U.S Fish and Wildlife Service

Recovery Plan for 23 Species in the Mariana Islands

Photos: *Hedyotis megalantha* (Lauren Gutierrez), *Phyllanthus saffordii* (Guam Plant Extinction Prevention Program), Slevin's Skink (*Emoia sleveni*) (Bjorn Lardner), and Rota blue damselfly (*Ischnura luta*) (Lainie Berry)

Recovery Plan for 23 Species in the Mariana Islands

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Portland, Oregon

Approved: HUGH MORRISON Digitally signed by HUGH MORRISON Date: 2023.08.30 17:37:01 -07'00'

Regional Director
Pacific Region 1

DISCLAIMER

Recovery plans delineate reasonable actions needed to recover and/or protect listed species. We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), publish recovery plans, sometimes preparing them with the assistance of recovery teams, contractors, State agencies, and others. Objectives of the recovery plan are accomplished, and funds made available, subject to budgetary and other constraints affecting the parties involved, as well as the need to address other priorities with the same funds.

Recovery plans do not necessarily represent the views or the official positions or approval of any individuals or agencies involved in the plan formulation, other than our own. They represent our official position only after signed by the Director or Regional Director. Draft recovery plans are reviewed by the public and may be subject to additional peer review before the Service adopts them as final. Recovery objectives may be attained and funds expended contingent upon appropriations, priorities, and other budgetary constraints. Recovery plans are guidance and planning documents only; identification of an action to be implemented by any public or private party does not create a legal obligation beyond existing legal requirements. Nothing in this plan should be construed as a commitment or requirement that any Federal agency obligate or pay funds in any one fiscal year in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year in contravention of the Anti-Deficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. 1341, or any other law or regulation. Approved recovery plans are subject to modification as dictated by new findings, changes in species status, and completion of recovery actions.

Literature citation of this document should read as follows:
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2023. Recovery Plan for 23 Species in the Mariana Islands. Portland, Oregon. xiv+102 pp.

An electronic copy of this recovery plan is available at:

https://www.fws.gov/endangered/species/recovery-plans.html

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Service gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the following individuals and organizations in developing the Recovery Plan for 23 Species from the Mariana Islands. The primary authors of this recovery plan are Tyler Willsey and Dawn Bruns (Service, Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office [PIFWO], Honolulu, Hawai‘i). Chelsie Javar-Salas, Lauren Weisenberger, Mary Jo Mazurek, Jacqueline Flores, Heather Benedict, Toni Mizerek, Laura Alexandria P. Gombar, Diane Sether, Fred Amidon, and John Vetter (PIFWO) compiled information used to develop the document. Bronson Curry, Dan Polhemus, Tom Mathies, Steve Miller, Bob Reed, Mari Reeves, Mike Richardson, and David Sischo provided valuable information as species experts. Reviewers were Lauren Weisenberger, John Vetter, Megan Laut, Gregory Koob, Katherine Mullett (PIFWO).

RECOVERY PLANNING PROCESS

The Service uses a three-part process to develop our recovery plans (click here for details). This approach is intended to reduce the time needed to develop and implement recovery plans, increase recovery plan relevancy over a longer timeframe, and add flexibility to recovery plans so they can be adjusted to new information or circumstances. Under this process, a recovery plan includes the statutorily-required elements under section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) (objective and measurable recovery criteria, site-specific management actions, and estimates of time and costs), along with a concise introduction and our strategy for how we plan to achieve species recovery. The recovery plan is supported by two supplementary documents: a species status assessment or species biological report, which describes the best available scientific information related to the biological needs of the species and assessment of threats; and the recovery implementation strategy, which details the particular near-term activities needed to implement the recovery actions identified in the recovery plan. Under this approach, new information on species biology or details of recovery implementation may be incorporated by updating these supplementary documents without concurrent revision of the entire recovery plan, unless changes to statutorily-required elements are necessary.

Thus, this recovery plan document is one piece of a three-part framework:

1. The **Species Status Assessment** (SSA) or **Species Biological Report** (SBR) informs the recovery plan; it describes the biology and life history needs of the species, includes analysis of each species' historical and current conditions, and includes discussion of threats and conservation needs of each species. The SSA or SBR's format is structured around the conservation biology principles of resiliency, redundancy, and representation (Shaffer and Stein 2000, pp. 307-310; Smith et al. 2018, entire; Wolf et al. 2015, entire). This document may be updated as needed based on new information.

   There are 23 Species Reports associated with this recovery plan (USFWS 2023a through USFWS 2023w, entire), which summarize the biology and threat status of each species addressed in the recovery plan including the geography and environmental context of their range in the Mariana Islands. Species Reports include information from Habitat Status Assessments completed by the Service (Frager et al. 2020; Polhemus and Richardson 2020; Willsey et al. 2020). Habitat Status Assessments are used to evaluate the current status, stressors, and future viability of the terrestrial habitats found in the Mariana Islands.

2. The **Recovery Plan** contains a concise overview of the recovery strategy for the species (indicating how its recovered state will achieve redundancy, resiliency, and representation), as well as the statutorily-required elements of recovery criteria, recovery actions, and estimates of the time and costs to achieve the plan's goals.

3. The **Recovery Implementation Strategy** (RIS) is the vehicle for implementing the recovery plan. The RIS is a short-term, flexible operational document focused on how, when, and by whom the recovery actions from the recovery plan will be implemented. This document may be updated as needed based on new information, allowing it to be adapted to changing circumstances with greater flexibility and efficiency. The RIS will

be developed and maintained in cooperation with our conservation partners and stakeholders and will focus on the period of time and activities that work best for our partners and stakeholders to achieve recovery goals.

We are coordinating with conservation partners at the Territory of Guam Department of Agriculture, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Department of Land and Natural Resources, University of Guam, University of Florida, Department of Defense, National Park Service, research institutions, conservation organizations, and public and private stakeholders, to identify the highest-priority actions for recovery of these species to develop a RIS. Some of these efforts, such as the Implementation Team for the *Tuberolabium guamense* Species Action Plan (DOD 2021), created under the Memorandum of Understanding Between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior Establishing a Recovery and Sustainment Partnership Initiative (DOD-DOI RASP 2018), are ongoing, and will help provide a framework for not only how to organize and discuss recovery activities, but the types of data, supplies, expertise and training, and other needs for accomplishing those activities.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Species Status

This recovery plan addresses 14 plants (7 threatened, 7 endangered), 1 endangered mammal, 1 endangered reptile, and 7 endangered invertebrates. These 23 species were proposed for listing on October 1, 2014 (USFWS 2014) and were listed October 1, 2015 (USFWS 2015). Critical habitat is scheduled to be designated for these 23 species in 2026. All of these species are currently or historically known from the Mariana Islands; the Pacific sheath-tailed bat and *Cycas micronesica* also occur outside of the jurisdiction of the United States. Listed plants currently occur on 7 of the archipelago's 15 islands and listed animals currently occur on 9 of the islands, plus Cocos Islet off Guam; 4 islands do not support these listed species.

Species included in this recovery plan:

SPECIES	COMMON NAME	DISTRIBUTION[1]	STATUS
PLANTS			
Bulbophyllum guamense	wild onion, siboyas hålom tåno', siboyas halumtanu [Ch], siboyan hålom tåno'[Ca]	Guam, Rota, **Saipan**, **Pagan**	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Cycas micronesica	fadang [Ch], faadang[Ca]	Guam, Rota, Tinian, Pagan[2], Palau[3], Yap[3]	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Dendrobium guamense	No Common Name (NCN)	Guam, Rota, Saipan, Tinian, Aguiguan, Agrihan	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Eugenia bryanii	NCN	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Hedyotis megalantha	pao de'do', pao dedu[Ch], pao doodu[Ca]	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Heritiera longipetiolata	ufa hålom tåno'[Ch], hufa halomtano', ufa halom tano[Ca]	Guam, Saipan, Tinian, Rota	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Maesa walkeri	NCN	Guam, Rota	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Nervilia jacksoniae	NCN	Guam, Rota	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Phyllanthus saffordii	Maigo' lålo' [Ch]	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Psychotria malaspinae	aplokating palaoan, applok hatteng palao'an [Ch/Ca]	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Solanum guamense	Beringhenas hålom tåno'[Ch], tano[Ca]	Guam, **Rota**, **Saipan**, **Tinian**, **Asuncion**, **Guguan**, **Maug, Farallon de Pajaros**	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Tabernaemontana rotensis	NCN	Guam, Rota	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Tinospora homosepala	NCN	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Tuberolabium guamense	NCN	Guam, Rota, **Tinian**, **Aguiguan**	Threatened (USFWS 2015)

SPECIES	COMMON NAME	LOCATION	STATUS
MAMMAL			
Emballonura semicaudata rotensis	Pacific sheath-tailed bat (Mariana subspecies), payesyes, payeyi [Ch], paischeey, fanihen ganas [Ca]	**Guam**, **Rota**, Aguiguan, **Tinian**, **Saipan**, **Anatahan**, **Maug**	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
REPTILE			
Emoia slevini	Slevin's skink, Mariana skink, Marianas Emoia, guåli'ek hålom tåno'[Ch], gholuuf [Ca]	**Guam**, Cocos Island[4], **Rota**, **Aguiguan**, **Tinian**, Sarigan, Alamagan, **Pagan**, Asuncion	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
INVERTEBRATES			
Hypolimnas octocula marianensis	Mariana eight-spot butterfly, ababang [Ch], Libweibwogh [Ca]	Guam, **Saipan**	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Vagrans egistina	Mariana wandering butterfly, ababbang [Ch], Libweibwogh [Ca]	Guam, Rota	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Ischnura luta	Rota blue damselfly, dulalas Luta [Ch], dulalas Luta [Ca]	Rota	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Partula gibba	humped tree snail, akaleha'[Ch], denden [Ca]	Guam, Rota[5], **Aguiguan**, Tinian, Saipan, **Anatahan**, Sarigan, Alamagan, Pagan	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Partula langfordi	Langford's tree snail, akaleha'[Ch], denden [Ca]	Aguiguan	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Partula radiolata	Guam tree snail, akaleha'[Ch], denden [Ca]	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Samoana fragilis	fragile tree snail, akaleha' dogas [Ch], denden [Ca]	Guam, Rota	Endangered (USFWS 2015)

Ch = Chamorro name, Ca = Carolinian name. Translations courtesy of the Chamorro/Carolinian Language Policy Commission.

[1] Bolded islands indicate historical range (i.e., taxa have been extirpated from islands in bold).

[2] Unconfirmed occurrence.

[3] Range outside of the Mariana Islands.

[4] Cocos Island is an islet off the southern coast of Guam.

[5] All known populations on Rota assigned to *Partula gibba* are believed to be a newly-described species *Partula lutaensis* (Sischo and Hadfield 2021).

Recovery Vision

The overall recovery vision for the 23 species addressed in this recovery plan (hereafter, the 23 species) is to have multiple redundant, self-sustaining populations representing the genetic and ecological diversity of the species distributed across their historical ranges in habitats where threats are managed. A recovery vision for each species group or species is presented in the main body of the recovery plan.

Recovery Strategy

The overall recovery strategy for the 23 species will require assessment of populations and their habitat, selection of sites for long-term conservation, control of threats, development of regulatory protections, species-specific research, and reinforcement and reintroduction to maximize the species' resiliency, redundancy, and representation. A detailed recovery strategy for each species group or species is presented in the main body of this document.

Most of the plant species covered by this recovery plan (10 of 14) persist at very low numbers and are in rapid decline. To target and track recovery efforts for critically rare plants, the Hawai‘i and Pacific Plants Recovery Coordinating Committee (HPPRCC) developed two interim recovery stages (i.e., preventing extinction and interim stabilization) with the goal of minimizing the likelihood of extinction and to stabilize populations (HPPRCC 2011). While these two interim recovery stages are not required under the Act, they are critical to the recovery of these species. Once these interim stages are achieved, additional criteria must be achieved to downlist or delist a species. Thus, recovery will be achieved through a series of conservation stages including: (1) preventing extinction, (2) interim stabilization, (3) downlisting, and (4) delisting.

The conservation measures recommended at these stages include genetic storage, controlling threats in the immediate vicinity of individual plants, and reinforcement and reintroduction with the goal of protecting and creating a limited number of small populations of each species. The recovery of each species will follow from these initial efforts and include continued assessments of the distribution and condition of the 14 species and their habitat, selection of sites for their long-term conservation, management of threats, and development of regulatory protections to assure their long-term protection. Several species will also need protection from species-specific threats including use of military ordnance, vandalism, recreational vehicles, introduction of disease, and limited numbers. Detailed recovery strategies for individual species are presented in the body of this document.

The recovery strategies for the animal species share the following measures: survey the historical range of each species to assess their distribution; conduct additional research to evaluate the species' status; collaborate with stakeholders to protect habitat; develop management and monitoring frameworks for habitat; manage threats; maintain the biosecurity of islands with extant populations to prevent the introduction of potential predators or habitat-altering invasive species; and evaluate conservation translocation as a tool to reestablish populations. Detailed recovery strategies for individual species and species groups are presented in the body of this document.

Plant Species

Preventing Extinction

To meet the preventing extinction goals, surveys must be completed throughout each species' historical range and all major threats must be controlled in the immediate vicinity of the three populations (see below). Studies of plant reproductive biology are completed as needed to inform management. Each species has a minimum of 3 populations comprised of 25 to 100 sexually mature individuals per population with evidence of natural reproduction (i.e., viable seeds, seedlings, saplings). Genetic storage is achieved with at least 50 individuals per population, or the total number of individuals if fewer than 50 remain, are secured in a well-managed *ex situ* collection.

Interim Stabilization

To meet the interim stabilization goals, all preventing extinction targets must be achieved and 3 populations, showing replacement regeneration, comprised of 100 to 600 mature individuals per population are conserved. Species known from multiple islands must be represented by at least one population on each historically occupied island, as long as appropriate stock is available for

planting within the species' known range. All major threats must be controlled around the target populations and each population is naturally reproducing.

The following tables summarize the downlisting and delisting criteria for the 23 species covered in this recovery plan. See the body of the recovery plan for a detailed explanation of each of the criteria.

Recovery Criteria

Plant Species

Downlisting and Delisting Criteria – 14 species of plants, having met preventing extinction and interim stabilization goals.

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3
Downlisting Criteria	5 populations including at least 3 on each island within species' historical range are stable for 10 years, each with at least 200, 500, or 1,000 individuals (number of individuals depends on the species' life history characteristics)	Monitoring in place; Population Viability Analysis completed	Threats managed; management plan that identifies actions needed to control threats to long-term persistence of habitat for all species completed
Delisting Criteria	10 populations including at least 3 on each island within species' historical range are stable for 20 years, each with at least 200, 400, 500, or 1,000 individuals (number of individuals depends on the species' life history)	Threats including ungulates controlled, with land protections in place	

Animal Species

Downlisting and Delisting Criteria – Pacific sheath-tailed bat.

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4
Downlisting Criteria	3 stable populations on at least 2 islands with at least 500 individuals in each population for 10 years	Roosts and habitat supporting Downlisting Criterion 1 are protected	Threats to the populations in Downlisting Criterion 1 are evaluated and are found to be absent or controlled to a level where the species is able to maintain stable to growing populations.	None

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4
Delisting Criteria	6 stable populations on at least 3 islands with at least 500 individuals in each population for 10 years	Roosts and habitat supporting Delisting Criterion 1 are protected	Threats to the populations in Delisting Criterion 1 are evaluated and are found to be absent or controlled to a level where the species is able to maintain stable to growing populations	A management plan (or plans) is developed and implemented to ensure the long-term protection of the habitat that supports the 6 populations

Downlisting and Delisting Criteria – Slevin's skink.

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4
Downlisting Criteria	Stable or increasing populations on at least 4 islands for 10 years	Suitable habitat supporting Downlisting Criterion 1 is protected	Biosecurity measures are in place and the predation risk to each population in Downlisting Criterion 1 is evaluated and predators are absent or are controlled to a level where these populations remain stable or increasing.	None
Delisting Criteria	Stable or increasing populations on at least 6 islands for 10 years	Suitable habitat supporting Delisting Criterion 1 is protected	Biosecurity measures are in place and the predation risk to each population in Downlisting Criterion 1 is evaluated and predators are absent or are controlled to a level where these populations remain stable or increasing.	A management plan (or plans) is developed and implemented to ensure the long-term protection of the habitat that supports the 6 populations

Downlisting and Delisting Criteria – Mariana eight-spot butterfly and Mariana wandering butterfly.

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4
Downlisting Criteria	At least 14 stable populations for at least 10 years	Habitat and host plants supporting Downlisting Criterion 1 are protected	The predation and parasitism risk of populations in Downlisting Criterion 1 is evaluated and predators and parasitoids are absent or are controlled to a level where the species are able to maintain stable to growing populations.	None

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4
Delisting Criteria	At least 20 stable populations for 10 years	Habitat and host plants supporting Delisting Criterion 1 are protected	The predation and parasitism risk of populations in Delisting Criterion 1 is evaluated and predators and parasitoids are absent or are controlled to a level where the species are able to maintain stable to growing populations.	A management plan (or plans) is developed and implemented to ensure the long-term protection of the habitat that supports the 20 populations

Downlisting and Delisting Criteria – Rota blue damselfly.

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4	Criterion 5
Downlisting Criteria	At least 3 stable or increasing populations in at least 3 streams on Rota or in suitable habitat on other islands for 10 years	The Sabana Plateau and other areas supplying water to streams occupied by the damselfly are managed to preserve existing native and secondary forest habitat to preserve water quality and temperature.	Stream habitat is protected and managed; turbidity, pollution, overharvesting of water is minimized; biosecurity measures are in place	None	None
Delisting Criteria	At least 3 stable or increasing populations in at least 5 streams on Rota or in suitable habitat on other islands for 10 years	The Sabana Plateau and other areas supplying water to streams occupied by the damselfly are managed to preserve existing native and secondary forest habitat to preserve water quality and temperature.	Stream habitat is protected and managed; turbidity, pollution, overharvesting of water is minimized; biosecurity measures are in place	A captive breeding population has been established to ensure survival of the species	A management and monitoring plan (or plans) is developed and implemented to ensure the long-term protection of the habitat that supports the 3 populations

Downlisting and Delisting Criteria – Four species of tree snails.

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4
Downlisting Criteria	At least 10 stable populations each with at least 400 observed individuals for 3 consecutive years	Suitable habitat supporting Downlisting Criterion 1 is protected	Biosecurity measures are in place, risk evaluation indicates that occupied habitat is free of predators or predators are controlled to a level where populations remain stable or increasing.	None

	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4
Delisting Criteria	At least 20 stable populations each with at least 400 observed individuals for 5 consecutive years	Suitable habitat supporting Delisting Criteria 1 is protected; agreements to maintain habitats are in place	Biosecurity measures are in place; risk evaluation indicates that occupied habitat is free of predators or predators are controlled to a level where populations remain stable or increasing; and at least 5 of the 20 populations must occur in areas without invasive predators	A management and monitoring plan (or plans) is developed and implemented to ensure the long-term protection of the habitat that supports the 20 populations

Recovery Actions and their Costs

Recovery actions and cost estimates for all 23 species are shown in the table below. Cost estimates are preliminary. Project-level details of recovery action implementation will be developed with partners and stakeholders in the RIS, which will supplement this recovery plan. Implementation is subject to availability of funds and is at the discretion of partners and stakeholders.

Recovery Actions and their estimated cost (in Fiscal Year 2023 dollars) over 20-years.

Recovery Actions	Action #	Estimated Costs
Determine population status and current distribution	1.0	$2,282,759
Conduct research to clarify life history information, identify limiting factors and/or threats to population viability, and develop solutions	2.0	$115,024,138
Conserve and enhance populations	3.0	$2,620,689,655
Develop regulations and policy essential to recover the species and conserve their habitats	4.0	$1,034,483
Improve stakeholder awareness and engagement	5.0	$117,241
Total Estimated Cost for First 20 Years of Recovery[1]:		$2,739,148,276

[1] Over the 30–95-year projected time to recovery, cost estimation is highly uncertain. We focus here on estimated costs for the initial 20 years of recovery implementation.

Date of Recovery

If all actions are fully funded and implemented as outlined, including cooperative efforts by all partners and stakeholders needed to achieve recovery, we estimate the earliest that the delisting criteria could be met would be between 2053 and 2118 for the listed plant species, 2063 for the sheath-tailed bat, 2053 for Slevin's skink, 2048 for the Mariana eight-spot butterfly, 2053 for the Rota blue damselfly, and 2048 for the humped tree snail, Guam tree snail, and fragile tree snail. The year of recovery of the Mariana wandering butterfly and Langford's tree snail cannot be estimated unless these species are rediscovered, but in any scenario, recovery is unlikely to be achieved before 2063.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CNMI	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
DLNR	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Department of Lands and Natural Resources
DFW	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife
GPEPP	Guam Plant Extinction Prevention Program
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
PIFWO	Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office
RIS	Recovery Implementation Strategy
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

The Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) (Act) protects species of wildlife and plants that are listed as endangered or threatened. Recovery is defined as "the process by which listed species and their ecosystems are restored and their future is safeguarded to the point that protections under the [Act] are no longer needed," according to the 2018 updated National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service or USFWS) Interim Recovery Planning Guidelines, Version 1.4 (NMFS and USFWS 2018, entire).

Recovery plans are guidance documents developed to provide recommendations to reduce or alleviate threats to the species (includes distinct population segments [DPS], subspecies, species groups) and ensure self-sustaining, wild populations. The Act (section 4(f)(1)) requires that recovery plans include: (1) a description of site-specific management actions necessary to conserve the species; (2) objective, measurable criteria that, when met, will allow the species to be removed from the Federal Lists of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants (Lists); and (3) estimates of the time and cost required to achieve the plan's goals and intermediate steps.

Table 1 summarizes the status, within the Mariana Islands, of the 23 species addressed in this recovery plan (hereafter, 23 species). The species addressed in this recovery plan were proposed for listing in 2014 (USFWS 2014, entire) and listed under the Act in a final rule published in October 2015 (USFWS 2015, entire). The Recovery Outline for the Mariana Islands was published on February 3, 2020, and covers all 23 species (USFWS 2020). Critical habitat is scheduled to be designated for these 23 species in 2026.

The Mariana Islands are comprised of 15 islands located west of Hawai‘i and south of Japan (Figure 1). The islands were the first settled by humans in Remote Oceania prior to Polynesian settlement of the rest of the Pacific islands. The Chamorro people colonized the islands between 1500 and 1400 BC. A second migration followed from the Caroline Islands by the first millennium AD and a third likely from the Philippines or eastern Indonesia by 900 AD. The native people of the Mariana Islands are of Chamorro and Carolinian descent. After World War II, the United States administered the Pacific islands formerly held by Japan pursuant to the United Nations Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (United Nations 1946 p. 124-125 and United Nations 1947). The Guam Organic Act of 1950 established Guam as an unincorporated organized territory of the United States and granted citizenship to residents. In 1975, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI), the 14 northernmost islands excluding Guam, was designated a U.S. territory. The CNMI adopted its constitution in 1977, and its first constitutional government took office in 1978. Many of the 15 islands comprising the archipelago are remote and difficult to access and have challenging terrain (Table 2), which has limited natural history studies of the 23 species and their native habitats.

Table 1. Species covered by this recovery plan, including the number of populations, number of individuals, their recovery priority number, distribution, and current listing status.

Species	Common Name	Number of Known Populations	Number of Individuals in the Wild in the Marianas	Recovery Priority Number[1]	Distribution[2]	Listing Status
PLANTS						
Bulbophyllum guamense	wild onion, siboyas halumtanu [C], siboyan halom tano[Ca]	13	<10,000	8	Guam, Rota, **Saipan, Pagan**	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Cycas micronesica	fadang [Ch], faadang[Ca]	15	175,133 to 590,133	5	Guam, Rota, Tinian, Pagan[3], Palau[4], Yap[4]	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Dendrobium guamense	NCN	26	>13,000	8	Guam, Rota, Saipan, Tinian, Aguiguan, Agrihan	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Eugenia bryanii	NCN	10	>1,000	8	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Hedyotis megalantha	pao dedu [Ch], pao doodu[Ca]	Unknown	<800	8	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Heritiera longipetiolata	ufa halumtanu [Ch], ufa halom tano[Ca]	19	>2,000	5	Guam, Saipan, Tinian, Rota	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Maesa walkeri	NCN	5	786	8	Guam, Rota	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Nervilia jacksoniae	NCN	8	708	8	Guam, Rota	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Phyllanthus saffordii	NCN	>17	Several thousand	8	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Psychotria malaspinae	aplokating palaoan [Ch/Ca]	4	12	5	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Solanum guamense	tano [Ca]	None known	None known	5	Guam, **Rota, Saipan, Tinian, Asuncion, Guguan, Maug, Farallon de Pajaros**	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Tabernaemontana rotensis	NCN	15	>16,000	8	Guam, Rota	Threatened (USFWS 2015)
Tinospora homosepala	NCN	4	150	2	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Tuberolabium guamense	NCN	9	>76,000	8	Guam, Rota, **Tinian, Aguiguan**	Threatened (USFWS 2015)

Species	Common Name	Number of Known Populations	Number of Individuals in the Wild in the Marianas	Recovery Priority Number[1]	Distribution[2]	Listing Status
MAMMAL						
Emballonura semicaudata rotensis	Pacific sheath-tailed bat (Mariana subspecies), payeyi [Ch], paischeey [Ca]	1	359 to 466	6	**Guam, Rota,** Aguiguan, **Tinian, Saipan, Anatahan, Maug**	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
REPTILE						
Emoia slevini	Slevin's skink, Marianas Emoia, Marianas skink, gualiik halumtanu [Ch], gholuuf [Ca]	4	Unknown	8	**Guam,** Cocos Island[5], **Rota, Aguiguan, Tinian,** Sarigan, Alamagan, **Pagan**, Asuncion	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
INVERTEBRATES						
Hypolimnas octocula marianensis	Mariana eight-spot butterfly, ababbang [Ch], libweibwogh [Ca]	6-10	Unknown	6	Guam, **Saipan**	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Vagrans egistina	Mariana wandering butterfly, ababbang [Ch], libweibwogh [Ca]	Unknown	Unknown	5	Guam, Rota	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Ischnura luta	Rota blue damselfly, dulalas luta [Ch], dulalas luuta [Ca]	1	Unknown	5C	Rota	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Partula gibba	humped tree snail, akaleha [Ch], denden [Ca]	7	Unknown	8	Guam, Rota[6], **Aguiguan,** Tinian, Saipan, **Anatahan,** Sarigan, Alamagan, Pagan	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Partula langfordi	Langford's tree snail, akaleha [Ch], denden [Ca]	Unknown	Unknown	5	Aguiguan	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Partula radiolata	Guam tree snail, akaleha [Ch], denden [Ca]	50+	Unknown	5	Guam	Endangered (USFWS 2015)
Samoana fragilis	fragile tree snail, akaleha dogas [Ch], denden [Ca]	9	Unknown	5	Guam, Rota	Endangered (USFWS 2015)

Ch = Chamorro name, Ca = Carolinian name. Translations courtesy of the Chamorro/Carolinian Language Policy Commission.

[1] Recovery Priority Number is based on degree of threat, recovery potential, taxonomic distinctiveness, and presence of an actual or imminent conflict between the species and development activities (click here for details). We updated the Recovery Priority Numbers (RPN) of two species from a high degree of threat and high recovery potential (RPN of 2) to a high degree of threat and low recovery potential (RPN of 5) because there are currently no known individuals of *Solanum guamense* and taxonomic uncertainty as well as the small number of individuals of *Psychotria malaspinae*.

[2] Bolded islands indicate historical range (i.e., taxa have been extirpated from islands in bold).

[3] Unconfirmed occurrence.

[4] Range outside of the Mariana Islands.

[5] Cocos Island is an islet off the southern coast of Guam.

[6] All known populations on Rota assigned to *Partula gibba* are now thought to be a newly-described species *Partula lutaensis* (Sischo and Hadfield 2021).

Figure 1. The 15 islands comprising the Mariana Archipelago in the western Pacific Ocean.

Table 2. The area of each island in the Mariana Archipelago along with their percentage of total archipelago land mass, maximum elevation, and predominant substrate.

Island	Land area square miles (square kilometers)	% of land area of Mariana Archipelago	Maximum elevation feet (meters)	Substrate
Guam	208.5 (540.)	53.3	1,335 (407)	limestone
Rota	32.9 (85.1)	8.4	1,627 (496)	limestone
Aguiguan	2.7 (7.0)	0.7	187 (57)	limestone
Tinian	39.1 (101.2)	1.9	614 (187)	limestone
Saipan	45.9 (119.0)	11.7	1,555 (474)	limestone
Farallon de Medinilla	0.3 (0.7)	>0.1	82 (25)	limestone
Anatahan	13.1 (33.9)	3.3	2,585 (788)	volcanic
Sarigan	1.7 (4.5)	0.4	1,765 (538)	volcanic
Guguan	1.6 (4.2)	0.4	942 (287)	volcanic
Alamagan	5.0 (13.0)	1.3	2,441 (744)	volcanic
Pagan	18.5 (47.8)	4.7	1,870 (570)	volcanic
Agrihan	17.0 (44.1)	4.4	3,166 (965)	volcanic
Asuncion	3.1 (7.9)	0.8	2,812 (857)	volcanic
Maug	0.8 (2.1)	0.2	745 (227)	volcanic
Farallon de Pajaros	0.9 (2.3)	0.2	1,181 (360)	volcanic
Total Land Area	**391.0 (1,012.8)**			

A. BACKGROUND

Basic Species Information

Species descriptions, life history, status, and historical and current range and distribution are included in the proposed listing rule (USFWS 2014, entire) and final listing decision (USFWS 2015, entire). Habitat status and species biological reports detail the habitat, biology, distribution, resiliency (the ability of a species to recover from periodic disturbance), redundancy (the number of populations of a species distributed across the landscape), and representation (the range of variation found within a species) of each of the species addressed in this recovery plan (Table 3, USFWS 2023a-w). These reports are available at https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species-reports and will be updated as new information informs the conservation status of the species and the habitats on which they rely.

Table 3. Species and the corresponding Species Biological Reports and Habitat Status Reports incorporated herein by reference.

Species	Species Report	Habitat Status Report
PLANTS		
Bulbophyllum guamense	USFWS 2023a	Willsey et al. 2020
Cycas micronesica	USFWS 2023b	Willsey et al. 2020
Dendrobium guamense	USFWS 2023c	Willsey et al. 2020
Eugenia bryanii	USFWS 2023d	Willsey et al. 2020
Hedyotis megalantha	USFWS 2023e	Frager et al. 2020
Heritiera longipetiolata	USFWS 2023f	Willsey et al. 2020
Maesa walkeri	USFWS 2023g	Willsey et al. 2020
Nervilia jacksoniae	USFWS 2023h	Willsey et al. 2020
Phyllanthus saffordii	USFWS 2023i	Frager et al. 2020
Psychotria malaspinae	USFWS 2023j	Willsey et al. 2020
Solanum guamense	USFWS 2023k	Willsey et al. 2020
Tabernaemontana rotensis	USFWS 2023l	Willsey et al. 2020
Tinospora homosepala	USFWS 2023m	Willsey et al. 2020
Tuberolabium guamense	USFWS 2023n	Willsey et al. 2020
MAMMAL		
Emballonura semicaudata rotensis	USFWS 2023o	Willsey et al. 2020
REPTILE		
Emoia slevini	USFWS 2023p	Willsey et al. 2020
INVERTEBRATES		
Hypolimnas octocula marianensis	USFWS 2023q	Willsey et al. 2020
Vagrans egistina	USFWS 2023r	Willsey et al. 2020
Ischnura luta	USFWS 2023s	Polhemus and Richardson 2020
Partula gibba	USFWS 2023t	Willsey et al. 2020
Partula langfordi	USFWS 2023u	Willsey et al. 2020
Partula radiolata	USFWS 2023v	Willsey et al. 2020
Samoana fragilis	USFWS 2023w	Willsey et al. 2020

Plants

All of the plants with the exception of *Cycas micronesica* are endemic to the Mariana Islands, with five being found only on Guam (see Table 2). The status of habitats supporting these plant species is summarized in the Habitat Status Reports listed in Table 3.

Bulbophyllum guamense

Bulbophyllum guamense is an epiphyte in the orchid family (Orchidaceae) now restricted to the native forests of Guam and Rota (Ames 1914, p. 13; Raulerson and Rinehart 1992, p. 90; Costion and Lorence 2012, pp. 54, 66; Global Biodiversity Information Facility [GBIF] 2019, entire; Zarones et al. 2015a, in litt). There are an estimated 9 populations with more than 10,000 individuals on Guam and 4 populations with at least 261 individuals on Rota (USFWS 2023a, p. 30).

