ADDRESS REPLY TO
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
AND REFER TO
INITIALS AND NUMBER

WBS:mmn

United States Department of Justice

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
U. S. COURT HOUSE
312 NO. SPRING STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

April 10, 1973

AIR MAIL

Dr. Frank C. Craighead, Jr.
Moose, Wyoming 83012

Dr. John J. Craighead
Moose, Wyoming 83012

Re: Dennis G. Martin, as Administrator of the Estate of Harry Eugene Walker, Deceased v. United States of America
Civil No. 72-3044-AAH

Gentlemen:

You may recall that one evening in 1965, I spoke with you at the Canyon Village coffee shop and met with Dr. John Craighead on August 28, 1965 at the field laboratory, when I was defending a lawsuit arising out of the Smith Parratt incident in Glacier National Park.

As you may be aware, Mr. Zetterberg and I are traveling to Jackson, enroute to Yellowstone. It is my understanding from Mr. Zetterberg that Dr. Frank Craighead will be in Moose the week of April 16. So that you may have an opportunity to look at the Complaint in the present lawsuit, I enclose a copy of the same herewith.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM D. KELLER
United States Attorney

William B. Spivak, Jr.

WILLIAM B. SPIVAK, JR.
Assistant U. S. Attorney

Enclosure:
1 xc Complaint In Action For Wrongful Death Under Federal Tort Claims Act By Administrator Of Decedent's Estate filed December 22, 1972

cc: Stephen I. Zetterberg, Esq.
319 Harvard Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711 w/no encl.

ZETTERBERG & ZETTERBERG
319 Harvard Avenue
Claremont, California 91711
(714) 621-2971
Attorneys for Plaintiff

FILED
DEC 22 10 48 AM '72
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.
BY BT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DENNIS G. MARTIN, as Administrator of the Estate of HARRY EUGENE WALKER, Deceased, Plaintiff, vs. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant.	CIVIL NO. 72-3044-CC COMPLAINT IN ACTION FOR WRONGFUL DEATH UNDER FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT BY ADMINISTRATOR OF DECEDENT'S ESTATE

Plaintiff complaining of the defendant, by Zetterberg & Zetterberg, his attorneys, respectfully shows to this Court, and alleges

AS A FIRST COUNT

1. That prior to the institution of this action, Dennis G. Martin was by order of the Superior Court, County of Los Angeles, State of California, duly appointed Administrator of the Estate of Harry Eugene Walker, Deceased, in California, and thereupon is entitled to bring this cause of action on behalf of the said decedent.

2. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendant was and now is a sovereign corporation.

3. This action arises under the Federal Tort Claims Act, being 28 U.S.C.A. Section 2671, et seq. and 28 U.S.C.A. Section 1346b, and jurisdiction over this cause is bestowed

INDEX

upon this Court by said statutes.

4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. Sections 2672 and 2675, plaintiff has filed an administrative claim for the death of Harry Eugene Walker with the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior, and said claim has been denied.

5. Plaintiff, Dennis G. Martin, at the time of filing this complaint, resides in the City of Upland, County of San Bernardino, State of California, within the jurisdictional boundaries of the District Court of the United States for the Central District of California.

6. Decedent, Harry Eugene Walker, was at the time of his death a resident of Anniston, Alabama.

7. Yellowstone National Park at all times mentioned herein was operated and maintained by defendant through the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior and by its supervisors, rangers, and other personnel under the provisions of 16 U.S.C.A. Section 21, et seq, and 16 U.S.C.A. Section 1, et seq. Its purpose and objective is to provide a recreational area for the people of the United States. Defendant has caused to be established in the park hotels, motels, camping sites, hiking and riding trails, and other facilities for use by the public. The park also serves as a refuge for wild animals, including grizzly bears.

8. Decedent, Harry Eugene Walker, was lawfully in Yellowstone National Park as an invitee of defendant on June 25, 1972, having entered the park on June 22, 1972.

9. At close to midnight of June 24, 1972, decedent and his companion, Phillip Bradberry, of Oxford, Alabama, left Old Faithful Lodge to return to their campsite, which was in the vicinity of Grand Geyser about one mile northwest of Old Faithful Village in the State of Wyoming.

10. At some time shortly after midnight on the morning

of June 25, 1972, decedent was attacked by a grizzly bear and died from wounds administered by the bear and shock caused thereby. As a result of Harry Walker's death, his parents, Wallace R. Walker and Jessie L. Walker, of Anniston, Alabama, were deprived of his services in operating their dairy farm and whatever earnings he might have contributed to the family income from his employment as a heavy-equipment operator, and were obliged to pay burial expenses. In addition, they were deprived of their son's comfort, care, advice, and society, and suffered extreme mental distress as a result of the horrible manner of his death.

11. All injuries and damages resulting from Harry Walker's death were proximately caused and brought about by the negligence and wrongful conduct on the part of defendant, its officers, agents, employees, and other representatives under circumstances where the United States of America, if a private person, would be liable under the law of Wyoming.

12. Grizzly bears are rare animals that are largely confined in the Forty-eight contiguous states to national parks in Wyoming and Montana where they have been harbored and protected by defendant. Grizzly bears are extremely powerful and dangerous wild animals. They are noted for their unpredictability and their apparent lack of fear of man.

13. Defendant knew or should have known of the vicious propensities of grizzly bears and failed to confine, destroy, or otherwise restrain them.

14. The grizzly bear that attacked Harry Walker, being an inhabitant of Yellowstone National Park, was owned by defendant. Decedent was killed as a direct and proximate result of an attack by an inherently dangerous animal which was protected, harbored, and possessed by defendant.

15. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff has been

damaged in the sum of $500,000.00, plus burial expenses in the sum of $1,217.67.

AS A SECOND COUNT

16. Paragraphs 1 through 12, inclusive, of Count One are incorporated herein as if fully set forth at length.

17. Grizzly bears that have frequented areas where humans are present are known to be more dangerous then bears that have avoided such areas.

18. The bear that killed Harry Walker was known to have visited a campground in the park at some time in the past.

19. Defendant, though it knew of the dangerous propensity of the particular bear, failed to confine, destroy, or otherwise adequately restrain it.

20. Plaintiff was injured as a direct and proximate result of an attack by an animal protected, harbored, and possessed by defendant which had dangerous propensity known to defendant.

21. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $500,000.00, plus burial expenses in the sum of $1,217.67.

