15 July 75

Dear Frank:

You may find some things in this of interest.

Best wishes,

Steve

Hansen

MONTANA COOPERATIVE WILDLIFE RESEARCH UNIT

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
MONTANA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

MISSOULA, MONTANA 59801

July 23, 1975

Dr. Frank C. Craighead Jr.
P. O. Box 156
Moose, Wyoming 83012

Dear Frank:

Just a short note before I take off for the Scapegoat. I talked to Smoke Elser, and he is planning to come directly into our camp on August 2. If you can arrange to come in then, it will save you a long hike. It would be necessary for you to be here the night before. I suggest that you phone "Ginger" to get details and make a final check since Smoke has had to alter his schedule quite a bit this summer.

If you want to contact Smoke directly, his phone number is 549-2820.

I am enclosing a copy of my letter to Stephen Herrero. After reading his manuscript that will appear in the bear symposium, it is obvious that he contacted Cole and Martinka and he puts a lot of weight on the questionable data he gets from these people. I have tried to criticize his report as it relates to his summary of the NAS report and the situation with regard to injuries in Yellowstone. I wish I could have been a lot more implicit. It would be a great help if I could get the precise data that you computed to be in the campgrounds in 1972 versus the number in other years. This I think speaks for itself, and it also shows that the Park Service deliberately withheld critical information. If you haven't time to prepare or send me the information, perhaps you would take time to write Herrero and send it to him. I think it needs to get out; if Herrero would include it in his paper, it would greatly help our position. If he refuses to use is, we can later criticize his article and indicate that such information was made available to him but that he failed to use it.

I think Herrero tries to be fair and objective, but it is impossible to do so when he obtains practically all of his data from park records provided to him by Cole and Martinka.

Regards,

John

John J. Craighead, Leader
Mont. Coop. Wildl. Res. Unit

JJC:gs
Encl:

MONTANA COOPERATIVE WILDLIFE RESEARCH UNIT

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
MONTANA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

MISSOULA, MONTANA 59801

July 23, 1975

Dr. Stephen Herrero
Department of Biology
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4
Canada

Dear Steve:

Thank you for the copy of your manuscript. I find it very interesting, but I guess because of my experience with fraudulent data in our national parks I am skeptical of some of the data; however, I think it is a good thing to get it into the literature especially if the shortcomings of the data collecting system within the parks are mentioned. I think it is very obvious from the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as well as from the total testimony in the Walker case that a scientist can not rely on records provided by agencies that have a position to support. Steve, there are two points in your paper that I would like to comment on.

One is on page 11, where you cite me (personal communication) as reporting an incident where a female grizzly just recovering from drugging was charged and killed by an adult male. I have no such record, and I do not recall communicating this type of information to you. Perhaps you confused this with a report from some other colleague. I suggest that you delete the incident or change the citation.

On page 17, the middle of the page, you state that "the NAS did conclude that there was no convincing evidence that the grizzly bears in the Yellowstone ecosystem were in immediate danger of extinction." I think it is far more pertinent that the NAS committee concluded that the grizzly bear population had declined drastically and that in all probability this was linked with the abrupt closure of the open-pit garbage dumps.

I am enclosing a brief resume of the conclusions as stated in the NAS report. I think it would strengthen your article if you would include some of the material which appears in the brief summary of the NAS report summary which I am enclosing. I have talked and corresponded with Dr. Cowan, and I think that this summary is a fair statement of the gist of the NAS report.

Also, on page 17, you have stated "Craighead et al., (1974) argue that

compensatory responses to mortality known to take place in many mammalian populations may not occur within the Yellowstone grizzly population under its present condition." If you wish to be completely objective and to up-date your paper, I think you should state that in 1974 Knight obtained an average litter size for the Yellowstone females of 1.7. This is lower than anything we recorded. In fact, it is the lowest average annual female litter size recorded since 1959, and I think it very strongly suggests that compensatory responses are not yet evident in the Yellowstone population.

On page 17, you also state "The NAS (1974) investigation of the grizzly in the Yellowstone ecosystem concluded that available data were inadequate to settle the controversy over whether or not abrupt closure of dumps increased the probability of human injury." Could you not offer a more complete analysis at this point by referring to the death of the Walker boy, also the other probable death which preceded the Walker boy and which was not officially reported by the National Park Service. Also, I think it is important to mention that the grizzly bear that killed the Walker boy was earlier captured and released locally in spite of the fact that there was knowledge that the bear was old, had bad teeth, and had been frequenting the Old Faithful area. The evidence from the trial would suggest that closure of the dumps did increase the probability of human injury especially since the number of bears recorded in campgrounds ("bear incidents"), but which were not reported in Cole's reports, greatly increased during 1971. This is all a matter of court record, and I think any objective scientific treatment of the subject cannot ignore the fact that more bears in campgrounds would automatically increase the probability of human injuries and that this information was withheld both from the public and from the scientific community. It is quite evident from the testimony in the Walker case.

Steve, I realize you have obtained much of your data with direct contact with Cole and Martinka, but by not more fully reporting the conclusions of the Walker case, you may be opening yourself to possible criticism. I hope you will accept this as constructive advice as I have only the greatest respect for you and your work.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

John Craighead

John J. Craighead, Leader
Mont. Coop. Wildl. Res. Unit

JJC:gs

ZETTERBERG & ZETTERBERG
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
319 HARVARD AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA 91711

STEPHEN I. ZETTERBERG
CHARLES L. ZETTERBERG
DENNIS G. MARTIN

TELEPHONE
(714) 621-2971

June 23, 1975

Mr. Harry V. Reynolds, Jr.
1460 East Twenty-First Street
Merced, California 95340

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

We agree with you that Mr. Anderson's letter "is something less than complete and candid."

In the trial, the judge was impressed with the findings of the National Academy of Science, and with the report signed by Dr. Cowan. The case (referred to by Anderson as "a recent law suit") is not over; the government has filed a notice of appeal. He doesn't reveal this to you.

Anderson might be fishing for information on which to base an appeal; or he might be fishing for information on which to challenge the basis for the NAS findings on an appeal; or he may be trying to strike out at people who fed information into Dr. Cowan; or he may simply be trying to defend himself in the National Park Service. We think the last is unlikely, because the letter appears to have been very carefuly drafted, likely by someone other than Anderson.

We are told that Anderson has had a heart attack, and is retiring. There is always some danger that he tries to get back, in legal and other ways, at people whom he may think responsible. If this is so, you should be ready to consult your own counsel to protect your personal position.

Representing the Walkers in the case, we feel that the less said now, the better. A fishing expedition to get principals to state and re-state information might be used to impeach the National Academy of Science's report. Had I received such a letter, I would likely simply write to Anderson stating that litigation has not been finally terminated and that I think it is inappropriate to go into the matter further at this time.

I would possibly add that I consider the various factual and expert information that was given to the National Academy of Sciences to be the property of the National Academy of Sciences and that requests for information concerning that would better be sent to this organization and to Dr. Cowan.

Then if the case is ever concluded, and he still comes back with a request for information, hopefully couched in different language and aimed at more concrete purposes, you can consider such request at that time, possibly after finding out the view of Dr. Cowan, and being sure to protect yourself.

In the trial, the evidence came through that Superintendent Anderson moved ahead, relying more on power of his office than on the independent view of the scientific community.

With your permission, I am keeping copies of his letter, and of the other information you sent me, including a copy of the draft you sent, but marking that as "draft only." If you do in fact send it, or any other letter, if you felt free to give us a copy, it would be helpful.

I should add that sometimes, in the preparation for a future trial, attorneys try to get a possible witness to put himself down in writing, on the off-chance that there will be something helpful in what is written.

The power of an administration, and a highly-placed administrative officer, in marshalling facts and witnesses, as the government did in our case, is awsome. Such a Service will go to almost any length and expense to protect the administrative structure, and administrative decisions that have been made. Sometimes the independent judiciary is the only way a truthful evaluation of such matters can be obtained.

Since dictating the above, I have seen an article stating that Jack Anderson is resigning July 1. This may be the reason why the letter was sent to you now.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen I. Zetterberg

SIZ:ck
Encs.

ZETTERBERG & ZETTERBERG
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
319 HARVARD AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA 91711

STEPHEN I. ZETTERBERG
CHARLES L. ZETTERBERG
DENNIS G. MARTIN

TELEPHONE
(714) 621-2971

July 28, 1975

Dr. Frank C. Craighead, Jr.
P.O. Box 156
Moose, Wyoming 83012

Dr. John J. Craighead
Montana Cooperative Wildlife
Research Unit
University of Montana
Missoula, Montana 59801

Dear Frank and John:

Enclosed is a description of the case from the American Trial Lawyers Association News Letter.

I talked with Mr. Spivak late last week and he informed me that the Government had ordered a transcript. I had our law clerk try to contact the court reporter, Betty Fitzsimons, for Judge A. Andrew Hauk, to find out the status of this. Frank, you once mentioned that you knew some person or organization that might want to obtain a transcript, and it would be cheaper to get a copy then to have it transcribed. If the transcript is still desired, you might write to the court reporter for Judge Hauk, as follows:

Ms. Betty Fitzsimons
Official Reporter
U. S. Courthouse, Room 430
321 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

and refer to case No. 72-3044-AAH, Martin v. U.S.A.

The court exhibits, such as the bear logs, according to our investigation, have to be copied by the clerk of the court at 50 cents per page.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen I. Zetterberg

SIZ:ck
Enc.

