

YGCC Meeting
October 28, 2009
Jackson, Wyoming at Snow King Resort

Steve Schmidt welcomed the committee members and the public attendees to the meeting. He also made the following comments:

- With Judge Molloy's ruling the grizzly bear is back on the threatened list.
- This leaves many questions on where to go from here.
- The grizzly bear population continues to grow and with this growth we can expect further conflicts.
- We are facing new challenges but we will chart a new path forward and that process starts today.

Proposed Spring Meeting Dates:

April 21-22 or April 28-29

A date was not decided upon. Steve Schmidt will send out the final date.

Agenda: Tomorrow morning we will have a panel of the agency representatives to review the April recommendations on how to reduce conflicts.

Review of Charter presented by Steve Schmidt - (PowerPoint and handout provided)

The charter was reviewed and presented for the benefit of the new committee members. This was an opportunity to reflect on the charter and consider possible changes for the future. Changes were not proposed at this time. There were no questions or discussion following Steve's review of the charter.

The boundary of the YGCC was reviewed. A map boundary was presented on the overhead.

Discussion/comments on the boundary map:

Pat Flowers - The boundaries were designed vague on purpose as the goal is to manage bears where they live and survive.

Becky Aus – I have not seen this map before.

Steve Schmidt – It is the same boundary on the letterhead that has been used for some time.

Becky Aus – I don't think this boundary matches the acceptable State Management. I don't want to accept this boundary until we check the State Management maps unless this is supposed to be the ecosystem at large.

Steve Schmidt – Idaho is not mapped with what is socially acceptable so it might be hard to verify.

Bill Rudd – What does this map mean?

Chuck Schwartz – It is one thing for humans to draw the map. It is another for the bears. Bears will live outside of these boundaries. We are going to document conflict and mortalities outside of this boundary.

Becky Aus – We need to know what this map is based on before we formally adopt this map.

Steve Schmidt – When would you like to revisit this map? Would you like to talk about it tomorrow?

Chris Servheen – Tomorrow we could display the map from the conservation strategy.

Steve Schmidt – We will try to display the map from the conservation strategy tomorrow for further discussion.

Judge Molloy's Ruling and Implications for Management presented by Chris Servheen

Background: The grizzly bear was delisted in April 2007. After the bear was delisted there were three court cases filed. Two cases were filed with Judge Law in Idaho. There has been no decision from Judge Law. The third case was filed with Judge Molloy in Montana. Judge Molloy rendered a decision voiding the delisting of the grizzly bear. FWS submitted a response which asked Judge Molloy to amend or alter his decision. That request is currently with the court. Within 60 days of the decision FWS will have to decide if they will appeal to the 9th circuit court.

The FWS does not agree with Judge Molloy for many reasons. There is concern of the ramifications this decision has on other T&E species. Based on this decision it will be hard to delist any species in the future. The grizzly bear is treated as a listed entity across the ecosystem at this time. Pending the court's decision, agencies will have to adapt their management of the grizzly bear. The final status of the bear is unknown at this time due to the two active court cases.

Discussion/Comments:

Wendy Reynolds – What were the allegations?

Chris Servheen – All three cases had almost the exact same allegations. The Justice Department made a motion to consolidate the three cases. Judge Molloy declined and would not give his case to Judge Law. There are two courts involved in the same issues with three separate law suits. There were a wide range of litigants in two of the cases. The third case was by an attorney in Illinois who filed on behalf of himself.

Maureen Davey – Did judge Malloy ask for any information from this committee before he made his decision?

Chris Servheen – No, he did not. The record was 58,000 pages and in addition to the record are the briefing documents. The judges can have hearings if they choose. The hearing with Judge Molloy was held and FWS had one hour to present the case. Judge Law has never scheduled a hearing and is currently reviewing the record. The committee was never asked for anything.

Bill Rudd – Do we want to be active participants in the law suit? Do we have a role or are we on the sidelines until they make a ruling and a decision?

Chris Servheen – The FWS was the defendant in the case but we also had interveners in this case. The States have been involved in the Montana hearing in the formal defense but the committee has not been involved.

Maureen Davey – I wondered if we should be involved as well. Would it be appropriate for this committee to submit a petition asking for the delisting or to write something to the court?

Pat Flowers – We should talk to our attorneys to see if that would be productive. There is the potential for appeal.

Steve Schmidt – Do we agree to investigate this or do we want to discuss it further?

Pat Flowers – I don't know how quickly we have to act to be timely with the appeal. We need to get answers from the three States and the Federal agencies and send the responses to you. The letter would be straight forward.

Wendy Reynolds – Do we want to see how Molloy responds to the petition before we move forward?

Bill Rudd – We need to give this serious consideration. What is our oversight role in the management of the grizzly bear? It is one thing to say we are going to be active participants. We need to publicly state our support for the decision to delist the grizzly bear.

Steve Schmidt – Would you like to make a motion to that affect?

- **Motion by Bill Rudd** – I move that we prepare a letter in support of overturning the decision by Judge Molloy.

Decision: It was agreed to table the decision.

Mary Gibson Scott – We can discuss it later tomorrow. I don't know if the federal agencies can comment because of the DOJ attorney representing our agencies. The DOJ is representing the Federal government in this action and I don't know that we can make a statement in an action that is already underway.

Chris Servheen – I will check with DOJ for a response.

Steve Schmidt – Do you want to table this discussion until tomorrow?

Maureen Davey – Yes.

Conservation reliant species, recovery agreement and management funding and conservation presented by University of Idaho Law Professor Dale Goble - (PowerPoint, slides provided on handout)

The presentation included the following information:

- Reviewed the Endangered Species Act (ESA)– decision to list or delist a species
- Two components of recovery – demographic and conservation management
- Assumptions behind the ESAs understanding of recovery
- Approx 85% of the species on the list are conservation reliant.

- Conditions of delisting a conservation reliant species.
- Conservation Management Agreement (CMAs)
- The biological components of a CMA
- The roles of a conservation manager under a CMA
- The challenges presented by the grizzly bear

Discussion/Comments:

Daniel Stone – Thanks for the presentation. According to Molloy grizzly bear management is missing two criteria; a specific action and a commitment of funding. Where are we going to get the funding and what are the actions that we are going to commit to that will make a difference?

Dale Goble - The Robbins' cinquefoil and the Columbian white-tailed deer would not make it through Molloy's definition of what is required. Molloy wants specificity beyond what is required for recovery plans. He also wants it to be enforceable. Recovery plans are not regulatory documents and are not enforceable. If that part of his decision stands, I don't see any way of delisting the Kirkland's warbler for example. The chair of the warbler recovery team has secured funding. She is putting together a CMA to fund the warbler through an endowment. I don't think the language she is working on would get past Malloy. The last 15 – 16 year there was a movement to adaptive management in an ecosystem approach and a contractual management effort. That approach is what the warbler chair is working towards.

