

Grizzly & Threatened Species

1966 - Documentary film - Natl. Geog. lecture
Research initiated in 1959 Sound track

Reasons - increasing recreational use of grizzly habitat
& of Parks.

Decline throughout their range

None left in Calif. by 1924

Decline of Yellowstone pop. in 1968 - $\frac{1}{2}$ by 1974

Endangered species Act of 1973

Protects species

Defines critical habitat - creates problems

History of ecosystem and regional pop. extinction

1967 - 245 pop 1974 - 136

Mortality - 128 - 1970 thru 1972

Statement

*Wording of Section 7 act (End. Share's Act) or based
Pop. estimate 1959-67 period*

Pop. estimate 1959-67 period

No of consensus (ref).

High mortality

reduced reprod. rate

1974 pop. estimate

Concentration 1967

Greater dispersion

Few sightings - no scientific pop. figures

no independent research

Lack of info.

Yellowstone ecosystem

Critical Habitat

У. Н. Р.

Y. N. P.
Surrounding wilderness area



University of Montana

Missoula, Montana 59801

(406) 243-0211

[Faint, illegible handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]

Endangered Species Act of 1973

Purposes - The purposes of this Act are to provide a means whereby the ecosystems upon which endangered species and threatened species depend may be conserved, to provide a program for the preservation conservation of such endangered species and threatened species, and to take such steps as may be appropriate to achieve the purposes of the treaties and conventions set forth in subsection (a) of this section.

Notice on Critical Habitat

the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the Natl. Marine Fisheries Service will be proposing areas to be designated by rulemaking to be "critical habitat" for such species.
Rulemaking procedure - notifying Governors & publishing in the Federal Register.

Section 7

all federal agencies should insure that actions authorized, funded, or carried out by them do not jeopardize the continued existence of such endangered species and threatened species or result in the destruction or modification of habitat of such species which is determined by the Secretary after consultation as appropriate with the affected State, to be critical



University of Montana
Missoula, Montana 59801

(406) 243-0211

H.W. Jr. definition

"Critical Habitat" — any land, air or water area determined to be essential to the survival of wild populations of a listed species or to its recovery to a point at which the measures are no longer necessary.

Wilderness Act. A wilderness area is to be protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions
ie: grizzly & grizzly habitat

No 4 1976
CONGRESSIONAL HEARING ON CRITICAL HABITAT FOR GRIZZLY BEAR
COMMENTS BY W. E. VEHNEKAMP ON BEHALF OF THE WYOMING WILDLIFE FEDERATION

A petition was filed by an organization known as "Funds for Animals, Inc.", to classify the Grizzly Bear as an endangered specie on March 25, 1974. On June 17, 1974, Wyoming Governor, Stanley Hathaway and James White, Director of our Game and Fish Department submitted a petition, vigorously opposing the classification of the Grizzly Bear as an Endangered Species.

On May of 1975, the U. S. Department of Interior; then, did classify the Grizzly Bear as a "Threatened Species." Again Mr. White virorously opposed this classification.

At the time they were classified, Wyoming in 1974 and Idaho in 1946, had already declared a moratorium on the hunting of Grizzly Bears, until the "Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team" had completed their study, which would have been in 1979. Montana was still hunting Grizzlies, but not in the areas surrounding Yellowstone Park and I might say they still are in one area. They may take up to 25 per year.

Prior to the time of classifying the Grizzly Bear as a "Threatened Species", the Department of Interior received letters from Idaho, Washington, Utah, Montana and Wyoming Game and Fish Departments and the U. S. Forest Service, Western Association of State Game & Fish Commissions; again vigorously opposing the classifying of the Grizzly Bear as a "Threatened Species."

