6 5/20/2016 Pop Mgmt Sub Group

CONS. agreement + proposed Rule = agreement
SOL - ~~opt~~ issued.

- 5,700 comments (115,000 comments from Sierra Club)
Peer Rvw (3-5) MT ≠ WY - have mgmt plan + draft resp
Jen - likely reopen ① comment period for state w/full mgmt & res. frame
② cons. strategy finalized reopen.

how comments will be coming to YES steering comm.

<hunting appropriate to linkage & connectivity>

= ~~stip~~ App. C: Prescriptive leap to change; less
everyone agrees - new estimator should be used.

concern that it will generate new RP criteria

engage with study team + state to discuss this topic...

State, counties - feel "too" prescriptive (p.99)

#4. NPS concerned abt "mgmt tears" ... reserve % minimum
NPS wants to defer to steering committee. Allocation of mortality.
- allocation - State mtg

? Issue. Is this the appropriate place to talk about this?
- secure land base to NPS harvest based on allowable tears
- adding seq hunts to secure hbff (p.64-CS.)

Guidelines and Assignments

Population Management Sub-Group

Conservation Strategy Update Steering Committee

Purpose: The intent of this document is to provide the Population Management Sub-Group with guidance and direction regarding the charge and expectations of the team. This team was established by the Conservation Strategy Update Steering Committee to help in achieving its commitments and assignments by the YES committee.

Background: During the April 2016 YES meeting, the committee identified several major themes offered for consideration in their update of the 2016 Conservation Strategy. The YES committee decided to establish a steering committee to: (1) categorize the major themes, (2) develop the conservation strategy approval process, (3) develop the timeline, and (4) determine whether major themes could be addressed in the conservation strategy. The Steering Committee decided to establish three sub-groups to help them in evaluating the major themes. Those teams were identified as the population management, habitat and agency coordination/conflict management sub-groups. Each group is assigned a set of major themes with the goal of providing recommendations on each theme to the steering committee. Your group themes are contained in the table at the end of this document.

Guidance and Expectations:

1) Your state agency representative will plan and facilitate the first meeting until a chair person is selected.
2) Identify a chair person-this person will be responsible for planning and facilitating meetings and communicating with the steering committee.
3) Maintain focus on the Conservation Strategy. Do not get side tracked by other processes and documents currently being worked like the delisting rule.
4) Review each theme and report back to the steering committee by May 25th with a recommendation on whether each theme is appropriate for the conservation strategy and the approximate amount of time it may take to address the issue. Please have your chair person report by e-mail to the Steering Committee. Your evaluation criteria should focus on:
    a. Is this theme necessary to update the conservation strategy based on changes that have occurred in the science or delisting framework or to improve the strategy?

b. Is this item relevant to the Conservation Strategy or should it be addressed somewhere else?

5) The steering committee will report back to your group with a modified list of themes that your group will be charged with addressing.
6) The deliverable will be recommended edits to the Conservation Strategy.. If the subgroup is unable to reach consensus on a recommendation, report this to the steering committee with appropriate background information.
7) There may be additional themes your group is asked to address as this process moves forward.

Timeline: The steering committee is working towards an ambitious goal of completing final YES approval of the document on or before the November meeting. As outlined above in item #4, your first due date is May 25th. Others will be established and disseminated as the steering committee continues its work.

Please contact any of the steering committee members if you have questions or concerns.

nps-not buffer-use hunters as conflict mgmt

* dealt w/ on annual basis from MOA

Population Management

needs intent somewhere

	Theme	Originator	Sub-group	Cons Strat
1	Harvest focused away from park boundaries in areas where human bear conflicts are prevalent. linked to coord.	NPS	PM	No
2	Hunting will not be permitted in the John D Rockefeller, Jr. Memorial Parkway — I agree doesn't belong in PL Rule; nor Cons. Strat.	NPS	PM	No
3	If a new estimator other than Chao 2 is used in the future, the states will recalibrate the population thresholds and proportions of allocated hunter harvest based on the estimates provided by the new model in comparison to Chao 2 — Appendix C	NPS	PM	already in Append
4	Harvest will be based on the number of grizzly bears available to be hunted outside of NPS units rather than the entire population. - 21% of DMA are NPS managed units - 39% of PCA are NPS managed units, and stated as "secure habitat" in the conservation strategy. What does "secure habitat" mean? ↳ defined in CS — not part of comments to FWS	NPS	PM	defer to steering comm.
5	Appendix C needs significant work	States	PM	

en NPS ds amin

Idaho Falls mtg. — States prefer cons. # to estimate trend .., wanted to remain silent on this future things, Frank says can't go back to these #s in 2014 ... FWS intended to pull out ...

so the issue is 2002-2014

Concern about FCOY being set at 48 – need flexibility #are too close	County Commission	PM
If new method is used to estimate population, does FCOY change? Needs to be clear what happens to all of the metrics if we move to a new methodology	County Commission	PM

yes

yes

complication — needs to clarify this point. Need clarificatn in unduplicated: cubs of year