

From: Servheen, Chris
To: [Matt Hogan](#)
Cc: [Michael Thabault](#)
Subject: Re:
Date: Wednesday, January 14, 2015 3:14:24 PM

Matt and Mike,
Here are the answers to your questions, which I numbered:

1. *Mike said that he though WY's own GB management plan called for an increasing population...is that in their plan?* Regarding your question about Wyoming, they call for a stable population post-delisting, just like we call for in the Conservation Strategy and proposed rule.

Here is a direct quote from the Wyoming bear management plan:

p. 16: "When delisting occurs, the overall population goal in Wyoming will have been met. With delisting, mortality thresholds will be adopted to allow Wyoming to stabilize its segment of the population, and management strategies will be adopted to achieve desired distribution within those areas considered suitable for grizzly bear occupancy. Mortality management and methods to allocate or direct mortality to areas where management objectives have been met will be coordinated with the other Yellowstone Grizzly Bear Coordinating Committee (YGCC) agencies and will be based on the best available science to ensure adherence to the CS population management objectives. All forms of mortality will be monitored within the GBDAU as per the Conservation Strategy. While the allowable human caused mortality threshold for the Wyoming segment of this population will be determined through a collaborative effort of all YGCC members, Wyoming will have the latitude to determine where to apply the mortality. The Department will have the ability to direct its share of the human caused mortality limit to the areas it deems appropriate. The only constraint will be that the Department cannot exceed the overall mortality threshold for the state. Consultation with appropriate state and federal agencies will continue to assure that management objectives for Montana, Idaho and the National Parks are not compromised."

p. 19: "Eventually grizzly bears will occupy all areas within the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem that are biologically suitable and socially acceptable. When that occurs, a stable population of grizzly bears will be the management objective, with mortality equaling recruitment over the long term."

Here are some quotes from Montana's plan:

p. 27: "**Alternative I.** FWP's preferred alternative for managing grizzly bears in southern MT is to manage grizzlies in a manner that allows for a sustainable, adequately distributed population that is secure and stable enough to meet the provisions of the GYA CS (2007) and remain out of federal ESA protections."

p. 42: "maintenance of an increased bear population in numbers and distribution outside the Recovery Zone helps ensure long-term viability of this population. There is valuable habitat outside the Recovery Zone on public land and grizzly bears currently occur in many of these areas (Figure 6)."

p. 45: "Based on current programs, both within and outside of the recovery area, it is expected that expansion will continue. It is FWP's intent to implement this management plan in a way that allows future expansion consistent with the approach used for most other species that FWP manages."

p. 49: "FWP did not consider an alternative to limit grizzly bear distribution to just the recovery area. In FWP's opinion, this approach is logistically impossible and biologically undesirable. In order to maintain resiliency in the population bears need to be allowed to occupy a broader landscape. Also, bears cannot be confined to the Recovery Zone because there are no barriers to contain them, and it is impossible to know the location of every animal all the time."

p. 55: "During 2003-2012, the average number of conflicts was 60 for an increase of 24% since the previous 10 year period. In reality, conflicts have been occurring at a relatively constant rate when considering the increase in human population (25%) over the last 10 years, the increase in the GYA grizzly population (32%), and the 36% increase in grizzly distribution. FWP believes that conflict reduction efforts have been successful in keeping the level of conflicts stable."

p. 60: "Regulated hunting programs or recommendations will be conservatively applied and while hunting may alter the timing and nature of grizzly use of some habitats, any negative impacts to the population should be negligible based on the anticipated low level of harvest opportunity."

p. 61: "In summary, FWP recommends a regulated hunting season be a part of the overall grizzly bear management program for the following reasons:

1. Legal harvest can be managed so as to have minimal impact on the population as a whole."

Here are some quotes from Idaho's plan:

p. 10: "Given that the grizzly bear population within the PCA includes parts of

Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, Yellowstone National Park, and Grand Teton National Park jurisdictions, a highly coordinated and cooperative management effort among the management agencies will be necessary."

p. 11: "The management direction established in the Draft Conservation Strategy is designed to maintain grizzly bear distribution and occupancy within the PCA and to keep mortalities at low levels. Management direction in the PCA has met the goals of the grizzly bear recovery plan. This management direction will allow for the grizzly bear population to occupy some limited areas outside of the PCA."