To solve the Craighead and Yellowstone Park dispute on the Grizzlies in Yellowstone, a committee was formed called Committee on the Yellowstone Grizzlies. This committee was to evaluate all of the records and other reports and make recommendations on management of the Grizzly Bears. The conclusion in the Craighead report, and I quote, "A moratorium on the Grizzlies is not supported by the facts of our study. The Grizzly must be hunted and harvested outside of the sanctuaries, or; like other species, it will in time over populate its habitat, move into intensive land-use areas, and re-create the very problem that brought about its decline." unquote.

The conclusion of the Committee on the Yellowstone Grizzlies, and I quote, "We recommend that, beginning in 1974, the total of man caused removals should be held to about 10." unquote This would be in Idaho, Montana and Wyoming; again, it was not recommended that the Grizzly Bear be classified as a "Threatened Species."

I might point out that during the Craighead research in Yellowstone Park, - 1959 - 1966; the population grew from 154 bears in 1959 to 202 bears in 1966. These numbers are actual count from six populated areas by actual count of identifiable bears by tag or certain markings.

In all of the reports that I have read from various agencies and individuals, not anywhere, do I find a recommendation that would indicate that they should be classified as a "Threatened Species"; actually, they strongly oppose the classification.

Had they not been classified as a "Threatened Species", as recommended by the various agencies and individuals; who so vigorously opposed the classification; there would be no need for a classification of a Critical Habitat outside of Yellowstone Park.

After reading Glen Cole's report, 1970 - 1975, regarding Grizzly Bear Management in Yellowstone Park; I would strongly support, that Yellowstone Park be designated as a Critical Habitat. Mr. Cole reports that there were 792 Grizzlies sighted in 1970 and Dr. Craighead reports 202 in 1966, which is a tremendous growth in a period of four years, which I do not believe. He also reports a decline from 1970 to 1975 of 571 Grizzlies on a population of 221 bears. Going back to the Craighead report, and from 1925 thru 1958, and these are estimates by Yellowstone Park personnel, Grizzlies were at a maximum of 320 in 1941 and a minimum of 75 in 1925. In view of Mr. Coles report, if it is correct, there is a great need to evaluate their control measures, if they lost or destroyed 571 Grizzlies in five years. In the same report, they only show 159 Grizzlies lost or destroyed. What happened to the other 412 Grizzlies that they show in 1970, in this report?

I would suggest to you, that Mr. Coles report does not have any factual data to back up his report.

In the area that you are describing in your purposed "Critical Habitat," which encompasses most all of the Shoshone and Teton National Forests in Wyoming; there are many activities, such as mining, logging, outfitting, cattle and sheep grazing, recreational activities and private land.

On page 5 of the Guidelines to Assist Federal Agencies, and in complying with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 - under paragraph (A) Quote - Constituent elements of Critical Habitat include human activity. The preceding statement would mean to me; that human activity, could and maybe would, be prohibited. Page 10 of the same report - paragraph (2) would also mean to me, that the Forest Service or the B L M could not issue any permits for cattle, sheep grazing or any other permits, which they now do; if in their opinion, it would conflict with Grizzlies, if these proposed areas are listed as Critical Habitat.

Mr. Curtis Bohlen, Acting Assistant Secretary for the Fish and Wildlife and Parks, has indicated that it will not stop human activity in these areas. This would be in conflict with the Guidelines, as written. Does Mr. Bohlen have the authority to change the guidelines of Section 7 to fit the need of the Department of Fish and Wildlife? If so, what assurance do we have that human activity would not be prohibited? NONE.

Yellowstone Park was established in 1872. Hunting was permitted without supervision or regulation until 1886. Since that time you could say that Yellowstone Park has been a Critical Habitat for all animals within the Park.

If there is a shortage of Grizzlies and Black Bears, and I firmly believe there is an acute shortage of bears in Yellowstone; it is a shortage created by the Department of Interior and Park Personnel.

Until the Park Personnel refrains from destroying the bears, there will be a shortage. It is a known fact, that after Glen Cole was transferred to Yellowstone Park

the word was passed to the rangers, for them to take care of their problem Grizzlies at a local level, in their own way that Park Superintendent Anderson, did not want to hear about it at Park Head quarters.

