concludes the Sonoran desert population has population characteristics of extended adult longevity, high juvenile mortality, intense territoriality, and may be in a position to enter a geometric population decline (Lande 1987).

Mortality

The petition contends the level of mortality in the Sonoran desert population is higher than can support a stable population, noting adult mortality is higher than recruitment for the population. The petition states, from 1987 to 1990, the rate of mortality for breeding adults has averaged 16 percent of the breeding population per year or 5.25 breeding adult mortalities per year. From 1991 to 1998, the rate of mortality was 11.9 percent, or 5.13 breeding adult mortalities per year (Beatty and Driscoll 1996, AGFD 1999a, 2000).

The petition further contends the high presence of subadults in breeding pairs likely reflects the high adult mortality rates. The petition notes Hunt et al. (1992) indicated the presence of subadults in breeding pairs may indicate excessive adult

mortality is draining the floating segment of adult bald eagles. As a result, non-breeding (i.e., subadult) eagles are recruited into the breeding population, either forming a new pair bond with another non-breeding bird, or more frequently, replacing the mate of another breeding eagle. Twelve subadult plumaged birds were observed holding territories in Arizona from 1987 to 1990, with seven subadult plumaged birds observed holding territories in Arizona since 1991. The petition notes the AGFD (1994b) found that, for 39 known vacancies of BAs, 15 (38.5 percent) were filled by adults and 24 (61.5 percent) by near-adults or subadults. The petition states this pattern is not observed in other populations (Gerrard et al. 1992), and that in Saskatchewan, population stability was maintained in part by bald eagles deferring first breeding to age six. The petition states that a 1992 survey of 14 bald eagle biologists throughout North America determined that the known incidence of breeding subadults outside of Arizona was 0.02 percent (Hunt et al. 1992). The petition concludes the persistent presence of three- and four-year-old breeding bald eagles in Arizona has created concern for the health of the breeding population.

The petition contends mortality for fledglings is also excessive, and that most Sonoran desert nestlings die prematurely. The petition notes, according to AGFD data, from 1987 to 1998, 97 fledglings have been found dead (Hunt et al. 1992, Mesta et al. 1992, Beatty and Driscoll 1996b, AGFD 1991, 2000), and concludes few Sonoran desert bald eagles survive to adulthood.

Bald eagle populations in North America experience an average of 85 percent of

hatched young surviving to fledging, resulting in a mean nestling morality rate of 15 percent (Stalmaster 1987, p. 143). By comparison, Hunt et al. (1992, p. C-108) concluded the Arizona population may suffer an 0.9 percent higher nestling mortality rate, and in turn, an 0.9 percent lower nestling survival rate.

Productivity

The petition states the reproductive rates for the Sonoran desert population are lower than those known for bald eagles in any other location. The petition indicates the AGFD (1999a, 2000) determined productivity rates are lower than those recorded throughout North America. For the Sonoran desert population, productivity rates from 1975 to 1984 were 0.92 young per occupied BA, but that since then, the average productivity rate has been 0.78 young per occupied BA. The petition notes productivity rates over a similar time span in Alaska, Florida, Washington, and Wisconsin, averaged 0.96 young per occupied BA (Sprunt et al. 1973, McAllister et al. 1986, Kozie and Anderson 1991). The petition adds that, in some areas of the Sonoran desert population, productivity rates are even lower. For example, productivity along the Salt River declined to 0.26 young per occupied BA in the 1990s.

The petition further contends BAs that formerly produced the majority of the fledglings are producing fewer fledglings, and that the most productive nests are in relatively close proximity to the rapidly growing Phoenix metropolitan area, so that survivability in these BAs is becoming increasingly problematic. The petition states the

Salt and Verde rivers support the bulk of the Sonoran desert population, and that it is in the lower parts of these drainages and nearby lakes where prey is most abundant and bald eagles are most productive. However, the proximity of these areas to Phoenix results in high recreation use. Due to predicted human population expansion (see factor A above), the petition predicts increased recreational and development pressures in close proximity to BAs along the Salt and Verde rivers (ADWR 1999a, 2000, Arizona Republic 2000, 2001; Chino Valley Review 2004; Prescott 2001; Prescott Daily Courier 2004a, 2004b, USFWS 2001a).

