

From: Servheen, Chris
To: [Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer](#)
Subject: Re: Chapter 3 comments
Date: Tuesday, August 02, 2016 9:41:00 PM

I agree!

On Aug 2, 2016, at 9:17 PM, Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer <jennifer.fortin-noreus@mso.umt.edu> wrote:

It is a slippery slope but when I talked to Kerry Gunther about it they may use it as a negotiating chip because the park service does not feel like they are getting much in return to what the states are getting.

*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*

From: Servheen, Chris
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2016 1:15 PM
To: Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer
Subject: Re: Chapter 3 comments

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> 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*

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> 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> 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> 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 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>

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>
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]

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
concurrency
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