Trial: (1) Hotel's Advertisement, Which Characterized Establishment as "a Family Resort" with Supervised Activities for Children and Teenagers, and which Plaintiff Read and Upon Which He Relied, Was Admissible as to Hotel's Representation of Its Quality and of Care Guests Should Expect; (2) Basing Ruling on 1959 Decision of 2d Cir. in Absence of More Recent Delineation of State Law by State Cts., N.Y. Law Construed to Oblige Inkeeper "to Use Reasonable Care, Commensurate with the Quality of the Accommodations Offered, to See That His Guest Is Not Abused, Injured or Insulted by His Employees", Which Reasonable Care, in the Case of a First-Class Family Resort, Would Mean a High Degree of Care; (3) Damages Awarded by Jury Were Not Excessive; (4) Punitive Damages Could Not Be Recovered; (5) Citing McKee v. Sheraton-Russell, Inc., 268 F.2d 669, 672 (2d Cir. 1959) & Stone v. William M. Eisen Co., 114 N.E. 44 (N.Y. 1916), Hotel Could Be Held Liable Even If Employee's Actions Were Not Within Scope of Employment; (6) Despite the High Standard of Care Noted, Hotel Is Not an Insurer of Its Guests' Safety, & Mere Proof of Injury to Guest Would Not Entitle Plaintiff to Directed Verdict, so Judge Erred in Directing Verdict for Plaintiff & New Trial Would Be Ordered on Jury Issue Created by the Evidence as to Whether It Was Reasonable to Have No Policing of Hotel Lobby or of Elevators in Order to Prevent Such Incidents. TOBIN v. SLUTSKY, 506 F.2d 1097 (2d Cir. 1974) [Instant ct. in its opinion noted that the 3 leading N.Y. cases on hotels' standard of care were more than 50 yrs. old, but nevertheless had formed the basis for the rule in the 1959 McKee decision. The ct. noted that, subsequent to McKee, "significant commentary" on the "reasonable care" standard had appeared in Pattern Jury Instructions at 561-63 (2d ed., 1974, New York State Office of Court Administration). That work analogized the hotel's liability to that of a common carrier to its passengers — i.e., absolute liability for assaults or insults by its employees unless caused by the guest's own improper act. The ct., however, felt obliged, in the absence of a clear line of decision in the state cts. following the Pattern Jury Instructions, to employ the "reasonable care" rule laid down in McKee, supra.][On occupiers' liability for criminal acts, cf. annotation and discussion of Samson v. Saginaw Professional Bldg., 224 N.W.2d 843 (Mich. 1975), 18 ATLA News L. 56 et seq. (March 1975) (landlord liability for criminal acts of 3d persons). For trial ct. decision imposing liability on hotel for criminal assault on guest, see Adams v. Holiday Inns of America, 15 ATLA News L. 411-12 (Nov. 1972).]

FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT — GRIZZLY BEAR KILLING IN NATIONAL PARK — Failure to Warn — DISCRETIONARY ACTS — WRONGFUL DEATH — $87,417.67 Judgment Awarded for Death of 24-Yr-Old Unmarried Woman — Decedent was killed by a grizzly bear while camped at an unauthorized site in Yellowstone National Park. The administrator of his estate brought action under FTCA, alleging that the National Park Service (NPS) had failed to warn of the danger from bears & had created a risk of serious injury by marauding grizzlies — EVIDENCE — Plaintiff showed that NPS had abruptly closed back-country garbage dumps, where grizzlies had been feeding for many years during the season in which the park was heavily used. This encouraged bears to move into the campground areas, without any warning being given to visitors of the danger created. Plaintiff showed that NPS had available to it the recommendations of two animal biologists who had studied grizzly bear habits in Yellowstone National Park since 1959. The biologists recommended that the garbage dumps be phased out gradually & that carrion be provided temporarily to bears in the high country until they were able to adjust to the closing of the dumps. NPS had failed to implement these recommendations, had ceased radio monitoring of bears, & had failed to post signs throughout the park warning visitors of the hidden dangers posed by the grizzlies — CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE — Altho' decedent was camped at an unauthorized site, & had entered the park with a park employee, thus avoiding paying the entrance fee & receiving camping instructions, instant ct. found specifically that he was not guilty of contributory negligence — VENUE — Action was brought in Calif., which permits probate of a cause of action. Defendant-U.S. government claimed that venue was proper only in Wyoming or in Alabama, & moved for change of venue, which was denied. MARTIN v. U.S., ___F.Supp.___ (C.D. Cal., No. 72-3044-AAH, Feb. 24, 1975) [Source: Letter from ATLA Member Stephen I. Zetterberg, Claremont, Calif., whose associate, Dennis G. Martin, was plaintiff/administrator of estate.] [For a settlement report of another "grizzly bear" case involving a mauling where plaintiff lost eye & sustained other facial injuries, see Parratt v. U.S. at 9 ATLA News L. 352 (Dec. 1966).]

Practice & Procedure

DISCOVERY — SURVEILLANCE OF PLAINTIFF — In Case of First Impression, Pa. Trial Ct. Allows Plaintiff's Interrogatories of Defendant as to Whether Any Sound, Photographic, Motion Picture Film, Personal Sight or Any Other Type of Surveillance of

DEPARTMENT of the INTERIOR

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

news release

For Release July 28, 1975

Levitt 202/343-5634

GRIZZLY BEAR LISTED AS THREATENED SPECIES

The grizzly bear has been listed as a threatened species in the lower 48 States by Interior's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Lynn A. Greenwalt, Director, announced today.

A rulemaking to this effect was published in the Federal Register on July 28.

The action means that the grizzly bear, an aggressive animal that is highly intolerant of man, now receives Federal protection under the Endangered Species Act. Except for limited circumstances prescribed by regulation, it is now unlawful to kill, capture, harm, harass, import, or export a grizzly bear anywhere in the lower 48 States, or to sell any parts or products of grizzlies in interstate or foreign commerce.

Although the grizzly population has remained fairly stable for the last 50 years, increasing human activity such as road building and developments that affect the grizzly's remaining habitat prompted its listing as a threatened species.

Today there are several hundred grizzlies in the United States south of Canada, and their range has been reduced to the point where virtually all occur in three relatively small ecosystems: The Selway-Bitterroot in Idaho and Montana; the Yellowstone covering parts of Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming; and the Bob Marshall in Montana. Most of these ecosystems are composed of Federal lands.

(More)

The most critical factor in the grizzly's past decline has been direct conflict with humans. More than any other North American mammal, the grizzly requires large tracts of undisturbed wilderness. The bears live in isolated pockets of suitable habitat, generally wild country; areas just big enough to provide the prey animals and vegetation their omnivorous diet requires. Each pocket can support only a certain number of grizzlies. And any above that number (the surplus) will usually turn to other food sources. The bears, which can stand eight feet and weigh 800 pounds, have been known to attack cattle, sheep, and other livestock under certain conditions. When grizzlies lose their fear of man, people-bear confrontations and conflicts are inevitable.

The rulemaking would permit grizzlies to be taken anywhere in the lower 48 when they pose a serious threat to humans. Authorized Federal or State officers could take bears when necessary to prevent significant depredation on lawfully present livestock. They may also be pursued, captured, collected, or removed by Federal or State officials for scientific or research purposes.

In northwestern Montana where bears are more numerous, sport hunting of the bears may continue if the total number of bears killed for all purposes in a given year does not exceed 25. This figure is about five less than have been killed annually for the past seven years. This quota will apply to the entire area of Montana west of U.S. Highway 91 and north of U.S. Highway 12, including the Bob Marshall ecosystem.

Permitting a small number of grizzlies to be hunted each year keeps such livestock depredations and human confrontations at a minimum. It is essential for the continual survival of the grizzly bear species that it maintain its fear of man and thus its distance from man and never become accustomed to human activity. Because of their range size, aggressive nature, and remote location nuisance bears are often difficult to remove or transplant to other locations.

The listing of the grizzly bear as a threatened species comes after a complete review of the bear's status which was initiated in March 1974. The grizzly population in Alaska, thought to be about 12,000 individuals, is not considered to be threatened at this time.

x x x

NOTE: Prints of the attached photo of the grizzly bear are available to editors. (call 202/343-5211)



CONFLICTS BETWEEN MAN AND GRIZZLY BEARS IN THE NATIONAL PARKS OF NORTH AMERICA

by STEPHEN HERRERO

Environmental Design Faculty

and

Department of Biology

University of Calgary

Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4

PRE-PUBLICATION COPY

This paper will be published as part of the proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Bear Research and Management to be published by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), 1110 Morges, Switzerland.

SUMMARY

During the period 1970-73 twenty-three persons were injured by grizzly bears in the national parks of North America. Persons were hiking or riding in a backcountry area prior to 14 (61%) injuries; were camping in a backcountry area prior to 3 (13%) injuries, and were camping in a developed area prior to 4 (17%) injuries. Two (9%) injuries were preceded by provocation of the attacking bear.

Female bears with cubs were the most dangerous age/sex class of grizzly and were responsible for a minimum of 17 (74.9%) of all injuries. Most of these injuries involved sudden surprise of the female at close range.

Very old grizzlies were another age class identified as being disproportionately involved in incidents with man. Careful monitoring is recommended for difficult bears from this age segment.

Examination of the current management programme in Glacier National Park, U.S.A., suggests that management strategies exist which can both encourage the long-term survival of free-ranging grizzly populations and also provide park visitors with a high degree of safety regarding females with cubs, as well as other age/sex classes.

Ways of avoiding attack by grizzly bear point to a joint responsibility shared by park managers and park visitors. Circumstances which preceded aggressive encounters with grizzlies which did not result in human injury are discussed. In the event of actual attack, especially after sudden surprise of a female with cubs, the data strongly suggest that playing dead can help to decrease the intensity of attack.

Garbage and human food disposal continued to be a problem, though in most parks the situation was markedly improved. Grizzlies who forage on human food or garbage in close proximity to people become habituated to man, and also become more dangerous to park visitors.

The effectiveness of management programmes is assessed with respect to human safety and grizzly bear preservation for most of the relevant North American national parks. Human safety is being adequately provided for in many parks, and the remaining problem areas are identified and can be made more safe by improved management. However, several park grizzly bear populations appear to be headed for endangerment during the next 50 years unless effective regional management plans are adopted soon.

I conclude that the grizzly bear is worth disproportionate study emphasis compared to other animal species in national parks. This is because the grizzly uniquely stimulates human imagination and thought, and can help man relate meaningfully to his own genetic heritage and to natural environments. The grizzly is a wilderness indicator species whose protection encourages the survival of many other species and their wild land habitat.

INTRODUCTION

Few Canadians or Americans have ever seen a grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos* L.). Far fewer have been injured by this massive, powerful and potentially dangerous Carnivore. Despite a very low probability of injury the possible presence of the bear crowds most people's thoughts when

travelling on foot or horseback through grizzly habitat. It does not matter if you fail to encounter a grizzly. A partial foot track set in mud showing claw marks well beyond the toes, or a massive scat full of partially digested huckleberries, is enough to make most backcountry travellers feel the presence of the bear. Where grizzlies exist, they set the mood for many backcountry excursions.