The petition further notes Sonoran desert bald eagles on private lands are either not reproducing or are destined to fail. The petition cites the Winkelman BA as an example, noting this BA on private property is now surrounded by housing, recreation, and industry. The petition states the Camp Verde and Perkinsville BAs are also on private property, and are surrounded by private lands have recently been sold or for which plans to sell are underway. The petition cites the reproductive history of these BAs, noting the Camp Verde and Winkelman BAs have a record of reproductive failure, and that the Perkinsville BA failed in 2002 and faces further threats from potential dewatering of the upper Verde River.

The petition includes information developed by the petitioners through the use of Vortex (version 9) modeling. The petition notes the petitioners worked with AGFD data. Some of the model assumptions are that the population is a closed population and not demographically linked to other populations, and that there is a 1:1 ratio of males to

females in the adult population. Because the petitioners determined that fecundity in the lower Verde and Salt BAs were inflated artificially by AGFD's stocking of exotic rainbow trout and Salt River Project's release of native fish captured from irrigation canals, BAs were divided into two groups of those on the lower Salt and Verde rivers, and those in other areas.

Additional detail regarding parameters used in and determinations derived from the model are in the petition. The petition notes the model determined juvenile and adult survival were the most critical parameters for the model. The petition indicates the model demonstrates a high risk of extinction for the Sonoran desert population within the next 57 to 82 years.

Response to the Petition

The majority of the data and information presented in the petition is, in part, consistent with the information in our files. Our information indicates, however, there is no data supporting the statement that nests in private property are destined to fail simply due to their location relative to private land. While it is true the Winkelman BA has been abandoned, the Camp Verde nest, for example, failed due to flooding. Two BAs on private land (Sheep and Beaver) are currently occupied and produced young in 2005 and 2006, respectively. In addition, we do not believe the population is overestimated due to individuals occupying more than one BA, noting this behavior has been observed at only two BAs, and that the survey protocols and definition of occupancy currently in use limit

this type of bias from occurring (E. Gardner, pers. comm. 2006, p. 3).

With respect to mortality, AGFD (2006, p. 24) notes adult mortality rates of 16 percent (from 1987 to 1990) and 12 percent (from 1991 to 1998) are higher than, but within the range of other populations, which ranged from 5 percent in Northern California and 17 percent in Chesapeake Bay. For nestling mortality, the petition concluded few Sonoran desert bald eagles survive to adulthood. Stalmaster 1987 (p. 143) found bald eagle populations in North America experience an average of 85 percent of hatched young surviving to fledging, resulting in a mean nestling mortality rate of 15 percent. By comparison, Hunt et al. (1992, p. C-108) concluded the Arizona population may suffer an 0.9 percent higher nestling mortality rate, and in turn, an 0.9 percent lower nestling survival rate.

While the productivity of bald eagles in Arizona may have dropped between 1975 and 1984, it has increased since 1998. During the period of 1998 to 2006, productivity for the Sonoran population increased from a low of 0.65 young per occupied BA in 1994 to a high of 1.06 in 2005 and 1.01 in 2006 (AGFD 2003, p. 15, AGFD 2004, p. 6, AGFD 2005, p. 7, AGFD 2006b). This productivity rate is similar to that cited by the petitioners above as 0.96 for Alaska, Florida, Washington, and Wisconsin. In addition, productivity for all BAs within the Sonoran population along the Salt River was at 0.89 young per BA for 2006 (AGFD unpubl. data 2006).

