IGBC MISSION

1. Achieve recovery and delisting.

2. Support ongoing conservation of grizzly bear populations and their habitats after delisting.

**Geographic scope:** Areas of the western United States

**Approach:** Interagency coordination of policy, planning, management, research and communication.
If you always do what you’ve always done, you will always get what you got.”

Henry Ford
What is Broken?

Grizzly bears populations are rewriting the recovery plans every day

• Change and adaptation is already happening in IGBC
• Bears are expanding far beyond the administrative lines
• Bears are moving between ecosystems
• BMUs in some ecosystems are too small to allow for recovery
• Science consistency between ecosystems is missing
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Change is Already Happening

IEO committee has a range wide group
Selkirk and Cabinet Yaak ecosystems are one subcommittee

- It was recognized that bear information was the same across the range
- Bears get in the same trouble everywhere
- Limited budgets and staff and needed to be utilized to the maximum extent
- Their efforts are making a difference all the boundaries and beyond
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Bear are expanding beyond Administrative boundaries

- Land management agencies
- State wildlife agencies
- The public

- More bears in more places
- NCDE: Bears are continually moving east into new territory
- GYE: Bears are expanding to the south into Wyoming and moving north into the Big Holes
- SCY: Bears are expanding into the Kootenai Valley and beyond
The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, in close coordination with state and federal partners, has developed a methodology for the grizzly bear “may be present” map to meet requirements under Section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). “May be present” maps help federal agencies determine where effects to listed species should be considered for consultation from actions they carry out, fund, or permit. As grizzly bears expand their range, the methodology will include additional areas based on the most current scientific information. The map above provides a visual representation of the grizzly bear habitat distribution.
Science consistency between ecosystems

Populations estimation different for several ecosystems

Original bear management units need to be modified in some ecosystems

- It was recognized that bear information was the same across the range
- Bears get in the same trouble everywhere
- Limited budgets and staff needed to be utilized to the maximum extent
- Their efforts are making a difference all the boundaries and beyond
Abundance Estimation

- GYE- Choa2- Aerial and Ground observations and data- USGS
- NCDE- Genetic Mark recapture with annual monitoring- MFWP
- Selkirk/Cabinet Yaak - Different than the others- USFWS

- We need consistency of how we estimate bears
  - Different agencies
  - Different techniques
  - “where’s waldo” for wide-ranging bears
We need to have comparable sized BMUs
So what does that mean for bears

If recovery and delisting of grizzly bears in the range is the objective—
We need to do better

People are the key to bear recovery

• People are the reason for the successes
• People will continue to shape the future of bear recovery
• People are struggling to coexist with bears in some areas
• Change could help people and bears
• Distinguish ESA recovery and state management of delisted population (risk of eroding public support if ESA recovery appears to keep moving goalposts and is unattainable)

Bears are telling us things have changed

• We cannot rest on what we thought recovery would look like 30 years ago
• Bears are expanding their range annually
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Achieve the IGBC Purpose & Mission –

Why Change the Multiple “Ecosystem” Organizational Structure

1. Reduce needless duplication of effort in current “ecosystem” approach
2. Prioritize available resources to support more effective conservation
3. Capitalize on untapped potential for interagency coordination
4. Maximize knowledge sharing for planning, management, research, and communication/education
5. Address 9th Circuit ruling regarding “remnant analysis” more effectively
6. Acknowledge that “ecosystem” boundaries are not distinct ecosystems
So what are our options?

Three basic paths forward

1. Status Quo
2. Conservation Teams
3. Hybrid
Conservation Teams

We can do better

• Realign subcommittees to focus on the 5 primary bear recovery tasks
  • Population Monitoring
  • Habitat Management
  • Conflict Management
  • Information & Education
  • Research (IGBST+)

• Change the administrative ecosystem boundaries

• Maintain involvement of area specific participation

• Pros
  • Benefit those outside the current lines
  • Would increase communication
  • Would encourage broader consistency
  • Would eliminate some redundancies
  • Would maximize budgets

• Cons
  • Could reduce local engagement by shareholders
  • Could force some staff to be on multiple teams
The Hybrid Concept

Adaptation is the key

- Expand the overarching group to a range wide focus
  - IEO
  - Research (IGBST)
  - Conflict

- Maintain the ecosystem subcommittees for local decision making, coordination, communication and maintaining partnerships
  - Habitat
  - Population monitoring

- Change the administrative ecosystem boundaries

- Pros
  - It will maintain local communication and coordination
  - Will increase coordinated range wide efforts
  - Will promote consistent work across the range
  - Will be inclusive and representative of the range for both the public and people who manage the land and bears

- Cons
  - Could cause more meetings for some people