

From: [Frey, Kevin](#)
To: [Shoemaker, Rebecca](#)
Subject: RE: help... PCA vs CMA vs new smoothed line
Date: Wednesday, March 06, 2013 9:37:53 AM

Thank-you much. I will incorporate it in the EIS.

From: Shoemaker, Rebecca [mailto:rebecca.shoemaker@cfc.umt.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 2013 11:53 AM
To: Frey, Kevin
Subject: RE: help... PCA vs CMA vs new smoothed line

hi Kevin!

How's it going?

I think the following language does what you need...let me know if you want more.

This language is still subject to change following public comment but this is how it's written so far. I also have a 1 page summary of how the USFWS defined "suitable habitat" if you want that.

In 2000, the Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team began a process to reevaluate and update methods to determine the status of the GYA grizzly bear population, estimate population size, and determine the sustainable level of mortality in the GYA. In 2007, the USFWS supplemented the 1993 Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan with revised demographic criteria for the Greater Yellowstone Area (GYA) population (72 FR 11376, March 13, 2007). In 2013, the USFWS proposed to designate a Monitoring Area within which population and mortality data (i.e., demographic criteria) would be assessed. There is consensus among scientists and statisticians that the area within which mortality limits apply should be the same area used to estimate population size. This would mean mortalities of bears outside this Monitoring Area would not count against sustainable mortality limits, and, conversely, bears observed outside the Monitoring Area would not count toward estimates of population size. This proposed change, if finalized, would be appended to the Yellowstone chapter of the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1993, p. 44) and the Final Conservation Strategy for the Grizzly Bear in the Greater Yellowstone Area.

The Study Team developed this Monitoring Area using USFWS suitable habitat (see 72 FR 14866, March 29, 2007) and adding areas which could serve as mortality sinks (Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team 2012). Mortalities outside of the Monitoring Area would continue to be recorded and reported but would not count against the sustainable mortality limits for that year. Grizzly bear occupancy would not be actively discouraged outside the Monitoring Area but management emphasis would be on conflict response. Grizzly bears would not be removed from the population just because they are outside the Monitoring Area but, as is the case within the Monitoring Area boundary, they may be removed from the population or relocated if there are conflicts. Grizzly bears may also be preemptively relocated to avoid conflicts, but their potential contribution to connectivity with other grizzly bear populations would be considered in any such preemptive moves. Preemptive moves would not be classified as a conflict for the bear being moved.

thanks!

rebecca

Rebecca Shoemaker
Policy Biologist
Grizzly Bear Recovery Program
University Hall, Room 309
Missoula, MT 59812

406.243.4994

From: Frey, Kevin [<mailto:KFrey@mt.gov>]
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2013 11:46 AM
To: Shoemaker, Rebecca
Subject: help... PCA vs CMA vs new smoothed line

Hey Rebecca,

I am working on re-writing the SW MT grizzly bear plan/PEIS....yee-haw.

In our 2002-2012 plan, we described and showed a map of the then valid recovery area/PCA. In 2007, you (FWS) amended to make the CMA and if adopted we are going to the new smoothed "blue smurf" area. Can you help me with the language on these changes? I think I will need to show what we are using (CMA) today and what we have proposed in 2012 to use now...smoothed area.

Confused or does this make sense?

Email or conversation is fine with me....at your convenience.

Hope all is well in western MT.

Thanks,

Kevin