From: Servheen, Chris
To: Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer
Subject: Re: Chapter 3 comments
Date: Tuesday, August 02, 2016 9:41:00 PM

I agree!

On Aug 2, 2016, at 9:17 PM, Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer <jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu> wrote:

> It is a slippery slope but when I talked to Kerry Gunther about it they may use it as a negotiating chip because the park service does not feel like they are getting much in return to what the states are getting.
>
> *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:** Tuesday, August 02, 2016 1:15 PM
> **To:** Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer
> **Subject:** Re: Chapter 3 comments
>
> 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