

# *Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee Five-Year Plan for 2013 – 2017*

Updated December 2014

**IGBC Mission:** Recover, manage, and secure the future of grizzly bear populations and their habitat so that grizzly bears no longer require protections afforded by the ESA.

## **A. Background**

In 1983, the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC) was established to help ensure recovery of viable grizzly bear populations and their habitats in the lower 48 states through interagency cooperation, including coordination of policy, planning, management, research and communication. The IGBC consists of top-level federal, state, and Canadian representatives from agencies with grizzly bear population and habitat management and research responsibilities. The objectives<sup>1</sup> of the IGBC are to:

- Coordinate the grizzly bear management, research, and communication activities of state, federal, and Canadian agencies to ensure the best utilization of available resources, prevent duplication of effort, and clearly articulate management intent and programs to decision-makers and the interested public.
- Implement the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan to facilitate recovery of grizzly bear populations. Initiate revisions to recovery goals, and management objectives and strategies as warranted by the status of the bear populations and associated habitats in the individual ecosystems.
- Implement and oversee management, research, and communication activities for all grizzly bear populations in the recovery area until individual populations are both biologically recovered and legally de-listed.

In September 1999, the IGBC met in executive session to reaffirm the Committee's objectives and set goals for the next five years. After the first five year period, goals were set in 2004 for the period 2005-2009 and have been periodically reviewed and revised since then. This document clarifies goals for grizzly recovery for 2013-2017.

Subcommittees were formed for each ecosystem. These subcommittees address IGBC goals through the formation of objectives and strategies identified in the specific ecosystem 5 year work plans. The IGBC also approves 5-year work plans for each of the ecosystem subcommittees. The last such subcommittee 5-year plans were completed in June of 2009. The IGBC work plan is the overall planning document for IGBC actions across the range of the grizzly while the ecosystem subcommittee plans are specific to the ecosystems they refer to.

## **B. Overarching Goals for the IGBC**

- Maintain leadership role and act collectively as a coordinating body. Be assertive in encouraging progress to recover, delist, and conserve grizzly bear populations.

---

<sup>1</sup> IGBC objectives are defined in the 1999 Memorandum of Understanding among member agencies.

- Educate the public, organizations, and agencies of the need to revise management direction, objectives, and goals as populations transition from threatened to biologically recovered.
- Emphasize communication and coordination among members, agencies, and ecosystems, and focus on providing clear messages concerning grizzly bear recovery to decision-makers and interested publics.
- Executive committee members will assist cooperating agencies in identification of funding needs and work with appropriate decision-makers to try to secure needed funding.
- Work with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to continually revise and approve Grizzly Bear Recovery Plans, including evaluation of demographic and habitat criteria for each ecosystem and creation of a functional “meta-population” of grizzly bears across existing ecosystems. Recovery Plans may include revision of recovery zone boundaries, revision of demographic recovery criteria, or alternative approaches to habitat conservation. IGBC member agencies are expected to appoint members to technical committee(s) to participate in this process and to ensure that members actively participate in the process.
- Provide **technical support and advice and coordinate efforts to to** defend against **legal challenges that inhibit IGBCs goals of recovery, management and delisting.**
- Document the history of IGBC actions and accomplishments.

Commented [TR1]: as stated, this give me heartburn, but if a SOL is ok then I can be overruled

### **C. Overarching issues to achieve grizzly bear recovery**

Two of the five grizzly bear populations in the lower 48 states have reached biological recovery, one remains below objectives, and evidence of grizzly bear presence is limited for two recovery areas. The IGBC has identified six issues as critical to grizzly recovery, delisting, and conservation. These issues include:

#### **1. Social and Political Aspects of Managing and Recovering Grizzly Bears**

**Issue Statement:** Social acceptance of grizzly bear populations and grizzly bear management policies and practices are crucially important. IGBC will coordinate, consider and work with all interest groups; including decision-makers at all levels of government, agencies, and the public.