But in National Parks, the grizzly has had another major interaction with man. For example, in Yellowstone as recently as 1967, it was commonplace to be able to see as many as seventy grizzlies standing shoulder to shoulder, foraging amongst garbage at the Trout Creek Dump. In public campgrounds in Yellowstone, grizzlies gradually became accustomed to feed on man's garbage and food became highly dangerous nuisances. Here too people thought of and feared the grizzly, but in response they demanded better management to end the unfortunate mixture of garbage and bears. Similar situations have occurred in other national parks because the omnivorous feeding habits of the grizzly have brought him into contact with omnivorous man.

It is because the influence of the grizzly on the behaviour of human beings extends well beyond its few sightings and statistically insignificant attacks on man that study of conflicts with man is justified. I began this type of research by analyzing the causes and character of grizzly bear attacks on man in the National Parks of North America from 1872-1969 (Herrero, 1970a; b). Since then further information has been collected mostly on a standardized form available to wildlife managers in National Parks having grizzly bear populations. In this paper I analyze these data for the period 1970-73 and compare them to my pre-1970 data and to analyses carried out by others.

Martinka (1971; 1974) has made the most detailed analysis of grizzly bear and human interactions in a single national park.

ATTACKS - How many? Where? Preceding circumstances? What type of bear?

Table 1 shows that during the period 1970-73 there were 23 persons injured in 18 separate incidents which occurred in 5 of the 13 national parks in Canada and the United States which have grizzly bear populations. One person was injured in each of 13 incidents and 2 persons in each of 5 incidents. A single grizzly bear inflicted all of the injuries in each case, although frequently a female grizzly was accompanied by cubs prior to attack. Crude estimates of the frequency of injury are summarized in Table 2. (Insert Table 1 and 2 about here).

Table 3 indicates that of the 23 persons injured 10 received major injury and 13 minor injury. Two deaths were included as major injuries, one death being inflicted by an adult female and the other by an adult male. Except for these two incidents the remainder of major injuries and most minor injuries were inflicted by female grizzlies with cubs. (Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here).

Table 4 categorizes the injured person's activity prior to attack and the age/sex class of the bear involved in each injury. Females with cubs were responsible for a minimum of 74% of all the injuries inflicted during the 1970-73 period. In my analysis of injuries 1872-1969, this age/sex class of bear was responsible for a minimum of 48% of all injuries. This difference is statistically significant because the data describe the entire population of injuries and not a sample, but it is important to note that during 1872-1969 in

42%, or 32 of 77 incidents, the age/sex class of the bear was unknown. During 1970-73 the age/sex class of the bear was unknown in 13%, or 3 of 23 incidents. The "unknown" age/sex class represent possible major sources of "error" which could significantly change the percentage of all incidents for which females with cubs were responsible during each period. Despite this, the most probable explanation for the apparent increase in percentage of incidents attributed to females with cubs is that circumstances preceding attacks have changed quantitatively since 1872-1969 (Table 5). (Insert Table 5 about here). During 1970-73 a significantly larger percentage of incidents (61%) were preceded by backcountry hiking-riding than during 1873-1969 (31%) (Herrero, 1970a). Conversely, during 1970-73 a significantly smaller percentage of incidents (30%) were preceded by camping as compared to 1872-1969 (61%). During 1872-1969, females with cubs were not found to be disproportionately involved in incidents preceded by camping in developed areas, although the data were incomplete. The percentage decrease in incidents preceded by camping generally reflects better garbage and food management in many of the national parks. Poor management of garbage and human food, especially in campgrounds and developed areas, were tentatively held responsible for 44 out of 47 incidents preceded by camping during 1872-1969 and for 5 out of 7 such incidents 1970-73. In these areas grizzlies seemed to learn to associate food or garbage foraging with human odour and thus lost some of their avoidance behaviour toward man. After habitually foraging on food or garbage near people, some grizzlies became directly aggressive toward people while others attacked people after they were surprised at close range.

Females with cubs accounted for a much larger percentage of incidents preceded by backcountry hiking/riding (minimum 71%, 1872-1969; minimum 79%, 1970-73) than their typical percentage fraction (17%)* within a population would predict if all age/sex classes were equally likely to be involved in attacks preceded by backcountry hiking/riding.

In summary females with cubs account for most backcountry incidents preceded by hiking/riding. Additionally, the data available do not demonstrate that females with cubs are more likely to be involved in campground foraging incidents than is any other age/sex class. This information, therefore, tentatively accounts for the percentage change in incidents attributed to females with cubs - a minimum of 48%, 1872-1969, and a minimum of 74%, 1970-73.

It is also probable that females with cubs of the year are more dangerous to the backcountry hiking/rider than are females with elder cubs. The 1970-73 data show that females with cubs of the year were positively identified as being responsible for five out of eleven back-country-hiking/riding incidents attributed to grizzly bear females with cubs. In the remaining six incidents the age of the cubs was not determined or was not reported. I advance the hypothesis that, despite individual differences in aggression, there is overall a decrease in aggression by females as their cubs grow older. The hypothesis is tentatively supported by the data trend showing more injuries inflicted by females with cubs of the year than by females with older cubs. The data are crude, however. Pearson's (in press) detailed field observations on aggressive behaviour of grizzly bear females with cubs also suggest a decrease in aggression as cubs grow older. This hypothesis is also

---

* This figure was calculated using data for the Yellowstone population available in Craighead *et al.* 1969, and Craighead *et al.* 1974.

logically supported by the cubs' increasing ability with age to defend themselves. The evolution and expression of aggressive behaviour in grizzlies is discussed elsewhere (Herrero, 1972).

As was found previously (Herrero, 1970a; b), sudden surprise at close range was an important variable preceding backcountry-hiking/riding incidents (Tables 4 and 5) which involved females with cubs. In each of 11 injuries inflicted under these circumstances, the attacked did not sight the bear at a distance greater than 100 m (328 ft.). Often the distance was less than 30 m (89.5 ft.). Under these circumstances females with cubs appear to be acting almost reflexively in response to an intrusion into their "individual distance". Martinka (1968) labelled this type of incident a "defence reaction". It is very important to realize that other age/sex classes of grizzly bears are seldom involved in this type of incident. Additional observations suggest that this behavior is rare even for females with young cubs. They will usually flee in response to an intrusion if sufficient escape space and time are available.

Females with cubs were also involved in six injuries in which backcountry hiking/riding was not a preceding variable (Table 4). Of these, two injuries were inflicted in one incident by a female with cubs assumed (from the presence of fresh scats) to have been living in an area chosen as a backcountry campsite. In this incident the female with cubs apparently came upon two men in their sleeping bags without being aware that the men were there. There was no reason to suspect that this female was foraging for human food or garbage. Sudden surprise at close range was probably the important preceding circumstance. Of the remaining four injuries inflicted by females with

cubs, three involved probable foraging for human food or garbage in camping areas, and one involved a photographer up a tree who made a squeaking noise like a rabbit to attract the female with cubs. The bear climbed 3.0-4.6 m (10-15 ft.) up the tree, pulled the man to the ground and inflicted major injury. This incident was classified as involving provocation.

The three incidents involving identified age/sex classes other than females with cubs were unique. They are important and merit detailed description because they resulted in one minor injury and two deaths, the sixth and seventh human fatalities inflicted by grizzly bear in the National Parks since 1872.

The sixth fatality occurred on June 25, 1972, at about one o'clock in the morning. Two young men returned to a technically illegal campsite in the Upper Geyser basin of Yellowstone National Park. In the dark they unexpectedly came upon an old female grizzly (the park's report estimated the age as about 20 years) who was foraging on their inadequately stored groceries. Both men ran and the bear charged, quickly catching and killing one man. Park's records show that the bear had been previously captured and transplanted from the Old Faithful developed area because of nuisance behaviour in 1970. After the attack the bear was killed and appeared reasonably healthy for an older bear. There were no parasites and the kidney fat index was normal. One possible indication of difficulty for the bear was that all canine teeth were broken and worn smooth to the level of the incisors. Several pieces of important data are disputed in this incident. A key issue is whether or not the abrupt closure of Yellowstone's dumps was a proper management strategy to restore and perpetuate natural

grizzly populations. This issue has been debated in the literature (Cole, 1972; 1974; Craighead and Craighead, 1972; Craighead *et al.*, 1974).

The National Academy of Sciences, U.S.A., has investigated this issue [National Academy of Sciences (NAS), 1974]. In brief the Craigheads have claimed that abrupt dump closure increased (at least for a period) the probability of injury in developed areas, and because of the large number of grizzlies killed, plus natural mortality to grizzlies, has given rise to a situation which, if it continues, will endanger the Yellowstone grizzly population. Conversely, Cole hypothesizes that abrupt dump closure decreased the cumulative probability of human injury because habitual campground foraging grizzlies were killed and young bears had less chance to learn this behaviour. Cole further claims that compensatory responses in the population have now restored the population to near carrying capacity. For the purposes of my present analysis the relevant data are clear - a very old bear with a history of some campground involvement killed and partially consumed a young man. My data suggest that very old grizzlies may be over-represented in aggressive encounters and attacks. I will discuss this later.

Sudden surprise of a grizzly bear on ungulate kills or carrion has been the cause of several aggressive encounters with grizzly bears in national parks. Outside national parks, hunters have been severely injured when returning to find cached game which, during the hunter's absence, has been claimed by a grizzly. Superficially the bear involved in the fatal Yellowstone incident behaved as if it were defending food. What is unknown is the extent to which the campground foraging history

of the bear, or the abrupt phasing out and closure of dumps, influenced its behaviour.

