

## Triggers for a Biology and Monitoring Review by the IGBST

The YGCC will use the IGBST's monitoring results and annual reports to determine if the population and habitat standards are being adhered to. The States, Tribes, and National Parks will use the IGBST's annually produced model-averaged Chao2 population estimates to set and establish total mortality limits within the DMA as per tables 1, 2, and 3, above. Adoption of a different population estimator will require recalibration of the associated demographic objectives and standards that are based upon the population estimator. The 2016 Conservation Strategy signatories have agreed that if there are deviations from certain population or habitat standards, the IGBST will conduct a Biology and Monitoring Review as described under Factor B, above. A Biology and Monitoring Review would be initiated if any of the following scenarios occur (as further described under Factor B, above): (1) Exceeding the total mortality limit for independent females for 3 consecutive years; (2) exceeding the total mortality limits for independent males for 3 consecutive years; (3) exceeding the total mortality limit for dependent young for 3 consecutive years; (4) failure to meet the distribution criterion requiring sightings of females with offspring in at least 16 of 18 BMUs in 2 consecutive years. In addition to the scenarios described under Factor B, a Biology and Monitoring Review by the IGBST would be initiated if there were a failure to meet any of the habitat standards described in the draft 2016 Conservation Strategy pertaining to levels of secure habitat, developed sites, and livestock allotments. These IGBST reviews were established to detect deviations that may occur due to normal variability or chance events and do not necessarily mean the GYE grizzly bear's status is deteriorating. As such, they are more easily activated than those that trigger a Service status review under the Act. These triggers could indicate the need to adjust management approaches and are intended to provide the YGCC with ample time to respond with management actions before involving the Service. An IGBST Biology and Monitoring Review examines habitat management, population management, or monitoring efforts of participating agencies with an objective of identifying the source or cause of failing to meet a habitat or demographic goal. This review also will provide management recommendations to correct any such deviations. A Biology and Monitoring Review could occur if funding becomes inadequate to the implementation of the draft 2016 Conservation Strategy to such an extent that it compromised the recovered status of the GYE grizzly bear population. If the review is triggered by failure to meet a population goal, the review would involve a comprehensive review of vital rates including survival rates, litter size, litter interval, grizzly bear-human conflicts, and mortalities. The IGBST will attempt to identify the reason behind any variation in vital rates such as habitat conditions, poaching, excessive roadkill, etc., and determine if these compromise the recovered status of the population. Similarly, if the review was triggered by failure to meet a habitat standard, the review would examine what caused the failure, whether this requires that the measures of the Act are necessary to assure the recovered status of the population, and what actions may be taken to correct the problem.

The IGBST would complete this review and release it to the public within 6 months of initiation and make it available to the YGCC and the public.

The YGCC responds to a Biology and Monitoring Review with actions to address deviations from habitat standards or, if the desired population and habitat standards specified in the draft 2016 Conservation Strategy cannot be met in the opinion of the YGCC, the YGCC could make a recommendation to the Service to consider relisting (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2016, Chapter 6). Because the YGCC possesses substantial information about the population's status, the Service would respond by conducting a status review to determine if relisting is warranted.

The Service can also initiate a status review independent of the IGBST or the YGCC should the total mortality limits be exceeded by a significant margin or routinely violated or if substantial management changes occur significant enough to raise concerns about population level impacts. Emergency relisting of the population is an option we can and will use, if necessary, in accordance with section 4(g)(2) of the Act, if the threat(s) were severe and immediate ([16 U.S.C. 1533\(g\)](#)). Such an emergency relisting would be effective the day the rule is published in the Federal Register and would be effective for 240 days. During this time, we would conduct our normal notice-and-comment rulemaking regarding the listing of the species based on the five factors of section 4(a)(1) of the Act to take effect when the 240-day limit on the emergency relisting expires.

#### Triggers for a Service Status Review

Should we finalize this proposal and delist the GYE grizzly bear population, we will use the information in IGBST annual reports and adherence to total mortality limits as per tables 1, 2, and 3, above, to determine if a formal status review is necessary. Because we anticipate the YGCC and IGBST are fully committed to maintaining GYE grizzly bear population management and habitat management through implantation of the draft 2016 Conservation Strategy and State and Federal management plans, and to correct any problems through the process established in the draft 2016 Conservation Strategy and described in the preceding section, we created a higher threshold for criteria that would trigger a formal Service status review. Specifically, the following scenarios would result in a formal status review by the Service: (1) Any changes in Federal, State, or Tribal laws, rules, regulations, or management plans that depart significantly from the specifics of population or habitat management detailed in this proposed rule (including adoption of a new population estimator without recalibration of the associated demographic objectives and standards that are based upon the estimator) and significantly increase the threat to the population; or (2) if the population falls below 500 in any year using the model-averaged Chao2 method, or counts of females with cubs fall below 48 for 3 consecutive years; or (3) if the population falls below 600 for 3 consecutive years using the model-averaged Chao2 method; or (4) if fewer than 16 of 18 bear management units are occupied by females with young for 3 consecutive 6-year sums of observations. Status reviews and relisting decisions would be based on the best available scientific and commercial data available. If a status review is triggered, the

**Deleted:** petition us for

**Deleted:** independent female total mortality limits as per tables 1, 2, and 3, above, are exceeded for 3 consecutive years and the population is fewer than 600

**Deleted:** For example, if independent female total mortality limits were exceeded in 3 of 4 years, but they were not 3 consecutive years, the Service would conduct a status review.

Service would evaluate the status of the GYE grizzly bear population to determine if relisting is warranted. We would make prompt use of the Act's emergency listing provisions if necessary to prevent a significant risk to the well-being of the GYE grizzly bear population. We have the authority to emergency relist at any time, and a completed status review is not necessary to exercise this emergency relisting authority.