**Status/Accomplishments:** There has been some progress on this particularly in the Cabinet/Yaak ecosystem where there have been public opinion surveys to better understand public attitudes and knowledge.

**Vision:** There is public and political understanding and acceptance for grizzly bear management and recovery.

**Executive Committee Goals:** Political support is critical to grizzly recovery both for stable funding and to maintain a secure support system for management decisions. The IGBC recognizes that political support is built through understanding of the issues and by listening to the concerns and interests of the public. Briefings of Congressional staff and state Congressional delegations are important opportunities to maintain political support and understanding. The IGBC commits to better outreach with Congress to maintain and enhance this political support.

**IGBC goals:**

- Build public support for recovery and delisting, and improve the social aspects of recovery. This can involve:
  - Outreach and education.

- Working closely with local residents and communities as they live with grizzly bears. This may include county commissioners becoming members of ecosystem subcommittees.
- Building confidence in local residents and communities that we can balance the needs of grizzly bears with the needs and desires of local communities and economies. Communicate agency response plans, implement agency actions, and advise the public about those responses to build public trust.
- Understanding the social acceptance of grizzly bears in communities, traditional users like livestock grazers, and special use groups.
- Acknowledge that grizzly bears do not belong everywhere. Develop and implement management strategies to promote grizzly bears in suitable habitats and discourage bears from areas where they will not succeed and cause repetitive conflicts which erodes public support.
- Educate the public of the benefits of the North American Wildlife Conservation Model as it pertains to grizzly bear recovery and management of a recovered population. Acknowledge the role of sportsmen dollars in funding grizzly bear conservation.
- Work with state and local governments to improve understanding and support for grizzly bears.
- Encourage public/private partnerships to advance recovery and conservation efforts.
- The IGBC recognizes the importance of social and political aspects to recovery and will commit the necessary resources to this task.
- ~~Secure funding to implement an EIS process and the resulting record of decision in the North Cascades to involve the public in the decision on how to proceed with recovery.~~

#### Research and Monitoring aspects of Social and Political Aspects of Recovery:

- There are opportunities to emulate the public opinion survey that was accomplished in the Cabinet/Yaak ecosystem. This approach should be accomplished in other ecosystems in the next 5 years. Surveys should be designed specific to the needs of each ecosystem.

## 2. Linkage

Issue Statement: Fostering management to link important wildlife habitats in the West is valuable to:

- maintain healthy wildlife populations,
- to allow animals to move in response to changes in land ownership/settlement patterns,
- to allow animals to move in response to changes in vegetation, habitats, and seasonal range, and
- improve safety on highways for the traveling public.

#### Status/Accomplishments:

- This IGBC goal of wildlife linkage is closely aligned with the goals of the WGA crucial areas and corridors initiative.
- Linkage work is progressing on the ground in some areas to identify linkage areas and to implement conservation action in these areas to make them

more secure as wildlife crossing areas. An example is the work of Proctor et al (2004)<sup>2</sup>.

- Cooperative efforts are underway with Vital Ground and the Nature Conservancy and other land conservation groups on linkage across private lands.
- An IGBC statement in support of the concept of linkage zones for wildlife has been signed by 13 state and federal agencies (Attached as Appendix B)
- MOU among state and federal wildlife, land management, and transportation agencies for cooperation in wildlife linkage has been circulated to transportation agencies but to date it has not been signed. ~~This is receiving little effort/interest at this time.~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.19", Tab stops: Not at 1.5"

Commented [TR2]: value laden.

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 1.19", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 1.25" + Tab after: 1.5" + Indent at: 1.5", Tab stops: 3.38", List tab + Not at 1.5"

**Vision:** Identify and achieve biologically effective linkage between all the large blocks of important habitat within and among the grizzly recovery areas. Maintain and enhance linkage with Canadian populations and between Canadian populations adjacent to the US/Canada border. Implement linkage as a transboundary interagency response mechanism to climate change in addition to the genetic and demographic benefits.

