

From: [Landenburger, Lisa A -FS](#)
To: [Shoemaker, Rebecca](#)
Subject: RE: Monitoring habitat outside PCA
Date: Tuesday, January 13, 2015 2:41:52 PM

Great! Thanks for the input Rebecca.

From: Shoemaker, Rebecca [mailto:rebecca.shoemaker@cfc.umt.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2015 2:39 PM
To: Landenburger, Lisa A -FS
Subject: RE: Monitoring habitat outside PCA

hi Lisa,

That sounds fine to me. The basic direction/limitation I've been given is "don't change it [the CS] unless you're improving it" and that addition sounds like an improvement to the strategy. I agree on dropping the language about socially acceptable and just sticking w/ the BAU language from Alt. 4.

thanks!

rebecca

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

406.243.4994

From: Landenburger, Lisa A -FS [mailto:lalandenburger@fs.fed.us]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2015 1:33 PM
To: Shoemaker, Rebecca
Cc: Frank Van Manen (fvanmanen@usgs.gov); Dixon, Bev -FS
Subject: Monitoring habitat outside PCA

RE: Monitoring habitat outside the PCA

Hi Rebecca,

I have been questioning whether to include the following in Chapter3:

- 1) monitoring protocol for habitat outside the PCA (in BAUs every 2 years)
- 2) present a map of BAUs

Although we have effectively been doing this since 2008, it was never addressed in the Strategy. In the 2006 FPA EIS, it says habitat outside the PCA will be monitored in areas identified in state management plans as biologically suitable and socially acceptable and reported to IGBST every 2 years (p.45). However, there is no real map elucidating "socially acceptable" in the 3 state plans. Instead, Kim Barber devised the BAUs to fit this bill. However, BAUs are only presented in the FPA as pertaining to Alt 4 (a rejected alternative which called for expanding habitat standards outside PCA). Although Kim Barber associated BAUs with areas "socially acceptable" in his 2008 IGBST

report, nobody else does. As we know, it's a very contentious subject.

I decided to introduce BAUs and monitoring outside the PCA as part of the Strategy. I explicitly avoid tying it to "socially acceptable" areas, and I also hammer the point that standards apply only inside the PCA. There should be no suspicion that we're trying to expand standards to areas outside the PCA. Frank is reviewing my write-up of Chapter 3 and will be looking for any red flags. My reasoning is for including the protocol: we've been reporting secure habitat outside the PCA (in BAUs) every 2 years since 2008 – let's formalize it in the Strategy. Also, the FPA says we will do it, it just doesn't mention where (i.e., BAUs). Frank thinks including monitoring outside the PCA only strengthens the Strategy as long as we don't imply a connection to areas suitable for potential occupancy. It only gives more information and the monitoring could provide useful connectivity information. Bev Dixon agrees.

Do you think including this as monitoring protocol is okay? Although it's only monitoring protocol, we all agreed that your advice is called for here. Do you see this as posing any problems? Like always, we value your insight.

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

This electronic message contains information generated by the USDA solely for the intended recipients. Any unauthorized interception of this message or the use or disclosure of the information it contains may violate the law and subject the violator to civil or criminal penalties. If you believe you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the email immediately.