Mary Erickson – What is different about the CMA process, the conservation strategy, and what we had in place?

Dale Goble - Not a whole lot. There are two ways of looking at a decision.

Bill Rudd – The committee and the conservation strategy has worked. Our ability to address the mortality issues that arose a year ago reflects our commitment and efforts. What we need is wider recognition.

Dale Goble – The grizzly bear is an iconic species and the committee is operating under a magnifying glass.

IGBST Report and Standardizing Conflict Reporting presented by Chuck Schwartz - (PowerPoint)

The presentation provided a summary of the monitoring the team has done over this past year. The work the study team performs will continue regardless of the label on the bear as it fits under the '93 recovery rule and the conservation strategy.

The presentation included the following information:

- 48 areal observation areas – 2 flight rounds in each area
- Total 184 hours flown
- 398 grizzly bears observed
- FCOY 117 observations - 55 aerial and 62 ground
- 42 unduplicated females – litter size up this year, including 2 sets of quadruplets in non-white bark pine years

- **Reviewed total population - estimated at 579 bears**
- 27 known and probable mortalities bears – 23 human , 2 natural, 2 undetermined
- Reports indicate the bears are in good condition with high body weights
- 93 captured bears – 60 research and 33 management
- Body composition - If bears are fat and healthy in the fall, they are getting adequate calories. We have not seen a difference in body fat composition between good white bark pine and bad white bark pine years.
- Study team would like to use body fat composition instead of foods as a monitoring measure.
- No evidence of bears from the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem in the genetic monitoring. Will continue to do the monitoring.
- Good cone crop this year for white bark pine. Does appear that there were adequate cones this year despite the mortality of white bark pine due to the pine beetle. Will continue to monitor the loss of the mature trees.
- Annual report is available at IGBST the website: www.nrmssc.usgs.gov/research/igbst-home.htm
- Agencies are going back to Section 7 Consultation.
- Would like a questionnaire about recreating in bear country and the use of bear spray. The study team will get together with specialist to develop the survey. Either the study team or the FWS will conduct survey.

Discussion/Comments

Bill Rudd – Resent mortality suggests that we may be at capacity with the current population. We might expect higher mortality as the norm.

Chuck Schwartz – That is correct. As you become successful it is time to rethink management strategy. Mortality thresholds are very conservative and our estimates are biased low. We could allow for the take of more females and not impact the population in a negative fashion. We are currently working on improving the rule set to make it more realistic. There are those that accuse us of moving the goal post. The rule set needs to become closer to truth. The limit of mortality at 9% was based on modeling of survival and was conservative. We are going to have increased conflicts as the population grows. Slowly you have to adjust your mortality thresholds and how we deal with problem bears. Mortally thresholds need to become more realistic. Hopefully, our formulas are sensitive enough that it will detect the small changes in the population.

Maureen Davey – Will the Judge see the condition of the grizzly bear despite the white bark pine?

Chuck Schwartz – A lot of the science that the judge was looking at was the study team science. I think he miss interpreted the science. When bears eat white bark pine they produce more offspring, we see less conflict and more survival. On bad white bark pine years we have a lower survival rate. This does not mean that the population increases in good white bark pine years and decreases in bad years. That is not what the science means. Rates of reproduction are still greater, increasing within the recovery zone regardless of the white bark pine. It is what is on the landscape such as roads that make the biggest difference. Agencies to a large degree have reduced those hazards. We were not allowed to testify in the hearing. The decision was all based upon the administrative record.

2009 Conflict Reports presented by Agency Representatives

Wyoming Game and Fish - Mark Brusino

It was an average year from a recent perspective.

- 137 conflicts.
- 2 Human serious injuries of non-hunters
- 42 Property damage
- 8 Food reward
- 74 Livestock damage = 50 cattle, 61 sheep, and 4 pigs killed.
- 2 Apiary Damage
- 27 Bear management actions = 19 relocations, 6 removals, 2 released on site.
- 11 Bear Mortality Investigations = road kill 1, natural 1, illegal 2, self defense 2, unknown 1, under investigation 4.

Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks - Pat Flowers

Conflicts were down this year compared to last year and average.

- 39 conflicts
- 0 captures
- 0 relocations
- 0 live removals
- 4 mortalities 1 unknown, 1 road kills, 2 self defense
- 15 Garbage/Unnatural foods
- 2 property damage
- 0 property/unnatural foods
- 14 At/Near/Residence/Developed
- 5 related to confrontations typically with hunters
- 0 livestock
- 3 human injuries
- 2 hunting mortalities

Idaho Fish and Game - Bryan Aber

It was a good food year.

- 0 property damage
- 0 food reward
- June – 20 miles west of the PCA. Two hunters with dogs ran a marked female grizzly bear with 3 COY. No damage to the bear.
- July –There was a livestock conflict in the Squirrel Meadows Allotment. The bear was relocated but returned to the allotment. The cattle were moved to Wyoming. Then on its own the bear also went to Wyoming.

- October – A grizzly bear was misidentified as a black bear and was shot by a hunter. The incident is under investigation.

Yellowstone National Park - Kerry Gunther

Good vegetation, foods, and white bark pine year. By late August the bears were in the high country.

- 150 bear jams prior to mid August
- 1 human conflict
- 0 injuries
- 1 back county campsite
- 0 capture in management actions
- 0 relocations
- 2 mortalities – 1 natural, 1 likely natural but undetermined
- 0 vehicle or human caused mortalities

Congress has passed a new law allowing firearms in National Parks. The National Parks will follow State laws. The laws followed in Yellowstone will depend on where you are in the Park. You still will not be able to discharge or use the firearm in Yellowstone but will be allowed to carry it.

Grand Teton National Park - Steve Cain

It was a quiet year and an excellent food year.

- 0 captures
- 0 relocations
- 0 mortalities
- 1 food reward/conflict

Wind River Reservation - Bob St. Clair

- 1 livestock conflict
- 1 bear #525 destroyed beehives in the Dry Creek area

Discussion/Comments

Pat Flowers – It was a great food year, conflicts are down and yet if you look at the mortalities they are not that far down from the threshold. I agree that it is time to take another look at the thresholds.

Northern Rockies Landscape Conservation Cooperative presented by Chris Servheen

This topic was not related to grizzly bears. A new initiative is being started to address climate change. This was an introduction to the Landscape Conservation Cooperative (LCC). There will be 22 geographic areas for LCC boundaries.

