

YES October 29, 2020 Virtual Conflict Reduction Workshop Public Input Form (listed in order received, excludes blank forms)

1. Russ Talmo - Defenders of Wildlife
2. Alex Few, Western Landowners Alliance
3. Shannon Pils, GIS Specialist Shoshone National Forest
4. Erin Edge, Defenders of Wildlife
5. Darby Hertel
6. Emily Harkness, Heart of the Rockies Initiative
7. Bonnie Rice, Sierra Club
8. Jocelyn Leroux, Western Watersheds Project
9. Josh Osher, Western Watersheds Project
10. Kristin Combs, Wyoming Wildlife Advocates

YES October 29, 2020 Virtual Conflict Reduction Workshop Public Input Form

Public input on "Recommendations for reducing bear-human conflicts and grizzly bear mortalities in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, 7/19/20", http://igbconline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_7_YES_MortReductionRecom_FINAL.pdf

Your Name / Affiliation (optional)

Russ Talmo - Defenders of Wildlife

Do you have any clarifying questions for the Tech Team about their Recommendations report?

nope

Backcountry and Hunting Related Conflicts

Front Country Conflicts and Community Planning

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Our organization has been involved in and had success with each of the specific recommendations listed in this category. These programs typically require direct involvement from community members, local government, wildlife management agencies, sanitation companies, and NGOs to move them forward. Costs vary considerably between each activity, but typically has some level of contribution by each of the entities involved.

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Each of the specific recommendations can be viewed as 5 year achievable goals, in my opinion.

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Meet with the garbage haulers to determine which bear resistant containers are compatible with their systems. Discuss cost sharing, fees, and subsidy options with them for providing containers to customers. Encourage local government to increase enforcement on existing ordinances, so as to increase compliance. Visit with city councils about strengthening existing ordinances or creating new ordinances for sanitation. Work with wildlife managers and NGOs to expand conflict prevention tools capacity, like electric fencing and attractant management.

Livestock Conflicts and Producer Outreach

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Defenders is involved in several range rider projects that have been successful. These efforts tend to be expensive and require a format of multiple partners and producers collaborating on the cost sharing. Electric fencing has been used with limited success in free-range conditions.

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Determine where conflicts and depredations are increasing or are most prevalent and explore the development of range rider projects in those areas.

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Identify producers with bordering or nearby allotments that would be willing to collaborate on range rider projects. Identify willing NGOs and other funding sources.

Anything else you would like organizers to know?

Anything else?

Conflict prevention tends to feel overwhelming and be a big lift on a regional level, but small projects start to add up over time and can have a real impact on reducing conflicts.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

YES October 29, 2020 Virtual Conflict Reduction Workshop Public Input Form

Public input on "Recommendations for reducing bear-human conflicts and grizzly bear mortalities in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, 7/19/20", http://igbconline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_7_YES_MortReductionRecom_FINAL.pdf

Your Name / Affiliation (optional)

Alex Few, Western Landowners Alliance

Do you have any clarifying questions for the Tech Team about their Recommendations report?

I was surprised to see the background info in the livestock conflicts section state that there are compensation programs available in all 3 states. My understanding is that grizzly bear compensation in ID is only available through the Livestock Indemnity Program under FSA. There is a program at the state level, but it is currently not available. It is currently either not funded or unavailable while grizzlies are listed.

Backcountry and Hunting Related Conflicts

Front Country Conflicts and Community Planning

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Livestock Conflicts and Producer Outreach

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Recommendation 5: Funding is needed to study effective implementation of range riding, carcass removal and electric fencing. These are the least studied tools to reduce conflicts with livestock and are not broadly implemented. Studies funded to implement, evaluate and integrate producer feedback would provide valuable information on best practices and provide an opportunity to further socialize these tools.

Recommendation 6: We caution the IGBC in tying depredation compensation to implementation of conflict prevention methods. The notion that producers need to be incentivized to reduce conflicts with grizzly bears is offensive to many. Most producers inherently care for the well being of their animals. A checklist of tools implemented as a prerequisite for compensation could be fraught with requirements that are labor intensive and take away from operational efficiency without effectively reducing conflicts. Producers want flexibility in implementation of conflict reduction methods so they can be tailored to their individual businesses, which are diverse. Furthermore, while previous research on social tolerance suggests that compensation does not increase social tolerance, producers in Wyoming regularly indicate that the multiplier adds to tolerance. The Conflict Reduction Consortium, a multi-stakeholder collaborative meeting monthly in 2020 led by Western Landowners Alliance, has a compensation subcommittee that has been discussing this at length and will be providing recommendations after their annual meeting in mid-November. Please consider incorporating these recommendations into this document.