The information provided by AGFD (2006) and Stalmaster (1987) indicate mortality rates for bald eagles within the Sonoran breeding population are similar to those

experienced in other populations in the United States, as are productivity rates. In addition, the population has continued to increase in terms of the number of breeding pairs and productivity, as noted above under the species description. Therefore, we find the petitioner did not provide substantial information to indicate the level of mortality and small population size place the Sonoran desert population in danger of becoming extinct. Therefore, with respect to this threat, we do not find the petitioned action may be warranted.

Declining Prey Base

The petition notes the primary prey item for bald eagles during spring is the native Arizona sucker population, consisting of desert and Sonora suckers. The petition cites recent reports indicating that Sonora sucker and desert sucker remain in approximately 73 percent and 74 percent, respectively, of the locations in which they were historically recorded, noting they have a low probability of local extirpation, but fragmentation of their range and isolation of individual populations could further reduce their occurrence in a watershed (Desert Fishes Team 2004). With respect to the potential effects of a decline in the native fish prey base, the petition quotes the biological opinion completed for the Central Arizona Project (CAP) (USFWS 2001a). The petition indicates in the CAP opinion that the Service concluded take of bald eagles was anticipated in the form of harm through alteration of the quantity and quality of the food base.

The petition cites, as a specific example, the effects of the decline of native

suckers on the Salt River. The petition states native suckers, which are a crucial prey species during the breeding season for bald eagles, became absent from the Salt River during the 1990s. The petition cites studies noting the lack of native fish species along those portions of the Salt River occupied by bald eagles may have reduced productivity from 0.69 young per BA in the 1980s to 0.26 in the 1990s (Hunt et al. 1992).

Response to the Petition

Based on a native prey study on the Salt River, the petition presents reliable and accurate information to indicate native fishes are continuing to decline and effects to the prey base can have effects on the Sonoran population of bald eagles. As outlined below, the effects of a reduced prey base seem to be affecting productivity rather than occupancy. Occupancy of these BAs remains fairly constant through 2002. Between discovery in 1978 and 2002, the Cedar Basin BA was unoccupied for one year only (1980). The Canyon and Pinal BAs were unoccupied for two years each (2001 and 2002 for the Canyon BA, 1986 and 2001 for Pinal). The Cibecue BA was unoccupied for three years (1974, 1976, and 1981). The Lone Pine and Redmond BAs have remained occupied since their discoveries in 1984 and 1975, respectively (AGFD 2006b). Two BAs, Ash and Mule Hoof, are no longer considered occupied. The Ash BA was occupied in 1984 and 1985, but has been unoccupied for ten consecutive years, and is no longer included in the list of occupied BAs. Mule Hoof was sporadically occupied in the 80s and the early 90s and was removed in 2002 after ten consecutive years of unoccupancy (AGFD 2006b, pp. 1-3).

However, while the upper Salt River BAs have remained largely occupied, productivity for the six BAs has remained low, declining after 1992 although remaining somewhat constant. From 1992 to 2002, between 0 and 3 total young have been produced each year (AGFD 2006b).

Hunt et al. (1992, p. A-46) note bald eagles in central Arizona forage on free-flowing and regulated rivers, reservoirs, small tributary streams, and on land, and that most, if not all pairs, use more than one of these environments during a given nesting season. Data indicate eagles commonly switch forage locations and/or prey species in response to changes in the distribution of prey and carrion. Hunt et al. (1992, p. A-46) cite as an example a study on a male eagle from the Blue Point BA took a variety of prey on both reservoir and riverine habitats. While those BAs that rely primarily on riverine habitat for prey, such as those in the upper Salt River, are showing a reduction in productivity, overall productivity for bald eagles throughout Arizona and within the Sonoran population has increased since 1996.