I am trying to put together facts why the Yellowstone Park does not have a great many bears and why the Critical Habitat should not be confined to Yellowstone Park boundaries.

We, in Wyoming, and I am referring to the many hikers, sportsmen and Game & Fish personnel, who have sited Grizzly Bears surrounding Yellowstone, do not believe there is a shortage of Grizzlies. Since 1966 in fact, we believe there is an increase. For four years they have not been hunted and for six years, only on a very restricted basis, due to the good judgement of our Game and Fish Department.

Much of the area that you have in your Critical Habitat Proposal is already classified as Wilderness area and according to the Wilderness Act, nothing can be done in these areas that would be detrimental to the habitat for the Grizzly Bear. Many of the other portions of the proposal are inhabited by people and are on private lands and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife people have not biologically said what is required for Critical Habitat and to my knowledge the U.S. Fish & Wildlife have not investigated the areas involved, as to its suitability for Critical Habitat. What is a viable population in this proposed Critical Habitat?, also in Yellowstone Park? What has the U.S. Fish & Wildlife done in Yellowstone Park to maintain a population of Grizzlies? According to my information it is the responsibility of the U. S. Fish & Wildlife to conduct research on any wildlife, in Yellowstone Park and since you have classified the Grizzly a Threatened Species and are now trying to classify Critical Habitat; it seems that it would be imperative to have started a research and scientific study team, to find out what is biologically needed for Habitat and to find out why you don't have a bear population within the Park.

I have lived in Wyoming 45 years, I have been in and around Cody for 30 years, I have worked and lived in the back country and near Yellowstone Park about 20 years and have been in constant contact with people who work in the back country and with all of the information that I can get there is not a decrease in the Grizzly population outside of Yellowstone; if anything it has increased to some degree in the past 10 years.

I have been particularly interested in the Grizzly for the past 10 years and have read many reports and been to many meetings in regards to Grizzly Bears. As yet, I have not seen or heard anything that says the Grizzly Bear is near extinction or in need of a Critical Habitat outside of Yellowstone.

Actually everyone and every report that I have seen, opposed the Grizzly being classified as Threatened.

It seems that since the Yellowstone Park people, with the help of U.S. Fish & Wildlife; both part of the Department of Interior cannot control and successfully manage the bears in Yellowstone Park, that they, should be the last people, to tell Wyoming, Montana or Idaho Game and Fish Department personnel, how to manage their game by first classifying the Grizzly Bear as Threatened and now trying to create a Critical Habitat for the Grizzly without knowing what biologically constitutes critical habitat.

It seems that all biological needs of the Grizzly are discounted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and as I said before in a letter to Mr. Schreiner on August 17th that political influences are paramount.

In conclusion, you will note that I have used the Yellowstone Park area many times in this presentation. Primarily, because they should use the U. S. Fish & Wildlife for research, according to legislation enacted by Congress many years ago, which conferred primary jurisdiction upon the U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service for all Wildlife research within the Park.

As yet, I haven't heard of any research conducted by

Habitat on Yellowstone Park. They do know that the area outside of Yellowstone, is occupied habitat, because sportsmen, our own game department, and Forest Service personnel have told of sighting Grizzlies in these areas.

They have not used the expertise of the various agencies, as they have implied in their correspondence. If they had, the Grizzly would not have been classified as Threatened and there would not now be a need to classify an area as Critical Habitat outside of the boundaries of Yellowstone Park.

On August 14, 1976; Dr. Frank Craighead said and I quote "A Habitat Bumper Zone is not needed around Yellowstone Park," unquote.

I as, Vice-President of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation, vigorously oppose any classification of Critical Habitat for the Grizzly Bear at this time or in the future outside of the Boundries of Yellowstone Park.