#### Executive Committee Goals:

- Update the IGBC linkage MOU in 2013
- Work cooperatively and engage actively with the WGA effort since the WGA initiative is similar to this IGBC goal.
- Engage land conservation NGOs and county commissioners on the objective of landscape level linkage.
- Support efforts to identify specific linkage areas where the opportunities for movement across the landscape are highest.
- Promote development and implementation of MOU among wildlife, land management, and transportation agencies to facilitate cooperation.
- Provide subcommittees and other agency managers and agency realty programs (i.e. the FWS Partners Program) with copies of linkage reports and other available tools.
- Promote use of linkage assessment tools in key areas in cooperation with others like transportation agencies and foundations.
- Enhance the efforts of subcommittees to identify high priority areas that would enhance linkage among ecosystems.

#### Subcommittee Goals:

- Promote assessment of linkage opportunities on public lands in land management planning.
- Promote outreach with private land owners, local governments, and land conservation NGOs to enhance awareness and opportunities for providing linkage.
- Promote cooperative efforts with transportation agencies to enhance linkage across transportation corridors.

#### Research and Monitoring:

- Enhance ongoing efforts to pinpoint specific linkage areas using radio-collared animals and modeling efforts using the data from radio-collared animals in order to focus management effort and land conservation action.

<sup>2</sup> Proctor, M, C. Servheen, W. Kasworm, and T. Radandt. 2008. Grizzly bear linkage enhancement plan for the Highway 3 corridor in the south Purcell Mountains of British Columbia. Birchdale Ecological, Ltd., Kaslo, B.C., Canada. 44 pp.

Monitor the use of identified linkage areas as a validation effort that management is successful in enhancing linkage at these sites.

### **3. Attractant Storage/Food-Conditioning**

**Issue Statement:** Grizzly bears are easily conditioned to unnatural food sources. Food conditioning generally leads to the death of the bear and often presents human safety risks. Hunting-related attractants like gut piles are a source of conflict and the management of these attractants is a challenge for the future.

**Status/Accomplishments:**

- All National Parks and many areas of the National Forests within grizzly bear habitat require proper storage of attractants.
- Some National Forests and all other land ownerships have no attractant storage requirements.
- Existing storage and camp safety requirements are inconsistent, leading to public confusion, potential safety risks, and possible liabilities.
- Many sources of food-conditioning exist on private land and these are being dealt with through outreach by state and Tribal bear conflict specialists and legislation prohibiting the feeding of bears.

**Vision:** The need to properly store bear attractants is understood by the public, and consistent, effective storage practices are in place on all land ownerships.

**Executive Committee Goals:**

- Promote consistent attractant storage requirements and education across all public land ownerships occupied by grizzly bears
- Support and improve ongoing efforts to manage attractants on private lands.
- Work to enhance public understanding and compliance with attractant storage requirements.
- Support outreach efforts to alert hunters to potential conflicts with bears attracted to gut piles/harvested game, and educate hunters on ways to minimize conflicts.
- Support outreach efforts to alert hikers and campers to the proper ways to store foods overnight to avoid bear conflicts.

**Research and Monitoring:**

- Better understand the differences between hunter-related conflicts in the NCDE versus Yellowstone ecosystems and why there seems to be more such conflicts in the Yellowstone ecosystem.
- Continue to monitor the source of human/bear conflicts over attractive food/nuisance related issues and develop new education materials that expand our “Living with Wildlife” portfolio.

### **4. Motorized Access Management**

**Issue Statement:** Motorized vehicle access in grizzly bear habitat can displace bears from important seasonal habitats and in some cases increase human-caused bear mortality. The level of mortality related to motorized access can be a significant issue in bear conservation and management. Access limitations via motorized transport are important issue with some publics.

**Status/Accomplishments:**

- Standards for limiting motorized access are in place on many areas of the Federal lands, state lands, and corporate lands.

