From: Servheen, Chris
To: Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer
Subject: Re: Chapter 3 comments
Date: Tuesday, August 02, 2016 1:15:43 PM

I agree about them increasing the number of overnight units as long as the footprint does not increase, but we need a standardized measure of the footprint.

This is a slippery slope that started when we allowed the states managed population decline. It is hard to justify limit on indirect mortality by land mgt. agencies when we have given direct mortality permission to the states.
C

On Aug 2, 2016, at 7:04 PM, Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer <jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu> wrote:

> Well the Park Service really wants to be able to increase overnight capacity. Without completely the intent of the 1998 baseline the only potential change I can see is if we allow modifications to existing developed sites as long as the footprint does not increase. What do you think?
>
> *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:** Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:28 PM
> **To:** Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer
> **Subject:** Re: Chapter 3 comments
>
> Let me know how they think it looks.
> C
>
> On Jul 31, 2016, at 7:15 PM, Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer <jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu> wrote:
>
> > I think that looks good. I will provide it to Kerry for the park service to discuss at their Monday meeting.
> > J
> >
> > Sent from my iPhone
> >
> > On Jul 30, 2016, at 2:31 AM, Servheen, Chris <grizz@umontana.edu> wrote:

Jenn,
Here are a few edits below IN CAPS to address the issue of allowing new developed sites. Let me know your thoughts.
C

On Jul 29, 2016, at 10:51 AM, Servheen, Chris <grizz@umontana.edu> wrote:

> A few ideas:
>
> Changes to EXISTING developed sites on public lands OR NEW SITES are acceptable as long as these changes OR NEW DEVELOPMENTS: 1) do not increase the number of overnight USE sites and/or result increased overnight human presence at EXISTING OR NEW sites; 2) are for the purpose of visitor safety, environmental protection, or enhanced visitor services such as outhouses, picnic 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