ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT
HERITAGE DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Animal Abstract **Element Code:** AAABH01250
Data Sensitivity: No

CLASSIFICATION, NOMENCLATURE, DESCRIPTION, RANGE

NAME: *Rana yavapaiensis*
COMMON NAME: Lowland leopard frog, Yavapai leopard frog
SYNONYMS: *Lithobates yavapaiensis* (Platz and Frost, 1984), *Rana pipiens* complex (lowland form)
FAMILY: Anura: Ranidae

AUTHOR, PLACE OF PUBLICATION: Platz and Frost, 1984. Copeia, 1984: 940-948.

TYPE LOCALITY: "Tule Creek (elev. 670 m), 34º 00', 112º 16', Yavapai County, Arizona", USA.

TYPE SPECIMEN: HT: AMNH 117632. J.E. Platz, 25 August 1971.

TAXONOMIC UNIQUENESS: *Rana* is a large genus, including Old and New World species (Stebbins 1985). The *Rana pipiens* complex was recently separated and contains nearly 30 species in North America and 7 species within Arizona (6 native and 1 introduced) (Hillis 1988). Distinguishing these 7 leopard frogs in Arizona has been problematic, mainly because they are recently described, are similar in appearance, and can inhabit the same locality (Platz and Platz 1973; Platz 1984; Jennings 1988; Jaeger et al. 2001). *R. yavapaiensis* is very similar to *R. onca* (Relict leopard frog); the two may be the same species (Rorabaugh 2006).

DESCRIPTION: A leopard frog of relatively small size, ranging from 1.8-3.4 in (4.6-8.6 cm) SVL; males are smaller than females with maximum lengths of about 2.8 in (7.2 cm) SVL. This is typically a brown frog, although some are green, particularly on the head. Usually there are no spots on the snout. There is often a yellowish wash to the groin area that many times extends onto the posterior venter and underside of the legs. The rear of the thigh has a dark brown and tight reticulate pattern. Adult males lack prominent vocal sacs, and a darkened thumb base. Dorsolateral folds are present, prominent, and lighter in color than the dorsum, broken and inset toward the rear. The upper-lip stripe is incomplete or vague (diffuse anterior to the eye), and the skin is tuberculate. The call is a series of high-pitched chuckles (*tuck-tuck-tuck*) that are not very loud and are similar to that of the Plains (*R. blairi.*) and Relict (*R. onca*) leopard frogs. (Platz 1988; Rorabaugh 2006; Stebbins 2003). The pulse rate is almost as low as that of *R. blairi*, but the repetition rate is faster, 10-16 pulses per second rather than 4-7. They also exhibit short guttural grunting sounds suggestive of rubbing an inflated rubber balloon. (Stebbins 2003).

AIDS TO IDENTIFICATION: *Rana yavapaiensis* is similar to *R. chiricahuensis* (Chiricahua leopard frog), but is biochemically distinct. The dorsolateral folds, tuberculate skin, and usually vague upper-lip strip is as in *R. chiricahuensis*, however, *R. chiricahuensis* has a more prominent vocal sac and dark thighs with a scattering of light spots rather than a dark network. (Stebbins 2003). *R. yavapaiensis* is most similar genetically to *R. onca* (Jaeger et al. 2001), and adult *R. onca* have "incomplete, indistinct, dorsolateral folds extending 1/2 to 3/4 of the way down the dorsum, ... shortened legs, an incomplete supralabial stripe, and upper surfaces of the thighs usually spotted rather than barred" (Jennings 1988).

Rana yavapaiensis can be distinguished from the 6 other species of leopard frogs within its range. "*Rana blairi* has a complete supralabial stripe extending anteriorly to the tip of the snout. *Rana pipiens* has a complete supralabial stripe, complete dorsolateral folds uninterrupted and undeflected in the sacral region. Adult *R. pipiens* may have green pigment in the groin region and males possess vestigial oviducts. The posterior surfaces of the thighs in *R. chiricahuensis* have numerous small papilla, each surrounded by cream-colored skin. Adult *R. chiricahuensis* have a mottled venter, and males along the southern Arizona border have vestigial oviducts. *R. berlandieri* is native to New Mexico and was unintentionally introduced in recent years to southwestern Arizona. Males, unlike *R. yavapaiensis*, possess prominent vestigial oviducts" (Platz 1988).

