

**Peer Review Plan**  
for the  
Draft Recovery Plan for the Sharpnose (*Notropis oxyrhynchus*) and Smalleye (*N. buccula*) Shiner

**About the Document**

Title: Draft Recovery Plan for the Sharpnose (*Notropis oxyrhynchus*) and Smalleye (*N. buccula*) Shiner

Dissemination Date: November, 2021

**Purpose:** This draft recovery plan describes strategies for recovering Sharpnose and Smalleye Shiners throughout their range. It provides specific criteria for reclassifying the species from endangered to threatened (downlisting), and removal from the Federal List of Endangered Species (delisting), in accordance with section 4(f)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). This draft recovery plan was prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). The plan contains information on the biology and status of the species, recovery goals, recovery actions, time and cost estimates, and objective and measurable criteria necessary for the full recovery of these species.

**About the Peer Review Process**

**Type of Review:** Influential

**Date of Peer Review:** Peer review is expected to be completed by January, 2021.

**Reviewers:** The Service will solicit external peer review of the scientific background information used in the draft recovery analyses from at least three or more independent scientific reviewers with expertise in ichthyology and conservation biology, with an emphasis on nativespecies in the southwestern United States.

Criteria for Reviewer Selection: Peer reviewers will be selected based on the following criteria:

- **Expertise:** Reviewers should have knowledge in one or more of the following areas: ichthyology, fish ecology, conservation biology, and land management activities and their effects on riverine fishes.
- **Independence:** Reviewers should not be employed by the Service. Academic and consulting scientists should have sufficient independence from the Service and the Department of the Interior if the government supports their work.

- Objectivity: Reviewers should be recognized by their peers as being objective, open-minded, and thoughtful. Reviewers should be comfortable sharing their knowledge and identifying their knowledge gaps.
- Advocacy: Reviewers should not be known or recognized for an affiliation with an advocacy position regarding the protection of this species under the Endangered Species Act.
- Conflict of Interest: Reviewers should not have any financial or other interest that conflicts with or that could impair their objectivity.

**About Public Participation:**

This peer review plan is made available on this website to allow the public to monitor our compliance with the Office of Management and Budget's Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review.

**Contact:** Jennifer Smith-Castro (281) 212-1509, or [jennifer\\_smith-castro@fws.gov](mailto:jennifer_smith-castro@fws.gov)