

From: Servheen, Chris
To: [Fortin-Noreus, Jennifer](#); Wayne_Kasworm@fws.gov
Subject: Fwd: questions from LA Times editorial writer on the proposed delisting of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem grizzly
Date: Friday, April 15, 2016 8:26:27 AM

FYI for both of you.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Chris Servheen <christopher.servheen@mso.umt.edu>
Date: April 14, 2016 at 5:16:06 PM MDT
To: <anna_munoz@fws.gov>
Subject: FW: questions from LA Times editorial writer on the proposed delisting of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem grizzly

Answers below questions in CAPS.

Christopher Servheen, Ph.D.
Grizzly Bear Recovery Coordinator
Region 6 White Nose Syndrome Coordinator
Polar Bear Recovery Team
USFWS
Adjunct Research Associate Professor
College of Forestry and Conservation
University Hall, Room 309
University of Montana Missoula, MT 59812
Phone 406-243-4903 Fax 406-329-3212
Email address: grizz@umontana.edu
<http://www.cfc.umt.edu/GrizzlyBearRecovery/>
<http://www.WhiteNoseSyndrome.org/>

“Try to learn something about everything and everything about something” –
Thomas Huxley

From: "Chris Servheen" <chris_servheen@fws.gov>
Date: Thursday, April 14, 2016 at 1:18 PM
To: Chris Servheen <grizz@umontana.edu>
Subject: Fwd: questions from LA Times editorial writer on the proposed delisting of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem grizzly

Begin forwarded message:

From: Serena Baker <serena_baker@fws.gov>
Date: April 14, 2016 at 10:19:33 AM MDT
To: Michael Thabault
<michael_thabault@fws.gov>, Marjorie Nelson
<marjorie_nelson@fws.gov>, "Christopher
Servheen Ph. D." <chris_servheen@fws.gov>
Cc: Matt Hogan <matt_hogan@fws.gov>, Anna
Muñoz <anna_munoz@fws.gov>, "Kenneth G.
Ostrand Ph. D." <kenneth_ostrand@fws.gov>,
Gavin Shire <gavin_shire@fws.gov>
**Subject: Fwd: questions from LA Times editorial
writer on the proposed delisting of the Greater
Yellowstone Ecosystem grizzly**

Good morning team,

Matt and I talked, and he would prefer that we reply in writing. He also asked if Chris you and Mike would take the first stab at drafting responses. Please let me know if I can be helpful. I'll let you know their deadline as soon as I hear back from them.

Thanks!

Serena Baker
Public Affairs Specialist
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Mountain-Prairie Region 6
134 Union Boulevard, Suite 400
Lakewood, CO 80228
Desk: 303.236.4588
Cell: 720.391.6583
Serena_Baker@fws.gov

Begin forwarded message:

From: Serena Baker
<serena_baker@fws.gov>
Date: April 14, 2016 at 9:10:21 AM MDT
To: Matt Hogan <matt_hogan@fws.gov>, Anna Muñoz <anna_munoz@fws.gov>, Michael Thabault <michael_thabault@fws.gov>, "Kenneth G. Ostrand Ph. D." <kenneth_ostrand@fws.gov>
Cc: Gavin Shire <gavin_shire@fws.gov>
Subject: Fwd: questions from LA Times editorial writer on the proposed

delisting of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem grizzly

Hi Team,

Please see LA Times editorial inquiry below. I will check to see what is her timeline. If immediate, perhaps even Matt and Chris and I could call her before we leave today. Or, if we have some time would you prefer a different tact?

Including HQ EA. Thanks!

Serena Baker
Public Affairs Specialist
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Mountain-Prairie Region 6
134 Union Boulevard, Suite 400
Lakewood, CO 80228
Desk: 303.236.4588
Cell: 720.391.6583
Serena_Baker@fws.gov

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Hall, Carla"

<Carla.Hall@latimes.com>

Date: April 13, 2016 at 8:11:31
PM MDT

To: "serena_baker@fws.gov"

<serena_baker@fws.gov>

Subject: questions from LA
Times editorial writer on the
proposed delisting of the
Greater Yellowstone
Ecosystem grizzly

Hi, Serena,

I have seen the proposed rule
change and have some questions.
Would it be possible to talk to you
or an expert, perhaps Dr. Servheen,
about the de-listing? (Or perhaps
you are an expert on all this!)