2. *What are the actual mortality limits for the various classes?* The numbers you see in the attached table are the mortality limits of independent females and independent males for the entire ecosystem. The average number of mortalities for independent males and females 2011-2014 for the ecosystem has been 38/yr. This compares to 74 available within the ecosystem under what we have proposed - a gain of 36/yr using the mark-resight estimator in 2014. The limits within the states will be 79.5% of those numbers (20.5% of the DMA is NPS lands). Wyoming has by far the most area within the DMA outside national parks so they get most available mortalities.

3. *Is the comparison in the chart for mortality limit a comparison on how many bears could be taken under each rule or numbers using the two different population estimators?* The difference is due to a combination of the new percentages to maintain a stable population and the new population estimators.

On Wed, Jan 14, 2015 at 2:39 PM, Matt Hogan <Matt_Hogan@fws.gov> wrote:

Thanks Chris. Couple questions. Mike said that he though WY's own GB management plan called for an increasing population...is that in their plan?

Also, what are the actual mortality limits for the various classes?

Finally, is the comparison in the chart for mortality limit a comparison on how many bears could be taken under each rule or numbers using the two different population estimators?

From: Servheen, Chris [mailto:chris_servheen@fws.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2015 2:36 PM
To: Matt Hogan
Cc: Michael Thabault

Subject: Re:

Matt and Mike,

Here is a comparison table of the main issues that seem to be of concern to the states. There are other things - like we will no longer be using the cumulative effects model for habitat assessment, but that is a USFS issue of no concern to the states. I haven't added anything about the coordination between the states on mortality management (dividing the available mortality outside national parks using the geographic area of each state within the demographic monitoring area) since I have not heard any comments about that from the states.

Let me know if this is helpful,

Chris

On Wed, Jan 14, 2015 at 12:10 PM, Matt Hogan <matt_hogan@fws.gov> wrote:

There continues to be a fair amount of confusion from the states (and even internally) on changes from 2007 v 2013 and it was suggested a document that showed changes would be helpful.

Matt Hogan

Deputy Regional Director

Mountain-Prairie Region

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

303-236-7920

On Jan 14, 2015, at 11:25 AM, Servheen, Chris <chris_servheen@fws.gov> wrote:

There is a strike-out version that notes the improvements we made based on the best available science as we built the original Strategy. We have cleaned all this strike-out stuff up in the current Strategy. The strike-out version is the old CS and is posted on our website:

http://www.fws.gov/mountain-prairie/species/mammals/grizzly/Final_Conservation_Strategy.pdf

You can see the strike-outs on p. 31, 33, and 34. The reader is referred to the

appropriate appendices that update these issues.

Why would this matter to Scott? Wyoming was involved in this process back then and supported it fully.

Chris

On Wed, Jan 14, 2015 at 10:44 AM, Matt Hogan <Matt_Hogan@fws.gov> wrote:

I was talking to Talbot yesterday to start nailing down details for our GB meeting with states. He referenced the existence of a strike-thru version of either the conservation strategy or rule...does such a document(s) exist?

--

Christopher Servheen, Ph.D.
Grizzly Bear Recovery Coordinator
Region 6 White Nose Syndrome Coordinator

Polar Bear Recovery Team

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

University Hall 309
University of Montana
Missoula, Montana 59812
406-243-4903
fax 406-329-3212
<http://www.cfc.umt.edu/GrizzlyBearRecovery/>
<http://www.fws.gov/whitenosesyndrome/>

"Try to learn something about everything and everything about something." - Thomas Huxley.

--

Christopher Servheen, Ph.D.
Grizzly Bear Recovery Coordinator
Region 6 White Nose Syndrome Coordinator

Polar Bear Recovery Team

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

University Hall 309

University of Montana

Missoula, Montana 59812

406-243-4903

fax 406-329-3212

<http://www.cfc.umt.edu/GrizzlyBearRecovery/>

<http://www.fws.gov/whitenosesyndrome/>

"Try to learn something about everything and everything about something." - Thomas Huxley.

--

Christopher Servheen, Ph.D.

Grizzly Bear Recovery Coordinator

Region 6 White Nose Syndrome Coordinator

Polar Bear Recovery Team

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

University Hall 309

University of Montana

Missoula, Montana 59812

406-243-4903

fax 406-329-3212

<http://www.cfc.umt.edu/GrizzlyBearRecovery/>

<http://www.fws.gov/whitenosesyndrome/>

"Try to learn something about everything and everything about something." - Thomas Huxley.