

From: [Frey, Kevin](#)
To: [Shoemaker, Rebecca](#); [Servheen, Chris](#); [Daniel Thompson \(daniel.thompson@wyo.gov\)](#); [Dan Bjornlie \(dan.bjornlie@wyo.gov\)](#); [Daryl Meints](#); [Bryan Aber](#); [ivanmanen@usgs.gov](#); [Mark A Haroldson \(mharoldson@usgs.gov\)](#); [Steve Cain](#); [Gunther, Kerry](#); [Tyers, Dan -FS](#); [pat_hnilicka@fws.gov](#)
Subject: more info. for ALL
Date: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:36:43 AM

Deep breath..... this is not to be a wrench in the process – honestly. I have contemplated this a lot. Even lost sleep, Chris!...which I am losing sleep over a lot of issues with this whole process. Now is the time to deal with things.

Anyway, I think we need to have language and an alternative method to allocate mortalities that would be based on the same % jurisdiction method. We initially discussed this last winter, but opted not to consider/use it. Now, after more exposure to administrations and considering the future, I think this may be needed and it would be a significant mistake to not use it and put it the documents now. This will save having to amend rules/regs/protocols down the road. As Mark H. initially said, before he was shot in the knees, this is actually a much “cleaner” method. We can more easily track numbers, develop consistent management programs, get public understanding and calculate mortalities. It also puts the onus on the managing agencies to realize and consider how mortalities get used/taken....uncontrollably or controlled. This alternative method may alleviate having to carry over exceeded mortalities, which will become confusing to people....and us. If desired, the States and Tribe can still shuffle the mortalities in their annual MOU, while keeping the population in the relative stable plane.

I have taken a stab at the language, which is pretty close. I will work on it more with anyone’s input. All of you have to consider and give a vote.

If states employ hunting as a management tool, the best method to achieve population, management objectives and annual discretionary mortalities will be determined and used by either, (a) the difference between the total mortality limit and the current year’s documented mortality, which will become the allowable take for grizzly bear harvest of independent males and/or females the following year. This allowable take within the DMA will determine the States and Tribal quotas. This proportion of allowable take mortalities will be allocated amongst all jurisdictions based on their geographic area within the DMA and outside the National Parks and Parkway, plus an additional MOU between the States and Tribe (Table 1) or

(b) based on the previous year’s population estimate and total mortality limit, each jurisdiction will be allocated their current year’s total mortality limits for all

causes of mortalities at the beginning of the current year. All causes of mortality including management action mortalities will be deducted from the each

jurisdiction’s total yearly allocation. Allocation quotas for all jurisdictions will also be determined by their geographic area within the DMA and outside the

National Parks and Parkway, plus an additional MOU between the States and Tribe (Table 1).

Granted: the preceding year’s pop est and mort limit may higher or lower than the actual current

year's, but managers will have to consider & accept that in their programs. The method may actually cause a smoother line of annual mortalities.

*After a considerable amount of mental anguish about being caught between two worlds and how this process has become "slightly" complicated, I feel like I am on the edge of several steep slopes and the only way to get things considered and resolved, is to kick a rock and see if it causes an avalanche. Not getting crushed is the trick!

Thanks to all,
Kevin