
From: Livingston, Sue </O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=6C64F523E6FE40E4A883A5295030EC38-SUE_LIVINGS>
To: Russell, Daniel
Sent: 3/3/2020 7:30:45 PM
Subject: RE: R1 comments on draft fisher rule

Ha! I've worked with you too long to take offense at your agitation J
I sent Jesse a brief synopsis of your concerns, suggesting that if he doesn't agree he get ahold of you.

Sue Livingston
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office
2600 SE 98th Ave., Suite 100
Portland, OR 97266
503-231-6908
FAX 503-231-6195
<http://www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/>
Connect with us on [Facebook](#)

From: Russell, Daniel <daniel_russell@fws.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 3:47 PM
To: Livingston, Sue <sue_livingston@fws.gov>
Subject: Re: R1 comments on draft fisher rule

We can have an offline conversation if you'd like. It's not the nonnative portion that supports the argument about our DPS, it's the fact that there are populations that are not "from" this 3-state region. But in Jesse's and Zach's position, if everything is native, then we should be including all those fishers up in Washington as part of the DPS. And evaluating their status as well, holistically with all the other fishers in the 3 west coast states. But somewhere along the line we decided not to do so...but have never said why!

We have said for years that all these fishers in the three west coast states are discrete from and significant to the remainder of the taxon. From WA down to CA.

But now we are not including WA fishers. Why not, because they're "reintroduced?"

That shouldn't matter, as they're still discrete from the remainder of the taxon. So there needs to be some other rationale for NOT evaluating the status of a 3-state DPS that includes those three reintroduced populations up in WA. We have for years been using the distinction of them being "nonnative," as they came from populations pretty far away. Those BC and Alberta fishers would never have made it down to WA on their own.

So in the context of our DPS, that's pretty nonnative.

But moving aside from those WA fishers, I know the SOC hasn't been part of the native vs. nonnative discussion surrounding fishers in WA, and have no bearing on their removal from a status evaluation.

But Jesse's desire to purge all use of the term nonnative, just because...well, that seems pointless to me, and actually a bit contradictory to our long history. Even using the term 'reintroduced' isn't accurate...reintroduced means they were there once, and now we're bringing them back in. But fishers from BC and Minnesota were never "there once," so it's really an introduction.

If you moved fishers from the far eastern edge of Canada to the far western edge, would they be native? Would we be reintroducing them?

Please understand, and I think you know this (I hope, anyway), my agitation about this isn't directed at you. But I feel very strongly about it, and I don't want to start revising language just based on some unfounded concern about using the word nonnative.

Daniel Russell - Regional Classification Program Coordinator
California - Great Basin / Legacy Region 8
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2606
Sacramento, CA 95825
Office (916) 978-6191
Cell (916) 335-9060

From: Livingston, Sue <sue_livingston@fws.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 3:04 PM
To: Russell, Daniel <daniel_russell@fws.gov>
Subject: RE: R1 comments on draft fisher rule

Maybe I missed something, but I'm not understanding how the "nonnative" portion of the DPS is an underpinning that supports our argument that the DPS is separate from the rest of the range.

Sue Livingston
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office
2600 SE 98th Ave., Suite 100
Portland, OR 97266
503-231-6908
FAX 503-231-6195
<http://www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/>
Connect with us on [Facebook](#)

From: Russell, Daniel <daniel_russell@fws.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 2:59 PM
To: Livingston, Sue <sue_livingston@fws.gov>
Subject: Re: R1 comments on draft fisher rule

But that would also assume it "needs" a fix.

We've been pointing out the "nonnative" component of this DPS for 20 fricking years now. If a fisher from Minnesota isn't nonnative, then I don't know what is.

Nonnative vs. native has been one of the underpinnings of this whole thing...the need to point out the separateness of our DPS fishers from those in the rest of the range.

I just don't want to dismiss this whole history (and underpinning) because some folks don't like the idea of calling fishers from hundreds and hundreds of miles away, in very different ecological settings, and with many, many years of separation...nonnative.