Recommendation 10: Equal emphasis should be placed on prevention and reaction-based management. As your report indicates, producers outside of the DMA are increasingly experiencing depredations as is expected in a recovered population. Clear and uniform expectations for management response (management actions will always be case-specific) will lead to increased social tolerance by creating a sense of working together. Stating publicly that prevention should be prioritized, when bears are biologically recovered, will likely lead to distrust and frustration among producers particularly when effective tools for reducing conflicts on large upland landscapes are not widely available, as the report mentions.

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

.....

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Recommendation 11: Producers have been meeting twice monthly since March 2020 to discuss conflict reduction and compensation as part of Western Landowners Alliance Practitioners Calls. We would welcome partnership with IGBC members to bring additional support to producers through these calls.

.....

Anything else you would like organizers to know?

Anything else?

.....

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

YES October 29, 2020 Virtual Conflict Reduction Workshop Public Input Form

Public input on "Recommendations for reducing bear-human conflicts and grizzly bear mortalities in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, 7/19/20", http://igbconline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_7_YES_MortReductionRecom_FINAL.pdf

Your Name / Affiliation (optional)

Shannon Pils, GIS Specialist Shoshone National Forest

Do you have any clarifying questions for the Tech Team about their Recommendations report?

Backcountry and Hunting Related Conflicts

Front Country Conflicts and Community Planning

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Bear Aware programs, programs to provide for secure garbage storage for both public and private landowners, maintaining staffing and food-storage infrastructure for front-country agency folks

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Identify needs for secure garbage facilities in occupied range, Identify potential funding sources to aid private landowners with securing garbage and other attractants, maintain public infrastructure and staffing. Continuing I&E efforts.

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

One suggestion, specifically target the COVID refugees who are flooding into the GYE and lack knowledge of how to coexist with bears.

Livestock Conflicts and Producer Outreach

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Anything else you would like organizers to know?

Anything else?

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

YES October 29, 2020 Virtual Conflict Reduction Workshop Public Input Form

Public input on "Recommendations for reducing bear-human conflicts and grizzly bear mortalities in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, 7/19/20", http://igbconline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_7_YES_MortReductionRecom_FINAL.pdf

Your Name / Affiliation (optional)

Erin Edge / Defenders of Wildlife

Do you have any clarifying questions for the Tech Team about their Recommendations report?

I would like to know more about what spurred #8 on page 15. Reassessment of Incentives

Backcountry and Hunting Related Conflicts

Front Country Conflicts and Community Planning

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Defenders of Wildlife Electric Fencing Incentive Program reimburses 50% of the cost of an electric fence up to a maximum of \$500. This program provides both technical and financial assistance. Funding for this program is needed annually. Currently we pull together funding from a variety of means (agency, private donors, grants, etc.)

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Explore alternative and/or additional achievable funding mechanisms that the agencies can support.

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Create a committee to better understanding current funding levels, needs and partners available. This could be used to better understand how to prioritize efforts.

Livestock Conflicts and Producer Outreach

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Anything else you would like organizers to know?

Anything else?



YES October 29, 2020 Virtual Conflict Reduction Workshop Public Input Form

Public input on "Recommendations for reducing bear-human conflicts and grizzly bear mortalities in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, 7/19/20", http://igbconline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_7_YES_MortReductionRecom_FINAL.pdf

Your Name / Affiliation (optional)

Darby Hertel

Do you have any clarifying questions for the Tech Team about their Recommendations report?

I am aware there was previous discussion about using dogs to prevent grizzly bear conflict. I notice that it's not included in the recommendation report, however; it is in the appendix. I would like to learn more about that as a method of prevention.

Backcountry and Hunting Related Conflicts

Front Country Conflicts and Community Planning

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

.....

Livestock Conflicts and Producer Outreach

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

.....

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

.....

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

.....

Anything else you would like organizers to know?

Anything else?

.....

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.