As the petitioners note, low productivity has been an issue on the upper Salt River since the 1980s. However, as noted above, the BAs in this area continue to remain occupied, and productivity, while low, remains fairly constant. Consequently, we do not perceive a new or increased threat due to a reduced prey base in this area. The situation on the upper Salt River is likely observed in other streams as well, where eagles rely primarily on rivers for foraging. This situation requires continued monitoring, and

improvements need to be made in managing for native fishes, as well as in increasing overall productivity in these BAs. However, there has been increased productivity in other BAs, including some of those that also rely on rivers for foraging. This increase is in part attributable to the increase in the total number of BAs throughout Arizona. We therefore conclude declines in the prey base for bald eagles does not warrant further consideration to reclassify the Sonoran population as endangered and that the petitioned action is not warranted based on this threat.

Contaminants

The petition claims insecticides such as carbofuran, endosulfan, fenthion, phorate, and terbufos (American Bird Conservancy 2004a, 2004b; Center for Biological Diversity 2004c; EPA 2004c, 2004d, 2004e, 2004f; University of Arizona 2004; USDA 2001; USFWS 1995) continue to threaten the bald eagle, noting hundreds of bald eagle deaths have been linked to carbofuran nationwide (American Bird Conservancy 2004b). The petition further states DDT and its derivatives are still found in Arizona waterways, noting toxic levels of DDE (a breakdown product of DDT) were found in an addled egg from the Sycamore BA in 1997 (AGFD 1999a, 2000; USGS 2004).

The petition notes chlorfenapyr resulted in a decline in the number of eggs, viable embryos, and hatchlings of mallards, and that this chemical has been put to use within the United States (EPA 1999). The petition further states toxic levels of mercury have been found in eggs from the Verde and Salt River BAs, and that mercury contamination has

also been found in the Tonto Creek BA and Gila River at levels high enough to cause failure in eggs (AGFD 1999a, 2000). The petition notes mercury concentrations in the Sonoran desert population were higher than those reported for most other North American populations (Grubb et al. 1990). The petition states studies have determined concentrations of mercury above 2 parts per million (ppm) are known to impair hatching (Newton 1979), and concentrations of 1.5 to 4.5 ppm are considered toxic (Ohlendorf 1993). Of thirteen eggs collected between 1994 and 1997, mercury levels ranged from 2.11 to 8.02 ppm for eggs from the Tower, 76, Pinal, and Winkelman BAs, and between 1.5 and 2.0 in three eggs from the Tower and Horseshoe BAs. They note that the Service considered concentrations of heavy metals to be a concern in Arizona (USFWS 2001d).

The petition contends mercury in bald eagles comes primarily from their prey, noting contaminants studies detected elevated levels of mercury in prey items ranging from 0.06 to 0.97 micrograms per gram (ug/g) with highest mean levels recovered from Lake Pleasant, the Salt River, and Alamo Lake (King et al. 1991). The petition contends these highest means were above the National Contaminant Biomonitoring Program's recommendation for no observable effects of 0.1 ug/g (Eisler 1987).

The petition notes methylmercury is the form of mercury that accumulates at greater rates than inorganic mercury, and that most mercury in fish or wildlife organisms is in the form of methylmercury (Bloom 1989). They further note methylmercury is more efficiently absorbed (Scheuhammer 1987) and preferentially retained (Weiner 1995).

The effects of mercury contamination have been studied in mallards. The petition cites a study on the effects of mallards that were fed 3.0 ppm methylmercury dicyandiamide for two years. They report lesions resulted, including necrosis and hemorrhaging in the lining of the brain (Heinz and Locke 1975). The petition contends the risk to bald eagles is increasing, noting eggs collected between 1982 and 1984 had concentrations of approximately 0.39 – 1.26 ppm (K. King, pers. comm.), while those collected between 1994 and 1997 had concentrations ranging from 2.11 to 8.02 ppm (Beatty et al. unpub. data), up to six times higher than those collected between 1982 and 1984.

Response to the Petition

The petition provides information specific to bald eagles in Arizona to indicate contaminants in the form of DDT and related breakdown products, and mercury continue to present a potential threat to the Sonoran bald eagle population. We find that some of the information presented by the petitioner is in error. With respect to carbofuran, it is important to note the granular form that caused the extreme risks in grain-eating birds is not registered for use in Arizona (C. Marr, USFWS, pers. comm. 2006). Similarly chlorfenapyr is not registered for use in Arizona (EPA 2006).