The following was included in the presentation:

- Consequences of climate change
- Develop partners to share science, information, and delivery
- The GYA would be included in the Northern Rockies subunit of the Great Northern Landscape LCC. We would be the leading LCC subunit in our region.
- Outlined the next steps over the next 12-18 months including science needs and staffing.
- Questions will be asked of all partners, (will be sent out to partners in the future) includes priority needs, science info needs. Hopeful that the answers will define a list of shared concerns across the LCC.
- Asking for agency participation in the development and implementation of the LCC.
- One example of what can we do - Link the large blocks of public lands in the Rockies together to facilitate species movement across the landscape. This applies to aquatic species as well.

Next year the introductory general meeting with all the partners will be held to determine operations, needs, and information. Hopeful for funding source in out years

Public Comments

Lyn Dalebout – Thanked the group for seeking solutions on a complex issue. Her comments highlighted the long range, philosophical, and spiritual concerns of the relisting of the grizzly bear. She commented that fear of large predators feeds the debate of whether or not the bear should be relisted. She wondered how discussions of delisting the grizzly bear can take place when the white bark pine is dying. She commented that current trends need to be well documented over many years before the grizzly bear should be delisted.

Steve Schmidt provided the committee with written comments by Dave Smith in California.

Craig Kenworthy, Greater Yellowstone Coalition - He recognized all the work accomplished by the committee and others in attendance. The GYC remains committed to performing on the ground work in order to continue the recovery of the grizzly bear.

Beth McIntosh – She thanked the committee for the work accomplished and expressed the desire for any work that would benefit the grizzly. She is supportive of keeping the bears safe.

Matt Scoville, Wildlife Defense Council – His comments concerned the survey Chuck Schwartz mentioned in the IGBST report. He asked that the survey include any encounter the hunter had in the previous season. He mentioned that hunters are already used to being surveyed on other species.

Louisa Wilcox, Natural Resources Defense Council – She was impressed by the statistics presented in the Yellowstone National Park report. The distance YNP has come is remarkable. Watching how the

crowds are handled is a great education and example of success in the Park Service. She is hopeful for the same success outside of the Park. The suggestion to put the mortalities on the web as they occur throughout the season has been very helpful and positive. She thanked the Forest Service for their leadership in the collaborative effort in collecting data on the white bark pine.

Whitney Leonard, Natural Resource Defense Council – Her comments highlighted the need for funding to continue this work. She thanked those individuals and NGOs who have provided funding in the past. She highlighted the concern that many of the agencies have significant funding shortfalls and benefit from outside education and outreach efforts. She hoped that the agencies will continue to work with the NRDC for funding and will move forward with the work regardless of the status of the listing.

A public comment from **an individual from Teton Village** – Support for relisting the grizzly bear was voiced. They also expressed concern for the white bark pine, the mortality rate and the increased conflicts when cone crops are down.

Kim Springer – Voiced her support in the relisting of the grizzly bear.

Barbara O’Grady – Expressed concern for those individuals who live around Yellowstone and have not had the opportunity to be educated on bear aware. Concern was also expressed for those citizens in Gardner, MT who don’t have bear proof garbage containers. She suggested getting out to the schools in that community.

Janet Barwick, NRDC – She thanked for Barbara for mentioning Gardner, MT as this is a community that is really interested in doing something. She felt that the Gardner community is ready for changes and some headway in educating the public could be made. She also thanked for Gregg Losinski, I&E subcommittee, and the other NGOs for their efforts.

Thursday October 29, 2009

Agency reviews and actions related to the recommendations to reduce conflict management presented by Agency Representatives

Background: In November 2008, the YGCC requested a report on the primary causes of grizzly bear mortality in 2008, as well as recommendations to reduce future mortality. At the April 2009 meeting the developed report was reviewed by the YGCC and comments from the committee and the audience were recorded. Agencies were then asked to review the recommendations to devise an implementation strategy. The following are the panel comments on implementation of the proposed recommendations for their agency.

1. **Better outreach and education on the value of bear spray as a deterrent and that it enhances the safety of hunters. Use the Smith et al. as an effective demonstration that spray works.**

Mark Bruscano, Wyoming Game and Fish (WGF) – Public Service Announcements directed towards the hunter demographic in Jackson and Cody were aired. The PSAs were paid for with grant money. An advertisement was placed in a Cody Hunting Guide newspaper. Constituent groups were called for their support in recommending hunters to use bear spray during hunting season. Inert cans of bear spray were purchased for demonstration purposes. Met with the State Outfitter and Guide Association and other groups. Agency personnel carry bear spray as examples. As a side comment, the public does not have confidence that bear spray works. Bear spray is not the answer to all incidents as incidents happen very quickly.

Bryan Aber, Idaho Fish and Game (IFG) - Continued promoting use through education programs. Both the Caribou-Targhee and the IFG carry spray for their own use and example. IFG sends a brochure to elk hunters in south east and northern Idaho on how to hunt in bear country safely.

Kerry Gunther, Yellowstone National Park (YNP) – Backcountry user must have permit and receives an informational booklet on how to use bear spray with the permit. Bear spray is provided to all employees who want it. Demonstrations on how to use bear spray is given to all concessionaries.

Steve Cain, Grand Teton National Park (GTNP) –The use of bear spray is recommended in all literature. Information on bear spray is given to all park visitors with their permits. All hunters are reminded that it is a condition of their permit to carry bear spray.

Pat Flowers, Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks (MFWP) – A preseason press release on bear aware and use of spray was issued. Kevin Fry gave a presentation to hunters as part of fall the archery season. Inert cans of bear spray for training were provided by Sierra Club. Cans were distributed to outfitters for the guides use. One of challenges of bear spray is confidence with hunters. Education must continue and as we progress. The reality of the spray is it is an important tool but is not the end all as some incidents happen too quickly.

Bob St. Clair, Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes (Tribe) –A booklet is handed out during hunting season. Outfitters are required to carry spray. Groups are required to carry spray and are encouraged to stay together and be bear aware. Anyone in their mountainous areas will be required to carry spray.

Marion Cherry, Forest Service (FS) –Employees are encouraged to carry bear spray in the field. I&E messages are ongoing. Backcountry groups are encouraged to carry spray.

2. **Develop a database with all encounters and mortalities with specific details on each incident.**

YNP – A database where we analyze conflicts is currently in use.

Chuck Schwartz– We need to get social scientists and the right people to analyze this. Conduct the interviews and after that is complete then make a decision on what we need to do to move forward. It is under discussion to decide if we really need to do this.