I would recommend to the U. S. Fish and Wildlife that they immediatly, allocate funds and initiate an inter-agency co-operative scientific study, using qualified people from the U. S. Forest Service; Idaho, Montana and Wyoming Game & Fish Biologists and U. S. Fish & Wildlife personnel. I would also suggest that these people be accountable to an independent body of people, such as the Academy of Science, so that the recommendations that come from this study will be in the interest of good sound game management.

I would also recommend to you that the Grizzly Bears future be returned to the expertise of the Game Managers of each state who are much more qualified for the management of the Bear and his future.

I have been told by one of my connections in Washington, who has visited with the U. S. Fish & Wildlife people, that the U. S. Fish & Wildlife people were not interested in the wants and needs of the people of Wyoming on the Grizzlies and that there was going to be a "Critical Habitat," without study of the Grizzly on habitat; wheather it was needed or not.

Thank you.

1134 Longworth Bldg.
Wash. D.C. 20575-

Box 156
Moose, Wyoming 83012
September 29, 1976

Congressman Teno Roncalio
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Teno:

I'm looking forward to participating in the hearings on the critical grizzly bear habitat to be held in Jackson, Wyoming. So far, I have not heard whether a date for this meeting has been set. I will be away from the valley most of the time during the last half of October, and I will be away on a lecture trip to the East from October 28 through about November 20. I hope that I will not miss this hearing; perhaps if it is set during the time that I'm away, I can fly back or send in a written statement. However, I would much prefer to be here. Wishing you the best of luck in November.

Sincerely,

Frank Craighead

FCC:rm

June 26, 1976

The Honorable Teno Roncalio
Congressman for Wyoming
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Teno:

I received information from Chuck Strage of your office concerning the grizzly bear critical habitat designation and information on endangered species. I fully agree that the decision on critical habitat should be delayed until public meetings can be held in Wyoming. I personally have had no input in regard to this subject and would like to express my views on some points. I've taken a quick look at the unofficial map of critical habitat. I certainly would express doubts as to whether the area south of the Dubois highway should be included. The Cook City area should definitely be included, all of Yellowstone Park, and also a buffer strip along the northern and western borders of Yellowstone.

The reason that the grizzly has reached a point where it has had to be classified as a threatened species in the Yellowstone ecosystem is not directly related to critical habitat. It has come about as a result of mis-management of the grizzly bears, particularly by the National Park Service. Although the idea of a cooperative research and management program with the grizzly has been accepted, it is not being carried out entirely in practice. There is still a need for contributions in both research and management by independent scientists.

I'm leaving for Alaska July first, and will be working on a research project, "The Satellite Tracking of Migratory Birds". This holds great promise and is also a very interesting project. I hope that some of the hearings will still be in progress so that I can attend upon my return in mid-August. If I can be of assistance to you and your staff in regard to the present situation of the grizzly bear, or contribute to the critical habitat analysis, I would be glad to do so.

Sincerely,

Frank C. Craighead, Jr.

FCC/ps

DEPARTMENT of the INTERIOR

news release

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

For Release November 12, 1976

McGarvey 202/343-5634

GRIZZLY BEAR CRITICAL HABITAT PROPOSED

Approximately 20,000 square miles in Idaho, Washington, Montana, and Wyoming have been proposed for listing as critical habitat for the grizzly bear, a threatened species, the Interior Department's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service announced recently in the Federal Register.

Public comments addressed to the Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 20240, are invited through February 9, 1977.

The November 5, 1976, Federal Register notice of these hearings was in error. The correct dates of the public hearings are as listed below:

<u>Date and Time</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Contact</u>
Dec. 8, 1976 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. 7 p.m. to 9 p.m.	Cody, Wyoming Municipal Auditorium	John Davis U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service P.O. Box 25486 Denver Federal Center Denver, Colorado 80225 Phone: 303/234-4600
Dec. 10, 1976 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. 7 p.m. to 9 p.m.	Missoula, Montana University Center Ballroom, University of Montana	(Same as above.)
Dec. 14, 1976 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. 7 p.m. to 9 p.m.	St. Anthony, Idaho South Freemont High School Auditorium	Philip A. Lehenbauer U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service P.O. Box 3737 Portland, Oregon 97208 Phone: 503/429-4041
Dec. 17, 1976 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.	Washington, D.C. Department of the Interior, South Auditorium	Robert Jacobsen Office of Endangered Species U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Washington, D.C. 20240 Phone: 202/343-5687