The seventh fatality occurred in a backcountry area of Banff National Park and involved significant provocation of the bear and poor judgement on the part of the men involved. In late September 1973 a large adult male grizzly, with a well-documented history of numerous aggressive, garbage/human food foraging incidents, was being transplanted by helicopter. A Canadian Wildlife Service (C.W.S.) employee, a professional photographer and the helicopter pilot accompanied the drugged bear to the transplant site. The C.W.S. employee and the photographer waited to photograph the bear as it came out of the drug. Photographing proceeded for several hours. Despite several clear signs of aggression, the two men continued to film and to move within 28 m (92 ft.) of the bear. The bear finally charged the men, both of whom ran. The bear caught and killed the C.W.S. employee despite attempts by the photographer throwing rocks to scare the bear away. The helicopter pilot flying his helicopter finally scared the bear off the body.

Bears recovering from the influence of drugs may behave strangely. John Craighead (pers. comm.) reported an instance where a female grizzly just recovering from drugging was charged and killed by an adult male. I interpret this to mean that the female's normal signal and defence system was altered, thus predisposing her death. These two incidents serve to suggest that drugged bears can be either dangerous to man or in danger themselves. Grizzlies under these circumstances should be regarded with utmost care.

The third incident involving an identified age/sex class of

grizzly other than a female with cubs allows further comment on incidents involving very old bears. In Mt. McKinley National Park, near Wonder Lake Ranger Station, a grizzly "in excess of 20 years" was involved in repeated break-ins into campers, garbage trucks, and finally the ranger's cabin (Mt. McKinley National Park, pers. comm., 1975). At the cabin the bear seemed to be breaking down the front door so a park's employee jumped through the rear window, cutting himself on the broken glass. This is one of several incidents which suggest that very old bears may be particularly dangerous to man. The death and partial devouring in Yellowstone in 1972 of a young man by a grizzly about 20 years old has been discussed. The August 1967 incident at Trout Lake in Glacier National Park, U.S.A., where a young girl was killed and partially devoured also involved an old female with worn canines and no cubs. This bear had aggressively sought food near humans many times before (Glacier National Park, 1967; Russell, 1968). Generally, park wildlife managers often have unusual trouble with this age class. Martinka (1974) reported that "selective disposal of five bears during 1968-69 involved sub-adult or old-aged individuals in each instance". Similarly in Waterton Lakes National Park, Canada, in October 1972 near Chief Mountain Customs station a grizzly was reported to be "obsessed" with breaking into every building nearby. The bear was killed and examination revealed worn teeth characteristic of an old bear. In an incident which occurred outside a National Park near Fort St. John, British Columbia, (Bryan and Jansson, 1973) a guide was partially eaten, and presumably killed, by a very old grizzly.

Among the most bizarre of all aggressive encounters with grizzly bears took place in the backcountry of Kluane National Park in August

1973 and involved a very old female accompanied by a 3-5 year-old sub-adult. Autopsy later showed the female to be "thin" (79.5 kg, 175 lb), and in "poor shape". She had broken nasal bones and long claws indicative that she had not been digging very much. A park warden out on patrol first saw these two bears at 137 m (450 ft.). The female charged, followed by the sub-adult. The warden dodged and warded off attack with his rain slicker and a poncho. Ten to twenty charges were endured, each beginning from a distance of 1.5-9.1 m (5-30 ft.). During several charges the old female leaped completely off the ground and launched herself into the air toward the warden. Finally after the bear had grabbed and worried both slicker and poncho, the warden dropped his hat, which was also grabbed and flipped about. At this point the warden was able to separate himself from the bears. He later returned with a companion and they were tracked when the bears apparently got their scent and discovered their camp. While the bears were in the wardens' camp a shout and thrown rock triggered a charge. The bears were shot and later autopsied.

These incidents collectively, while often lacking precision of detail, strongly suggest the potential danger of some very old grizzlies to man. It appears that difficulties in securing adequate food to maintain a healthy body weight may increase foraging motivation so that human food or garbage may be aggressively sought. The possibility that some old grizzly bears under special circumstances may be potential predators of man is also suggested by the data. Bryan and Jansson (1973) report that Corbett in his studies of man-eating leopards and tigers in India found that the only animals which became man-eaters were those prevented from normal hunting by age or injury.

The data should not be interpreted to sanction the widespread disposal of very old grizzlies from national park populations. Old females can produce offspring (Craighead and Craighead, 1972), and if for this reason alone are valuable. The analysis does suggest that old-aged grizzlies may form a difficult management challenge and that specific individuals require careful evaluation if involved in aggressive incidents.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES RELATED TO ATTACKS

The data suggest that sleeping in the open without a tent may be particularly dangerous in grizzly bear habitat, but especially when garbage foraging grizzlies exist which are habituated to human odour. During 1872-1969 records show that nine persons were injured while in sleeping bags on the ground without a tent, whereas ten were injured in sleeping bags while in tents. From 1970-73, five of seven persons injured in incidents preceded by camping were in sleeping bags on the ground without tent or other protection. During the same period, no one was injured while in a tent. I do not know what percentage of persons camp without tents, though I suspect that it is only a small percentage of those who camp using tents. If this assumption is correct, then the data do suggest that "sleeping under the stars" may increase the probability of injury as compared to using a tent. Martinka (1974) has recommended that in some areas protective sleeping accommodation might be considered.

I have found no records of persons in national parks who were on horseback prior to being directly injured by a grizzly bear. In two incidents which were included in my 1970-73 injury analysis, the persons

were injured when thrown from a horse which was startled by aggressive behaviour from a grizzly bear. In these incidents the grizzly did not contact the person.

Making noise to prevent sudden surprise of a grizzly, or climbing a tree if adequate time exists, are two frequently recommended techniques. These should not be inferred as giving absolute protection as the noise may be masked or the bear's attention focussed sharply on something such as feeding. Mature grizzlies do not commonly climb trees, but with strong motivation and proper spacing of limbs they can climb. During 1970-73 a party of two persons were both injured although they claimed to be making noise prior to attack. In another incident a grizzly climbed 3.0-4.6 m (10-15 ft.) into a tree and injured a man who had been provoking the bear. Grizzlies have previously been reported to climb trees above the level of their reach and then injure people (Herrero, 1970a).

Data did not indicate that either menstration or the use of cosmetics by women were related to any attacks as has been hypothesized (Glacier National Park, 1967). Because of the grizzly's acute sense of smell this hypothesis might merit experimental investigation.

INDIVIDUAL NATIONAL PARKS

Glacier National Park, U.S.A.

The most significant decline in grizzly bear inflicted injury rates from the 1960s to 1970-73 took place in Glacier National Park, U.S.A., (Table 2). Here the dramatic death of two girls in two separate incidents in 1967 sparked a very intensive management programme (Martinka, 1968, 1971, 1974). Management actions there have

included successful clean-up of garbage and other unnatural food sources both in developed and backcountry areas, an intensified research programme on both grizzly bear ecology and the grizzly's relationship to man, as well as management of human activities in certain backcountry areas. The latter point has included periodic trail closure in areas known to be frequented by female grizzlies with cubs or in areas where grizzlies seasonally congregate for food, or in areas where unnatural food sources attracted grizzlies. In Glacier 1969-73 there were no grizzly-caused human injuries, despite an increase in number of visitors at a mean annual rate of 4.8 per cent. Also very important is the fact that few grizzlies were captured and transplanted or purposely killed by park personnel during the period, thus indicating that the causes of the grizzly problem were dealt with rather than the symptoms.

Yellowstone National Park, U.S.A.

Evaluating the situation in Yellowstone National Park is more difficult for reasons previously indicated. In Yellowstone the garbage management problem, especially in campgrounds, was far worse than in any other national park. The number of grizzly bear injuries inflicted to man during the 1960s and earlier reflected this (Table 2). Sanitation of campgrounds and successful bearproofing of sanitary landfill sites has improved the situation with regard to danger to the visitor although abrupt phasing out of dumps 1969-70 and abrupt closure of dumps 1970-71 may have temporarily increased the probability of human injury. Yellowstone still has several major campgrounds located in or near prime grizzly bear habitat and this will continue to create special management demands beyond those existing in Glacier National

Park, U.S.A., where a comparable situation does not exist. Cole (1974) presents evidence that injuries to humans declined significantly in Yellowstone during 1970-73. He also argues that during this period the grizzly bear population suffered no serious decline despite removal of many grizzlies in management control actions. The Craigheads strongly dispute both points, arguing that after initial dump phase-out and closure the probability of human injury increased at least during 1968-71 (Craighead and Craighead, 1972) and that the decline in numbers of grizzlies in the total Yellowstone ecosystem is serious (Craighead *et al.*, 1974). The N.A.S. (1974) investigation of the grizzly in the Yellowstone ecosystem concluded that available data were inadequate to settle the controversy over whether or not abrupt closure of dumps increased the probability of human injury. They did conclude that there was no convincing evidence that the grizzly bears in the Yellowstone ecosystem were in immediate danger of extinction. The question of current population status clearly requires further research. Compensatory responses within the Yellowstone grizzly bear population postulated by Cole to have occurred, and considered probable by the N.A.S. team, still require further documentation. Craighead *et al.*, (1974) argue that compensatory responses to mortality known to take place in many mammalian populations may not occur within the Yellowstone grizzly population under its present condition.

Banff and Glacier National Parks, Canada

The most serious increase in injury rates from the 1960s to 1970-73 took place in Banff and Glacier National Parks in Canada (Table 2). My understanding of injury data from these parks suggests

different causes. In Glacier National Park, Canada, increased injury rates have reflected increases in park and backcountry use. Here there is no reason to suspect serious garbage or human food mismanagement. Rather, sudden surprise encounters at close range were the cause of all injuries. Glacier National Park, Canada, is experimenting with an interesting management strategy to decrease the probability of sudden encounters with grizzlies in backcountry areas. In grizzly habitat where trails pass through densely vegetated areas, and especially where fast-flowing streams create a masking sound, park wardens have made trail cuts up to 6.1 m (20 ft.) wide. The object is to allow hikers to see grizzly bears at a great enough distance to prevent sudden surprise. While such a technique may be effective in preventing injury it obviously should be a last resort after considering trail re-routing, periodic trail closure, and other environmentally and aesthetically less damaging techniques.