3. Make carrying bear spray in an immediately accessible fashion a requirement.

FS – This is not popular with the outfitters. A statement of strong encouragement will be given to the outfitters and guides but it will not be a requirement.

WGF – This will not be required. The focus is on education at this time.

IFG – This will not be required. The focus is on education at this time. IFG and the CTNF employees carry bear spray as examples and are trained in use of it.

YNP – This is not a requirement.

MFWP – It is not mandatory that bear spray be carried. This is an ongoing discussion. Hunters complain because they are being singled out from other recreationists who would not be required to carry it. All employees carry it in the backcountry. The need for keeping it accessible is described in the literature.

Tribe – It is recommended that hunters carry bear spray but there may be changes before next hunting season.

GTNP – It is required for hunting in the park.

4. Better understanding of bear behavior by hunters = more hunter directed education. This is particularly important to minimize the encounters that occur before elk are killed and elk carcasses attract bears. This will help minimize chance encounters.

IFG – Our brochure was updated to include more bear behavior and bear density information. The CTNF and the IFG partner together to perform hunting patrols to talk to hunters on the ground about bear spray and other issues.

WGF – A ton of hunter education has gone on for years. Hunters are way more knowledgeable than they were years ago and we have made a lot of progress. Signs about bears have been placed at trailheads. Possible encounters are happening around meat poles. Work to get poles moved is in progress. Work with outfitter camps that use electric fencing is ongoing.

YNP – Park Rangers contact hunters in the field around the boundaries and talk with them to minimize conflicts. Education on using calls is taking place. Rangers are to be contacted if bears are seen on a carcass.

GTNP – Bow hunting and calls are not permitted in GT.

MFWP – Bear aware letters and postcard are sent to big game permit holders. New hunting license folders were produced with bear aware information included on the covers. An online test on bear identification is required for all black bear hunters. Bear identification signs are being posted.

Tribe – The Wind River Reservation has an informational booklet for hunters. Expected to be out the first of the year is a booklet with fishing regulations for nontribal members who purchase fishing permit. Signs are posted at trailheads for backcountry users.

5. Tell bow hunters not to call alone, to have bear spray out and to look around them with their partner while calling.

MFWP – This message has been a part of all education effort.

Tribe – We talk to bow and elk hunters about not calling alone.

YNP – This is not allowed in the park.

IFG – This is stressed in educational programs and was highlighted at the East Idaho State Fair.

WGF – This message has been stepped up the last couple of years through education.

6. Reevaluate the opening day of elk season and extending the end of the season to reduce overlap of hunters of bears.

WGF – Our hunting seasons are very complex due to migrations of various animals. Not recommending any large scale changes to reduce mortality. Overlap of activity will happen. The seasons as established are the right times to be hunting those animals.

MFWP – There is a lot of tradition with opening dates of hunting seasons. To change the dates even for the best reasons presents a ton of challenges. This is a big debate.

Tribe – There has been no conflicts of this nature with bears. There has been no discussion to change dates.

IFG – The opening of elk season has not contributed to increase in bear mortality. Not looking at changing dates.

7. Educate the public on the relationship between white bark Pine crops and food shifts by bears.

YNP – A press release is sent out when bears come out of the high country.

WGF – Information on food conditions are released constantly throughout the year and not just on white bark pine.

Chuck Schwartz – This year's press release emphasized that bears would be in areas with a good cone crop. In areas with mature dead white bark pine trees it would be similar to poor cone crop. The message is adjusted as changes occur.

8. Emergency closures in areas where conflicts are occurring and/or when mortality limit is approached.

IFG – Closures have been utilized in the past and will continue in the future.

YNP – This has been used for past 25 years regardless of high or low mortality rates.

MFWP – We cooperate with the FS to implement closures and post signs at trailheads to either close the trail or alert recreations of potential encounters. Complaints are received if it is a good hunting area. We will continue to close areas regardless of the resistance.

Tribe – We have never needed to do this but we do have the power if it is needed.

FS – We did have closures this year in concerned areas where carcass or other attractants were located. It must be done for public safety.

9. Hunting in limited numbers and relate to hunting opportunities. If mortalities are high then sport hunting opportunities would be eliminated.

WGF – This message has been incorporated. Hunters are very aware that it would limit any future opportunities to hunt.

IFG – This is included in brochure and in education efforts.

MFWP – Hunters are concerned with how mortality limits affect this opportunity.

10. Increased presence by agencies. This would require more people assigned to the backcountry in grizzly habitat during the hunting season.

WGF –We have not increased our presence but most of our employees are out and about in the fall. This is very effective although expensive.

FS – Most Forests have an increased presence in the fall and have funded patrols into Oct. The CTNF, BDNF and Shoshone NF have done an outstanding job. The CTNF has made a lot of door to door contacts in Island Park, ID and have held various meetings. A wilderness ranger position was added this summer. Ropes were provided for people to hang food while backpacking.

IFG – Coordinated patrols with the FS in both the front and back country and by plane to find camps in order to focus efforts.

GTNP –In the field contacts are at 30-35%.

YNP – Contacts are made around park boundaries.

MFWP – Patrols during the early rifle season have been ongoing for years. Bear spray is given to guides to give to their clients. 3-4 multiple day patrols are held each year.

Tribe – The Wind River Reservation don't have formal patrolling but out on a daily basis.

11. Improve carcass management associated with elk hunting. Time of removal and other ideas.

Portable electric fences around carcasses.

IFG - The CTNF has been doing this for years. This information is covered in the hunting brochure and is stressed in all hunter education programs.

WGF – Everything that was covered by IFG applies. We worked to get carcass storage poles moved. There is a high awareness to remove carcasses as quickly as possible. Most try to remove it out by the next day.

FS – Electric fences are allowable with the Forest Supervisor's approval. This is still a concern because the carcass is still on the ground and is still an attractant if it is fenced or not.

GTNP - Hunters are encouraged not to leave the carcass over night. If bear are seen they are to contact a Ranger.

MFWP – This message is provided as part of education efforts.

12. Replace tags to hunters who think grizzlies are on their elk.

Tribe – There has only been one conflict of this nature. There were pictures of the bear on the carcass. The tag was reissued.

MFWP – MT will reissue tags. It is the right thing to do and hunters are aware that they will be reissued.

IFG –This does not happen very often but the tag will be reissued.

WGF – The tag can't be reissued. The hunter can be put on meat donation list or purchase a left over license.

GTNP – Wyoming's policies are followed.

13. Requiring hunter to pack their meat out first and the antlers last.

WGF – This would require state legislative approval. State statute requires hunters to remove their meat within the first 48 hours. Most get it out much quicker than that.

IFG – This would require legislative approval. This has not been an issue to date.