AS A THIRD COUNT

22. Paragraphs 1 through 12, inclusive, of Count One are incorporated herein as if fully set forth at length.

23. Knowing that the park was an extremely hazardous place for visitors, defendant, its officers, employees, and agents, nevertheless encouraged the public to visit it and developed facilities making it possible for large numbers of the public to do so. Having voluntarily assumed the duty to protect the public by representing that the park was a reasonably safe place, defendant was obligated through its agents, officers, and employees, to take simple and effective measures to prevent injuries by grizzly bear attacks.

24. Defendant, through its officers and employees and other agents, failed todischarge its duties to plaintiff and was guilty of negligence in the following several respects:

25. Defendant negligently failed to warn and advise visitors of the danger from grizzly bears, in particular failing to distinguish adequately between the grizzly bear and the smaller, gentler, and more predictable black bear.

26. Prior to 1968, defendant maintained within park boundaries several large, open garbage dumps at which very large numbers of grizzly bears derived a high percentage of their diet. This was particularly true during the summer months when the largest volume of visitors appeared in Yellowstone. In 1968, the open garbage dump operations were closed and the bears which hitherto had congregated there were forced to seek other food sources. Not being able to support themselves on their natural fodder, and being used to scraps from the tables of humans, grizzly bears increasingly invaded visitors' campsites. The closure of the dumps was negligent in that defendant knew or should have known that it would substantially increase the number of grizzly bear attacks on visitors.

27. Defendant negligently failed to warn visitors, including Harry Walker, of the increased danger of grizzly bear attacks caused by the greater number of grizzlies invading camp-sites for food.

28. Defendant was negligent in failing to ascertain the true number of grizzly bears that fed at the dumps and the extent to which they derived their sustenance therefrom, and although the findings of students of grizzly bear behavior indicated the dependence of the grizzly bear population on the garbage dumps.

29. Defendant promulgated various rules and regulations regarding measures to be taken by campers to avoid bear

attacks and regarding proper and safe places to camp, but negligently failed to enforce such rules and regulations, thus lulling visitors, including Harry Walker, into a false sense of security.

30. Defendant was negligent in failing to confine, destroy, or otherwise adequately restrain the grizzly bear, when it had knowledge of its dangerous propensities from the bear's prior visit to a campground.

31. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $500,000.00, plus burial expenses in the sum of $1,217.67.

AS A FOURTH COUNT

32. Paragraphs 1 through 12 of Count One and paragraph 26 of Count 3 are incorporated herein as if fully set forth at length.

33. Defendant's purpose in closing the dumps, plaintiff is informed and believes, was to encourage the grizzly bears to return to their natural habits, forsaking man-conditioned eating and migrating habits.

34. In view of the number of visitors in the park in the summer months, particularly the increased number of campers, and in view of the extent to which the grizzly bear population had become accustomed to feeding at the garbage dumps, defendant's activities in closing the garbage dumps and encouraging the bears to return to their natural habits, constituted an ultra-hazardous activity.

35. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $500,000.00, plus burial expenses in the sum of $1,217.67.

AS A FIFTH COUNT

36. Paragraphs 1 through 12 of Count One and paragraph 26 of Count 3 are incorporated herein as if fully set forth at

length.

37. The closing of the garbage dumps without taking measures to protect visitors amounted to wanton and wilful disregard of substantial risk to park visitors, including Harry Eugene Walker.

38. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $500,000.00, plus burial expenses in the sum of $1,217.67.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff demands judgment against the defendant, as follows:

On behalf of Dennis G. Martin, as Administrator of the Estate of Harry Eugene Walker, Deceased, in California, $500,000.00, plus burial expenses of $1,217.67.

Dated: December 20, 1972.

ZETTERBERG & ZETTERBERG

By Stephen I. Zetterberg
STEPHEN I. ZETTERBERG
Attorneys for Plaintiff

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, DENNIS G. MARTIN, being duly sworn, say:

I am the Administrator of the Estate of Harry Eugene Walker, Deceased, the plaintiff in the above-entitled matter. I have read the foregoing "Complaint in Action for Wrongful Death Under Federal Tort Claims Act by Administrator of Decedent's Estate" and know its contents. The petition is true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief and as to those matters I believe it to be true.

Dennis G. Martin

DENNIS G. MARTIN

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 20th day of December, 1972.

Clarice K. Kelly

CLARICE K. KELLY
Notary Public

OFFICIAL SEAL
CLARICE K. KELLY
NOTARY PUBLIC - CALIFORNIA
PRINCIPAL OFFICE IN
LOS ANGELES COUNTY
My Commission Expires July 13, 1973

L-TS12336-2

MEMO-LETTER

Law Offices
ZETTERBERG & ZETTERBERG
319 HARVARD AVENUE - CLAREMONT, CA 91711
Phone: (714) 621-2971

MESSAGE REPLY

TO Mr. Frank C. Craighead, Jr.

P.O. Box 156

Moose, Wyoming 83012

DATE March 12, 1974

Dear Mr. Craighead:

Thanks for your letter of February 24, just received.

Enclosed clippings were sent me by Clyde and Mary Ann Eriksen. He heads Sciences at four colleges here, and they have been fighting for wilderness area in Southwest Montana.

Sincerely,

Stephen Zetterberg

Stephen Zetterberg

SIZ:ck
Encs.

SIGNED

DATE

SIGNED

FORM AVAILABLE FROM GRAYARC CO., INC.
882 THIRD AVE., B'KLYN., N. Y. 11232

THIS COPY FOR PERSON ADDRESSED

U.S. Approves Grizzly Study; Suit Dropped

WASHINGTON (AP) – The National Park Service has agreed to prepare an environmental impact statement, as urged by a conservation group in a lawsuit, on its grizzly bear management program in Yellowstone National Park.

In return, the conservation organization, the Fund for Animals, agreed to drop the lawsuit if the statement is submitted to the council on Environmental Quality by July 1.

The agreement was announced Monday by Lewis Regenstein, executive vice president of the fund, who said the Park Service had "conceded defeat."

"This refusal by the government to have their policy stand a test in court should erode any remaining support or credibility for Interior's grizzly extermination program, and should remove any doubts that this 'management' program is dangerously misguided and certainly illegal," Regenstein said.

"It is imperative that Interior act immediately to protect our nation's endangered grizzly population; otherwise, these proud and awesome giants will soon be gone forever."

The fund has petitioned the Interior Department to put the grizzly on its list of endangered species, bring it under protection from hunting.