(over)

The Service is proposing that the areas delineated below be determined as critical habitat. These areas actually merge to form four zones of about 13 million acres which are located in:

(1) The region where Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho come together, in Yellowstone National Park and adjacent areas, including parts of Custer, Shoshone, Teton, Targhee, Beaverhead, and Gallatin National Forests, and part of Grand Teton National Park.

(2) Northwestern Montana, in Glacier National Park, the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, most of the Flathead National Forest, and adjacent areas, including parts of the Lewis and Clark, Helena, and Lolo National Forests, and small parts of the Blackfeet and Flathead Indian Reservations;

(3) Extreme northwestern Montana and northern Idaho, in the Cabinet Mountains, mostly in the Kootenai, Kaniksu, and Lolo National Forests; and

(4) Extreme northern Idaho and northeastern Washington, mostly in the Kaniksu National Forest.

These areas coincide approximately with the present regular distribution of the grizzly bear in the 48 conterminous States, and are the only remnants of the original range of the species which once covered a region approximately 50 times as great, from Canada to Mexico, and from the Great Plains to the Pacific. These areas contain the only significant grizzly populations south of Canada, and, insofar as is known, provide all biological, physical, and behavioral requirements of those populations. Among the important characteristics of these areas is their relative inaccessibility and lack of the kinds of human developments and activities that tend to result in conflicts between the bears and man. This degree of isolation and freedom from excessive human presence seems critical to the survival of the grizzly. It is true that there are many natural or man-made sites scattered over these areas that are seldom or never utilized by the grizzly bear. It would not be possible, however, to attempt to identify all of these sites and exclude them from the overall designation, the Service said.

There has been widespread and erroneous belief that a critical habitat designation is something akin to establishment of a wilderness area or wildlife refuge, and automatically closes an area to most human uses. Actually, a critical habitat designation applies only to Federal agencies. It is essentially an official notification to the agencies that the Endangered Species Act requires them to insure that their activities in a critical habitat area do not jeopardize endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or modification of the habitat.

X X X

Box 156
Moose, Wyoming 83012
October 25, 1976

The Honorable Gale McGee
U. S. Senator
U. S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator McGee:

I appreciate your letter informing me of the public hearing to be conducted in Cody November 4th. Unfortunately, I have a lecture commitment in Albany at the State University of New York on the evening of November 4. Regretfully I will be unable to attend this meeting. However, I am enclosing a letter from a former Ranger, Mr. Harry Reynolds, Jr., that I would like to see incorporated into the record of this public hearing. He has given his approval and your aide Arthur Eck plans to corroborate this. The letter provides information helpful in understanding the grizzly Bear management situation as it has deteriorated in Yellowstone National Park since 1967. Coverups, lack of trained personnel for managing some of our most unique natural resources, lack of personal and official integrity and misuse of power are all part of the problem.

Since the destruction and general appropriation of the grizzly bear research program that my brother, Dr. John J. Craighead, and I developed and carried out from 1959 to 1968, there has been no independent research on this subject in the Yellowstone ecosystem, specifically in Yellowstone National Park. At the Denver North American Wildlife meetings in late March and early April, 1974, there was a meeting of an interagency committee on revitalization of the grizzly bear study team. At this time a Sierra Club member asked Undersecretary Nat Reed whether independent research would be a part of the new team research program. The answer was that there was no way currently to add an independent biologist, and to this date none has been added. It is my opinion that the more sensitive and complex the problem, the more the need for independent researchers who are not biased by existing policy and by jurisdictional limitations and prerogatives.