In Banff Park, Canada, increases in injury rates reflected both increased overall visitation and backcountry use as well as a continuing inability to solve serious garbage management problems, thus allowing grizzlies to forage unnaturally and become habituated to human odour. For instance in Banff Park 1970-73, four of five injuries were caused by grizzlies with known histories of garbage/campground feeding. In one incident already mentioned, a Canadian Wildlife Service employee was killed. In this incident the man would never have been handling the bear if it had not been necessary to transplant it because of garbage feeding in a developed area. The remaining three garbage-influenced incidents were all probably inflicted by one female grizzly with three cubs of the year with a long and well-documented history of

garbage problems in developed and backcountry areas. Two women suffered minor injury from this female grizzly in a brief attack near a backcountry lodge. In the other incident a man was very seriously injured by this same female with cubs when she attacked him while he lay in his sleeping bag at a backcountry campsite. He and his companion's food was properly stored well away from the campsite. This incident, though not fatal, is similar in character to an incident which resulted in death in Glacier Park, U.S.A., in 1967. In Banff National Park serious and immediate effort is needed to improve management, especially with regard to garbage. The extent of the problem is documented by the fact that during 1972-73 wardens in one district alone (District 2, Lake Louise) handled grizzlies 56 times in control incidents, purposely destroying nine and one dying accidentally. During this same period in Glacier Park, U.S.A., only one family of bears was handled in a control incident and one bear was purposely destroyed. Glacier has both a higher population density and greater total population of grizzly bears. There is some indication that the situation may be improving in Banff, since in 1974 only 4 grizzlies were handled in the Lake Louise district, although grizzly bear problems continued in other park areas including a sanitary landfill site near Banff. Detailed scientific assessment of both the grizzly bear population status and the management problems is required to give accurate answers regarding Banff National Park.

Jasper National Park, Canada and Mt. McKinley National Park, U.S.A.

In both Jasper and Mt. McKinley National Parks there was little change in frequency of injury when total visitation during the 1960s is compared to 1970-73 (Table 2). Both parks had 5 injuries during

1970-73. These relatively high numbers of injuries reflect amongst other things significant backcountry human use of grizzly bear habitat in both parks. In Mt. McKinley a garbage problem is not obvious but injury rates are amongst the highest in North America (Table 2). Better trail planning and management of human backcountry use is indicated for both parks. In Jasper in addition to backcountry human use of grizzly habitat there is also a garbage problem needing immediate attention. Here grizzlies occasionally forage in some campgrounds and during the study period they frequently got into the sanitary landfill (Retfalvi, pers. comm., 1973).

Kluane and Nahanni National Park

A challenge is faced in the new national parks having grizzly bear populations. In Kluane and Nahanni of Canada the cumulative knowledge of grizzly bear ecology, and encounters and incidents with man is being used in initial park planning to avoid problems present in established parks.

HOW TO AVOID ATTACKS

There are many ways to reduce to a minimum the small probability of being attacked by a grizzly bear and yet still hike and camp in national parks inhabited by grizzlies. The simplest way is to plan trips into areas where grizzlies are not found or are uncommon. Park Service personnel should be able to provide this information to persons not familiar with seasonal grizzly bear habitat.

If a party chooses to cohabit an area where grizzlies are found, then they and the park service have a joint responsibility. Park

officials are responsible for managing and maintaining grizzly bear populations in as near a natural state as is possible. With regard to human safety this means little or no human food or garbage feeding sources. Past failure to control this variable has allowed grizzly bears to become habituated enough to man to forage in developed and backcountry campsites and has thus predisposed grizzly bear attacks on campers. Prompt action and constant surveillance by park officials is required to identify and clean up such areas. Temporary closure of such areas may be required while they are cleaned up (Martinka, 1974). A special problem is present in areas of good fishing where grizzlies also exist. Both dead fish and fish remains can attract grizzly bears and create danger. Special fishing regulations regarding both the keeping and cleaning of fish may be needed in some areas.

Trapping and transplanting, or "control kills" of garbage-addicted grizzly bears are inadequate and symptomatic treatment of the garbage and human food problem. Transplants serve to move highly dangerous and human-habituated garbage-feeding bears away from areas of high human concentration into areas of low human concentration. Return rates from most transplants are high. The "biological success" of transplants has not been studied but is probably low. Bear proof garbage management can nearly eliminate the need for trapping, transplanting, and "control kills".

Proper garbage and food management cannot stop at park boundaries in areas where acceptable grizzly bear habitat is located adjacent to but outside national parks. Grizzly bears are known to travel long distances in search of food or other needs (Craighead *et al.*, 1974; Pearson, in press).

To provide further for human safety, park officials need to know the seasonal distribution of grizzly bears, particularly the approximate location of individual females with cubs. Temporary trail closure, or public warnings, may need to be employed, or mode of access may need to be regulated. Trail re-routing away from prime grizzly bear habitat may be desirable in some instances. Where re-routing is not practical wide trail cuts may be a partial solution in areas where surprise encounters might take place. Campgrounds located in grizzly bear habitat either require special management or they should be closed. Special grizzly bear preserve areas may be necessary in some cases, with the public seasonally excluded.

The average park visitor is unfamiliar with characteristics of grizzly bears. Adequate information should be provided to the visitor to alert him to potential dangers. Specific information should be available from park service personnel regarding probable grizzly bear activity in a given area. Park visitors unfamiliar with grizzly bear habitat and characteristics should be encouraged to make enough noise to warn bears of their approach (Mundy and Flook, 1973). Ideally visitors should also learn enough about the grizzly so that their value for the bear outweighs their fear.

Park managers have a broad responsibility to the public regarding human safety in grizzly habitat. A thorough scientific research programme is needed to provide information on grizzly bear ecology and population characteristics in each park. This information is needed by the manager, both to protect the public and also to provide for the long-term survival of grizzly bear populations. Not all biological data collected on one population applies throughout

the grizzly bears' range because different ecotypes exist, each adapted to their own local conditions.

Glacier National Park, U.S.A., is a good example of a park which has employed most of these research and management techniques and has as a result greatly decreased both human injury and also handling and control kills of grizzly bears. Their work is well documented (Martinka, 1968, 1971, 1974).

The park service cannot, however, guarantee complete safety to the visitor, nor does it have total control over visitors. Visitors can be strongly encouraged to store food and garbage properly, but despite regulations it is the visitors decision whether or not to leave a clean camp. Ironically, refuse left by one or several groups may predispose the injury by a grizzly bear of some future visitors.

In addition to following rules and suggestions presented by park managers, there are other things that the backcountry park visitor can do to avoid injury in grizzly habitat. Learning about grizzlies' seasonal habitat preferences, behavioural traits, movement capabilities, food preferences, track and scat characteristics, can assist the visitor in knowing where and when grizzlies might be encountered. Dirty campsites and areas to which garbage bears have been transplanted should be avoided, as should areas of high seasonal natural bear activity.

Knowledge of the grizzly by the visitor, and thorough management activities by parks, can allow the visitor to avoid in most cases the two main causes of human injury - garbage-influenced grizzlies and sudden surprise of grizzlies, especially females with cubs, at close range.

CHARACTERISTICS OF AGGRESSIVE ENCOUNTERS WITH GRIZZLY BEARS. WHAT TO DO IF A GRIZZLY IS ENCOUNTERED, OR IF A GRIZZLY ATTACKS.

There are no absolute formulas. The characteristics of individual bears vary as much as do the characteristics of individual people. Nevertheless grizzlies have species-specific patterns of behaviour which are fairly regular. Defense of and care of cubs by a female is a good example of this. The agonistic behaviour signal system is another good example. The grizzlies language of aggression and appeasement has been described by Stonorov and Stokes (1972).

I examined reports of fifty aggressive encounters between people and grizzly bears in North America's National Parks. These incidents did not result in human injury but involved a grizzly (or grizzlies) acting in what was perceived to be an aggressive manner. These data come from park records, written reports (especially Mundy and Flook, 1973) and individual responses to my questionnaire. They are only a partial sample of all aggressive encounters. Table 6 categorizes the actions of people prior to the fifty grizzly bear encounters which I studied. (Insert Table 6 about here). These are the actions either before the bear was sighted or before it acted in what was perceived to be an aggressive manner. These actions do not appear to be very different from those which led to attacks in other cases. More revealing are the actions of both people and bear during an aggressive encounter. Single and multiple charges by the bear were common, sometimes to within very close distances such as 1.2-1.5 m (4 or 5 ft.). Grunting, woofing, snapping jaws, and laboured breathing were sounds reported in several instances. These sounds and close charges without contact are part of the normal species-specific agonistic display

system of the grizzly. What is it then which turns a possible aggressive encounter into an actual attack? The characteristics of the individual bear which seem important are factors such as: has it a history of garbage feeding and habituation to human beings? is it a particularly reactive female with cubs of the year? has it previously been wounded outside the park? is it a very old bear with feeding difficulties? I have already hypothesized that most females with cubs of the year may be more dangerous than females with older cubs. In a given instance, characteristics of the individual bear will interact with the specific situation to produce flight, an aggressive encounter, or an attack. Probably 95% of encounters are non-aggressive and result in the bear fleeing. This is an impression for which I do not have accurate data. How important are the actions of the person(s) involved in a confrontation? Certainly sudden surprise at close range should be avoided but if it is not, what then? Table 7 (insert Table 7 about here) categorizes people's actions during the fifty aggressive encounters which I studied. Particular note should be taken that several behaviours not recommended in park's grizzly bear information pamphlets (Parks Canada, 1974) were common and did not in these instances lead to attacks. Twelve actions by persons involved shouting, screaming, banging, clapping or even growling. Thirteen actions involved running away. This documents that under certain circumstances, with certain bears, these actions by people do not necessarily lead to attack. Conversely my analysis of attacks during 1872-1969 revealed that 13 persons injured while hiking (54% of all persons injured while hiking) were attacked while fleeing. Five were running away and eight were part way up a tree. I conclude that

fleeing does not necessarily trigger an attack, although it certainly may. The documented ability of grizzlies to outrun human beings (Herrero, 1970a) is an important variable in this context.

The commonly recommended course of action if actually charged by a grizzly at close range is to stand one's ground or slowly withdraw while quietly talking to the bear. This action seems to be effective for those people calm enough to pursue it.

I also tried to discover whether or not the dropping of an object, such as camera or pack, during the chase might help to distract a grizzly. In the reports which I examined approximately one out of two charging bears seemed to be distracted.

