From: van Manen, Frank
To: Wayne Kasworm; Cecily Costello; Servheen, Chris; Curtis Hendricks; Dan Bjornlie; Dan Thompson; Dan Tyers; Frank T. van Manen; Gustine, David; Jennifer Fortin-Noreus; Katharine Wilmot; Kerry Gunther; Kevin Frey; Mark A Haroldson; Pat Hnilicka; Steve Cherry
Subject: Nat Geo excerpt
Date: Saturday, April 02, 2016 10:09:41 AM

By the way, if you have not read David Quammen's online articles yet, I highly recommend it. Here is a key excerpt towards the end of the article:

"And me? My concerns focus on the grizzly bear, because I consider this the highest and best purpose of Yellowstone Park and the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem: to preserve a viable population of that great, terrible animal at the center of the American West into the indefinite future. But I no longer share the extreme pessimism of bear-advocate friends of mine, like Doug Peacock and Dave Mattson, nor their distrust of Kerry Gunther, Mark Bruscino, Chris Servheen, and the other conscientious agency biologists I've met, who believe that the bear's intelligence and flexibility of behavior will keep it robust and numerous despite changes in the landscape that require greater reliance on some different foods.

After all, they say, the grizzly is an omnivore, and three major dietary items—the trout, the pine nuts, the moths—have never been available to all of Yellowstone's bears every year, nor even to many bears during some years. Whitebark pine nuts come and go in cycles. Spawning cutthroat offered nothing to bears on the west side of Yellowstone, distant from the lake. Likewise with army cutworm moths: Many grizzlies exploit them, but not all grizzlies.

Change may come, these scientists say, but the bear will adapt to the challenge. Dan Wenk is right, though, that the devil could be in the details—that the opaque process of delisting and the return of responsibility to the states contain potential harm to the grizzlies, and to the public's interest in them, against which there must be guarantees."