ILLUSTRATIONS:

Color drawing (Stebbins 1985: plate 15)
Color drawing (Stebbins 2003: plate 17)
Color photo (Randy Babb, *in* AZ PARC 2006 at http://www.reptilesofaz.com/Turtle-Amphibs-Subpages/h-r-yavapaiensis.html)
Color photo (Tom Brennan, *in* AZ PARC 2006 at http://www.reptilesofaz.com/Turtle-Amphibs-Subpages/h-r-yavapaiensis.html)
Color photos (William Flaxington 2004, *in* CalPhotos at http://calphotos.berkeley.edu/cgi/img_query?)
Color photo (Suzanne L. Collins 2001, *in* CNAH at http://www.cnah.org/detail.asp?id=1182)
Color photos of frogs and egg mass (Erik F. Enderson, *in* The Tucson Herpetological Society at http://www.arts.arizona.edu/herp/RAYA.html)
Color photo (Cecil Schwalbe, *in* The Tucson Herpetological Society at http://www.arts.arizona.edu/herp/RAYA.html)

TOTAL RANGE: Currently found in central and southeastern Arizona below the Mogollon Rim, southwest New Mexico (Gila River and Rio San Francisco), and probably northern Sonora and northwestern Chihuahua, Mexico. (Stebbins 2003; Sredl in Lannoo 2005).

Historically, *R. yavapaiensis* ranged from northwestern Arizona through central and southeastern Arizona, southwestern New Mexico, and northern Sonora, Mexico. Populations were also known from southwestern Arizona and southeastern California along the lower Colorado River and in the Coachella Valley (Platz and Frost, 1984; Platz 1988; Jennings 1995; cited by Sredl in Lannoo 2005). Because of the problem with identifying leopard frogs

in southwestern Utah, southeastern Nevada, and extreme northwestern Arizona, this account follows the taxonomy of Jaeger et al. (2000) and considers frogs of the Virgin River downstream into the Black Canyon of the Colorado River below Hoover Dam in Nevada to be relict leopard frogs (*R. onca*). (Sredl in Lannoo 2005). "Vitt and Ohmart (1978) surveyed numerous localities along the lower Colorado River and concluded that populations of leopard frogs, which would now be considered lowland leopard frogs, in that area may be extinct. All post-1980 records from the lower Colorado River and in the vicinity of the Salton Sea have turned out to be Rio Grande leopard Frogs (*R. berlandieri*), which have established themselves in the lower Colorado River and Gila River to Phoenix, Arizona (Plat et al., 1990; Jennings and Hayes, 1994a; Rorabaugh et al., 2004)." (Sredl in Lannoo 2005).

RANGE WITHIN ARIZONA: Found in central and southeastern part of state, with close to 60 % of all localities occurring in Gila, Maricopa and Yavapai counties (central Arizona below the Mogollon Rim). They are now absent from the lower Colorado River, and have declined significantly in southeastern Arizona. (Rorabaugh 2006).

SPECIES BIOLOGY AND POPULATION TRENDS

BIOLOGY: Where their range overlaps with the Chiricahua Leopard Frog (*R. chiricahuensis*), hybridization may occur. The two frogs hybridize in California Gulch and Big Casa Blanca Canyon, Santa Rita Mountains, Santa Cruz County. (Stebbins 2003).

Size at metamorphosis for *R. yavapaiensis* ranges from 25-29 mm (0.9-1.2 in) SVL (Platz 1988). The smallest males to exhibit secondary sexual characteristics from study sites in Graham and Yavapai counties, Arizona were 53.5 mm (2.1 in) and 56.2 mm (2.2 in) SVL, respectively (Sredl unpublished data). Size at which females reach sexual maturity is not known. Females have a mean asymptotic SVL of 76.4 mm (3.0 in), while that of males is 63.1 mm (2.5 in) (Sredl et al. 1997a).