The organization has also petitioned the Forest Service to ban hunting of grizzlies in national forests adjoining Yellowstone Park, but has been turned down.

The suit against the Park Service charged the agency was threatening the grizzly bear with extinction by closing down garbage dumps where the animals feed.

The agreement reached by attorneys said a study of the grizzly bear management program, being prepared by the National Academy of Sciences, would be made public shortly after it is transmitted to the Department of Interior about May 31.

"By . . . obtaining written agreement that the study . . . will be made public," said the Fund, "the Fund has assured that this report will not be suppressed and concealed from the public."

The organization has accused the Interior Department of suppressing a report critical of the program by Drs. John and Frank Craighead, wildlife biologists.

The Idaho Statesman
Boise, Idaho
February 25, 1971

Grizzly Problem

Only part of the grizzly problem that has generated the alleged feud between the Craighead biologists and the Park Service supervisors was presented in the Jim Stingley article (Feb. 5) on "Grizzly: Men Fight to Death . . . Maybe His."

Both Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks were set aside, among other things, to preserve outstanding geomorphological features, with little concern for landscape fertility or the wildlife productivity, including bears. If these areas would have contained rich soils and abundant resources, it is highly unlikely that they would have ever become parks, but would be rather profitable cattle ranches or lumber lands like the other fertile parts of Wyoming and Montana.

As a result, the parks are generally marginal lands for wildlife and only maintained maximum productivity while nature was still in charge of the management. When the Park Service took over, they saw fit to suppress the numerous lightning-caused fires that characterized these areas. As a result, the mosaic patterns of various-aged forests and openings, generally young and vigorous, that the fires created, gave way to middle-aged homogeneous forests that contained little food and edges, and can only lead to large-scale wildfires.

Many parts of the parks presently support few invertebrates or vertebrates; one can walk for days during the berry season without finding enough berries to fill a cup. The numbers of grizzlies in the parks have only persisted because of the garbage dumps. Therefore, closing the dumps is not the answer, at least not until a crash program of controlled burning or letting lightning fires burn has returned these marginal lands to productive bear country. Bears seek out landscapes that were burned 3 to 20 years ago; if they don't find them they will flee the park into waiting gun barrels.

2/8/73.

RICHARD J. VOGL
Professor of Biology
California State University
Los Angeles

L.A. Times

from NAE

June 13, 1973

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

Dear Frank:

I am enclosing a copy of an analysis that we made of the data Zetterberg requested I comment on. Obviously, I can not send him this direct, so I am sending it on to you and hope you will forward it on to Zetterberg.

Regards,

John

P. S. His address, as you no doubt know, is: Stephen I. Zetterberg
Zetterberg & Zetterberg,319 Harvard Ave, Claremont, Ca. 91711

gs

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

STEPHEN I. ZETTERBERG
CHARLES L. ZETTERBERG
MARK S. KAISERMAN
DENNIS G. MARTIN

TELEPHONE
(714) 621-2971

May 15, 1973

Dr. Frank Craighead
Environmental Research Institute
P.O. Box 156
Moose, Wyoming 83012

Dear Dr. Craighead:

I went in to hear your brother, John, at U.C.L.A. last Friday, and found his presentation very interesting.

I asked him if he had seen the exhibits to Mr. Cole's latest draft report on grizzly bears. These exhibits were attached to the deposition. I enclose another copy herewith. He said he had not had a chance to see the exhibits or my letter.

Though I marked my letter "personal and confidential" to you, I certainly did not intend to exclude your brother, John Craighead, from access to the letter or to the exhibits I mentioned. I should like very much to have your comments on the exhibits and their meaning.

I wonder if you can shed any light on the particular bear. The bear that killed the Walker boy was tagged with number 17473. It weighed about 232 pounds, and was the same bear that had been trapped, as I recall, on October 14, 1970, and removed to Gibbon Meadow. I enclose a Xerox of the bear autopsy report which I obtained from Bozman.

When the bear was caught in 1970, it is my understanding that it was near the garbage storage area at the Old Faithful Inn.

I have asked for pictures of the abandoned campsite found on Firehole River south of Old Faithful Inn, on September 16, 1970. This bear had no canine teeth, and there were very few teeth marks on the Walker boy. The photos of the camp showed that the bear had unsuccessfully bent up some tinned foods. I should like to try to find out if this is the same bear involved in this September 16, 1970, episode near Old Faithful. I suspect that it was. If I could identify

it in some way, then I would have a "fix" on the bear to show that it was probably the same bear involved in all three episodes.

Do you have any information that can help us determine this?

Also, do you have any comments on any of the substance of my last letter to you, reporting on our depositions? Much of that material is for your own use and the use of your brother, and I should not like it to get to the National Park Service, as you would appreciate.

Thanking you, I remain

Very truly yours,

Stephen Zetterberg

Stephen I. Zetterberg

SIZ:ck

Enc.

PS Dear Frank Craighead -
your good hand-typed letter
came as I was having this typed. Am
a way, much of what I mention here
is duplicative of material discussed
in your letter. I will not necessarily
repeat discussion on this, but I know
you will read some of my material,
and discuss it with John C. and if
you come upon anything that is helpful,
you will send it. As I understand the
"walker" bear was tagged in 1970. It would
be it is to some bear involved in the Jeremiah
river camp.
what Stoker report stated all this change? Cole
seemed unsure. Steve

STEPHEN I. ZETTERBERG
CHARLES L. ZETTERBERG
MARK S. KAISERMAN
DENNIS G. MARTIN

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

TELEPHONE
(714) 621-2971

April 24, 1973

Dr. Frank C. Craighead, Jr.
Moose
Wyoming 83012

Personal + Confidential

Dear Frank Craighead:

Despite the blizzard last weekend, we took the deposition of Park Rangers, and of Mr. Cole.

Mr. Haradon, Assistant Superintendent of the Park, was the senior Park personnel present. The Superintendent was absent.

Mr. Haradon said that he understood "from statistics, that there had been a sharp drop in grizzly bear incidents with humans."

Mr. Cole said he was publishing a paper, which was at press, reviewing grizzly bear management policies in the Park as of this time. I have a draft, but I'm under strict agreement not to release it until the printed version is out. I understand it should be out shortly. However, the U. S. Attorney took five pages from the exhibits to the paper and attached them to the deposition. I enclose photocopies thereof to you.