Tree climbing was effective prevention if appropriate trees were available and the bear was spotted far enough away.

Clearly, no absolute recommendations can be made regarding human behaviour in close proximity to grizzly bears. Ultimately progress will be made as we begin to better understand grizzly bear behaviour in an evolutionary and ecological perspective. Why grizzly bears occasionally charge and sometimes attack human beings can be understood by knowing grizzly bear ethology. In incidents related to foraging for garbage or human food specific grizzlies seem to have overcome a reluctance to associate with man, and have become willing to forage aggressively near man in campsites. The danger comes either from this aggressive foraging or from sudden encounters with people while the bear is foraging. Occasionally it appears that a grizzly will "explore" a person as a possible food source.

Sudden surprise of a grizzly at close range is the other major category of circumstances preceding encounters and attacks. My data

demonstrate that for bears who have not become habituated to man through garbage feeding it is females with cubs which constitute the primary danger. They apparently charge in response to a perceived violation of their individual distance, i.e. they charge in response to a perceived threat. To alter this situation either a person needs to leave, i.e. retreat beyond the individual distance, or needs to allow the female and cubs opportunity to leave. Being sensitive to this situation can suggest different human actions in different specific situations. Age/sex classes of grizzlies other than females with cubs do charge people and will occasionally attack in response to sudden surprise, but these instances are very rare. For further understanding of grizzly bear behaviour the reader should consult Hornocker, (1962); Stokes, (1970); Stonorov and Stokes, (1972); and Herrero (1972).

The final situation to be considered is that where actual attack occurs. What does analysis of actual attacks tell us concerning bear and human behaviour?

Grizzly bears, when attacking people, almost always do so from a position with the four legs on the ground. During 1970-73 only one attack took place while a bear was standing on its hind legs. Here minor injury was inflicted to each of the two women involved. The hind-leg stance, however, often preceded attack, and appears to be a reaction whereby a bear is attempting to sense a situation through smell or sight. During attack both jaws and claws are used as weapons although in cases of death it is injuries inflicted by the jaws which are usually fatal. Cattle are also killed with the jaws (Murie, 1948). Attacks are almost always of short duration, 30 seconds to several minutes, although in certain instances where major injury has been inflicted attacks have lasted in excess of ten minutes. In incidents

preceded by backcountry hiking/riding and sudden surprise of non-garbage/human habituated bears the bear seems to have behaved as if it were responding to a threat. Generally, once the person (threat) is chased away or held still (playing dead, fainting), this category of attack ceases.

In 1970(a), I hypothesized that the extent of injury, once attacked, might in some cases be related to the behaviour of the person during the attack. I further suggested that incidents involving people attacked by garbage-influenced/man-habituated bears might be subject to different rules than incidents involving non-garbage-influenced bears suddenly surprised at close range. I suggested then, and have further discussed in this paper, that the motivation of the bear was different in each instance. Table 8 presents data which relate to these questions. (Insert Table 8 about here). Here I attempted to analyze attack reports to see whether playing dead or fighting back increased or decreased the intensity of attack after the attack began. Because of the subjective interpretation necessary for these data, statistical analyses are not valid. The data do, however, suggest that playing dead may be a good strategy if involved in a sudden surprise incident while hiking. Further, in this type of incident fighting back seemed to increase the intensity of attack. In a few cases the opposite effects were found, so once again absolute rules are not possible. In such sudden surprise hiking incidents the bears' attack was sometimes diverted from one person to another by shouting or running, with the person doing the action receiving the fresh attack. In incidents preceded by camping and involving garbage/man habituated bears, neither fighting back nor playing dead seemed to influence the intensity of attack. Here also the number of instances was small.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF GRIZZLY BEAR ATTACKS

In some cases the question of blame for a grizzly bear attack becomes a legal one. Several persons have attempted to sue and prove negligence on the part of park managers who are ultimately the Canadian and United States government. Few cases have come to trial and only in one instance have the courts supported the claimants. A 1974 decision in the United States awarded approximately $87,000 to the estate of the man killed in Yellowstone during 1972. As better information is developed concerning the proper management of grizzly bear populations for human safety (as well as for human enjoyment and local grizzly bear population survival) the issue of liability will become increasingly more clearly defined. This should force the management of every park population of grizzly bears to be of the highest known standards.

THE BIOLOGY OF REMNANT POPULATIONS AND REGIONAL PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

In North America, all National Parks have the statutory obligation to preserve natural ecosystems. The long-term fulfilment of this mandate will be particularly difficult with regard to grizzly bears in several national parks. At one time the grizzly's range in North America was large (Storer and Tevis, 1955; Haynes and Haynes, 1966; MacPherson, 1965; N.A.S., 1974). Today in the contiguous United States and in southern Canada the grizzly exists in remnant populations. The question of what is a minimum population size for grizzlies for their survival is a complex one. Part of the answer depends upon the number of years into the future one wishes to have a high probability that grizzlies will survive in a given park or other area. Diamond's (1972) data on extinction rates in tropical ecosystems

can tentatively be interpreted to suggest that, other things being equal, the smaller the population of any species the greater the probability of extinction over time. For species like the grizzly, national parks essentially become island refuges with gene flow to other populations prevented. If we are forced to choose, and can only allow certain populations to survive, then the biology of remnant populations tells us to choose the largest populations in the largest areas.

In a genetically isolated remnant population of European brown bear (*U. a. marsicano*), which Franco Zunino and I studied in central Italy, the population was estimated to have numbered only 70-100 (Zunino and Herrero, 1972). In a population of this size we can expect in any one year about 5-7 adult females with their cubs of the year. Unusual natural death in this population segment coupled with deaths inflicted by man could in one bad year seriously endanger this population. If further the population is fractionated and its habitat altered, the swing to extinction could be rapid.

Are any of the North American National Park populations endangered? Craighead *et al.*, (1974) present evidence that, if present trends continue, this will be the case for the Yellowstone population. Good quality population data are not available for any southern Canadian national park population; however, I believe that three populations require careful study to document population characteristics and to generate long-term planning for protection. These grizzly bear populations exist in Waterton, Glacier and Revelstoke, and Banff, Yoho and Kootenay National Parks. Waterton is a small park (525 km^2 = 203 sq. mi.), intensively used. Surrounding land is significantly utilized for cattle grazing and resource

extraction. On the British Columbia border of the park a proposed road over the Akamina Pass could remove potentially valuable habitat, cause conflict with human users, and further fractionate the population. A hopeful condition exists where the southern border of Waterton Park is continuous with Glacier Park, U.S.A.

A similar problem exists in Glacier and Revelstoke National Parks. Here small park size, Glacier, 1349 km^2 (521 sq. mi.), and Revelstoke 259 km^2 (100 sq. mi.), means small park grizzly bear populations, estimated to be 74 grizzly bears for the larger and more densely populated Glacier (Mundy and Flook, 1973;Hamer,1974a). These two parks are surrounded largely by B.C. provincial lands. Historically the grizzly has been heavily hunted in these areas as well as being killed when in conflict with men logging, mining or farming (Hamer, 1974a; b). In Banff, Yoho and Kootenay, similar conflicts exist in surrounding British Columbia and Alberta Provincial Lands. In parts of Banff Park, population declines have been tentatively attributed to hunting in surrounding British Columbia Provincial Lands (Noble, 1972). The situation, no doubt, exists elsewhere but has not been studied. There is, however, evidence that both provinces, British Columbia and Alberta, are well aware of the potential impact of hunting on grizzlies and that their management plans reflect this. Further concern is necessary in Banff, where control kills and stress induced by transplantation are high. In addition Banff may soon see development of a new visitor service centre at Lake Louise, very near grizzly habitat. A very large (tentative permanent service population of up to 3700 persons) proposed development was withdrawn only after extreme protest (Herrero, 1970c; Olmstead *et al.*, 1972).

Clearly the potential impact of all proposed developments within these parks must be carefully evaluated with regard to influence on grizzly bear populations. This cannot be done until proper scientific data exist regarding grizzly bear population characteristics and overall ecology. Often we have managed dynamic ecosystems as if they were static. From this view, development might be justified in closed coniferous forest. This habitat type is usually not important for grizzly bear feeding habitat. But if the forest is burned, successional stages can be very productive of food for the grizzly. Martinka (1973) reported a major grizzly bear concentration on huckleberries (*Vaccinium sps.*) in one area forty-four years after a burn. In addition to careful impact assessment for all developments, regional wildlife management plans should be developed with surrounding provincial and municipal jurisdictions. The best example of this regional management approach is in the Yellowstone ecosystem, where coordinated research and management exists for a 69,930 km^2 (27,000 sq. mi.) area, having the 8,806 km^2 (3,400 sq. mi.) of Yellowstone as its core (National Park Service, 1973). This integrated research and management unit is clearly valuable and necessary, but its initial success has been questioned (N.A.S., 1974). If rapid progress is not made in the direction of regional research and management in Canada, several grizzly bear populations could be lost within the 50-year future.

THE GRIZZLY BEAR IN THE MIND OF MAN

Scientific data on grizzly bear ecology and on the interactions between man and grizzly are necessary for management programmes. However, these data are not sufficient to ensure the future of the

grizzly in the various North American national parks where it is found. For survival the grizzly needs to become a valued resource to a significant percentage of North Americans. The challenge is to reach, educate, and relate the grizzly to the average North American whose life is normally far removed from grizzly bears.

There is hope. For those who appreciate the grizzly it is one of the finest living components and symbols of natural ecosystems. Because the grizzly requires large tracts of relatively undisturbed land for its survival it is a type of wilderness indicator species where it is found. Monitoring the status of grizzly bears and maintaining their population status usually ensures the integrity of many other ecosystem components (Herrero *et al.*, in press).