MFWP – This is not required but recommended. Feedback is mixed but is an ongoing effort.

Tribe – Hunters are aware that the animal should be removed as soon as possible. Charges can be filed on want/waste.

14. Link elk tags to a discount on bear spray.

WGF – This is something that we can work towards.

IFG – Investigating this but no action to date.

MFWP – Bear spray is sold at HQ in Bozeman. A retailer complained that we are taking away business. More has not been done on this but we need to think about implications on retailers and wholesalers as we have not looked into that.

15. Full page ad in the outdoor life type magazines in September promoting bear spray for safety.

YNP – Gregg Losinski checked into the cost of a full page ad in Outdoor Life and it was \$72,000.

WGF – Placed ads in local newspapers.

IFG – Decided to put full page ad in the 2010 hunting regulations.

16. Link reductions in encounter mortalities to eventual grizzly season.

No comments

17. Require hunters in grizzly habitat to view an online Hunting in Grizzly Habitat video and print certificate.

WGF – This is not required. A short video on bear safety that will be aired locally is in the works.

IFG – This is not available. Gregg Losinski has been working on something for entire GYA. A coupon for bear spray could be issued for watching the video.

MFWP – A video for bison hunters has been implemented and it has been effective. This is a bigger effort and more of a challenge.

18. Enhance outreach and education to Tribal members who may hunt under Tribal rights

19. Enhance Wind River efforts on mortality management.

Tribe – Tribal members have a regulation booklet that is handed out. We hold hunter safety courses. Tribal mortality management follows the lead of Wyoming and FWS. A Tribal Grizzly Bear Plan has been developed and we will continue to work with the State.

20. Promote R&S on new products and techniques to minimize conflicts and encounters and increase human safety.

YNP – Currently working with a contractor on electric tents to condition bear's avoidance.

FS – Working on furthering the work on bear resistant containers and coolers.

WGF – A great fence design has been developed. Working with private manufacture.

21. Send letter to all permitted operations. Get a letter from both USFS and outfitter state boards saying people should carry bear spray, know how to use it, and say how effective it is.

FS – This has not been a focus item. The State Outfitter Boards have not been contacted.

WGF – Met with the Outfitter & Guide Association to discuss this issue and they are in favor.

IFG – The Outfitter Board has not been contacted.

MFWP – Have not contacted the Board. Will follow up on that.

Tribe – Only have one outfitter and he does carry spray. He also requires all employees to carry spray.

22. Extend the bear ID efforts to all bear hunters in all grizzly habitats to improve knowledge base.

MFWP – A bear ID test is required for all black bear hunters.

Tribe – There are a couple of individuals who like to run the bears but seldom kill the bears.

IFG – The ID test was linked to IFG website but is not required at this time.

WGF – A voluntary ID test is on our website. A card with ID tips is given to each hunter. Hunters have to register as bear hunters. Hunters are informing WGF of grizzly bears on baits. Our staff made 200 phone calls to inform hunters of grizzly bear.

FS – Hunters need to be able to identify the bear species not only by sight but also by tracks. It was suggested to add track identification to websites.

23. Describe bear density in hunting units so hunters know they have chosen a high density grizzly area to hunt.

WGF – The literature that targets hunters does not describe density. Most hunters know where the high density areas are. Information will be sent out as it becomes available.

IFG – This information is covered in the updated brochure that is sent to hunters. There is a map which shows grizzly bear density the hunting units. This information is also covered in hunter education programs.

MFWP – Covered in hunter education classes.

Tribe – Poster are hung at trailheads with bear ID information. Problems have not been encountered.

24. Evaluate the effectiveness of all outreach and education including actions like the online bear ID education with a formal evaluation.

WGF – The knowledge level of the public has come up considerably. Don't have a quantitative measure on that success but the public is better informed. Work on a project involving residential efforts with garbage and bird feeders is ongoing.

FS – The Gallatin NF has a graduate student working on this research. In a year or two we will have the data on affects of the educational efforts.

25. Reduce the opening hour and closing hour for shooting hours for black bear seasons. IGBST has the data concerning high activity times for grizzly and black bears.

WGF – This would take a statute change and there is not much legislative support. Dawn and dusk is a factor but wet bears and heavy cover are also large factors.

IFG – This would require a statute change. The mistaken ID bear that was shot last week was shot in the afternoon and in close proximity to the hunter.

MFWP – This is not enough of a problem to warrant statutory change.

Tribe – This has not been discussed. Our tribal members that are hunters don't typically hunt or shoot bears.

Chuck Schwartz – The IGBST does have data on both grizzly bears and black bears. They are active at opposite times of the day. We could have presentation on that in the future, if interested.

26. Front country conflicts. Need to proactively expand outreach and sanitation efforts in areas the bears are expected to expand into in the future.

FS – Most of the Forests worked on getting front areas and developed sites equipped with storage boxes and equipment. Front country education is going on. Most Forests installed signs on the highways notifying travelers that they are entering bear country.

WGF – We are seeing an expansion in area and numbers. Need to revise distribution maps. Expansion will be seen in other suitable habitat. Bear Wise Programs were held in Jackson and Cody. Outreach and education and will continue and expand in areas that we expect bears to show up in the future. Living in bear country workshops focused in GYA communities.

IFG – Work to expand education and sanitation infrastructure is being completed. Bear proof sanitation is already used in Fremont, Clark and Teton Counties. Expanding our sanitation efforts to Bonneville and other counties in our efforts to stay ahead.

YNP/GTNP – Visitors need to modify their behavior to reduce conflicts. Both parks have garbage cans and food storage regulations and are frequently patrolled. Any unattended attractants left in campgrounds are confiscated by rangers. In GTNP bears have been expanding and the park has installed 156 food storage boxes. New educational material and trail signs have been added.

MFWP - Bear aware and sanitation work has been accomplished in various counties.

Tribe – Work with WY and the grizzly bear coordinators to be bear aware will continue. The tribal members are not experts and are new to grizzly bears. We will work corporately to keep the grizzly bear safe.

27. Sheep Conflicts. Enhance outreach to and consideration of sheep operations in areas where bears will be expanding.

WGF – In one sheep operation a permanent electrified pen was installed to put the sheep in at night. This has been effective when used. One problem was that the sheep grazed over a large area and would need a lot of these pens to be totally effective. Temporary fences have also been effective. A compensation program is in effect for livestock losses. The losses are addressed on a case-by-case basis. An expansion of bears in sheep grazing habitat is on the rise and more issues will come.

FS – Most of the sheep allotments in the recovery zone have been phased out. The BDNF had the idea to translate the food storage order into Spanish. This could be done on other Forests. Efforts to bear proof sheep camps are underway.

