

From: Servheen, Chris
To: [Landenburger, Lisa A -FS](#)
Cc: [Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer](#)
Subject: Re: argument for new version of CS
Date: Friday, September 18, 2015 12:50:00 PM

This sounds reasonable to me, Lisa. We would then put the entire CS out for public comment along with the rule.

C

From: Lisa Landenburger <llandenburger@fs.fed.us>
Date: Friday, September 18, 2015 at 12:46 PM
To: Chris Servheen <grizz@umontana.edu>
Cc: "jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umn.edu" <jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umn.edu>
Subject: argument for new version of CS

Hi Chris,

For what it's worth, I wanted to share some of my thoughts on why we should create a totally new version of the CS:

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->Less confusion to the public and all parties by eliminating multiple versions of a 2007 Strategy.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->The CS is an example of Adaptive Management which is to be updated every 5 years – keeping 2007 in the title makes it appear dated and stagnant.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->Some literature citations in the current 2007 document are ancient and outdated. In some places text has been updated and cites more recent literature (POST 2007) to confirm and substantiate a given point. It would be confusing to have post-2007 literature cited in a document titled as 2007.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->In Chapter 2 on Population Standards the actual standards are literally struck out and the reader must refer to Appendix C to learn what the standards are. Appendix C is now to be updated and will we have an Appendix to an Appendix? The standards should be explicit in the body of text, not relegated to appendices; otherwise, it's confusing and makes the document appear as a draft and very unprofessional.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->5. <!--[endif]-->We could put the word Ecosystem in the title (i.e., GYE instead of GYA) which indicates to the public that perhaps the government can think on an ecosystem level.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->6. <!--[endif]-->It makes everything more transparent if we put the

whole enchilada out there for public review.

It's argued that life is simpler if we keep it as a revision to the 2007 version since we won't need to put the entire document out for public review. It is simpler but it also makes for an unprofessional document. In the WBP monitoring section some of the research findings from the recent Food Synthesis has been incorporated into Chapter 3 to communicate the point that the long term survival of the Yellowstone population is not threatened by the WBP decline. Putting it out for review indicates that we have addressed this concern, that we support the research, and that we took the concern seriously. Thanks for listening.

Lisa Landenburger
Grizzly Bear GIS Database Coordinator, GYE
USGS Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center
USFS Affiliate, Region 1
Email: lalandenburger@fs.fed.us
phone: 406-994-7430