I am sending you, either with this letter or under separate cover, the paper you and your brother did on "Grizzly Bear-Man Relationships in Yellowstone National Park." I have made a Xerox copy thereof. Incidentally, what is the date of that paper? I can't find a date on it.

In his deposition, Mr. Cole:

1. Said that grizzly bear management policies in the Park started with the Starker-Leopold Report. Bucknall thought that it started in 1967. Cole was not clear on the date, and gave me a copy of a March 4, 1963 report from the Advisory Board.

2. Said he was present at the discussion, November 1970, at Calgary, Alberta, at the reported summary of discussion

when John Craighead (page 338) stated "I would even go so far as to predict that if it is done, there's very likely to be a fatality in Yellowstone." He also said that he must have reported your brother's warning to the Superintendent of the Park.

3. Stated that the separation of garbage at Trout Creek from burnables to edibles was done as an experiment to follow your recommendations, but that he didn't know what it was intended to accomplish.

4. Said that he "worked" the South one-third of the Park when he was doing a study out of Teton; but on my cross-examination, asking him about all of the trails that lead out of and around Old Faithful, indicated very meager hoofing in the back country; he stated that he did not know how many campsites there were; he did not know how many back-country hikers were using the Park in 1972; stated that these were problems for the Park to manage, and that he was dealing with bears. When I asked him if the bear management did not involve problems of humans, he just smiled and did not answer, and the U. S. Attorney objected to my question.

5. Stated that your research was not continuing, so far as he knew, although he had heard reports that you, too, were in the Park; that no one in the Park was keeping track of your tagged bears; that the N.P.S. was tagging bears, but only bears that happen to be involved in an "incident." He stated he was doing research on bears by observation, but it was apparent he was doing no hiking, no tracking, no radio tracking, and that his observation must have been from the roadside. He was "monitoring" bears on maps, with colored pins, and a quick look at his maps indicated lots of colored pins around Canyon, Lake, and some around Old Faithful. He did state, and his papers reflect, that with the closing of the dumps:

a. "Wouldn't have subsequent generations of young learning to have their food habits altered by artificial food sources, but that

b. "Initially there would be more bears coming into developed areas."

He quoted Hornocker on Garbage Dumps.

6. On examination by the U. S. Attorney, who tried to get him to state that his views were based on his background in the literature, he took the positions that his views were "based on research and reason, on analyses of forty years of information, including information from some prior closures of dumps." That the bear policy program at Yellowstone was intended to be experimental, witness the adoption for a period of your program of dividing refuse into burnable and edible. In other words, he seemed to be saying that the theory that was being applied in Yellowstone was experimental, and his paper which is at the press now undoubtedly will take the position that the experiment is supporting his thesis. The Assistant Superintendent said as much.

I mentioned to the Assistant Superintendent that, aside from the case, I was concerned with the Craighead brothers being able to follow through on their research begun in 1959, and that I thought it would be very unfortunate if the work, commenced in 1959, and continued for twelve years, could not be followed through, especially since you had a group of bears that you had been keeping track of. He made no comment.

On the particular bear involved in our case, we have a copy of the bear card and of the bear autopsy report. It was a bear about twenty years of age. It had no canine teeth, and as you know, the Walker boy was killed with very few tooth punctures. The bear weighed about 235 pounds. It had been found in the food, or garbage holding area of Old Faithful Inn on October 14, 1970, and had been transplanted to Gibbon Meadow. It was tagged 1792.

On September 16, 1970, an abandoned camp was found on Firehole River South of Old Faithful, but neither Bucknall nor Cole, nor anyone else we asked, had any information was to who the owner of the camp was, or whether anyone had been missing. I have asked for pictures of the camp, in an effort to try to identify this episode with the episode of the same bear a month later nearby at Old Faithful. I gather from Mr. Cole's attitude towards this particular bear that it was probably a

special case. There is no evidence that the bear had been tagged by you. Can you possibly identify the bear, from your own records?

The paradox in this case is that the girl who brought the decedent into the Park testified that they were stopped at a "bear jam." That the boys were both shocked at the way the "tourists mingled with the bears." The boys stated that they had come from Alabama and that they had camped in the wilderness in Alabama and had let the animals alone and they were very much against the tourists playing tag with bear cubs, as was happening the day they entered the Park. One of the specific reasons they went into the forest to camp was they apparently wanted to be away from the "tourists" and the "Rangers," because of observing tourists "mingling" with wild animals.

I also enclose a further clipping on Indian tigers, which might interest you.

If you have any comments on any of the above, I would be glad to hear them.

What, if anything, do you think I might do with reference to your further work, and the letter from the Senator?

We very much enjoyed our visit with you a week ago Saturday night, and are appreciative of your coming down to joint us for dinner.

With best personal regards, I remain

Very truly yours,

Stephen I. Zetterberg

SIZ:ck

Encs.

Table 1. Numbers of injuries to humans from grizzly bears by periods and years, Yellowstone National Park, 1930-1972.

Years	No. grizzly-caused injuries per year[1]		No. of visitors per injury
	Developments	Backcountry	
1930's	0.6 (0-3)	0	800,000
1940's	1.2 (0-7)	0	600,000
1950's	0.6 (0-2)	0	2,700,000
1960's	3.6 (1-8)	0.3 (0-2)	500,000
1970	2	1	700,000
1971	0	0	0
1972	1	1	1,000,000

[1] Averages of known and probable injuries due to grizzlies by decades from Cole (1971b). The one injury in a development in 1972 was also a probable case.

Table 2. Total number of grizzly bears observed on a daily basis in developments and in the wild within Yellowstone National Park, 1968-72.

Locations:	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
No. in developments	293	99	178	146	105
No. in wild	414	315	614	320	349

Table 3. Records of grizzly bear control actions in developed areas, Yellowstone National Park, 1968-1972.

Developed areas:	Control Actions[a] 1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Old Faithful	1[b]	0[b]	22	1	0
Canyon	14	16	9	11	10
Lake Outlet	16	25	11	20	13
Grant Village	20	5	15	5	0
Bridge Bay	8	9	0	1	3
Eleven other units	0	2	13	1	0
Total control actions	59	57	70	39	26
No. different bears[c]	?	?	50	33	21
Pct. successful transplants	33[d]		60	80	74
No. bears destroyed[e]	5(3)	10(5)	12(6)	6(2)	6(4)
No. bears to zoos	0	0	8	0	1

[a] Number of times a bear was captured for transplanting, shipped to a zoo, or destroyed.

[b] Grizzlies present until Rabbit Creek dump opened each year.

