

**From:** Servheen, Chris  
**To:** [Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Chapter 3 comments  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 02, 2016 1:15:43 PM

---

I agree about them increasing the number of overnight units as long as the footprint does not increase, but we need a standardized measure of the footprint.

This is a slippery slope that started when we allowed the states managed population decline. It is hard to justify limit on indirect mortality by land mgt. agencies when we have given direct mortality permission to the states.

C

On Aug 2, 2016, at 7:04 PM, Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer <[jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu](mailto:jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu)> wrote:

Well the Park Service really wants to be able to increase overnight capacity. Without completely the intent of the 1998 baseline the only potential change I can see is if we allow modifications to existing developed sites as long as the footprint does not increase. What do you think?

*Jennifer Fortin-Noreus, Ph.D.  
Postdoctoral Researcher  
Grizzly Bear Recovery Program  
University of Montana  
University Hall, Room 309  
Missoula, MT 59812  
phone: (406) 243-4994  
[jennifer.fortin-noreus@umontana.edu](mailto:jennifer.fortin-noreus@umontana.edu)*

---

**From:** Servheen, Chris  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 31, 2016 2:28 PM  
**To:** Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer  
**Subject:** Re: Chapter 3 comments

Let me know how they think it looks.

C

On Jul 31, 2016, at 7:15 PM, Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer <[jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu](mailto:jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu)> wrote:

I think that looks good. I will provide it to Kerry for the park service to discuss at their Monday meeting.

J

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 30, 2016, at 2:31 AM, Servheen, Chris  
<[grizz@umontana.edu](mailto:grizz@umontana.edu)> wrote:

Jenn,

Here are a few edits below IN CAPS to address the issue of allowing new developed sites. Let me know your thoughts.

C

On Jul 29, 2016, at 10:51 AM, Servheen, Chris  
<[grizz@umontana.edu](mailto:grizz@umontana.edu)> wrote:

A few ideas:

Changes to EXISTING developed sites on public lands OR NEW SITES are acceptable as long as these changes OR NEW DEVELOPMENTS: 1) do not increase the number of overnight USE sites and/or result in increased overnight human presence at EXISTING OR NEW sites; 2) are for the purpose of visitor safety, environmental protection, or enhanced visitor services such as outhouses, picnic sites, parking areas, or interpretative displays; and 3) that appropriate sanitation and human/bear conflict minimization efforts are associated with any such changes or enhancements.

Thoughts?

C

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 28, 2016, at 5:10 PM, Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer <[jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu](mailto:jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu)> wrote:

I talked to Kerry this morning and he thinks allowing for increased visitor services without increasing overnight capacity should meet their needs. He is meeting with Dan Wank on Monday, the day before the YES meeting, to talk about this issue. It would be nice to provide some draft language by then for him to consider. It seems to me that we can add language similar to that already there for modifying developed sites "to reduce resource damage, detrimental environmental impacts, and/or the potential for grizzly bear

conflicts" is applicable to the addition of restrooms and parking. Please let me know if you want me to take a first stab at it. Hate to have you working on your vacation, especially when you're retired! Thanks!  
J

*Jennifer Fortin-Noreus, Ph.D.  
Postdoctoral Researcher  
Grizzly Bear Recovery  
Program  
University of Montana  
University Hall, Room 309  
Missoula, MT 59812  
phone: (406) 243-4994  
[jennifer.fortin-noreus@umontana.edu](mailto:jennifer.fortin-noreus@umontana.edu)*

---

**From:** Servheen, Chris  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 28, 2016 3:40 AM  
**To:** Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer  
**Subject:** Re: Chapter 3 comments

Jenn,  
I can see how YNP can think that they need some relief to do some management enhancements that will not result in bear deaths since we have given the states permission to actually kill more bears (10% of the females in the ecosystem including a share of Park bears) while they can't even put in a few visitor enhancements. My thought is that we allow NPS to enhance visitor services other than increasing campground sizes and numbers to allow them to help serve visitor needs while they continue to employ their successful bear management program. The justification for this departure is the long term successful NPS bear management programs. I would suggest that we try and keep campground sizes and numbers at present levels while allowing them to expand other

visitor services. Let me know what kind of response you get from them and I will help you craft an appropriate response.

I think they have a valid point.  
C

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 27, 2016, at 8:53 PM,  
Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer  
<[jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu](mailto:jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu)> wrote:

Hate to bother you again while in Paris but as you know we're on this crazy timeline for Strategy revisions. The park service seems to want to get away from the 1998 baseline. Originally they presented it as an administration problem which I pointed out was already addressed. Now they seem to want more leeway on developed sites. In my opinion this would create problems for several reasons. First, if we let the park service have an exception then the Forest Service will want the same exception. Second, I'm not sure how we would defend it.

Thoughts?