Preliminarily, skeletochronology of *R. yavapaiensis* indicate that they can live as long as 3 years (Sredl and Fernandez unpublished data). Estimates of survivorship of the adult and juvenile stages appear to follow a seasonal pattern (Sredl et al. 1997a; Sredl in Lannoo 2005), high in the spring and summer and lower in the fall and winter. Within any given year, survivorships were always lowest in the winter. In 3 of 4 years for which there were estimates for all four intervals, wintertime survivorship was by far the lowest; this pattern held for both adults and juveniles. In populations examined, sex ratios generally do not differ from 1:1 (Sredl et al. 1997a).

REPRODUCTION: Reproduction is aquatic. Breeding migrations have not been noted in *R. yavapaiensis* as have been described for some amphibians. In Arizona, frogs breed primarily from January to May, with additional breeding occurring in some populations in summer and early fall after the onset of the summer rains. (Sredl unpublished data; Rorabaugh 2006). Male lowland leopard frogs attract a potential mate by emitting an airborne call

consisting of a series of low pulses lasting 3-8 seconds (Platz and Frost 1984). Proximate cues that stimulate mating in *R. yavapaiensis* are not well studied, although rainfall and water temperature have been mentioned as cues for other leopard frog species in the Southwest. Egg masses have been observed from January through late April and October (Ruibal 1959; Collins and Lewis 1979; Frost and Platz 1983). Females deposit spherical masses attached to submerged vegetation, bedrock, or gravel. Eggs usually are deposited near the surface of the water (Sartorius and Rosen, 2000; cited by Sredl in Lannoo 2005). Clutch size has not been studied in *R. yavapaiensis*. Egg masses have been observed to hatch in the wild in 15-18 days (Sartorius and Rosen, 2000; cited by Sredl in Lannoo 2005). Larvae metamorphose in as little as 3-4 mo or as long as 9 mo, and can overwinter (Collins and Lewis 1979; Sredl unpublished data); size at metamorphosis ranges from 25-29 mm SUL (Platz, 1988 cited by Sredl in Lannoo 2005). Altig et al. (1998) describes the tadpoles of *R. yavapaiensis*.

FOOD HABITS: Adults eat arthropods and other invertebrates (Stebbins 1985; Degenhardt et al. 1996). Larvae are herbivorous and likely eat algae, organic debris, plant tissue, and minute organisms in water (Marti and Fisher 1998). Stomach analyses of other members of the leopard frog complex from the western United States show a wide variety of prey items, including many types of aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates (e.g., snails, spiders, and insects) and vertebrates (e.g., fish, other anurans [including conspecifics], and small birds; Stebbins 1951).

HABITAT: *Rana yavapaiensis* inhabit aquatic systems in desert grasslands to pinyon-juniper (Platz and Frost 1984). They are habitat generalists and breed in a variety of natural and man-made aquatic systems. Natural systems include rivers, permanent streams, permanent pools in intermittent streams, beaver ponds, cienegas (=wetlands), and springs, while man-made systems include earthen cattle tanks, livestock drinkers, canals, irrigation sloughs, wells, mine adits, abandoned swimming pools, and ornamental backyard ponds (Platz and Frost 1984; Scott and Jennings 1985; Sredl and Saylor 1998). Most historical localities are small to medium-sized streams and rivers (Jennings 1987; Sredl and Saylor 1998). In lotic habitats, they are concentrated at springs, near debris piles, at heads of pools, and near deep pools associated with root masses (Jennings 1987; Sredl unpublished data).