[c] Numbers in 1968 and 1969 unknown due to unmarked animals; 4 of 33 were 1970 transplants, 4 of 21 were 1970 or 1971 transplants.

[d] Sample of 20 marked and 1 recognizable bear.

[e] Yearly totals with the number that were unintentional because bears charged personnel, came out of drugs during handling, injured themselves in traps, or failed to recover from drugs shown in parentheses.

Table 4. Numbers of grizzlies removed by park and state control programs and other known deaths of marked and unmarked bears in adjacent state areas, 1970-72.

	Removals due to control programs		Killed by vehicles	Other known kills[1]		
	Park[2]	Mont.		Wyo.	Mont.	Idaho
1970	20	0	2	8(1)	4(1)	7(1)
1971	6	14	1	6	6(3)	5
1972	9	2	1	5	0	4
	35	16	4	19	10	16

[1] Total deaths from hunting or kills to protect livestock or property, with those marked inside Yellowstone Park prior to or since 1970 in parentheses.

[2] Includes 9 animals donated to zoos, 13 unintentional, and 13 intentional deaths.

Table 5. Numbers and ratios of female grizzlies and young seen in Yellowstone Park during a 1959-66 period[1] and subsequent years[2].

	Numbers			Numbers		
Years	Females	Cubs	Ratios	Females	Yearlings	Ratios
1959-66 average	15	33	2.2	15	20	1.3
1970	16	28	1.7			
1971	16	31	1.9			
1972	31(11)	58(22)	1.9(2.0)	25(9)	48(18)	1.9(2.0)

[1] Average female-cub figures from Craighead and Craighead (1967) with female-yearling figures calculated from a reported 39% mortality rate in a population segment that used garbage dumps.

[2] Figures in parentheses considered to be different individuals; others include some duplicate classifications of the same family group.

STATE OF MONTANA

#1419

DEPARTMENT OF

FISH AND GAME

Wildlife Laboratory
Fish and Game Building
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59715
July 20, 1972

Mr. Jack Anderson, Superintendent
Yellowstone National Park
Mammoth, Wyoming

Dear Mr. Anderson:

The Wildlife Lab received a female grizzly bear (No. 176789) from Yellowstone National Park on June 26, 1972.

Cause of Death: Captured in snare and shot with powder cartridge.

Pertinent Circumstances for Necropsy:

A bear consumed portions of a human between 0100 and 0400 hours on June 25, 1972.

At site of attack, a bear was snared and shot at 0745 on June 26, 1972.

Between these hours, digestion processes were in effect for 24 to 30 hours.

It is known for humans that the time from ingestion and digestion of animal tissues in the stomach is from 5 to 8 hours. Further assimilation of small particles in the small intestine continues for the next 3 to 5 hours.

Special Request for Necropsy:

Any evidence of human tissues present in the bear submitted.

Findings:

External: Tag present in left ear (YNP, 1792)
Whole weight = 232 pounds
Fresh or old body scars were not present
Mammary glands = teats large, glands regressing, few drops of fluid present. I would assume this female nursed cubs during the previous year.

#1419

To: Mr. Jack Anderson
Date: July 20, 1972

Internal: The firearm bullet contacted the thoracic vertebrae and ruptured the aorta. Fortunately, the complete digestive tract was unbroken.

Mouth, teeth and esophagus were empty of tissues or hairs.

Stomach = about 50cc of small particles of almost completely digested animal tissues were present in the stomach. A very few hairs were found and these were bear hair.

Small Intestine = about 25cc of grass and small particles were recovered from the complete length of intestine. The few hairs found were from bear.

Descending Colon = about 100cc fecal material was removed when dressing out the bear. This was composed of grasses and included a few large pieces of tinfoil. This material was carefully disentangled while washing in a screen container. I personally found from 50 to 80 short, curley, black hairs. External features of these hairs resembled those of human genital hairs. Many hairs were in and around the sharp edges and creases in the tin foil. It is possible that without this tinfoil that the large amount of hair would not have been accumulated in as small an area.

Further Examination: The unknown hairs, known human hairs, and animal hairs were examined microscopically for internal and external features. These materials were also viewed by Dr. C. Anderson of the Vet Research Laboratory in Bozeman.

Our independent examinations revealed that the unknown hair samples found in this bear were genital hairs.

Sincerely yours

Kenneth R. Greer

KENNETH R. GREER
LAB SUPERVISOR

KRG/b

STATE OF MONTANA

DEPARTMENT OF

FISH AND GAME
Wildlife Laboratory
Fish and Game Building
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59715
September 25, 1972

Superintendent,
Yellowstone National Park
Mammoth, Wyoming 82190

Attention: Ted Bucknall

Dear Ted:

This is an endorsement to my letter of July 20, 1972 involving a female grizzly bear (No. 176789).

The animal was considerably free of any internal parasites that are frequently found in grizzly bears. No parasites or larvae were found in the entire gastro-intestinal tract. Only a ligh infection (1 larvae per gram) of *trichinella* were present in the various muscle tissues.

A method used for assessing physical condition of game animals is the kidney fat index. This bear had an index of 29 which was similar to other bears at the same time of the year.

All canine teeth were broken and worn smooth to the level of the worn incisor teeth. The cheek teeth had considerable use and were smoothly cupped.

The ossification of all but one skull suture is indicative of about 20 years of age. Cementum layers of root sections will be made to determine a specific age designation.

Generally, this female was a very old individual of average size with weight and at the time of death its physical condition was normal.

Sincerely yours

Ken Greer

KENNETH R. GREER
LAB SUPERVISOR

KRG/b

Copies
To.

John
Martha Shell
Harry Reynolds
Dad
Fetterberg
Bud Ozmun

February 24, 1974

Mr. Stephen F. Zetterberg
Zetterberg & Zetterberg, Attorneys-at-Law
319 Harvard Avenue
Claremont, Calif. 91711

Dear Mr. Zetterberg:

You have requested that I appear as a witness in the complaint action concerning the Walker boy's death so I thought that it might be of value to both you and to me to briefly state my general views of this situation and then perhaps to receive from you a list of questions that might be asked. To begin with, I am not pro or against Park Service or government on this issue. I am opposed to incompetence and negligence that may result in harm or death to innocent victims or their families and to arrogance and irresponsibility of supposedly qualified officials, Civil Service employees of the people.