The discussion on mercury indicates mercury levels were found to exceed 2 ppm for 13 eggs collected between 1994 and 1997. Our data indicate these levels were

exceeded for 10 eggs collected between 1994 and 2004 (AGFD 2006c, Table 4, p. 22). Mercury concentrations from 1998 to 2004 ranged from 0.55 to 2.9 for all 11 eggs collected in this timeframe at the Winkelman, Pinal, 76, Tonto, Tower, Fort McDowell, Horseshoe, Box Bar, Sycamore, East Verde, and Bartlett BAs (as well as the Luna BA, which falls outside of the Sonora population under consideration here). For the year in which mercury was detected, the majority of these nests failed. Successful production of young has occurred at the majority of these BAs following the year or years in which mercury was detected. Subsequent to mercury detection in 1996, the Winkelman BA failed one year, was occupied with no eggs produced one year, and has remained unoccupied since. Since mercury detection in 1995, the Pinal BA experienced additional failures, but has since produced young, including in 2006. At the 76 BA, with mercury detections in 1995 and 1999, young were produced in 1996 through 1998, as well as in 2000 and 2001. With mercury detected at the Tonto BA in 2000 and 2001, young were produced in 2002, 2004, 2005, and 2006. Similar data is available for the Tower, Fort McDowell, Horseshoe, Box Bar, Sycamore, East Verde, and Bartlett BAs (AGFD 2006b, AGFD 2006c, AGFD 2006 unpubl. data). These data indicate mercury detection at a given nest site may cause nest failure, but does not prevent future production of young.

DDE does continue to be detected in eggs, with the highest recent detection at 4.23 ppm wet weight in one egg from the Rodeo BA in 2002. Wiemeyer et al. (1984) found reductions in productivity occurred when DDE values in bald eagle eggs were between 3 and 5 ppm (wet weight). This level has been reached at the Tonto, Tower, Sycamore, and Rodeo BAs. The most complete DDE data set over time is from the

Tower BA, where DDE concentrations have declined from 3.2 ppm in 1994 to 0.91 ppm in 2001. We do not have enough data to reach a reliable conclusion on DDE contamination levels in Arizona (C. Marr, USFWS, pers. comm. 2006). However, the Tonto BA has produced young since DDE levels of 4.17 ppm wet weight were found in 2001. Following DDE levels of 3.20 ppm wet weight, the Tower BA produced young in 1996 through 2003, 2005, and 2006. At the Sycamore BA, DDE levels of 7.00 ppm wet weight were detected from egg from 1997, but the BA produced young in 1998, 1999, and 2001 through 2006. The Rodeo BA, with DDE levels of 4.23 ppm in 2002, produced young in 2004 and 2006 (AGFD 2006c, 2006 unpubl. data).

The information presented on the mercury levels found in eggs from the Verde and Salt River BAs is generally accurate, as is that for the Tonto Creek and Gila River area. The information on DDT and its breakdown products is also generally accurate. Productivity at those BAs affected by high levels of mercury and DDE indicates while nest failure may result when those levels are detected, young are produced in subsequent years. We have been evaluating the effects of mercury, DDE, and pesticides for many years, concluding they should be monitored but are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the species. We do not believe the petitioner provided substantial information to indicate contaminant-related threats are present at a level that leads us to conclude the petitioned action may be warranted.

Fishing Line and Tackle

The petition cites AGFD data that finds fishing line and tackle have been found in nests and have entangled bald eagles. There have been 62 separate instances involving entanglement, and 19 BAs with fishing line and/or tackle in nests or entangled individuals since 1986 (Hunt et al. 1992, Beatty 1992, Beatty and Driscoll 1994a, Beatty et al. 1998). The petition notes mortalities have resulted from entanglement. The petition indicates bald eagles encounter fishing line primarily by catching dead or dying fish with fishing line or tackle still attached, but that some birds have become entangled while perched on the shoreline or while feeding on dead shorebirds and waterfowl that have themselves been entangled.

