

From: [Servheen, Chris](#)
To: [van Manen, Frank](#)
Cc: [Canfield, Jodie E -FS](#); [Shoemaker, Rebecca](#); [Tyers, Dan -FS](#); mark_haroldson@usgs.gov; [Dixon, Bev -FS](#); Katrina.Dixon@fws.gov; [Landenburger, Lisa A -FS](#)
Subject: Re: Gallatin Clean up Amendment and adoption of Conservation Strategy Standards
Date: Thursday, January 15, 2015 6:52:40 PM

That week is pretty good on Tuesday and Wednesday.
Chris

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 15, 2015, at 3:50 PM, van Manen, Frank <fvanmanen@usgs.gov> wrote:

Hi Jodie,

Last week of January does not work for Mark and I; we'll be in WY to update our databases...

Frank

Frank T. van Manen
Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team
U.S. Geological Survey
Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center
2327 University Way, Suite 2
Bozeman, MT 59715
Phone 406-994-5043
<http://nrmssc.usgs.gov/research/igbst-home.htm>

On Wed, Jan 14, 2015 at 1:37 PM, Canfield, Jodie E -FS <jecanfield@fs.fed.us> wrote:

Hi folks. We've been going down this "clean-up" path for a while and the EA is now out for public comment. In the meantime, we are working on the BA and talking with Katrina Dixon of the FWS in Helena about *what it is we are consulting on*, which existing Biological Opinions could be superseded, and whether we think our determination on this cleanup will result in informal or formal consultation.

It's a bit messy and confusing, and we think it would be helpful to include you folks in a discussion as soon as possible, so we can move forward and submit our BA with a good understanding of the science and other implications.

As part of an overall pretty benign clean-up amendment (remove/correct out of date items in the 1987 Gallatin Forest Plan), we elected to include the word-smithed (per Lisa Landenburger and Dan) conservation strategy standards, definitions, and application rules as part of our proposed action for either a listed or de-listed grizzly bear (knowing it will be 6 years or more before we have a new Forest Plan).

As part of our proposal, we have adopted a new baseline for the 3 subunits in need of improvement on the Gallatin to reflect fully implemented travel plan standards. In other units, we'd be allowed to go back to the 1998 baseline secure levels before invoking the application rules. In some cases, this amounts to thousands of acres.

Bev Dixon is working on the BA and came up with the bullets below to help us frame our discussion.

I'm hoping to find a 2-3 hour slot the last week in January for a conf. call. Could you please let me and Bev know if you could participate that week, and I'll send out a Doodle Poll for specific days and times.

Thanks in advance. I'm looking forward to a robust discussion!

Jodie Canfield

587-6739

From: Dixon, Bev -FS
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2015 9:22 AM
To: Canfield, Jodie E -FS
Subject: topics re: FPCU and GB

Potential topics for FP Cleanup Amend discussion with FWS (Servheen, Shoemaker, K.Dixon) and IGBST (Van manen, Haroldson, Tyers):

- Effects of proposed adoption of CS (LAA vs. NLAA)
 - o Application Rule: 1% reduction below 1998 or TP baseline
 - o Subunits well above 1998 – projects that could reduce secure back to 1998 levels (perm and/temp roads possible); multiple projects simultaneously active and/or affecting secure within a subunit w/o triggering “application rules”
 - o Effects to individuals vs. population
 - o Supporting info; e.g. literature, unpublished studies, pers. comms, etc that could help support a call either way
- Possible discussion of OMARD/TMARD vs. secure only as metric to monitor – especially outside of RZ/PCA (re: Schwartz et al. 2010)

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.