In general, I think that the Walker boy's death can be traced to irresponsibility of Park Service officials at the decision making level. In other words, policy established by the superintendent of Yellowstone National Park influenced by advice from his biologist. The policy concerning the management of the grizzly bears and the conducting of independent research in Yellowstone National Park was drastically altered in 1968 soon after Jack Anderson became Superintendent and Glen Cole biologist for Yellowstone. There were three major actions that ultimately led to the situation climaxed by the death of the Walker boy.

(1) Destruction of the on-going grizzly bear research project and appropriation of same by the Park Service biologist. This was done with full knowledge and approval of the Superintendent. The statement can be supported by witnessed conversations my brother, Dr. John Craighead, and I had with Jack Anderson and Glen Cole, with correspondence relative to this subject, including a letter written by Mr. Harry Reynolds, Jr. former Park Service ranger to Dr. Cowan. Dr. Cowan is Chairman of the National Academy of Science Grizzly Bear Committee.

Destruction of the research program involved the removal of markers on bears and the establishment of a policy preventing further marking of animals. This policy was initiated by Jack Anderson in 1969 and disrupted our research on grizzly bear, black bear and elk, eventually causing us to terminate our work. It became increasingly difficult to accurately and systematically gather certain types of information we had been gathering in the past. Equally important the Park Service itself could not obtain reliable information that was needed to evaluate the effects of the change in bear management and the

influence of these stressful changes on the bear population. This unilateral decision was not only not justified but indicates negligence particularly when it was known and admitted by Park personnel that the new bear management program would increase bear-man problems. A letter from Jack Anderson, and correspondence between Jack Anderson and John Craighead verify this policy change.

The prevention of further marking of grizzly bears was said by Anderson to be a decision of the Natural Sciences Advisory Board. But, this was denied by Dr. Stanely Cain in the presence of myself, Anderson and others at the Sept. 6, 1969 Grizzly Bear Management Meeting. Jack Anderson then admitted that this was a decision that he himself had made. His prior statement to us had no basis of truth. In other ways, such as the bull-dozing and burning of our laboratory at Canyon without providing comparable space, he implemented the destruction of our research program. In addition to this, Glen Cole insisted that we dis-seminate what he admitted was false information concerning the Glacier National Park grizzly bear killings of two girls and he threatened that if we did not, they would get us out of Yellow-stone.

(2) Rejection of our major bear management recommendations, a result of 8 years of study, placed the Park Service in an inflexible position not substantiated by facts. In 1967 the Park Service was provided with a 113 page report, "Management of Bears in Yellowstone National Park", based on 8 years of research. Park Service personnel were provided time and oppor-tunity to make changes and suggested alterations in this report, but failed to do so. As part of a harassment technique against the researchers, the Cole-Anderson team started the rumor that we had not provided the Park Service with the results of our research and were not getting out publications. Thinking at first that Jack Anderson was merely misinformed we tried to reason with him. At one meeting in his office Anderson personally told me that we were not providing the Park Service with information, reports and publications nor were we publishing enough of our findings. I handed him two papers across the desk and asked him if he had seen them and told him that they had been sent to his people, (We routinely sent them all reports). He said, "No". I then replied, "Why don't you keep them?" He immediately shoved them back across the desk to me saying, "I don't want them." This set the tone of much that would follow. The Park Service under Anderson and Cole would have nothing to do with recommendations made by "outsiders". In our management report, we had advised against the rapid closure of the dumps, warning that the bears traditional feeding behavior could not be rapidly changed and if dumps were abruptly closed, the bears would move into campgrounds increasing bear-man incidents with possible tragic personal injury, costly damages and a drastic reduction in the number of grizzlies. This warning was provided to the Park Service well in advance of the closing of the dumps and with the intent of helping them with their problem of changing the feeding habits

of the grizzly bears. A practical and tested solution we suggested was to utilize carcasses to prevent movement of grizzlies into campgrounds. As near as could be determined, Cole's approach to the problem was to take action opposite to anything that we had recommended.

At the Sept. 19, 1972 meeting when Dr. John Craighead presented an abstract of the Computer Analysis of the Yellowstone Grizzly Bear Population, Cole did not stay to listen, but left the meeting. The Park Service encouraged newspaper articles and numerous news releases that gave out false or misleading information regarding grizzly bear biology and were not supported by fact or research efforts. When dumps were closed and bears entered campgrounds, news releases were continually put out that all was going well and the bear problem was under control. In other words, the Park Service had at its disposal detailed scientific information and recommendations as how best to handle the problem of closing the dumps, but this information was largely ignored.

(3) The Park Service embarked on a grizzly bear management policy, supervised by a relatively inexperienced biologist, unfamiliar with grizzly bears. There were few meetings or discussions to utilize our knowledge other then the Sept. 6, 1969 meeting with the Natural Sciences Advisory Board. Almost all input at this meeting was by my brother John and myself. The Park Service took only that information for their report which fitted pre-established views. There was not unanimity of agreement as the report and news releases stated. Correspondence with Dr. Starker Leopold and a letter written to Jim White, Director of the Wyoming Fish and Game Commission, state my views and those of Dr. John Craighead regarding this meeting. The report, "A Bear Management Policy and Program for Yellowstone National Park" that resulted from this meeting, is the so called "Leopold Report". It contained false and misleading information some of which we later were able to have Dr. Leopold and Dr. Robert Linn retract. There was no reference to the 113 page management report provided to all participants prior to the meeting, as well as to many other papers, reports and publications.

At this Sept. 6, 1969 meeting, the general concensus of the group was that the Craighead team would continue their research and document the dispersion of bears as the dumps were closed-whether abruptly or phased out. This was not a recommendation later included in the report. The principle contributors (unpaid consultants) to this meeting had no opportunity to review the report prior to its release and dissemination. It contained numerous statements that we most certainly did not agree with. The prior experience of Glen Cole, the biologist in charge of carrying out the revised management program, was a survey of the grizzly bear situation following the killings of two girls in Glacier National Park. This report by Glen Cole was admitted by him to be a whitewash report and he went further, stating

that the truth would only come out if there were litigations. In spite of this statement, he insisted that we, as scientists, disseminate the false information put out in this report when dealing with the public. And once again I wish to state that it was followed by the threat that if we didn't, we would be pushed out of Yellowstone. Instead of creating an atmosphere where we could work in harmony, Park officials did everything possible to harass us in our work. Our research was repeatedly discredited and letters to high government officials contained outright lies regarding both us and our positions in regard to the controversy.