The role of habitat heterogeneity within the aquatic and terrestrial environment is unknown, but likely important. Shallow water with emergent and perimeter vegetation provides basking habitat and deep water, root masses, undercut banks, and debris piles provide refuge from predators and potential hibernacula (Jennings 1987; Platz 1988; Jennings and Hayes 1994a; Sredl unpublished data). In semi-permanent aquatic systems, *R. yavapaiensis* may survive the loss of surface water by retreating into deep mud cracks, mammal burrows, or rock fissures (Howland et al. 1997). Seim and Sredl (1994) studied the association between juveniles and adult stages and pool size and found juveniles were more frequently associated with small pools and marshy areas while adults were more frequently associated with large pools.

ELEVATION: In Arizona elevation ranges from 480 – 8200 ft (146-2499 m) but generally <6400 ft (1951 m) (unpublished records, AGFD, HDMS accessed 2006). Range

wide, they are found from sea level to 1817 m (5,960 ft) (Jennings and Hayes 1994b); sea level to 5,577 ft (1700 m) as reported by Stebbins (2003).

PLANT COMMUNITY: Lower and Upper Sonoran Desert, grassland, oak and oak-pine woodland (Stebbins 1985). Common overstory at six lowland leopard rd frog sites, observed by Sredl et al. (1997, in Sredl edited by Lannoo 2005), "Consisted of Fremont cottonwoods (*Populus fremonti*), willows (*Salix* sp.), seepwillows (*Baccharis glutinosa*), mesquite (*Prosopis* sp.), and introduced salt cedars (*Tamarix chinensis*). Common ground cover in moist areas included yerba-mansa (*Anemopsis californica*), canyon ragweeds (*Ambrosia ambrosioides*), and arrow-weeds (*Tessaria sericea*). Three-square rushes (Scirpus *americanus*), spike rushes (*Eleocharis* sp.), and introduced Bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*) lined the banks or perimeter of ponds and slackwater pools. The largest, deepest pools had stands of narrow-leafed cattails (*Typha angustifolia*); large ponds in addition to having cattails, had pondweeds (*Potomageton* sp.)."

POPULATION TRENDS: Adequate data is needed to determine status of *Rana yavapaiensis* in central Arizona, but populations are thought to be stable (Sredl et al. 1997a). According to NatureServe (2006), "Large numbers of occurrences still exist in central Arizona (the largest portion of United States range) but, apparently extirpated from other portions of range in the southwestern United States; information is not available for Mexico." The species is declining in southeast Arizona and is extirpated from southwestern Arizona (USDI, FWS 1991; Sredl et al. 1997b).

SPECIES PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT STATUS:	None (USDI, FWS 1996) [C2 USDI, FWS 1994] [C2 USDI, FWS 1991] [C2 USDI, FWS 1989]
STATE STATUS:	WSC (AGFD, WSCA in prep) [State Candidate AGFD, TNW 1988]
OTHER STATUS:	Forest Service Sensitive (USDA, FS Region 3 1999) [Forest Service Sensitive USDA, FS Region 3 1988] Determined Subject to Special Protection (Secretaría de Medio Ambiente 2000) [Listed Rare, Secretaría de Desarrollo Social 1994] LC (IUCN Red List 2004)

MANAGEMENT FACTORS: The greatest threats to *R. yavapaiensis* are habitat alteration and fragmentation, accentuated by the introduction of non-native predatory and competitive

fishes, crayfishes, and frogs (mainly bullfrogs). (IUCN, Conservation International, and NatureServe 2006). Damming, draining, and the diversion of water have fragmented formerly contiguous aquatic habitats. A chytrid fungus (see Additional Information section) has infected populations of *R. yavapaiensis* as well as six other ranid frogs and two other amphibians causing mass die-offs and local extirpations (Sredl et al. 2000). Habitat fragmentation and water manipulation can lead to local extirpation by disrupting the metapopulation dynamics of lowland leopard frogs in arid landscapes (Jennings and Scott 1991). Other prominent factors are water pollution and heavy grazing.

PROTECTIVE MEASURES TAKEN: *Rana yavapaiensis* is a closed season species. Collections of this species are illegal statewide without a scientific collecting or similar permit (Arizona Game and Fish Department 2001).