MFWP – There have been very few sheep conflicts in MT over the past few years but the grizzly bears are right on the edge of some big sheep producers. Conflicts may be coming.

Maureen Davey submitted a letter for the committee's consideration concerning phasing out grazing allotments on Federal lands on behalf of the Montana Association of Counties.

28. Need to trace individual bears as to their history to see if bears involved in conflicts have histories in other conflict types.

YNP – The IGBST are looking at the data on bears involved in conflicts and long term successes. Because the data still needs to be analyzed we are not ready to report on it yet. The data analysis should be ready to start before Christmas. The data is currently being compiled.

29. Front country conflicts – Need to find a funding source for maintenance for bear-resistant containers.

WGF – The Bear Wise Program is addressing this. A comprehensive plan has not been developed. Different jurisdictions are being worked on with a focus on hot spots. They are doing most of their own maintenance in areas with ordinances in place or the sanitation companies are providing the containers. This is becoming high interest across the nation and more retailers are interested in this.

FS – We have been working on this for years and years. Have hard time to get funding from interest groups. This is an issue and we need to be taking inventories to see what is working and what is not. This is maintenance that will require us to be vigilant on a yearly basis.

YNP/GTNP – The Parks haul our own garbage through our maintenance division.

30. Research capture mortalities – IGBST needs to detail the protocol they have implemented to minimize capture mortalities.

Chuck Schwartz – Protocol has been implemented. No capture mortalities occurred this year.

31. Livestock allotment conflicts – Explore the possibility of extending the non-use period on allotments with recurring conflicts.

FS – Handbook policy states that there is not a year limit to Resource Protection Non-use as long as the resource will continue to benefit from further non-use. Region 1 Handbook supplement further defines and clarifies.

Bill Rudd – This issue may warrant some additional discussion at a future agenda.

Maureen Davey – If this committee comes up with suggestions that affects the future of allotments we need to have more discussion.

Bill Rudd – I recommend that we discuss this at a future meeting.

Kniffy Hamilton/ Brent Larson – There is some misinformation in the comments received in the summary of recommendations.

32. There is a need for improved subdivision regulations relating to sanitation and development in bear habitat.

WGF - We were able to work with commissioners in Teton County to get a regulation. In the Cody area they are working on a case-by-case basis. They have been willing to work with us when we can prove that there has been a historical problem. Waste management has been required in 7 subdivisions. In Fremont County the local residents have been volunteering their compliance.

IFG – The IFG, CTNF, BLM, State, and NGOS have been working with planning and zoning regulations. It is in some regulations in the new subdivisions but it does not cover the older subdivisions.

MFWP – Gallatin County has had regulations for a while. Work is ongoing but no new regulations have been established.

Comments/Discussion:

Maureen Davey – I am not aware of any new development of regulations. This may need to be changed in the recommendations summary.

Mary Erickson – What are the intentions of the long term use of this list? A lot of good work is going on but there is a lot of redundancy. We still have the draft brainstorm list. Wouldn't there be value in a short term focus list? What is our evaluation method in the long term?

Steve Schmidt – That question was asked of the committee that proposed the recommendations. They did identify the top priorities.

Mary Gibson Scott – There is not an action list. There is a lot of work going on but the focus actions are not identified.

Gregg Losinski – An I&E action plan is being developed. I&E will more focused in the future but we need a human evaluation method and a feedback method.

Steve Schmidt – These should be boiled down into action item lists.

Chuck Schwartz – It is one thing to have an I&E program, it is another thing to know the effectiveness of that program and what efforts are effective and what is not moving us forward. We need to evaluate these programs to see how effective they are. The human dimension group will do part of this. We need to develop a program to evaluate where we are reaching.

Steve Schmidt – We have not agreed on where we go from here with these recommendations.

Mark Bruscino – Wyoming bears are moving out to areas where land uses are considerably different from where they were 10 years ago. Bears do not do well in areas of concentrated domestic sheep. I am not worried about this level of mortality. It is probably sustainable and may be the new norm with other uses in the landscape.

Chuck Schwartz – It is important that in our really good secure habitat there are extra bears produced. When they go to places that they shouldn't be then they die at a higher rate than they are produced in the unsecured habitat areas. Must maintain a good source habitat recognizing that bears will die on the edge and as long as more bears are produced in the secure source then are lost in the edge you have a good healthy population. Bear distribution and the study team did an analysis and repeated the analysis in 2005. We are now under Section 7 and the question is, "How often so we do this exercise

and how accurate does it need to be?” Alternative methods that are quicker or more accurate are being looked at depending on the need. When do we need to redo the distribution map and what is the level of accuracy needed? The study team could discuss these questions and could come up with recommendations. Either way but it is unresolved.

Pat Flowers – I recommend the study team answer the question, as you have the knowledge, develop a recommendation, and then come to the committee with a proposal.

Chuck Schwartz– This is not an issue of where they should be or will be. It is a document of where they are currently. It is not political but biological of where the bears are in the GYA.

Steve Schwartz – It is a question of how much time should be spent and how frequently this map should be updated.

Chuck Schwartz - We can address that. If you want to express concern, contact your rep. It takes a lot of time. I will put it as an agenda item for the study team and an agenda item for the YGCC in the spring.

Bill Rudd – Do you expect to have this put together by April?

Chuck Swartz – Yes.

Steve Schmidt – A subset of folks were asked make recommendations and they have done that. Agency reps have considered implementation but as Mary pointed out where do we go from here. Do we want a subset of folks to reformat the recommendations and propose action plans? What would you like to do? Do we have a volunteer to lead this effort?

Pat Flowers– Do we still have a five year planning process? Each organization should offer part of the one and five year plans.

Mary Erickson– I was hoping we would have shorter more collective list. What are the vital items for us?

Steve Schmidt – Make the list more concise and reduce redundancy.

Mary Erickson – We need to focus on the items in the forefront.

Steve Schmidt– Before we incorporate the recommendations into action plans, we need to boil them down a bit.

Mark Orme – This set of recommendations is primarily to reduce mortalities and conflicts. To me where we go from here is we ought to see the level and causes of mortality and have that guide what we focus on. It should depend on the mortality and conflict data sets.

Steve Schmidt– Could a subset of people take the data sets and narrow this down?

Mary Gibson Scott – Each agency is going to have to commit to this but we all spoke differently based on jurisdiction. Agencies do need to come up with a one and five year plan.

Chuck Swartz– The recommendations were driven by the conflicts and mortality. It is not evident in the recommendations.