I know the Service has
meticulously tracked the numbers
and distribution of grizzlies over the
years and now say the population is
717 bears and that the grizzly has
tripled its range since being listed. I
know the Service says it has
accomplished the goals of the
recovery plan. I know FWS looks at
three demographic criteria: is the
minimum pop large enough to

maintain genetic integrity; the distribution of the population, and “total mortality limits” (meaning that the number that die don’t leave the population depleted?) But beyond that I have some questions:

1)How did the FWS come to decide that 500 was the absolute minimum number and that over 674 was very good for this population. I understand that the Service has said that that can be maintained-- but why is that the correct number to maintain? 500 IS THE MINIMUM NUMBER NECESSARY TO AVOID LOSS OF GENETIC DIVERSITY OVER TIME BUT IT IS NOT THE POPULATION GOAL, WHICH IS 674. 674 IS THE AVERAGE POPULATION SIZE SINCE 2002. THE POPULATION HAS STABILIZED OVER THAT TIME DUE TO THE BEARS OCCUPYING ALL THE ALL THE SUITABLE HABITAT AND REACHING CARRYING CAPACITY.

2)One critic of the delisting told me that the GYE population is isolated and until the Service can improve connectivity between all the ecosystems, then genetic diversity of the species won’t be maintained

—or improved. What are your thoughts on that? THERE IS NO GENETIC THREAT TO YELLOWSTONE BEARS. WE ARE WORKING TO FACILITATE MOVEMENT OF BEARS BETWEEN THE YELLOWSTONE AND THE NEAREST POPULATION, WHICH IS THE BOB MARSHAL/GLACIER POPULATION. BEARS ARE CURRENTLY HALF WAY BETWEEN THESE AREAS AND IT IS JUST A MATTER OF TIME UNTIL WE DOCUMENT NATURAL MOVEMENT BETWEEN THESE AREAS.

3)And why de-list this one ecosystem? I've heard it's important that all ecosystems are thriving and sustainable before any of them get de-listed. What are your thoughts on that? WE DELIST BY THE CONSERVATION STATUS OF EACH POPULATION. SOME POPULATIONS LIKE YELLOWSTONE ARE RECOVERED WHILE OTHERS LIKE THE NORTH CASCADES WILL TAKE MANY DECADES TO REACH RECOVERY. THE RECOVERY OF POPULATIONS LIKE THE NORTH CASCADES HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CONSERVATION STATUS OR DELISTING OF THE YELLOWSTONE POPULATION.

4)Will the biggest difference for the de-listed Yellowstone grizzlies be that they will now be transferred to state management which can set up hunting programs (with numerous

restraints and guidelines—I've read the Wyoming plan) and choose how to handle trouble grizzlies—whether relocating or killing? THE STATES ALREADY MANAGE NUISANCE GRIZZLIES WHILE THEY ARE LISTED. HUNTING MAY HAPPEN BUT ALL MORTALITIES FROM HUNTING WILL BE MAINTAINED WITHIN THE TOTAL MORTALITY LIMITS FROM ALL CAUSES SET TO MAINTAIN THE POPULATION AT 674. IF HUNTING HAPPENS, IT WILL BE VERY FEW BEARS AND PROBABLY NONE IN SOME YEARS.

5)I've heard that if grizzlies are de-listed and roam out of the DMA, then anything can happen to them—they can be hunted without strict regulation. Is this a concern? THE STATES CAN MANAGE BEARS OUTSIDE THE DMA. THEY WILL MAINTAIN MOVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES BETWEEN THE YELLOWSTONE AND NORTHERN POPULATIONS BY LIMITING ANY MORTALITIES IN THE POSSIBLE MOVEMENT AREAS BETWEEN THEM. BEARS WILL NOT BE PERSECUTED JUST BECAUSE THEY ARE OUTSIDE THE DMA.

6)Why is the Service not concerned about the demise of whitebark pine? Is this because you think that grizzlies, which are opportunistic eaters, have replaced it with something else? And if it's ungulates, doesn't a greater dependency on ungulates end up with more grizzlies in more trouble—feasting

on livestock, fighting each other for carcasses... THE PROPOSED RULE EXTENSIVELY REVIEWS THE SCIENCE THAT SHOWS THAT DECLINES IN WHITEBARK PINE HAVE NOT HAD A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE BEARS. THIS IS NOT AN OPINION, IT IS BASED ON DETAILED SCIENCE PRODUCED BY USGS. BEARS HAVE NOT INCREASED USE OF MEAT TO A MEASURABLE DEGREE– MEAT USE VARIES EACH YEAR JUST AS IT DID BEFORE THE DECLINE IN WHITEBARK. THERE IS NO SUPPORT FOR THE THEORY THAT MORE MEAT MEANS MORE CONFLICTS WITH PEOPLE OR OTHER BEARS.

Thanks so much for your help on this.

Carla Hall

LA Times editorial writer

office: 213-237-6058

cell: 310-497-9944