Ecologically the grizzly bear usually has minor influences. The ecosystem effects of grizzly bears are greatest in the infrequent situation where they function as significant predators, especially if other more specialized predators such as wolves are absent or reduced in numbers. Such a situation exists periodically in Yellowstone Park where Cole (1972) believes that grizzlies through predation help to dampen elk population fluctuations by culling vulnerable animals. The grizzly in this specific circumstance could also influence local elk evolution because predation becomes a selection factor. Further Cole demonstrated how a grizzly population, through predation and scavenging upon elk, could influence secondary consumers such as coyotes. The same types of relationships would exist where grizzly predation upon salmon is significant (Shuman, 1950; Gard, 1971). More typically, however, the omnivorous food habits of the grizzly mean that

its energy intake sources overlap with many other species. It functions as a browser, grazer, scavenger and predator. Remove a grizzly population from an area and there is no ecosystem collapse. But the grizzly does demonstrate what spectacular beings biological evolution can produce to fill an open niche. The grizzly is a massive and powerful statement of the evolutionary history of circumpolar northern environments. The grizzly symbolizes the power, dynamism and productivity of the ice ages. Grizzly bears are a well-tuned way of capturing and utilizing a broad range of available energy. But omnivorous grizzly ultimately competes with omnivorous man, and human beings through their technology have what our primitive ancestors lacked - the power to exterminate the grizzly.

We should preserve grizzly bear populations, not because their ecological function is critical, but because of what they can do for human imagination, thought and experience. York Edwards (1970) described two similar mountains, only one has lost its grizzlies, and the other still has them. On the mountain with the great bears there is suspense, caution, more of the unknown - mystery, in a word. The other mountain, having lost its grizzlies is tamer and somehow depauperate.

Travelling through grizzly country can provide human visitors with a rare opportunity to establish relationships with the natural world. Fernandez (1972) discusses the manner by which human experience with animals was essential for definition of the self in aboriginal human beings. We still have the genotype of our ancestors. Travel in grizzly country can help us to define, understand and appreciate ourselves through appropriate responses to this species which shared Pleistocene evolution with man. In grizzly habitat caution, care,

and occasional fear and awe, are key elements. These are significant components of the wilderness experience and are elements for which our own genetic heritage is preadapted. But a wilderness experience cannot be had with a grizzly bear tamed and warped by garbage feeding.

I have discussed what the grizzly bear in national parks can become to fortunate and understanding visitors. It should be clear that this is the hopeful and biased opinion of one who appreciates grizzlies.

Public opinion concerning grizzlies is another important source to consider. Mahalic (1974) did a detailed study of the attitudes toward grizzlies of 158 visitors to Glacier National Park, U.S.A. Approximately 65% of all persons surveyed had positive attitudes, 20% were neutral, and 15% had negative attitudes. Mahalic had little success in understanding the genesis of their attitudes. An attitude survey done by the Christian Science Monitor of its readers (Cahn, 1968) just after two girls were killed by grizzlies in 1967 in Glacier National Park, U.S.A., revealed that only 104 out of 3420 persons (3%) favoured elimination of grizzlies from national parks, Bryan and Jansson (1973) surveyed human attitudes toward grizzlies, and knowledge about grizzlies, in three Canadian communities in Alberta. They concluded that substantial inaccuracies exist with regard to people's understanding of grizzly bear behaviour, but that improvements in understanding are correlated with familiarity or contact with wildlife. They also predicted that increased injuries would create strong public pressure to destroy potentially dangerous wildlife species such as the grizzly. At least one scientist (Moment, 1968, 1969, 1970)

has called for the elimination of grizzly bears from the national parks of North America.

Also relevant are the views of those individuals who have actually been injured by grizzly bears in the national parks. Some opinion has been against the grizzly: "They shouldn't be allowed to exist anywhere near civilization" and "I can see no reason why grizzlies should be preserved in the national parks" or "Guns should be carried so that aggressive grizzlies can be shot". But even amongst the group of individuals actually injured by grizzlies the majority of opinions favour the bear. "We are in complete agreement concerning the preservation of the grizzly" was one comment. "There is no reason in the name of civilized progress to kill an animal for doing what is natural. I feel no malice toward the bear." This statement came from a man seriously mauled by a female with cubs.

What influences these different preceptions of the grizzly? How can the grizzly bear become more of a valued resource and less of a liability to North Americans? The formation of our perceptions seems to be imbedded in our lifestyle, education system and attitudes toward nature.

The grizzly bear is worth the strong focus and disporportionate interest which I have suggested, because of its unique place in the mind of man. It alone is the "beast which walks like a man". It is similar in some ways to man, yet awesomely more physically powerful and clearly more at home in nature environments. In learning to share some of our national parks with the grizzly we can begin to rediscover and redefine our place in nature.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper would not have been possible without the support and assistance of many people and agencies.

I extend special thanks to the following individuals: Glen Cole, Cliff Martinka and Dick Prasil, who helped me to collect data in Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks, and Alaska, U.S.A.; David Day, Tony Bull, Barry Noble, Lazlo Retfalvi, and many park wardens who helped in the collection of data from the Canadian National Parks; Kenneth Greer, Montana, and Gerald Kemp, Alberta, for providing data on grizzly and black bear skulls which helped me to understand grizzly bear behaviour. My special thanks to Ian McTaggart-Cowan, David Henry, Cliff Martinka, Art Pearson, Jim Sime, Keith Baker and Mt. McKinley National Park for review of the manuscript and to Mike Pelton for his patient encouragement. J.B. Cragg, the past director of the Environmental Sciences Centre, University of Calgary, provided an opportunity and encouragement, without which this study never could have begun. Many individuals also filled out attack or encounter forms and this invaluable assistance was sincerely appreciated.

I gratefully acknowledge the following agencies for financial or institutional support:

National Research Council of Canada

Parks Canada

National Parks Service, U.S.A., especially Glacier, Mt. McKinley and Yellowstone National Parks

University of Calgary, especially the Environmental Design Faculty, the Environmental Sciences Centre and the Biology Department.

REFERENCES

BRYAN, R.B. and JANSSON, M.C. 1973. Perception of wildlife hazard in national park use. In Transactions 38th North American Wildlife and National Resources Conference, Washington, D.C.: Wildlife Management Institute. Pp. 312-322.

CAHN, R. 1968. Will success spoil the national parks? Boston, Massachusetts: Christian Science Publishing Society.

COLE, G.F. 1972. Preservation and management of grizzly bears in Yellowstone National Park. In Bears - Their biology and management, S. Herrero ed. Morges, Switzerland: International Union for Conservation of Natural and Natural Resources (I.U.C.N.), New Series (NS), No. 23. Pp. 274-288.

_____ 1972. Grizzly bear-elk relationships in Yellowstone National Park. J. Wildlf. Mgte. 36(2): 556-561.

_____ 1974. Management involving grizzly bears and humans in Yellowstone National Park, 1970-73. Bio Science 24: 335-338.

CRAIGHEAD, J.J. and CRAIGHEAD, F.C. 1972. Grizzly bear-man relationships in Yellowstone National Park. In Bears - Their biology and management, S. Herrero ed. Morges, Switzerland: I.U.C.N., NS, No. 23. Pp. 304-332.

CRAIGHEAD, J.J., HORNOCKER, M.G. and CRAIGHEAD, F.C., Jr. 1969. Reproductive biology of young female grizzly bears. J. Reprod. Fert. Suppl. 6: 447-475.

CRAIGHEAD, J.J., VARNEY, J.R. and CRAIGHEAD, F.C., Jr. 1974. A population analysis of the Yellowstone grizzly bears. Missoula, Montana: Bulletin 40, Montana Forest and Conservation Experiment Station, School of Forestry, University of Montana.

DIAMOND, J.M. 1972. Bio-geographic kinetics: estimation of relaxation times for avifaunas of southwest Pacific islands. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 69: 3199-3203.

EDWARDS, Y. 1970. The proof of wilderness: where caribou still stand. In Wilderness Canada, B. Spears ed. Toronto: Clarke Irwin & Co. Ltd. Pp. 149-165.

FERNANDEZ, J. 1972. Persuasions and performances: of the beast in everybody and the metaphores of every man. Daedalus 101: 39-60.

GARD, R. 1971. Brown bear predation on sockeye salmon at Karluk Lake, Alaska. J. Wildlf. Mgte. 35(2): 193-204.

GLACIER NATIONAL PARK. 1967. Grizzly bear attacks at Granite Park and Trout Lake in Glacier National Park, August 13, 1967. Pp. 22 mimeo.

HAMER, D. 1974a. Distribution, abundance, and management implications of the grizzly bear and mountain caribou in the Mountain Creek watershed of Glacier National Park, British Columbia. M.S. Thesis, University of Calgary, Alberta 164 pp.

_____ 1974b. The grizzly bear in Mt. Revelstoke Park. Report submitted to park superintendent. Pp. 6 mimeo.

HAYNES, B.D. and HAYNES, E. 1966. The grizzly bear: portraits from life. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. Pp. 386.

HERRERO, S. 1970a. Human injury inflicted by grizzly bears. Science 170: 593-598.

_____ 1970b. Man and the grizzly bear (present, past, but future?). Bio Science 20: 1148-1153.

HERRERO, S. 1970c. New developments proposed for Canada's Rocky Mountain National Parks. Can. Field Nat. 84: 333-342.

_____ 1972. Aspects of evolution and adaptation in American black bears *(Ursus americanus Pallas)* and brown and grizzly bears *(U. arctos Linne)* of North America. In Bears: Their biology and management, S. Herrero ed. Morges, Switzerland: I.U.C.N., NS, No. 23. Pp. 221-231.

HERRERO, S., HAMER, D. and EDWARDS, B. (In Press). Biological indicators of human impact and relative ecosystem completeness. Bio Science Symposium #2, University of Calgary.

HORNOCKER, M.G. 1962. Population characteristics and social reproductive behaviour of the grizzly bear in Yellowstone National Park. M.S. Thesis, Montana State University, Missoula, 94 pp.

MacPHERSON, A.H. 1965. The barren-ground grizzly bear and its survival in Canada. Canadian Audubon 27: 2-8.

MAHALIC, D.A. 1974. Visitor attitudes toward grizzly bears in Glacier National Park, Montana. M.S. Thesis. Michigan State University.

MARTINKA, C.J. 1968. 1968 Bear management activities, Glacier National Park. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service Progress Report.

_____ 1971. Status and management of grizzly bears in Glacier National Park, Montana. In Transactions 36th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, Washington, D.C.: Wildlife Management Institute. Pp. 312-322.