Mary Erickson– We should base our recommendations by agency or jurisdiction looking at cross cut themes we can agree to as a group. I&E is an ad really going to be effective? And who puts up the money and was it effective? We need to start by seeing what the agency is willing to commit to.

- **Proposal by Steve Schmidt:** Each agency provides the chair with both one and five year actions they would like to pursue. Does anyone disagree with that approach?
There were no comments of disagreement to Steve’s proposal.

Jim Claar – The FS is already doing that.

Mark Bruscino– We are doing that although we have not put into the context of one, three, and five year actions.

Steve Schmidt – Agency heads please put this on your to do list.

Pat Flowers– When is the IGBC meeting?

- **Decision:** Agencies please submit your one and five year actions to Steve Schmidt by the end of December.

Forest Service Update presented by Marion Cherry

- A GIS Specialist was hired to complete the GIS work. Funding is provided 75% by the Forest Service and 25% by the USGS.
- The GIS Specialist and Kim Barber's replacement will be stationed at the University of Montana.
- Good candidates responded to the outreach to fill behind Kim. You don't have to respond to the outreach to apply to the position. The position may be reclassified.

Other Accomplishments -

- The Task Force responded to large FOIA.
- Motorized access layers were updated.
- Moving towards a new model that is supported by new geodatabases that forest employees can do themselves.
- White bark pine work on Forests for various reasons not just for grizzly bears. The B-T NF is esp. active in this effort as there are a number of grant sources available to the B-T NF.
- Most Forests are implementing travel plans and that are beneficial to the grizzly bear in enforcing road closers.
- Site surveys were conducted to determine grizzly bear and human use.
- Data that has been collected of white bark pine transects, post burn data, public food storage response and grizzly bear recovery data has been analyzed. This data was provided to the study team.

I&E Subcommittee Report presented by Gregg Losinski

- The subcommittee works with the media to craft a message that won't be misinterpreted. When we deal with the media we need to help frame for them what the bear is doing in response to what the people are doing.
- All agencies received uniform signage from the IGBC. The same signage went to all grizzly bear areas across the United State in order to provide the same message to people as they move across the landscape.
- Inert cans for training purposes and education outreach were ordered.

- A draft direction label for bear spray cans was provided to the committee for review.
- Retail coupons idea was explored but it will be a slow process.
- Purchasing banner ads on websites such as monstermuley.com, and other hunting sites. It is most cost effective to use banner ads on internet.
- Conference calls with agencies and NGOs.
- IGBC products cycle is up again. Prototype request forms have been drafted with supplemental instructions. Make sure the forms go back to Ellen Davis.
- A bear education trailer has been purchased and the large decals made. The trailer will be based out of Idaho Falls but will be available for anyone to use. A grizzly bear is still needed for the trailer. The trailer should be complete by next spring.

Awards to recognize I&E efforts were sent to a number of individuals and organizations to show appreciation for their work in this effort.

Comments/Discussion:

Bill Rudd – It is important that we send a positive message to the public such as a press release to express adaptive process and that we continue to think the population is robust and doing well.

Gregg Losinski – Anything that the committee wants to put together we are happy to get it out.

Steve Schmidt –A release to the media is a good idea. There are a few ways to handle that.

Bill Rudd –The subcommittee could draft a release and then send it out for the committee review.

Gregg Losinski – There is an I&E plan that we are following. You will all get draft copies of the release.

Bear Education 2009 Idaho presented by Lynn Dickerson

Completed in 2009

- 11 events
- 22 presentations
- 23 newspaper articles
- Bear information distribution was widespread to businesses, campgrounds, and churches
- Bear aware signs on all major roadways and roads with heavy hunting traffic
- Bear aware trailer at the East Idaho State Fair
- Education priority was on preventing mortalities with a focus on conflict prevention , spray information and use, safety, and ID

Audience Reached

- 1814 youth
- 1004 adults
- Hunters 7000-10000 ID cards
- Other 98 (agency personnel, camp hosts)

On-going efforts

- Birdfeeder conversion program to be implemented in 2010. This program will be free to seniors.
- Working with the North Fork Club and subdivisions to work with their own people and have a zero tolerance policy on bear attractants.
- Effective ordinances and enforcement of those ordinances.
- Other media sources such as bill boards.

Draft Letter to the US Sheep Experiment Station presented by Steve Schmidt

Background: The Sheep Experiment Station is a Federal facility researching domestic sheep operated by the Department of Agriculture and is located in various locations in eastern Idaho and Montana. In some areas the operations take place in the PCA. Steve was asked to draft a letter for the committee informing the Experiment Station of the grizzly bear conservation strategy. The draft letter was sent to the committee for review and feedback prior to this meeting

Decision to be made: Should the committee submit the letter to the Experiment Station?

Comments /Discussion:

Tim Bozorth – When an entity has the potential to impact grizzly bears it is incumbent of the committee to comment. Their operation operates in the PCA and adjacent to the PCA. There are potential impacts to both the sheep and the grizzly bear.

Paul Romrell– What is the history with conflicts?

Steve Schmidt – The issues have been more with black bears than grizzly bears. The issue is as the population expands to the west against the Centennials we want to avoid the potential death of a grizzly bear that would potentially migrate to central Idaho.

Brent Larson – I suggested not sending the letter. Individual agencies should send their own comments. Are we going to comment on all the projects and NEPA across the GYA? There may be differences of opinions between the agencies on what we wanted to include in the comment letter. By the time we work out the differences with this large of group it would be too late. Individual agency's comments will not be bound to the consensus of the group. It is a slippery slope if we going to comment on all the projects in the ecosystem.

Pat Flowers– The committee has commented in the past and had an important influence on projects. It is not heavy handed and is appropriately worded. I do support sending the letter. Agencies can send in comments as well.

Daniel Stone –These comments are appropriate for the committee as it does incorporate the expertise of this group. The Tribe can still send in their comments.

Maureen Davey – I agree with Brent. I don't know where we stop and start. We are being very specific in asking them to not do what they have done for years. Not in favor of sending although the letter is very well written.

Steve Schmidt – We are not going to reach consensus. A majority vote is allowed with the Charter. The Chair would entertain a motion at this time.

- **Motion:** Maureen Davey moved to not send any letter to the Experiment Station. Paul Romrell seconded the motion. The motion did not pass 7 to 5.
- **Motion:** Tim Bozorth moved that we send the letter as written. Pat Flowers seconded the motion. The motion was not voted upon at this time.

Discussion:

Maureen Davey - Is this letter going create an auto response in the future or will someone have to raise the question?

Steve Schmidt –We will handle future comments on a case-by-case basis.

Maureen Davey – To request that they stop doing what they have historically done is a great request.