Cycas micronesica

Cycas micronesica is a gymnosperm in the cycad family (Cycadaceae) native to Guam, Rota, and tentatively Pagan. It is also found in Palau (Republic of Palau) and Yap (Federated States of Micronesia) (Keppel et al. 2008, p. 1,006; Cibrian-Jaramillo et al. 2010, pp. 2,372-2,375; Marler 2013, p. 1). *Cycas micronesica* used to be the most common understory tree in the region's limestone forests (Stone 1970, p. 65; Raulerson and Rinehart 1991, p. 4; Donnegan et al. 2004, p. 19) and it can also be found in coastal strand habitat (Marler 2013, p. 1). It was the most abundant tree on Guam forest inventory surveys in 2002 with over 1.5 million trees (Donnegan et al. 2004, entire) and was similarly common on Rota. Their numbers are declining rapidly; a significant percentage of the cycads observed on Guam and Rota are in poor health or dying. In 2015, there were an estimated 15 to 20 populations with 900,000 to 950,000 individuals on Guam, Rota, Yap, and Palau. Extrapolation of data from the Forest Inventory and Monitoring plots (Donnegan et al. 2004, pp. 16-29; Lazaro et al. 2020, pp 15, 30-39) on Guam indicate an 8.1 percent average annual rate of decline, most likely due to the cycad scale (*Aulacaspis yasumatsui*; Donnegan et al. 2004, p. 29; Lazaro et al. 2020, p. 15, JRM 2019, pp. 4-37). Application of this estimated rate of decline to the most recent population estimates and a 0.6-mile (mi) (1-kilometer (km)) population separation threshold (see page 34) for the wild plants on Guam and Rota, we estimate that in 2020, there were 344,000 (123,000 to 538,000) individuals in 11 populations on Guam and fewer than 52,133 in 4 populations on Rota (USFWS 2023b, p. 22).

Dendrobium guamense

Dendrobium guamense is an epiphyte and occasional lithophyte (i.e., plant that grows on bare rock) in the orchid family (Orchidaceae) known from native forests on Guam, Rota, Saipan, Tinian, and Aguiguan (Ames 1914, p. 14; Raulerson and Rinehart 1992, p. 98; in litt.; Costion and Lorence 2012, p. 66; Zarones et al. 2015a, in litt.; Zarones et al. 2015b, in litt.). Currently an estimated 26 populations totaling more than 13,000 individuals are distributed across the 5 islands. (USFWS 2023c, pp. 26-27).

Eugenia bryanii

Eugenia bryanii is a perennial shrub in the myrtle family (Myrtaceae) endemic to Guam, where it historically occurred on windy, exposed cliff lines along the western and eastern coasts of the island and in forest along the Pigua River (Costion and Lorence 2012, p. 82). When listed in 2015, there were fewer than 420 known individuals (USFWS 2015, entire). Recent botanical surveys have recorded more than 1,000 individuals (USFWS 2023d, p. 20).

Hedyotis megalantha

Hedyotis megalantha is a perennial herb in the coffee family (Rubiaceae) endemic to savannas on Guam. As of 2020, fewer than 800 individuals of *H. megalantha* were known to occur on southern Guam in an unknown number of populations (Costion and Lorence 2012, pp. 54, 86; Gawel et al. 2013, in litt.; USFWS 2023e, p. 27).

Heritiera longipetiolata

Heritiera longipetiolata is a tree in the hibiscus family (Malvaceae) endemic to the native forest on Guam, Rota, Saipan, and Tinian (Stone 1970, p. 420; Raulerson and Rinehart 1991, p. 94; GBIF 2019). There are an estimated 13 populations on Guam with 1,103 established plants and over 10,000 seedlings (GPEPP 2015 in litt., USFWS 2017, Demeulenaere et al. 2018 in litt., and GPEPP 2018 in litt., GPEPP 2019 in litt., and RASP 2023, p. 5-8). There are three known populations on Tinian, with 558 mature plants and 204 seedlings, but seedling survival appears low, likely due to ungulates, and few immature plants have been found. In 2020, two populations with at least 53 mature individuals and several hundred seedlings occurred on Saipan (Camacho and Micronesian Environmental Service 2002 in litt.); 1 tree remains on Rota (USFWS 2023f, p. 21).

Maesa walkeri

Maesa walkeri is a shrub or small tree in the primrose family (Primulaceae) endemic to native forests of Guam and Rota (Fosberg and Sachet 1979, pp. 368-369; M & E Pacific, Inc. 1998, pp. 31, 79; Raulerson and Rinehart 1991, p. 67; Costion and Lorence 2012, p. 84; GBIF 2019; Wagner et al. 2012). In 2020, an estimated 786 individuals were known from 5 populations. On Guam in the late-1990s, there were 3 populations consisting of 52, 43, and 7 individuals and evidence of some recruitment (M & E Pacific, Inc. 1998, pp. 31 and 79). On Rota, there were at least 684 individuals throughout the Sabana Plateau, with multiple age classes indicating successful reproduction (Harrington et al. 2012, in litt.; Gawel et al. 2013, in litt.; Liske-Clark 2015, in litt; USFWS 2023g, p. 17).

Nervilia jacksoniae

Nervilia jacksoniae is a small herb in the orchid family (Orchidaceae) endemic to Guam and Rota. As of 2020, there were an estimated 8 populations with at least 708 individuals in native limestone forest, mixed forest, and ravine forest (Harrington et al. 2012, in litt. and Zarones et al. 2015c, in litt.). On Guam, *N. jacksoniae* remains in 3 populations totaling 388 individuals (M & E Pacific, Inc. 1998, p. 58; McConnell 2020, pers. comm., USFWS 2020h, p. 31). On Rota, *N. jacksoniae* persists in 5 scattered populations with at least 320 individuals (Rinehart and Fosberg 1991, pp. 81-85; Raulerson and Rinehart 1992, p. 118; Costion and Lorence 2012, p. 67; Consortium Pacific Herbarium 2020; GBIF 2020; McConnell 2020, pers. comm.; Zarones et al. 2015c, in litt.; USFWS 2023h, p. 29).

Phyllanthus saffordii

Phyllanthus saffordii is a short-lived shrub in the Phyllanthaceae family endemic to low-growing grass and shrub communities in ecotones between forests and savannas, and between savannas and barrens, in southern Guam. *Phyllanthus saffordii* is often found in clusters of up to 20 individuals, depending on the available habitat (Demeulenaere 2020, in litt.). Although there have been no surveys focused on the distribution and abundance of *P. saffordii*, 17 potential populations with several thousand individuals (Demeulenaere 2020 in litt.) have been identified based on a 1-km (0.5-mi) separation criteria (USFWS 2023i, p. 24).

Psychotria malaspinae

Psychotria malaspinae is a shrub or small tree in the coffee family (Rubiaceae) endemic to Guam. Historically, *P. malaspinae* was known from scattered populations in the forests of northeastern and southwestern Guam (Merrill 1914, pp. 148-149; Stone 1970, pp. 554-555; Raulerson and Rinehart 1991, p. 83; Fosberg et al. 1993, pp. 111-112; Costion and Lorence 2012, pp. 54, 85-86; Wagner et al. 2012, p. 1). The most recent surveys indicate up to 12 individuals in four populations (Guam Plant Extinction Prevention Program 2015, in litt.; USFWS 2023j, p. 18).

Solanum guamense

Solanum guamense is a small shrub in the nightshade family (Solanaceae) endemic to Guam, Rota, Saipan, Tinian, Asuncion, Guguan, and Maug (Merrill 1914, pp. 139-140; Stone 1970, p. 521; Costion and Lorence 2012, p. 89). The species may be extinct; it was last documented in 1994. The last known individuals occurred on cliffs or outcrops inaccessible to ungulates in Guam's limestone forest (Perlman and Wood 1994, pp. 135–136; Stone 1970, p. 521). While in recent decades the species was only known from Guam, it may still occur on Asuncion, Guguan, Maug, and/or Farallon de Pajaros (USFWS 2023k, p. 14).

Tabernaemontana rotensis

Tabernaemontana rotensis is a small- to medium-sized tree in the dogbane family (Apocynaceae) known from limestone forests on Guam and Rota (Stone 1970, p. 485). More than 16,000 plants have been documented within 10 populations on Guam (USFWS 2020l, p. 1-15). In 2015, 9 remaining naturally-occurring individuals were found on Rota (CNMI DLNR 2015, in litt.; USFWS 2015) distributed across the western, southern, and eastern parts of the island and by 2020, 30 outplanted individuals had been planted (Manglona 2019, pers. comm.; USFWS 2023l, pp. 17, 19).

Tinospora homosepala

Tinospora homosepala is a vine in the moonseed family (Menispermaceae) historically known from forests on Guam (Merrill 1914, p. 83; Stone 1970, pp. 27, 277; Costion and Lorence 2012, pp. 92-93). Four populations with a total of 150 individuals are known, including at least 30 male plants and an unknown number of female plants (Yoshioka 2008, p. 15; Gawel et al. 2013, in litt.; NAVFAC 2021, p. 116; USFWS 2023m, p. 13).

Tuberolabium guamense

Tuberolabium guamense (*Trachoma guamense* is a synonym) is an epiphyte in the orchid family (Orchidaceae) endemic to the forests of the Mariana Islands. Recent surveys have tripled the number of wild plants known on Guam to more than 76,000 and 239 plants have been found on Rota. All age classes are found on Guam and on Rota, where individuals were documented along 6 of 18 transects surveyed in the Sabana, indicating they are successfully reproducing (Harrington et al. 2012, in litt.; Gawel et al. 2013, in litt.; Zarones et al. 2015d, in litt.; University of Guam 2019, NAVFAC 2022, pp. 108, 111; NAVFAC 2023 pp. 2, 6, and 8; USFWS 2023n, p. 26).

Animals

The nine animal species are endemic to the Mariana Islands, with the Rota blue damselfly known only from Rota, Langford's tree snail known only from Aguiguan, and the Guam tree snail known only from Guam (see Table 1). The status of habitats supporting these animal species is summarized in the Habitat Status Reports listed in Table 3.

Pacific sheath-tailed bat

The Mariana Island subspecies of the Pacific sheath-tailed bat is a small insectivore in the old-world family Emballonuridae with an extensive tropical distribution. Historically, the Pacific sheath-tailed bat occurred on Guam, Rota, Aguiguan, Tinian, and Saipan, and possibly on Anatahan and Maug (Steadman 1999, p. 321; Wiles and Worthington 2002, pp. 1-3; Wiles et al. 2011, p. 299; Lemke 1986, pp. 743-745). Surveys in 2002 to 2013 confirmed it was restricted to a single population on Aguiguan with an estimated 359 to 466 individuals in a few colonies (Wiles and Worthington 2002, p. 15; O'Shea and Valdez 2009, pp. 2-3; Wiles et al. 2011, p. 299; Oyler-McCance et al. 2013, p. 1,030). The species is nocturnal, forages in native forest habitats, and roosts during the day under or in overhanging cliffs, limestone solution caves, crevices, and lava tubes (hereafter caves); (Grant et al. 1994, pp. 134-135; O'Shea and Valdez 2009, pp. 105-108; Craig et al. 1993, p. 51; Wiles and Worthington 2002, p. 13; Wiles et al. 2011, pp. 301-303; USFWS 2023o, p. 12).

Slevin's skink

Slevin's skink, also known as the Marianas skink, is a small lizard in the family Scincidae and is the only lizard endemic to the Mariana Islands. Historically, the species has been recorded from Guam, Rota, Aguiguan, Tinian, Sarigan, Alamagan, Pagan, and Asuncion; it is currently extant on Sarigan, Alamagan, and Asuncion, and was recently rediscovered on Cocos Island off southern Guam. The species is found in leaf litter and tree debris in several forest types including native limestone, mixed-native, *Casuarina equisetifolia* (ironwood), and *Cocos nucifera* (coconut) forests (Brown and Falanruw 1972, p. 110; McCoid et al. 1995, p. 72; Berger et al. 2005, p. 175; Vogt in litt. 2007; Lardner in litt. 2013; Mathies pers comm. 2020, USFWS 2023p, p. 6).

Mariana eight-spot butterfly

The Mariana eight-spot butterfly in the family Nymphalidae is endemic to the forests of Guam and Saipan (Schreiner and Nafus 1996, p. 2; Schreiner and Nafus 1997, p. 26), although it may be extirpated from Saipan (Schreiner and Nafus 1997, p. 26). The species' habitat is closed-canopy native limestone forest with an abundance of their host plants, *Procris pedunculata* and

Elatostema calcareum (Schreiner and Nafus 1996, p. 1); caterpillars are restricted to both species. Despite surveys between 2011 and 2013 on Rota, Tinian, and Saipan, the butterfly has recently only been documented on Guam (Schreiner and Nafus 1996, p. 2; Schreiner and Nafus 1997, p. 26; Rubinoff and Haines 2012, in litt.; Rubinoff 2013 in litt.). Recent surveys across Guam confirmed the presence of the species in seven areas (Lindstrom and Benedict 2014, p. 9), but did not provide an estimated number of individuals per population (USFWS 2023q, p. 30). The population dynamics of this species are not well known, and these occupied areas may comprise between 6 and 10 populations.

Mariana wandering butterfly

The Mariana wandering butterfly in the family Nymphalidae is endemic to native limestone forests of Guam and Rota that support the species' host plant, *Maytenus thompsonii,* a small tree endemic to the Mariana Islands (Vogt and Williams 2004, p. 121; Schreiner and Nafus 1996., p. 1). The species has not been observed on Guam since 1979 and is likely extirpated from the island (Schreiner and Nafus 1996, pp. 1-2; Rubinoff 2013, in litt.). During surveys on Rota in 1995, the butterfly was recorded at only one location among the six sites surveyed (Schreiner and Nafus 1996, pp. 1-2). However, comprehensive surveys for the species have not been conducted since 1995, so its current status on Rota is unknown. This species possibly occurs on the northern islands of the archipelago where its host plant is found (Rubinoff 2013, in litt.), although no historical records exist (USFWS 2023r, p. 26).

Rota blue damselfly

The Rota blue damselfly is a small, blue-colored stream-obligate damselfly in the family Coenagrionidae endemic to the island of Rota where it was originally known only to persist in the Okgok Stream in the Talakhaya Watershed. However, the damselfly has recently been observed in a nearby ephemeral stream in the same watershed. The Talakhaya Watershed is a predominantly forested area in the southern part of the island that encompasses all the available stream habitat on Rota. The presence of several dry stream beds and intermittent streams in the Talakhaya Watershed suggests that the range of the damselfly may have been historically larger (USFWS 2023s, p. 27).

Humped tree snail

The humped tree snail in the family Partulidae is endemic to the forests of the Mariana Islands where it historically occurred on Guam, Rota, Saipan, Tinian, Aguiguan, Anatahan, Sarigan, Alamagan, and Pagan. The species occurs in cool, shaded forests (Crampton 1925, pp. 31, 61), with high humidity and reduced air movement. Based on the most recent information, the humped tree snail is extant on Guam, (Hopper and Smith 1992, p. 81; Smith et al. 2008, pp. 10, 12, 16), Saipan (Hadfield 2010, pp. 20-21), Tinian (NavFac Pacific 2014, pp. 5-5—5-7), Sarigan (Hadfield 2010, p. 21), Alamagan, (Bourquin 2002, p. 30), and Pagan (Hadfield 2010, pp. 8-14); the species appears to be extirpated from Aguiguan and Anatahan. Recent genetic work indicates that some individuals on Rota, thought to be the humped tree snail, are genetically distinct and should be considered a different species, *Partula lutaensis* (Sischo and Hadfield 2017, p.1; Sischo and Hadfield 2021, entire), which may need to be considered for listing in the future.

Langford's tree snail
Langford's tree snail in the family Partulidae is endemic to the forests of Aguiguan. Although little is known about the species, like other partulid snails in the Marianas, it presumably occurred in cool, shaded forests (Crampton 1925, pp. 31, 61), with high humidity and reduced air movement. It has not been observed in the wild since 1992, when one individual was observed on the island's northwestern terrace (Berger et al. 2005, p. 154). Surveys conducted in 2006 and 2008 found only shells of Langford's tree snail (Smith 2013, p. 14; USFWS 2023u, p. 16).

Guam tree snail
The Guam tree snail in the family Partulidae is endemic to the forests of Guam and prefers cool, shaded forests with high humidity and reduced air movement. Prior to its listing in 2015, there were approximately 20 known populations, but extensive surveys in 2019 identified more than 50 populations. While some may support only a few individuals, others likely number in the thousands (Fiedler pers. comm. 2019, entire; USFWS 2023v, p. 5).

Fragile tree snail
The fragile tree snail in the family Partulidae is known from the forests of Guam and Rota and prefers cool, shaded forests with high humidity and reduced air movement. Historically, the fragile tree snail was known from 13 populations on Guam and 1 population on Rota (Crampton 1925, p. 30; Kondo 1970, pp. 86-87). As of 2023, eight populations are known from Guam (Fiedler pers. comm. 2019) and most are small and narrowly distributed. On Rota, the habitat supporting the only known population located on the Sabana was converted to agricultural fields, and no living snails were found during surveys in 1995; however, in 1996, a previously unknown population was discovered in a different location roughly 1 mi (1.6 km) south of the Sabana in the Talakhaya area (Bauman 1996, pp. 18, 21).

Threats
Section 4 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1533) and its implementing regulations (50 CFR part 424) set forth the procedures for adding species to the Federal Lists of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants (Lists). A species may be determined to be endangered or threatened due to one or more of the five factors described in section 4(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range; (2) overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes; (3) disease or predation; (4) the inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; and (5) other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence.

The most important threats to the 23 species herein are habitat loss and degradation due to development, invasive animals and plants, typhoons, and climate change, which is increasing typhoon frequency and intensity as well as changing precipitation and temperature (USFWS 2015, Willsey et al. 2020, Frager et al. 2020, Polhemus and Richardson 2020, USFWS 2023a – USFWS 2023w). In addition, 8 of the 14 listed plants and 8 of the 9 listed animals are threatened by predation or herbivory by invasive animals. Inadequate regulatory mechanisms affect the conservation of all 23 species and all species except for 4 plant species face additional species-specific threats. Inadequate regulatory mechanisms allow development, human-caused wildfires, ungulate presence across landscapes, and the inadvertent and purposeful movement of invasive species (USFWS 2015, Willsey et al. 2020, Frager et al. 2020, Polhemus and Richardson 2020,

USFWS 2023 a-w). Species-specific threats include herbivory by introduced ungulates and invasive invertebrates, predation by invasive animals, competition with invasive introduced species, as well as an increase in vulnerability to threats because of small numbers of individuals and/or populations (USFWS 2020a-w). Threats are summarized and organized in Table 4 by the five factors and discussed in detail below. The distribution of introduced animals across the archipelago (Table 5) illustrates the complexity of conserving species across islands with different threats. Additional information about specific threats are in the final listing rules (USFWS 2015; USFWS 2020) and Species Biological Reports for each species (USFWS 2023 a-w).

Table 4. Summary of habitats and threats[1] of the 23 species in this recovery plan, organized by the five listing factors[2].

Species	Habitat	Listing Factor A						Factor B	Factor C		Factor D	Factor E
		Agricultural and urban development, military training	Invasive animals	Invasive plants		Typhoons	Climate change	Over-utilization	Predation or herbivory by invasive vertebrates	Predation or herbivory by invasive invertebrates or disease	Inadequate existing regulatory mechanisms	Other species-specific threats
				Invasion of intact habitat	Invasion after wildfire							
PLANTS												
Bulbophyllum guamense	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓	✓	✓	✓		U$^{(P)}$	S	✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, W$^{(P)}$
Cycas micronesica	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓	✓	✓	✓		U	CAS and others ✓✓	✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, ORD, W$^{(P)}$
Dendrobium guamense	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓	✓	✓	✓		U$^{(P)}$	S	✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, W$^{(P)}$
Eugenia bryanii	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓		✓	✓		R, U		✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, RUST$^{(P)}$
Hedyotis megalantha	Savanna	✓	U, R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓	✓✓	✓	✓		U$^{(P)}$		✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, REC, W$^{(P)}$
Heritiera longipetiolata	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓		✓	✓		R, U	D, I	✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, ORD, W$^{(P)}$
Maesa walkeri	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓	✓	✓	✓		U$^{(P)}$		✓✓	BTS$^{(P)}$, CC$^{(P)}$, LC, W$^{(P)}$
Nervilia jacksoniae	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓	✓	✓	✓		U$^{(P)}$	S	✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, W$^{(P)}$
Phyllanthus saffordii	Savanna	✓	U, R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓	✓✓	✓	✓		U$^{(P)}$		✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, REC, W$^{(P)}$
Psychotria malaspinae	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓	✓)	✓	✓		U		✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, LN ✓✓, BTS$^{(P)}$, W$^{(P)}$
Solanum guamense	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓		✓	✓		U		✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, LN ✓✓
Tabernaemontana rotensis	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓	✓	✓	✓		U$^{(P)}$	I	✓✓	BTS$^{(P)}$, CC$^{(P)}$, LC, V, W$^{(P)}$
Tinospora homosepala	Native Forest		U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓		✓	✓		U$^{(P)}$		✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, LN ✓✓, W$^{(P)}$
Tuberolabium guamense	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A$^{(P)}$	✓	✓✓	✓	✓		U$^{(P)}$	S	✓✓	CC$^{(P)}$, LC, W$^{(P)}$

Species	Habitat	Listing Factor A						Factor B	Factor C		Factor D	Factor E
		Agricultural and urban development, military training	Invasive animals	Invasive plants		Typhoons	Climate change	Over-utilization	Predation or herbivory by invasive vertebrates	Predation or herbivory by invasive invertebrates or disease	Inadequate existing regulatory mechanisms	Other species-specific threats
				Invasion of intact habitat	Invasion after wildfire							
MAMMAL												
Pacific sheath-tailed bat (*Emballonura semicaudata rotensis*)	Native Forest, Cave	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS	✓		✓	✓		R, BTS, ML		✓✓	C, CC, P, LN ✓✓, RD
REPTILE												
Slevin's skink (*Emoia slevini*)	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A(P)	✓		✓	✓		R, C, BTS (✓✓), Sh	A(P)	✓✓	CC, LC, LN✓✓
INVERTEBRATES												
Mariana eight-spot butterfly (*Hypolimnas octocula marianensis*)	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, S, A(P)	✓		✓	✓			A✓✓, PW✓✓	✓✓	CC, LC, LN ✓✓, W(P)
Mariana wandering butterfly (*Vagrans egistina*)	Native Forest		U (✓✓), BTS, R, S, A(P)	✓		✓	✓			A, PW,	✓✓	CC, LN ✓✓, W(P)
Rota blue damselfly (*Ischnura luta*)	Stream	✓	U (✓✓), BTS	✓	✓(P)	✓	✓✓		Fi, Am		✓✓	CC, W, LN ✓✓, WE ✓✓
Humped tree snail (*Partula gibba*)	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A(P)	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓		R, Sh	F (✓✓), PS (✓✓), A(P)	✓✓	CC, LC, LN ✓✓, W(P)
Langford's tree snail (*Partula langfordi*)	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS	✓		✓	✓		R, Sh	F (✓✓), PS (✓✓), A(P)	✓✓	CC, LN ✓✓, W(P)
Guam tree snail (*Partula radiolata*)	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A(P)	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓		R, Sh	F (✓✓), PS (✓✓), A(P)	✓✓	CC, LC, W(P)
Fragile tree snail (*Samoana fragilis*)	Native Forest	✓✓	U (✓✓), R, BTS, A(P)	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓		R, Sh	F (✓✓), PS (✓✓), A(P)	✓✓	CC, LC, LN ✓✓, W(P)

[1] Threats to the species and their habitat include direct and indirect threats. A = ants, Am = predatory amphibians, BTS = brown treesnake (includes indirect effects), C= cats (*Felis catus*), CAS = cycad *Aulacaspis* scale (*Aulacaspis yasumatsui*) , an introduced cycad specialist armored scale insect, CC = climate change, D = disease, F = Manokwari flatworm (*Platydemus manokwari*), Fi = predatory fish, I=invertebrate herbivore, LC = land clearing, LN = limited numbers, ML = monitor lizard, ORD = ordnance, P = pesticide, PS = predatory snails, PW = parasitic wasps, R = rats, RD = roost disturbance, REC = recreational vehicles, RUST = *Austropuccinia psidii* (myrtle rust, pathogen), S = slugs, Sh = shrew, U = ungulates, V = vandalism, W = wildfire, WE = municipal and agricultural water extraction from groundwater and diversion and harvesting directly from streams.

[2] Listing Factors: A = The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of the species' habitat or range. B = Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes. C = Disease or predation. D = Inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms. E = Other natural or manmade factors affecting the species' continued existence.

✓✓ indicate most pressing known threats to the species

(P) = potential threat/instances not yet documented, ✓(H) = historical threat

Table 5. Animal species that threaten some or all of the 23 species, or their habitat, by island.

Island	Pigs (*Sus scrofa*)	Goats (*Capra aegagrus hircus*)	Cattle (*Bos spp.*)	Water buffalo (*Bubalus bubalis*)	Deer (*Rusa marianna*)	Rats (*Rattus spp.*)	Asian House Shrew (*Suncus murinus*)	Monitor lizard (*Varanus tsukamotoi*)	Brown treesnake (*Boiga irregularis*; BTS)	Invertebrates [1]
Guam	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓*	✓	A, W, F, S, CAS
Rota	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓*		A, W, F, S, CAS
Aguiguan		✓				✓	✓	✓*		F
Tinian			✓			✓	✓	✓*		A, CAS, F
Saipan						✓	✓	✓*	✓**	A, W, F, S
Farallon de Medinilla						✓				
Anatahan						✓		✓*		
Sarigan						✓		✓*		F***
Guguan						✓				
Alamagan	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓*		F
Pagan	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓*		F
Agrihan	✓	✓				✓		✓*		
Asuncion						✓				
Maug						✓				
Farallon de Pajaros										

[1] A = ants, CAS = cycad *Aulacaspis* scale (*Aulacaspis yasumatsui*), an introduced cycad specialist armored scale insect, F = Manokwari flatworm (*Platydemus manokwari*), S = slugs, W = parasitic wasps

* Threat affects only listed animals.

** Confirmed sightings of BTS have occurred on Saipan; however, a BTS population is not known to be established.

*** Sightings of flatworm have not occurred on Sarigan, but surveys have not been conducted

The following sections summarize the listing factors still affecting the species and contain updated information as available since the final listing rule.

Factor A (*Present or threatened destruction, modification or curtailment of its habitat or range*)

The 23 species are threatened by habitat loss and degradation from development, typhoons, invasive animals, invasive plants, wildfire, pesticide use, and climate change. Habitat clearing for development is among the greatest threats to the recovery of the 23 species. The archipelago's native habitats have been lost and degraded by residential, urban, and military development, ranching, clearing for agriculture, military training activities, and bombing and ground combat during World War II (Ohba 1994, pp. 17, 28, 54–69; Mueller-Dombois and Fosberg 1998, p. 242; Berger et al. 2005, pp. 45, 105, 110, 218, 347, 350). More than 20 percent of Saipan and Guam and approximately 6 percent of Tinian and Rota are developed (Spies et al. 2020, p. 7). The total loss of native forest on Guam and Rota since human settlement is estimated to be 83 and 53 percent, respectively (Willsey et al. 2020, pp. 13-18).

The Mariana Islands occur in the world's most active typhoon basin, the western Pacific, and typhoons are a major threat to the 23 species. Typhoons have direct and indirect effects to native species and the habitats on which they depend. Intense typhoon winds defoliate and uproot trees and/or break their primary branches and trunks. Forests can take several years to recover and during this time are susceptible to encroachment from invasive trees, shrubs, and vines (Marler 2001, p. 1). After typhoons, more light penetrates forests because of damage to or loss of vegetation, which benefits invasive plant species, which in turn alter basic soil hydrology and nutrient cycling (Willsey et al. 2020, p. 18; Polhemus and Richardson 2020, pp. 3-4; Kerr, 2020, entire). "Dry" typhoons, which are characterized by very little rainfall, carry salt spray inland, which causes many tree species to drop their leaves within 2 days of a storm and can result in tree mortality (Kerr 2000, p. 895). Tree mortality when followed by a drought can increase the likelihood and intensity of wildfires (Aydlett 2017 in litt.). Such catastrophic events can lead to the direct loss of a listed species or degradation/loss of the habitats needed for their conservation. Species with small populations or those with narrow distributions are particularly vulnerable to such catastrophic events.

Invasive animals including ungulates, the brown treesnake (*Boiga irregularis*), rodents, and invasive ants degrade native forest, savanna, and stream habitats, which provide habitat for the 23 species. Many native plants and animals from the Mariana Islands, as well as other Pacific islands, lack competitive and predator avoidance mechanisms because they evolved in the absence of invasive plants and animals (Fritts and Rodda 1998 p. 115). With few exceptions, invasive species are non-native and have been introduced to the Mariana Islands by humans.

Ruminant ungulates including Philippine deer (*Rusa marianna*), goats (*Capra aegagrus hircus*), pigs (*Sus scrofa*), cattle (*Bos spp.*), and water buffalo (*Bubalus bubalis*) degrade habitat on Pacific Islands by preventing regeneration of native plants via browsing, grazing, and trampling (Stone et al. 1992, p. 666-702; Leopold and Hess 2017, entire; Latham et al. 2017, entire; Gawel et al. 2018, entire; Manglona pers. comm. 2019, 2021). Mortality of palatable native plants increases availability of habitat for colonization by invasive plants and can lead to barren land and extensive soil erosion (Diong 1982; LaRosa 1992; Stone et al. 1992; Tep and Gaines 2003, and Liddle et al. 2006, in JRM 2019, p. 4-30). In the Mariana Islands, browse lines are visible

where palatable native tree and understory vegetation is removed as high as these invasive animals can reach (Bruns 2019, pers. comm; Rieffanaugh 2021, pers. comm.). On Guam, centuries of deer browsing preferences have shaped species composition of forests (Gawel et al. 2018, p. 9). Ungulates also facilitate the spread of invasive plants by transporting seeds and plant parts (Cuddihy and Stone 1990, pp. 63–64) although on Guam, pigs may be aiding in the dispersal of native seeds where native seed dispersers have been extirpated by the brown treesnake (Gawel et al. 2018, pp. 5-10). As of 2023, 2,286 acres (ac) (925 hectares (ha)) of native forest on Guam are fenced to exclude ungulates and ungulates have been removed from approximately 65 percent of these areas (Burt pers. comm. 2023; Kedziora pers comm. 2023; Loerzel pers comm. 2023; Mizerek pers. comm., 2023). A 600-ac (243-ha) ungulate-fenced area in the Mason Live-Fire Training Range Complex is also slated for ungulate removal (Loerzel pers. comm. 2023). On Rota, individual *Serianthes nelsonii* and *Osmoxylon mariannensis* trees are fenced to prevent ungulates from impacting them and their seeds and seedlings (Manglona pers. comm. 2019, 2021) and fencing is used to minimize the threat of domestic goats and cattle escaping and establishing feral populations (Bruns pers. comm. 2019).

The invasive brown treesnake threatens the persistence of native habitats indirectly via the elimination of vertebrate seed dispersers and pollinators. Introduced to Guam in approximately 1949, it caused the extinction of a majority of Guam's endemic birds. The brown treesnake poses an ongoing threat to the persistence of the habitats needed for the recovery of the 23 species (Rodda et al. 1997, p. 565-567; Fritts and Rodda 1998, pp. 115, 131; Savidge 1987, entire; Perry and Morton 1999, p. 137; Rodda and Savidge 2007, p. 311; Wandrag et al. 2015, p. 4-6). Almost three quarters of Guam's native trees depend on birds to eat their fruits and disperse their seeds (Rogers et al. 2009, in litt.). Seeds falling under parent trees experience reduced germination and survival due to conspecific competition and increased exposure to pathogens and herbivores (Rogers et al. 2017, p. 3; Nathan and Muller-Landau 2000, p. 278-283; Muller-Landau 2001, p. 165-178). In addition, germination of some seeds is reduced unless seed coats are digested by passing through the gut of a bird (Rogers et al. 2009, in litt.). On Guam, the only remaining native avian frugivore is the Micronesian starling (*Aplonis opaca*); 86 percent of species in the seedbank on Guam had a conspecific adult plant nearby compared to 33 percent on Rota and 39 percent on Saipan, which still supports a relatively intact avian frugivore community (Wandrag et al 2015, p. 6). In the absence of avian seed dispersers on Guam, 94 percent of *Psychotria* seeds and 95 percent of *Premna* seeds fall beneath the parent's canopy compared with 26 and 40 percent on islands with avian seed dispersers (Rogers et al 2017, p. 3). On Saipan, the median distance of the seeds of 15 tree species dispersed by 5 bird species was 184 feet (ft) (56 meters (m)) (Rehm et al. 2019, pp. 1, 5). On Guam, the extirpation/extinction of native seed dispersers due to the brown treesnake is reducing recruitment and forest regeneration as well as the spatial distribution of native tree species and species richness (Rogers et al. 2017, entire). The potential introduction of the brown treesnake to other islands poses an ongoing threat to all native habitats addressed in this recovery plan.

