

From: [Shoemaker, Rebecca](#)
To: [Hanauska-Brown, Lauri](#)
Subject: RE: dma vs cma vs rz vs bs
Date: Monday, November 25, 2013 12:13:00 PM

I'm good with this language. Are we putting the BS boundary on the final map?

Rebecca Shoemaker
Policy Biologist
Grizzly Bear Recovery Program
University Hall, Room 309
Missoula, MT 59812

406.243.4994

From: Hanauska-Brown, Lauri [mailto:LHanauska-Brown@mt.gov]
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2013 3:39 PM
To: Frey, Kevin; Shoemaker, Rebecca
Subject: dma vs cma vs rz vs bs

I fear we are treading on thin ice here as this is a significant re-write of page 7-8. However, I think it reflects the actual situation at this time and will prove to be actually useful as part of a management plan.

Please review and I'll figure out how to highlight this section to indicate this is clarification, not new info.

In 2000, the Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team (IGBST) began a process to reevaluate and update methods to determine the status of the GYA grizzly bear population, estimate population size, and determine the sustainable level of mortality in the GYA. In 2007, the USFWS supplemented the 1993 federal Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan with revised demographic criteria for the GYA population (72 FR 11376, March 13, 2007) and in 2013, the USFWS proposed to designate a new 'demographic monitoring area' within which population and mortality data (i.e., demographic criteria) would be assessed. There is consensus among scientists and statisticians that the area within which mortality limits apply should be the same area used to estimate population size. The previous CMA area within which grizzly bear mortalities were counted against annual sustainable limits, was substantially larger than the area within which female grizzly bears with cubs of the year were surveyed and used to estimate population size. This meant researchers were counting mortalities in areas where bears weren't being monitored for population size or trend. The revised Demographic Monitoring Area addresses this known bias so that mortalities and population health and size will be monitored within the same area. This proposed change, if finalized, would be appended to the Yellowstone chapter of the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1993, p. 44) and the Final Conservation Strategy for the Grizzly Bear in the Greater

Yellowstone Area.

Overtime grizzly bears from Yellowstone are expected to inhabit areas throughout the DMA however not all areas are biologically suitable or socially acceptable for grizzly bear occupancy. Mortalities outside of the DMA would continue to be recorded and reported but would not count against the sustainable mortality limits for that year. Grizzly bear occupancy would not be actively discouraged outside the DMA, rather management emphasis would be on conflict response. Grizzly bears would not be removed from the population just because they are outside the DMA but, as is the case anywhere with southwest Montana, they may be removed from the population or relocated if there are conflicts. Grizzly bears may also be preemptively relocated to avoid conflicts, but their potential contribution to connectivity with other grizzly bear populations would be considered in any such preemptive moves. Preemptive moves would not be counted against a bear as a traditional conflict event would.

Lauri Hanauska-Brown
Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks
Nongame Management Bureau Chief

PO Box 200701
Helena, MT 59620
Phone: 406-444-5209
Email: lhanauska-brown@mt.gov