We can talk more tomorrow if you'd like 😊

Daniel Russell - Regional Classification Program Coordinator
California - Great Basin / Legacy Region 8
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2606
Sacramento, CA 95825
Office (916) 978-6191
Cell (916) 335-9060

From: Livingston, Sue <sue_livingston@fws.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 2:41 PM

To: Russell, Daniel <daniel_russell@fws.gov>; Eyes, Stephanie A <stephanie_eyes@fws.gov>; Picco, Angela <Angela_Picco@fws.gov>; Glenne, Gina <gina_glenne@fws.gov>; Willy, Elizabeth <elizabeth_willy@fws.gov>; Hull, Josh <Josh_Hull@fws.gov>; Drake, Madeline K <madeline_drake@fws.gov>

Subject: RE: R1 comments on draft fisher rule

Maybe. But the revisions say the same thing without us making a conclusion about the native status. Seems like a clean fix.

Sue Livingston
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office
2600 SE 98th Ave., Suite 100
Portland, OR 97266
503-231-6908
FAX 503-231-6195
<http://www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/>
Connect with us on [Facebook](#)

From: Russell, Daniel <daniel_russell@fws.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 2:19 PM

To: Eyes, Stephanie A <stephanie_eyes@fws.gov>; Livingston, Sue <sue_livingston@fws.gov>; Picco, Angela <Angela_Picco@fws.gov>; Glenne, Gina <gina_glenne@fws.gov>; Willy, Elizabeth <elizabeth_willy@fws.gov>; Hull, Josh <Josh_Hull@fws.gov>; Drake, Madeline K <madeline_drake@fws.gov>

Subject: Re: R1 comments on draft fisher rule

Yeah, I'm gonna say no on that one.

R1's concern has been with the term nonnative as it applies to fishers in Washington. The SOC fishers are nonnative...this is not the same issue as saying the reintroduced fishers in Washington came from BC and Alberta, and these Canadian fishers are basically the same as what was in Washington before extirpations.

The SOC being established with BC and Minnesota fishers next to the NCSO is NOT the same thing, and it's absolutely appropriate to call these fishers nonnatives.

Daniel Russell - Regional Classification Program Coordinator
California - Great Basin / Legacy Region 8
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2606
Sacramento, CA 95825
Office (916) 978-6191

From: Eyes, Stephanie A <stephanie_eyes@fws.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 2:14 PM

To: Livingston, Sue <sue_livingston@fws.gov>; Picco, Angela <Angela_Picco@fws.gov>; Russell, Daniel <daniel_russell@fws.gov>; Glenne, Gina <gina_glenne@fws.gov>; Willy, Elizabeth <elizabeth_willy@fws.gov>; Hull, Josh <Josh_Hull@fws.gov>; Drake, Madeline K <madeline_drake@fws.gov>

Subject: Re: R1 comments on draft fisher rule

Ok - I'll work with Angela to make sure these get addressed in the correct document.

From: Livingston, Sue <sue_livingston@fws.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 2:11 PM

To: Picco, Angela <Angela_Picco@fws.gov>; Russell, Daniel <daniel_russell@fws.gov>; Glenne, Gina <gina_glenne@fws.gov>; Willy, Elizabeth <elizabeth_willy@fws.gov>; Eyes, Stephanie A <stephanie_eyes@fws.gov>; Hull, Josh <Josh_Hull@fws.gov>; Drake, Madeline K <madeline_drake@fws.gov>

Subject: R1 comments on draft fisher rule

So I heard back from Kim Garner (my boss), Jesse D'Elia (acting Kit Hershey—regional listing coordinator). I don't know yet if Paul Henson will review it or not.

Neither Kim nor Jesse found any fatal flaws and both said the DPS analysis portion was well-written and made sense. Jesse had only 2 edits that he felt necessary for clarification. I'd go in and make them but I'm not sure which document to use anymore. But I will memorialize here and folks can discuss it on the call tomorrow, which I won't be able to make.

