From: Servheen, Chris
To: Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer
Subject: Re: Chapter 3 comments
Date: Friday, July 29, 2016 2:51:21 AM

A few ideas:

Changes to developed sites on public lands are acceptable as long as these changes: 1) do not increase the number of overnight sites and/or result increased overnight human presence at such sites; 2) are for the purpose of visitor safety, environmental protection, or enhanced visitor services such as outhouses, picnics sites, parking areas, or interpretative displays; and 3) that appropriate sanitation and human/bear conflict minimization efforts are associated with any such changes or enhancements.

Thoughts?
C

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 28, 2016, at 5:10 PM, Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer <jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu> wrote:

> I talked to Kerry this morning and he thinks allowing for increased visitor services without increasing overnight capacity should meet their needs. He is meeting with Dan Wank on Monday, the day before the YES meeting, to talk about this issue. It would be nice to provide some draft language by then for him to consider. It seems to me that we can add language similar to that already there for modifying developed sites "to reduce resource damage, detrimental environmental impacts, and/or the potential for grizzly bear conflicts" is applicable to the addition of restrooms and parking. Please let me know if you want me to take a first stab at it. Hate to have you working on your vacation, especially when you're retired!
> Thanks!
> J
>
> *Jennifer Fortin-Noreus, Ph.D.*
> *Postdoctoral Researcher*
> *Grizzly Bear Recovery Program*
> *University of Montana*
> *University Hall, Room 309*
> *Missoula, MT 59812*
> *phone: (406) 243-4994*
> *jennifer.fortin-noreus@umontana.edu*
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Servheen, Chris
> **Sent:** Thursday, July 28, 2016 3:40 AM
> **To:** Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer
> **Subject:** Re: Chapter 3 comments
>
> Jenn,
> I can see how YNP can think that they need some relief to do some management enhancements that will not result in bear deaths since we have given the states permission to actually kill more bears (10% of the females in the ecosystem including a share of Park bears) while they can't even put in a few visitor

enhancements. My thought is that we allow NPS to enhance visitor services other than increasing campground sizes and numbers to allow them to help serve visitor needs while they continue to employ their successful bear management program. The justification for this departure is the long term successful NPS bear management programs. I would suggest that we try and keep campground sizes and numbers at present levels while allowing them to expand other visitor services. Let me know what kind of response you get from them and I will help you craft an appropriate response.

I think they have a valid point.
C

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 27, 2016, at 8:53 PM, Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer <jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu> wrote:

> Hate to bother you again while in Paris but as you know we're on this crazy timeline for Strategy revisions. The park service seems to want to get away from the 1998 baseline. Originally they presented it as an administration problem which I pointed out was already addressed. Now they seem to want more leeway on developed sites. In my opinion this would create problems for several reasons. First, if we let the park service have an exception then the Forest Service will want the same exception. Second, I'm not sure how we would defend it.
>
> Thoughts?
>
> Thanks!
> Jennifer
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> > **From:** "Gunther, Kerry" <kerry_gunther@nps.gov>
> > **Date:** July 27, 2016 at 12:42:56 PM MDT
> > **To:** "Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer" <jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu>
> > **Subject: Re: Chapter 3 comments**
> >
> > Jennifer
> >
> > Up to this point we have complied with the standard and have not exceeded the 1998 baseline. However with visitation increasing significantly almost every year (we will likely set a new record again this year), we see a point in the future where the public may demand to have

some additional infrastructure for visitor use (not admin use), such as restrooms with running water, restaurants, and parking lots, and these will become increasingly difficult to build within the existing development foot-prints. NPS managers tend to like to have options to make good decisions and the 1998 Base-line Standard pretty much removes those options. Since we have such a good record of protecting bear habitat (22% of park is seasonally closed to recreational use) and preventing human-caused grizzly bear mortalities (we almost never remove a bear unless it kills and eats someone), can the Conservation Strategy language build in a little more trust for us in regards to habitat issues, as it does with the states in regards to managing grizzly bear population issues? PJ and I have a meeting with Dan Wenk early next week to discuss this issue, and determine what he can and can't live with as far as habitat commitments.

Kerry

On Wed, Jul 27, 2016 at 8:13 AM, Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer <jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu> wrote:

> Kerry,
>
> Has YNP already made changes so that the 1998 baseline is no longer applicable? I want to make sure that I clearly understand the concern that NPS has with the 1998 baseline. As we previously discussed, there is an exception to the baseline for administrative purposes when mitigation is not possible. I have added the proposed changes to the language that clarify that change is both in capacity and acreage.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Jennifer
>
> Jennifer Fortin-Noreus, Ph.D.
> Postdoctoral Researcher
> Grizzly Bear Recovery Program
> University of Montana
> University Hall, Room 309
> Missoula, MT 59812
> phone: (406) 243-4994
> jennifer.fortin-noreus@umontana.edu
>
> _____
> From: Gunther, Kerry [kerry_gunther@nps.gov]
> Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2016 1:30 PM

To: Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer
Subject: Chapter 3 comments

Jennifer,

Here are my comments on Chapter 3. I do not yet have concurrence on the 1998 baseline standard. The NPS has a proven record of keeping human-caused mortalities to an absolute minimum despite very high visitation. Since we have proven we can do it, is this standard really necessary for NPS lands. It really restricts our management capabilities. We are 21% of the PCA but less than 5% of the human-caused mortalities occur on the lands we manage.

--
Kerry Gunther
Bear Management Office
P.O. Box 168
Yellowstone National Park, WY 82190

Phone: 307-344-2162
Fax: 307-344-2211

--
Kerry Gunther
Bear Management Office
P.O. Box 168
Yellowstone National Park, WY 82190

Phone: 307-344-2162
Fax: 307-344-2211