

From: [T van Manen, Frank](#)
To: [Katrina Dixon](#)
Cc: [Canfield, Jodie E -FS](#); [Servheen, Chris](#); [Shoemaker, Rebecca](#); [Tyers, Dan -FS](#); [Landenburger, Lisa A -FS](#); [mark_haroldson@usgs.gov](#); [Dixon, Bev -FS](#)
Subject: Re: further discussion on GBCS needed
Date: Saturday, February 07, 2015 10:29:32 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

All,

Thanks for the update. Feb 23 and Feb 24 would work fine for me.

Frank

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 6, 2015, at 16:29, Katrina Dixon <katrina_dixon@fws.gov> wrote:

Monday the 23rd works for me. I could do the 24th but only from 10:30am-12pm or after 3pm.

Katrina Dixon
Montana Field Office
US Fish and Wildlife Service
katrina_dixon@fws.gov
406-449-5225 ext. 222

From: Canfield, Jodie E -FS [mailto:jecanfield@fs.fed.us]
Sent: Friday, February 06, 2015 2:46 PM
To: chris.servheen@cfc.umt.edu; Shoemaker, Rebecca (rebecca.shoemaker@cfc.umt.edu); Tyers, Dan -FS; Landenburger, Lisa A -FS
Cc: T van Manen, Frank <vanmanen@utk.edu> (vanmanen@utk.edu) (vanmanen@utk.edu); mark_haroldson@usgs.gov; Katrina_Dixon@fws.gov; Dixon, Bev -FS
Subject: FW: further discussion on GBCS needed

Hey everybody. I had a chance to brief Mary Erickson and we also got comments on our cleanup amendment from Sara Jane Johnson of Native Ecosystem Council. I think Dan also had a good conversation with our boss, Scott Barndt about this topic. It would be good to touch base again and discuss the implications of the GNF moving forward and to talk about language we may want to include in our decision (in the event the CS changes) to be adaptable. Lastly I think Bev is right on about bears outside the RZ and what kind of protection we should be looking at relative to the 2010 paper.

Does Monday, February 23 or Tuesday Feb. 24 work? Please let me know if yes or if you no longer want to be a part of the conversation, or if you think there are others that need to be part of the conversation. THANKS.

From: Dixon, Bev -FS

Sent: Friday, February 06, 2015 12:05 PM

To: Canfield, Jodie E -FS

Cc: Katrina Dixon (katrina_dixon@fws.gov)

Subject: further discussion on GBCS needed

Hey Jodie – just got off the phone with Katrina, and was reminded that we still need further discussion to clarify the CS access standard – what it is, when it applies, and what is the appropriate baseline to measure compliance with the standard. It would also be good to continue to discuss the effects of activities in subunits that have improved beyond 1998 (not those identified as in need...) At what point can we reasonably expect adverse effects to occur, when there's a wide range of potential impacts (0 – 15,000 acres). Finally, we still haven't had a chance to talk about how OMARD and TMARD fit into the CS; i.e. is secure habitat really the only metric necessary to state as a standard, while only requiring monitoring for OMARD and TMARD? What about outside the rz/pca where the only requirement is to monitor changes in secure? How does that measure up against the findings in Schwartz et al 2010? Should we schedule another conference call to try to get at some of these issues?

<image001.png> **Bev Dixon**
Wildlife Biologist
Forest Service
Custer Gallatin National Forest, Bozeman Ranger District
p: 406-522-2541
f: 406-522-2528
bdixon@fs.fed.us
3710 Fallon, Suite C
Bozeman, MT 59718
www.fs.fed.us
<image002.png><image003.png><image004.png>
Caring for the land and serving people

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.