

**Peer Review Plan: Species Status Assessment Report for Upper Missouri River Arctic Grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) DPS**

**Timeline of the Peer review (estimated):**

**Draft documents to be disseminated:** February 2026

**Peer review to be initiated:** March 2026

**Peer review to be completed by:** April 2026

**Determination regarding species' status expected:** This report will inform a decision on whether the species warrants listing under the Endangered Species Act. If we determine that the species warrants listing, we will publish a proposed rule to list the species and designate critical habitat with appropriate opportunities for public review and comment.

**About the Peer Review Process:**

In accordance with our July 1, 1994, peer review policy (59 FR 34270), the Service's August 22, 2016, Director's Memo on the Peer Review Process, and the Office of Management and Budget's December 16, 2004, Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review, we will solicit independent scientific reviews of the information contained in our Species Status Assessment Report for the Arctic grayling.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) will request peer review from three or more independent experts. We will consider the following criteria.

- Expertise: The reviewer should have knowledge of or experience with Arctic grayling or similar species biology.
- Independence: The reviewer should not be employed by the Service. Academic, consulting or government scientists should have sufficient independence from the Service if the government supports their work.
- Objectivity: The reviewer should be recognized by his or her peers as being objective, open-minded, and thoughtful. In addition, the reviewer should be comfortable sharing his or her knowledge and perspectives and openly identifying his or her knowledge gaps.
- Conflict of Interest: The reviewer should not have any financial or other interest that conflicts or that could impair his or her objectivity or create an unfair competitive advantage. If an otherwise qualified reviewer has an unavoidable conflict of interest, the Service may publicly disclose the conflict.

While expertise is the primary consideration, the Service will select peer reviewers (considering, but not limited to, these selections) that add to a diversity of scientific perspectives relevant to the Species Status Assessment Report for the Arctic grayling. We will not be providing financial compensation to peer reviewers. We will solicit reviews from at least three qualified experts.

The Service will provide each peer reviewer with information explaining their role and instructions for fulfilling that role, the Species Status Assessment Report, and a list of citations

as necessary. The purpose of seeking independent peer review is to ensure use of the best scientific and commercial information available and to ensure and to maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of the information upon which the report is based, as well as to ensure that reviews by recognized experts are incorporated into the Species Status Assessment process. Peer reviewers will be advised that they are not to provide advice on policy. Rather, they should focus their review on identifying and characterizing scientific uncertainties. Peer reviewers will be asked to answer questions pertaining to the logic of our assumptions, arguments, and conclusions and to provide any other relevant comments, criticisms, or thoughts. Specific questions put to the reviewers include the following:

1. Is our description and analysis of the species' needs, biology, habitat, population trends, and historic and current distribution of the species accurate?
2. Does the Species Status Assessment Report provide accurate and adequate review and analysis of the current and projected future condition of the species?
3. Are our assumptions and definitions of suitable habitat logical and adequate?
4. Are there any significant oversights, omissions, or inconsistencies in our Species Status Assessment Report?
5. Are the conclusions we reach logical and supported by the evidence we provide?
6. Did we include all the necessary and pertinent literature to support our assumptions/arguments/conclusions?

Peer reviewers will provide individual, written responses to the Service. Peer reviewers will be advised that their reviews, including their names and affiliations, will: (1) be included in the decisional record of our determinations regarding this species' status (i.e., final rules or withdrawals); and (2) be available to the public upon request once all reviews are completed. We will summarize and respond to the issues raised by the peer reviewers in the record supporting our determinations. A decision on whether or not this species warrants listing under the Endangered Species Act is expected in 2025.

### **About Public Participation**

This peer review plan is made available to allow the public to monitor our compliance with the Office of Management and Budget's Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review. The SSA along with the final decision document will be made available to the public through a news release, direct mail to interested parties, and posts on Service websites (with solicitations for public comment if we prepare a proposed rule to list the species as endangered or threatened and designate critical habitat). If appropriate, the Service will publish a final listing and designation of critical habitat following consideration of all comments received from the public.

### **Contact**

For more information, contact Laura Mendenhall, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6 Ecological Services, email: [Laura\\_Mendenhall@fws.gov](mailto:Laura_Mendenhall@fws.gov).