YES October 29, 2020 Virtual Conflict Reduction Workshop Public Input Form

Public input on "Recommendations for reducing bear-human conflicts and grizzly bear mortalities in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, 7/19/20", http://igbconline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_7_YES_MortReductionRecom_FINAL.pdf

Your Name / Affiliation (optional)

Emily Harkness Heart of the Rockies Initiative

Do you have any clarifying questions for the Tech Team about their Recommendations report?

No

Backcountry and Hunting Related Conflicts

Front Country Conflicts and Community Planning

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

.....

Livestock Conflicts and Producer Outreach

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Landowner Led group: range riding, carcass composting, fencing, bear-proof containers (NFWF) Current CIG grant being reviewed for \$\$ for conflict reduction in the west

.....

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

.....

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

.....

Anything else you would like organizers to know?

Anything else?

Thank you for letting me attend

.....

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.



YES October 29, 2020 Virtual Conflict Reduction Workshop Public Input Form

Public input on "Recommendations for reducing bear-human conflicts and grizzly bear mortalities in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, 7/19/20", http://igbconline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_7_YES_MortReductionRecom_FINAL.pdf

Your Name / Affiliation (optional)

Bonnie Rice

Do you have any clarifying questions for the Tech Team about their Recommendations report?

- 1) On page 6 of the technical report, it summarizes mortalities for two time periods. "Site conflicts" and "self defense" are general categories of grizzly bear mortality. Can the tech team/IGBST give YES members and the public specific information on what percentage of each of these categories is from hunting-related conflicts? In order to reduce conflicts/mortalities it seems important to have more detailed information from which the conflict/mortality arose. There could be many causes of "site conflicts" and "self defense" bear mortalities. In addition, in the 2009 report the IGBST recommended creation of a detailed database specifically for hunting-related conflicts and mortalities to help prevent those conflicts. Can this database be created and utilized beginning in 2021?
- 2) What percentage of backcountry recreation grizzly bear mortalities are not hunting related?
- 3) On page 11 of the technical report, it states that 'stage agencies have provided portable electric fencing and grain storage containers to outfitters for many years where extra measures are needed to prevent conflicts in certain camps.' Assuming these outfitters are operating on USFS lands, why aren't these types of conflict prevention measures required in their permits? (of all outfitters) What is the extent of compliance with using these measures, and enforcement?
- 4) There were several good recommendations from the public as well as in the 2009 IGBST conflict and mortalities report regarding prevention of hunting-related conflicts. Why are those not being discussed/evaluated for implementation in the technical report? (e.g. much more emphasis on hunter education on the efficacy of bear spray over firearms, requiring electric fencing around carcasses, not shooting prey late in the day, no bear baiting in grizzly habitat, etc)
- 5) Can the technical team provide a list of what ordinances or zoning regulations are in place in the region regarding proper attractant storage? (page 14 mentions a couple of places). Can the technical team also provide a list of priority counties/communities where ordinances are most needed? NGOs might be able to help with this, not only with funding but in building public support. One of the recommendations on page 15 is to 'enact new local sanitation orders where they are needed' - what are the highest-priority places?
- 6) There are virtually no measures given for preventing conflicts with livestock, and it seems that everything is being left to voluntary actions by producers. At a minimum, can the technical team/YES provide detail on "...[e]xpansion of methods already being utilized, including the use of electric fencing where appropriate and implementing large carcass disposal programs"? What are the highest-priority areas in which to do this and how will it be accomplished? Are there ongoing efforts to encourage voluntary retirement of allotments at least within the DMA?
- 7) How did the technical team evaluate the recommendations from the public from the public on conflict prevention, particularly from the Cody workshop? The technical report is silent on whether it even considered those recommendations.

Backcountry and Hunting Related Conflicts

Front Country Conflicts and Community Planning

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

.....

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Identify 3-5 highest priority areas (where current conflicts are, and where bears are expanding such as Bozeman- recent sighting of griz there) to prevent front country conflicts and achieve enactment of attractant/sanitation ordinances in these communities within the next 5 years.

.....

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

.....

Livestock Conflicts and Producer Outreach

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

.....

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Reduce conflicts in the Upper Green by at least 50%.
Retirement of sheep allotments in the Wyoming Range.

.....

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Require more conflict prevention measures in the Upper Green rather than just continually increasing the incidental take of grizzly bears. Institute the pilot projects that BTNF biologists recommended years ago to reduce conflicts, which were not tried/implemented.

Actively seek retirement of sheep allotments in the Wyoming Range - excellent grizzly bear habitat that should be in the DMA.