The petition states the persistent occurrence of fishing line indicates the level of recreational pressure in many of the BAs and contends, as the human population of central Arizona increases, so will the accompanying recreational demands on riparian areas (AGFD 1999a, 2000). The petition concludes these increased recreational pressures will lead to even greater incidences of fishing line and tackle in nests and resulting adverse effects to Sonoran desert bald eagles.

Response to the Petition

The petition does not mention AGFD's monofilament recovery program. Although this program is voluntary, it has helped to educate anglers and reduce the amount of improperly disposed monofilament. For probable causes of mortality in bald eagles in Arizona between 1987 and 2005, monofilament is listed as causing one adult

mortality and two nesting mortalities. It is ranked as the fifteenth most common cause of mortality, and responsible for 3 out of 281 deaths, or approximately 1.1 percent (AGFD 2006c, Table 6, p. 25). Monofilament is an ongoing problem for Sonoran desert bald eagles, but represents a minor threat. In part, we attribute this to the active management of the ABENWP, which we anticipate will continue. We find the petitioner did not provide substantial information to indicate monofilament entanglement represents a threat that will result in placing the Sonoran bald eagle population in danger of becoming extinct, therefore we are not able to determine the petitioned action may be warranted based on this threat.

Climate Change

The petition notes adaptation to the Southwest's combination of high temperature and low humidity is considered one of the characteristics that demonstrate the uniqueness of the Sonoran desert eagle population. The petition continues, however, to state heat stress is also a leading cause of nestling mortalities. The petition notes the Service (USFWS 1990b) determined this situation will likely become more common, citing more days above 100° Fahrenheit in 1990 than 1989. The petitioners indicate older nestlings have fallen from nest cliffs while attempting to reach shade or have fledged prematurely from nests without shade, usually resulting in their mortality. The petition cites studies indicating that 23 nestlings died and seven pre-fledged due to heat stress (Hunt et al. 1992). The petition cites additional information regarding heat-related mortalities.

In addition to heat, the petition notes global warming will lead to more frequent drought cycles. They note the Service (USFWS 2003b) determined that, between 1993 and 2001, eagles that depend on Roosevelt Lake for food had lower reproduction as the lake's surface area declined.

Response to the Petition

The petition presents some information to indicate heat is a stressor for the Sonoran desert bald eagle, and that drought and declining water levels at reservoirs may result in decreased productivity. The AGFD notes heat stress is the fourth-leading cause of known nestling mortalities, behind predation, parasitism, and starvation (E. Gardner, AGFD, pers. comm. 2006). It is ranked as the sixth greatest threat to bald eagles in all age classes (AGFD 2006c).

Productivity for the Sonoran population of bald eagles has reached its highest level yet for 2003 (at 0.62 young per occupied BA), 2004 (at 1.06 young per occupied BA), and 2005 (at 1.01 young per occupied BA), while the southwest is experiencing drought conditions. Climate variability and drought conditions may ultimately cause adverse effects to the bald eagle, however, the long-term effects of ongoing drought for desert-adapted birds like those of the Sonoran desert bald eagle population are unknown. We do not believe the petitioner provided substantial information to demonstrate that the level of threat posed by drought and increased heat will necessarily lead to adverse effects to the Sonoran desert population of bald eagles to a level which will cause them to

be in danger of becoming extinct, and therefore we can not conclude the petitioned action may be warranted based on this threat.

Eggshell Thinning

The petition contends eggshell thinning remains a potential problem for bald eagles in the Southwest. The petition cites (Wiemeyer et al. 1984) in noting that eggshell thinning greater than 10 percent causes problems in reproduction for other bald eagle populations. Similarly, the petition notes studies have determined a population would experience reproductive problems when eggshell thinning has become severe (15 to 20 percent) for a period of years (Anderson and Hickey 1972).