Rats have caused plant and animal extinctions across Pacific islands directly through predation and indirectly by altering native habitats by reducing native plant reproduction and vigor by eating fruits, seeds, flowers, stems, leaves, roots, and other plant parts (Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 69; Campbell and Atkinson 1999, in Atkinson and Atkinson 2000, pp. 23-24; Shiels et al. 2014, pp., 152-159; Shiels and Drake 2015, p. 1; Duron et al. 2017, p. 764). Rats are considered

a major predator of partulid snails, Slevin's skink, and potentially the Pacific sheath-tailed bat (USFWS 2023o, 2023p, 2023t, 2023u, 2023v, 2023w). Three rat species are found throughout the Mariana Islands: the Polynesian (*Rattus exulans*), the Norway (*R. norvegicus*), and a newly introduced southeast Asian *Rattus* species, originally thought to be *R. diardii* (synonymous with *R. tanezumi*) (Kuroda 1938 in Wiewel et al. 2009, p. 208; Wiewel et al. 2009, pp. 210, 214–216). One or more of these species are present on all 15 islands of the Mariana archipelago (Wiewel et al. 2009, pp. 205– 222; Kessler 2011, p. 320). At the same time, rats may serve an important seed disperser role where native seed dispersers have been extirpated (Shiels 2005, p. 142-145). On Guam, rodent populations may be suppressed by the brown treesnake, and threats to listed species from rats are expected to increase as brown treesnake suppression is implemented.

Invasive ants recently introduced to, or those at risk of being introduced to, the Mariana Islands are a potential threat to the habitat of the 23 species. Invasive ant species also prey on vertebrates and invertebrate eggs, pupae, larvae, and adults (Wild 2014, p. 1). Several species also facilitate plant pests such as aphids, white flies and scale insects, which feed on plant sap and secrete sugar-rich sticky liquid that the ants eat (Hawai‘i Invasive Species Council 2021, p. 1). Many invasive ants including big-headed ants (*Pheidole megacephala*) and Argentine ants (*Linepithema humile*) eat a wide variety of plants and animals and they would be expected to prey on the listed vertebrates and invertebrates in the Mariana Islands (Farmer 2017, p.1). Aggressive invasive ants, defending nectar, ward off, and may prey on, invertebrate and vertebrate plant pollinators (Lach 2008, entire; Hanna et al 2015, pp. 222-228; SWCA 2020, pp. 9, 11, and Appendix C; Fuster et al. 2020, pp. 957-966; Unmi et al. 2021, pp. 1-5). Although, where native invertebrate and vertebrate pollinators have dwindled, some non-native invertebrates may serve in some capacity as plant pollinators (Aslan et al. 2019, pp. 318-321). Little fire ants (*Wasmannia auropunctata*) sting the skin and eyes of vertebrates causing blindness (Hawai‘i Invasive Species Council 2021, p. 1) and occur in many areas on Guam; there is the potential for this species to be moved to other locations on Guam and to other islands via green waste and potted plants. Yellow crazy ants (*Anoplolepis gracilipes*), which are becoming established on Rota and Saipan, and may occur on Tinian and Aguiguan, spray formic acid on nesting seabirds, causing deformities that affect vertebrate breathing and vision and cause seabirds to abandon the site (Plentovich et al. 2017, pp. 1, 3-7). Other invasive ants already introduced to the Mariana Islands include the ghost ant (*Tapinoma melanocephalum*), dwarf pedicel ants (*Tapinoma minutum*), tropical fire ants (*Solenopsis geminata*), white-footed ants (*Technomyrmex albipes*), and bi-colored trailing ants (*Monomorium floricola*). Invasive ants are likely to directly or indirectly affect the 23 species listed species and these species and their habitats may not be able to persist in areas where ants disrupt ecosystem function by harassing, injuring, or killing native plant pollinators and vertebrates, including seed dispersers.

The native flora of the Mariana Islands consists of approximately 500 taxa, 10 percent of which are endemic. Over 100 plant taxa have been introduced to the Mariana Islands and at least one-third of these are invasive (Stone 1970, pp. 18–21; Mueller-Dombois and Fosberg 1998, pp. 242–243, 249, 262–263; Costion and Lorence 2012, pp. 51–100). The greatest risk posed by invasive plant species is the displacement of native plants. Invasive plants indirectly affect the 23 species by degrading the habitat on which they depend and can directly outcompete the 14 listed plants. The establishment of invasive plants has led to significant changes to the native habitats

in the Mariana Islands (Willsey, et al. 2020, p. 17) by reducing the availability of light, soil, water, and nutrients that native forest and savanna species require.

Because of rapid post-fire establishment of invasive grasses, wildfires in the Mariana Islands convert native forest and diverse native savanna to non-native grasslands and the grass provides fuel that increases the probability and intensity of subsequent fires (i.e., the grass-fire cycle) (Smith 1985, pp. 180–181 and 217-218; Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 74; D'Antonio and Vitousek 1992, p. 73; Ohba 1994, pp. 17, 28, 54– 69; Vitousek et al. 1997, p. 6-9; Mueller-Dombois and Fosberg 1998, pp. 242–243, 249, 262–263; Berger et al. 2005, pp. 45, 105, 110, 218, 347, 350; Willsey, et al. 2020, p. 17). Wildfires burn an average of 1.6 to 2.4 percent of the land area in the Northern Mariana Islands and 3.5 to 4.0 percent of land area of Guam annually (Minton 2006, p. 23; Dendy 2019 in litt.; Trauernicht and Kunz 2019, p. 1); in comparison, only 1 percent of California's land areas burns annually (Chodosh, 2018, p. 1). Wildfires in the Mariana Islands are primarily human-caused (Minton 2006, p. 3; Dendy 2019 in litt.; Demeulenaere 2020 in litt.). During severe droughts, which typically occur from February through June and during El Niño years (Aydlett 2017 in litt.), fires that are otherwise limited to grassy areas can burn into native forest and shrubland (Athens and Ward 2004, p. 18; Greenlee 2010 in litt., entire; Kunz 2018 p. 1; Dendy 2019, entire; Trauernicht and Kunz 2019 p. 1; Trauernicht and Chimera 2020, p. 1). Where native trees and shrubs are killed by fire, grasses can outcompete native plant seedlings for light, water, and nutrients (Fosberg 1960, p. 40; Stone 1970, p. 184; D'Antonio, and Vitousek 1992, p. 68-70; Minton 2006 p. 21, pp. 25-29; NRCS 2011, p. 1; Johnson 2012, p. 27; Leary 2018, p. 3-4). Areas converted to grass facilitate the spread of future fires and reduce the area of remaining native forest each successive dry season (Fujioka and Fujii 1980 in Cuddihy and Stone 1990, p. 93; D'Antonio and Vitousek 1992, pp. 70, 73–74; Tunison et al. 2002, p. 122). The majority of fires on Guam have occurred in the southern half of the island where they are routinely set by humans (Minton 2006 pp. 3, 20) and steep slopes make controlling fires difficult. Southern Guam was historically dominated by native ravine forest but by 2020, the area of ravine forest was reduced by more than 50 percent due to human-caused fires (Minton 2006, p. 23-30; Greelee 2010, entire; Camacho Fejeran 2021, p. 22). As ungulate browsing can remove much of the native forest's understory fuel, removal of ungulates from native forest can increase the site's vulnerability to the spread of wildfire. This highlights the need for fire management plans that minimize fuel loads, especially during periods or drought and the dry season to be included in management plans for ungulate exclosures (Bruns 2019, pers. comm).

Pesticides, when used in or adjacent to native habitat, can reduce pollinators needed for native plant reproduction (Kearns et al. 1998, entire). Where typhoons defoliate and topple native forest, invasive vines can grow in dense patches, smothering regeneration of the native forest by outcompeting native plants (Marler, 2001, p. 264, Liske-Clark 2015, in litt.; Willsey, et al. 2020, p. 17).

The habitats needed to support the 23 species are susceptible in varying degrees to the anticipated effects of climate change. Future sea surface temperature increases are expected to result in increased typhoon intensity in the Mariana Islands (Camargo 2013, p. 9896; Kossin et al. 2014, p. 350; Zhou et al 2019, entire; Grecni et al. 2021, p. 5), which is expected to result in further degradation and loss of habitat for the 23 species by favoring invasive, disturbance-

tolerant, species. At the same time, poleward migration of typhoon tracks (Lin et al. 2023, entire) may result in decreased typhoon frequency in the Mariana Islands. More extreme El Nino events (Grecni et al. 2021, p. 23) may exacerbate wildfire threat, alter stream flows, and change microclimate and suitability of sites for persistence of the habitats needed to support the 23 species. Anticipated sea level rise and coastal erosion (Grecni et al. 2021, p. 27) are expected to remove low-lying and coastal sites from future terrestrial species conservation use in addition to, synergistically with typhoons (Grecni et al. 2021, pp. 32-33), complicating logistics of conservation efforts. Current models indicate, under a very low greenhouse gas emissions scenario (shared socio-economic pathway (SSP) 1 to 1.9), global mean sea level, relative to the 1995 to 2014 period, is likely to rise 0.49 to 0.75 ft (0.15 to 0.23 m) by 2050 and 0.91 to 1.8 ft (0.28 to 0.55 m) by 2100, while under the very high greenhouse gas emissions scenario (SSP 5 to 8.5) global mean sea level would be expected to rise 0.66 to .95 ft (0.20 to 0.29 m) by 2050 and 2.07 to 3.31 ft (0.63 to 1.01 m) by 2100 (IPCC 2023, p. 45). Sea level rise in the Mariana Islands is expected to be 15 to 20 percent higher than the global average (Grecni et al 2021, p. 23). Low-lying coastal areas will become uninhabitable to the terrestrial listed species and their habitats.

Factor B (*Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational purposes*)

At present, overutilization is not known to be a threat to any of the 23 species. Partulid snail shells were used historically as jewelry and decorations by the Chamorro people (Crampton 1925 p. 1), but this practice appears to have ceased around the time of World War II.

Factor C (*Disease and Predation*)

The 14 plants and 8 of the 9 animals are directly threatened by herbivorous vertebrates and invertebrates or predation by invasive animals including ungulates, rodents, the brown treesnake, ants, wasps, the New Guinea flatworm (*Platydemus manokwari*), predatory snails, and slugs (Table 4) and *Heritiera longipetiolata* seedlings are affected by a leaf spot disease (Gutierrez in litt. 2023). The 23 species did not evolve with these herbivores and predators nor leaf spot disease and lack defense mechanisms against these introduced species. Invasive species are the primary driver of island extinctions; they have been implicated in 86 percent of extinctions of island species since 1500 A.D. and in 2017, significantly reduced populations of 596 species of birds, mammals, and reptiles (Spatz et al 2017, p. 1). Ongoing introductions and spread of disease and invasive herbivores and predators to the Mariana Islands are expected to continue.

Introduced ungulates trample and crush individual plants and animals. Ungulates injure or kill listed plants by eating seedlings, shoots, or young plants before they can become established or tolerate herbivory.

Invasive rodents and shrews have caused declines, and in many cases extirpation of island plant and animal species (Cuddihy and Stone 1990, pp. 68-70). Rats eat seeds, flowers, stems, leaves, roots, and other plant parts (Atkinson and Atkinson 2000, p. 23) and can significantly affect regeneration. Vast lowland palm forests throughout Hawai‘i and on Rapa Nui (Easter Island) have been lost because rats ate their flowers, seeds, and seedling, preventing them from regenerating (Hawai‘i DLNR 2020, p. 1; Hunt 2006, p. 416-419). Rodents and the Asian house shrew are known predators of partulid snails and may depredate Slevin’s skinks (USFWS 2023p, 2023t, 2023u, 2023v, 2023w).

The introduction of the brown treesnake has caused significant ecological damage to Guam including the extirpation/extinction of many of the island's birds and other small animal species (see above). *Maesa walkeri*, *Psychotria malaspinae*, and *Tabernaemontana rotensis* have fleshy fruits and likely relied on now-extirpated frugivores for dispersal. Thus, the spatial distribution of these species may be affected by the brown treesnake. Survey data gathered between 1976 and 1998 indicated that the brown treesnake had severely affected 2 native bat species, 4 native lizard species, and 13 (59 percent) of Guam's 22 native bird species (Wiles et al. 2003, p. 1,358; Rodda and Savidge 2007, p. 307). The brown treesnake also likely contributed to the extirpation of Slevin's skink on Guam (Wiles et al. 2003, p. 1,358). The snake is also a potential predator of the Pacific sheath-tailed bat (USFWS 2023o, p. 21).

Invasive herbivorous invertebrates including slugs and insects directly or indirectly impact seven of the listed plants. The insects include the cycad aulacaspis scale (*Aulacaspis yasumatsui*), a leaf miner (*Erechthias* sp.), and the cycad blue butterfly (*Chilades pandava*) as well as a native longhorn beetle (*Dihammus marianarum*), all of which kill or limit the growth and reproduction of *Cycas micronesica* individuals (USFWS 2023b, p. 10). Slugs are a threat to the plant species addressed herein as well as to their native habitats. Herbivory by slugs can result in the death of individual plants, especially seedlings (Joe and Daehler 2008, entire). In addition to the direct effects to the listed plant species, slugs feed on the host plants on which the larvae of both the Mariana eight-spot and Mariana wandering butterflies depend. The Cuban slug (*Veronicella cubensis*) has been known on Rota since 1996, occurs in large numbers, and is a pest to agricultural and ornamental crops (Badilles et al. 2010, entire). This species is known to forage on orchids and thus they may threaten the four species of orchids addressed herein.

Ant predation is a known threat to the Mariana eight-spot butterfly and Mariana wandering butterfly and is a potential threat to all species addressed in this plan except for the Pacific sheath-tailed bat. Ants eat butterfly eggs (Schreiner and Nafus 1996, p. 3; Rubinoff in litt. 2013) and possibly caterpillars. Dwarf pedicel ants, tropical fire ants, white-footed ants, bi-colored trailing ants, and little fire ants all feed on vertebrate and invertebrate eggs, pupae, larvae, and adults (Wild 2014, p. 1). In the Mariana Islands, ants commonly occur in large, potentially high-density colonies (Schreiner and Nafus 1996, pp. 3-4).

Egg parasitism by wasps is a significant threat to the Mariana eight-spot butterfly. Wasps parasitize native insects, laying their eggs inside the native insect's egg or caterpillar where the hatching wasp will feed on and kill the native insect. Two species of parasitoid wasp, *Telenomus* sp. (NCN) and *Ooencyrtus* sp. (NCN), have been documented emerging from Mariana eight-spot butterfly eggs. Both are apparently native to Guam; thus, the butterfly is likely adapted to some level of parasitism (Moore 2013, p. 9). However, Schreiner and Nafus (1996, p. 3) found rates of Mariana eight-spot butterfly egg parasitism as high as 86 percent, which may be higher than historical levels and is likely inhibiting the recovery of the species (Rubinoff and Holland 2018, p. 222).

The New Guinea flatworm and introduced predatory snails are considered the most significant threat to the partulid snail species (USFWS 2023t, p.15). The flatworm can climb trees when they are wet and locate arboreal snails via scent and has contributed to the extirpation of several snail populations (Sugiura and Yamaura 2009, p. 737). The introduced rosy wolf-snail (*Euglandina rosea*) is also a potential predator of partulid snails (Hopper and Smith 1992, p. 77).

Although predator dynamics for the Rota blue damselfly are unknown, many damselfly groups found on Pacific islands are naïve to predatory fish and insects due to their lack of evolutionary history with these predators (USFWS 2023s, p. 51). Therefore, the introduction and/or proliferation of an invasive predator on Rota could severely affect the recovery of the Rota blue damselfly.

Factor D (*Inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms*)

Inadequate local regulatory mechanisms or failure to enforce these regulations, allows for the development and degradation of habitats occupied by the 23 species and do not address biosecurity and the spread of invasive species. This inadequacy threatens the 23 species and the habitats on which they depend. Although these species are federally listed, Commonwealth and Territorial laws have not been updated to include all 23 species, so under local law, take is not prohibited during development and other activities. In addition, laws do not prohibit or fail to penalize the intentional introduction of ungulates or intentional ignition of wildfires.

Factor E (*Other natural or manmade factors affecting the species' continued existence*)

Similar to the manner in which these stressors affect their habitats, the 23 listed species themselves are vulnerable to threats detailed in Factor A, above. Drought-related wildfires (as detailed in Factor A, above) may also result in injury or death of individuals of all of the listed plant species with the exception of *Eugenia bryanii* and *Solanum guamense* (which grow in sparsely-vegetated outcrop areas) and to the seven listed invertebrate species. Additionally, 12 of the 23 species are especially vulnerable to threats because of their small populations or limited distributions. Two plant species are threatened by direct and indirect impacts from use of military ordnance (ball ammunition use at firing ranges has the potential to injure plant leaves and stems), one plant is threatened by vandalism, two plants are threatened by off-road recreational vehicles, one plant is vulnerable to a non-native rust pathogen, the Pacific sheath-tailed bat is directly threatened by disturbance of roosting caves as well as being vulnerable to pesticide use, and the Rota blue damselfly is vulnerable to streamflow alterations from water harvesting for human use (Table 4) (USFWS 2023a – 2023w).

Three of the plant species: *Solanum guamense*, a species with no known individuals; *Tinospora homosepala*, a species with an unknown number of females; and *Psychotria malaspinae*, and all the animal species are especially vulnerable to demographic and environmental stochasticity due to their limited numbers (see Table 1). All else being equal, species with small populations are at greater risk of extinction than species with larger populations for the following reasons: (1) reduced reproduction due to lack of reproductive opportunities (e.g., reduced likelihood an insect pollinator will encounter multiple conspecific plants, reduced amount of pollen available for wind-pollinated species, for animals, the low probability of encountering conspecifics) or inbreeding depression (Darwin 1859 Chapter 3, p. 1; Lacy 1997, entire; Crnokrak and Roff 1999, pp. 262-263; Frankham 1998, entire; Frankham et al. 2002, pp. 24-38; and Frankham 2005 p.133); (2) reduced genetic variability or allele loss due to bottlenecks, which can lead to reduced resiliency, especially in changing environments (Stebbins 1950, entire); and (3) the loss of all remaining individuals of a species by a single catastrophic event such as a typhoon, drought, flood, or wildfire.

A potential threat to *Eugenia bryanii* would be the introduction of the *Austropuccinia psidii* (myrtle rust) pathogen to the Mariana Islands. This rust fungus infects species in the Myrtaceae family. It is wind dispersed and has spread throughout the Pacific, including Hawai‘i, Japan, Indonesia, New Caledonia, New Zealand, and Australia (Pegg et al. 2014, entire). It can also be introduced through the shipment of infected plants (Loope 2010, entire). After arrival to Hawai‘i in 2005, all populations and trees of the endangered *Eugenia koolauensis* were infected by 2006, and damage was evaluated as severe to lethal. All *E. koolauensis* populations are currently in decline, with several having less than 10 percent of their numbers remaining and a couple populations have been extirpated (OANRP 2014, p. 275). If *A. psidii* becomes established on Guam, it could result in the mortality of *E. bryanii* individuals and drastically reduce the species' resiliency.

Human activity near or in roost sites used by the Pacific sheath-tailed bat has contributed to the species' decline throughout its range. Recreation and guano mining are examples of human activities that disturb roosting bats (Grant et al. 1994, p. 135; Tarburton 2002, p. 106; Wiles and Worthington 2002, p. 17; Palmeirim et al. 2005, pp. 63, 66; Malotaux 2012a in litt.; Malotaux 2012b in litt.). Feral goats use caves on Aguiguan for shelter, which disturbs colonies of the endangered Mariana swiftlet (*Aerodramus vanikorensis bartschi*) and likely also disturbs roosting Pacific sheath-tailed bats (Wiles and Worthington 2002, p. 17; Cruz et al. 2008, p. 243; Scanlon 2015, in litt.). Roosts facilitate complex social interactions, provide protection from inclement weather, help bats conserve energy, and minimize predation risk (Kunz and Lumsden 2003, p. 3). Thus, any disturbance, especially that which results in bats leaving their roosts, likely cause bats to incur elevated energetic costs, physiological stress, and potentially increased predation. Pesticide use in the vicinity of bat foraging and roosting habitat may have been one factor leading to the decline and eventual extirpation of the Pacific sheath-tailed bat on Rota and other islands in the Marianas; in other bat species, pesticides result in secondary poisoning or reduced insect availability (USFWS 2023o, p. 16).

II. RECOVERY

A. RECOVERY VISION AND STRATEGY

Recovery Vision

A recovery vision is an explicit expression of recovery in terms of species resiliency, redundancy, and representation. It builds on the description of viability for the species and defines what recovery looks like for the species. The recovery strategy provides a recommended approach for achieving the recovery vision, and ultimately, the down- and delisting criteria.

Our overall recovery vision for the 23 species is to have redundant populations of each species, representing the remaining genetic diversity distributed throughout their historical range in areas where threats to individuals and their habitats are managed to support resilient populations. Habitat needed for recovery will be protected from development, invasive animals and plants, and other human activities which degrade habitat quality. Species-specific threats will be sufficiently managed to assure the long-term persistence of healthy populations of each species (see below).

Our recovery vision for the 14 plant species entails having redundant populations of each species distributed throughout their historical range in the Mariana Islands (see Table 1). Populations will be self-sustaining, resilient, and represent the remaining genetic and ecological diversity of the species. Habitat required to support each of the populations needed for recovery will be protected from development, invasive animals and plants, and other human activities. Species-specific threats, including invasive species and disease, will be sufficiently managed. To be downlisted and delisted, each species will need a minimum number of populations with a minimum population size that remain stable for 10 or 20 years as an indication that they can withstand repeated typhoons and the effects of climate change.

Our recovery vision for Pacific sheath-tailed bat entails having multiple self-sustaining populations on the islands in the Mariana archipelago within its historical range, which function as one or more viable metapopulations. The population must have stable or increasing numbers, with sufficient resiliency and redundancy to withstand foreseeable short- and long-term threats. Populations should be well-distributed on islands to provide adequate genetic representation and to facilitate their recovery from catastrophic events such as typhoons. To facilitate resilient populations, adequate areas of high-quality forest for foraging will be maintained or restored near suitable roosting sites. Threats should be managed such that the Pacific sheath-tailed bat maintains stable to growing populations throughout its range.

Our recovery vision for the Slevin's skink entails having multiple self-sustaining populations on several islands in its historical range. The range-wide population must have stable or increasing numbers, with sufficient resiliency to withstand foreseeable, long-term threats. The populations should be well distributed on islands on which they occur to provide adequate genetic representation of the species. Threats should be managed such that the Slevin's skink maintains stable to growing populations throughout its range.

Our recovery vision for the Mariana eight-spot butterfly and the Mariana wandering butterfly entails having multiple self-sustaining populations on the islands in their historical range in the Mariana Islands. The populations must have stable or increasing numbers, with sufficient resiliency to withstand foreseeable, long-term threats. The populations should be well distributed on the islands on which they occur to provide adequate genetic representation of the species and to facilitate their recovery from catastrophic events such as typhoons. Threats should be managed such that Mariana eight-spot butterfly and the Mariana wandering butterfly maintain stable to growing populations throughout their range.

Our recovery vision for the Rota blue damselfly entails having multiple self-sustaining populations in multiple watersheds to increase redundancy and genetic representation. The populations must have stable or increasing numbers, with sufficient resiliency to withstand foreseeable long-term threats such as drought and typhoons. Threats should be managed such that Rota blue damselfly maintains stable to growing populations throughout its range.

Our recovery vision for the four listed partulid tree snails entails having multiple self-sustaining populations on the islands in their historical range. The populations must have stable or increasing numbers, with sufficient resiliency to withstand foreseeable long-term threats. Populations should be well distributed on the islands on which they occur to provide adequate genetic representation of the species and to facilitate their recovery from catastrophic events such as typhoons. Threats should be managed such that partulid tree snails maintain stable to growing populations throughout their range.

Recovery Strategy

General Recovery Strategy

Recovery of the 23 species will require surveys of remaining populations and their habitat, selection of sites for their long-term conservation, control of threats in areas needed for their recovery, development of regulatory protections, initiation of species-specific research, and reinforcement and reintroduction to improve the resiliency of each population and increase the redundancy and representation of each species.

Recovery of the 23 listed species will require thorough surveys of their historical range to locate remnant populations, identify availability of suitable occupied and unoccupied habitat, evaluate the health of existing populations, and assess site-specific threats. These surveys are a crucial first step in the development of durable, long-term conservation plans for these species.

Research into the life history and species-specific threats will need to be completed for all species where knowledge gaps exist and to ensure that management continues to be informed by the best available science. The impacts of invasive predators and the specific microclimate needs of each species should be studied to inform their management. Modeling is needed to examine how climate change will affect the 23 species' distributions, including whether it will exacerbate the effects of invasive species. Once the overall condition of each species is known, as well as their potential future condition and distribution, sites for their long-term conservation must be established. Well-designed conservation programs, including adaptive management and monitoring, will need to be established to manage each species and its habitat.

Sites for the long-term conservation of each species will need to be selected. Regulatory and land conservation designations or landowner agreements will need to be established and/or augmented to facilitate protection of the 23 species and their habitat from development, invasive species, and species-specific threats. The 23 species should be designated as endangered or threatened under Guam's and CNMI's Endangered Species Acts and regulatory mechanisms developed and implemented to reduce threats to the 23 species from biosecurity limitations, introduced ungulates, habitat loss, and wildfire. Habitats needed to support the 23 species must have long-term recovery conservation status (e.g., conservation purchase, conservation easements, landowner conservation agreements) such that they cannot be developed and on-site management (e.g., invasive species control, reinforcement and reintroduction and reinforcement of populations) can be accomplished.

Invasive species degrade the habitat required by the 23 species and also directly affect many of the species. Thus, controlling invasive plants and animals (Table 4) will be necessary. Biosecurity measures to prevent the transport of new invasive species to the archipelago and among the islands in the archipelago are critical to the recovery of the 23 species. Improving biosecurity should include public outreach, coordination and inspection at ports of entry, and passing Commonwealth and Territorial biosecurity legislation.

Recovery of the 23 species will require ungulate-free habitats. Five of the 14 plant species and 8 of the 9 animal species (all but the Pacific sheath-tailed bat) are vulnerable to ungulate trampling, grazing, browsing, and rooting (Table 4, Table 5). In addition, native habitat, which is essential to the recovery of all 23 species, is degraded by ungulates (see Threats section above). Where ungulates are not eradicated from the entire island, sites selected for the long-term conservation of these species must be protected from ungulates via construction and maintenance of ungulate-proof enclosures or exclusion of ungulates from the area through lethal control. To prevent extinction, short-term management of remnant populations at sites where ungulates will not be removed may be necessary while the permanent sites for the long-term conservation and recovery of the species are secured and protected from threats.

Recovery of the 23 species will require control of rodents, brown treesnakes, invasive invertebrates, diseases and pathogens as well as programs to prevent the spread and introduction of such pests. The implementation of rodent control or eradication programs is needed to increase reproduction, recruitment, and survival of the 23 plant and animal species as well as to ensure the long-term persistence of their habitat. Almost three-quarters of the native tree species on Guam rely on birds to disperse their seeds (Rogers 2009; Rogers 2011, pp. 1–75). To facilitate the long-term persistence of the native habitats needed to conserve Guam's listed species, landscape-scale control of the brown treesnake is necessary to allow the recolonization of the island's frugivorous birds and fruit bats. Without effective brown treesnake control and recolonization by effective seed dispersers, these tree species may be unable to persist on Guam without human-assisted dispersal. The brown treesnake, rodents, and invasive invertebrates also depredate the 9 listed animals and directly or indirectly affect the listed plants and the habitats needed by the 23 species. Thus, recovery of the 23 species also will require site-specific invasive vertebrate and invertebrate control programs. Control of invasive ants that interfere with native pollinators and feed on vertebrate and invertebrate eggs, pupae, larvae, and adults, may be necessary to conserve plant pollinators and seed dispersers needed for the persistence of native

habitat. Control of invasive slugs may be necessary to protect the plant species addressed herein as well as the native habitats that all 23 species rely upon.

Recovery of most of the 23 species will require management of invasive plant species. Control or eradication of habitat-modifying invasive plants, wildfire threat control, and interdiction to prevent introduction of new invasive plants will be necessary to conserve the listed species addressed herein and the native habitats needed to support them. New tools and strategies to control or eradicate invasive plants and enhance native habitat to improve the survival of the 23 species may need to be developed. In addition to being a direct threat to listed plants and animals, wildfire facilitates the establishment of invasive grasses in burned native forest and savanna vegetation. Recovery of the listed species will require strategies to prevent wildfires from burning native forest habitats and directly killing listed individuals as well as ensuring that fire-return intervals in the savanna habitats needed for recovery are long enough to enable a diverse savanna plant community to persist.

Catastrophic events such as typhoons can degrade or destroy forest habitat, as well as the microhabitat conditions essential to the 23 species (USFWS 2023 a-w). While typhoons are a natural occurrence, the damage they cause can exacerbate the vulnerability of small or isolated populations. Typhoons and other catastrophic events tend to be spatially limited, thus the establishment of multiple populations on each island and on multiple islands is necessary to limit the species' vulnerability to catastrophic events. With all *ex situ* conservation and translocation efforts, all remaining genetic diversity must be preserved but the removal of individuals for translocation should not harm donor populations (Sischo and Hadfield 2017, p. 1).

For the purposes of this document, conservation translocation (hereafter translocation) is defined as the deliberate movement of organisms from one site for release in another for conservation benefit and includes population restoration (reinforcement and reintroduction) and conservation introduction (assisted colonization and ecological replacement) as defined by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN, 2014, entire). If part of a species' recovery strategy, translocations will follow the IUCN/Species Survival Commission Guidelines on the Use of *Ex Situ* Management for Species Conservation (IUCN 2014, entire), as updated.

Population restoration is needed to establish a sufficient number of populations to allow each species to persist over the long-term despite reoccurring catastrophic events such as typhoons. While having redundant and resilient populations distributed throughout a species' range is a hallmark of most recovery criteria, the periodic and extremely destructive potential of typhoons, which will likely increase with climate change, indicates that conservation translocations will be particularly important to the recovery of the 23 species. Because the species and their habitats are vulnerable to typhoons, maintaining redundant, viable populations on multiple islands is needed to mitigate for losses associated with typhoons. This strategy, in addition to having *ex situ* collections (i.e., captive propagation of animal, seed storage and nursery collections of plants), increases the likelihood that the number of stable populations needed for recovery will persist over the long term. *Ex situ* populations will be established within or outside of the species' historical ranges in locations protected from threats such as botanical gardens, zoos, and captive facilities. These will serve as insurance populations as well as providing a source for conservation translocations. The development of micro-climate models to identify suitable

current and future habitat will be needed to support the recovery of those species susceptible to the effects of climate change. The selection of sites for reinforcement or reintroduction will be prioritized based on threat and habitat suitability assessments, current and long-term conservation potential, population demography, genetics (Hoffmann et al. 2015, entire), and other site- and species-specific considerations. All populations created via translocation should incorporate the full genetic representation of the source population. To achieve this, species-specific translocation plans will be developed and will include the genetic composition of the founders, number of founders to be used, number of individuals from each founder, the species' reproductive capacity as well as suitability and availability of habitat. Threats will be controlled or mitigated prior to any reinforcement or reintroduction efforts. To achieve the required number of populations for recovery, assisted colonization may be needed to establish species outside of their known historical range.

In addition to the above general recovery actions, species-specific strategies and habitat needs are detailed below.