Letter to Senator McGee:
October 25, 1976
Page Two

Critical habitat will apparently be treated at this meeting. It is a wise management step to delineate such habitat, but this is currently being used to draw attention from the real issue, which is the mismanagement of the Yellowstone grizzly. There will be no need for large expanses of grizzly habitat if there are no bears left. I seriously question whether anyone now involved in grizzly bear management knows the true figures on annual grizzly mortalities nor has even an approximate total population figure based on hard scientific data. With the facts that I have at my disposal I believe the population is low and still declining.

As to critical grizzly bear habitat, I'd like to study this in more depth than has been possible but most certainly all of Yellowstone National Park should be considered critical habitat as well as surrounding forest lands, an area of about five million acres designated as the Yellowstone ecosystem in the publication "A Population Analysis of The Yellowstone Grizzly Bears", 1975, Craighead, Varney and Craighead.

Sincerely,

Frank C. Craighead, Jr.
Senior Research Biologist, ASRC,
State University of New York, and
President of the Environmental
Research Institute, Moose, Wyoming

FCC:rm

Enclosure

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

October 20, 1976

Dr. Frank C. Craighead, Jr.
Post Office Box 156
Moose, Wyoming 83012

Dear Frank

Knowing of your interest in the management of grizzly bears, I would like to inform you that a public hearing will be conducted in Cody, Wyoming at 10 a.m. on November 4th at the Cody Civic Auditorium.

This hearing will examine all aspects of the grizzly bear management problem and will seek to acquire information from private citizens and public agencies. Should you wish to participate, I would suggest that you present your views in written form for the record, even though you may wish to present oral testimony.

If you cannot attend, please send any testimony that you wish to be included in the public record to my office in Washington. That address is: 344 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

Sincerely



GALE MCGEE
United States Senator

GM:jbt

QUESTIONS THAT MIGHT BE ASKED AT THE CODY GRIZZLY BEAR
MANAGEMENT MEETING SHOULD THE OCCASION ARISE:

1. Why is it necessary to now consider critical habitat for the grizzly bear when this was not considered necessary as far back as 1968? At that time, the grizzly population was doing well. Is it due to the recognition that grizzly bear numbers have declined throughout the Yellowstone ecosystem? If so, to what extent have they declined and what has been the major cause of this decline?

In 1968, the National Park Service Yellowstone Administration started their own grizzly bear management and research program. This was then further implemented by the Interagency Grizzly Bear Research Team organized in about 1973 or 4. At any rate, to date the National Park Service and federal and state agencies comprising the interagency team have had nine years in which to come up with population figures on the grizzly bears existing within the Yellowstone ecosystem and to support this with hard scientific data. In addition, this study has been amply funded to the tune of well over \$100,000 a year. The question then is with ample time and funds to gather essential population data on the grizzly, in turn necessary for any evaluation of critical habitat, what is the current grizzly bear population in terms of total figures, in terms of sex ratios and in terms of annual productivity and annual mortality? What approved scientific

methods have been used to gather such information and has it been presented to and scrutinized by the scientific community as has the Craighead data?

(Another question)

It is my understanding that there have been no independent researchers attached to this interagency team nor have the past researchers who conducted nine years of intensive grizzly bear research in Yellowstone been consulted in any way. At a meeting between March 31 and April 3, 1974, in Denver at the North American Wildlife Conference, there was a meeting held on revitalization of the interagency committee on grizzly bears. Studies were to be set up for management purposes and both state and federal participation was anticipated. At this meeting, a question was asked by Sierra Club representative regarding independent research on the grizzly bear in the Yellowstone ecosystem. Federal representatives, specifically Nat Reed, replied that there was no way currently to add an independent biologist and to date none have been included nor have any been encouraged to help or participate in this important research project. Such participation was recommended by the NPS Science Advisory Committee and the National Academy of Science in their grizzly bear report.