Thanks!  
Jennifer

Sent from my  
iPhone

Begin forwarded  
message:

**From:**  
"Gunther,  
Kerry"  
<[kerry\\_gunther@nps.gov](mailto:kerry_gunther@nps.gov)>

**Date:**  
July  
27,  
2016 at  
12:42:56  
PM  
MDT

**To:**  
"Fortin-  
Noreus,  
Jennifer"  
<[jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu](mailto:jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu)>

**Subject:**  
**Re:**  
**Chapter**  
**3**  
**comments**

Jennifer

Up to  
this  
point  
we  
have  
complied  
with  
the  
standard  
and  
have

not  
exceeded  
the  
1998  
baseline.  
However  
with  
visitation  
increasing  
significantly  
almost  
every  
year  
(we  
will  
likely  
set a  
new  
record  
again  
this  
year),  
we see  
a point  
in the  
future  
where  
the  
public  
may  
demand  
to have  
some  
additional  
infrastructure  
for  
visitor  
use  
(not  
admin  
use),  
such as  
restrooms  
with  
running  
water,  
restaurants,  
and  
parking  
lots,

and  
these  
will  
become  
increasingly  
difficult  
to  
build  
within  
the  
existing  
development  
foot-  
prints.  
NPS  
managers  
tend to  
like to  
have  
options  
to  
make  
good  
decisions  
and the  
1998  
Base-  
line  
Standard  
pretty  
much  
removes  
those  
options.  
Since  
we  
have  
such a  
good  
record  
of  
protecting  
bear  
habitat  
(22%  
of park  
is  
seasonally  
closed  
to

recreational  
use)  
and  
preventing  
human-  
caused  
grizzly  
bear  
mortalities  
(we  
almost  
never  
remove  
a bear  
unless  
it kills  
and  
eats  
someone),  
can the  
Conservation  
Strategy  
language  
build  
in a  
little  
more  
trust  
for us  
in  
regards  
to  
habitat  
issues,  
as it  
does  
with  
the  
states  
in  
regards  
to  
managing  
grizzly  
bear  
population  
issues?  
PJ and  
I have  
a



meeting  
with  
Dan  
Wenk  
early  
next  
week  
to  
discuss  
this  
issue,  
and  
determine  
what  
he can  
and  
can't  
live  
with as  
far as  
habitat  
commitments.

Kerry

On  
Wed,  
Jul 27,  
2016 at  
8:13  
AM,  
Fortin-  
Noreus,  
Jennifer  
<[jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu](mailto:jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu)>  
wrote:

Kerry,

Has  
YNP  
already  
made  
changes  
so  
that  
the  
1998  
baseline

is no  
longer  
applicable?

I  
want  
to  
make  
sure  
that I  
clearly  
understand  
the

concern  
that

NPS

has  
with

the  
1998  
baseline.

As

we  
previously  
discussed,  
there

is an  
exception  
to

the  
baseline

for  
administrative  
purposes

when  
mitigation

is  
not  
possible.

I  
have  
added  
the  
proposed  
changes

to  
the  
language  
that  
clarify  
that

change  
is  
both  
in  
capacity  
and  
acreage.

Thank  
you,

Jennifer

Jennifer  
Fortin-  
Noreus,  
Ph.D.

Postdoctoral  
Researcher

Grizzly  
Bear  
Recovery  
Program

University  
of  
Montana

University  
Hall,  
Room  
309  
Missoula,  
MT  
59812

phone:  
(406)  
243-  
4994

[jennifer.fortin-  
noreus@umontana.edu](mailto:jennifer.fortin-noreus@umontana.edu)

---

From:  
Gunther,  
Kerry  
[[kerry\\_gunther@nps.gov](mailto:kerry_gunther@nps.gov)]

Sent:  
Tuesday,  
July  
26,  
2016  
1:30  
PM

To:  
Fortin-  
Noreus,  
Jennifer

Subject:  
Chapter  
3  
comments

Jennifer,

Here  
are  
my  
comments  
on  
Chapter  
3. I  
do  
not  
yet  
have  
concurrence  
on  
the  
1998  
baseline  
standard.  
The  
NPS  
has a  
proven  
record  
of  
keeping

human-  
caused  
mortalities  
to an  
absolute  
minimum  
despite  
very  
high  
visitation.  
Since  
we  
have  
proven  
we  
can  
do it,  
is  
this  
standard  
really  
necessary  
for  
NPS  
lands.  
It  
really  
restricts  
our  
management  
capabilities.  
We  
are  
21%  
of  
the  
PCA  
but  
less  
than  
5%  
of  
the  
human-  
caused  
mortalities  
occur  
on  
the  
lands

we  
manage.

--

Kerry  
Gunther

Bear  
Management  
Office

P.O.  
Box  
168  
Yellowstone  
National  
Park,  
WY  
82190

Phone:  
307-  
344-  
2162  
Fax:  
307-  
344-  
2211

--

Kerry  
Gunther  
Bear  
Management  
Office  
P.O.  
Box  
168  
Yellowstone  
National  
Park,  
WY  
82190

Phone:  
307-

344-  
2162  
Fax:  
307-  
344-  
2211