The petition presents information on eggshell fragments collected from 32 southwestern bald eagle BAs between 1977 and 1997. Mean eggshell thicknesses were compared with those from Baja California, which had a mean of 0.591 mm (0.024 in). The petition cites for studies on eggshell fragments for southwestern bald eagles. The results of these studies found eggshell thickness means of 0.539 mm (0.021 in) for 32 sets of eggshell fragments from 14 BAs between 1977 to 1985; 0.562 mm (0.022 in) for 71 sets of eggshell fragments from 23 BAs between 1987 and 1990; 0.552 mm (0.022 in) for 27 sets of eggshell fragments from 18 BAs between 1991 and 1992; and 0.534 mm (0.021 in) for 135 sets of shell fragments collected from 27 BAs between 1993 and 1997. In comparison with the Baja California mean eggshell thicknesses, these studies found a comparative 8.8 percent thinning for 1977 to 1985; 4.9 percent from 1987 to 1990; 6.6

percent in 1991 and 1992; and 9.7 percent from 1993 to 1997 (Grubb et al. 1990, Hunt et al. 1992, Mesta et al. 1992, Driscoll and Beatty, unpublished data). The petition notes, since 1993, the annual percent thinning exceeded 10 percent in 1994 and 1995, and remained high at 9.9 percent in 1996 and 1997.

The petition notes the cause of the eggshell thinning is not known at this time. While chlordane and DDE were the most frequently detected organochlorines in fish sampled near eagle nests, they were present at levels below those associated with eggshell thinning in bald eagles. The petition further notes studies found trace elements, especially mercury, were elevated, as were aluminum, arsenic, copper, and zinc (Hunt et al. 1992, King et al. 1991).

Response to the Petition

AGFD (2006c, p. 23) notes eggshell thinning exceeded ten percent on five separate occasions between 1993 and 2004. These occurred in 1994 at 10.7 percent, 1999 at 10.8 percent, in 2000 at 12.3 percent, in 2003 at 10.7 percent, and in 2004 at 10.0 percent. However, AGFD concludes that, since the ban of DDT in 1973, other factors may have a greater influence on productivity than DDT, but that egg collection and eggshell measurements will continue to ensure the effects of DDT and other organochlorines do not affect productivity (2006c, p. 23). We agree with this conclusion, and believe eggshell thinning warrants further study and monitoring; however, at this time we are not aware of any data to indicate thinning at the levels cited is resulting in

losses of eggs. We do not believe the petition provided substantial information to indicate eggshell thinning will place the Sonoran desert bald eagle population in danger of becoming extinct, and therefore find the petitioned action is not warranted.

Finding

We have reviewed the petition and literature cited in the petition. After this review and evaluation, we find the petition does not provide substantial information to indicate the petitioned action may be warranted. We find the level of threat was not demonstrated to be high enough in the southwest for us to make a finding that the petitioned action may be warranted. As discussed throughout this finding, this is primarily based on the fact that the population has continued to increase in the number of breeding pairs and in its overall distribution. As noted above, we are not making a DPS determination at this time. Based on our analysis we find the third prong of the DPS policy is dispositive and it is not necessary for us to reach a conclusion on the other two prongs.

We encourage interested parties to continue to gather data that will assist with the conservation of the species. If you wish to provide information regarding the bald eagle, you may submit your information or materials to the Field Supervisor, Arizona Ecological Services Office (see ADDRESSES section above).

References Cited

A complete list of all references cited herein is available, upon request, from the Arizona Ecological Services Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (see ADDRESSES section above).

Author

The primary authors of this notice are staff of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arizona Ecological Services Office and Regional Office (see ADDRESSES).

Authority:

The authority for this action is section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Dated:_____

Director, Fish and Wildlife Service