Is it anticipated in the near future that independent researchers, that is, those not attached to federal or state agencies, will have an opportunity to gather data simultaneously and in the same areas as interagency team members are working? If so, will any of this work be federally financed? It seems to me that to get the truth we need a cross section of both federal, state and independent scientists working freely on public lands to obtain data relative to problems affecting the grizzly bear management.

Could you outline briefly for me the history of the capture and subsequent releases and recaptures of grizzly bear #7155, the sow with cubs that seriously mauled a camper in Yellowstone this summer?

Questions to follow this are:

The bear was released in the area of Mariposa Lake. This is an area used by backpackers, trail riders and at that time trail crew members were present. To my knowledge the public was not informed of the release of this bear, a bear that posed a serious threat to those in the vicinity of the release area, to those in the path of her return to the Fishing Bridge area and to anyone camping out in the Lake or Fishing Bridge areas. In the Walker case, Judge Hawk in Federal District Court in Los Angeles ruled that the Park Service was negligent for not putting up signs and

informing the public of the danger of grizzly bears in the vicinity of Old Faithful developed areas. His statement was as follows: "Defendant failed to provide decedent and other Park visitors adequate warnings about the dangers posed by grizzly bears, which defendant knew to be dangerous animals within the Park". Why then was the public not informed of the several transplants and releases of this dangerous bear #7155?

Is it true that the blame for the attack on the camper Mr. Melvin Ford in the Fishing Bridge Campground August 16 was blamed on tourists who carelessly left out food. Is it not true that a fish trap was being operated on Pelican Creek approximately a mile from the Fishing Bridge Campgrounds during the period of high visitor use, July and the first week of August? This catching of fish, stripping them of eggs and the accumulation of carcasses and dead fish in the vicinity of the trap was an inducement to attract grizzlies to the area. The odor alone could have been picked up by grizzlies many miles away. Was consideration ever given to the fact that this operation may and did attract grizzlies to the area where there were campers. At the termination of this operation grizzlies previously attracted to the trap would move into nearby campgrounds? Why then was all the blame focused on the campers and tourists?

Oct. 26/76
F.C.C.

Mc Gee: Dudley Miles - Mc Gee's chief of staff on
concern over status of grizzly appropriations

Hansen: Tony Blumetto

Heich Steiner - FWS - Endangered Species

'73 Endangered Species Act

Threatened Species: can be taken for safety reasons,
predation, hunting by Montana law.

Sec. 7 applicable to federal agencies

FWS "cannot predict action of other federal agencies"

Draft proposal sent Aug. to "

will publish in Fed. Register. then 90
days. Then have hearings.

March or April will be final
action, based on best scientific
information available

Mc Gee:

You're putting hard on people who object. People
don't like you to say grizzly is threatened or
critical habitat needed when you're given
no proof.

Steiner: We determine it all on pure biological
basis, not political or anything else.

Fed. agencies

"Assume themselves" of rightness of action.

McGu: Your early statements, ^{in Aug.} were ambiguous about hearings. This hearing is to assure everyone of a voice.

Hansen: You say legally the Area would have no effect on F&G, etc. but wouldn't it affect them in other ways?

Steiner - Could be used in detrimental way. Have to be watched carefully.

John Moorman - Forest Service - Supervisor Shoshone representing Chief F.S. -

FS interested in grizzly habitat & has supported studies. (Border study team & intragery team)

FS is now proposing a study of critical lands in their forests. Section 7 is vague.

this Plan is Premature:

areas not studied

public has not been heard

population density not addressed
should be stated

two "excellent teams" now working
Bury Int. two have right to establish their areas.

Forest Service plan is too less land

All occupied area is not critical habitat. Forest Service would exclude many things too

Hansen: (what he was saying)

Dale Strickland - biologist Game & Fish

We urged FWS to cooperate in studies

Consider all other problems. Do not agree with Critical Habitat. Do not want bears only in YNP, but don't think Habitat necessary. Estimate in 1975 was 80 bears.

