Rene,

Thank you so much for attempting to apply the results of the paper to the planned projects on the Sequoia. I’ve gone over stuff pretty thoroughly and asked my coauthors to do so as well and we agree that you have discovered an error in the paper. It looks like the 7.4 ha value was mistakenly carried forward from a previous version of the paper, and based on a different set of numbers, but was not updated when the percent values were updated. I want to especially thank Jim Garner, who saved a bunch of our old emails and versions of the paper, for his sleuthing. Looks like the true value should be 2.6 ha/year/km². It doesn’t change our conclusion about the percent of the land area that fisher’s tolerate, thus it also doesn’t affect our comparison with what % fire ecologists (particularly Syphard et al.) predict is necessary to treat to reduce fire spread rates. Nonetheless, it will probably give others fits who are trying to do what you are doing and, in the worst case scenario provide an overestimate of the treated area that fishers will tolerate to those future readers whose eyes are drawn only to the area values in the paper (and not the percentages). Thus, I plan to contact the journal to see about publishing a correction in the form of an erratum. In that, I plan on acknowledging you by name for discovering the error. Let me know if you have any reason for me not to do so.

Thanks again!

Bill

p.s. I also plan to read the material you sent more carefully and get back to you, but I first wanted to get the bottom of this issue and to make sure to acknowledge your help in identifying the problem.

William J. Zielinski
USDA Forest Service
Pacific SW Res Station
1700 Bayview Drive
Arcata, CA 95519
707 825-2959
bzielinski@fs.fed.us
Hi Bill,

Thanks for your time on the phone this morning.

Based on my analysis of your Zielinski et al. (2013b) paper on fisher tolerance, I’ve done some calculations of the restorative treatments proposed in several large projects in the Greenhorn Mountains of the Sequoia National Forest, north and south of the community of Alta Sierra, all in core Pacific fisher habitat.

Based on my calculations, I estimate that if the Forest Service implements the Summit, Rancheria, Frog, and Tobias projects over the next 10 years that they will disturb roughly 5% of the larger Pacific fisher core area on average per year. Attached are my comments with those calculations as well as the cumulative projects map of these 4 projects (Exhibit C). But if these projects are implemented over the next 5 years (which is possible, according to the Forest Service’s documents), the treatment rate will be double that or up to 10% on average per year.

In addition, the Summit Project proposes to treat a narrow 1-mile isthmus of core fisher habitat where Highway 155 crosses the summit, just northwest of Alta Sierra. If, as predicted, fishers will avoid these treatment units (Garner (2013)), then the fisher’s natural north-south movements will cease, cutting off the fisher population in the southern-most part of their range. I’ve also included my isthmus comments and analysis with associated maps in another attachment.

Attached, as well, is the Summit Project proposal for your reference. We appreciate any input you could give us or the managers at the Sequoia NF to avoid adverse effects on the Pacific fisher in this area.

Thank you, and I look forward to speaking with you further about this.

René Voss
415-446-9027
renepvoss@gmail.com
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