Anything else you would like organizers to know?

Anything else?

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

YES October 29, 2020 Virtual Conflict Reduction Workshop Public Input Form

Public input on "Recommendations for reducing bear-human conflicts and grizzly bear mortalities in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, 7/19/20", http://igbconline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_7_YES_MortReductionRecom_FINAL.pdf

Your Name / Affiliation (optional)

Jocelyn Leroux- Western Watersheds Project

Do you have any clarifying questions for the Tech Team about their Recommendations report?

- 1) The report states that the agencies have been largely unsuccessful in identifying strategies to reduce livestock depredation on large public lands grazing allotments, yet page 17 lists several ways agencies have worked with producers to reduce the risk of conflict. In particular, electric fence for sheep bedding, and range riders trained to keep livestock together and detect signs of depredation. Why then, are these actions not included specifically under agency recommendations?
- 2) Can the committee explain why the recommendations for reducing livestock-grizzly conflicts center on voluntary measures? In a presentation to the MT Grizzly Bear Advisory Committee presenters Garth Mowat of British Columbia and Larry VanDale of Alaska said that livestock producers in those places are not compensated for the loss of livestock, but that losing livestock to grizzly bears is simply a part of doing business where grizzly bears are, and that livestock producers have instead had to alter their animal husbandry practices to reduce livestock losses to grizzlies. Can the committee explain how effective they anticipate livestock producers to be in implementing voluntary conflict prevention measures? Why has the committee not evaluated livestock husbandry techniques employed in places such as British Columbia?
- 3) Can the committee discuss why requiring human presence and regular producer checks on livestock allotments within grizzly habitat (particularly the DMA where most conflict occurs) was not considered in this report and offered as a recommendation? For livestock carcasses to be removed and not act as attractants, they must be found quickly and there is no way for this to happen without regular human presence and herd monitoring.
- 4) Can the committee please describe what the report means by "giving producers more flexibility within grazing permits to address conflict?" And can the committee explain why this recommendation was given more weight over a recommendation to require specific nonlethal conflict prevention measures as terms and conditions on public lands livestock grazing permits?
- 5) If prevention is really to be prioritized over reactive management, why are the agencies not looking into groups such as the Blackfoot Challenge who have had great success at reducing livestock-grizzly bear conflict?

Backcountry and Hunting Related Conflicts

Front Country Conflicts and Community Planning

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

.....

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

.....

Livestock Conflicts and Producer Outreach

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

.....

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

No grizzlies killed for livestock conflicts on public lands

.....

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Close livestock grazing allotments within the recovery zone and the DMA, require nonlethal deterrence measures such as range riding and electric fencing on all livestock grazing allotments within grizzly bear habitat.

.....

Anything else you would like organizers to know?

Anything else?

.....

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

YES October 29, 2020 Virtual Conflict Reduction Workshop Public Input Form

Public input on "Recommendations for reducing bear-human conflicts and grizzly bear mortalities in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, 7/19/20", http://igbconline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_7_YES_MortReductionRecom_FINAL.pdf

Your Name / Affiliation (optional)

Josh Osher / Western Watersheds Project

Do you have any clarifying questions for the Tech Team about their Recommendations report?

I have two specific issues I would like the Committee to address in the upcoming meeting. Both are related to the same general concept: The failure of the Committee to Recommend actions that have been proven effective in reducing grizzly/human conflicts and thereby reducing grizzly mortality.

First on the issue of livestock grazing, both the data sets relating to conflict and narrative presented in the report paint a clear picture about what works best to reduce grizzly/livestock interactions on public lands. The answer is the removal of livestock and particularly the change in class of livestock from sheep to cattle, particularly steers instead of cow/calf. The number 1 reason that there have been only two livestock conflicts in the RZ from 2009-2018 is the that here are very few livestock remaining, especially those that present a high risk for conflict. And as the report indicates, "Most of these actions over the past 15 years were the result of 3rd party transactions, in which non-agency affiliated groups have provided financial compensation to permittees who agreed to waive their grazing permits back to the USFS."

However, even though voluntary permit retirement is by far the most effective means of reducing conflict, it is not mentioned anywhere in the recommendations for future actions. As a member of the public who has brought up this issue numerous times over many IGBC meetings during the public comment, I was also surprised to not see any mention of permit retirement in the public recommendations section. I wasn't able to attend the meeting in Cody but this information and my advocacy for it are well know by the Committee members. Aside for that, it is still a glaring omission from the committee. It would be like telling people that they should avoid head injuries while riding a bicycle by checking their tire pressure and being careful when crossing streets rather than wearing a helmet.