SUGGESTED PROJECTS: Studies on disease, population and metapopulations, dispersal abilities, habitat reservations, and effectiveness of translocations are needed.

LAND MANAGEMENT/OWNERSHIP: BIA – Fort McDowell and San Carlos Reservations, and Indian Allotments; BLM – Havasu, Kingman, Phoenix, Safford and Tucson Field Offices; NPS – Saguaro National Park; USFWS – Bill Williams and San Bernardino National Wildlife Refuges; USFS - Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino, Coronado, Prescott, and Tonto National Forests; State Land Department; Alamo Lake State Park; Pima County - Cienega Creek Natural Preserve; Private; TNC – Aravaipa Canyon, Bingham Cienega, Buehman Canyon, Hassayampa River, Muleshoe Ranch, and San Pedro River Preserves, Cascabel Community Management Area, and Lower San Pedro Program; Boyce Thompson Southwestern Arboretum.

SOURCES OF FURTHER INFORMATION

REFERENCES:

Altig, R., R.W. McDiarmid, K.A. Nichols, and P.C. Ustach. 1998. A key to the anuran tadpoles of the United States and Canada. Contemporary Herpetology Information Series 2:1-53.

AmphibiaWeb: Information on amphibian biology and conservation. [web application]. 2006. Berkeley, California: AmphibiaWeb. Available: http://amphibiaweb.org/. (Accessed: Sep 20, 2006).

Arizona Game and Fish Department. 1988. Threatened Native Wildlife in Arizona. Arizona Game and Fish Department Publication. Phoenix, Arizona. p. 10.

Arizona Game and Fish Department. In prep. Wildlife of special concern in Arizona. Arizona Game and Fish Department Publication. Phoenix, Arizona. 32 pp.

Arizona Game and Fish Department. 2001. Amphibian and Reptile Regulations.

ARMI Atlas. *Rana yavapaiensis*, lowland leopard frog. Available: http://www.pwrc.usgs.gov/armiatlas/species.cfm?recordID=173462.

Bradley, G.A., P.C. Rosen, M.J. Sredl, T.R. Jones, and J.E. Longcore. 2002. Chytridiomycosis in native Arizona frogs. Journal of Wildlife Diseases, 38(1), 2002, pp. 206-212.

Clarkson, R.W., and J.C. Rorabaugh. 1989. Status of leopard frogs (*Rana pipiens* complex) in Arizona and southeastern California. Southwestern Naturalist 34: 531-538.

Collins, J.P., and M.A. Lewis 1979. Overwintering tadpoles and breeding season variation in the *Rana pipiens* complex in Arizona. Southwestern Naturalist 24: 371-373.

Cooper J. 1994. Extirpation of lowland leopard frog from Sonoita Creek. Memorandum to Tom Collazo at The Nature Conservancy.

Degenhardt, W.G., C.W. Painter, and A.H. Price. 1996. Amphibians and reptiles of New Mexico. University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Fernandez, P.J., and P.C. Rosen. 1996. Effect of the introduce crayfish *Orconectes virilis* on native aquatic herpetofauna. Report to Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona.

Frost, Darrel and The American Museum of Natural History. 1998-2006. Amphibian Species of the World 4.0, an Online Reference – *Lithobates yavapaiensis* (Platz and Frost, 1984). http://research.amnh.org/herpetology/amphibia/references.php?id=21806. Accessed: 20 September 2006.

Frost, J.S., and J.E. Platz. 1983. Comparative assessment of modes of reproductive isolation among four species of leopard frogs (*Rana pipiens* Complex). Evolution 37(1):66-78.

Hillis, D.M. 1988. Systematics of the *Rana pipiens* complex: puzzle and paradigm. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 19:39-63.

Howland, J.M., M.J. Sredl, and J.E. Wallace. 1997. Validation of visual encounter surveys. pp. 21-36. *In* Sredl, M.J. (Ed.), Ranid Frog Conservation and Management. Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program Technical Report 121, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona.

