

From: [Servheen, Chris](#)
To: [Shoemaker, Rebecca](#)
Subject: Fwd: how many can be taken
Date: Thursday, February 05, 2015 8:17:23 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Servheen, Chris" <christopher.servheen@mso.umt.edu>
Date: February 4, 2015 at 4:06:52 PM MST
To: "van Manen, Frank" <fvanmanen@usgs.gov>
Cc: Mark A Haroldson <mharoldson@usgs.gov>
Subject: Re: how many can be taken

Guys,

I agree with your answers with some comments as follows:

1. I agree. This is a big deal to the administrators who do not understand how we can reduce the % of indy females allowed and at the same time stabilize the population. They see the old method with a 9% indy female limit and a stable to increasing population 95% of the time, then they see the % of indy females has declined yet we say we are of stabilizing the population. This is counterintuitive. This may be close to the biggest issue. They suspect we are not leveling with them on this issue.
2. I agree. The best available science can be adopted when it is available without any "vote". The question is when is it "available". This s another big deal as they are suspicious that they will think this is being adopted but they do not know when. As I said before, Scott Talbot had the idea that mark-resight would not be available for 5 or more years.
3. No vote was ever taken nor is it necessary.
4. This is very important that they have some faith in the process of moving the mark-resight to acceptance and application. They know nothing about the scientific process and the time involved. All they care about is that we begin to use it in the summer of

2015.

Here are the key issues that I got from my talk with Chris Smith:

- 500 not being a population target but a genetic minimum number. They think that 500 was the number needed for a recovered population in 2007 and have missed the point that this is a genetic minimum number.
- Population stability as being essential to recovery success and the states being willing to accept this. They will probably try to push managed population decline post-delisting. This will never fly. This is a Service issue not yours.
- The population stability management system we built will not resulting in a ratcheting up of population size over time - it will not. Ken

McDonald is the one who thinks this. This will come up so be prepared for it. I explained that our management system has an objective of population stability and they every 5 years we will reevaluate the results (stability) and refine it as necessary. We are trying to stabilize inside the DMA at the population level at delisting.

C

From: "<van Manen>", 'Frank van Manen' <fvanmanen@usgs.gov>

Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2015 2:39 PM

To: Chris Servheen <grizz@umontana.edu>

Cc: Mark Haroldson <mharoldson@usgs.gov>

Subject: Re: how many can be taken

Hi Chris,

Here are my answers:

1. This is probably the most challenging point we need to clarify in the director's meeting. We will need a day or 2 to craft the right language.
2. Well, maybe not: based on the revised recovery criteria, which would

allow IGBST to use the best available science, technically IGBST could adopt a new technique without a YES vote, once the revised criteria are officially accepted. Given where we are, I think it would be important that the YES committee does vote on it after we present our final assessment (see #4).

3. Agree, I'm not aware of an official vote regarding mark-resight. I checked with Mark and he too does not remember a vote (but it appears there was a vote on the DMA at the Spring 2012 meeting).

4. Our current analyses of effective population size should help us by tying trends and estimates based on a completely different technique (genetic sampling) with those of mark-resight. In the Discussion of the paper, we plan to make the point that the genetic-based techniques support the findings of the mark-resight technique. I've edited a draft of this paper but the Discussion still needs to be fleshed out further. Probably best not to raise expectations too high with the directors in terms of the timing, as it will take several more months to submit, plus peer-review, etc.

Frank

On Wed, Feb 4, 2015 at 11:35 AM, Servheen, Chris

<grizz@umontana.edu> wrote:

Frank,

I just got this from Matt Hogan, my DRD who will be at the meeting. You ned to do #1. I think #2 is YES based on a recommendation from the IGBST. Do you agree? #3 is no. Your thoughts on #4?

Thanks,

Chris

1. A plain language paragraph that explains why we revised the mortality limits down (9 to 7.6) while changing from increasing to stable (the conversation we had this am, just in writing in simple terms)
2. Who is the decision maker on whether or not to use mark/resight? Is it FWS or does the decision rest with the IGBC.
3. Had the IGBC and/or any of its subcommittees ever voted on the use of mark/resight.
4. What is it that happens in June that then allows us to start using this (publishing a paper or something else)?

From: "<van Manen>", 'Frank van Manen'

<fvanmanen@usgs.gov<mailto:fvanmanen@usgs.gov>>

Date: Wednesday, February 4, 2015 11:18 AM

To: Chris Servheen

<grizz@umontana.edu<mailto:grizz@umontana.edu>>

Subject: Re: how many can be taken

Thanks Chris,

Let me review this but I'll plan on basing our example on these numbers, makes sense to me....

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://nrmsc.usgs.gov/research/igbst-home.htm>

On Wed, Feb 4, 2015 at 11:02 AM, Servheen, Chris

<grizz@umontana.edu<mailto:grizz@umontana.edu>> wrote:

Frank,

I just talked to Chris Smith about next week. He said he asked you to provide real numbers that can be taken and maintain population stability. I have sent the attached to my people. The lower table is what I previously worked up with your help a few months ago.

We can talk more after you have digested it.

c