Following Dr. John Craighead's presentation of the results of the Computer Analysis of the Grizzly Bear Population in a meeting at Mammoth Sept. 19, 1972, Robert Linn, Chief Scientist, either signed or wrote for the signature of others (Nat Reed) letters containing false information concerning the report and the meeting. For example, in one such letter he stated that he had not seen the computer report, only knew what he had read in the newspaper. In another he stated, "No written statement, unfortunately, is available from Dr. Craighead which presents the information given by him". However, he was at the meeting when the report was presented and he was present when a large number of abstracts were placed on a table in front of him and those present invited to take them.

My brother John and I had grave reservations concerning the safety of visitors if dumps were abruptly closed. We were equally concerned over the tragedy posed to the grizzly bear population by the revised Park Service management policy. The course of action that the Park Service embarked on in relation to our research and to bear management as briefed in the foregoing statement, led to the dire results predicted. Grizzlies moved in and were all over campgrounds as attested by rangers, some of whom stated to us that our prophecies were absolutely right. Beside this influx of bears into campgrounds which we documented and which we published in "Bioscience" (Aug. 15, 1971), there were grizzly maulings of visitors. One little girl from Pennsylvania was badly mauled June, 1969. There was destruction of a visitor's camp by a bear near Old Faithful. It was found September 16, 1970. To my knowledge there was no public report made of this to alert visitors, nor any warnings issued that there had been a grizzly-man incident and perhaps a fatality. Following the September destruction of this camp and the unexplained disappearance of its occupant, an old bear was trapped back of the Old Faithful Inn and tagged on Oct. 14 with a National Park Service tag number 1972. Apparently no association was drawn or even considered between the presence and capture of this bear and the destruction of the nearby camp. This bear was moved 18 miles away, a short distance for bears to travel (they will move this distance in a single day), and it was this same bear in almost the same spot that eventually killed the Walker boy June 25, 1972. With the killing of the Walker boy by a bear, the

immediate action was not to take steps to prevent further incidents and to alert the public. Instead the approach was to try to protect the Park Service image to make the agency look good. A function of this government agency is to protect and manage unique public resources and to provide the public with professional services, including information affecting visitor safety. Instead a smear campaign, in many respects similar to that directed against the researchers, was conducted against the Walker and Bradberry boys. Its apparent objective was to make the Walker boy and his companion appear to be "dirty hippies", illegally camping and recieving their just desserts. Careful investigation will show that the boys were not at fault, in fact, did everything right, but this was not disseminated to the public.

At the Sept. 1972 bear management meeting, Ken Greer of the Montana Fish and Game Department made the statement that there was not much adverse reaction to the grizzly bear killing the Walker boy. At this I stood up and asked whether this might not be due to the image projected of the boys as dirty hippies. Nat Reed reacted to my statement by saying something to the effect that, "Surely you don't mean that". I said no more, but felt that perhaps my statement would start an investigation into the cover-up and smear campaign relative to the Walker boy's death and possibly even lead to an expose of what did or might have happened to the camper along the Firehole River. I was trying to give Nat Reed a tip with the hope that I could obtain an opportunity to discuss the whole grizzly bear management-research controversy with him. I felt it was imperative that he get information on both sides of the issue in order to make proper and unbiased decisions.

Sincerely,

Frank C. Craighead Jr.

Frank C. Craighead

22

ANIMAL INCIDENT REPORT

(YELL 371 REV. 5/1/69)

LOCATION Old Faithful TIME

PERSON INVOLVED - NAME AGE

ADDRESS

NATURE AND CAUSE OF INJURY/DAMAGE Copy -

(ORIGINAL TO LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICE)

PROPERTY LOSS $

INJURY TREATED BY AT

MANAGEMENT ACTION? X EVIDENCE OF PROVOCATION? (DETAIL THESE ON REVERSE)

BEAR WARNING GIVEN? SPECIFY

REPORT BY LOG DATE REVIEWED BY

(REMARKS AND ADDITIONAL DETAILS ON REVERSE SIDE)

E-Z VISIT SYSTEMS LTD. San Francisco 101-1819

A1 TORT ? YES NO POSSIBLE

ANIMAL INVOLVEMENT: ACCIDENT, ATTACK, PROPERTY DAMAGE, FOOD THEFT, PROVOKED, POACHED, INJURED, KILLED

MANAGEMENT ACTION: NONE, TRAPPED X, DRUGGED, TRANSPLANT X, MANAGEMENT KILL, OTHER

TYPE OF AREA: NPS RESIDENCE, CAMPGROUND, OTHER DEVELOPED AREA X, PARKING OVERLOOK, OPEN ROAD, BACK COUNTRY

NORTH DISTRICT: MAMMOTH, TOWER, LAMAR

WEST DISTRICT: OLD FAITHFUL X, MADISON, BECHLER, WEST YELL.

SOUTH DISTRICT: CANYON, LAKE, GRANT, SNAKE

ANIMAL INVOLVED: GRIZZLY, BLACK BEAR, UNKNOWN BEAR, BISON, MOOSE, ELK, BIGHORN, DEER, ANTELOPE, COYOTE, HORSE, DOG, OTHER

SEX: MALE X, FEMALE X, UNKNOWN

AGE: ADULT X, IMMATURE, UNKNOWN

PERSON INVOLVED: MALE, FEMALE, MENSTRUAL PERIOD?, ADULT, UNDER 16, VISITOR, RESIDENT, NPS EMPLOYEE, YP CO. EMPLOYEE, CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEE, CO-OP EMPLOYEE, U.S. GOVT. X

HOW INVOLVED: INJURY, PROPERTY DAMAGE, VEHICLE ACCIDENT, FIRST-AID, M.D. CARE, FATALITY, OTHER

LEGAL: VIOLATION, WARNING, CITATION

YEAR: 69, 70 X, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79

MONTH: JAN, FEB, MAR, APR, MAY, JUN, JUL, AUG, SEP, OCT X, NOV, DEC

DAY: TENS 1 X 2 3; UNITS 0 1 2 3 4 X 5 6 7 8 9

Mgt. Action — Trap + Transplant

Disposition — Released at Gibbon Meadows

Tag No. 1792

Previous Incidents - None

ANIMAL INCIDENT REPORT

(YELL 371 REV. 5/1/69)

ANIMAL INVOLVEMENT: ACCIDENT; ATTACK; X PROPERTY DAMAGE; FOOD THEFT; PROVOKED; POACHED; INJURED; KILLED

MANAGEMENT ACTION: NONE; TRAPPED; DRUGGED; TRANSPLANT; MANAGEMENT KILL; OTHER

TYPE OF AREA: NPS RESIDENCE; CAMPGROUND; OTHER DEVEL OPED AREA; PARKING OVERLOOK; OPEN ROAD; X BACK COUNTRY

NORTH DISTRICT: MAMMOTH; TOWER; LAMAR

WEST DISTRICT: X OLD FAITHFUL; MADISON; BECHLER; WEST YELL.

