From: Servheen, Chris
To: Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer
Subject: Re: Chapter 3 comments
Date: Wednesday, August 03, 2016 11:41:10 AM

We are actually on the plane right now on the way back (over North Dakota).

This sounds disastrous. I am so pleased with Dan Wenk. Did anyone from the Service support his point? What number did the states want or would they not say?

What a mess. This is all transparent to the NGOs. The state administrators are going to wreck what was a sound and defendable policy decision.
C

On Aug 3, 2016, at 7:09 PM, Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer <jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu> wrote:

> Well the YES meeting yesterday went just as I expected it to. The states are adamant about not including calibration language in the Strategy. Dan Wank called them out on their objective, directly asking them if it was the intent of the states to manage to a stable population or to a number. After attempting to avoid the issue and Dan continuing to press it, Brian Nesvik admitted that it was the intent of the states to manage to a number. That recalibration would be moving the bar again and recovery is based on a number not a condition. Of course Dan and the Service strongly disagreed with that view point. We are still trying to work on potential language with the steering committee but it doesn't look promising.
>
> Enjoy your last days in Paris!
>
> *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 9:40 PM
> **To:** Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer
> **Subject:** Re: Chapter 3 comments
>
> 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