IUCN, Conservation International, and NatureServe. 2006. Global Amphibian Assessment. www.globalamphibians.org. Accessed on 04 May 2006.

Jaeger, J.R., B.R. Riddle, R.D. Jennings, and D.F. Bradford. 2001. Rediscovering *Rana onca*: evidence for phylogenetically distinct leopard frogs from the border region of Nevada, Utah, and Arizona. Copeia 2001(2):339-354.

Jennings, R.D. 1987. The status of *Rana berlandieri*, the Rio Grande leopard frog, and *Rana yavapaiensis*, the lowland leopard frog, in New Mexico. Report to Share with Wildlife, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Jennings, R.D. 1995. Investigations of recently viable leopard frog populations in New Mexico: *Rana chiricahuensis* and *Rana yavapaiensis*. Report to Endangered Species Program, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Jennings, R.D., and N.J. Scott, Jr. 1991. Global amphibian population declines: insights from leopard frogs in New Mexico. Report to Endangered Species Program/Share with Wildlife, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Jennings, M.R. 1988. *Rana onca* Cope, relict leopard frog. Catalogue of American Amphibians and Reptiles 417.1-417.2.

Jennings, M.R., and M.P. Hayes. 1994a. Decline of native ranid frogs in the desert Southwest. pp. 183-211. *In* Brown, P.R., and J.W. Wright (Eds.), Herpetology of the North American

Deserts: Proceedings of a symposium. Southwestern Herpetologists Society, Van Nuys, California.

Jennings, M.R., and M.P. Hayes. 1994b. Amphibian and reptile species of special concern in California. Report submitted to California Department of Fish and Game, Rancho Cordova, California.

Marti, E., and S.G. Fisher. 1998. Factors controlling algal growth in the ponds at Ramsey Canyon Preserve. Report to The Nature Conservancy, Tucson, Arizona.

NatureServe. 2006. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 5.0. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. Available http://www.natureserve.org/explorer. (Accessed: September 20, 2006).

Platz, J.E. 1988. *Rana yavapaiensis*. Catalogue of American amphibians and reptiles. p.418.1.

Platz, J.E., and J.S. Frost. 1984. *Rana yavapaiensis*, a new species of leopard frog (*Rana pipiens* complex). Copeia. pp.940-948.

Platz, J.E., and A.L. Platz. 1973. *Rana pipiens* complex: hemoglobin phenotypes of sympatric and allopatric populations in Arizona. Science 179:1334-1336.

Rorabaugh, J. in AZ PARC 2006. Reptiles of Arizona, Lowland Leopard Frog – *Rana yavapaiensis*. http://www.reptilesofaz.com/Turtle-Amphibs-Subpages/h-r-yavapaiensis.html. Accessed: 20 September 2006.

Rosen, P.C., C.R. Schwalbe, D.A.J. Parizek, P.A. Holm, and C.H. Lowe. 1995. Introduced aquatic vertebrates in the Chiricahua region: effects on declining ranid frogs. *In* L.F. DeBano, G.J. Gottfried, R.H. Hamre, C.B. Edminster, P.F. Ffolliott, and A. Ortega-Rubio, editors. Biodiversity and management of the Madrean Archipelago: the sky islands of southwestern United States and northwestern Mexico, pp. 251-261. Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experimental Station, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Ruibal, R. 1959. Ecology of a brackish water population of *Rana pipiens*. Copeia 1959: 315-322.

Scott, N.J., Jr. 1992. Ranid frog survey of the Gray Ranch with recommendations for management of frogs habitats, August 1990-September 1991. Report to Gray Ranch, Animas, New Mexico.

Scott, N.J., Jr., and R.D. Jennings. 1985. The tadpoles of five species of New Mexican leopard frogs. Occasional Papers for the Museum of Southwestern Biology 3: 1-21.

Secretaría de Desarrollo Social. 1994. Diario oficial de la federacion. p. 50.

