

These questions are for internal purposes and are designed to help Service spokespeople address questions from the media, Congressional offices and the public.

**Q. I wasn't aware there was so much disagreement on the impacts of rodenticide on fisher. Does this mean that fishers in the West Coast DPS may not need federal protection.**

A. We are in the middle of our evaluation and can't pre-judge the outcome. We are engaged in the process of gathering information, which includes public comments and a peer review process. We will make our decision based on the best available information. We have re-opened the comment period and extended our deadline for making a final determination to ensure we thoroughly evaluate the threats and impacts to the species. We will make a final determination by April 7, 2016.

**Q. Who did the peer review, when did they do it and what were the over-riding issues they identified?**

During the comment period from Oct 7, 2014, to Feb 4, 2015, we sought peer review from 29 individuals with expertise on a range of topics, including fishers, genetics and climate change. We received 22 peer reviews. The main issues identified by the peer reviewers involved discussions about genetics, climate change, rodenticides, fisher population sizes and distribution within the DPS.

**Q. You noted there was substantial scientific uncertainty and disagreement about certain data you're considering as part of this listing determination. In what areas are there scientific disagreements?**

We received nearly 600 comment letters (with 31,000 letters attached) and 22 peer reviews. We are reviewing the information provided in the 4-month comment period and seeking specific information in this comment period. Scientific disagreement and uncertainty is evident in the peer reviews and comments received from Federal agencies regarding genetics, threats, and the DPS configuration.

**Q. Will you get enough information in the 30-day comment period to settle this uncertainty? How will you determine if the issues are settled? Will there be more peer review?**

We are required to use the best available commercial and scientific information in our analysis. We hope we will receive additional information to help answer the remaining questions, but if we do not, we are still required to move forward with our evaluation and a final listing determination or withdrawal of the proposed rule. We do not anticipate additional peer review. We received 22 peer reviews on this proposed rule.

**Q. You mentioned you want law enforcement related information. What will this help you determine? Has law enforcement resisted giving you this information thus far?**

We are hoping the information from law enforcement will help to clarify whether the rodenticide quantities found at illegal marijuana grow sites is increasing, decreasing, or stable, as well as whether illegal marijuana grow site numbers are increasing, decreasing or stable. There may be additional information about prohibited toxicants being found at sites and their impacts on fisher or other wildlife.

**Q. You mentioned you want additional survey data. Didn't you already request this info? What are you hoping to conclude from this data?**

We did request information on fisher surveys, distribution, and population trends. However, we failed to explicitly state that we seek information on surveys in which no fishers were found. In this Federal Register notice, we are explicitly stating we would like information on fisher surveys that have been conducted, but where no fishers were found, to help inform our analysis of population distribution and trend.