

From: [Loren Grosskopf](#)
To: [Brian Nesvik](#); [Loren Grosskopf](#)
Cc: [dan wenk](#); [Delissa Minnick](#); [O'Connor, Patricia -FS](#); [Bush, Jodi](#); [little bear watson](#)
Subject: RE: CS project
Date: Saturday, July 16, 2016 8:29:06 AM

Thanks for the responses.

Loren Grosskopf, Park County Commissioner

From: Brian Nesvik <brian.nesvik@wyo.gov>
Sent: Saturday, July 16, 2016 7:25 AM
To: Loren Grosskopf
Cc: dan wenk; Delissa Minnick; O'Connor, Patricia -FS; Bush, Jodi; little bear watson
Subject: Re: CS project

Loren, I put my responses to your recommendations at the end of each question or comment in bold.

pg 40-sightings/radio tracking/flights: the reader would assume that the IGBST is the agency responsible for the effort as they are the agency to collect the data. Agree?? I think in the context of the CS, you are correct. When it comes down to legal responsibility, I think it really is charged to the states and the National Parks for a delisted population. The IGBST is not an agency with any authority, but rather is a team made up of representatives of several agencies. Should we leave the language as is without clarification (to be worked out later if necessary) or officially assign the responsibility to the IGBST or to the States/NPs?

pg 41--includes collecting data of Fcoy, w/cubs etc--responsible agency IGBST. Agree? Same as above OK

pg 68-69-70-grazing and other habitat issues: I believe that a clarification should be added to each monitoring protocol such as " the required information and evaluations will be conducted by the appropriate land management agency" Agree

pg 74--same as above suggestion Agree

pg 76--monitoring of the 4 high calorie food sources by IGBST "as long as budgets allow": If their budget does not allow for continued monitoring, what is the next action? Does the GYCC take over? Are we acknowledging that the effort is no longer a priority? That caveat seems to present uncertainty and bias to the IGBST--each agency will have budget restrictions in the future. I believe we should ask the IGBST. I know they have had several discussions post food synthesis report regarding the need for the "4 foods monitoring" requirements. We should strike if they agree. I think we could add some language that indicates the IGBST will collect foods and other habitat data as necessary and in accordance with land management agency plans. Should the steering committee request the IGBST now before our Aug 2 meeting? I agree with striking. I agree with adding the language as suggested--gathering data in the future may be necessary.

pg 81--monitoring protocol for white bark pine production annual transects: The paragraph indicates that the results will be summarized by the IGBST--do we assume they conduct the effort? I think the IGBST may argue that this isn't necessary. I think we could include this concept with the language in the paragraph above (p. 76)

pg 85--monitoring protocol for hunter numbers: The monitoring protocol indicates that data will be used as an index to backcountry use with hunter numbers. It does not indicate who is responsible for compiling the index. We have already identified concern that since there is little evidence of any relationship between hunter numbers and hunting related human caused grizzly bear mortality (pg 84), is there a known benefit offsetting the costs of compiling and analyzing the data? I agree with your assertions, however I defer to Tricia on this. I know the habitat group may be making changes regarding the collection of this data. Agree

On Sun, Jul 3, 2016 at 12:42 PM, Loren Grosskopf
<LGrosskopf@parkcounty.us<<mailto:LGrosskopf@parkcounty.us>>> wrote:
Brian, et al:

As per our steering committee project direction, I have perused the conservation strategy (CS) again to identify monitoring standards where it does not appear to assign clear responsibility. In some cases, the reader would assume such direction based on language or where certain agencies are directed to coordinate etc. but the following appears to warrant further discussion. Accordingly I am seeking further input from each of you as follows based on your knowledge of the current situation:

pg 40-sightings/radio tracking/flights: the reader would assume that the IGBST is the agency responsible for the effort as they are the agency to collect the data. Agree??

pg 41--includes collecting data of Fcoy, w/cubs etc--responsible agency IGBST. Agree?

pg 68-69-70-grazing and other habitat issues: I believe that a clarification should be added to each monitoring protocol such as " the required information and evaluations will be conducted by the appropriate land management agency"

pg 74--same as above suggestion

pg 76--monitoring of the 4 high calorie food sources by IGBST "as long as budgets allow": If their budget does not allow for continued monitoring, what is the next action? Does the GYCC take over? Are we acknowledging that the effort is no longer a priority? That caveat seems to present uncertainty and bias to the IGBST--each agency will have budget restrictions in the future.

pg 81--monitoring protocol for white bark pine production annual transects: The paragraph indicates that the results will be summarized by the IGBST--do we assume they conduct the effort?

pg 85--monitoring protocol for hunter numbers: The monitoring protocol indicates that data will be used as an index to backcountry use with hunter numbers. It does not indicate who is responsible for compiling the index. We have already identified concern that since there is little evidence of any relationship between hunter numbers and hunting related human caused grizzly bear mortality (pg 84), is there a known benefit offsetting the costs of compiling and analyzing the data?

HAPPY BIRTHDAY AMERICA!

Loren Grosskopf, Park County Commissioner

--

Brian R. Nesvik
Chief Game Warden
Chief, Wildlife Division
Wyoming Game and Fish Department
307.777.4579

E-Mail to and from me, in connection with the transaction of public business, is subject to the Wyoming Public Records Act and may be disclosed to third parties.