**Vision:** Motorized access in grizzly bear habitat is managed appropriately to limit bear displacement and mortality within acceptable levels while impacting the public to the minimum degree possible.

**Executive Committee Goals:**

- Provide consistent science-based guidance to land management agencies on the issue of motorized access management.
- Work to enhance public understanding and political support for appropriate levels of motorized access management on public lands.
- Balance motorized access management for bears with other natural resource management objectives (e.g. elk management, recreation use).

**Subcommittee Goals:**

- Implement consistent science-based motorized access management as needed in grizzly bear habitat.
- Work with local publics to improve understanding and acceptance of motorized access management.

**Research and Monitoring:**

- Continue to monitor bear mortality and causes related to access management.
- Explore the role of exurban development and human use related to bear mortality.
- Evaluate and document bear response to motorized access, road crossings and rail crossings and related human activity.

## **5. Population and Habitat Research/Monitoring**

**Issue Statement:** Adequate and current levels of population and habitat research and monitoring are needed in each ecosystem in order to understand population and habitat dynamics sufficiently to ensure progress towards recovery and long-term persistence.

**Status/Accomplishments:**

- A multi-pronged approach that has documented bear population size, population trend, and habitat conditions has provided agencies with key information on the status and trend of grizzly bears in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem.
- A DNA-based population census is now complete and trend monitoring is underway in the NCDE. Additional research is ongoing to examine the potential role of genetic based monitoring in the NCDE.
- A DNA based population estimate is underway in the Cabinet Yaak Ecosystem to support previous work estimating the population in this area. Additional work is ongoing in the Selkirks both on the US and Canadian sides of the border.
- Recent monitoring has been done in the Bitterroot ecosystem but no evidence of grizzly bears has been found.
- Little monitoring or research has been done in the North Cascades, but there is recent evidence that grizzly bears are inhabiting the North Cascades and have most likely migrated south from British Columbia.

**Vision:** Robust research and monitoring programs with adequate funding and personnel are in place to ensure that sound science is available for decision making in each

ecosystem, particularly on emerging issues like climate change and human-caused impacts.

**Executive Committee Goals:**

- Use the best science; it is the responsibility of the subcommittee members and IGBC staff to assure this is the case.
- Continually evaluate and update population and habitat monitoring methods as appropriate to assure these methods reflect conditions accurately; make the changes necessary to have in place a practical and defensible system of monitoring.
- Secure adequate funding to monitor to enhance population and habitat monitoring systems in the NCDE.
- Develop a consistent and coordinated approach for research and monitoring to ensure that funding and personnel are effectively deployed to support IGBC priorities.
- Enhance population and habitat research and monitoring efforts and funding in the Cabinet/Yaak and Selkirk ecosystems.
- Develop political/financial support for research/monitoring – cross-ecosystem research priorities.
- Collect data on human activities and impacts and how they relate to bear habitat and population status.

**Subcommittee Goals:**

- The IGBC approved 5-year plans for each ecosystem (approved June 2009 and attached as an Appendix A).
- Implement research and monitoring actions as funding is available.

**Research and Monitoring:**

- As explained in this section.

## 6. Management Strategy for Recovered Populations

**Issue Statement:** The GYE and NCDE grizzly bear populations are biologically recovered.

~~Legal challenges to delisting have stalled the changes in management necessary to properly manage the Yellowstone population.~~

**Status/Accomplishments:**

- The GYE and NCDE populations have met or exceeded recovery criteria and are increasing in numbers and distribution.

**Vision:** State management plans are approved and being successfully implemented for all recovered populations.

**Executive Committee Goals:**

- Facilitate the revision of demographic recovery criteria to allow for management and maintenance of biologically recovered populations as per state management plans, objectives, and suitable habitats.
- Facilitate cross-boundary management schemes to deal with grizzly bear management post delisting.

**Subcommittee Goals:**

- Design and implement the appropriate management strategies along with developing supporting information that allows individual states to meet their management objectives.

