

From: [Snyder, Caitlin](#)
To: [Servis, Jennifer](#)
Subject: Re: 90-day PRF question
Date: Tuesday, June 23, 2015 7:28:06 AM

Hi Jennifer,

I think it makes sense to identify them both in the text as you describe, as well as separating them out and having two sections within the lit cited -- a list for the primary petition and a list of the secondary petition. Both will add better clarity for the public to see how we evaluated each petition on its own merits (although we are consolidating our finding into one form).

Thanks,
Caitlin

Caitlin Snyder
Branch of Listing
Ecological Services Program
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
MS: ES
5275 Leesburg Pike
Falls Church, VA 22041-3803
phone: 703 358 2673

On Mon, Jun 22, 2015 at 1:17 PM, Servis, Jennifer <jennifer_servis@fws.gov> wrote:
Hi Caitlin,

Thank you for getting back to me so quick with the helpful comments. I see now that I can make it more clear which claims and sources came from which petitions.

For each citation, do you think it would be helpful to include which petition it came from within the citation? For example, "...as their numbers are stable or increase each year (Meagher 1973, p. 70, primary petition; Meagher and Meyer 1994, p. 646, both petitions)." Or I could separate the citations within the literature cited section at the end of the document. Do you think either option would be helpful?

Thanks,

On Mon, Jun 22, 2015 at 10:43 AM, Snyder, Caitlin
<caitlin_snyder@fws.gov> wrote:

> Hi Jennifer,

>

> Thanks for sending this. Generally I think the set-up for this will work,

> although I suggest that at the start of each Factor we identify which

> purposes each petition is claiming may be a threat to the species. (See

> attached -- I inserted some comments). I also think we should separate out

> the DPS discussion and identify the citations we used to support a
 > discreteness finding and the citations we used to support a significance
 > finding (and do this for both petitions -- not sure if they used the same
 > references, but we should verify that we agree that both petitions present
 > an argument that the petitioned entity may be a DPS (and be both discrete
 > and significant)).
 >
 > There were some instances where it appeared that just the primary petition
 > was claiming something may be a threat, but then we seemed to indicate that
 > both petitions were claiming that something was a threat. I inserted some
 > comments asking for clarity on this. We also need to be clear on which
 > citations came from which petition.
 >
 > I inserted some other general comments.
 >
 > Please let me know if you have any additional questions or would like to
 > discuss further.
 >
 > Thanks,
 > Caitlin
 >
 >
 >
 >
 > Caitlin Snyder
 > Branch of Listing
 > Ecological Services Program
 > U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
 > MS: ES
 > 5275 Leesburg Pike
 > Falls Church, VA 22041-3803
 > phone: 703 358 2673
 >
 > On Fri, Jun 19, 2015 at 5:57 PM, Servis, Jennifer <jennifer_servis@fws.gov>
 > wrote:
 >>
 >> Hi Caitlin,
 >>
 >> Hope you are well. I wanted to follow up on the brief discussion we had
 >> with Justin earlier this month on how to combine two petitions into one
 >> finding. I recall there not being specific guidance on the process since it
 >> hasn't come up often. I've put together a draft of a PRF for two petitions
 >> to list the Yellowstone bison and wanted to send it your way so you have a
 >> chance to give input on aspects of its organization and wording, if you have
 >> time.
 >>
 >> Please let me know if you have any other ideas for ways to combine the
 >> petitions.
 >>
 >> Thank you,

>>
>> --
>> Jennifer Servis
>> Directorate Fellow
>> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
>> Mountain Prairie Region
>> Phone: 303-236-4264
>> Email: jennifer_servis@fws.gov
>
>

--
Jennifer Servis
Directorate Fellow
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mountain Prairie Region
Phone: 303-236-4264
Email: jennifer_servis@fws.gov