SOUTH DISTRICT: CANYON; LAKE; GRANT; SNAKE

TORT: YES; NO; POSSIBLE ?

ANIMAL INVOLVED: GRIZZLY; BLACK BEAR; X UNKNOWN BEAR; BISON; MOOSE; ELK; BIGHORN; DEER; ANTELOPE; COYOTE; HORSE; DOG; OTHER

SEX: MALE; FEMALE; X UNKNOWN

AGE: ADULT; IMMATURE; X UNKNOWN

PERSON INVOLVED: MALE; FEMALE ?; MENSTRUAL PERIOD ?; ADULT; UNDER 18; X VISITOR; RESIDENT; NPS EMPLOYEE; YP CO. EMPLOYEE; CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEE; OTHER; U.S. GOVT

INJURY INVOLVED: INJURY; X PROPERTY DAMAGE; VEHICLE ACCIDENT; FIRST-AID; M. D. CARE; FATALITY; OTHER

LEGAL: VIOLATION; WARNING; CITATION

LOCATION ½ mile south of new Firehole River Bridge NAME Unknown

PERSON INVOLVED - NAME Person Unknown AGE Unknown

ADDRESS Unknown

NATURE AND CAUSE OF INJURY/DAMAGE Tent completey destroyed, can food and other misc. items destroyed and/or eaten by bear - abandoned camp discovered and reported by Mr. Dan Bean from 1975 Taney St. Eugene, Oregon

PROPERTY LOSS $ 50-75.00

INJURY TREATED BY N/A AT -

MANAGEMENT ACTION? - EVIDENCE OF PROVOCATION? No (DETAIL THESE ON REVERSE)

BEAR WARNING GIVEN? ? SPECIFY

REPORT BY Jerry Herbster DATE 9-16-70 REVIEWED BY

Additonal Info and photos in O.F. File

(REMARKS AND ADDITIONAL DETAILS ON REVERSE SIDE)

E-Z 107-1819

YEAR											MONTH												DAY																			
69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	TENS 1	2	3	UNITS 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9							
	X																		X				X									X										

Did ranger ever learn victim's name?
Any inquiries from relatives or friends?
Was human hair found near tent?

This abandoned camp was located up-stream on the west bank of the Firehole River about ½ mile above the new large bridge crossing the river south of Old Faithful. This abandoned camp appears to have been there unattended for some length of time - at least a week possibly or more. A search of the adjacent area for additional clues proved negative.

Breed:
Sex:
Age:

Diagnostic Report

Dept. Path., Montana Veterinary Research Laboratory

Date: June 27, 197
Species

Identification 17473 Ref. Veterinarian Ken Greer

Owner _____ Owner's Address Fish & Game Department

History: A grizzly bear killed a park visitor and ate the intestines and genital organs. Necropsy of the bear about 30 hours later revealed very little except for some hair in the intestine which, grossly, resembled human genital hair.

Clinical Diagnosis:

Macroscopic Lesions:

Microscopic Lesions:

Known human genital hair and known bear hair were placed on separate slides and mounted in Permount to compare with the unknown hair. The only valid distinguishing feature appeared to be the medulla of the hair. In the bear this was dense, compact, and definitely beaded in appearance. The known human hair and the unknown appeared identical and the medulla was less dense, more granular, and lacked a definite pattern of beading. My conclusion is that the unknown hair sample is human genital hair.

Diagnosis:

HOST-PARASITE DATA SHEET

68-72

Host: Ursus arctos - Grizzly

Date collected: 26 June 72

No.:

Sex: ♀ Weight/age: 232

Date examined: 27-28 June 72

Other ID. No.:

Locality: Old Faithful Area
Yellowstone National Park

Habitat:

Collector: Rangers

Elevation:

Collecting method: Shot

Bear suspected of killing a camper. 25 June

Host condition:

Preserving method: Fresh

External Exam

Head
Ears
Tail

Appendages
Ventral Surface
Dorsal Surface

Internal Exam

Upper digestive tract: Neg. 75%
Stomach: Neg. Amorphous Plant Matter
Dirt 5% - Hair 5% - Pine Needles 15%
Small intestine: Negative
Large intestine: Hair - Human Pubic (Dr. Anderson)
Subcutaneous tissue:
Heart: Neg. Dorsal Aorta neg.
Lungs & Trachea: Neg.
Liver: Neg. Bile Neg.
Spleen/Pancreas:
Kidneys: Neg.
Other:

Gonads:
CNS:
Mesenteries → (Not human Hai
Urinary bladder:
Body cavity: Neg.
Musculature:
Baermann:
Fecal: Negative for worm ova and coccidia

Trichinella Exam:		Gms. Tissue	Larval Count	L.P.G.
Tongue	x	25.0	25	1.0
Masseter	X	25.0	7	0.28
Diaphragm	X	25.0	28	1.12
Thigh	X	25.0	9	0.36
Other				

NOTES:

Several small plaques in liver which probably were old abscesses. The bronchiolar epithelium was slightly nodular and rough in one area, but no new inflammation or evidence of parasites was seen. There were two localized pneumonic areas along the lower margins of the diaphagmatic lobes.

Parasite	Location	Number	Fixative	Stain	Clearing Agent	Mounting medium	Ident. by

The stomach, small and large intestines were carefully examines for the presence of human flesh. Since about 30 hrs. had elapsed between the time of the bear attack and the time the bear was shot, one would expect all tissues to have been digested beyond recognition. However, human hair was observed in the contents of the colon. Confirmed by Dr. Anderson, V. R. L. Pathologist.

Place of Publication: Date: Specimen Received:

Acc. No. - 17473

Date - June 27, 1972

Project - Fish and Game Department

Source - Yellowstone Park

Nature of Specimen - Unknown hair from intestine of grizzly

History and Symptoms

Bear killed and partially ate a park visitor. At necropsy, a small mass of hair resembling human genital hair was found in the intestine. Microscopic examination and comparison with bear hair, and with known human genital hair indicates the sample is human genital hair.