Given that the highest rate of grizzly mortality is related to livestock conflict outside of the RZ but in the DMA and that the vast majority are still occurring on public lands, it would seem obvious that the Committee would look to what worked inside the RZ for solutions. No other category of mortality has such a sharp contrast and there would be no easier solution to the problems. This is especially true since permit retirement is a voluntary option that is paid for by private funds. Instead of promoting solutions, unfortunately, the FS Supervisors on the Committee are actively pursuing strategies to undermine permit retirement or claim to have their hands tied on the issue. The former is simply shameful, the latter is an excuse that simply doesn't hold water given the broad discretion allowed to each forest to determine whether or not to permit livestock grazing and under what conditions.

The second issue is similar in nature. The report clearly indicates in both the backcountry/hunter and front country and community planning discussions that regulations and area closures are the some of the most effective means of reducing conflicts. Yet except for a brief nod to enforcement of sanitation orders and support of new ones, there is nothing in the Committee's recommendations about effective regulatory actions. I am well aware of the climate we now live in and the current administration's desire to remove rather than create new regulations but the truth lies in the numbers and the experiences of what works and what doesn't. In general, regulation work to reduce conflicts and less bears die.

Most of the Committee's members are senior level land managers and are actively involved in planning efforts and permitting decisions. Yet rather than developing plans and approving actions to reduce conflict, there seems to be more and more efforts at increasing permitted uses of public lands that are known to increase conflicts and an overall antipathy to mandatory orders and regulations.

Please consider these comments as you proceed through this exercise and take a hard look at why the best tools available are off the table. If it's the politics of the day then it's really time to examine the value of this effort and the Committee in general.

Sincerely,

Josh Osher

Backcountry and Hunting Related Conflicts

Front Country Conflicts and Community Planning

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Livestock Conflicts and Producer Outreach

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Voluntary permit retirement is by far the most successful tool that has been employed to reduce livestock conflict and requires no federal funding

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

.....

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Make it clear that the FS and BLM will not reauthorize grazing allotments that have been voluntarily waived by the permittee and that the reason is to serve the goals of the agency to protect grizzly bear habitat.

.....

Anything else you would like organizers to know?

Anything else?

.....

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

YES October 29, 2020 Virtual Conflict Reduction Workshop Public Input Form

Public input on "Recommendations for reducing bear-human conflicts and grizzly bear mortalities in the Yellowstone Ecosystem, 7/19/20", http://igbconline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_7_YES_MortReductionRecom_FINAL.pdf

Your Name / Affiliation (optional)

Kristin Combs, Wyoming Wildlife Advocates

Do you have any clarifying questions for the Tech Team about their Recommendations report?

1. The report states, "As grizzly bear numbers increase and their range continues to expand well beyond the DMA, it may not be possible to reduce the number of bear mortalities and human-caused grizzly bear mortalities are expected with a recovered population."

This is a very pessimistic way to approach this issue. Communities are indeed being successful at preventing and reducing conflicts and improving every day. It can be done. We should be striving to coexist with very limited conflicts as the end goal here. Recovered grizzly populations living alongside humans with minimal conflicts.

2. The goal of these recommendations is to ensure that grizzly bear mortalities continue to be managed within the established limits inside the DMA and that efforts continue to minimize human bear conflicts throughout the GYE.

These limits need to be for all territory of the states, not just within the DMA. With grizzlies expanding their range, we cannot ignore or discount the bears outside of the DMA.

3. Considering, "Central to this has been outreach efforts by state, federal, and tribal (Wind River Reservation) agencies to inform hunters and other backcountry users on how to minimize conflicts with bears" has been somewhat ineffective (with conflicts increasing), what threshold of conflicts will need to be reached before regulations are enacted? Including for all backcountry users – hikers and hunters included.

4. Can "provided portable electric fencing and grain storage containers to outfitters" be a requirement for all outfitter camps operating on public lands – both BLM and USFS?

5. The report states, "although there are inconsistencies across forests and ranger districts in how these are applied (particularly within designated wilderness)."

What efforts will be made to streamline and make this process uniform across agencies?