Designate: "That portion of Yellowstone lying within Wyo"
as
Critical Habitat
April 30, 1968 - Frank Craighead at G & F
174 grizzlies then. Advised hunting on trophies restricted bears. 1969. 1974 - no hunting now. } Committee objecting to population model. 1975 no known mortality

Mc Gee: (Stood up for Craighead.)

Bill Venneberg - Wyo. Wildlife Fed.

Petition 1974 - to classify grizzly as endangered

Opposed. Also opposed threatened.

Also opposed by states & forest service etc.

Committee on Yell. Grizzly recommendation
During research period 202 bears 1966.
Quotes Craighead studies ↗

Are bears
outside Yellowstone.

Cole report. 700 bears. I do not believe. Acute shortage
of 571 bears lost or destroyed by Park 1972-76
Cole has no factual data.

no assurance that FWS will

Until Park personnel quits killing bears, there
will be few bears. And no need for critical habitat
beyond Park.

What is population?

Dept of Int cannot manage their own bears
Why tell WFO what to do?

Political questions are paramount.

Frank "a buffer zone around VN 17 is not
needed" (speech or letter)

Recommends good study of present pop. by outside
agency.

DeGee: FWS must include in record their present
studies on bears & habitats

Rory Coleman:

no transfer of wildlife from state to fed. control
Rush study of 1937, elk had. None of his
recommendations were accepted.

(Got into elk reduction program.)

Park Service elk program terrible.

Quotes Craighead analysis & new Park program
ignored it. Quote NARS report properly.

Injuries since "new program" - have increased.
no numbers.

Park Service has made it endangered
if it is endangered.

Against wilderness in general.

Wants hearings before any law passed by fed. govt.

Jane Cooper - Cody Chamber of Commerce

Against designation as threatened & thus debated.

Recommend EIS by FWS

Jay Ward - Cody Sportsman's Club Pres.

to hear average belting in Wyo since 1914
apparent of dumps.

Quotes Cole's report.

145 killed '60-'73 by Park.

No FWS proven in Wyo for 2 yrs before
Threatened Species adopted.

Recommend removal from list of quizzies
Believe Park is belting Wyo's bears

Reuben Fuller - geologist, private citizen (geothermal energy)

Against all regulations.

Mentioned helicopter dropped bears in Sunlight Basin

Duke Hanson - Cody Lumber Co.

proper forest ought not hunting, bear

— — VP Dude Ranches Assoc.

Dept of Int. is hardly the agency to manage quizzies

Bob Small - Snowmobilers

Problem caused by mismanagement in YNP

letter to Nege from asst of FWS, "can't tell effect on other land users at this time"

John Townsley - NPS

PR speech first.

Offered free copies of Cole's report and Annual report of Interagency Team

Our beliefs
~~Perhaps omit the word~~

250 or more grizzlies

650 black bears

Defended management program

2000 injuries since park establishment

records of all bear sightings & activities
since 1970

Park people in last ten years have been
horrible, moral, integrity people.

Hansen - what is the carrying capacity for grizzlies

Townsley - don't know, but want it

Hansen - what percent can be removed without danger?

Townsley. He thinks 5%. None removed or killed
in 1975!

code
Arden Trusts - Illinois

For animals. Against bureaucracy.

John - a few remarks - put 32 pages in record.

Object to Shu Island's interpretation
of NAS report.

Mc Gee - applause to Craighead

Rick - Wind River Cattlemen's Assoc.

dotted-line section of proposed Critical Habitat
no grizzlies there in many years.

Bill Nielsen - spokesman for property owners.
Took a poll in Park Co:

increased area 19%

no increase 76%

Random system around State

increased " 50%

no increase 29%

undecided 21%

December 1 end of period to get something
into the record.

Senate Appropriations Committee
for copy of hearing

from the desk of

Robert W. Campbell

Oct. 26/76

Have Bob Campbell } To be
Judge Hank's court findings } returned
Reynolds letter }
Copy of letter to McGee
Foy's letter & brochure