Mary Erickson –The committee has the ability to choose what we comment on. We are very divided. Not sure how much power the YGCC has if we are divided as a group. The encouragement would be that the agencies who do agree go ahead and send the letter.

Pat Flowers – We have identified that sheep in the PCA is a significant threat and that is why we have stated what we have. Are we going to give a second standard or expectation to the Experiment Station as opposed to other groups? They will still consider the letter even though we are not at consensus.

Gregg Losinski – The early meetings of this group were not as cordial as they are today. There were many topics that the majority vote was needed as consensus was not going to be reached.

Wendy Reynolds – It would be hard for me to go either direction as they are a permittee of the Upper Snake River Field Office. I feel that I should remove myself from the vote.

Brent Larson – We are in a similar stance as we have this allotment. We have issues coming down the pike. Significant conflicts are going to occur outside of the recovery area. We have to move sheep allotments into country that the bears will expand into with problems knocking at the door. We have the relationship with the Meyer Creek allotment that they trail through.

Daniel Stone – We are not asking that the allotment be closed but that they consider an alternative. It is a broader range.

Steve Schmidt – When I talked to the Station I did discuss trucking the sheep rather than trailing.

Brent Larson – I do like the letter and the contents.

Steve Cain – It is more appropriate that the letter comes from the agencies rather than this group.

- **Motion:** Tim Bozorth restated his motion to send letter as written. The vote was an equal split.
- **Motion:** Daniel Stone moved that agencies, if they feel the comments in the letter are appropriate, send a letter to the Sheep Experiment Station. Mary Erickson seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous in the affirmative.

Follow Up Boundary Map Discussion

A map was displayed with a complex summary of the different areas of PCA, suitable habitat, conservation strategy line, and distinct population segment line. All the boundaries reflected were different than what was shown previously.

Steve Schmidt suggested that the boundary be considered when the committee considers modifying the Charter. Steve further suggested that considerations be postponed until a final Judge ruling.

Pat Flowers – There is a map on pg. 19 of the conservation strategy is that also needs to be added as an alternative for consideration for the charter boundary.

- This will be a topic for the April meeting.

Wildlife Management in North America DVD

This video discussed the history and models of wildlife conservation in North America.

Public Comment

Robert Hoskin – For the past couple of year he has been participating in a partnership that encourages people to develop a body of knowledge of traditional ecosystems in their local area. The idea is to get people on the land collecting information that is usable for the agencies. Please take the opportunity to develop relationships with citizen groups who can provide data and on the ground work that may be of use in the future.

Steve Schmidt – We appreciate that. In Idaho we have a strong volunteer program. A lot of the Master Naturalists made up of retired folks who have a good knowledge base already. This is a great opportunity.

Franz Camenzind – We have a success in front of us with the grizzly bear recovery. Now we have grizzly bears in the Teton valley and that is a success story. A lot of credit goes to Grand Teton National Park which has implemented a lot of the programs that you are discussing. Franz is concerned for the delisting in the future. The white bark pine situation and the impact that it may have on the wildlife cannot be dismissed. The human population growth in and around grizzly bear habitat is a concern. There is a big problem with genetics connectivity. The consequences of climate change are unknown. The target may be too low. Black bear baiting should be stopped. Delisting under WY current management plan is a concern. Recommend that the Forest Service continue to protect the conservation strategy. The strategy is good and it would be a net loss.

Janet Barwick, NRDC – She thanked the game agencies for stepping up their efforts with bear aware this fall. She thanked the IGBST for reevaluating how they collect data as this will help I&E efforts. She

asked if a statement could be developed concerning bear spray to counter folks who are actively engaged in efforts to confuse the public and its effectiveness. She asked that the IGBC and YGCC have a statement ready to go to respond to those who spread misinformation.

Steve Schmidt– The University of Calgary will soon publish another paper on the ethics of bear spray vs. firearms.

Louisa Willcox, NRDC – The Departments of Ag and Interior and the States signed the conservation strategy. There are policy reasons for the steps taken in the conservation strategy to remove sheep out of the PCA. There has been an effort with the Forest Service to change the allotments in areas with bears. The policy is to try to move the sheep allotments. How this groups can ask private permittees to move out of allotments but have a double standard with the Sheep Experiment Station. Why should the permittees and ranchers move out of the area if you will not ask another Federal agency? Louisa asked the group reconsider its stance with the Experiment Station.

Phil Brown –There is a lot of good news but the truth is that serious threats are on our door steps and they affect the GYA and they affect bears. The white bark pine trees are dead and dying. This problem should not be underestimated. The remaining population of bears in the west will always be in peril due to humans, genetics, and loss of habitat and food sources. These are perpetual problems despite what the numbers are. Protection is needed into the foreseeable future.

Deidre Bainbridge – White bark pine is dying. Discussions on the bear relocating due to a loss of food source need to take place. Humans need to know what the ramifications are if they shoot a grizzly bear. She would like to see more regulations. The evaluation criteria and ramifications of shooting a bear should be clearly outlined.

Steve, Northern Rockies Conservation Corp – The session this morning was impressive. The body of knowledge was impressive. The recommendation list is too numerous and should be condensed. It is a justifiable concern of grizzly bears expanding into new areas that aren't ready for them. We have experts who have spent years on how we can work together to live with bears. Social acceptance can be worked with and changed. If we can avoid problem bears we can have more bears on the landscape. We can work together to make this a success. Do we have a better process of involving people to avoid going to court? Could we hire a good facilitator and iron out some of our differences? Differences are not going to be solved by science only. The science is indispensable but you can't answer all questions with science as this dilemma is value based and not fact based. Before making recommendations on changing cattle allotments from cow/calf to yearlings you need to talk to the wolf specialists. Avoid whole sell recommendations as it could create unintended consequences. We have Federal sheep in the PCA. Let's put them to good use while they are on the Federal payroll. Use this as a best practice of sheep in predator country.

Steve White –The grizzly bear is a success story in the GYA right now. Credit the unyielding efforts of grass roots groups like this that brought us where we are. Hazards of increased grizzly bear/human

conflict are foreseeable in the future. Legislation is being drafted to predicate the license of spray in bear country. Public support of this legislation is needed. It is insane that we have people in grizzly bear country and we don't have a requirement to carry bear spray.

Steve Schmidt– Who would you require carrying the bear spray?

Steve White - That is my question to you. By just targeting hunters we would not have support but if we include everyone than we will probably fail as well. Hunters are more likely to have conflict just by the nature of their actions. The idea behind the current draft goes beyond hunting. Any activity that requires a permit would require you have to carry spray in grizzly bear country as a requirement of the permit.

Steve thanked everyone for their comments and participation in the meeting.