MARTINKA, C.J. 1973. Interim report on grizzly bear research. U.S. Government Memo dated October 25, 1973. Pp. 12 mimeo.

_____ 1974. Preserving the natural status of grizzlies in Glacier National Park. Wildlf. Soc. Bull. 2(1): 13-17.

MOMENT, G.B. 1968. Bears: the need for a new sanity in wildlife conservation. Bio Science 18: 1105-1108.

_____ 1969. Bears and conservation: realities and recommendations. Bio Science 19: 1019-1020.

_____ 1970. Man-grizzly problems - past and present, implications for endangered species. Bio Science 20: 1142-1144.

MOUNT McKINLEY NATIONAL PARK. 1975. Personal communication.

MUNDY, K.R.D. and FLOOK, D. 1973. Background for managing grizzly bears in the national parks of Canada. Canadian Wildlife Service Report Series. Number 22. Ottawa: Information Canada. 35 pp.

MURIE, A.J. 1948. Cattle on grizzly bear range. J. Wildlf. Mgte. 12: 57-72.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES (N.A.S.). 1974. Report of: Committee on the Yellowstone grizzlies. I. McTaggart-Cowan, Chairman 61 pp. mimeo.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE (U.S.A.). 1973. Yellowstone National Park: Master Plan. U.S. Dept. Interior, 34 pp.

NOBLE, B. 1972. Man and grizzly bear in Banff National Park, Alberta. M.S. Thesis. University of Calgary, Alberta. 119 pp.

OLMSTEAD, R., HERRERO, S. and PHARIS, R. 1972. Downhill at Lake Louise. Sierra Club Bull. 57: 22-27.

PARKS CANADA. 1974. You are in bear country. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1 page foldout, bilingual.

PEARSON, A. (In Press). The northern interior grizzly bear *(Ursus arctos L.)*. Canadian Wildlife Service.

RUSSELL, A. 1968. The people vs. the grizzlies. Field and Stream 62(11): 60-61, 113-119, 151.

SHUMAN, R.F. 1950. Bear depredations on red salmon spawning populations in the Karluk River system, 1947. J. Wildlf. Mgte. 14(1): 1-9.

STOKES, A.W. 1970. An ethologist's views on managing grizzly bears. Bio Science 20: 1154-1157.

STONOROV, D. and STOKES, A.W. 1972. Social behaviour of the Alaska brown bear. In Bears - Their biology and management, S. Herrero ed. Morges, Switzerland: I.U.C.N., NS, No. 23. Pp. 232-242.

STORER, T.I. and TEVIS, L.P. 1955. California Grizzly. Berkeley: University of California Press.

ZUNINO, F. and HERRERO, S. 1972. The status of the brown bear *(Ursus arctos)* in Abruzzo National Park, Italy, 1971. Biol. Consv. 4: 263-272.

	NORTH AMERICAN NATIONAL PARKS WHICH HAVE GRIZZLY BEAR POPULATIONS	1970-1973 NUMBER OF INCIDENTS	1970-1973 NUMBER OF INJURIES	1872-1969 NUMBER OF INCIDENTS	1872-1969 NUMBER OF INJURIES
U.S.A.	Yellowstone	4	5	45	45*
	Glacier	0	0	10	14
	Mt. McKinley	4	5	2	2
	Grand Teton	0	0	0	0
CANADA	Banff	4	5	2	4
	Jasper	4	5	4	8
	Waterton	0	0	0	0
	Yoho	0	0	2	3
	Kootenay	0	0	0	0
	Glacier-Revelstoke	2	3	1	1
	Kluane	0	0	-	-
	Nahanni	0	0	-	-
	Totals	18	23†	66	77

† Includes 3 incidents and injuries not directly inflicted by grizzly bear.

* In 1970 when the first analysis was conducted there were an additional 18 incidents resulting in 18 injuries listed as "possibly" attributed to grizzly bears in Yellowstone. Cole (1972) referred to these 18 cases as "probable" grizzly attacks. Cole (1974b) as a result of further investigation refers to these incidents as 12 probable and 6 known. All of these incidents took place in developed areas and were preceded by camping. None of these 18 incidents have been included in my analysis.

Table 1. Grizzly bear incidents and injuries 1872-1969 and 1970-1973, showing the National Park in which they occurred.

	TOTAL VISITATION (# of visitors/injury)		BACK COUNTRY USE (# of backcountry man days/injury)
	1960	1970-73	1970-73
Banff	17,170,465 : 1	2,019,753 : 1	53,200 : 1
Jasper	872,839 : 1	1,176,714 : 1	38,175 : 1
Waterton	4,742,100 : 0	2,149,372 : 0	15,187 : 0
Yoho	6,136,125 : 0	4,032,260 : 0	78,700 : 0
Kootenay	6,571,778 : 0	4,972,459 : 0	25,050 : 0
Glacier/Revelstoke	12,487,444 : 1	2,610,511 : 1	2,620 : 1
Yellowstone	510,000 : 1	1,745,142 : 1	59,300 : 1
Glacier(USA)	500,000 : 1	4,403,000 : 0	85,469 : 0
Mt. Mckinley	131,750 : 1	153,340 : 1	5,054 : 1

*These figures are only crude estimates of frequency of injury. Data on total visitation in some parks includes persons driving through as well as persons stopping. Data from which backcountry man days were calculated are very tentative, especially for the Canadian Parks where errors could be in magnitudes of two or three. More precise data quantifying human use of grizzly bear habitat is needed.

Table 2. Crude estimates of the frequency of injury inflicted by grizzly bears*.

EXTENT OF HUMAN INJURY	AGE/SEX CLASS OF GRIZZLY BEAR				
	Female with cubs	Adult female	Adult male	Unknown	Totals
No. of persons receiving major* injury	8	1	1		10
No. of persons receiving minor† injury	9		1	3	13

* MAJOR injury included those injuries which resulted in greater than overnight hospitalization or death.

† MINOR injury included those injuries which resulted in overnight or less hospitalization.

Table 3. Extent and number of human injuries and age/sex class of grizzly bears involved with the injury 1970-1973.

AGE/SEX CLASS OF GRIZZLY BEAR		ACTIVITY OF PERSON				
			CAMPING			
		HIKING OR RIDING BACKCOUNTRY AREA	BACKCOUNTRY UNDEVELOPED AREA	DEVELOPED AREA	PROVOKING BEAR	TOTAL
Females with cubs	Of year	5[√]		2		7
	Older		1			1
	Age unknown or unstated	6	2[†]		1	9
	Total all females with cubs	(11)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(17)
Adult female (no cubs)				1		1
Adult male				1[*]	1	2
Unknown		3				3
	Totals	14[#]	3	4	2	23

[√] Two of the injuries were inflicted in one incident by a female with cubs of the year who had a history of garbage foraging.

[#] Two of these persons were injured when thrown from horses.

[†] These two injuries were inflicted by a female with cubs in what appeared to be a sudden surprise incident in camp. The bears had no known or suspected history of garbage foraging.

[*] An old male grizzly tried to enter a cabin. A park employee was injured when he jumped through a window.

Table 4. Person's activity preceding attack and age/sex class of grizzly bear involved with the injury.

	HIKING OR RIDING BACKCOUNTRY AREA	CAMPING		PROVOKING BEAR	OTHER
		BACKCOUNTRY UNDEVELOPED AREA	DEVELOPED AREA		
1872-1969 %	31	5	56	6	1
		61			
1970-1973 %	61	13	17	9	-
		30			

Table 5. Percentage of injuries during 1872-1969 and 1970-1973 preceded by different activities.

AGE/SEX CLASS OF GRIZZLY BEAR		ACTIVITY OF PERSON					
			CAMPING OR RESIDING				
		HIKING OR RIDING BACKCOUNTRY AREA	BACKCOUNTRY UNDEVELOPED AREA	DEVELOPED AREA	DRIVING CAR	OTHER	TOTAL
Female with cubs	Of year	2					2
	Older	6	3	2	1	2√.	14
	Age unknown or unstated	9		1	2		12
	Total all females with cubs	(17)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(2)	(28)
Group		3		1			4
Adult	Sex unknown	3			1	1	5
	Male	1#				1*	2
Sub-Adult	Sex unknown	3	1				4
	Female					1†	1
Unknown		5		1			6
Totals		32	4	5	4	5	50

Large male grizzly which had been previously shot.

√ Female grizzly with older cubs charged a crew working on train tracks.

. What was assumed to be a female grizzly with a 3 year old cub chased 4 fisherman at a backcountry lake.

* Adult male grizzly aggressively approached a fish cleaning table and then a boy.

† A three year old female grizzly aggressively approached 3 fishermen at a backcountry lake.

Table 6. Person's activity preceding aggressive encounter and age/sex class of grizzly bear involved in the aggressive encounter.

PREDOMINATE ACTION	NUMBER OF PARTIES DOING ACTION
Stand still	6
Talk quiet	1
Shout, or bang, or clap, or scream, or growl	12
Run away	13
Walk slowly away	5
Climb tree	10
Slap or hit bear	1
Get into car	1
Fire shot	1
Total	50

Table 7. Person's predominate action(s) during aggressive encounter.

ATTACK INTENSITY	PLAY DEAD OR AT LEAST NOT RESIST		FIGHT BACK, (YELL, KICK, STRUGGLE, KNIFE)		PRECEDING CIRCUMSTANCES
	1872-1969	1970-1973	1872-1969	1970-1973	
Decrease	7	7	2	0	All incidents preceded by hiking*, or involving sudden surprise in camp of a presumably non-garbaged conditioned grizzly bear.
	14		2		
Increase	1	1	3	4	
	2		7		
Decrease	2	0	2	1	All incidents preceded by camping and all bears presumably garbage conditioned.
	2		3		
Increase	0	1	3	0	
	1		3		

* In incidents preceded by hiking the bear's attack was sometimes diverted from person to person by shouting or running, with the person doing the action receiving the fresh attack.

Table 8. Number of the increases or decreases in intensity of attack per person once contact made, tabulated against action of person during attack, and circumstances preceding attack.

S. Herrero
EVDS
Univ. Calgary
Alta.





Prof. Frank Craighead
Environmental Research Institute
MOOSE, WYO.
USA