**Commented [TR3]:** To me this statement doesn't look forward for 5 years. Maybe it needs to address management under a litigation scenario

Research and Monitoring:

- Facilitate the implementation of a practical and defensible system of population monitoring.

## APPENDIX A

### Five year work plans of action for each ecosystem 2015-2017

#### January 2015

At the winter (December 2014) IGBC meeting in Missoula, MT, the IGBC Executive Committee made a decision that each ecosystem subcommittee would revise their five year work plans for the period of 2015-2017 instead of a five year revision. This would allow the IGBC work plan and the Subcommittee work plans to be in sync again. Both the IGBC Executive Committee and the Subcommittee Ecosystems will do another five year revision in 2017 for 2018-2022.

Development of such work plans is a business model that:

1. Provides clear guidance from the IGBC to each ecosystem subcommittee; and
2. Allows tracking of progress on the accomplishment of these tasks through annual reporting by each subcommittee chair.

Reporting progress and accomplishments on these tasks is a primary agenda item for each subcommittee chair when they report to the IGBC each year at the winter meeting.

The following is a list of tasks and accomplishments for each ecosystem subcommittee's 5-year work plan and for the IGBC Linkage initiative.

---

#### Five year work plans:

##### IGBC

- Work to secure funding to fully implement grizzly bear conservation and management actions pre- and post-recovery and delisting through development of a grizzly conservation trust fund and/or through Congressional action.

##### All Ecosystems

- Evaluate the need to revise the 1993 Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan by December 31, 2017. This evaluation would involve reconsideration of demographic and habitat criteria in each ecosystem and the relationships between each ecosystem in creating a "meta-population." This evaluation may include revision to the recovery zone lines, demographic recovery criteria, or alternative approaches to habitat conservation given the availability of new scientific data and techniques. This evaluation would include a cost-benefit analysis of proceeding with any such Recovery Plan revision. IGBC member agencies will appoint members, with dedicated time commitments, to a technical committee to participate in this process. ~~It is recognized that any decision to proceed with revisions to the Recovery Plan would require suspending efforts to complete the NCDE Conservation Strategy and suspend development of a proposed delisting rule for NCDE because any revisions to recovery zone lines, demographic criteria, or habitat conservation in the Recovery Plan would invalidate current recovery approaches in the NCDE and other ecosystems. Revision of the Recovery Plan would require an extensive process and public and peer review and would take 1-2 years or more if it were initiated.~~

Commented [TR4]: I don't disagree with this statement, but it's a positional statement on the part of FWS, not IGBC



~~Any Recovery Plan revision is subject to litigation. Any litigation on a revised Recovery Plan would need to be resolved before work could resume on the NCDE Conservation Strategy and a proposed delisting rule for the NCDE.~~

•

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Tab after: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.5", Widow/Orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text

## Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem

- Begin discussions concerning the content and mechanisms of a conservation strategy for one or both recovery areas (i.e. Cabinet-Yaak, Selkirk) with the intent of assessing the information and resources necessary to start the process.
- Define tactics/prioritization of effort between Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystems by spring of 2016.
- Continue the Cabinet Mountains augmentation with at least one additional sub-adult female grizzly bear per year if available. Consider male augmentation as needed. Specifically:
  - Develop enhanced public outreach and support for augmentation
  - Enhance and coordinate agency resources toward achieving augmentation goals
- Determine the most effective monitoring method(s) to assess current population status and trends. Ensure agency commitments are adequate to implement those methods.
- Continue to reduce grizzly bear mortality due to illegal kills, conflict kills and removals. Accomplish this through enhanced outreach and education and assistance to secure attractants at residences, businesses, waste transfer sites and public campgrounds.
- Expand monitoring efforts beyond the recovery zone boundaries to assess grizzly bear presence in these areas.
- Achieve an increasing population trend estimate of at least two percent per year until we reach the Cabinet-Yaak ecosystem recovery goal.
- Identify and work to secure locations of possible wildlife linkage areas across Hwy 2, Hwy 200 and Hwy 95.
- Achieve motorized access management standards in the remaining BMUs, i.e. Bull, St. Paul, Wanless, Grouse, Boulder, and Mt. Headley by 2019.
- Increase Information and Education efforts across the Ecosystem
  - Enhance cooperative efforts with local communities by working closely in partnership with local residents and county governments in each mountain valley to build local support and understanding about grizzly recovery and ecosystem health.
  - Increase coordination and communication between Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak concerning information and education personnel, activities and financing.
    - Annually solicit Information and Education projects in order to target multiple funding opportunities.
    - Increase contact between members of the Information and Education Subcommittee to discuss projects, funding, opportunities and efforts.
  - Create a localized grant program (managed by the S/C-Y Subcommittee of the IGBC) for both the Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystems so local projects can be more fully funded. This is supplemental to our annual requests to the parent IGBC.