Edit 1 is on page 24, the second sentence up from the summary heading that states, "The SSN DPS has only a single mitochondrial DNA haplotype which is genealogically distinct from the NCSO DPS" He thought this may be missing a comma after haplotype, otherwise, it is unclear whether the population has only a single haplotype AND that single haplotype is distinct, or whether it has multiple haplotypes, but only one is distinct. I believe it is the former, correct? If so, needs a comma after haplotype.

Edit 2 is on page 55, 2nd sentence that reads, "First, the SOC portion west and south of Crater Lake in the southern Oregon cAscade Range is predominantly represented by nonnative reintroduced fishers. However, recent analyses have documented that at least some of these nonnative SOC individuals and native NCSO individuals are overlapping in range . . ." Jesse wanted to delete the nonnative terms used twice, and proposed the following change (in red):

predominantly represented by ~~nonnative~~ reintroduced fishers from British Columbia and Minnesota. However, recent analyses have documented that at least some of these ~~nonnative~~ reintroduced SOC individuals and native NCSO individuals

Sue Livingston

Fish and Wildlife Biologist

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office

2600 SE 98th Ave., Suite 100

Portland, OR 97266

503-231-6908

FAX 503-231-6195

<http://www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/>

Connect with us on [Facebook](#)

From: Picco, Angela <Angela_Picco@fws.gov>

Sent: Friday, February 28, 2020 4:06 PM

To: Souza, Paul <paul_souza@fws.gov>; Holzworth, Jody K <jody_holzworth@fws.gov>; Senn, Michael J <michael_senn@fws.gov>; Fris, Michael <michael_fris@fws.gov>; Garner, Kim <kim_garner@fws.gov>; White, Rollie <rollie_white@fws.gov>; Henson, Paul <paul_henson@fws.gov>; Delia, Jesse <jesse_delia@fws.gov>;

Fahey, Bridget <bridget_fahey@fws.gov>; Snyder, Caitlin <caitlin_snyder@fws.gov>; O'Hara, Kerry <Kerry.O'Hara@sol.doi.gov>

Cc: Livingston, Sue <sue_livingston@fws.gov>; Drake, Madeline K <madeline_drake@fws.gov>; Hull, Josh <Josh_Hull@fws.gov>; Russell, Daniel <daniel_russell@fws.gov>; Willy, Elizabeth <elizabeth_willy@fws.gov>; Glenne, Gina <gina_glenne@fws.gov>; Eyes, Stephanie A <stephanie_eyes@fws.gov>; Crowell, Heidi <heidi_crowell@fws.gov>

Subject: Fisher final rule for your expedited review

Hello all,

Attached is the fisher final rule for your review. Please note that this document does not yet include the Responses to Comments section; our small team is working on that section next, and we hope to get it to you next week (~March 4) . Under this expedited timeline, we have a single week to both complete your review and address your comments. Because of this, our small team will be responding to your concerns in real time next week (March 2-6). The document is due to Gary on March 9. Please do a big picture review of this document and leave out the small editorial issues at this point. If you are able to call me or a member of our small team to discuss any issues that come up during your big picture review, that would be best. We are not looking for track changes documents from each reviewer or even each office because we are focusing on this big picture review at this point. Sorry for the remaining highlighted sections and edits; we ran into issues with Microsoft and the document today (this is also why you are getting a pdf).

Thank you for your help and willingness to review this document in this short amount of time. Please let me or any member of our small team know if you have any questions.

Thanks again!

Angela

Fisher small team members:

Heidi Crowell
Madeline Drake
Stephanie Eyes
Gina Glenne
Josh Hull
Sue Livingston
Angela Picco
Dan Russell
Elizabeth Willy

--

Angela Picco, Ph.D.
Deputy Chief of Ecological Services and Regional Recovery Coordinator
California-Great Basin Region 10 (formerly Pacific Southwest Regional Office-Region 8)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2606
Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 414-6490 (office)
(916) 335-5169 (work cell)