Recovery Strategy for Plants

In addition to the above outlined general strategies, the following specific strategies will be required to recover the 14 plant species. First, preventing extinction and interim stabilization measures (see below) must be taken to reverse the extinction trajectory and stabilize these species. These include genetic storage, controlling threats in the immediate vicinity of individual plants, and reinforcement and reintroduction to support and/or establish a small number of relatively small populations. Of the 14 plant species, all but 5 (*Dendrobium guamense*, *Eugenia bryanii*, *Phyllanthus saffordii*, *Tabernaemontana rotensis*, and *Tuberolabium guamense*) persist at very low numbers, are in rapid decline, or are thought to be extinct (see Table 2). Because of their low numbers, surveys will be especially important to the recovery of *Solanum guamense*, *Tinospora homosepala*, and *Psychotria malaspinae* to locate all individuals and closely track population status. Downlisting and delisting will require development and implementation of measures to protect the habitat needed for the long-term conservation of the species from threats including development, invasive animals, and invasive plants (including wildfire-mediated grass invasion). In addition to the measures needed to assure long-term persistence of their needed habitat, most plants will also require protection from direct impacts of herbivory by invasive vertebrates and invertebrates. On Guam, the brown treesnake has extirpated most vertebrate seed dispersers. The recovery of *Maesa walkeri* (USFWS 2023g, p. 14), *Psychotria malaspinae* (USFWS 2023i, p. 15), and *Tabernaemontana rotensis* (USFWS 2023l, p. 15), all of which were likely dispersed by fruit-eating vertebrates, will require landscape-scale control of the brown treesnake or human-assisted seed dispersal to persist on Guam (Egerer et al. 2018, p. 655). Several species also need protection from use of military ordnance, vandalism, recreational vehicles, and the introduction of new diseases as well as increasing the number of individuals to ameliorate the suite of threats resulting from or exacerbated by limited numbers. New tools and methods to control and manage threats and limiting factors to enhance survival and reproduction may need to be developed and implemented. These may include micropropagation and the development of *ex situ* populations. Research pertaining to the detection and mitigation of threats, such as disease, should be initiated as needed to inform management. Reinforcement and reintroduction of plant populations to protected areas will be needed to recover the 14 plant

species. To offset the risk from reoccurring typhoons, more protected populations than are typically required for recovery will be needed.

Recovery Strategy for the Pacific sheath-tailed bat
Recovery of the Pacific sheath-tailed bat will require surveys of historically occupied islands to identify if remnant populations persist and suitable roosting and foraging habitat. To inform management, research on population structure and dynamics as well as life history is needed. The management and protection of remnant populations and the habitat that supports them is essential for the recovery of the subspecies. Currently the subspecies is known to occur only on Aguiguan and this population will be prioritized for management, unless surveys locate other, higher-priority populations. Islands such as Rota, however, where the species is extirpated, may also offer management opportunities (e.g., reintroductions), especially given the island's size and infrastructure compared to the smaller and more difficult to access, uninhabited islands in the northern part of the archipelago.

In American Samoa, forest clearing around cave entrances has been associated with abandonment of Pacific sheath-tailed bat roosts (USFWS 2021, p. 7; USFWS 2023o, p. 15). Therefore, protection of forests near roosting areas via ungulate removal, conservation agreements, and invasive plant control is necessary to maintain foraging habitat and ensure that caves provide adequate roosting habitat and are not abandoned. Both are critical to the restoration and recovery of bat populations.

Pacific sheath-tailed bat typically produce one pup annually (Wiles et al. 2011, p. 306). Their low reproductive potential makes the species vulnerable to events or threats that increase adult mortality, as well as reproductive failure, and results in a slow recovery from catastrophic events. Because cats (*Felis catus*) and rats may opportunistically prey on roosting Pacific sheath-tailed bats (USFWS 2023o, p. 21), predator control measures may be necessary to reduce this source of mortality.

Pacific sheath-tailed bats are nocturnal and roost in caves, and are vulnerable to daytime disturbance (e.g., entry of humans and goats). Therefore, where roost disturbance is an issue, public outreach, management, and fencing should be considered to minimize human disturbance and maintain the viability of existing roosts and aid in the reestablishment of abandoned roosts. Based on future surveys to assess the suitability of unoccupied caves, those with the most preferable characteristics for roosting and pup rearing should be protected as soon as possible.

Roosting caves and foraging habitat can be destroyed by typhoons and bats can be killed during storms (USFWS 2015 p. 59440). Climate change will likely increase the frequency and severity of typhoons. Thus, the Pacific sheath-tailed bat must be reestablished on multiple islands to limit its vulnerability to catastrophic events.

Pesticide use near foraging habitat or roosts is thought to have been one of the factors leading to the species' decline (Wiles and Worthington 2002, p. 17) and its extirpation on Rota and other islands in the archipelago. Pesticides are known to adversely affect bat population either by secondary poisoning from consuming contaminated insects or by reducing the availability of prey; however, the extent to which either mechanism has affected the subspecies in the Mariana

archipelago remains unknown (Hutson et al. 2001, p. 138; Mickleburgh et al. 2002, p. 19). To avoid negatively impacting the species, pesticide use near current or potential roost and foraging sites should be avoided unless research determines pesticide use is not a threat to the species. Historically, the population dynamics of this subspecies likely functioned as a metapopulation that facilitated gene flow among islands and natural recolonization after catastrophic events. If any inter-island dispersal currently occurs it is likely insufficient to re-establish extirpated island populations. Given the small population restricted to Aguiguan, surveys throughout the subspecies' range are required to identify and protect any additional remnant populations as well as identify potential reintroduction sites.

If populations are not found outside of Aguiguan, reintroductions will be necessary to establish redundant populations necessary to buffer the subspecies from the effects of typhoons and other stochastic events. Surveys and modeling will be required to evaluate the Aguiguan population's capacity to serve as a donor for translocations, as would be genetic analyses to ensure that founders possess a significant percentage of the subspecies' remaining genetic diversity. Determining the suitability of roosting and foraging habitat at reintroduction sites; protocols and logistical support for safe capture, transport, and release; and coordination and permitting all would need to be conducted or be in place prior to any translocation efforts.

Recovery Strategy for Slevin's skink
Little is known about Slevin's skink life history requirements; therefore, its recovery strategies are currently limited to those outlined above in the General Recovery Strategy section. Research will be conducted to determine the most significant threats to the species as well as research on population structure, population dynamics, and life history. This information will be used to refine the species' recovery actions.

Recovery Strategy for Mariana eight-spot butterfly and Mariana wandering butterfly
Little is known about either the Mariana eight-spot butterfly or the Mariana wandering butterfly; therefore, their recovery strategies are currently limited to those outlined above in the General Recovery Strategy section and the paragraphs below. Research will be conducted to determine the most significant threats to the species as well as on population structure, population dynamics, and life history. This information will be used to refine the species' recovery actions.

Due to the dependence of both species on their respective host plants, ungulate and slug control or eradication are priority actions. The development of techniques to reduce or eliminate predation by native and non-native insects, mostly by ants and parasitic wasps, are also priority actions, with the following caveat: native parasitic wasp populations should not be reduced to the point where the ecosystem benefits they provide is diminished. Together, these actions would restore or enhance native forest habitat and improve the resiliency of butterfly populations.

Given the Mariana eight-spot butterflies' limited range and number of populations, as well as the limited amount of suitable habitat, captive propagation and reintroduction and/or assisted colonization to suitable habitat should be evaluated as potential tools to establish additional populations to improve the species' redundancy. The establishment of a captive rearing facility to propagate the species on Guam has proven successful in producing both caterpillars and adult butterflies (Fiedler 2023, entire). The success of this program suggests that captive propagation

and release of the butterfly could establish the species in additional areas in Guam, a reintroduction to Saipan, or potentially an introduction to other islands in the archipelago.

Unless the Mariana wandering butterfly is rediscovered, no direct recovery actions can be implemented; however, management of appropriate habitat and host plants would improve conditions for any individuals that may still exist.

Recovery Strategy for the Rota blue damselfly
Little is known about Rota blue damselfly; therefore, its recovery strategies are currently limited to those outlined above in the General Recovery Strategy section and the paragraphs below. While we have some information regarding the life history and population dynamics of damselflies in Hawai‘i and other Pacific Islands, research (or a Population Viability Analysis [PVA]) is needed to determine the most significant threats to the species as well as on population structure, population dynamics, and life history. This information will be used to refine the species' recovery actions.

The protection of the population in the Okgok Stream and management of the threats that are degrading the watershed are essential to the recovery of the species. These include managing the forest on the Sabana Plateau to maintain water quality, reducing or preventing excessive sedimentation from projects such as road grading/stabilization in the watershed, and preserving forest cover adjacent to the stream to prevent sediment runoff. The latter also will preserve the microhabitat conditions (i.e., temperature and humidity) that are essential to the species. Excluding ungulates from stream habitat or reducing their populations, in addition to reducing wildfire, will likely be necessary to improve and maintain water quality. In addition, based on what is known of other island damselflies, preventing the introduction of potential predators is critical. Thus, bolstering the biosecurity of Rota is of particular importance to the recovery of this species.

The presence of several dry and intermittent stream beds in the Talakhaya Watershed suggest that the range of the Rota blue damselfly may once have included all of the watershed (USFWS 2023s, p. 27) The species could potentially recolonize these streams if conditions are improved. Comparing these streams to the Okgok will help determine whether the species' range could be expanded.

Given the Rota blue damselfly's extremely limited range and number of populations as well as the limited amount of suitable habitat, captive propagation and reintroduction or assisted colonization to suitable stream habitat should be evaluated as potential tools to establish additional populations to improve the species' redundancy. The establishment of an insectary facility to propagate *Megalagrion xanthomelas*, a damselfly endemic to the Hawaiian Islands, has proven successful (Polhemus pers. comm. 2020). The success of this program suggests that captive propagation and release of the Rota blue damselfly could establish the species in additional watersheds.

Recovery Strategy for tree snails
Little is known about specific life history needs of the partulid tree snails in the Marianas; therefore, recovery strategies are currently limited to those outlined above in the General Recovery Strategy section and in the paragraphs below. Although we do have some information

regarding the tree snails in Hawai‘i and other Pacific Islands, research is needed to determine the most significant threats to the species in the Marianas, as well as population structure, population dynamics, and life history. This information will be used to refine the species' recovery actions. Non-native predators are one of the most significant threats to tree snails in the Marianas (USFWS 2023t, p. 14; USFWS 2023u, p. 12; USFWS 2023v, p. 12; USFWS 2023w, p. 14). Development of effective tools to eradicate introduced predatory snails and New Guinea flatworm populations would benefit the Mariana tree snails as well as those on other Pacific islands. To date, no effective methods are available for controlling or eradicating established population of these predators; therefore, preventing their introduction to islands or areas of islands where they do not occur is essential for the recovery of tree snails in the Marianas. Due to the dependence of the snails on shaded forest habitat, ungulate exclusion, control, or eradication will be a priority action both to maintain forested habitat and reduce the likelihood of trampling. Given the prevalence of predators and ungulates in occupied partulid habitat, as well as the limited range and number of populations for some of the snails, captive propagation and reintroduction or assisted colonization to more suitable habitat should be evaluated as potential tools to establish additional populations to improve a species' redundancy. Unless Langford's tree snail is rediscovered, no direct recovery actions can be implemented; however, management of appropriate habitat would likely improve conditions for any individuals that may still exist.

B. RECOVERY CRITERIA

Section 4(f)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act states that each recovery plan shall incorporate, to the maximum extent practicable, "objective, measurable criteria which, when met, would result in a determination that the species be removed from the List." Legal challenges to recovery plans (see Fund for Animals v. Babbitt, 903 F. Supp. 996 (D.D.C. 1995)) and a Government Accountability Audit (GAO 2006) also have affirmed the need to frame recovery criteria in terms of threats assessed under the five listing factors.

Recovery criteria serve as objective, measurable guidelines to assist in determining when an endangered species has recovered to the point that it may be downlisted or that the protections afforded by the Act are no longer necessary and the species may be delisted. Delisting is the removal of a species from the Lists. Downlisting is the reclassification of a species from endangered to threatened. The term "endangered species" means any species (or distinct population segment [DPS], subspecies, or species group) that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. The term "threatened species" means any species that is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

Recovery criteria represent our best assessment, at the time the recovery plan is completed, of the conditions that would likely result in a determination that listing under the Act as threatened or endangered is no longer required. However, revisions to the Lists, including delisting or downlisting a species, must reflect determinations made in accordance with sections 4(a)(1) and 4(b) of the Act. Section 4(a)(1) requires that the Secretary of the Interior determine whether a species is an endangered or threatened species because of threats to the species, based on an analysis of the five listing factors in section 4(a)(1). Section 4(b) require that the determination be made "solely on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available." Thus, while recovery plans provide important guidance to the Service, States, and other partners and

stakeholders on methods of minimizing threats to listed species and measurable criteria against which to measure progress towards recovery, they constitute guidance and are not regulatory documents.

All classification decisions consider an analysis of the following five factors described under **Threats** (above). Thus, a decision to delist or downlist a species is informed by the recovery criteria but must ultimately be based on an analysis of threats using the best scientific and commercial data then available. When considering changing the status of a species, we first propose the action in the Federal Register to seek public comment and peer review, after which we announce a final decision in the Federal Register.

The species addressed in this recovery plan should be considered for downlisting and delisting when the following objective[s] and criteria have been met. Downlisting and delisting criteria are subject to change as additional information becomes available about species biology and threats.

1. Recovery Criteria - Plant Species

Objective - Establish multiple, self-sustaining populations of each species on multiple islands to increase population redundancy, preserve or enhance genetic diversity to maintain or increase representation, protect and manage suitable habitat, and manage threats to improve the resiliency of populations of all species.

At recovery, populations of each of the 14 species will be self-sustaining, resilient, and represent the remaining genetic diversity existing in the species. The species and the habitat on which they depend for recovery will be protected from threats, including development and invasive animals and plants. Species-specific threats will be sufficiently managed so that each species maintains stable to positive population growth.

The HPPRCC, comprised of biologists from Federal and State agencies, private conservation organizations, botanical gardens, and universities, was established to advise the Service on the biology as well as management needed to recover listed plants. The HPPRCC outlined general actions and targets for the stages leading to the recovery of listed plants in the Mariana Islands (HPPRCC 2011, entire). Current information is lacking for many of the 14 listed plant species with respect to the number of populations and their status and size, habitat requirements, breeding systems, genetics, and propagule storage options. We therefore adopted downlisting and delisting criteria based on the revised general recovery objective guidelines developed by the HPPRCC (2011, entire). To assist in tracking progress toward recovery, we also developed criteria for avoiding imminent extinction and an interim stabilization stage before downlisting based on the recommendations of the HPPRCC. While these two interim recovery stages are not required under the Act, they are critical to the recovery of these species. The plant survey, genetic storage, site selection, and threat control criteria, as well as the minimum number of individuals and populations needed in each stage build upon previous stages; a stage is not considered complete unless goals of the previous stage has been achieved.

For many species, we do not have adequate data to determine the effective population size or the number of individuals contributing to the next generation. Thus, we used the number of

reproducing individuals per population as a surrogate for effective population size. The number of sexually mature (mature) individuals per population required to meet the goals of the preventing extinction stage (greater than 25 to 100 individuals; Table 6) is based on the number of individuals needed to avoid immediate extinction due to demographic stochasticity as well as catastrophic events (HPPRCC 2011, p. 4-5). The number of mature individuals per population required to meet the goals of interim stabilization (greater than 100 to 500 individuals; Table 7) is based on the number of individuals needed to avoid inbreeding (HPPRCC 2011, p. 6), while the number of individuals required to meet downlisting and delisting criteria (approximately 5,000 mature individuals; Tables 8 and 9) is based on the estimated number of individuals needed to maintain evolutionary potential and resiliency (Reed et al. 2002, pp. 12-13; Traill et al. 2010, pp. 30, 32; HPPRCC 2011, p. 7-10).

For the purposes of recovery criteria in this plan, a plant population is a group of conspecific individuals in close proximity to each other (i.e., less than 3,280 ft [1,000 m] apart) and presumed to be genetically similar and capable of sexual reproduction (HPPRCC 2011, p. 1). Species-specific life history and population characteristics used by the HPPRCC to set goals for the number of populations and the size of each of the 14 plants in this plan include life span, reproductive strategy, and population trend.

General distinctions made by the HPPRCC that are relevant to the 14 plants in this plan include the following:

- *Life span*: Long-lived perennials are defined as species with life spans greater than 10 years, short-lived perennials are those with life spans greater than 1 year but less than 10 years, and annuals are those with life spans less than or equal to 1 year. None of the 14 listed species are currently believed to be annuals. The HPPRCC recommends that populations of short-lived perennials have two to three times as many individuals as long-lived perennials to meet the goal of each stage (see Tables 6 through 9; referred to as "short" and "long," respectively). When a species' life span was unknown, we erred on the side of caution and considered the species short-lived. We currently do not have the data needed to determine the mean life span of most of these species; as more data is collected we will update species' life span categorizations.
- *Reproduction strategies*: Obligate outcrossers are species that either have male and female flowers on separate plants (i.e., dioecious plants) or otherwise require cross-pollination to fertilize seeds; hence not all individuals produce viable offspring. Therefore, for obligate outcrossers, the HPPRCC (HPPRCC 2011, p. 5, 6, 8, 10) recommends doubling the number of total reproductive individuals required per recovery stage compared to that necessary for species that are not obligate outcrossers. The majority of genetic variation in species that predominantly reproduce vegetatively or asexually (i.e., without seeds) is typically found among populations versus within populations (Frankham et al. 2002, pp. 414-415). While we currently are uncertain if this applies to any of the 14 listed plant species, if future data suggests this is the case, additional populations would be required. To maximize reproductive success and the maintenance of genetic diversity within each population where outplanting is conducted, founder (unique genetic lines) representation should be balanced among individuals (Falk et al. 1996 p. 182-183) and, for dioecious plants, males and females should be planted near each other (Maschinski and Haskins 2012, p. 287).

- *Population size trends:* Species characterized by large fluctuations in the number of mature individuals or a known history of severe declines in the number of mature individuals in the population require a larger number of mature individuals (approximately 50 percent higher) than species without such fluctuations for the population to persist during, for example, drought years and to recover during typical years (HPPRCC 2011, p. 5-10). Our current understanding is that none of the 14 listed plants have populations that greatly fluctuate in size; should a species be identified as having this characteristic, the minimum number of mature individuals needed in each of the stages would be increased by 50 percent.

The following targets for the preventing extinction and interim stabilization stages and the downlisting and delisting criteria were determined based on known biology of the 14 plants addressed herein with consideration given to the above general guidelines.

Preventing Extinction

To meet the preventing extinction goal, several conditions should be satisfied. Surveys throughout each species' historical range are completed to document occurrences, and studies of plant reproductive biology are completed as needed to inform management. Each species has the minimum number of populations and reproducing individuals per population as shown in Table 6. All threats are assessed and controlled in the immediate vicinity of each such population. Each of these populations shows evidence of natural reproduction (i.e., viable seeds, seedlings, saplings). Finally, at least 50 individuals per population, or the total number of individuals if fewer than 50 remain, must be secured in a well-managed *ex situ* collection as defined in the Center for Plant Conservation's (CPC) guidelines (Guerrant et al. 2004, pp. 419-441). According to these CPC guidelines, *ex situ* means offsite, away from the wild population, usually referring to collections conserved in a secure nursery or botanic garden setting (https://saveplants.org/tag/ex-situ/) and germplasm collections are living seeds or tissues from which plants can be grown (https://saveplants.org/tag/germplasm/). *Ex situ* storage or genetic storage are used interchangeably. Propagules are stored (banked) or maintained in cultivation until needed for propagation. Propagules not immediately propagated and outplanted are stored in germplasm collections so that there is secured representation of the individual wild plant or population that can be withdrawn and propagated when needed. Genetic storage is a secured, off-site backup of the genetic diversity contained in a wild population.

Table 6. Number of populations and individuals needed for each plant species to meet preventing extinction goals based on population and life history characteristics.

Life Span	Population and Life History Characteristics	Minimum Number of Populations	Reproducing Individuals / Population	Plant Species
Long	No specific characteristics known	3	25	*Eugenia bryanii*
		3	25	*Heritiera longipetiolata*
		3	25	*Maesa walkeri*
		3	25	*Psychotria malaspinae*
		3	25	*Tabernaemontana rotensis*
Long	Obligate outcrosser	3	50	*Cycas micronesica*
Short	No specific characteristics known	3	50	*Bulbophyllum guamense*
		3	50	*Dendrobium guamense*
		3	50	*Hedyotis megalantha*
		3	50	*Nervilia jacksoniae*
		3	50	*Phyllanthus saffordii*
		3	50	*Solanum guamense*
		3	50	*Tuberolabium guamense*
Short	Obligate outcrosser	3	100	*Tinospora homosepala*

Interim Stabilization

In addition to meeting all of the preventing extinction goals, to meet the interim stabilization goals, the minimum number of populations and reproducing individuals per population identified in Table 7 must be achieved. All major threats must be controlled around the target populations and each population must be naturally reproducing. Seedlings transitioning to mature individuals, a replacement regeneration, or an age-class distribution indicative of a stable population must be documented in all the populations. Once outplanted populations are producing viable seed or vegetatively reproducing they can count toward the population number criteria. Species known from multiple islands must be represented by at least one population on each historically occupied island, as long as appropriate stock is available for successful reintroductions. All populations are adequately represented in an appropriate *ex situ* collection as defined in the Center for Plant Conservation's guidelines (Guerrant et al. 2004, entire) that is secure and well maintained.

Genetic analyses of wild, reintroduced, and *ex situ* populations of each species should be conducted to ensure maintenance of genetic variation within and between populations throughout controlled propagation efforts. The results of the genetic analyses will be used to develop translocation strategies to correct any genetic deficiencies and determine if translocation efforts should be from single or multiple wild populations. Finally, adequate monitoring is in place to assess individual plant survival, population trends, trends of major limiting factors, and the response of populations to threat management.

Table 7. Number of populations and individuals needed for each plant species to meet interim stabilization goals based on population and life history characteristics.

Life Span	Population and Life History Characteristics	Minimum Number of Populations	Reproducing Individuals / Population	Plant Species
Long	No specific characteristics known	3	100	*Eugenia bryanii*
		3	100	*Heritiera longipetiolata*
		3	100	*Maesa walkeri*
		3	100	*Psychotria malaspinae*
		3	100	*Tabernaemontana rotensis*
Long	Obligate outcrosser	3	200	*Cycas micronesica*
Short	No specific characteristics known	3	300	*Bulbophyllum guamense*
		3	300	*Dendrobium guamense*
		3	300	*Hedyotis megalantha*
		3	300	*Nervilia jacksoniae*
		3	300	*Phyllanthus saffordii*
		3	300	*Solanum guamense*
		3	300	*Tuberolabium guamense*
Short	Obligate outcrosser	3	600	*Tinospora homosepala*

Recovery Criteria

Downlisting

In addition to meeting all the interim stabilization goals, the following criteria should be met to consider downlisting the seven endangered plant species to threatened:

Downlisting Criteria

Criterion 1: The minimum number of mature individuals per population and the number of populations designated for downlisting detailed in Table 8 are stable, secure, and naturally reproducing for a minimum of 10 years. Species known from multiple islands within the archipelago, have at least three populations on each of the historically occupied islands, as long as suitable appropriate stock is available for successful reintroductions and climate conditions needed to support the species and its habitat remain on the historically occupied island.

Criterion 2: Monitoring of the populations designated for downlisting is adequate to ascertain effectiveness and sufficiency of threat control and determine population size trend or growth. A PVA has been conducted to confirm the number of individuals needed to achieve a viable population and inform refinements to the recovery needs of the species. This analysis is based on data collected at intervals determined by the life history, threats, and management prescriptions of the species. The results of the PVA should not be given more weight than other criteria in making a downlisting decision.

Criterion 3: Threats to each species and their habitat are managed to ensure that all populations meet downlisting Criterion 1. A species' management and monitoring plan is drafted and identifies actions necessary to control threats to the long-term persistence of habitat supporting these (i.e., invasive animals including ungulates, invasive plants

including grass invasion due to wildfire) populations. Species-specific management actions may be necessary to ensure stable populations even after species are downlisted. The plan also identifies monitoring procedures and schedules to track the response of species to management.

Table 8. Number of populations and individuals needed to meet downlisting Criterion 1 based on population and life history characteristics.

Life Span	Population and Life History Characteristics	Minimum Number of Stable Populations	Reproducing Individuals / Population	Plant Species Listed as Endangered
Long	No specific characteristics known	5	200	*Eugenia bryanii*
		5	200	*Heritiera longipetiolata*
		5	200	*Psychotria malaspinae*
Short	No specific characteristics known	5	500	*Hedyotis megalantha*
		5	500	*Phyllanthus saffordii*
		5	500	*Solanum guamense*
Short	Obligate outcrosser	5	1,000	*Tinospora homosepala*

Delisting

To consider delisting the 14 listed plant species, the above downlisting criteria should be met for a 10-year period for the 7 endangered plant species, as well as the following criteria for all species.

Delisting Criteria

Criterion 1: At least 10 populations designated for delisting, with population sizes detailed in Table 9, are stable, secure, and naturally reproducing for a minimum of 20 years within secure and viable habitats to be considered for delisting. Species known from multiple islands within the archipelago, have at least three populations on each of the historically occupied islands, as long as suitable appropriate stock is available for reintroduction and climate conditions needed to support the species and its habitat remain on the historically occupied island.

Criterion 2: Threats to the species and the native habitat of plant populations conserved to meet recovery Criterion 1 are controlled. For example, on islands with ungulates all populations designated for delisting are within fenced areas free of ungulates, with funding and agreements from conservation partners and stakeholders to maintain fences and ungulate-free status of fenced areas. Monitoring of the status and the threats to each population is ongoing. Population censuses and threat assessments are completed annually for at least 20 years prior to delisting. Species-specific management actions (e.g., hand-pollination, propagation, and translocation) should no longer be necessary, but habitat management will be necessary over the long term.

Table 9. Number of populations and individuals needed to meet delisting Criterion 1 based on population and life history characteristics.

Life Span	Population and Life History Characteristics	Minimum Number of Stable Populations	Reproducing Individuals / Population	Species
Long	No specific characteristics known	10	200	*Eugenia bryanii*
		10	200	*Heritiera longipetiolata*
		10	200	*Maesa walkeri*
		10	200	*Psychotria malaspinae*
		10	200	*Tabernaemontana rotensis*
	Obligate outcrosser	10	400	*Cycas micronesica*
Short	No specific characteristics known	10	500	*Bulbophyllum guamense*
		10	500	*Dendrobium guamense*
		10	500	*Hedyotis megalantha*
		10	500	*Nervilia jacksoniae*
		10	500	*Phyllanthus saffordii*
		10	500	*Solanum guamense*
		10	500	*Tuberolabium guamense*[1]
	Obligate outcrosser	10	1,000	*Tinospora homosepala*

[1] Please see the *Tuberolabium guamense* Species Action Plan (DOD 2021) for more details on how populations are identified and monitored.

Rationale for Plant Recovery Criteria

The recovery criteria for the 14 plants are based on the currently known biology of each species as detailed in the latest species reports, the Hawai‘i and Pacific Plants Recovery Coordinating Committee’s Revised Recovery Objective Guidelines, and expert opinion (HPPRCC 2011, entire; references in Tables 1 and 3). Rationale for the need to control threats to the listed plants and their habitats are detailed below in the “Recovery Strategy” section.

Life history traits have been used to infer minimum viable population numbers (Pavlik 1996, entire). We used each species’ life span and reproductive strategy to determine the number of populations and the number of mature individuals per population needed to progress from the preventing extinction stage to delisting. Suitable habitat is required to maintain viable populations, and long-term habitat maintenance and, in some cases, habitat restoration will be necessary. Reinforcing existing populations and reintroductions to create new populations will be crucial to achieving recovery for many of the plant species; increasing the number of individuals will improve population resiliency and increasing the number of populations will improve species redundancy. All translocations will be informed by the genetic composition of the founders, number of founders used, number of individuals from each founder, and the species’ reproductive capacity and habitat availability.

The number of populations and the number of individuals in each population needed to prevent extinction (and to achieve the preventing extinction goals) are based in part on models that demonstrate loss of genetic variation in populations of various sizes. For example, a population of 25 individuals will lose approximately 25 percent of its genetic variation over 10 generations. Vegetatively reproducing and dioecious species are believed to possess less genetic variation compared to sexually-reproducing and hermaphroditic or monoecious species, and hence the

number of populations (for vegetatively-reproducing species) or individuals per population (for dioecious species), needs to be higher to minimize the loss of genetic variation (see HPPRCC 2011, pp 5-10; Hartl and Clark 1989).

As we learn more information about how many populations and number of reproducing individuals are needed in each population to maintain resiliency and species viability, we can update these recovery criteria. Surveying and monitoring efforts, such as those of the *Tuberolabium guamense* Species Action Plan (DOD 2021), can help provide the data needed to evaluate species-specific goals. Initiatives such as this Species Action Plan help identify targets or milestones for identifying populations as well as assessing population resiliency throughout parts of the species' known range. For example, the *T. guamense* Species Action Plan identifies targets for the number of populations found on non-military lands that can be used to assess progress toward recovery.

2. Recovery Criteria for Pacific sheath-tailed bat

Objective: Establish multiple, self-sustaining populations on multiple islands to increase population redundancy, establish metapopulation dynamics, enhance inter-population morphological and genetic diversity to maintain or increase representation, protect and manage suitable habitat, and manage threats to improve the resiliency of Pacific sheath-tailed bat populations in the Marianas.

Downlisting

To consider downlisting the Pacific sheath-tailed bat from endangered to threatened, the following criteria should be met.

Downlisting Criteria

Criterion 1: There are at least three stable or increasing populations of Pacific sheath-tailed bats with consistently occupied roosts on two or more islands. To be considered stable, a population must number at least 500 individuals over a 10-year period.

Criterion 2: Roosts that contribute to Downlisting Criterion 1 and the surrounding forest habitat are protected from development and habitat-altering invasive species, including ungulates. Long-term management commitments are in place to maintain the quality and quantity of foraging and roosting habitat.

Criterion 3: Threats to the populations in Downlisting Criterion 1 including predation, habitat alteration, and pesticides are evaluated and found to be absent or controlled to a level where the species is able to maintain stable to growing populations.

Delisting

To consider delisting the Pacific sheath-tailed bat, the above downlisting criteria should be met, as well as the following criteria.

Delisting Criteria

Criterion 1: There are at least six stable or increasing populations of Pacific sheath-tailed bats with consistently occupied roosts on three or more islands. To be considered stable, a population must number at least 500 individuals over a 10-year period.

Criterion 2: Roosts that contribute to Downlisting Criterion 1 and the surrounding forest habitat are protected from development and habitat-altering invasive species, including ungulates. Long-term management commitments are in place to maintain the quality and quantity of foraging and roosting habitat.

Criterion 3: Threats to the populations in Delisting Criterion 1 including predation, habitat alteration, and pesticides are evaluated and found to be absent or controlled to a level where the species is able to maintain stable to growing populations.

Criterion 4: A management plan (or plans) is developed and implemented to ensure the long-term protection of the habitat that supports the six populations.

Rationale for Pacific sheath-tailed bat recovery criteria

Protecting and facilitating the growth of populations on Aguiguan is a necessary first step to restoring populations on other islands, as they will be the source for future reintroduction efforts. Establishing new populations on additional islands will improve the resiliency and redundancy of the species and provide the opportunity to reestablish a functioning metapopulation. Using an estimated generation time of 2.5 years (Pacifici et al. 2013 -Appendix, row 1438), periodic monitoring over a 10-year period will provide sufficient data to assess population trends over several generations and potentially allow the effects of catastrophic events to be tracked.

Based on the preference of the Mariana subspecies for foraging in forests adjacent to roosts, Wiles et al. (2011, p. 307) suggested that past deforestation was likely a principal factor in limiting the current population to Aguiguan, an island that retains significant forest cover. Overgrazing of the forest understory by ungulates results in little or no recruitment of canopy tree species, which inhibits or prevents forest recovery after catastrophic events such as typhoons. Protection of extant and extirpated roost sites from disturbance and management of adjacent forest habitat should preserve the essential foraging habitat needed to keep existing colonies viable and unoccupied roosts suitable for recolonization.

The most significant threats to the subspecies include predation by invasive mammals, disturbance at roost caves, habitat loss due to deforestation and overgrazing by ungulates, and stochastic events such as typhoons. In addition, pesticide use is thought to have contributed to the decline and eventual extirpation of bat colonies on Guam, Rota, Tinian, and Saipan. The magnitude and mechanism of these threats and their effect on population viability will need to be further researched and evaluated, but it is expected that the management of these threats is necessary to substantially improve the resiliency of populations.

Given the number of threats and the species' dependence on intact native forest for foraging, suitable habitat for this subspecies must be managed continuously. Developing and implementing a Pacific sheath-tailed bat management plan will ensure the species' needs are met

and threats are managed to facilitate the eventual translocation to or recolonization of islands or areas from which they were extirpated. Expanding populations to other islands will increase redundancy and resiliency and will enhance their ability to recover from catastrophic and stochastic events.

3. Recovery Criteria for Slevin's skink

Objective: Establish self-sustaining populations of Slevin's skink on six islands with threats adequately managed to increase redundancy, preserve inter-population morphological and genetic diversity to maintain or increase representation, protect and manage suitable habitat, and manage threats to improve the resiliency of Slevin's skink populations.

Downlisting
To consider downlisting the Slevin's skink from endangered to threatened, the following criteria should be met.

Downlisting Criteria

Criterion 1: Stable or increasing populations of Slevin's skink occur on at least four islands and must be reproducing and have a stable or increasing population trend for 10 years.

Criterion 2: Suitable habitat supporting skink populations on the four occupied islands is effectively protected from development and habitat-altering invasive species, including ungulates.

Criterion 3: Biosecurity measures are in place and the predation risk to each population in Downlisting Criterion 1 is evaluated and predators are absent or are controlled to a level where these populations remain stable or increasing.

Delisting
To consider delisting Slevin's skink, the above downlisting criteria should be met, as well as the following criteria.

Delisting Criteria

Criterion 1: Populations of Slevin's skink are stable or increasing on at least six islands. To be considered stable, populations must be reproducing and not decreasing in abundance for 10 years.

Criterion 2: Suitable habitat supporting skink populations on the six occupied islands is effectively protected from development and habitat-altering invasive species, including ungulates. Agreements from conservation partners and stakeholders to maintain protections are in place to ensure the habitat remains suitable.

Criterion 3: Biosecurity measures are in place and the predation risk to each population in Downlisting Criterion 1 is evaluated and predators are absent or are controlled to a level where these populations remain stable or increasing.

Criterion 4: Management and monitoring plans are completed and identify the actions and procedures needed to control threats to habitat (i.e., ungulates and invasive plants) and support recovery. The monitoring plan identifies procedures and schedules to track the response of populations to management.

Rationale for Slevin's skink recovery criteria

We did not include a specific number of populations in the recovery criteria because of the species' cryptic nature and the difficulty of surveying the northern islands. Instead, we rely on a target geographic distribution. Based on the most recent surveys, Slevin's skink populations occur on four islands. Although the skink was historically found on nine islands in the Marianas, if stable or increasing populations exist on four islands the species will have sufficient redundancy to protect them from catastrophic events. Three of the four islands where the skink occurs, Sarigan, Alamagan, and Asuncion are presently not likely to be impacted by development pressure, have large areas of suitable skink habitat, and other threats are expected to remain at current levels due to the low likelihood of human disturbance in the northern islands. No life history studies of the skink have been conducted; however, a study of the related littoral skink (*Emoia atrocostata*), which also occurs in the Marianas, found that they have a life span of between 3 to 4 years (Alcala and Brown 1967, p. 596). A 10-year period should be sufficient to differentiate seasonal and/or annual variation from long-term trends, as well as document the effects of catastrophic events.

Habitat loss and degradation are a significant factor in the decline of Slevin's skink (USFWS 2020p). Based on the area of forest habitat occupied by populations, the distribution of Slevin's skink has declined by 99 percent since the arrival of humans (USFWS 2023p). The islands from which the skink has been extirpated (i.e., Guam, Rota, Aguiguan, Tinian, and Pagan) have a long history of human occupation including the introduction of ungulates. There is strong evidence linking the decline of Slevin's skink to the degradation of forest habitat by introduced ungulates, as illustrated by the four-fold increase in skink abundance following the eradication of ungulates on Sarigan (Vogt in litt. 2007, entire). The islands with extant skink populations (i.e., Cocos, Sarigan, Alamagan, and Asuncion) have a high percentage of native or coconut forest cover, are relatively free from human disturbance, and all but Alamagan are ungulate-free. The species is apparently declining on Alamagan, likely due to decades of habitat degradation by ungulates, further supporting the need to manage and protect suitable habitat. Agreements with conservation partners to ensure these threats are controlled will be necessary to ensure the recovery of the long-term resiliency of all skink populations.

Despite no direct evidence of predation contributing to the decline of Slevin's skink, there is some correlation between the decline of Slevin's skink and predation. Researchers have identified the Asian house shrew, rats, and brown treesnake as potential predators (USFWS 2023p). Therefore, to downlist and eventually delist the species, skink populations should exist on islands or habitats free from predators or where predators are controlled such that the species is able to maintain stable to growing populations throughout its range. In addition, biosecurity measures will need to be in place to ensure predators are not introduced to the islands occupied by the Slevin's skink populations.

4. Recovery Criteria for Mariana eight-spot butterfly and Mariana wandering butterfly

Objective: Establish multiple, self-sustaining populations to increase redundancy, preserve morphological and genetic diversity to maintain or increase representation, and protect and manage suitable habitat and manage threats to improve the resiliency of Mariana wandering butterfly and Mariana eight-spot butterfly populations.

Downlisting
To consider downlisting the Mariana eight-spot butterfly and/or the Mariana wandering butterfly from endangered to threatened, the following criteria should be met.

Downlisting Criteria

Criterion 1: There are at least 14 stable populations of each species within their historical range. To be considered stable, populations must be reproducing and not decreasing in abundance for 10 years.

Criterion 2: Suitable habitat, including host plants, to support the 14 populations of each species is actively managed or protected from development, ungulates, and invasive plants. The host plants also must be protected from slugs.

Criterion 3: The predation and parasitism risk of each population in Downlisting Criterion 1 is evaluated and predators and parasitoids are absent or are controlled to a level where the species can maintain stable to growing populations.

Delisting
To consider delisting the Mariana eight-spot butterfly or the Mariana wandering butterfly the above downlisting criteria should be met as well as the following criteria.

Delisting Criteria

Criterion 1: There are at least 20 stable or increasing populations of each species within their historical range. To be considered stable they must be reproducing and not decreasing in abundance for 10 years.

Criterion 2: Suitable habitat, including host plants, to support the 20 populations of each species is actively managed or protected from development, ungulates, and invasive plants. The host plants also must be protected from slugs.

Criterion 3: The predation and parasitism risk of each population in Delisting Criterion 1 is evaluated and predators and parasitoids are absent or are controlled to a level where the species can maintain stable to growing populations.

Criterion 4: A management and monitoring plan has been written identifying the actions and procedures that will be necessary to control predator and parasitism threats and threats to habitat (i.e., ungulates, slugs, and invasive plants) at the sites occupied by recovery populations. A monitoring plan identifies procedures and schedules to track the

response of the species' populations to management. Agreements from conservation partners to maintain protections are in place.

Rationale for Mariana eight-spot butterfly and Mariana wandering butterfly recovery criteria

The Mariana eight-spot butterfly is historically known from approximately 14 locations on Guam and occurred on Saipan; it can now be consistently found at only 7 locations on Guam, which may reflect 6 to 10 populations, that support large aggregations of its 2 host plant species (USFWS 2023q, p. 30). The Mariana wandering butterfly has not been documented on Guam or Rota since 1979 and 1995, respectively. Without knowing if the species still persists, we used the recovery criteria for the Mariana eight-spot butterfly, which shares similar habitat requirements and distribution, and also is dependent on specific host plants for reproduction. We determined that 14 stable populations is appropriate as that is the number of known historical populations of the Mariana eight-spot butterfly and will provide redundancy for both butterfly species as long as the species is broadly distributed through portions of its historical range. We also determined that for the species to have adequate redundancy to be delisted, there must be 20 butterfly populations distributed throughout its historical range. A 10-year period should be sufficient to differentiate seasonal and/or annual variation from long-term trends, as well as document the effects of catastrophic events.

The primary threat to the butterflies is habitat loss and host plant suppression by invasive plant species. Mariana eight-spot butterfly habitat is closed canopy, native limestone forest with an abundance of the host plants, *Procris pedunculata* (no common name) and *Elatostema calcareum* (no common name; Schreiner and Nafus 1996, p. 1). The host plant for the Mariana wandering butterfly, *Maytenus thompsonii* (Chamorro: luluhot), is a small shrub-like tree endemic to the Mariana Islands found primarily in the understory of closed-canopy native limestone forests (Vogt and Williams 2004, p. 121; Schreiner and Nafus 1996, p. 1). Development, invasive animals (including ungulates and slugs), and invasive plants all cause substantial damage to butterfly habitat by degrading forest habitat, inhibiting plant recruitment, and killing host plants. Therefore, for the butterflies to be downlisted and eventually delisted, these threats must be managed or mitigated such that they do not cause population-level effects to the butterflies or their habitat and host plants.

Predation by native and non-native ants, and egg parasitism by wasps, are other significant threats to both the Mariana eight-spot butterfly and potentially the Mariana wandering butterfly (USFWS 2023q, p. 6; USFWS 2023r, p. 6). Ants eat butterfly eggs (Schreiner and Nafus 1996, p. 3; Rubinoff in litt. 2013) and possibly caterpillars. In recent years, during surveys for the Mariana eight-spot butterfly, researchers consistently observed high rates of egg parasitism by wasps (Fiedler pers. comm. 2019). The introduction and/or proliferation of predators and parasitoids has the potential to reduce or extirpate populations of both species. To ensure adequate redundancy and representation in the Marianas, butterflies must occupy predator and parasitoid-free habitat or have predators and parasitoids controlled such that both species are able to maintain stable to growing populations throughout their range.

5. Recovery Criteria for Rota blue damselfly

Objective: Establish multiple, self-sustaining populations to increase redundancy, preserve morphological and genetic characteristics to maintain representation, and protect and manage water quality, stream flow, and threats to improve the resiliency of the Rota blue damselfly.

Downlisting
To consider downlisting Rota blue damselfly from endangered to threatened, the following criteria should be met.

Downlisting Criteria

Criterion 1: There are at least three stable or increasing populations of the Rota blue damselfly in three or more streams in the Mariana Islands. To be considered stable a population must be reproducing and not decreasing in abundance for 10 years.

Criterion 2: The Sabana Plateau and other areas supplying water to streams in the Talakhaya Watershed are managed to preserve existing native and secondary forest habitat to preserve suitable water quality and flow.

Criterion 3: On Rota, streams suitable for the damselfly are actively managed to preserve stream overstory cover as well as to prevent increased turbidity, pollution, and overharvesting of water and biosecurity measures are in place that minimize the likelihood for the introduction of potential predators and competitors.

Delisting
To consider delisting the Rota blue damselfly, the above downlisting criteria should be met, as well as the following criteria.

Delisting Criteria

Criterion 1: There are at least three stable or increasing populations of the Rota blue damselfly in five or more streams in the Mariana Islands. To be considered stable a population must be reproducing and not decreasing in abundance for 10 years and demonstrate resiliency against drought.

Criterion 2: The Sabana Plateau and other areas supplying water to streams occupied by the damselfly will be managed to preserve existing native and secondary forest habitat to preserve suitable water quality and temperature.

Criterion 3: Streams suitable for the damselfly are actively managed to preserve stream overstory cover as well as to prevent increased turbidity, pollution, and overharvesting of water and biosecurity measures are in place that minimize the likelihood of the introduction of potential predators and competitors.

Criterion 4: A captive breeding population has been established to ensure the survival of the species in the event that a catastrophic event damages the Talakhaya Watershed and degrades the population at the Okgok Stream.

Criterion 5: A management and monitoring plan has been completed that identifies the actions and procedures necessary to control predators, competitors, and threats to habitat (i.e., ungulates, wildfire, and invasive plants) at the sites occupied by recovery populations. A monitoring plan identifies procedures and schedules to track the response of species to management. Agreements from conservation partners to maintain protections are in place.

Rationale for the Rota blue damselfly recovery criteria

The presence of several dry and intermittent stream beds located east of the Okgok Stream suggests that the Rota blue damselfly once had a larger distribution that may have included all of the Talakhaya Watershed. These streams may have been perennial prior to the increased withdrawal of water from the Talakhaya Watershed for human use (Golabi et al. 2018, p. 194). To ensure the species has sufficient redundancy and is able to recover from catastrophic events and be downlisted, the damselfly must maintain populations in three or more streams. Given the typical generation time of a damselfly, requiring a stable or increasing population for 10 years would allow monitoring to capture seasonal and yearly variation in population numbers.

To ensure the species remains viable and can meet delisting criteria, the damselfly must occur in additional streams on Rota and possibly on other islands if other streams on Rota are not suitable. The feasibility of assisted colonization of the species to Guam or Saipan must thus be evaluated. There are several perennial watersheds on Guam and one on Saipan that may be suitable sites for the damselfly. Confirming the suitability of these streams will require comparing the hydrology and water quality of the Okgok Stream to potential introduction streams as well as an understanding of the habitat needs of the species at all life stages. The success of propagating damselfly species in Hawai‘i suggests that captive propagation could facilitate the establishment of the Rota blue damselfly to other watersheds. The introduction of the damselfly to additional watersheds will increase the species’ redundancy and increase its resiliency to stochastic and catastrophic events.

The species’ dependence on freshwater streams makes it particularly vulnerable to drought. In the Mariana Islands, El Niño events contribute to severe droughts. Droughts result in the desiccation of grasslands and forests, the draw-down of streamflow and well-heads, and more severe and frequent wildfires, all of which impact water quantity and quality as well as essential damselfly habitat (USFWS 2023s, pp. 22, 38). Therefore, for delisting, the 10-year monitoring period must include at least one drought year. This will provide information on how drought affects the species’ populations viability as well as an assessment of the likelihood that the species can be recovered.

The loss and alteration of stream habitat and loss and degradation of forest habitat on the Sabana Plateau and in the Talakhaya area are the main threats to the Rota blue damselfly. For the species to remain viable, there must be sufficient quantity and quality of forest habitat on the Sabana Plateau to enable natural filtration and precipitation to feed the streams in the Talakhaya Watershed. Although little is known about the water quality requirements of the Rota blue damselfly, other odonates, particularly coenagrionid damselflies, are sensitive to changes in water quality (Córdoba-Aguilar and Rocha-Ortega 2019, pp. 1, 4-5). Generally, they are intolerant of high temperatures, pollutants, hypoxic conditions, and silted water. In addition, a

reduction or loss of stream flow in conjunction with potential effects associated with climate change could eliminate or reduce the species' habitat (Polhemus and Richardson 2020, p. 3). To downlist and eventually delist the species, the occupied watersheds and the forest habitat that supports the aquifer must be managed to limit unsustainable human withdrawal and sustain adequate water quality and quantity.

Sufficient forest cover along streams in the Talakhaya Watershed is essential to the survival and recovery of the species by contributing to cool water temperatures, refugia and shelter, and habitat for damselfly prey, as well as providing sufficient stream flow to support all life stages (USFWS 2023s, p. 44). In addition to over-harvesting of water, if forest vegetation is converted to grassland, water flows are reduced by increased vegetation transpiration rates. The most significant threats to stream habitat on Rota are ungulates, fire, and over-harvesting of water. Ungulates degrade watersheds by causing erosion, spreading invasive plants, and decimating understory vegetation. Currently, deer are hampering ongoing efforts to revegetate the slopes of the Talakhaya to reduce soil erosion. Given the damselflies' dependence on cool stream water free of silt and pollution, ungulates must be managed to prevent the degradation of water quality. Fire is a human-exacerbated threat to native species and ecosystems throughout the Mariana Islands. On the Sabana Plateau and within the Talakhaya Watershed, deer hunters frequently burn areas to lure deer to new growth (Mattos et al. 2015, p. 13; Golabi et al. 2018, p. 198; CNMI-DCRM 2019, p. 1; Manglona pers. comm. 2019). When vegetation is destroyed or degraded by wildfire, water is not efficiently absorbed, and surface flow can erode stream beds and deposit silt into the stream. Although fire has affected forest habitat on Rota, particularly within the Talakhaya, the impact of fire on the stream habitat of the Rota blue damselfly has not been quantified. Although the remote and relatively inaccessible location of the Rota blue damselfly populations affords the species some protection from humans, the reduction or loss of stream flow due to increased human use or reduced aquifer recharge on the Sabana Plateau could significantly diminish the damselfly habitat in the Talakhaya Watershed.

Given that the species is currently restricted to one watershed, it is vulnerable to extinction; thus, establishing additional populations would increase the probability the species would survive a catastrophic event. To facilitate the establishment of additional populations, a captive breeding facility must be established to house a captive population which will allow for the establishment of additional populations as suitable habitat is located and restored.

6. Recovery Criteria for humped tree snail, Langford's tree snail, Guam tree snail, and fragile tree snail

Objective: Establish multiple self-sustaining populations to increase redundancy, preserve inter-population morphological and genetic diversity to increase representation, protect and manage suitable habitat, and manage threats to improve the resiliency of the humped tree snail, Guam tree snail, Langford's tree snail, and fragile tree snail populations.

Downlisting
To consider downlisting the humped tree snail, Langford's tree snail, Guam tree snail, and/or fragile tree snail from endangered to threatened, the following criteria should be met.

Downlisting Criteria

Criterion 1: There are at least 10 stable populations of each listed partulid snail species distributed across their respective historical ranges. To be considered stable, each population must number at least 400 observed individuals distributed across all age classes, and 6 of the 10 populations must maintain populations greater than 400 observed individuals for 3 consecutive years. If differences in morphology or genetics are determined to exist based on geography, each must be represented by at least one population.

Criterion 2: Each population in Downlisting Criterion 1 occurs in suitable habitat that is protected from development and invasive plants and animals (i.e., ungulate-free) and is managed to protect native forest vegetation.

Criterion 3: Biosecurity measures are in place to prevent the introduction of new predators to the Mariana Islands as well as the spread of existing predators to new islands. The predation risk of each population in Downlisting Criterion 1 is evaluated and predators are absent or are controlled to a level where populations remain stable or increasing.

Delisting

To consider delisting the humped tree snail, Langford's tree snail, Guam tree snail, and/or fragile tree snail, the above downlisting criteria should be met, as well as the following criteria.

Delisting Criteria

Criterion 1: There are at least 20 stable populations of each listed partulid snail species distributed across their respective historical ranges. To be considered stable, a population must number at least 400 observed individuals distributed across all age classes, and 15 of the 20 populations must maintain populations greater than 400 observed individuals for 5 consecutive years. If differences in morphology or genetics are determined to exist based on geography, each must be represented by at least 1 of the 20 populations.

Criterion 2: Each population in Delisting Criterion 1 occurs in suitable habitat that is protected from development and invasive plants and animals (i.e., ungulate-free) and is managed to protect native forest vegetation.

Criterion 3: Biosecurity measures are in place to prevent the introduction of new predators to the Mariana Islands, as well as the spread of existing predators to new islands. The predation risk of each population in Delisting Criterion 1 is evaluated and predators are absent or are controlled to a level where populations remain stable or increasing.

Criterion 4: A management and monitoring plan has been completed that identifies the actions and procedures needed to control threats to habitat (i.e., ungulates and invasive plants) at the sites occupied by recovery populations. A monitoring plan identifies procedures and schedules to track the response of the species' populations to

management actions. Agreements from conservation partners to maintain protections to needed habitat are in place.

Rationale for the tree snail recovery criteria

Due to the similarities in ecology, threat vulnerability, and habitat usage between partulid snails of the Marianas and snails of the genus *Achatinella* on O‘ahu, we used the criteria established in the Amendment to the Recovery Plan for Oahu Tree Snail of the Genus *Achatinella* as a model (USFWS 2019b, entire). Despite reaching maturity faster and producing young more frequently than *Achatinella*, partulid snails are still slow growing, long lived, and slow reproducing (Cowie 1992, p. 174). The relative short time to first reproduction, high annual fecundity, and limited life span of partulid snails, indicates that annual population surveys over a 3-year period are sufficient to capture population trends spanning multiple generations. The frequency of cyclones (i.e., typhoons in the Mariana Islands and hurricanes in the Hawaiian Islands) that destroy or degrade forest habitat is greater in the Mariana Islands than O‘ahu and projections of future cyclone activity indicate that typhoons are likely to increase in both frequency and severity in the Mariana archipelago (Camargo 2013, p. 9896). Consequently, to allow for the recovery of snail populations from stronger and more frequent typhoons, we established larger population thresholds for partulid snail recovery than those required for *Achatinella* recovery (USFWS 2019, pp. 3-4). Pending a detailed assessment of geographic variation and threats, 10 populations of 400 observed individuals should be sufficient to conserve the representation, and redundancy of the partulid snail species. Requiring that 6 of the 10 populations have greater than 400 observed individuals for 3 consecutive years will provide a buffer against catastrophic events such as typhoons and allow for the recovery of the population once habitat has recovered.

To delist any of the partulid snails, annual population monitoring over a 5-year period is required to confirm long term stability. As described in the downlisting and delisting requirements, any documented inter- or intra-island genetic or morphological distinctions among populations will require that we differentiate among the populations and ensure each are represented in the 10 or 20 populations necessary for downlisting or delisting, respectively.

Recent genetic analysis of *Partula gibba* found significant genetic variation among populations (Sischo and Hadfield 2017, p.1; Sischo and Hadfield 2021, entire) making it essential that each genetically distinct, geographic unit is protected to ensure that all remaining genetic diversity is maintained.

One of the primary conservation concerns for partulid snails is habitat loss and, more specifically, the alteration of the micro-habitat conditions on which they rely. Partulid snails require cool, shaded forest with high humidity and low air movement, which prevents excessive water loss in individual snails, and stable temperature, humidity, and light are essential to the survival of juvenile snails. Feral pigs, goats, and Philippine deer degrade forest habitat, inhibit plant recruitment, and facilitate the spread of invasive plants. While partulid snails currently persist in habitats occupied by feral ungulates on Guam, Rota, Tinian, Saipan and the northern islands, habitat degradation caused by ungulates is contributing to the decline and extirpation of partulid snails in the Mariana Islands. Therefore, to downlist and eventually delist the species, snail populations must exist on or in ungulate-free islands or habitats.

To be delisted, snail populations must be able to expand their range and establish new populations through natural dispersal or captive propagation and reintroduction. Redundant populations will facilitate the species' ability to withstand catastrophic events.

The current and most serious threat to humped tree snails is predation by the New Guinea flatworm, as well as by rats and introduced predatory snails. Therefore, delisting will require a clear understanding of invasive predator distribution, abundance, and predator-prey dynamics. Although some partulid snail populations appear to be persisting with predators, several populations have been extirpated or are rapidly declining. Given the extensive history of partulid and *Achatinellidae* snail extirpations on Pacific islands (Bick et al. 2018, p. 508), we expect that establishing and maintaining snail populations on predator-free islands or within predator-free habitats will be needed to recover these species.

III. RECOVERY ACTIONS

This recovery plan identifies recovery actions, which will need to be implemented to meet the recovery criteria for the 23 species. Implementation of a recovery action will depend on its priority, availability of funds and resources, coordination with partners and stakeholders, complexity, and logistical constraints. A broad action may have multiple components developed as needed to best coordinate recovery implementation. Project-level implementation of these actions will be accomplished through shorter-term activities (collectively referred to as the Recovery Implementation Strategy) in coordination with the recovery partners interested and willing to work on implementing the activities. Activities are intended to be adaptable and guide partners to coordinate recovery implementation and further describe those responsible for each action described in the plan. Because these activities will be described in the RIS, they can be modified as needed without requiring future revision of the recovery plan, as long as they are consistent with the recovery plan.

As discussed in the Introduction, this recovery plan is a guidance document rather than being regulatory in nature. As such, implementation of recovery actions is voluntary and depends on the cooperation and commitment of numerous partners. All Federal agencies, however, have an obligation under section 7(a)(1) of the Act to carry out programs for the conservation of listed species.

The actions needed to alleviate threats to the species and achieve recovery criteria are organized into five categories: (1) Determine population status and current distribution of the species and their habitats, (2) conduct research to clarify life history information, identify limiting factors and/or threats to population viability, and develop solutions, (3) conserve and enhance populations, (4) develop regulations and policy essential to recover the species and their habitats, and (5) improve stakeholder awareness and engagement.

Recovery Actions

1. **Determine the current distribution and status of the species and their habitats.**
   - 1.1. Develop survey methods for each of the 23 species and conduct range-wide surveys for listed plants, vertebrates, and invertebrates to determine their current distribution and status.
     - 1.1.1. Determine the current range and estimate the number and age class of individuals within each area and determine the number and genetic structure of populations on each island.
     - 1.1.2. Monitor the range-wide population, tracking trends and distribution at time intervals appropriate for each species.
   - 1.2. Map the remaining habitat for each species and assess the severity of threats to the persistence of these areas.
2. **Conduct research to clarify life history information, identify limiting factors and/or threats to population viability, and develop solutions.** Assess factors limiting population growth and stability to inform conservation actions.

2.1. Habitat requirements – Identify and assess any potential factors limiting the species population growth and determine what constitutes high quality habitat for all species, including ecological requirements for successful reproduction and population stability, as well as feeding and sheltering needs for animals, the distribution of this habitat, and threats to the sites with high-quality habitat.

2.1.1. Monitor water quality and flow rates for the Okgok Stream and compare it to similar streams on Rota, Guam, and Saipan.

2.1.2. Conduct research to determine if artificial roosts are suitable refugia for bats.

2.1.2.1. Evaluate whether bats will use roost boxes placed in roost caves (to facilitate conservation translocations and minimize capture and handling stress).

2.2. Population biology and breeding systems – determine where and when reproduction occurs, population structure, and factors limiting population stability.

2.2.1. Evaluate population trends and dynamics for each of the 23 species and determine which will require captive rearing/captive propagation to meet recovery criteria.

2.3. Food sources – determine preferred prey during different life stages.

2.4. Identify potential predators, competitors, and habitat-modifying invasive animals on each island, quantify their effects, and develop effective control methods.

2.4.1. Conduct research to determine the best way to control or eradicate the New Guinea flatworm and predatory snails from essential snail habitat.

2.4.2. Conduct research to determine the best way to control or eradicate the brown treesnake, slugs, parasitic wasps, and predatory ants from listed plant and animal habitat.

2.4.3. Conduct research to determine the best way to control or eradicate rodents from listed plant and animal habitat.

2.4.4. Determine whether other species compete for similar resources (i.e., food or shelter) used by the listed species.

2.5. Assess development, land designation, and zoning threats to the conservation of habitat needed for recovery.

2.6. Assess wildfire threat to each population and the habitats needed to achieve recovery.

3. Conserve and enhance populations. Once the overall condition of the 23 species is known (Recovery Actions 1 and 2), establish recovery sites (hereafter sites) to be managed for the recovery of the species and develop well-designed conservation programs that incorporate consistent monitoring and adaptive management. Establish or augment populations within sites as needed to achieve the recovery criteria for each species.

3.1. Select sites to be managed for recovery of the 14 plants and 9 animals.

3.1.1. Select sites of sufficient number and size to support populations needed to achieve the recovery criteria of each species.

3.1.2. Prioritize site selection by balancing factors including conservation value to target or multiple species, likelihood of success of threat control efforts, and other relevant criteria. Secure the long-term conservation status of sites through fee simple purchase, conservation easements, landowner agreements, and/or regulatory mechanisms, to protect and manage the sites from development and enable control of threats from invasive animals, invasive plants, and wildfire.

3.2. Protect listed animals, plants, and their habitats from invasive animals and plants.

3.2.1. Control habitat-modifying invasive plants and animals at all sites needed to achieve the recovery criteria for the 23 species. Control or eradicate predators, herbivores, parasitoids, and diseases to minimize or eliminate effects to listed plant and animal populations needed to achieve recovery criteria.

3.2.1.1. Control or eradicate ungulates at all recovery sites. Construct and maintain ungulate-proof fencing around all occupied recovery sites, eradicate ungulates from islands needed to achieve recovery of the 23 species, or otherwise prevent ungulates from degrading sites.

3.2.1.2. Control or eradicate habitat-modifying invasive plants at all recovery sites.

3.2.1.3. Control or eradicate rodents and other habitat-modifying invasive animals at all recovery sites.

3.2.1.4. Control the brown treesnake to protect listed species and their habitat.

3.2.1.4.1. Prevent the introduction of the brown treesnake to other islands (i.e., outside of Guam) through appropriate interdiction efforts and have programs in place to detect and eradicate the brown treesnake should it be found on islands occupied by populations needed to achieve recovery.

3.2.1.4.2. Develop and implement landscape-scale control and suppression of the brown treesnake on Guam.

3.2.1.4.3. Eradicate the brown treesnake from all recovery sites supporting listed vertebrates using snake exclusion fences or other means.

3.2.1.5. Control invasive invertebrates including slugs, ants, cycad blue butterflies, and cycad scale at all recovery sites. Eradicate the little fire ant and any other ants from all recovery sites.

3.2.1.6. Develop and implement biosecurity systems and measures to prevent the introduction or spread of habitat altering, invasive plants, animals, and pathogens to recovery sites.

3.2.1.7. Develop and implement fire management plans, as needed, to minimize the likelihood that native forest at recovery sites will burn, assure fire return intervals in savanna habitats are long enough to promote diverse native vegetation, and ensure the persistence of stream habitat needed for recovery of the 23 listed species.

3.3. Identify and implement additional site-specific and species-specific treatments at recovery sites to control threats.

3.3.1. Ensure stream flow in the Okgok Stream is preserved, through forest conservation to support recharge, and management of water harvesting and diversion, to optimize Rota blue damselfly survival and productivity.

3.3.2. Manage unoccupied but suitable habitat as well as occupied roost caves to minimize disturbance and reduce predation on Pacific sheath-tailed bats.

3.3.3. Develop and implement methods to control cycad *Aulacaspis* scale.

3.3.4. Control other threats, such as pesticides, to listed plant and animal populations and their pollinators and seed dispersers as appropriate.

3.4. Establish and conserve a sufficient number of populations of each of the 23 listed species within protected sites to achieve recovery criteria.

3.4.1. Increase the number of individuals in each population and the number of populations of each species to improve resiliency, redundancy, and representation.

3.4.1.1. Select species/populations for reinforcement and/or sites for reintroduction. Reintroduction sites must meet the same criteria as those supporting recovery populations (i.e., long-term protection is secured, threats are managed).

3.4.1.2. Establish captive rearing/propagation programs for the species/populations that were determined to benefit most from husbandry.

3.4.1.3. Prepare reinforcement and reintroduction sites. As needed, propagate and outplant common native plants including host plants to improve habitat quality for listed animal and plant species.

3.4.1.3.1. In sites selected to benefit the recovery of the two butterflies, ensure sufficient numbers of host plants by protecting plants and/or through outplanting.

3.4.1.4. Reintroduce genetically appropriate individuals to sites; reinforcement or reintroduction must not be undertaken until threats have been controlled.

3.4.1.5. Consider assisted colonization for those with narrow ranges or when appropriate, as needed.

3.4.1.6. Monitor success of conservation translocation efforts and adapt management and/or protocols as appropriate.

3.4.2. Develop and maintain genetic storage and propagation facilities where needed.

3.4.3. Propagate genetically appropriate individuals for genetic storage and reinforcement or reintroduction.

3.5. Monitor response of populations to recovery actions and adapt actions as appropriate.

4. **Develop regulations and policy essential to recover the species and their habitats.**

4.1. Facilitate or encourage regulations and policy to ensure protection of the listed species under Commonwealth or Territorial law.

4.1.1. Recognize the 23 species for protections under the Guam and CNMI's Endangered Species Act.

4.1.2. Facilitate or encourage regulations and policy to control the threats of ungulates and wildfire to occupied recovery sites.

4.2. Develop and support the implementation of biosecurity plans to prevent the arrival and spread of new invasive species into the Territory and Commonwealth and inter-island movement of invasive species already established in the archipelago.

4.3. Evaluate the utility of developing and implementing island-wide habitat conservation plans for key islands to protect the 23 species addressed herein.

5. **Improve stakeholder awareness and engagement.** Create and share outreach materials with partners and stakeholders regarding the current and historical status of the 23 listed species, the conservation value of the listed species, and how we can work together to enhance populations and manage threats.

Table 10. Crosswalk relating threats, recovery criteria, and recovery actions for the 23 species.

Listing Factor	Threat	Downlisting and Delisting Criteria	Recovery Actions
14 listed plants			
A **Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification or Curtailment of its Habitat or Range**	Development (e.g., urbanization, agricultural, and military)	Downlisting and Delisting 2	1.2, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4, 4.3, 5
	Invasive animals (e.g., ungulates, rodents, brown treesnake, little fire ant)	Downlisting and Delisting 2	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 4.2, 5
	Invasive plants (including wildfire-mediated)	Downlisting and Delisting 2	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 4.2, 5
B **Overutilization**	Not applicable (N/A)		
C **Disease or Predation**	Seed predation by rats	Downlisting and Delisting 2	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 4.2, 5
	Herbivory by invasive invertebrates	Downlisting and Delisting 2	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 4.2, 5
D **Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms**	Regulations and policy needed to secure local protected status for species, protected status for recovery habitats, and control biosecurity, ungulate, and invasive plant threats	Downlisting and Delisting 2	3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5
E **Other Natural or Manmade Factors**	Typhoons	Downlisting and Delisting 2	1.2, 3.4, 4.3, 5
	Small population sizes and/or small number of populations	Downlisting and Delisting 1, Delisting 3	1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5

	Loss of genetic diversity	Downlisting and Delisting 1	1.2, 2.2, 3.4
Pacific sheath-tailed bat			
A **Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification or Curtailment of its Habitat or Range**	Development (e.g., urbanization, agricultural, and military), invasive animals (particularly goats), invasive plants	Downlisting and Delisting 2, Delisting 4	1.2, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4, 4.3, 5
B **Overutilization**	N/A		
C **Disease or Predation**	Predation by invasive animals	Downlisting and Delisting 3	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5
D **Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms**	Regulations and policy needed to secure local protected status for species, protected status for recovery habitats, and control biosecurity, ungulate, and invasive plant threats	Downlisting and Delisting 3, Delisting 4	3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5
E **Other Natural or Manmade Factors**	Human disturbance of roosts	Downlisting and Delisting 2	2.5, 3.3, 4.3, 5
	Typhoons	Downlisting and Delisting 1	1.2, 3.4, 4.3, 5
	Small population sizes and/or small number of populations	Downlisting and Delisting 1	1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5
	Breakdown of metapopulation dynamics	Downlisting and Delisting 1	1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5
	Pesticides (possible)	Downlisting and Delisting 3	3.3, 4.3, 5
Slevin's skink			
A **Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification or Curtailment of its Habitat or Range**	Development (e.g., urbanization, agricultural, and military)	Downlisting and Delisting 2, Delisting 4	1.2, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4, 4.3, 5
	Invasive plants and invasive animals	Downlisting and Delisting 2	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5
B **Overutilization**	N/A		
C **Disease or Predation**	Predation by invasive mammals and reptiles	Downlisting and Delisting 3	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5
	Predation by reptiles	Downlisting and Delisting 3	1.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5
D **Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms**	Regulations and policy needed to secure local protected status for species, protected status for recovery habitats, and control biosecurity, ungulate, and invasive plant threats	Downlisting and Delisting 3	3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5
E **Other Natural or Manmade Factors**	Typhoons	Downlisting and Delisting 2	1.2, 3.4, 4.3, 5
	Small population sizes and/or small number of populations	Downlisting and Delisting 1	1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5

Mariana eight-spot butterfly and Mariana wandering butterfly			
A **Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification or Curtailment of its Habitat or Range**	Development (e.g., urbanization, agricultural, and military)	Downlisting and Delisting 2, Delisting 4	1.2, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4, 4.3, 5
	Invasive plants and invasive animals	Downlisting and Delisting 2	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5
	Herbivory of host plants by slugs	Downlisting and Delisting 2	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5
B **Overutilization**	N/A		
C **Disease or Predation**	Predation by ants	Downlisting and Delisting 3	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5
	Egg parisitization by invasive wasps	Downlisting and Delisting 3	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5
D **Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms**	Regulations and policy needed to secure local protected status for species, protected status for recovery habitats, and control biosecurity, ungulate, and invasive plant threats	Downlisting and Delisting 3	3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5
E **Other Natural or Manmade Factors**	Typhoons	Downlisting and Delisting 1 and 2	1.2, 3.4, 4.3, 5
	Small population sizes and/or small number of populations	Downlisting and Delisting 1	1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5
Rota blue damselfly			
A **Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification or Curtailment of its Habitat or Range**	Development (e.g., urbanization, agricultural, and military)	Downlisting and Delisting 2, Delisting 5	1.2, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4, 4.3, 5
	Invasive plants and invasive animals	Downlisting and Delisting 3	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5
B **Overutilization**	N/A		
C **Disease or Predation**	Predation by invasive fish or amphibians	Delisting and Dowlisting 3	3.2, 4.2
D **Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms**	Need for watershed planning	Downlisting and Delisting 2	2.1, 3.3, 4.3, 5
	Regulations and policy needed to secure protected status for species, recovery conservation status for land, and to control biosecurity, ungulate, and invasive plant threats	Downlisting and Delisting 3	3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5
E **Other Natural or Manmade Factors**	Wildfire	Downlisting and Delisting 2	3.2, 4.3, 5
	Small population sizes and/or small number of populations	Downlisting and Delisting 1, Delisting 4	1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5
Partulid *snails*			
A **Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification or Curtailment of its Habitat or Range**	Development (e.g., urbanization, agricultural, and military)	Downlisting and Delisting 2, Delisting 4	1.2, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4, 4.3, 5
	Invasive plants and invasive animals	Downlisting and Delisting 2	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5

B **Overutilization**	Collection (historical threat)	Downlisting and Delisting 1	4.1, 5
C **Disease or Predation**	Predation by rats	Downlisting and Delisting 3	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5
	Predation by invasive invertebrates	Downlisting and Delisting 3	1.2, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 5
D **Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms**	Regulations and policy needed to secure local protected status for species, protected status for recovery habitats, and control biosecurity, ungulate, and invasive plant threats	Downlisting and Delisting 3	3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5
E **Other Natural or Manmade Factors**	Typhoons	Downlisting and Delisting 1	1.2, 3.4, 4.3, 5
	Small population sizes and/or small number of populations	Downlisting and Delisting 1	1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5
	Loss of local genetic diversity	Downlisting and Delisting 1	1.2, 2.2, 3.4

IV. TIME AND COST ESTIMATES

Recovering species can be time-consuming and expensive, as it often entails undoing centuries of impacts that have led to their current imperiled state. When species are listed under the Act they are often restricted to a fraction of their historical range, in habitats where major ecological processes have been disrupted. Demographic characteristics and genetic structure of populations may be degraded. Stressors such as invasive species, diseases, climate change, and habitat loss and degradation can interact synergistically with severe consequences for species. While the Act mandates that recovery plans include an estimate of the cost to recover species, this does not signify that these funds will be allocated. A wide range of partners often contribute to the cost of recovery, including the Department of Defense, other Federal agencies, States, and non-governmental organizations. Funds actually dedicated to species recovery are typically a fraction of the estimated cost. Because recovery periods may cover multiple decades, annual costs are much lower than overall cost estimates. While our focus here is on recovery of the 23 listed species addressed in this recovery plan, implementation of recovery actions will also often benefit other listed and nonlisted species as well as human welfare.

Achieving the recovery criteria for these 23 species is expected to require, at minimum, approximately 30 to 95 years. The Draft Recovery Plan for 23 Species in the Mariana Islands included a cost estimate of $7,943,530,000 for the 30 to 95 years necessary to recover all 23 species. While we acknowledge all of the estimated costs of implementing recovery actions to recover these species, it is most relevant and accurate to focus on the costs over the first 20 years. Under the best circumstances, given the myriad of uncertainties associated with recovering listed species, estimating recovery costs over a longer period is difficult. In general, these uncertainties include: (1) emergence of new threats, (2) response of species to management, (3) innovations in methods / technologies to address threats, and (4) potential economies of scale.

We calculated the annual implementation cost for each recovery action and then multiplied these annual costs by 20 years (Table 11). Estimated costs include only project specific contract, staff, or operations costs in excess of base budgets. They do not include funds that support ongoing staff responsibilities. This recovery plan does not commit the Service or any partners to carry out a particular recovery action or expend the estimated funds. Estimated costs incorporate planning, design, implementation, and research, monitoring, and evaluation associated with specific actions. The high estimated cost to conserve and enhance populations is primarily due to the significant costs to control invasive species (Table 11). Actual costs may exceed the estimated costs if invasive species interdiction fails. Adaptive management will ensure that conservation strategies are effectively mitigating threats and meeting the objectives of this recovery plan. If not effective, additional planning and scientific research may be necessary to inform and develop new strategies.

Table 11. Recovery Actions common to all 23 species, their estimated cost (in Fiscal Year 2023 dollars) over a 20-year time horizon, and the priority of each recovery action.

Recovery Actions	Recovery Action #	Priority[1]	Species	Estimated Costs
Determine population status and current distribution	1.0	1	All	$2,282,759
Conduct research to clarify life history information, identify limiting factors and/or threats to population viability, and develop solutions	2.0	1	All	$115,024,138
Conserve and enhance populations.	3.0	1	All	$2,620,689,655
Develop regulations and policy essential to recovery the species and conserve their habitats	4.0	2	All	$1,034,483
Improve stakeholder awareness and engagement	5.0	2	All	$117,241
Total Estimated Cost for First 20 Years of Recovery: $2,739,148,276				

[1]Priority 1 - an action that must be taken to prevent extinction or prevent the species from declining irreversibly in the foreseeable future. Priority 2 - an action that must be taken to prevent a significant decline in species population or habitat quality.

Cost estimates are preliminary. Project-level details of recovery action implementation will be developed with partners and stakeholders in the RIS that will accompany this recovery plan. Pursuant to Section 7(a)(1) of the Act, the Secretary of the Interior "shall review other programs administered by him and utilize such programs in furtherance of the purposes of this Act. All other Federal agencies shall, in consultation with and with the assistance of the Secretary, utilize their authorities in furtherance of the purposes of this Act by carrying out programs for the conservation of endangered species and threatened species listed pursuant to section 4 of this Act." Under this provision, Federal agencies often enter into partnerships and Memoranda of Understanding with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) for implementing and funding conservation agreements, management plans, and recovery plans developed for listed species. Implementation of specific recovery actions pursuant to section 7(a)(1) is subject to availability of funds and is at the discretion of partners. Section 7(a)(2) of the Act states that each Federal agency shall, in consultation with the Secretary, ensure that any action they authorize, fund, or carry out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. In fulfilling these requirements, each agency must use the best scientific and commercial data available. The consultation process is further developed in regulations promulgated at 50 CFR §402.

Date of Recovery

If all actions are fully funded and implemented as outlined, including full cooperation of all partners and stakeholders, we estimate the earliest that the delisting criteria could be met would be between 2053 and 2118 for the listed plant species, 2063 for the Pacific sheath-tailed bat, 2053 for Slevin's skink, 2048 for the Mariana eight-spot butterfly, 2053 for the Rota blue damselfly, and 2048 for the humped tree snail, Guam tree snail, and fragile tree snail. The recovery timing of the Mariana wandering butterfly and Langford's tree snail cannot be estimated until the status of each species is determined. If populations of these species are rediscovered, recovery is unlikely to be achieved before 2063.

For all species, the time to delisting accounts for the time it will take to complete recovery actions in occupied recovery sites including developing and implementing species-specific threat control strategies, fencing and control or eradication of invasive animals, mitigating wildfire threat, controlling of invasive plants and implementing conservation translocation programs to meet population goals.

For the 14 plant species, delisting is likely to require between 30 and 95 years depending on each species' life span and the challenges associated with securing habitat against threats, propagating species with limited founders, and protecting the species from species-specific threats as well as each species' recovery potential or ability to recover (see the *Plant Recovery Criteria* section and Table 1). For each plant species, life span and biological requirements were factored into the estimated time to delisting. The delisting time for long-lived species is greater than for short-lived perennials due to their long generation time and the time required for individuals to become reproductively mature. The length of time needed to achieve downlisting and delisting is also dependent on each species' recovery potential. Plants with a low recovery potential will probably require additional effort to achieve recovery.

Reintroduction or natural recolonization of populations of the Pacific sheath-tailed bat from the remnant population on Aguiguan will likely require decades of active management. The small Aguiguan population will need to be protected and enhanced to facilitate growth as a first step to be a source population for reintroduction efforts to other islands. For Pacific sheath-tailed bat, delisting criteria includes a 10-year monitoring period. Uncertainty associated with both captive propagation and translocation resulted in a long-estimated recovery period, but delisting of the species could conceivably be achieved by 2063 with an aggressive recovery implementation strategy.

Slevin's skink is extant on four islands with a moderate degree of threats and has a high recovery potential; however, not much is known about the species' life history. With a better understanding of its life history as well as habitat and threat management, recovery of the species could be achieved by 2053.

Recovery of the Mariana wandering butterfly and Langford's tree snail is contingent on the species still being extant; neither species has been observed since the 1990s. Thus, it is impossible to estimate a recovery timeline, but even if both species are rediscovered, recovery is unlikely to be achieved before 2063. For downlisting to occur, 14 and 10 populations of the

butterfly and the snail respectively, are required. This will require significant habitat restoration and threat management as well as a source of individuals for reintroduction efforts. However, both species are relatively short-lived and have a relatively high rate of reproduction leading us to believe that the species could be delisted by 2063.

Very little is known about the life history of the Rota blue damselfly and it is currently restricted to one watershed on the island of Rota making it susceptible to stochastic and catastrophic events. Without the establishment of additional populations, recovery cannot be achieved. Captive propagation of the species and conservation translocations to additional watersheds is essential to recovery of the species. Uncertainty associated with both captive propagation and introduction resulted in a long-estimated recovery period, but delisting of the species could be achieved by 2053.

The Guam tree snail appears widely distributed on Guam, although current survey data is needed, as is a better understanding of how predators affect this species. Under an aggressive recovery implementation schedule, delisting could be achieved within 25 years. The humped tree snail and fragile tree snail are both found on more than one island, however some populations have been extirpated or are declining and gene flow among populations is restricted, resulting in both species having low resiliency and redundancy. A successful captive rearing program would further facilitate the recovery of the species by potentially increasing both resiliency and redundancy. With habitat and threat management recovery could be achieved within 25 years.

V. REFERENCES

A. LITERATURE CITED

Alcala, A.C. and W.C. Brown. 1967. Population ecology of the tropical Scincoid lizard, *Emoia atrocostata*, in the Phillipines. Copeia 3: 596-604.

Ames, O. 1914. Orchids of Guam. Philippine Journal of Science C9:13–14.

Aslan, C.E., A.B. Shiels, W. Haines, and C.T. Laing. 2019. Non-native insects dominate daytime pollination in a high-elevation Hawaiian dryland ecosystem. American Journal of Botany 106:313-324.

Athens, J. and J. Ward. 2004. Holocene vegetation, savanna origins and human settlement of Guam. Records-Australian Museum 29:15-30.

Atkinson, I.A.E. and T.J. Atkinson. 2000. Land vertebrates as invasive species on islands served by the South Pacific regional environmental programme. Pages 19-84. *In* Invasive species in the Pacific: a technical review and draft regional strategy, South Pacific Regional Environment Programme, Apia, American Samoa.

Badilles, A.E., J. Manglona, N.I. Paeda, B. Richards, and E. Depalog. 2010. Suppression of Cuban slug (*Veronicella cubensis*) (Pfieffer) using selected practices. Pest Identification Workshop 2010. Saipan.

Bauman, S. 1996. Diversity and decline of land snails on Rota, Mariana Islands. American Malacological Bulletin, 12(1/2): 13-27. https://archive.org/details/biostor-143154

Berger, G.M., J. Gourley, and G. Schroer. 2005. Comprehensive wildlife conservation strategy for the CNMI. CNMI Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR), Division of Fish and Wildlife (DFW), Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. 358 pp.

Bick, C.S., P. Pearce-Kelly, T. Coote, and D. Foighil. 2018. Survival among critically endangered partulid tree snails is correlated with higher clutch sizes in the wild and higher reproductive rates in captivity. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 125:508-520, https://doi.org/10.1093/biolinnean/bly124

Bourquin, O. 2002. Invertebrates recorded from the Northern Marianas Islands Status 2002. Report to CNMI Department of Land and Natural Resources. December 2002. 359 pp.

Brown, W.C. and M.V.C. Falanruw. 1972. A New Lizard of the Genus *Emoia* (Scincidae) from the Marianas Islands. Proceedings of the California Academy of Sciences 39:105-110.

Camacho Fejeran, C. 2021. Guam Forest Action Plan 2020-2030. Guam Department of Agriculture Forestry and Soil Resources Division, Mangilao, Guam. 140 pp.

Camargo, S.J. 2013. Global and regional aspects of tropical cyclone activity in the CMIP5 models. Journal of Climate 26:9880-9902.

Carnegie, A.J. and F.R. Giblin. 2019. *Austropuccinia psidii* (myrtle rust) datasheet, Invasive Species Compendium, CAB International. https://www.cabi.org/isc/datasheet/45846#

Chodosh, S. 2018. See how much of California has burned in the last five years it's a lot. Popular Science. https://www.popsci.com/california-five-year-wildfire/.

Cibrian-Jaramillo, A., A.C. Daly, E. Brenner, R. Desalle, and T.E. Marler. 2010. When north and south don't mix: genetic connectivity of a recently endangered oceanic cycad, *Cycas micronesica*, in Guam using EST-microsatellites. Molecular Ecology 19:2364-2379.

CNMI-DCRM (Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Division of Coastal Resources Management). 2019. Talakhaya. https://dcrm.gov.mp/our-programs/water-quality-and-watershed-management/talakhaya/. Accessed August 15, 2019.

Consortium Pacific Herbarium. 2020. *Heritiera longipetiolata*. Sterculiaceae Collections Catalog. https://serv.biokic.asu.edu/pacific/portal/. Accessed July 8, 2020.

Córdoba-Aguilar, A. and M. Rocha-Ortega. 2019. Damselfly (Odonata: Calopterygidae) population decline in an urbanizing watershed. Journal of Insect Science 19:1-6. https://doi.org/10.1093/jisesa/iez063

Costion, C. and D. Lorence. 2012. The endemic plants of Micronesia: A geographical checklist and commentary. Micronesica 43:51-100. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269055933_The_Endemic_Plants_of_Micronesia_A_Geographical_Checklist_and_Commentary

Craig, P., P. Trail, G. Grant, J. Craig, and D. Itano. 1993. American Samoa: Natural History and Conservation Topics. Volume 1. Biological Report Series, Report Number 42. Department of Marine and Wildlife Resources, American Samoa Government.

Crampton, H.E. 1925. Studies on the variation, distribution, and evolution of the genus Partula. The Species of the Mariana Islands, Guam and Saipan. The Carnegie Institution of Washington. March 1925. 123 pp. https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/65927

Crnokrak, P. and D.A. Roff. 1999. Inbreeding depression in the wild. Heredity 83:260-270. https://www.nature.com/articles/6885530

Cruz, J.B., S.R. Kremer, G. Martin, L.L. Williams, and V.A. Camacho. 2008. Relative abundance and distribution of Mariana swiftlets (Aves: Apodidae) in the Northern Mariana Islands. Pacific Science 62:233-246.

Cuddihy, L.W. and C.P. Stone. 1990. Alteration of Native Hawaiian Vegetation: Effects of Humans, Their Activities and Introductions. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Cooperative National Park Resources Studies Unit. 138 pp. http://manoa.hawaii.edu/hpicesu/book/1990_chap/

Darwin, C. 1859. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection. Chapter III – On possibility of all organisms crossing: on susceptibility of reproduction to change, ill-effects of interbreeding. London: J. Murray, 1859. https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbctos.2017gen17473/?sp=3

Dendy, J. 2019. Mariana Islands wildfire perimeter online GIS maps 2015-2019, funded by U.S. Forest Service. https://arcg.is/WunnH https://arcg.is/KO1j8 Last accessed May 7, 2020.

D'Antonio, C. and P. Vitousek. 1992. Biological invasions by exotic grasses, the grass/fire cycle, and global change. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 23:63-87. https://doi.org/10.1002/eco.1742

Diong, C.H. 1982. Population biology and management of the feral pig (*Sus scrofa* L.) in Kipahulu Valley, Maui. Dissertation. University of Hawaii. 408 pp.

Donnegan, J.A., S.L. Butler, W. Grabowiecki, B.A. Hiserote, and D. Limtiaco. 2004. Guam's forest resources, 2002. Portland, Oregon. 32 pp.

Duron, Q., A. Shiels, and E. Vidal. 2017. Control of invasive rats on islands and priorities for future action. Conservation Biology 31:761-771. https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01793853/file/output-2.pdf

Egerer, M. H., E.C. Fricke, and H. S. Rogers. 2018. Seed dispersal as an ecosystem service: Frugivore loss leads to decline of a socially valued plant, capsicum frutescens. Ecological Applications 28, 655-667. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/eap.1667. doi: 10.1002/eap.1667.

Falk D.A., C. Millar, and P. Olwell. 1996. Restoring Diversity: Strategies for Reintroduction of Endangered Plants. Island Press, Washington D.C. 495 pp.

Farmer, C. 2017. Invasive ants in Hawai'i: Small Species, Big Problems. February 23, 2017. Birdcalls News and Perspectives on Bird Conservation. https://abcbirds.org/battling-invasive-ants-in-hawaii/

Fosberg, F.R. 1960. The vegetation of Micronesia. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 119:1-75.

Fosberg, F.R. and M.H. Sachet. 1979. *Maesa* (Myrsinaceae) in Micronesia. Phytologia 44:362-369.

Fosberg, F.R., M.H. Sachet, and R. Oliver. 1993. Flora of Micronesia, 5: Bignoniaceae-Rubiaceae. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C. 135 pp. https://repository.si.edu/bitstream/handle/10088/6958/scb-0081.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Frager, R., M. Reeves, F. Amidon, R. Pe'a, S. Miller, C. Brunson, J. Flores, and F. Galsim. 2020. Savannas of the Mariana Islands Archipelago. Savannas of the Mariana Islands Archipelago. Pages 948-970. *In* Encyclopedia of the Worlds Biomes. M.I. Goldstein and D.A. DellaSala (Eds.). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-409548-9.11986-4

Frankham, R. 1998. Inbreeding and extinction: island populations. Conservation Biology 12:665-675.

Frankham, R. 2005. Genetics and extinction. Biological Conservation 126:131-140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2005.05.002

Frankham, R., J.D. Ballou, and D.A. Briscoe. 2002. Introduction to Conservation Genetics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom. 617 pp.

Fritts, T.H. and G.H. Rodda. 1998. The role of introduced species in the degradation of island ecosystems: a case history of Guam. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 29:113-140. https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.29.1.113

Fuster, F., C.N. Kaiser-Bunbury, and A. Traveset. 2020. Pollination effectiveness of specialist and opportunistic nectar feeders influenced by invasive alien ants in the Seychelles. American Journal of Botany 107:957–969.

Gawel, A.M., H.S. Rogers, R.H. Miller, and A.M. Kerr. 2018. Contrasting ecological roles of non-native ungulates in a novel ecosystem. Royal Society open science 5:170151. 11 pp. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.170151

GBIF (Global Biodiversity Information Facility). 2019. GBIF Secretariat. GBIF Backbone Taxonomy. Checklist dataset https://doi.org/10.15468/39omei accessed via GBIF.org on July 8, 2020.

Golabi, M.H., S. Manibusan, T. Righetti, D. Okano, and C. Iyekar. 2018. Using Vetiver grass technology for mitigating sediment loads in the Talakhaya Watershed areas in Rota, CNMI. International Soil and Water Conservation Research 6:194-201.

Grant, G.S., S.A. Banack, and P. Trail. 1994. Decline of the sheath-tailed bat *Emballonura semicaudata* (Chiroptera: Emballonuridae) on American Samoa. Micronesica 27:133–137.

Grecni, Z., E.M. Derrington, R. Greene, W. Miles, and V. Keener, 2021: Climate Change in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands: Indicators and Considerations for Key Sectors. Report for the Pacific Islands Regional Climate Assessment. Honolulu, HI: East-West Center. https://zenodo.org/record/4426942

Guerrant, Jr., E.O., P.L. Fiedler, K. Havens, and M. Maunder. 2004. Revised Genetic sampling guidelines for conservation collections of rare and endangered plants. Appendix 1. Pages 419-438. *In* Ex Situ Plant Conservation. Supporting Species Survival in the Wild. E.O. Guerrant, Jr., K. Havens, and M. Maunder, (Eds.). Island Press, Washington, D.C.

Hanna, C., I. Naughton, C. Boser, R. Alarcon, K.J. Hung, and D. Holway. 2015. Floral visitation by the Argentine ant reduces bee visitation and plant seed set. Ecology 96:222-230.

Hartl, D.L. and A.G. Clark. 1989. Principles of Population Genetics. Fourth Edition. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland, Massachusetts. 628 pp.

Hawaii DLNR (Department of Land and Natural Resources Division of Forestry and Wildlife). 2020. Impacts of rodents and mongooses. 1 pp. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275701235_Rethinking_the_Fall_of_Easter_Island/link/55bf716d08ae092e96669099/download

Hawaii Invasive Species Council 2021. Little fire ant. https://dlnr.hawaii.gov/hisc/info/invasive-species-profiles/little-fire-ant/

Hoffmann, A., P. Griffin, S. Dillon, R. Catullo, R. Rane, M. Byrne, R. Jordan, J. Oakeshott, A. Weeks, L. Joseph, P. Lockhart, J. Borevitz, and C. Sgro. 2015. A framework for incorporating evolutionary genomics into biodiversity conservation and management. Climate Change Responses 2:1-23.

Hopper, D. and B. Smith. 1992. Status of Tree Snails (Gastropoda: Partulidae) on Guam, with a Resurvey of Sites Studied by H.E. Crampton in 1920. Pacific Science 46:77-85.

HPPRCC (Hawai‘i and Pacific Plants Recovery Coordinating Committee). 2011. Revised recovery objective guidelines. 8 pp.

Hunt, T.L. 2006. Rethinking the fall of Easter Island; new evidence points to an alternative explanation for a civilization’s collapse. American Scientist 94:412-419. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275701235_Rethinking_the_Fall_of_Easter_Island/link/55bf716d08ae092e96669099/download

Hutson, A.M., S.P. Mickleburgh, and P.A. Racey. 2001. Microchiropteran Bats—Global Status Survey and Conservation Action Plan. IUCN/SSC Chiroptera Specialist Group, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, United Kingdom 259 pp. https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/2001-008.pdf

IPCC 2023. IPCC Synthesis report of the IPCC sixth assessment report (AR6). 85 pp. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/syr/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_SYR_LongerReport.pdf

IUCN, 2014. IUCN Species Survival Commission guidelines on the use of ex situ management for species conservation. https://portals.iucn.org/library/node/44952

JRM INRMP 2019. Final Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan for Joint Region Marianas- Administered and Leased Lands on Guam, Tinian, and Farallon de Medinilla. June 2019. 936 pp.

Joe, S.M. and C.D. Daehler. 2008. Invasive slugs as under-appreciated obstacles to rare plant restoration: evidence from the Hawaiian Islands. Biological Invasions 10:245-255.

Johnson A. 2012. A water-budget model and estimates of groundwater recharge for Guam: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2012-5028. 53 pp.

Kearns, C.A., D.W. Inouye, and N.M. Waser. 1998. Endangered mutualisms: The conservation of plant-pollinator interactions. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 29:83-112.

Keppel, G., P.D. Hodgskiss, and G.M. Plunkett. 2008. Cycads in the insular south-west Pacific: dispersal or vicariance? Journal of Biogeography 35:1004-1015.

Kerr, A.M. 2000. Defoliation of an island (Guam, Mariana Archipelago, Western Pacific Ocean) following a salt spray-laden ‘dry’ typhoon. Journal of Tropical Ecology 16:895–901. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266467400001796.

Kessler, C.C. 2011. Invasive species removal and ecosystem recovery in the Mariana Islands; challenges and outcomes on Sarigan and Anatahan. Pages 320-324 *In* Island Invasives: Eradication and Management, C.R. Veitch, M.N. Clout, and D.R. Towns (Eds.), IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

Kondo Y. 1970. Some aspects of Mariana Islands Partulidae (Mollusca, Pulmonata). Bishop Museum Occasional Papers 24:73–90. http://hbs.bishopmuseum.org/pubs-online/pdf/op24-5.pdf

Kossin, J., K. Emanuel, and G. Vecchi. 2014. The poleward migration of the location of tropical cyclone maximum intensity. Nature 509:349-352. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13278

Kunz, M. 2018. The grass-fire cycle on Pacific Islands. Pacific Fire Exchange Fact Sheet. 1 pp. https://www.pacificfireexchange.org/research-publications/category/grass-fire-cycle-on-pacific-islands

Kunz, T.H. and L.F. Lumsden. 2003. Ecology of cavity and foliage roosting bats. Pages 3-89. *In* Bat Ecology. T.H. Kunz and M.B. Fenton (Eds.). University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 798 pp.

Lacy, R.C. 1997. Importance of genetic variation to the viability of mammalian populations. Journal of Mammalogy 78:320-335.

Lach, L. 2008. Floral visitation patterns of two invasive ant species and their effects on other Hymenopteran visitors. Ecological Entomology 33:155-160.

LaRosa, A.M. 1992. The status of banana poka in Hawaii. Pages 271–299. *In* C.P. Stone, CW. Smith, and J.T. Tunison (Eds.), Cooperative National Park Resources Studies Unit, University of Hawaii, Hawai'i. 887 pp.

Latham, A.D.M., B. Warburton, A.E. Byrom, and R.P. Peck. 2017. The ecology and management of mammal invasions in forests. Biological Invasions 19:3121–3139. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-017-1421-5

Lazaro, M., O. Kuegler, S. Stanton, A. Lehman, J. Mafnas, and M. Yatskov. 2020. Guam's forest resources: Forest Inventory and Analysis, 2013. Resource Bulletin PNW-RB-270. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 43 pp.

Leary, J. 2018. Webinar Recording: Kickin' grass in Hawaii for wildfire management and restoration. https://www.pacificfireexchange.org/research-publications/category/kickin-grass-recording and https://static1.squarespace.com/static/54825edae4b0426dc2c78f10/t/5bf47fb240ec9ae6805e93e3/1542750201710/LEARY+KICKN+GRASS+PFX+2018_Slides.pdf

Lemke, T.O. 1986. Distribution and status of the sheath-tailed bat (*Emballonura semicaudata*) in the Mariana Islands. Journal of Mammalogy 67:743-746.

Leopold, C.R. and S.C. Hess. 2017. Conversion of native terrestrial ecosystems in Hawai‘i to novel grazing systems: a review. Biological Invasions 19:161-177. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-016-1270-7

Lin, H.., S.J. Camargo, C.C. Lien, C.A. Shi, and J.P. Kossin. 2023. Poleward migration as global warming's possible self-regulator to restrain future western North Pacific Tropical Cyclone's intensification. *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science* **6**, Article number 34. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-023-00329-y

Lindstrom, D.P. and J.C. Benedict. 2014. Federal Candidate Species Surveys on Guam. University of Guam CESU N40192-12-8001, Project report prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Marianas. 195 pp.

Loope, L. 2010. A summary of information on the rust Puccinia psidii Winter (guava rust) with emphasis on means to prevent introduction of additional strains to Hawaii: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2010-1082.

M & E Pacific, Inc. 1998. Investigation and Report on Medicinal Plant Species U.S. Naval Activities, Guam M.I. Contract N62766-95-D-0006 Work Request 62085. Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813-3497.

Malotaux, J. 2012a. Surveying roosting caves of the Pacific sheath-tail bat (*Emballonura semicaudata*) at Tavuyaga Cave and Waitabu Cave, Taveuni Island, Fiji. NatureFiji-MareqetiViti, Report Number 2012-14. 8 pp.

Malotaux, J. 2012b. Bat caves in Fiji, status and conservation of roosting caves of the Fiji blossom bat (*Nopteris macdonaldi*), the Pacific sheath-tailed bat (*Emballonura semicaudata*), and the Fiji free-tailed bat (*Chaerephon bregullaae*). NatureFiji-MareqetiViti, Report Number 2012-15. 40 pp.

Maschinski, J. and K.E. Haskins (eds). 2012. Plant Reintroductions in a Changing Climate: Promises and Perils. Island Press, Washington D.C. 432 pp.

Marler, T. 2001. Tropical cyclones and perennial species in the Mariana Islands. Horticultural Science 36:264-268.

Marler, T.E. 2013. Temporal variations in leaf miner, butterfly, and stem borer infestations of *Cycas micronesica* in relation to *Aulacaspis yasumatsui* incidence. Horticultural Science 48:1334-1338.

Mattos, K., E. Atalig, D.M. Calvo, and F. Rabauliman. 2015. Talakhaya-Sabana Conservation Action Plan. 74 pp. https://dcrm.gov.mp/wp-content/uploads/crm/Talakhaya-CAP-Revised-July-2015.pdf

McCoid, M.J., G.H. Rodda, and T.H. Fritts. 1995. Distribution and abundance of *Emoia slevini* (Scincidae) in the Mariana Islands. Herpetological Review 26:70-72.

Merrill, E.D. 1914. An enumeration of the plants of Guam. The Philippine Journal of Science. Section C, Botany 9:17-95; 97-155.

Muller-Landau, H.C. 2001. Seed dispersal in a tropical forest: empirical patterns, their origins, and their consequences for community dynamics (dissertation). Princeton University. Princeton, New Jersey. 208 pp.

Mickleburgh, S.P., A.M. Hutson, and P.A. Racey. 2002. A review of the global conservation of bats. Oryx 36:18-34.

Minton, D. 2006. Fire, erosion, and sedimentation in the Asan-Piti watershed and War in the Pacific NHP, Guam. University of Hawai‘i Pacific Cooperative Studies Unit. Technical Report 150. November 2006. 99 pp. https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/836/v150.pdf

Moore, A. 2013. The Mariana Eight Spot Butterfly, *Hypolimnas octocula marianensis* Unpublished status report. 13 pp.

Mueller-Dombois, T. and F.R. Fosberg. 1998. Chapter V. Micronesia. pp. 241-275. *In* Vegetation of the Tropical Pacific Islands. M.M. Caldwell, G. Heldmaier, O.L. Lange, H.A. Mooney, E.T. Schulze, and U. Sommer (Eds.), Springer Publishing, New York, New York. 733 pp.

Muller-Landau, H.C. 2021. Seed dispersal in a tropical forest: empirical patterns, their origins, and their consequences for community dynamics. Doctoral dissertation, Princeton University. Princeton, New Jersey. 194 pp.

Nathan, R. and H.C. Muller-Landau. 2000. Spatial patterns of seed dispersal, their determinants and consequences for recruitment. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 15:278–285. (doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(00)01874-7).

[NAVFAC Pacific] Naval Facilities Engineering Command Pacific. 2014. Final survey report Terrestrial biological surveys on Tinian in support of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. July 2014. 95 pp.

[NAVFAC Marianas] Naval Facilities Engineering Command Marianas. 2021. Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan Summary of 2020 Projects, Guam Report. U.S. Navy, Guam. 210 pp.

[NAVFAC Marianas] Naval Facilities Engineering Command Marianas. 2022. Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan Summary of 2022 Projects, Guam Report. U.S. Navy, Guam. 216 pp.

[NAVFAC Marianas] Naval Facilities Engineering Command Marianas. 2023. Joint Region Marianas Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan Project Summaries 2022. March 6, 2023. U.S. Navy, Guam. 281 pp.

NMFS and USFWS (National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2018. Interim Recovery Planning Guidelines, Version 1.4.

NRCS 2011. Invasive species fact sheet – Pacific Islands Area – Swordgrass (*Miscanthus floridulus*). 2 pp. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_036998.pdf

OANRP [Oahu Army Natural Resources Program]. 2014. Five Year Plan for *Eugenia koolauensis*. 2014 Status Report for the Makua and O'ahu Implementation Plans. 275 pp.

Ohba, T. 1994. Flora and vegetation of the Northern Mariana Islands, Micronesia. Natural History Research. Special Issue No. 1:13-69.

O'Shea, T.J. and E.W. Valdez. 2009. Assessment for Pacific sheath-tailed bats (*Emballonura semicaudata rotensis*) on Aguiguan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. USGS Administrative Report to the US Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Collins, Colorado. 113 pp.

Oyler-McCance, S.J., Valdez, E.W., O'Shea, T.J., and J.F. Fike. 2013. Genetic characterization of the Pacific sheath-tailed bat (*Emballonura semicaudata rotensis*) using mitochondrial DNA sequence data. Journal of Mammalogy 94:1030-1036.

Pacifici, M., L. Santini, M. Di Marco, D. Baisero, L. Francucci, G. Grottolo Marasini, P. Visconti, and C. Rondinini. 2013. Generation length for mammals. Nature Conservation 5:87-94.

Palmeirim, J. M., A. Champion, A. Naikatini, J. Niukula, M. Tuiwawa, M. Fisher, M. Yabaki-Gounder, S. Qalovaki., and T. Dunn. 2005. Distribution, status, and conservation of bats in the Fiji islands. The University of the South Pacific, Fauna and Flora International, Universidade de Lisboa.

Pegg, G.S., F.R. Giblin, A.R. McTaggart, G.P. Guymer, H. Tayloe, K.B. Irelenad, R.G. Shivas, and S. Perry. 2014. *Puccinia psidii* in Queensland, Australia: disease symptoms, distribution and impact. Plant Pathology 63:1005-1021.

Perlman, S. and K. Wood. 1994. Appendix III: Survey report of the seacliffs of Anderson Air Force Base, Guam. Pages 128-164. *In* Vegetation Baseline Survey, Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, September 1994, L.R. Quinata, prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Pp. 36.

Perry, G. and J. M. Morton. 1999. Regeneration rates of the woody vegetation of Guam's Northwest Field following major disturbance: Land use patterns, feral ungulates, and cascading effects of the brown tree snake. Micronesica 32:125-142.

Plentovich, S., T. Russell, and C. Camacho Fejeran. 2018. Yellow crazy ants (*Anoplolepis gracilipes*) reduce numbers and impede development of a burrow-nesting seabird. Biological Invasions 20:77-86. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318641696

Polhemus, D. and M. Richardson. 2020. Streams of the Mariana Islands. Streams of the Mariana Islands. Pages 400-418. *In* Encyclopedia of the Worlds Biomes. M.I. Goldstein and D.A. DellaSala (Eds.). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-409548-9.11943-8

[RASP] Recovery and Sustainment Partnership. 2023. Recovery and Sustainment Partnership Initiative – *Tuberolabium guamense* Summary Report: September 2019 - August 2020, Report. U.S. Navy, Guam. 8 pp.

Raulerson, L. and A. Rinehart. 1991. Trees and shrubs of the Northern Mariana Islands. Coastal Resources Management, Office of the Governor, Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. 120 pp.

Raulerson, L. and A.F. Rinehart. 1992. Ferns and orchids of the Mariana Islands. American Printing Corporation. Agana, Guam. 138 pp.

Reed, J.M., L.S. Milles, J.B. Dunning, Jr., E.S. Menges, K.S. McKelvey, R. Fryer, S.R. Beissinger, M.C. Anstett, and P. Miller. 2002. Emerging issues in population viability analysis. Conservation Biology 16:7-19. https://ase.tufts.edu/biology/labs/reed/documents/pub2002ReedCB.pdf

Rehm E., E. Fricke, J. Bender, J. Savidge, and H. Rogers. 2019. Animal movement drives variation in seed dispersal distance in a plant–animal network. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 286:20182007. http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2007.

Rinehart, A.F. and F.R Fosberg. 1991. *Nervilia jacksoniae* nov. sp., a new species of Orchidaceae from Guam and Rota. Micronesica 24:81-85. https://micronesica.org/sites/default/files/article4combo.pdf

Rodda, G.H., T.H. Fritts, and D. Chiszar. 1997. The disappearance of Guam's wildlife: New insights for herpetology, evolutionary ecology, and conservation. BioScience 47:565-574.

Rodda, G.H. and J.A. Savidge. 2007. Biology and impacts of Pacific Island invasive species. 2. *Boiga irregularis*, the brown tree snake (Reptilia: Colubridae). Pacific Science 61:307-324.

Rogers, H.S., E.R. Buhle, J. HilleRisLambers, E.C. Fricke, R.H. Miller, and J.J. Tewksbury. 2017. Effects of an invasive predator cascade to plants via mutualism disruption. Nature Communications 8:14557.

Rubinoff, D. and B. Holland. 2018. The conservation status of two endangered Mariana butterflies, *Hypolimnas octocula marianensis* and *Vagrans egistina* (Nymphalidae). Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society 72:218-226. https://doi.org/10.18473/lepi.v72i3.a7

Savidge, J.A. 1987. Extinction of an island forest avifauna by an introduced snake. Ecology 68:660-668. https://doi.org/10.2307/1938471

Schreiner, I. and D. Nafus. 1996. Survey of rare butterflies in the Mariana Islands. Draft report to the USFWS. 13 pp.

Schreiner, I. and D. Nafus. 1997. Survey of rare butterflies in the Mariana Islands. Report to the USFWS.

Shaffer, M.L. and M.A. Stein. 2000. Safeguarding our precious heritage. Pages 301-321. *In* Precious heritage: the status of biodiversity in the United States. B.A. Stein, L.S. Kutner, and J.S. Adams (Eds.). Oxford University Press, New York, New York. 416 pp.

Shiels, A.B., W.C. Pitt, R.T. Sugihara, and G.W. Witmer. 2014. Biology and impacts of Pacific Island invasive species. 11. *Rattus rattus*, the black rat (Rodentia: Muridae). USDA National Wildlife Research Center - Staff Publications. 1404 pp. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2418&context=icwdm_usdanwrc

Shiels, A.B. and D.R. Drake. 2015. Barriers to seed and seedling survival of once-common Hawaiian palms: the role of invasive rats and ungulates. AoB Plants 7: plv057. https://academic.oup.com/aobpla/article/doi/10.1093/aobpla/plv057/201627

Sischo D. and M. Hadfield. 2017. Phylogeographic relationships among multi-island populations of the tree snail *Partula gibba* (Partulidae) in the Mariana Islands. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 121:731-740.

Sischo D.R. and M.G. Hadfield. 2021. The tree snail on Rota Island, Northern Mariana Islands, long identified as *Partula gibba* (Partulidae), is a different species. Zookeys 1037:105-118. https://doi.org/10.3897/zookeys.1037.56303

Smith B. 2013. Taxonomic inventories and assessments of terrestrial snails on the islands of Tinian and Aguiguan in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana islands. University of Guam Marine Laboratory Technical Report 154. September 2013

Smith B., R. Cooper-Nurse, and A.M. Gawel. 2008. Survey of Endangered Tree Snails on Navy Owned Lands in Guam.

Smith, D.R., N.L. Allan, C.P. McGowan, J.A. Szymanski, S.R. Oetker, and H.M. Bell. 2018. Development of a species status assessment process for decisions under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management 9:302-320.

Smith, C.W. 1985. Impact of alien plants on Hawai'i's native biota. Pages 180-250. *In* Hawai'i's Terrestrial Ecosystems: Preservation and Management. C.P. Stone and J.M. Scott (Eds.), Cooperative National Park Resources Studies Unit. University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Spatz D.R., K.M. Zilliacus, N.D. Holmes, S.H.M. Butchart, P. Genovesi, G. Ceballos, B.R. Tershy, and D.A. Croll D. 2017. Globally threatened vertebrates on islands with invasive species. Science Advances 3:e1603080. https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/3/10/e1603080

Spies, N.P., T. Mizerek, M.K. Reeves, F. Amidon, S.E. Miller. 2020. Developed systems in the Mariana Islands archipelago. Pages 228-242. *In* Encyclopedia of the Worlds Biomes. M.I. Goldstein and D.A. DellaSala (Eds.). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-409548-9.12045-7

Steadman, D.W. 1999. The Prehistory of Vertebrates, Especially Birds, on Tinian, Aguiguan, and Rota, Northern Mariana Islands. Micronesica 31:319-345.

Stebbins, G.L. 1950. Variation and evolution in plants. Columbia University Press, New York, New York. 644pp.

Stone, B.C. 1970. The flora of Guam. A Manual for the Identification of the Vascular Plants of the Island. Micronesica. 6(1/2):1-659.

Stone, C.P., L.W. Cuddihy, and J.T. Tunison. 1992. Responses of Hawaiian ecosystems to removal of feral pigs and goats. Pp. 666-704. *In* Alien Plant Invasions in Native Ecosystems of Hawai‘i. Management and Research. C.P. Stone, C.W. Smith, and J.T. Tunison (Eds). University of Hawai‘i Cooperative National Park Resources Studies Unit, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa. 887 pp.

Sugiura, S. and Y. Yamaura. 2009. Potential impacts of the invasive flatworm *Platydemus manokwari* on arboreal snails. Biological Invasions 11:737-742.

SWCA Environmental Consultants. 2020. Honua‘ula surveys for ‘Āwikiwiki, tree tobacco, Blackburn’s sphinx moth, yellow-faced bee host plants, and yellow-faced bees. August 15, 2020. 24 pp.

Tarburton, M.K. 2011. White-rumped swiftlet breeding colony size and colony locations in Samoa. Helictite 40:35–49.

Tep, P. and K. Gaines. 2003. Reversing the impacts of feral pig on the Hawaiian tropical rainforest ecosystem. Restoration and Reclamation Review 8:1-8.

Traill, L.W., B.W. Brook, R.R. Frankham, and C.J.A. Bradshaw. 2010. Pragmatic population viability targets in a rapidly changing world. Biological Conservation 143:28-34.

Trauernicht, C. and M. Kunz. 2019. 2018 Western Pacific Wildfires – Pacific Fire Exchange Annual Summary. 1 pp. https://www.pacificfireexchange.org/research-publications/category/2018wpacificsummary

Trauernicht, C. and M. Chimera. 2020. 2019 Western Pacific Wildfires – Pacific Fire Exchange Annual Summary. 1 pp. https://www.pacificfireexchange.org/research-publications/category/2019-wildfire-summary-in-the-western-pacific

Tunison, J.T., C.M. D’Antonio, and R.K. Loh. 2002. Fire and invasive plants in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. Pages 122-131. *In* Proceedings of the Invasive Species Workshop: the Role of Fire in the Control and Spread of Invasive Species, Fire Conference 2000: the First National Congress on Fire Ecology, Prevention, and Management, K.E.M. Galley and T.P. Wilson (Eds.), Miscellaneous Publication No. 11, Tall Timbers Research Station, Tallahassee, Florida. 146 pp.

United Nations. 1946. Transmission of Information under Article 73 of the Charter. http://www.undocs.org/A/RES/66(I)

United Nations. 1947. UN Documentation: Trusteeship Council https://research.un.org/en/docs/tc/pacificislands

University of Guam. 2019. Plant and invertebrate surveys for Joint Regional Marianas (JRM) area of responsibility and areas specified on Guam and CNMI. Bolanos area, December 01, 2019 – December 31, 2019, monthly progress report #3. Cooperative Agreement N40192-17-2-8006.

Unmi, A.P., S.H. Mir, T.P. Mir, T.P. Rajesh, U.P. Ballullaya, T. Jose, and P.A. Sinu. 2021. Native and invasive ants affect floral visits of pollinating honey bees in pumpkin flowers (*Cucurbita maxima*). Scientific Reports 11:4781. http://doi:10.1038/s41598-021-83902w

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2014. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Proposed Endangered Status for 21 Species and Proposed Threatened Status for 2 Species in Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; Proposed Rule. September 16, 2014. 80 FR 59423 59497. https://www.govinfo.gov/link/fr/79/59363?link-type=pdf

_____. 2015. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for 16 Species and Threatened Status for 7 Species in Micronesia; Final Rule. 79 FR 59364-59413. https://www.govinfo.gov/link/fr/80/59423?link-type=pdf

_____. 2017. Revised biological assessment for the Marine Corps relocation from Okinawa to Guam. Contract Number N62742-14-D-1863 CTO 0023. Honolulu: Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

_____. 2019. Amendment to the recovery plan for the Oahu tree snails of the genus *Achatinella*. September 25, 2019. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/304

_____. 2020. Recovery outline for 23 Mariana Island Species. Portland, Oregon. 22 pp. + appendices.

_____. 2023a. Species report for *Bulbophyllum guamense*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 40 pp.

_____. 2023b. Species report for *Cycas micronesica*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 32 pp.

_____. 2023c. Species report for *Dendrobium guamense*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 38 pp.

_____. 2023d. Species report for *Eugenia bryanii.* Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 24 pp.

_____. 2023e. Species Report for *Hedyotis megalantha.* Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 37 pp.

_____. 2023f. Species Report for *Heritiera longipetiolata.* Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 32 pp.

_____. 2023g. Species Report for *Maesa walkeri.* Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 23 pp.

_____. 2023h. Species report for *Nervilia jacksoniae*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 40 pp.

_____. 2023i. Species report for *Phyllanthus saffordii*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 33 pp.

_____. 2023j. Species report for *Psychotria malaspinae*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 24 pp.

_____. 2023k. Species report for *Solanum guamense*.Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 17 pp.

_____. 2023l. Species report for *Tabernaemontana rotensis*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 27 pp.

_____. 2023m. Species report for *Tinospora homosepala*.Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 18 pp.

_____. 2023n. Species report for *Tuberolabium guamense*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 41 pp.

_____. 2023o. Species Report for *Emballonura semicaudata rotensis*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 42 pp.

_____. 2023p. Species Report for *Emoia slevini*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 55 pp.

_____. 2023q. Species report for *Hypolimnas octocula marianensis*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 38 pp.

_____. 2023r. Species report for *Vagrans egistina*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 34pp.

_____. 2023s. Species report for *Ischnura luta*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 66 pp.

_____. 2023t. Species report for *Partula gibba*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland Oregon. 33 pp.

_____. 2023u. Species report for *Partula langfordi*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 21 pp.

_____. 2023v. Species report for *Partula radiolata*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 23 pp.

_____. 2023w. Species report for *Samoana fragilis*. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, Pacific Region 1, Portland, Oregon. 26 pp.

_____. 2021. Draft recovery plan for five species from American Sāmoa. Portland, Oregon. xiii + 50 pages. May 17, 2021. 86 FR 26740. https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/Draft_American_Samoa_Recovery_Plan.pdf

Vitousek, P.M., C.M. D'Antonio, L.L. Loope, M. Rejnanek, and R. Westerbrooks. 1997. Introduced species: a significant component of human-caused global change. New Zealand Journal of Ecology 21:1-16.

Vogt, S. and L. Willliams. 2004. Common flora & fauna of the Mariana Islands. WinGuide Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. 158 pp.

Wagner W.L., D.R. Herbst, M.W. Tornabene, A, Weitzman, and D.H. Weitzman. 2012. Flora of Micronesia website. http://botany.si.edu/pacificislandbiodiversity/micronesia/index.htm

Wandrag, E.M., A.E. Dunham, R.H. Miller, and H.S. Rogers. 2015. Vertebrate seed dispersers maintain the composition of tropical forest seedbanks. AoB PLANTS 7: plv130; https//doi:10.1093/aobpla/plv130

Wiewel, A.S., A.A.Y. Adams, and G.H. Rodda. 2009. Distribution, density, and biomass of introduced small mammals in the southern Mariana Islands. Pacific Science 63:205-222.

Wild, A. 2014. Little fire ants causing big problems on Guam. Entomology Today, 1 pp. September 11, 2014. https://entomologytoday.org/2014/09/11/little-fire-ants-causing-big-problems-on-guam/

Wiles, G.J., J. Bart, R.E. Beck, Jr., and C.F. Aguon. 2003. Impacts of the brown tree snake: patterns of decline and species persistence in Guam's avifauna. Conservation Biology 17:1350-1360.

Wiles, G.J., T.J. O'Shea, D.J. Worthington, J.A. Esselstyn, and E.W. Valdez. 2011. Status and natural history of *Emballonura semicaudata rotensison* Aguiguan, Mariana Islands. Acta Chiropterologica 13:299–309.

Wiles, G.J. and D.J. Worthington. 2002. A population assessment of Pacific sheath-tailed bats (*Emballonura semicaudata*) on Aguiguan, Mariana Islands. Prepared for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Islands Office, Honolulu, Hawai'i. 32 pp.

Willsey, T., J.A. Kwon, M.K. Reeves, F. Amidon, and S.E. Miller. 2020. Mariana Islands Forest. Pages 373-402. *In* Encyclopedia of the Worlds Biomes. M.I. Goldstein and D.A. DellaSala (Eds.). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-409548-9.12012-3

Wolf, S., B. Hartl, C. Carroll, M.C. Neel, and D.N. Greenwald. 2015. Beyond PVA: Why recovery under the Endangered Species Act is more than population viability. BioScience 65:200-207.

Yoshioka, J.M. 2008. Botanical survey of the War in the Pacific National Historical Park Guam, Mariana Islands. Pacific Cooperative Studies Unit, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, Hawai'i. Technical Report 161. 89pp.

Zhou, X., Z. Liu, Q. Yan, X. Zhang, L. Yi, W. Yang, R. Xiang, Y. He, B. Hu, Y. Liu, and Y. Shen. 2019. Enhanced tropical cyclone intensity in the western north Pacific during Warm periods over the last two millennia. Geophysical Research Letters. 9145-9153. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL083504

B. PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND *IN LITTERIS*

Aydlett, W. 2017. Unpublished Powerpoint Keetch-Byram Drought Index, Saipan, NOAA, National Weather Service. Received by D. Bruns, USFWS, May 24, 2017. 6 pp.

Bruns, D. 2019. Photographs of ruminant ungulate browse lines on CNMI islands Aguiguan and Rota, understory fuel loads in ungulate-exclusion areas, and observations of fencing to contain cattle and goats on Rota. July 24 and 27, 2019.

Burt, M.D. 2023. Email correspondence from Supervisory Planning and Conservation Branch Chief, Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, updated ungulate fence and ungulate removal status. May 1, 2023.

Camacho, E.F. and Micronesian Environmental Services. 2002. Coastal Resources Management Application Package for Dandan Homestead Subdivision. Pp. 38−39 and associated *Heritiera longipetiolata* maps.

Chamorro-Carolinian Language Policy Commission. 2020. Website: http://www.dcca.gov.mp/cclpc-chamorro-carolinian-language-policy-commission/

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Department of Land and Natural Resources (CNMI DLNR) Rota. 2015. Comment letter received from the acting director of DLNR on the island of Rota regarding the proposed listing of 23 species in the Mariana Islands. February 11, 2015.

Demeulenaere, E., M. Putman, and G.C. Fiedler. 2018. Threatened and Endangered Plant Surveys of Northwest Field Progress Report. University of Guam. 114 pp.

Demeulenaere, E. 2020. Notes regarding the origin and status of savanna habitat on Guam, and the biology and status of two endangered savanna plants (*Phyllanthus saffordii* and *Hedyotis megalantha*). February 6, 2020.

Fiedler, C. 2023. Annual Report for USFWS Permit No. ES19076C: Captive Rearing of the Mariana eight spot butterfly (MESB) *Hypolimnas octocula marianensis.* TE-19076C_2022.

Gawel, A.M., L. Gutierrez, and G. Grimm. 2013. Notes from FWS biologist A.M. Gawel to FWS biologist C. Harrington providing botanical survey data collected by Gawel, Gutierrez, and Grimm, at various sites on the island of Guam between January 2013 and August 2013, 16 SEP 2013.

Greenlee, D. 2010. Southern Guam loss of limestone forest due to fire: 1975-present. 2 pp. US. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

Guam Plant Extinction Prevention Program (GPEPP). 2015. Progress Report for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office; Consolidated Funding FY2014 and 2015. Reporting period Feb 2014 to July 2015. 24 pp.

Guam Plant Extinction Prevention Program (GPEPP). 2018. Data provided to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

Guam Plant Extinction Prevention Program (GPEPP). 2019. Data provided to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

Gutierrez, L. 2023. in litt. Comments on Draft Recovery Plan for 23 species in the Mariana Islands. 23 JAN 2023.

Harrington, C., A.M. Gawel, and J.A. Kwon. 2012. Southern Mariana Islands rare plant surveys, draft final report for USFWS (PIFWO), 23 JUL to 5 AUG 2012, 65 pp.

Kedziora, M.T. 2023. Updates regarding ungulate fencing and ungulate removal, Guam. May 1, 2023, email.

Lardner, B. 2013, Powerpoint presentation regarding the redetection of *Emoia slevini* on Cocos Island, 7 pp.

Liske-Clark, J. 2015. Wildlife action plan for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana archipelago 2015-2025. CNMI-DLNR-Division of Fish and Wildlife, Saipan, MP. https://www.fws.gov/pacific/images/feature/2017/highlights/CNMI%20SWAP%202015%20FINAL%20secured.pdf

Loerzel, A. 2023. Email updating ungulate fencing and ungulate removal on Guam. May 1, 2023.

Manglona, J. 2019. Site visit conversations on Rota with Tyler Willsey and Dawn Bruns. 25 July 2019.

Manglona, J. 2021. Video discussions with Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office Biologists Heather Benedict and Dawn Bruns regarding the ungulate fencing measures Rota Forestry takes to protect native plant outplanting sites from deer browsing. June-July 2021.

Mathies, T. 2020. Colorado State University, Center for the Environmental Management of Military Lands. Pers. comm. with Tyler Willsey and John Vetter, Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, phone call dated March 4, 2020. Subject: Slevin's skink Recovery Criteria.

McConnell, J. 2020, pers. comm. Telephone interview with GPEPP lead scientist and staff and FWS biologist Carrie Harrington regarding *Mariana Islands GPEPP species, including Nervilia jacksoniae*. March 4, 2020.

Mizerek, T. 2023. Conversation between Service biologist T. Mizerek and Service biologist D. Bruns regarding the status of ungulate fencing and ungulate removal on Department of Defense lands on Guam. January 12, 2023.

Polhemus, D. 2020. Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office. Pers. comm. with Tyler Willsey, Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, phone call dated April 16, 2020. Subject: Recovery Criteria for the Rota Blue Damselfly.

Rieffanaugh, A. 2021. Photographs of ungulate browse line on Guam, February 24, 2021, Natural Resource Specialist, Andersen AFB, Guam, Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command (NAVFAC) Marianas, email to Dawn Bruns, Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office.

Rogers, H.S., J.J. Tewksbury, and J.H.R. Lambers. 2009. The impact of complete bird loss on seed dispersal and plant recruitment in Guam. Abstract presented at 94th Annual Meeting of the Ecological Society of America, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Rubinoff, D. 2013. Guam Butterfly surveys March 25-April 4, 2013. Unpublished Report. 7 pp.

Rubinoff, D. and W. Haines. 2012, in litt. Report for surveys conducted on Guam and Rota October 10-20, 2012 assessing the conservation status of *Hypolimnas octocula* and *Vagrans egistina*, candidates for ESA listing, 25 pp.

Scanlon, A. 2015. Email from Dr. Annette Scanlon to FWS biologist James Kwon, providing information on disturbance to roosts of the Pacific sheath-tailed bats, 15 April 2015.

U.S. Navy (DoN). 2018. in litt. Spreadsheet of survey results of listed species on DoD lands.

Vogt, S. 2007. Ground Skink Surveys on Sarigan Island, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Wildlife and Vegetation Surveys of Sarigan Island, April 13-25, 2006. Technical Report 14:51-56.

Zarones, L., J. Liske-Clark, T. Willsey, and R. Ulloa. 2015a. Preliminary survey of three Mariana Island endemic epiphytic orchids *Dendrobium guamense*, Bulbophyllum guamense, and *Dendrobium guamense* on Rota, CNMI. Division of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Saipan, MP. 16 pp.

Zarones, L., J. Liske-Clark, T. Willsey, and P. Perez. 2015b. *Dendrobium guamense* observation on Aguiguan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Division of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Saipan, MP. 3 pp.

Zarones, L., T. Willsey, J. Liske-Clark, and R. Ulloa. 2015c. Preliminary survey of *Nervilia jacksoniae on Rota, CNMI*. Division of Fish and Wildlife and Department of Lands and Natural Resources, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. 2015, February.

Zarones, L., J. Liske-Clark, T. Willsey, and R. Ulloa. 2015d. Preliminary survey of three Mariana Island endemic epiphytic orchids *Dendrobium guamense*, *Bulbophyllum guamense*, and *Tuberolabium guamense* on Rota, CNMI. Division of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Saipan, MP. 16 pp.

APPENDIX A

Summary of comments on the Draft Recovery Plan for 23 Species from the Mariana Islands

On November 8, 2022, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) released the Draft Recovery Plan for 23 Species from the Mariana Islands for a 90-day comment period for local, territorial, and Federal agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and the public. The comment period closed February 8, 2023 and we thank all those that provided comments. Comments were received from five different individuals and groups. Comments were generally supportive of the recovery plan, providing useful information about the biology and status of the species, minor editorial comments, additional references, suggestions for future planning and implementation strategies, creative ideas for public outreach and engagement, and offers of assistance to help with species recovery. We considered all comments received and we have incorporated new factual information provided throughout the final recovery plan, as appropriate.

Summarized Comments and Responses

Comment	Response
Cost Estimates	
One reviewer questioned some of the methodology and cost estimates for enacting the recovery strategy and actions.	We used standard methodology to determine cost estimates and developed them at a broad scale. During the recovery implementation strategy (RIS) process we will refine cost estimates for specific activities with our conservation partners.
One reviewer commented regarding several aspects of the cost estimates: Determine the Current Distribution and Status of the Species and Their Habitats is estimated at $6,620,000. Genetic sampling needs to be included during this set of surveys in order to provide more accurate assessments of population status and health for the listed species. Given this added cost as well as the remoteness and difficulty in the accessibility of many of the islands in the Mariana Island archipelago, the cost for Recovery Action 1 is underestimated. They then requested we re-evaluate this cost to more accurately reflect the effort.	We used standard metrics to determine cost estimates and developed them to align with the recovery actions. During the RIS process we will develop more specific cost estimates for each activity with our conservation partners.
A reviewer expressed concern that eradication of invasive predators such as snakes is not realistic and that recovery would necessitate achieving unattainable goals.	Recovery of the species is not possible without the threats posed by invasive species ameliorated. The cost estimate reflects the significant challenges in recovery of these species most notably invasive species control or eradication.
One reviewer indicated greater funding should be allocated to regulations, policy, and stakeholder awareness. This reviewer also stated the level of funding is inadequate to support the potential billions cited for the other recovery actions. 2.	We used standardized metrics to estimate costs to achieve recovery. The overall high cost reflects the long-term threat management required to sustain these species.

On reviewer noted that funding for "Genetic analyses of wild, reintroduced, and ex situ populations of each species should be conducted to ensure maintenance of genetic variation within and between populations throughout controlled propagation efforts." is costly and asked about funding sources for genetic research and noted that the scale of genetic research is a large undertaking and requested clarification regarding which recovery action addresses the need.	All actions in the recovery plan are included within the time and costs estimates.
Data Availability	
Two reviewers indicated information about species was missing. One reviewer noted the Recovery Plan is informed by the Species Status Assessment or Species Biological Reports and it is unclear that the most up to date information was used. They noted it appears that several of the Species Status Assessments appear to be missing known populations or have populations incorrectly mapped. The second reviewer noted data used to determine listing appears outdated and lacks current status.	The Species Biological Reports in the Draft Recovery Plan had been developed in 2000, and therefore did not include data received after that time. We have updated the document with the most up to date information available to the Service. Information provided to the Service by the biologists and species experts in our partner agencies in Guam and the CNMI. This information is an integral component of this recovery plan and we continue to rely on the information and efforts by them and other stakeholders and partners continue to provide to guide and facilitate recovery of these species. In addition, should new information be made available after the document is published, the data will be incorporated into the 5 year review which informs a recommendation on whether a particular species' status may warrant evaluation.
Two reviewers indicated a concern regarding the lack of species-specific information informing selection of the number of populations needed in the down listing and delisting criteria for the animal species. They requested the criteria be re-evaluated and refined based on scientific research and literature in order to set realistic and attainable recovery goals.	There is little information available about these species or their natural history. In the absence of species-specific information, we applied conservative assumptions in our recovery criteria development. These are preliminary criterion which can be updated when more information becomes available.
Data on specific phorophytes (host plants) for *Bulbophyllum guamense* seems to be lacking and should be better described in the Recovery Plan and Species Report.	Information regarding host plant and other species-specific needs will be important research topics, the results of which will help inform the future conservation of the species.

One reviewer noted there is some degree of uncertainty regarding the listed species historical ranges. For some species, the historical ranges don't include islands where the species is believed to have occurred and where recent observations of the species have been made. The reviewer asked that the document indicate the historical ranges are based on records confirmed at the time of Recovery Plan writing. They indicated recovery is dependent on conserving and restoring the species throughout this historic range.	We have refined the number of known individuals and each species' current and historic range based on the survey and other data that we have received. We were unable to rely on unpublished information we could not confirm with, for example, voucher specimens or site-specific survey reports. We requested survey reports from recent survey efforts and incorporated the information we received. The plant recovery framework is devised in a way that enables it to be applied as a species' historic range is updated by the new information we receive. As new information becomes available, it will be incorporated into the 5-year review.
One reviewer noted it is unclear how a previously unknown location of a population on an island not identified in the "historical" range outlined of the Draft Recovery Plan affects the downlisting and delisting criteria.	If a species is found on an island where it had not previously been known to occur, the new information will be incorporated into the 5-year review to inform the species' status.
One reviewer indicated they would like to request the addition of NavFac surveys that documented the occurrence in 2022 and the confirmed occurrences of *Partula gibba* on Alamagan by the Division of Fish and Wildlife in 2022 to the species' distribution.	We requested this data and didn't receive it in time to include it in this Recovery Plan.
One reviewer indicated information regarding Fragile tree snail distribution is incorrect. Specifically, there is at least one extant population on Rota. The presence of one remaining population on Rota, presumably harboring important genetic diversity distinct from Guam populations, may significantly influence recovery action prioritization for this species.	We have updated this document with the most up to date information available to the Service. In addition, should new information be made available after the plan is published, the data will be incorporated in the 5 year review.
One reviewer indicated *Tinospora homosepala* seems to be a very long lived plant. Since only males are known and there are persistent individuals these plants have been alive at least since the listing date. Suggest changing life span to long.	Where, as in the case of *Tinospora homosepala*'s average life span, we have limited information about the species' life history, we take a conservative approach in classifying *T. homosepala* as short-lived such that recovery criteria would also be conservative. New information about the species life history, including information about female plants, would be incorporated into the species' conservation planning and

	prioritization via the five-year reviews and future updates to the recovery plan.
One reviewer provided comments regarding tree snail occurrence that differed from the information available to us.	The Service based our occurrences on the most recent published data for the species and information in our files. When we receive new data or new information is published we will review it and, if appropriate, incorporate it into our 5 year reviews.
One reviewer noted that the lack of tree snail life history information necessitates that research be conducted to inform development of recovery criteria.	We used the best available scientific data to draft the recovery plan and recovery criteria. Recovery criteria represent our best assessment, at the time the recovery plan is completed, of the conditions that would likely result in a determination that listing under the Act as threatened or endangered is no longer required. Should new information be made available after the plan is published, the data will be incorporated in the 5-year review process in order to ensure we incorporate the most recent data.
One reviewer indicated *Partula radiolata* and *Samoana* habitat needs are not as restricted as we indicate they are.	The Service based our threat descriptions on the most recent published data for the species and information in our files. When we receive new data or new information is published we will review it and, if appropriate, incorporate it into our 5 year reviews. In addition, Recovery Action 2.1. states that research would be conducted on the " Habitat requirements – Identify and assess any potential factors limiting the species population growth and determine what constitutes high-quality breeding, feeding, and sheltering habitat for each plant and animal species, the distribution of this habitat, and threats to the sites with high-quality habitat." Through this research we could have a better understanding of the specific habitat needs of each partulid snail and their ability to adapt to habitats that were previously thought to be unsuitable.

One reviewer noted *Euglandina* is gone from the Marianas, wiped out by the flatworm. No longer a threat. Same for *Gonaxis*. *Achatina* has never been observed or considered a predator of partulid snails.	We have revised the document to incorporate the changes to *Achatina* and Gonaxis. Systematic surveys for *Euglandina* have not occured in quite some time. Since the *Euglandina rosea* was intentionally introduced in the 1950's, until thorough surveys have confirmed absence we will need to consider these species a continued threat to partulid tree snails.
Updated Information Incorporated	
Two reviewers noted The Rota blue damselfly occurs in more than one stream in the Talakhaya region of Rota.	We have revised the document to correct the description of the occurrence of the species in the Talakhaya streams.
One reviewer noted high seed predation by rats has been observed on Saipan for *Heritiera longipetiolata* and rats need to be included as a threat to this species under Factor C in the table. Rats should be included as a Factor C threat for some of the other plants as well.	We have corrected the threats table to incorporate the threat of rats to *Heritiera longipetiolata*. Additionally, in the Factor A, threats to habitat description, rat damage to fruits, seeds, flowers, stems, leaves, roots, and other plant parts is addressed and in Factor E, we indicated the listed species individuals are themselves vulnerable to the Factor A threats.
One reviewer noted during the 2015 response to the Proposed Rule, we stated that there were no feral pig populations on Rota and asked for this threat to be removed. During the time between publication of the draft rule and the development of the draft recovery plan, feral pigs have established on Rota	We have revised the document to incorporate the change.
One reviewer noted the addition of ants and cycad scale as threats need to be added for Tinian.	We have revised the document to reflect this information.
One reviewer provided information to augment the document's description of threats posed by invasive ants.	We have revised the document to refine the description of the invasive ants and their impacts to the listed species.
One reviewer indicated the Service incorrectly states that yellow crazy ants (*Anoplolepis gracilipes*) are not present in the Northern Mariana Islands. Yellow crazy ants are widespread and well established on Rota, occur on Saipan, and potentially occur on Tinian and Aguiguan.	We have revised the document to incorporate the updated information.
Two reviewers noted the giant African snail (*Achatina fulica*) is not known to depredate partulid snails.	We have removed the African snail from the document.

One reviewer requested that generalized threats to Rota blue damselfly include other land use changes, such as road grading/stabilization that fills in wetland areas and results in sedimentation of streams.	The document has been refined to clarify these important threats.
One reviewer noted, regarding *Emoia slevini* delisting, that although redundancy of populations on at least six islands is required to ensure conservation of the species, they disagreed that these islands must include a large island (Guam, Rota, Tinian, Saipan, or Pagan).	We have revised the document to remove the requirement that one of the six islands occupied by a stable or increasing population of the Slevin's skink be a large island. Selection of sites to be managed for the long-term conservation species, considered during RIS development and recovery implementation may include selection of at least one large island to afford one or more populations with a higher degree of logistical access and ease of conservation support.
One reviewer indicated the Recovery Plan's population size estimates were outdated.	We have updated this document with the most up to date information available to the Service.
One reviewer indicated we should add invasive leaf miner herbivory and leaf spot disease of seedlings as a Factor C threat to *Heritiera longipetiolata* .	We have updated this document to incorporate this existing invasive herbivorous invertebrate threat in addition to acknowledging the threat posed by anticipated new introductions of invasive invertebrate species.
One reviewer indicated we should add invasive caterpillar herbivory defoliates trees as a Factor C threat to *Tabernaemontana rotensis*.	We have updated this document to incorporate this existing invasive herbivorous invertebrate threat in addition to acknowledging the threat posed by anticipated new introductions of invasive invertebrate species.

Clarification Requests	
One reviewer noted the plant population sizes for recovery criteria do not differentiate between genotypes and phenotypes. Because plants that reproduce vegetatively can form patches with many stems that are identical in genotype, accounting for the number of distinct individuals will be important for the conservation of the species genetic diversity.	Recovery Action 1 calls for range-wide surveys to be conducted to determine "the number and genetic structure of populations on each island" for all 23 species to inform conservation of the species' genetic diversity. As described in the Recovery Criteria - Plant Species, Reproductive Strategies section, most of the genetic variation in species that predominantly reproduce vegetatively or asexually is typically found among populations versus within populations. While we currently are uncertain if this applies to any of the 14 listed plant species, if future data suggest this is the case, additional populations would be required.
One reviewer commented use of fencing for creating ungulate-free habitats is a reliable means of protecting populations in some instances, however, it could be cost-prohibitive in the Mariana islands. With the frequency of severe weather events in the Mariana Islands, the cost of repairing and maintaining fences requires that this solution be a recurring cost over the long periods outlined in the Draft Recovery Plan. Population control and maintenance to acceptable levels that minimize threats to species should be considered as an alternative solution.	A site can be "ungulate-free" without ungulate fencing. For instance, ungulate fencing would be unnecessary, and long-term financial efficiencies would be realized, where ungulates are eradicated from an island or otherwise kept separated from the area managed for species conservation. Cost estimates include ungulate fencing and ongoing maintenance, but they anticipate efficiencies that are expected to come from up-front site selection efforts. Money spent on actions that are not expected to help meet downlisting and delisting recovery criteria, such as outplanting listed plants to areas where long-term ungulate exclusion has not been secured, are not included in the recovery plan cost estimates.
One reviewer indicated captive propagation and ungulate exclusion or population control should be included in the recovery strategy for snails.	We have revised the document to incorporate the change.
One reviewer indicated sheath-tailed bat Criterion 1 language is unclear.	We have revised the language to read 500 individuals per population
One reviewer indicated recent surveys on Guam indicate high abundances at multiple sites across the island for the Guam tree snail (*Partula radiolata*) and that “Low numbers” should not be considered a threat to this species.	We have revised the document to incorporate the correction.

One reviewer commented they are unaware of any New Guinea flatworm records from Sarigan or Guguan, and are aware that a brief survey for flatworm presence was conducted on Guguan.	We have revised the document to incorporate the change. Should survey results indicate the flatworm is present on an island occupied by listed partulid snails we will incorporate it in the 5-year review.
One reviewer indicated that while rats occur on Farallon de Pajaros, the unforested island does not have suitable habitat for any of the 23 species so rats are not a threat there.	We have revised the document to incorporate the change.
One reviewer noted the number of years of partulid population monitoring required for reclassification was not long enough to encompass several generations because partulids first reproduce at approximately 18 months of age so more time is needed to encompass multiple generations.	The number of years the populations of tree snails would need to remain stable or increasing were not updated. Three years of stable or increasing populations (meeting other criteria for population distribution, size, and control of threats to the population) are needed for downlisting and five years of meeting certain criteria will continue to be needed for delisting. We clarified the number of individuals per population (400) would need to be based on the number of tree snails observed, rather than population estimates based on surveys with low detection probabilities. We also augmented Criterion 2, 3, and 4, which relate to securing long-term protections of these tree snail populations from threats.
One reviewer expressed concern because the only remaining population of the Pacific sheath-tailed bat occurs almost exclusively in one cave where it is at considerable risk of extinction due to a single catastrophic event such as disease, typhoon, etc. Considering the risk of imminent extinction, they felt it may be necessary to assume higher risk than we might normally be comfortable with to undertake translocations to establish one or more additional population.	We updated the document to be consistent with the recovery rationale. The RIS, which will be developed in coordination with stakeholders and partners, will further refine and prioritize the conservation actions that will be needed, and will identify partners and stakeholders that could develop the plans, including USFWS.
One reviewer noted *Tuberolabium guamense* numbers are low based on survey data provided	We have updated this document with the most up to date information available to the Service.
One reviewer noted the document had no definition of "genetic storage".	We have revised the document to incorporate the change.
One reviewer noted cats should be included as a threat for Slevin's skink	We have revised the document to incorporate the change.

One reviewer noted *Euglandina rosea* has not been seen on Guam.	Systematic surveys for *Euglandina rosea* have not occurred in quite some time (Hopper and Smith 1992, Kerr 2013). Since the *Euglandina rosea* was intentionally introduced in the 1950's until surveys have confirmed absence we continue to consider the predatory species a threat to partulid tree snails.
One reviewer expressed concern that ants, especially little fire ants, are probably the second major predator of snails.	We have augmented our description of the considerable threat ants pose to the listed species including the tree snails.
One reviewer noted threat Factor D should include not just updating laws but actual enforcement of the existing laws and recommended a more explicit regulatory strategy to ensure species are listed and protected,	We have revised the document to incorporate the changes. Recovery action 4.1. states that we will "facilitate or encourage regulations and policy to ensure protection of the listed species under Commonwealth or Territorial law and "4.1.1 Recognize the 23 species for protections under the Guam and CNMI's Endangered Species Act."
One reviewer indicated it would be crucial to ensure adequate funding is secured for improving law enforcement and on the ground conservation management at the local level.	Control of threats to habitat and individuals is expected to vary considerably by threat, by site, and by species. Site-specific threat control plans, which will help inform requests for funding, can prioritize actions to most efficiently reduce threat levels over time. Costs are detailed in the Time and Cost Estimates section of the document.
One reviewer commented implementation is subject to availability of funds and is at the discretion of partners.	The document has been updated to clarify the role of federal agencies in funding recovery implementation.
One reviewer commented: In reference to having biosecurity measures in place, there has never been a conviction or even serious investigation of tree snail take on Guam since the snails were listed.	We have identified the need for further enforcement in relation to biosecurity.
One reviewer commented the species description is out of date *Partula lutaensis* was described in 2021 by Sischo and Hadfield.	We have reviewed the Sischo and Hadfield 2021 publication, although as of 2023 this taxonomic change has not been made in the Federal Register. Until this change is made we will continue to refer to the snails in question as P*artula gibba* and reference the recent publication. We would address a taxonomic change through a formal rule making process.
One reviewer noted rats are a considerable conservation concern in the CNMI where brown tree snakes aren't present. In particular, rats prey on tree snails in the CNMI.	Thank you for your comment. We have revised the document to incorporate the change.

One reviewer commented regarding the statement "All populations created via translocation will incorporate the full genetic representation of the source population." And questioned the feasibility given costs and other hurdles.	The document was updated to indicate the population created via translocation should (rather than will) incorporate the full genetic representation of the source population. These activities are included in the time and costs estimates.
One reviewer asked if there would be separate management and monitoring plans developed for each species and who would be responsible for developing the plans.	Development of management and monitoring plans will be needed. The RIS, which will be developed in coordination with stakeholders and partners will further refine and prioritize the types of plans that will be needed, and will identify partners and stakeholders that could develop the plans, including USFWS.
Conservation strategies relating to seed collection, propagation in rare plant nurseries, outplanting in new suitable habitat, or augmenting existing habitat, seed storage (and in addition, the need for seed storage research, as for now little is known about that) are lacking in the document.	Development of management and monitoring plans will be needed. The RIS, which will be developed in coordination with stakeholders and partners will further refine and prioritize the types of plans that will be needed, and will identify partners and stakeholders that could develop the plans, including USFWS.
One reviewer noted Table 5 does not include Asian house shrews as a threat to Slevin's skink, but they are included later in the document as a predator.	We have revised the document to incorporate the change.
One reviewer noted it is unclear why pigs are not mentioned as tramplers and grazers in this section and only mentioned as possible dispersers of native seeds	We have revised the document to incorporate the change.
One reviewer noted the Mariana eight-spot butterfly recovery section doesn't incorporate captive breeding.	We have updated the Recovery Plan to incorporate captive breeding for the Mariana eight-spot butterfly. In addition, we added Recovery action 2.2.1 which will evaluate which of species may need captive rearing/ propagation to achieve recovery criteria and action 3.4.1.2 which would establish husbandry programs for the selected species.
One reviewer recommended use of the alternative English name “Mariana skink” for *Emoia slevini* as it highlights the endemism of this species, enabling cultivation of a sense of pride and ownership among local agencies and the public and ultimately generating necessary support for recovery efforts.	According to the Federal Register, the listed entity is the Slevin's skink so the Service must refer to it as such, however we added "also known as the Mariana Skink" to the basic species information section to highlight its endemism.
One reviewer asked how is Population defined and indicated it should be defined for each species.	We have augmented descriptions of population in the document.

One reviewer noted *Tabernaemontana rotensis* persists in high numbers and is not in decline and should be included with *Dendrobium guamense*, *Eugenia bryanii*, *Phyllanthus saffordii*, and *Tuberolabium guamense*	We have refined the document to correct the error.
Questions	
Regarding listed plant downlisting or delisting timelines, one reviewer asked: if the number of populations and number of individuals per population aspect of criterion 1in are currently satisfied, can the species be reclassified now or will it still require 20 years of population stability?	A period of monitoring, to confirm plant populations are stable or increasing, rather than in decline or vulnerable to environmental perturbations, would be needed to confirm the status of the population. Surveys conducted in previous years could help inform population status. In addition to meeting the criterion 1, numbers, downlisting and delisting would also be dependent on criterion 2 and 3 related to securing threat control for these populations. We evaluate a species' status in the 5-year review, and make an initial recommendation to down or delist in that process. Population stability or growth and threat reduction are the factors components we consider when determining a status change.
One reviewer asked if Criterion 3 for plants has items for "all species", does this mean downlisting/delisting is only possible when all plant species have met these criteria or is it possible to downlist/delist for a single species.	Reclassification decisions are made at the individual species level, independent of the status of the other species.
Regarding *Solanum guamense*, Mariana eight-spot butterfly, Mariana wandering butterfly, and Langford's tree snail, one reviewer asked how many years of non-discovery will it be before declared extinct?	We evaluate the status of the species during the 5 year review process. Those reviews incorporate the population status as well as threat amelioration and ultimately provide a recommendation on whether or not to change its status, including delisting due to extinction.

Recovery Criteria	
One reviewer questioned the necessity of controlling ungulates and slugs in areas conserved for the Mariana eight-spot butterfly because they had not found considerable ungulate and slug damage to the host plant species.	Recovery criteria represent our best assessment, at the time the recovery plan is completed, of the conditions that would likely result in a determination that listing under the Act as threatened or endangered is no longer required. Thus, a decision to delist or downlist a species is informed by the recovery criteria but is ultimately based on an analysis of threats using the best scientific and commercial data available. Because relic Mariana eight-spot butterfly host plants are primarily restricted areas that are, due to topography and substrate, relatively inaccessible to ungulates, we consider ungulates to be one of the primary threats to this species' habitat. Site-specific needs for active management of slugs to facilitate long-term conservation of the Mariana eight-spot butterfly's host plants would be addressed in site-specific management plans.
One reviewer indicated that in response to climate change threats, we recommend the Service consider alternative criteria to establishing populations on every island in the species "historical" range; perhaps a subset or combination of viable islands within the region that are targeted as refugia or used for experimental populations/outplantings. This approach would require modeling future conditions to select appropriate islands/population.	As described in the Recovery Plan, modeling will be needed to examine how climate change will affect the 23 species' distributions, including their potential future condition and distribution to inform selection of sites for their long-term conservation. Updates to the recovery criteria could be made as modeling and other new information inform adaptive management.
One reviewer noted for the 14 listed plant species, requiring populations on every island within a defined "historical" range as a recovery criterion is problematic considering some islands may no longer be viable environments for some species.	We have modified the plant recovery criteria to ensure islands that no longer experience climate conditions needed to support the species and its habitat would not be targeted for conservation management of the species. Habitat restoration may be among the efforts needed to conserve the listed species on one or more islands.

General Comments	
One reviewer felt that *Bulbophyllum guamense* does not meet the criteria for listing because Zarones et al. (2015) estimated population sizes up to 15,000 individuals on the island of Rota.	The recovery plan does not assess the species listing decision.
One reviewer expressed concerns about the invertebrate downlisting and delisting criteria. They felt the number of tree snails per population was too small and they indicated uncertainty regarding the number of Mariana wandering butterfly populations in the criteria due to the lack of species life history information.	We used the best available scientific data to draft the recovery plan and recovery criteria. Recovery criteria represent our best assessment, at the time the recovery plan is completed, of the conditions that would likely result in a determination that listing under the Act as threatened or endangered is no longer required. Thus, a decision to delist or downlist a species is informed by the recovery criteria but is ultimately based on an analysis of threats using the best scientific and commercial data available. Should new information be made available after the plan is published, the data will be incorporated in the 5-year review process in order to ensure we take into account the most recent data.
One reviewer commented the recovery criteria for animal species are focused entirely on numbers instead of establishing genetically distinct populations and suggested genetic sampling be conducted earlier in the process during the population status surveys.	Recovery Action 1 details the need for range-wide surveys need to be conducted to determine "the number and genetic structure of populations on each island" for all 23 species to determine which populations are important to the recovery of a species. If a study determines that a population is genetically distinct we will incorporate that into the RIS and prioritize recovery actions accordingly.
One reviewer commented regarding Recovery Action 1.2: Map the remaining habitat for each species and assess the severity of threats to the persistence of these areas. Mapping of specific species' habitats will require detailed information including micro-topography and detailed forest data. The data analyzed in the Habitat Status Reports are insufficient for these efforts and for modeling species distributions. We identify these factors to discourage the over-mapping of the critical habitat for species during this process.	We agree that more detailed information and modeling will be helpful to determine the remaining suitable habitat of the 23 species. During the critical habitat designation process we will be engaging with species experts, partners, and stakeholders to collect the best available data to inform the critical habitat designated for each species. Further, when we develop species management plans and the RIS, we will aim to identify targeted management areas.
One reviewer noted they don't agree with the recovery strategy to conserve one population on each historically occupied island.	Downlisting and delisting criteria for the 14 plants would be met when threat control and population development targets are met on

	each of the historically-occupied islands. In the absence of range-wide representation, the species would remain at the more vulnerable Interim Stabilization stage of recovery.
One reviewer commented plant species recovery criteria should be species-specific to ensure limited funding addresses the most pressing conservation needs of the species.	Plant species recovery criteria were grouped based on life span, reproductive strategy, and population dynamics because these are the primary drivers of plant population viability. Where conservation sites supporting multiple species can be protected, efficiencies in conservation funding are expected.
One reviewer noted they are unaware of any feral or domestic cattle on Tinian that present a threat to any of the 23 species.	Herbivory and trampling inhibit the regeneration and persistence of the habitat needed for the recovery of the species included in this plan which occur or have the potential to occur on Tinian.
One reviewer recommended a change to read "Of the 14 plant species, all but 4 (*Dendrobium guamense, Eug*enia bryanii, *Phyllanthus saffordii*, and *Tuberolabium guamense*) persist at very low numbers, are in rapid decline, or are thought to be extinct". *Cycas micronesica* is in slow decline.	Although *Cycas micronesica* is in decline, it does not yet meet criteria to be classified as a listed plant at risk due to having "low numbers".
While we agree that current knowledge of *Emoia slevini* life history and threats is severely lacking, the Cocos Island population, as the last remaining population in the southern islands, is critically important for recovery and should be highlighted. Conservation of the Cocos Island genetic diversity is critically important as the immediate priority action, whether by establishing a captive population or translocation to establish an assurance population. It is understood that research will be needed to prepare for this action.	Recovery Action 1.1.1 explains that "the number and genetic structure of populations on each island" for Slevin's skink and all 23 species is needed to determine which populations are important to the recovery of a species. If new information indicates the Cocos island population is critically important to the recovery of the skink, we agree that intervention, whether by captive rearing or translocation, would be a necessary recovery action and included it as Recovery Action 3.4.1.1 , 3.4.2 , and 3.4.3. Furthermore, during the RIS process we will prioritize recovery actions with our conservation partners.

One reviewer noted in the description of the origins of Chamorros and settlement in the Mariana Islands only cites an “in litt” document from 2020 and from the CNMI. Recommend citing published, peer-reviewed reports and stating that there continues to be debate on the origins of Chamorros.	We have removed the "in litt" citations and updated the paragraph.
One reviewer requested the *Partula lutaensis* and *Partula gibba* taxonomic change be clarified in relation to Sischo and Hadfield 2021.	We have reviewed the Sischo and Hadfield 2021 publication, although as of 2023 this taxonomic change has not been made in the Federal Register. Until this change is made we will continue to refer to the snails in question as *Partula gibba* and reference the recent publication. We would address a taxonomic change through a formal rule making process.
One reviewer asked if the three epiphytic orchids are truly impacted by ungulates, rats, and BTS? Factor C also says Predation by slugs is a threat but there isn’t documentation of this having a significant impact.	Rats, ungulates, and BTS are a "Factor A" threat to the persistence of the native forest habitat. If slugs are not preventing a plant population from meeting recovery criteria, additional slug control would not be needed to reclassify the species.
One reviewer noted a statement that Cuban slugs are known to forage on orchids and may be a threat for all four species. This may be true for *Nervilia*, but seems unlikely for the epiphytic species especially for the ones growing higher in the canopy.	If slugs are not currently preventing a plant population from meeting recovery criteria, and not expected to cause the population to fail to continue to meet recovery criteria in the future, additional slug control would not be needed to reclassify the species and would not be addressed in the RIS or species management plans
One reviewer suggested the Recovery Plan include some way of indicating which species are already meeting these goals. For example I think *E. byranii, H. longipetiolata, T. rotensis, B. guamense, D. guamense, P. saffordii, and T. guamense* already meet these numbers.	Although there may be listed plant populations with numbers that meet recovery criteria, other targets may not have been achieved. We will analyze the status of the species and their threats during the 5-year review process.
One reviewer noted recovery criteria call for the listed species conservation areas to be free of ants and asked if this was even possible to accomplish.	Recovery of the species is not possible without the threats posed by ants ameliorated with anticipated ongoing future protection from ant threats. We recognize the challenges associated with interdiction and control of ants. Ant control is being conducted on a landscape scale in the Hawaiian islands and elsewhere using ground and helicopter applications of ant bait. Detection and interdiction of ants at ports of entry using detector dogs, and detection and rapid

	response to incipient populations have been effective at preventing and controlling ant introductions when they do occur. The recovery plan does not identify specific sites for management.
One reviewer indicated *Psychotria malaspinae* has not been properly identified. Amongst botanists there is debate between *Psychotria malaspinae* and *Psychotria hombriana*. This should be discussed and clarified.	Recovery plans address the species as it is currently listed. Species names and taxonomy are formally updated via other formal processes.
One reviewer expressed how important it would be to conserve habitat on a landscape level rather than in small pockets. They also expressed the importance of planning and developing multi-species conservation areas rather than a small tapestry of single-species conservation sites.	The recovery plan is meant to act as general road map for the next stage, which is the RIS. It is during this process and others where we will work with our conservation partners to develop approaches to inform conservation site selection. Recovery Action 3.1.2 states "Prioritize site selection balancing factors including conservation value to target or multiple species." The RIS will rely heavily on input and coordination with conservation partners and stakeholders.
Regarding *Phyllanthus saffordii*, one reviewer asked why we document several thousand and not a range of numbers or a specific numbers like other plants.	Our assessment of the number of *Phyllanthus saffordii* individuals is based on estimates from the literature which do not include specific numbers.
One reviewer noted for listing Factor E: While you cite potential direct threats to species you do not make any mention on the substantial direct loss of habitat through land development and encroachment – especially on non-military lands. There is no mention in the document of “conservation areas”.	Factor E addresses threats to the plant or animal itself. Threats to habitat loss are addressed in Factor A. Potential conservation areas for the 23 species can be identified in RIS or management plans.
One reviewer asked us to clarify how tree snail populations were defined.	Because we don't have enough species-specific information to inform delineation of populations, we currently consider populations to be groups of individuals that are separated by 1 km or greater distance. When we have a better understanding of population dynamics and gene flow, we may be better able to ascertain the level of mixing between populations and the metapopulation dynamics of each species.

One reviewer asked what would be considered a stable population for butterflies.	Recovery Criterion 1 states "To be considered stable, populations must be reproducing and not decreasing in abundance for 10 years."
One reviewer indicated its incumbent on USFWS to fund conservation work on Mariana eight-spot butterfly to get better data in addition to or to augment captive rearing work.	Research will help inform requests for funding and prioritization of actions to most efficiently conserve the species. Frameworks for the selection of conservation actions including research needed to inform on the ground work can be further refined by our conservation partners and stakeholders in either the RIS process, during the development of species management plans, or during consultation under section 7 of the Act.
One reviewer commented that for a species to be downlisted or delisted a “minimum population size that remain stable for 10 or 20 years as an indication that they can withstand repeated typhoons and the effects of climate change” is needed. Is there a monitoring strategy that will document this?	The recovery plan addresses the need for data collection and monitoring. Ongoing assessments will be necessary to track the status of threat control and population characteristics of plant populations that are managed to meet recovery criteria. Development of sampling protocols for initial and ongoing surveys and development of conservation site selection criteria could be further developed within the RIS or species management plans.
One reviewer asked us to define genetic storage in more detail in the executive summary.	The Executive Summary is a brief recap of the more specifics detailed within the body of the document.
One reviewer noted under 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 development and maintenance of genetic storage and propagation facilities is mentioned but there are not any facilities set up for any of the species and noted the substantial long-term investment.	The distribution and number of genetic storage facilities and ex situ collections have not been determined. These needs may be further developed within the RIS. The IUCN Species Survival Commission Guidelines on the Use of Ex Situ Management for Species Conservation (as updated) will serve as the framework for ex-situ conservation actions.
One reviewer indicated overall, short- and long-term goals need to be detailed further.	Further development of short- and long-term goals would be incorporated into the RIS.

One reviewer noted the Biden-Harris Administration's environmental justice whole-of-government commitment that requires early, meaningful, and sustained partnership with communities and prioritization of the principles of equity and environmental justice when working to support native and indigenous communities. The commenter indicated that recovery must incorporate crowd-sourced conservation actions including special indigenous stewardship permits for members of the public to conduct captive breeding of culturally significant listed animal species.	Equity and environmental justice are foundational to the conservation of these culturally-significant species and the habitats on which they depend, throughout their historic ranges. The RIS, which will be developed with the assistance of stakeholders and partners, will enable further development of conservation frameworks and strategies to seek funding for and undertake conservation of the species.
Two reviewers indicated the Service should work with the Commonwealth and Territory conservation agencies in the development of plans prior to plans being announced for public comment.	The recovery plan contains the species recovery vision, threats, actions, and strategy and is meant to act as general road map for the next stage, which is the RIS. The RIS is a living, short-term, flexible operational document which relies heavily on input and coordination with the local community; academic institutions; public, Territorial, Commonwealth and state partners; nonprofit organizations; conservation groups; individuals; as well as federal, state and local governmental agencies (collectively Conservation Partners). The development of the RIS involves working collaboratively with and engaging Conservation Partners to determine how, when, and with whom recovery actions will be implemented. We will be working on the RIS in the upcoming months and will reach out to our Conservation Partners as the process is meant to be collaborative.
One reviewer noted the recovery plan does not identify the amount of acreage needed for animal species recovery.	The recovery plan contains the species recovery vision, threats, actions, and strategy and is meant to act as general road map for the next stage, which is the RIS, which will help inform conservation site selection and the development of site-specific and species-specific management plans. The RIS will rely heavily on input and coordination with conservation partners and stakeholders. We will be working on the RIS in the upcoming months and will reach out to our conservation

	partners and stakeholders as the process is meant to be collaborative.
One reviewer commented we need to clarify "individuals per population" in plant species recovery.	The number of reproducing individuals per population is an integral component of recovery criteria detailed in the recovery plan for each species.
One reviewer indicated the plan should have a section describing recommended conservation measures such as buffer distances that should be incorporated into conservation management plans.	Control of threats to habitat and individuals is expected to vary considerably by threat, by site, and by species. Site-specific threat control plans, which will help inform requests for funding, can prioritize actions to most efficiently reduce threat levels over time. Frameworks for the selection of conservation areas and conservation measures including buffers can be further refined by our conservation partners and stakeholders in either the RIS process or during consultation pursuant to section 7 of the Act.
One reviewer indicated the criteria for all species and the length of time for expected down and delisting is considerable and they asked how these criteria were determined.	Downlisting or delisting the d species entails ensuring a specified number of total populations range-wide and populations per island remain stable or increasing for a specified period of time and delisting increases the number of populations and reproducing individuals and increases the time span over which the populations remain stable. These time periods are designed to enable confirmation of conservation site and species stability in relation to threats.
One reviewer asked how the plan will address development on the island and if there is consideration for habitat set aside as mitigation sites for species recovery.	Development is among the threats that informed the need to list these species. Future reclassification of the species will require identification and conservation of sites that would be protected from development. Long-term conservation will most efficiently occur on sites that can be protected from threats. Where partnerships including mitigation project, proponents could contribute to conservation of sites that are selected by the conservation community for the long-term conservation of the species, efficiencies will be realized, but would be addressed on a project by project basis.

One reviewer noted a map of species locations and photographs of each species should be included in the Recovery Plan.	The recovery plan incorporates by reference the species status reports, which include species location maps and photographs.
One reviewer noted that a table of each of the species and the criterion they have met would help determine where each of the species are at. For Criterion 1, if population is in the tens of thousands, when does the 10 year countdown begin?	We evaluate the status of the species during the 5-year review process. Those reviews incorporate the population status as well as threat amelioration and ultimately provide an initial recommendation on whether the species should be evaluated for a status change.
One reviewer noted we will have to decide is it control or eradicate predators. Two very different management goals and levels of costs.	Whether predators will need to be controlled or eradicated is species and site-specific. As we move toward recovery implementation, these targets will need to be identified in more detail, as part of management plans.