## Selkirk Ecosystem

- Begin discussions concerning the content and mechanisms of a conservation strategy for one or both recovery areas (i.e. Cabinet-Yaak, Selkirk) with the intent of assessing the information and resources necessary to start the process.
- Define tactics/prioritization of effort between Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystems by spring of 2016.

- As possible, apply enhanced monitoring to assess the presence of grizzly bears along the international boundary of Washington and British Columbia between the Selkirks and the North Cascades.
- Achieve an increasing population trend estimate of at least two percent per year until we reach the Selkirk ecosystem recovery goal.
- Evaluate the options available in dealing with bear-human conflicts in the Selkirks and the relocation options for bears that may come into conflict in this ecosystem. Specifically, are there options to relocate such bears into other ecosystems in order to reduce the probability that they might rapidly return to the origin of the conflict and thereby reduce their own survival?
- Identify and work to secure locations of possible wildlife linkage areas across Hwy 3 and 3A (BC) and Hwy 95.
- Provide grizzly movement opportunities between the Selkirks and the Purcell Mountains by delivering conservation action to the Duck Lake area south of Kootenai Lake, British Columbia.
- Achieve motorized access management standards in the Blue Grass BMU by 2019.
- Increase Information and Education efforts across the Ecosystem
  - Increase emphasis in northeastern Washington.
  - Increase Information and Education efforts with British Columbia to specifically help reduce mortality in the Canadian portion of the ecosystem.
    - Goal: Jointly host a subcommittee meeting in BC (e.g. Creston) in spring of 2016
  - Increase coordination and communication between Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak concerning information and education personnel, activities and financing.
    - Annually solicit Information and Education projects in order to target multiple funding opportunities.
    - Increase contact between members of the Information and Education Subcommittee to discuss projects, funding, opportunities and efforts.
  - Create a localized grant program (managed by the S/C-Y Subcommittee of the IGBC) for both the Selkirk and Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystems so local projects can be more fully funded. This is supplemental to our annual requests to the parent IGBC.

### **Bitterroot Ecosystem**

- Continue to monitor key areas of the ecosystem using scent lure hair collection sites and automatic cameras to document presence of bears. Report credible sightings to the USFWS.
- Continue outreach and education and sanitation efforts to minimize attractants that would cause mortality and conflict. Establish a process for doing MRDG analysis for noninvasive wildlife monitoring techniques in USFS wilderness R1 & R4 that would be consistent and approved at the District Ranger level.
- Develop a comprehensive sanitation strategy for wilderness, non-wilderness, and private lands in the Bitterroot Ecosystem. Facilitate /Coordinate with all Forests on food storage order status and consistency.
- Enhance cooperative efforts with local communities and organizations by working closely in partnership with local residents and county governments to build local support, trust and understanding about grizzly recovery and ecosystem health.
- Consider natural recovery options under fully threatened status through natural movement of grizzly bears into the Bitterroot ecosystem from adjacent areas. Consider what would be necessary to facilitate natural movement into the Bitterroot area and implement actions to facilitate these natural movements, including: sanitation assistance to private land owners, identification of linkage areas in mountain valleys, working with land conservation organizations for private land conservation within those key linkage areas.

