

From: [Kasdin, Alexandra](#)
To: [Baker, Serena](#)
Cc: [Matt Hogan](#); [Michael Thabault](#); [Seth Willey](#); [Marjorie Nelson](#); [Jodi L. Bush](#); [Jennifer Fortin-Noreus](#); [Tyson Powell](#); [Anna Muñoz](#); [Roya Mogadam](#); [Ryan Moehring](#)
Subject: Re: question regarding revised CS, analysis
Date: Monday, December 12, 2016 4:28:17 PM
Attachments: [image005.png](#)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Baker, Serena** <serena_baker@fws.gov>
Date: Mon, Dec 12, 2016 at 4:04 PM
Subject: Re: question regarding revised CS, analysis
To: bonnie.rice@sierraclub.org

Good Afternoon Bonnie,

Thank you for your email, and I apologize it has taken me longer than anticipated to respond.

You asked what "around" means?

As I'm sure you know, population levels are not based on a specific number, but an estimate of the of grizzly bears in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, which tends to fluctuate. The

agreed upon mortality limits are meant to address this population variability, which is why they are based on a sliding scale to allow for adjustments.

Mortality limits analysis:

The IGBC Study Team is conducting an assessment on the proposed mortality limits, which is expected to be published in a peer reviewed journal in the coming months. It is anticipated that all the methods the teams utilized, and their full analysis will be included in this publication.

Your question: If the population is managed to 'at least' within the confidence intervals, the lower bound is 600; which of course would not be managing to a 'stable' population according to current estimates.:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and our partners have all agreed to maintain the total population size near the average estimate achieved from 2002-2014. As measured by the model-averaged Chao2, this equates to 674 grizzly bears. However, the Service believes that it is not practical, or even possible, to manage for an exact population target as populations naturally and inevitably fluctuate over time. Add to that, our belief that partners should reasonably be given some management flexibility recognizing the complexities of the system and of managing grizzly bears. Therefore, the Service and our partners agreed to allow flexibility around this population target by creating a population management range of between 600 and 747 grizzly bears, as measured by the the model-averaged Chao2. In our professional opinion, management within this range, as measured by the the model-averaged Chao2, will maintain recovery and a large, robust, healthy and viable population.

It is my understanding that in the current draft of the Conservation Strategy, you can find the following references on the pages noted:

the parties agreed to “maintain the recovered status of the grizzly bear in the GYE” (pg. 20) and commit to “managing for a stable population within the GYE demographic monitoring area around the 2002-2014 model-averaged Chao2 estimate” (pg. 4). This objective is identical to

the wording of the revised demographic recovery criterion 3. Thus, the Service has confidence that the state agencies will manage to retain the population’s recovered status, and will manage around the long-term average that occurred as the population stabilized over the period 2002-2014.

Foreseeable future:

The Service believes "foreseeable future" is an evaluation of the time frame during which we are reasonably certain a species will remain in a recovered status in light of the measures taken to abate the threats to the species. We believe its use in the Conservation Strategy is intended to indicate that this agreement will remain in place for the long term and its termination is not a foreseeable event.

Please let me know if this response sufficiently addresses your questions, or if you have follow-up inquiries. Thank you for your continuing efforts for wildlife conservation, and thank you for your patience.

Respectfully, Serena

Serena Baker

Public Affairs Specialist
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
[Mountain-Prairie Region 6](#)
134 Union Boulevard, Suite 400
Lakewood, CO 80228
Desk: 303.236.4588
Cell: 720.391.6583
Serena_Baker@fws.gov



On Sun, Nov 20, 2016 at 10:19 AM, Bonnie Rice <bonnie.rice@sierraclub.org<mailto:bonnie.rice@sierraclub.org>>> wrote:
Hi Jennifer,

Thank you for getting the revised CS with tracked changes up on the IGBC web site.

I wanted to ask you for a clarification and a couple of other things. As you know, at the Cody meeting the conversation regarding the recent agreement on 'stable population' was very quick and members of the public didn't have access to the document. Now we do, but I'd like to ask for some additional clarification regarding the population level that states will be required to maintain/manage to.

In the Exec Summary (p. 11) it states:
Managing for a stable population within the GYE DMA around the 2002-2014 model averaged Chao2 estimate (per Demographic Criterion 3)

In Chapter 2 (p. 48) it states:
Maintain the population within the DMA around the 2002–2014 model-averaged Chao 2 estimate (= 674; 95% CI = 600-757-747; 90% CI = 612-735) by maintaining annual mortality limits for independent females, independent males, and dependent young as shown in Table 2. These adjustable mortality rates were calculated as those necessary to manage the population to the model- averaged Chao2 population estimate of 674

In Chapter 2 (p. 50) it states:
...to ensure the population remains recovered in accordance with the Recovery Criteria by managing the grizzly bear population within the GYE DMA to at least within the confidence intervals associated with the 2002-2014 model-averaged Chao2 estimate (per Demographic Criterion 3)

My question is how is 'around' defined? Also, if the population is managed to 'at least' within the confidence intervals, the lower bound is 600; which of course would not be managing to a 'stable' population according to current estimates.

Secondly, in conversation with some of the other NGOs after the meeting, I heard that FWS would be defining 'foreseeable future'. Could you confirm that?

Last, regarding the analysis of proposed mortality limits that I've been asking for, I heard that FWS was planning to do that and release a summary. I'm very glad to hear that FWS is planning to do that analysis, and Sierra Club requests that you release the full analysis, not just a summary.

Thank you,
Bonnie

--

Bonnie Rice
Greater Yellowstone/Northern Rockies Senior Campaign Representative
Sierra Club
P.O. Box 1290
424 E. Main Street, Suite 203C
Bozeman MT 59771
Phone (406) 582-8365 x1<tel:%28406%29%20582-8365%20x1>
Fax (406) 582-9417<tel:%28406%29%20582-9417>
bonnie.rice@sierraclub.org<mailto:bonnie.rice@sierraclub.org>
<mailto:bonnie.rice@sierraclub.org<mailto:bonnie.rice@sierraclub.org>>
www.sierraclub.org<<http://www.sierraclub.org>><<http://www.sierraclub.org>>