Secretaría de Medio Ambiente. 2000. Diario oficial de la federacion. p. 38.

Seim, S.G., and M.J. Sredl. 1994. Lowland leopard frog micro-habitat use in Arizona. Annual Meeting of Arizona and New Mexico Chapters of the Wildlife Society, Sierra Vista, Arizona.

Sredl, M.J. *Rana yavapaiensis* Platz and Frost, 1984, Lowland Leopard Frog. In Lannoo, M., ed. 2005. Amphibian Declines, the conservation status of United States species. University of California Press. Berkeley, California. Pp. 596-599.

Sredl, M.J., and L.S. Saylor. 1998. Conservation and Management Zones and the role of earthen cattle tanks in conserving Arizona leopard frogs on large landscapes. pp. 211-225. *In* Feller, J.M., and D.S. Strouse (Eds.), Environmental, Economic, and Legal Issues Related to Rangeland Water Developments, The Center for the Study of Law, Science and Technology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

Sredl, M.J., E.P. Collins, and J.M. Howland. 1997a. Mark-recapture studies of Arizona leopard frogs. pp. 1-35. *In* Sredl, M.J. (Ed.), Ranid Frog Conservation and Management. Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program Technical Report 121. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona.

Sredl, M.J., J.M. Howland, J.E. Wallace, and L.S. Saylor. 1997b. Status and distribution of Arizona's native ranid frogs. pp. 37-89. *In* Sredl, M.J. (Ed.), Ranid Frog Conservation and Management. Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program Technical Report 121. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona.

Sredl, M.J., P.C. Rosen, and G.A. Bradley. 2000. Chytrid fungus widespread in Arizona. Annual meeting for the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, La Paz Mexico.

Stebbins, R.C. 1951. Amphibians of western North America. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.

Stebbins, R.C. 1985. A field guide to western reptiles and amphibians. Second edition, revised. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. New York. Pp.91-92, plates 14-15.

Stebbins, R.C. 2003. A field guide to western reptiles and amphibians. Third edition, revised. Houghton Mifflin Company. Boston, Massachusetts. P. 239.

USDA, Forest Service Region 3. 1988. Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List.

USDA, Forest Service Region 3. 1999. Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List.

USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1989. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Animal Notice of Review. Federal Register 54(4):558.

USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1991. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Animal Candidate Review for Listing as Endangered or Threatened Species; Proposed Rule. Federal Register 56(225):58814.

USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Animal Candidate Review for Listing as Endangered or Threatened Species; Proposed Rule. Federal Register 59(219):58996.

USDI, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1996. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Review of Plant and Animal Taxa that are Candidates for Listing as Endangered or Threatened Species; Notice of Review; Proposed Rule. Federal Register 61(40):7596-7613.

Vitt, L.J., and R.D. Ohmart. 1978. Herpetofauna of the lower Colorado River: Davis Dam to the Mexican border. Proceedings of the Western Foundation of Vertebrate Zoology 2: 35-72.

Windes, J.D. 1990. Leopard frog survey of the Coconino National Forest. Report prepared for the Coconino National Forest.

MAJOR KNOWLEDGEABLE INDIVIDUALS:

J.E. Platz - Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska.

Cecil Schwalbe - US Geological Survey, Sonoran Desert Unit, University of Arizona, Tucson.

Mike Sredl - Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

"Chytridiomycosis is a recently recognized cutaneous infection of both wild frogs and toads (Berger et al., 1998; Bosch et al., 2000) and captive frogs (Pessier et al., 1999) caused by the fungal agent *Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis*. … Clinical signs include lethargy, abnormal posture, loss of the righting reflex, and death (Daszak et al., 1999). The infection results in a severe diffuse dermatitis characterized by epidermal hyperplasia, hyperkeratosis, and variable degrees of cutaneous ulceration and hyperemia." (Bradley et al., 2002).

Revised: 1991-02-19 (NML)
1995-03-28 (MJS)
1997-12-24 (SMS)
2001-05-14 (SMB)
2006-10-26 (SMS)