### **North Cascades Ecosystem**

- Complete an EIS by December 31, 2017, for the North Cascades that involves the public in the

decision on how to recover this population. Upon completion of the EIS process, develop a Record of Decision (ROD) ~~and have it signed for signature in~~ early ~~in~~ 2018. Implement the ROD ~~with funded conservation actions~~ in cooperation with our British Columbia partners. The cost will not be known until a decision is made. Technical team and subcommittee members will be available to assist as possible with document preparation and public review.

- Enhance cooperative efforts with local communities by working closely in partnership with local residents and county governments to build local support and understanding about grizzly recovery and ecosystem health.
- Explore means to formalize access management on the two national forests through a NEPA process. This may take the form of amendments to existing forest plans until forest plans can be completed. Interim guidance was issued by the three forests (now 2) in 1997.
- Re-evaluate core areas and road management in the western part of the recovery area (Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie NF).
- Expand the NPS food storage requirements to other federal lands in the recovery area.
- To investigate potential population linkages to the North Cascades, as possible, apply enhanced monitoring via DNA-hair snags, automatic cameras, and follow-up on reported observations to assess the presence of grizzly bears along the international boundary of Washington and British Columbia between the Selkirks and the North Cascades.
- Monitor key back country areas in the north end of the ecosystem using baited hair collection sites and automatic cameras to document the presence of bears.

### **Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem (NCDE)**

- Enhance cooperative efforts with local communities by working closely in partnership with local residents and county governments to build local support and understanding about grizzly recovery and ecosystem health.

Complete the NCDE Conservation Strategy, including:

- Establish the area within which mortality standards and mortality limits will be applied.
- Establish the area within which habitat standards and habitat criteria monitoring will be applied.
- Decide whether to apply a tiered management intensity system involving higher levels of habitat and population management in a core area and lesser levels of management intensity in surrounding areas.

Develop demographic recovery criteria for the NCDE, including:

- Population monitoring methods
- Sustainable mortality limits
- Unknown/unreported mortality calculation
- Decide on and apply trend monitoring methods

Develop public lands habitat standards for the NCDE.

- Motorized access management standards
- Site development standards
- Livestock allotment standards

Develop demographic and habitat monitoring protocols:

- Assign responsibility for annual reporting systems on demographic monitoring including population size, trend, sustainable mortality, and unknown /unreported mortality.
- Assign responsibility for the annual reporting of habitat standards on public lands including the motorized access management, amount of secure habitat by subunits, developed sites by subunits, and livestock allotments by subunits.

- Get habitat standards in the 5 forest plans (FNF, KNF, LNF, HNF, LCNF), and in plans for GNP, BLM, MTDNRC, and tribal management plans using appropriate processes.
- Get all agencies to sign a MOU to implement the NCDE Conservation Strategy.
- Report NCDE trend estimate results using female survival and fecundity monitoring.
- Propose delisting
- Improve conditions that allow for interchange and dispersal between NCDE and Bitterroot, NCDE and the Yellowstone, and NCDE and Cabinet Yak ecosystems.

### **Yellowstone Ecosystem**

- Continue to implement the Yellowstone Conservation Strategy, apply adaptive management to this implementation and achieve delisting status.
- Support implementation of the YES/IGBC approved Demographic Monitoring Area (DMA).
- Continue efforts to identify and validate the most accurate methodology to estimate grizzly bear abundance in the DMA of the Yellowstone Ecosystem.
- Continue public education and awareness efforts about grizzly bear ecology, attractant storage, conflict resolution, human safety, and population recovery/status throughout the GYE especially in areas outside of the recovery zones where grizzly population expansion has occurred.
- Continue implementation and evaluation of the "Bearwise" programs among agencies responsible for grizzly bear recovery/management in the System in order to provide long-term perpetuity of grizzly bears on the landscape and foster public acceptance of the role of grizzly bears in the System.