6. "YNP has designated 16 Bear Management Areas encompassing 12 464,638 acres (21% of YNP) of the highest quality bear habitat within the park, where recreational activity is closed or access restricted on a seasonal basis. Bear Management Area designation reduces habituation, human-bear encounters, and human-bear conflicts by limiting recreational access to important high quality bear habitat during the seasons the habitat is most critical to grizzly bears."

How can this be used in areas such as connectivity corridors to reduce conflicts outside of the RZ and DMA? As stated, "Collectively, these actions have been highly successful at reducing the number of human caused grizzly bear mortalities in backcountry areas on NPS lands." If this has been proven successful, shouldn't agencies be looking to use this in other areas where it can be? A sort of gold standard of how to effectively reduce conflicts? Recommendation 6 for hunting and backcountry regulations only states that parks will further use these methods. Shouldn't this be for all agencies?

7. If a prohibition on bear baiting was suggested by the public, why isn't this being considered for future recommendations? We are taking great efforts to reduce the chance of grizzlies obtaining human food but then allowing bear baiting in occupied grizzly territory?

8. The report stated, "On most private lands inside the GYE, there are no sanitation regulations requiring that attractants be stored so they are unavailable to bears." Teton County Wyoming is one place that is cited as having some regulations in place, but these still are not sufficient enough and we see conflicts each year

with black bears mostly involved and being killed as a result. Why aren't more regulations being considered? If we know that bear-proof containers are successful at preventing conflicts, what is the major barrier to requiring them in all places occupied (or with the potential to be occupied) by grizzlies? We've heard that cost is a factor, but NGOs could help with this.

What has the enforcement been like in places where regulations for sanitation already exist?

9. What can be done to increase the efficacy of livestock carcass removal on large landscapes? Is this being considered? Why or why not? What can be done to improve this?

10. The report states, "there have been significant changes in grazing allotment management on USFS lands in the GYE which have generally resulted in fewer domestic sheep and cattle grazing on public lands and fewer allotments. Over the past 10-15 years, several domestic sheep allotments inside the DMA with chronic grizzly bear conflict histories have been vacated, closed, or converted to cattle grazing." Considering this has been successful, why isn't this within the recommendations? Retiring these allotments could go a long way, especially in connectivity corridors, to preventing future livestock-grizzly conflicts.

11. The recommendations for reducing livestock conflicts are pretty sparse and mostly rely upon voluntary measures from producers. What else can be done to be more proactive in preventing conflicts? For example, if retiring grazing allotments has been effective in the past, why wouldn't agencies promote that as a solution? If range riders and human presence has also been effective, shouldn't efforts for more effective range riders be promoted with funding available? Also, what can be done to ensure that producers who are using effective techniques (such as the Bean Ranch in Idaho) can communicate and share that information with producers in other states? How can agencies be more involved in the sharing of information among producers?

12. Why is the Forest Service entertaining the idea of restocking allotments that were bought out, especially in Wyoming? If we know that this has been effective in reducing conflicts – especially with sheep – why would this even be considered in grizzly territory?

13. How will the public continue to be meaningfully engaged in this process moving forward? Will comments be incorporated into future recommendations and plans?

Backcountry and Hunting Related Conflicts

Front Country Conflicts and Community Planning

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Many communities with black bears (i.e., Colorado, Lake Tahoe, FL) have successful programs for bear-proof sanitation. NGOs and agencies have contributed to funding.

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

A 50% reduction in garbage and attractant related conflicts in all counties occupied by grizzlies.

25% of communities in cities without grizzly bears currently occupying the region to be prepared with securing of attractants and bear-proof garbage.

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Increased public awareness, regulations, and enforcement.

Livestock Conflicts and Producer Outreach

Please share current successes that address the recommendation and who is involved (and if funding is needed, how that has been achieved).

Individual livestock producers taking on accountability and conflict prevention methods. Bar B Ranch in Montana, Cloudy Ridge Ranch in Alberta, etc. Innovative livestock training methods (herding, reducing fear in livestock, etc.) Funding from livestock producers supported by state and federal agencies.

Can you suggest goals for this recommendation that are achievable over a five year period?

At least 75% of producers implementing non-lethal methods and/or trying out different procedures.

Can you suggest specific actions to meet the recommendation and goal?

Workshops to share information among producers. No compensation without non-lethal techniques being implemented first.

Anything else you would like organizers to know?

Anything else?

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms