LINN TO LINDUSKA

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

IN REPLY REFER TO:
N22-N

May 21, 1968

Memorandum

To: Associate Director Joseph P. Linduska, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

From: Deputy Chief Scientist Robert M. Linn, National Park Service

Subject: Management of Bears in Yellowstone National Park, by Drs. John and Frank Craighead

The report, "Management of Bears in Yellowstone National Park," by Drs. John J. and Frank C. Craighead, dated July 1967, was received in August 1967. It contains four sections: (I) History and Past Management of Grizzly and Black Bears in Yellowstone, (II) The Problem of Managing Bears, (III) Population Dynamics of Grizzlies, and (IV) Suggestions for Managing the Grizzly. The question now arises as to the feasibility of publishing the report, to which I should like to address the following observations.

Section III of the report deals with population dynamics of the grizzly, and it is this aspect that is supported by field research. I am inclined to believe that this section is of most value to the scientific world and should be given further refinement for publication. On page 33 is the statement: "In this report we will not attempt to explain methods, to provide complete quantitative evidence, or to analyze all supporting data; such material will be presented in separate scientific papers." In order to produce publishable material, these omissions should be rectified because, as the authors state in various places throughout the report, scientific data must form the basis for conclusions and subsequent management procedures. This implies that the data upon which conclusions are drawn should be readily available and that the same conclusions could be extracted by most any scientist treating these data. Extremely important to any scientific paper is the exposition of methods used and the data obtained from the enactment of those methods, as well as the interpretation of those data to form conclusions. In summary, it is recommended that Section III be prepared for publication, giving full emphasis to sections on methods and data. From what I know of the project, this should make a fascinating paper, replete with important new methodology of great benefit to the scientific community.

I have serious reservations concerning the remainder of the report--at least for publication purposes. Primary among these is the way in which the purpose of a national park, as related in the report, comes through to me. For example, I would consider as a goal in the management of natural areas of the National Park System, "to maintain, or re-create when necessary and to the extent possible, those ecological conditions that would currently prevail were it not for the advent of post-Columbian man and his cultural impact." But the implication in the report is that the Park Service should manage the resources to augment the grizzly population. For example, on pages 46 and 58, it is shown that the grizzly population has increased at an average annual rate of 6 individuals from 1959 through 1966; then on page 61 is the suggestion that management should be directed toward increasing the survival of females to breeding age, thus increasing population numbers. In view of the fact that on page 6 the report states, "It is not known how the present population in the Yellowstone area compares with that of early times," it seems to me to be unscientific to recommend augmentation of population numbers when the entire idea is to present a natural population. Again on page 72, the first fact enumerated reads, "Annual recruitment is only slightly in excess of annual mortality; therefore the growth of the population is very slow." My question is, why should there be continued growth of a population except as segments of short-term cycles? This would only lead to overpopulation. Again the objective is to maintain or restore natural ecosystem relationships.

There are other management recommendations that need much further investigation prior to serious consideration. For example:

1. The reestablishment of distinct grizzly bear populations on suitable lands outside park boundaries is desirable. However, this would require that other agencies assume responsibilities that they probably will not be able to uphold. Hunters and grizzly do not mix too well where a downed elk or moose is the issue. It is also unlikely that the grizzly would remain protected on other than park lands after even one incident such as occurred in Glacier. It is probably realistic to recognize that significant grizzly bear populations will only be maintained in the larger national parks or game preserves where hunting is excluded and human use is carefully regulated.

2. The recommended "phasing out" of the Trout Creek dump represents an impossible research design for evaluating a practice which must either be eliminated or continued. I am apprehensive that phasing out would at some point hold animals on limited food supplies (as in Glacier), actually encourage incidents and lead to a restoration of garbage feeding before the no garbage feeding situation was tested.

3. I heartily disagree with the recommendation that the park policy should not be to afford visitors the opportunity to see a grizzly bear. I would consider it essential that we provide the opportunity for visitors to safely see a grizzly in a natural setting, or at least have an awareness that the animal exists in the park. One such approach could be to have an interpretive pullout with signs on both ends of the Hayden Valley. The sign could read along the lines of "The Hayden Valley is the home of the grizzly bear and other native animal life. Enjoy these scenes of primitive America from your car, or by staying on the roadside. Foot travel off roadsides is prohibited to assure your safety and to avoid disturbing the wild animals." A brief interpretive treatment of grizzly habits in relation to when he can be seen could follow. I would like to think that even if a visitor did not take the time to see a grizzly, his park experience would be enriched by knowing he at least drove through an area where they lived.

4. Last, but not least, the report directs some rather severe criticism toward the park's bear protection and management program. Early work by Murie is ignored, and it is apparently considered accidental that a representative grizzly population has been maintained over all these years and in the face of increasing visitation. It is one thing to be responsible for human safety and another to dramatize the removal of the few grizzly that have had to be controlled over the years. Here, too, the biological approach which realizes that the death of one member of a naturally regulated population simply provides food or space for another to recruit into the population would be appropriate.

In regard to the latter, I believe it inappropriate to accuse Service personnel on page 23: "Many of these accidental deaths resulted from incompetent administration of drugs by rangers attempting to immobilize bears..."; and then on page 57 to excuse mortality due to the research operation with:

> "Ten grizzlies were inadvertently killed by the injection of drugs. Three of these occurred during the first year of the study and were the result of developing and improving the immobilization technique. The other seven were all bears that for one reason or another were unusually susceptible to the immobilizing drug or were purposely drugged heavily to prevent accidents in congested campgrounds where these bears had become troublesome. Mortality induced by the research project averaged 1.4 grizzlies per year, or one animal for every 40 that were handled."

The bear management recommendations have been made to the National Park Service for consideration in advance of the supporting data. However, if

the Service is to manage its natural resources as a result of pertinent, scientifically obtained information, it must have access to the data which formed the basis for these recommendations. While the Service is considering each of the recommendations, it is handicapped by the lack of these data--especially in view of conflicting opinions that I have commented upon above. Therefore, I would suggest that "publication of most of the supporting data" (page 1) be accomplished as soon as possible so that due consideration can be given to the conclusions.

In summary, it is my opinion that (1) the report, in its present form, is far from publishable; that (2) Section III material should be expanded to include methodology and basic data before publication, and publication of this material should materialize; that (3) management recommendations cannot be judged without supporting evidence, and the Service cannot condone publication of recommendations having such broad impact without hard data to support them. I would also like to point out that on page 1 the report states, "The results of this study are being prepared for publication in scientific journals," and on page 33 it states, ". . . such material will be presented in separate scientific papers."

In view of the several contemplated publications concerning the several specific issues within the report, I wonder why the report itself should be published as such. It will be the total body of data and conclusions as found in many scientific reports that will be used to develop the policies and guidelines for management of bears and other natural resources in Yellowstone National Park.

Robert M. Linn

John Craighead

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. James M. Coutts, Acting Chief
Division of Wildlife Research

DATE: May 29, 1968

FROM : John J. Craighead

SUBJECT: Deputy Chief Scientist Robert M. Linn's Comments on the Craighead Report MANAGEMENT OF BEARS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Before commenting on Mr. Linn's memorandum of May 21, 1968, I think some background information and some general comments are in order - especially since the gist of Mr. Linn's review of the bear management report is highly critical and he discourages publication on the grounds that the report has served its purpose now that it is in custody of the National Park Service. I think it is essential for Mr. Linn to be aware of the following facts.

The grizzly bear study was initiated in 1959 solely on the initiative of Drs. Frank and John Craighead, but with the consent and cooperation of Lemuel Garrison, Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park. A major objective of the research was to gather information that would enable the National Park Service and federal and state agencies to cope with the problem of managing an endangered species. We recognized that since Yellowstone National Park is not a complete ecologic unit and since grizzlies move in and out of Yellowstone that the problem of managing bears would have to be shared by a number of land management agencies. Those agencies concerned, also recognized this essential fact.

Since the beginning of the research study in 1959, the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit in cooperation with the Environmental Research Institute has annually budgeted approximately $85,000 for the grizzly bear research project. Funds have been obtained from such organizations as the National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, the National Geographic Society, the American Museum of Natural History, the New York Zoological Society, the Wildlife Management Institute, Montana State Fish and Game Department, the University of Montana, Philco Corporation, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and other organizations.

Contributions were made for basic research but most contributors, including the National Park Service, emphasized their interest in the development of a management program. Correspondence from some of the financial backers specifically indicated they expected a management plan and the eventual publication of such a plan with wide distribution of such. The interagency nature of the responsibility for managing grizzly bears was never questioned.

When the study began, no funds were provided by the National Park Service. A housing facility was provided in 1959 and 1960. In 1962 Dr. Frank

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. James M. Coutts, Acting Chief
Division of Wildlife Research

DATE:

FROM : John J. Craighead

SUBJECT: Deputy Chief Scientist Robert M. Linn's Comments on the Craighead Report MANAGEMENT OF BEARS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Craighead requested support for the project directly from the office of Senator Metcalf. Senator Metcalf expressed keen interest and this letter was passed on to the Assistant Secretary of Interior John A. Carver, who authorized funds in the amount of $6,000 annually. The request for these funds did not go to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife or to some other government source, but to the National Park Service. The Yellowstone Park administration was directed to supply the funds. This was a high-level decision.

From the beginning the intent was that there would be no strings attached to this contribution so as to keep the research as objective as possible. However, the National Park Service eventually managed to incorporate it into a contract against the wishes and judgment of the researchers. The financial contribution to this study by the National Park Service has been minor compared to the total investment. Cooperation during Mr. Garrison's term as superintendent was excellent.

Surely Mr. Linn realizes that the investigators have responsibilities to other supporters and collaborators as well as to the National Park Service. Also Mr. Linn must be aware that eventually all the material gathered in this study will be available to the National Park Service. The Park Service is the chief recipient of the effort that has been put out. The study and our presence in Yellowstone were instrumental in showing the need for basic research in this park and we strongly urged and supported the National Park Service in its efforts to develop its own research capability.

We have made rather exceptional efforts to resolve difficulties and to cooperate. Nevertheless, the general feeling among some responsible Park Service personnel is that they will tolerate privately sponsored research activities within Yellowstone but not encourage it. A condescending but not cooperative attitude prevails. Unnecessary "roadblocks" are all too frequently manufactured. This attitude has prevailed in spite of the fact that we have repeatedly pointed out that it is a responsibiliyty of the Bureau to do research on public lands. This negative, often hostile, attitude has grown in direct proportion to the success of our research efforts.

We believe it is our responsibility to eventually make available to the National Park Service all the information we have obtained, but we also feel there should be no restriction on the publication of this material unless it can be clearly shown that the information is invalid or would be unnecessarily embarrassing to the Park Service.

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. James M. Coutts, Acting Chief
Division of Wildlife Research

DATE:

FROM : John J. Craighead

SUBJECT: Deputy Chief Scientist Robert M. Linn's Comments on the Craighead Report MANAGEMENT OF BEARS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Now with regard to the specific comments made by Mr. Linn.

On Page 1, Paragraph 2, Mr. Linn objected to the fact that in our report we did not attempt to explain methods or to provide all of the quantitative evidence we have for some of the conclusions arrived at. He has stated that in order to produce publishable material, these omissions should be rectified. I think it is clearly stated in the report why it is not feasible to include all of the data. It would constitute a report of from 500 to 800 pages, which would not be read by the very people who should read such a report. Also, the time involved in compiling a report of this kind would take years - and the grizzly bear is a threatened species and the management of this species needs immediate attention. Furthermore, the report contains more quantitative data than any similar report of this nature that I am aware of.

What Mr. Linn does not state is that ample quantitative evidence, but not all our data, have been included in the report to substantiate the conclusions drawn, and as such enables other scientists and administrators to determine how our conclusions were reached.

Also, if Mr. Linn were at all familiar with the work we have published to date, he would realize that much of the methodology has been described in the scientific literature and other papers are in progress. The purpose of the management report was not to go into detail on methodology but to draw conclusions from a long and detailed research study.

It is rather difficult to reconcile how Mr. Linn as deputy chief scientist of the Park Service can consider our report scientifically inadequate, yet have apparently given his official sanction to the recent National Park Service report GRIZZLY BEAR ATTACKS AT GRANITE PEAK AND TROUT LAKE IN GLACIER NATIONAL PARK IN AUGUST 1967. This report not only has been published, but the Park Service has felt it of sufficient importance that they can charge the public $6.50 without photographs and $7.50 with photographs.

Although the above-mentioned report deals with bear incidents and management implications, no attempt was made by the National Park Service to elicit the help of scientists with long experience in bear research. It is certainly impossible for the reader to arrive at the conclusions stated by the National Park Service from the type of data presented in the report. This report certainly should be carefully scrutinized by the scientific community, because the objectivity of the report can certainly be questioned and no doubt will be since a national resource is at stake.

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. James M. Coutts, Acting Chief
Division of Wildlife Research

DATE:

FROM : John J. Craighead

SUBJECT: Deputy Chief Scientist Robert M. Linn's Comments on the Craighead Report MANAGEMENT OF BEARS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

On Page 20 of his memorandum, Mr. Linn states "I have serious reservations concerning the remainder of the report - at least for publication purposes" and he states "Primary among these is the way in which the purpose of a national park, as related in the report, comes through to me . . . . . But the implication in the report is that the Park Service should manage the resources to augment the grizzly population." Mr. Linn takes a full paragraph to state that the report recommends augmentation of the grizzly bear population so as to create an unnatural population. Mr. Linn also states that on Page 61 of our report we suggest that management should be directed toward increasing the survival of females to breeding age, thus increasing population numbers.

Actually what we have stated is as follows: "In view of these findings, grizzly-bear management should be directed toward increasing the survival of females to breeding age and providing greater security for those that have attained this age. This would increase the size of the productive female segment of the population and help to insure survival of the species." Since the grizzly bear is a threatened species, it would seem reasonable to suggest management techniques or management procedures that would enable this species to increase in numbers. In the body of the report we show how this can be done by creating a buffer zone around Yellowstone National Park. The report does not discredit the primary Park Service goal of maintaining or re-creating ecological conditions existing before the advent of the white man.

We suggest that the Park Service could cooperate with other agencies in creating a larger base population of grizzlies which would afford a greater margin of safety for the species. Nowhere have we advocated artificiality in management, but have pointed out where it already exists or how it could be eliminated or partially rectified. Again, it must be recognized that management of the grizzly is not the sole responsibility of the National Park Service but is also very much the responsibility in the Yellowstone Park area of the National Forest Service and the Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho Fish and Game Departments.

Mr. Linn goes on to say that he considers it unscientific to consider augmentation of population numbers even though this augmentation is done by natural means. Apparently he does consider it scientific to recommend the reduction of population numbers even for an endangered species such as the grizzly, or perhaps his concept is that the Park Service should do nothing.

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. James M. Coutts, Acting Chief
Division of Wildlife Research

DATE:

FROM : John J. Craighead

SUBJECT: Deputy Chief Scientist Robert M. Linn's Comments on the Craighead Report MANAGEMENT OF BEARS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

The problem is that park land has protected the grizzly, but more than passive protection is now needed. We have provided information which will enable the Park Service to do some constructive management of grizzlies providing the Service chooses to look at this problem not as a National Park Service problem alone but as a problem involving other resource management agencies as well.

I fail to see anything in our report which infers or suggests that the management procedures we have advocated would conflict with the Park Service policy of maintaining or restoring natural ecosystem relationships. We suggest how these relationships can be restored or partially restored (see Page 88).

During the period of study, there was a slow growth of the population of grizzlies in Yellowstone. This was due partly to the fact that the Park Service personnel reduced the number of grizzlies annually killed in their control operations and that we perfected bear-handling techniques and passed these on to ranger personnel. Also there was a concerted effort on the part of agencies outside the Park to cut down on grizzly bear mortalities. The wide publicity given the study created an awareness of the need to conserve the grizzly and we believe this all had a beneficial effect.

There is no doubt that overproduction on the part of the grizzly could lead to overpopulation which is clearly pointed out in our report (Page 105). However, the fact that a population will increase if protected cannot be used as an argument that this is "tampering" of the ecosystem. Certainly no population biologist could be that naive. I fail to see Mr. Linn's point. Perhaps he is opposed to management of wildlife in a National Park. If so, he should state his belief - not confuse biological principles.

On Page 2 Mr. Linn states that there are "other management recommendations that need much further investigation prior to serious consideration". Number 1, he states that, "The reestablishment of distinct grizzly bear populations on suitable lands outside park boundaries is desirable. However, this would require that other agencies assume responsibilities that they probably will not be able to uphold." The fact is that these agencies have been assuming and upholding these responsibilities, and appear to be far more responsive to the suggestions resulting from nine years of intensive research than is the National Park Service's Deputy Chief Scientist.

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. James M. Coutts, Acting Chief
Division of Wildlife Research

DATE:

FROM : John J. Craighead

SUBJECT: Deputy Chief Scientist Robert M. Linn's Comments on the Craighead Report MANAGEMENT OF BEARS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

A careful reading of the report will show that the grizzlies were not to be given complete protection on lands outside the park. In fact, the report clearly states how grizzly bears can be controlled outside of Yellowstone National Park (see Page 106). Suffice is to say that we have overwhelming correspondence and personal conversations to support the fact that the National Forest Service and the Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming Fish and Game Departments are ready and willing to cooperate in any plan that will help to sustain a population of grizzly bears outside the immediate environs of Yellowstone. This can be accomplished if the National Park Service is willing to cooperate.

Page 2, Number 2. Mr. Linn states that "phasing out" of the Trout Creek dump represents an impossible research design for evaluating a practice which must either be eliminated or continued." There is no statement anywhere in the report suggesting that the National Park Service either maintain their earth-filled dumps or eliminate these substituting them with incinerators. On Page 93, last paragraph, we state "However, concentration of grizzlies during the summer at refuse dumps has both advantages and disadvantages in the management of the species." For six pages then we go on to say in as objective a manner as possible, the pros and cons of retaining or eliminating refuse dumps. When officials of Yellowstone were questioned concerning administrative plans for garbage disposal, we were informed that there were long-range plans for substituting incinerators for the open-pit dumps, but no official time scheduling. There was certainly no communication that this decision was an either/or proposition and that we should consider management suggestions in this context. Mr. Linn implies that after the decision was made to install incinerators that the possibility of doing this gradually and evaluating the effects on grizzlies was not possible if a valuable resource were at stake. There is no question that slow phasing out of garbage dumps would be costly; however, this point is recognized by the authors in the report (Page 89).

No direct funds are now appropriated for bear management in Yellowstone. It does not seem unreasonable to spend some of the taxpayer's money to determine what will occur when the open-pit garbage dumps are removed. Mr. Linn has criticized our report as lacking in supporting data, yet his evaluation of phasing out garbage dumps is based only on his personal beliefs and an apparent budgetary problem.

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. James M. Coutts, Acting Chief
Division of Wildlife Research

DATE:

FROM : John J. Craighead

SUBJECT: Deputy Chief Scientist Robert M. Linn's Comments on the Craighead Report MANAGEMENT OF BEARS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. Linn states "I am apprehensive that phasing out garbage dumps" (as recommended in our report) "would at some point hold animals on limited food supplies (as in Glacier), actually encourage incidents and lead to a restoration of garbage feeding before the no garbage feeding situation was tested." It is hard to conceive how one reasons that some food for the animals would make them more dangerous than no food at all. To the best of my knowledge, there is no statement in our report which indicates that the National Park Service should either get rid of open-pit dumps or provide incinerators. We simply present the pros and cons.

It seems incomprehensible to us that such points as these should be the subject of criticism when to date no member of the National Park Service has ever had either direct conversation or correspondence with us concerning our management report - with the exception of one phone call on August 14, 1967, from Superintendent McLaughlin who took issue with one or two statements in the report referring to Park Service personnel - in spite of every effort of the authors to bring this about.

On June 12, 1967, Dr. Frank Craighead and myself met with the Yellowstone staff specifically to go over the report, left the report with them, and specifically asked for comments and suggestions so we could finalize the report. Since then we have vainly tried to communicate for nearly a year. Mr. Linn's reponse is the first and came only after official prodding. Prior to this time there have been no comments or suggestions forthcoming, either verbally or in writing. Correspondence and phone calls produced no results. The manuscript was finally printed after a long delay, but still with no comment from Park Service officials.

On Page 3, Number 3, Mr. Linn states "I heartily disagree with the recommendation that the park policy should not be to afford visitors the opportunity to see a grizzly bear." Again Mr. Linn has grossly misinterpreted our statements. We have suggested in the management policy how grizzly bears could be viewed by the public but did state on Page 97 "However, providing a wildlife display of grizzly bears for the public should be secondary to the objective of holding the base population of grizzlies within the confines of the park." We then propose a modest program for the public viewing of grizzlies. I think that Mr. Linn should know that we discussed with former superintendent, John McLaughlin, how grizzly bears could be baited using elk kills and how these carcasses could be placed so that grizzlies would be attracted and could be viewed by the

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. James M. Coutts, Acting Chief
Division of Wildlife Research

DATE:

FROM : John J. Craighead

SUBJECT: Deputy Chief Scientist Robert M. Linn's Comments on the Craighead Report MANAGEMENT OF BEARS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

general public. We helped the Park Service to initiate a pilot program of this type based on our research; however we did warn there were dangers to a program of public viewing and that it could easily get out of hand.

It is hard to believe that Mr. Linn has read our report and arrived at the types of conclusions and statements he has incorporated into his memorandum. It would appear that he has been influenced by other information and not by the content of our report alone. Since Mr. Linn is not in a position to have any considerable amount of first-hand information on the grizzly in Yellowstone, it would be illuminating to know the sources of his information. I suspect he is relying on the attitudes of colleagues rather than on systematically gathered data.

Number 4, Page 3. Mr. Linn's comments on Item 4 are of such an emotional nature that it appears useless to even comment on them here. Obviously the research workers recognize the role of Yellowstone National Park in protection of the grizzly bear. It is stated in the very beginning of the report. It would be easy to strengthen this if this has caused concern.

In no way has the removal of a few grizzlies been dramatized. We have simply indicated how these grizzlies have died and we have been consistent in stating, as noted by Mr. Linn, that research people were responsible for some mortality. Had we wished to dramatize the control mortality, we could have stated how prior to the inauguration of our research program, practically all grizzlies killed within the park were thrown on the dumps with only an occasional attempt to preserve a specimen. Also we could have told how one extremely valuable marked grizzly bear was shot by a ranger and then the claws cut off for souvenirs. This was done with full knowledge of the value of the bear to our research program. We were not informed of the incident. We might also have cited incidents of grizzly bear killings by park personnel that were not reported by rangers in accordance with National Park Service directives. We also might have stated that we developed the immobilizing techniques and in turn instructed park rangers so that they in turn could utilize these techniques. The fact that some rangers tried this without adequate training and the fact that this was attempted on a much larger scale than it should have been without greater proficiency could have been highly dramatized by us if this had been our purpose.

Instead we have recognized the problems the Service has in managing bears and have tried to be helpful. Our attitude on this point is summed up on

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. James M. Coutts, Acting Chief
Division of Wildlife Research

DATE:

FROM : John J. Craighead

SUBJECT: Deputy Chief Scientist Robert M. Linn"s Comments on the Craighead Report MANAGEMENT OF BEARS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Page 101 "The majority of rangers, however, understand the problem and require only more supervision and adequate financing to do a more efficient job." The section on personnel was included only after discussion with rangers and because they felt it would be helpful.

At the end of Page 3 Mr. Linn again reiterates that the management recommendations have been made to the National Park Service for consideration in advance of the supporting data. Our contention is that more than an adequate amount of supporting data have been presented in the report and that any additional data would be superfluous and would detract from its readability. Also, as stated before, the National Park Service and other agencies will have to manage grizzly bears in the very near future if they are going to save this endangered species. My personal feeling is that the chief scientist of the National Park Service should be thankful to have nine years of scientific data and experience on which to base a management program.

The few critical statements that have been made in the report have been made in the interest of the Park Service and in the interest of managing the resource and not to embarrass the Service which seems to be a central theme of Mr. Linn's memorandum.

It also should be noted that the National Park Service was given more than ample opportunity to rectify these situations in the advance copy of the manuscript. We pleaded with park personnel to make these corrections so that we would not be put in a position of unnecessarily or inadvertently criticizing a sister organization. Since we made every attempt to work out these problems with the National Park Service at the field level, and since an important aspect of research is to get information into published journals so that it can be available to all, we feel that the management report, with minor alterations, should be published at the earliest possible time.

We can offer concrete evidence that other scientists, agencies, and financial backers support this view. We should again like to point out that the National Park Service has been receiving the benefits of an $85,000 annual research project for an annual Park Service investment of less than $2,700.

We should like very much to sit down with Mr. Linn and discuss his points, one by one, where he can make ready reference to the manuscript, and where

STANDARD FORM NO. 64

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. James M. Coutts, Acting Chief
Division of Wildlife Research

DATE:

FROM : John J. Craighead

SUBJECT: Deputy Chief Scientist Robert M. Linn's Comments on the Craighead Report MANAGEMENT OF BEARS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

we can clarify points that have confused him. The investigators feel they have a responsibility to the supporting agencies to publish. We wish to give every consideration to Mr. Linn's criticisms and we wish to emphasize that we are more than willing to take suggestions and to make changes that have merit and which can be supported by fact or where our own data is proved to be unreliable. However, our ultimate responsibility is to the resource and this resource is the responsibility of a number of agencies and it is the property of the American people. It would be unfortunate indeed if the results of nine years of research effort could be withheld from publication because of what appears to be bureaucratic nitpicking.

I would like to again suggest that you read the recent report issued by Glacier National Park on the grizzly bear attacks. If this represents the kind of reports that the Park Service is willing to publish, then I must conclude they are operating on a double standard.

John Craighead

John J. Craighead

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85721

COLLEGE OF MINES
DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY

January 12, 1966

Dr. John Craighead
Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit
Montana State University
Department of Zoology
Missoula, Montana

Dear John and Frank:

You must have known from the hearty applause and the many questions afterward how highly successful your AAAS lecture was on December 30th.

Though I have read about your work and have visited you briefly, I had no idea of the magnitude and the depth of your work. It is a superlative achievement in ecological research of the highest order.

I only hope there is opportunity for many many more people to see your film and to hear the two of you make your comments about it.

I knew you were excellent photographers and have seen other pictures of yours but from an artisitic standpoint this one is tops. I want very much for my friend Herbert Ullmann who made the film "Antarctic Biology" which you saw, to see it. He is one of the best field photographers I have ever known.

Perhaps most of all was the great pleasure in having the leisurely visit with you at dinner from which I was sorry to leave so soon to do one more chore as retiring president of AAAS. That responsibility has been a pleasant and stimulating one but now that it is finished I shall not be traveling quite so much. Peg assured me that she will like this and I know it will give me more time in my garden.

With warmest regards to all of you,

Sincerely yours,

Laurence M. Gould

cc: Frank Craighead

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

June 5, 1968

Dear Dad:

I am enclosing a copy of the comments of Robert Linn, chief deputy scientist of the Park Service, made on our report and a copy of my reply. Frank is drafting a reply also.

It is hard to imagine a responsible official acting in this manner. Thought you would be interested.

Regards,

JJC:AB

XEROX COPY

National Geographic Society
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

MELVIN M. PAYNE
PRESIDENT

August 9, 1967

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

Dear John:

This is a belated reply to your letter of July 25th, which arrived while I was absent on vacation.

I checked into the matter of the Magazine announcement of the Grizzly television film with Rowe Findley who advises that he and Edith Berg have already made the changes suggested by you. Consequently, I believe the article is now in good shape.

Incidentally, we showed the Grizzly film to George Hartzog and a group of some twenty regional directors and other high officials of the National Park Service last week. They were obviously impressed with it and especially with the conservation theme which certainly supports their efforts throughout the park system. I feel the show is going to be one of our best.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Mel

President.

MMP:sj

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

June 28, 1967

Mr. John McLaughlin, Superintendent
Yellowstone National Park
Yellowstone Park, Wyoming 83020

Dear John:

I want to thank you for your phone call concerning the National Geographic TV production GRIZZLY. I appreciated your frank comments concerning certain portions of the narration and also your concern as to whether the film sufficiently emphasizes the grizzly bear and its present status.

I can only reiterate what I said over the phone that the sole purpose of this film is to create a public understanding of some of our major resource problems including the need to preserve a threatened species and to portray to the public how information is obtained to carry out these objectives. We probably will not know whether the show will accomplish this until it has been released to the public. However, I do believe that the show will do this, and hopefully not at too great a risk to scientific reputations.

I am enclosing a letter that Dr. Paul Saltman wrote me after he had viewed the film. I think you should know that Dr. Saltman was a stranger to me until I received this letter so his judgment is based entirely on what he saw in the film.

I am sure that no one recognizes the hazards involved in presenting a film of this kind to the general public any more than Frank and I do. We did a lot of soul searching before we agreed to cooperate with the National Geographic Society in this venture.

I am making every attempt to get a finished copy of the film prior to the general release date of November 1st. If I manage to effect this, I would be most happy to show the film to a small group of Park officials, and I would certainly appreciate as candid a review of the film as you made of the script.

Sincerely,

John Craighead

John J. Craighead

JJC:AB

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY PARK
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007

BIOCHEMISTRY

February 24, 1967

Dr. John Craighead
Route 3
Missoula, Montana

Dear John,

Yesterday I had a wonderful experience. Irwin invited me to the Wolper screening rooms to see the film that you had worked on with him. It is magnificent. It was an exciting and moving 1 hour presentation of one of the most important concerns of modern man - the preservation of our resources and natural beauty.

Any fears or concerns that you might have about the importance of this film should be set aside. Any feelings that you have "sold out" science to show business should be wiped from your mind. Sure, you'll have some more academic colleagues wandering up to you at meetings and putting you down. But believe me, its comes more from their jealousy than any other single feature.

Congratulations once again on being involved in a most important project. You have done more for ecology in making this film than you would have in a hundred articles in the technical journals.

I hope we will have a chance to be togehter soon.

With best regards,

Paul Saltman
Professor

PS/dl

August 14, 1967

Superintendent McLaughlin phoned me at the Laboratory in Yellowstone today. We had just learned from the newspapers that two young girls had been killed by grizzlies in Glacier National Park. I thought his call would be in reference to this but he made no mention of the incident whatsoever. Instead he said that he had glanced at our report on MANAGEMENT OF BEARS IN YELLOWSTONE and that though he had not yet read it, he was concerned about a statement in the report appearing on Page 101. The statement had to do with attitude of rangers regarding the control of grizzly bears within the park. He said he did not believe the statement belonged in a scientific report and that it was critical of the Park Service.

I answered that I did not think it was critical and that it was in the report because we thought the information would be of value to him and to his staff. His rangers believed it was a constructive statement. I said I was sorry if he felt strongly about what we had said but reminded him that we had sent the report to him and to his staff for review, specifically requesting that they indicate anything in the report that might in any way be embarrassing to him or his staff. I said that his staff had read the report but that in spite of two letters and several phone calls, I had never received any acknowledgement that the report had been received and not one word of criticism, instruction, or suggestions. I told him the report had been released and it was now too late to make changes. On August 8th I had informed Mr. McLaughlin of my intention to complete the report and requested joint release so as to avoid any embarrassing situation.

Mr. McLaughlin did not reply to the letter but in this phone conversation he said he would not release the report jointly to the press as I had suggested in a letter to him. This I had done as a courtesy and with the hope that we would all be in agreement. He said he saw no need to send copies of the report to the press but would not prevent us from doing so since it was

our report. I told him that I had promised Mr. Bibler of the Associated Press in Helena, Lloyd Schermer of the Missoulian, and John Campbell of the Missoula Radio station that I would provide them copies of the report. They had followed our work closely and were personally interested in the work. All had made repeated requests for the report. I told him that this sort of public education was a major objective of the Montana Unit and that I could not withhold the report. He said he would not ask me to withhold the report but did want to register his objection to certain things in the report which he said should not be in a scientific report.

I questioned him further but it was obvious that he had not read the report but only certain sentences, probably underlined by his staff, and it was apparent that we could have no discussion based on contents of the report. I again said I was sorry but felt the information was there for his best interests and not as a criticism of his rangers or the National Park Service. I said I felt sure the report would be valuable to him and hoped he and his staff would still take time to read it and make a detailed report to us of their objections and also of the areas of agreement. He said there would not be a written comment. However, before terminating the conversation he requested that I send him the names and addresses of the press receiving a copy of the report.

I think that a mistake has been made by not making a joint release to the press. To have done so would prevent possible misunderstanding between the researchers and the Yellowstone Park Administration should some of the material in the report be taken out of context or used to attempt to embarrass either party. Now any adverse comments made by the press can be used by the Park administration to discredit our work and to cite improper handling of the

release of information. I feel that we did all we could to prevent such a situation from arising. The decision not to work with us on this problem was made without any discussion with us and the decision given to us over the phone. My letter on the subject has not been answered to date.

Chronological Review of Grizzly Bear and Elk Research Programs Within Yellowstone National Park

1959

The study of the grizzly bear, Ursus Arctos horribilis, in Yellowstone National Park was initiated in 1959. Arrangements for conducting the study within the Park were made with Superintendent Lemuel Garrison and the plans were cleared with the Research Division of the Fish and Wildlife Service. The Fish and Wildlife Service is authorized by Congress to conduct wildlife research on public lands. Other federal land management agencies do not have this responsibility and funds cannot be budgeted for this.

The project has been conducted jointly through the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit headed by Dr. John J. Craighead and the Environmental Research Institute headed by Dr. Frank C. Craighead.

Verbal agreements were made with Superintendent Garrison regarding conduct of the study. It was generally agreed that the Park Service would maintain a closure on the Trout Creek area so that observations would not be disrupted, that housing and laboratory facilities would be furnished, that rangers would be requested to actively cooperate in the study, and that findings and publications resulting from the study would be made available to the National Park Service. We agreed to abide by Park rules and regulations.

The first year of work was financed entirely by the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit*. Housing facilities for the project were made available by the Park Service at the old ranger station at Canyon.

---

*Fish and Wildlife Service, Montana Department of Fish and Game, University of Montana, and Wildlife Management Institute cooperating.

1960

Similar housing arrangements were made for 1960 and study plans for a long-range study financed by numerous organizations was discussed with the Superintendent and his staff. A research proposal submitted to the National Science Foundation at the end of the 1959 season was approved. Financial support for the project was thus increased by $19,400. Financial support was also secured from the National Geographic Society. Philco Corporation agreed to provide electronic equipment for developing a radiotracking system for use with the grizzly bear. This was provided gratis.

1961

National Park Service long-range development plans called for destruction of the Canyon Ranger Station. Operations began early in the spring of 1961 and we were informed we would have to provide our own quarters. The National Park Service was unable to provide housing or laboratory facilities for the research team. Fortunately the Yellowstone Park Company, a private concessionaire, agreed to allow us to use their housing facilities in the Canyon area. These facilities were far superior to those that had been available in previous years. The Company volunteered to assume the costs of heating, lighting, and maintaining the facility. Without the use of the Yellowstone Park Company facilities, the research program could not have survived. The Park administration could not openly oppose this arrangement, but we were informed from several sources that the Park authorities were not happy with the arrangement because it lessened their control of our operation.

1962

Project personnel were again housed in the Yellowstone Park Company facilities at Canyon and improvements were made in these facilities. Additional support for the grizzly bear research was obtained from the Boone and Crockett Club and the Wildlife Management Institute. The National Geographic Society continued to support the research effort and so did Philco Corporation.

In spite of this additional support, there was need for more funds in order to expand the scope of the study. Dr. Frank C. Craighead made a request to Senator Metcalf for some federal support since the research findings were of special value to the National Park Service and other federal agencies. In making this request, Dr. Craighead requested that no strings be attached to any funds provided. It was believed that if certain demands were made, these demands might retard the research effort. This request was forwarded by the Senator to the Secretary of the Interior and the request for funds was approved by him. Notice was received from Under-Secretary Carver that funds would be made available through the National Park Service. Such funds could have been requested by the Under-Secretary directly from the Fish and Wildlife Service but his decision was to make the request from the National Park Service. The researchers had no part in this administrative decision but were on occasion accused of using influence to obtain funds earmarked for other Park Service activities. A grant of $6,000 was made available from National Park Service funds with no strings attached and apparently with full concurrence at top administrative levels.

During the winter of 1962-1963 the Northern Yellowstone elk herd was reduced by approximately 5,000 animals. This reduction and the action taken by the Service was given full support by the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit. This support was much needed in order to swing public opinion in support of the Park Service Objectives.

Because this support proved extremely helpful in accomplishing the reduction goals and clearly showed the value of research, Superintendent Garrison suggested it would be desirable to have an elk research project under way similar to the grizzly bear project and requested that Dr. John Craighead prepare a research plan and a budget. This was done and as a

result an elk migration and movement study was initiated in 1964 with annual support of $4,500 from the National Park Service.

A loose contract was negotiated which set no deadlines with regard to research objectives, procedures, or completion reports. Because of the additional research load and the necessity of housing graduate students, we requested that the Yellowstone Park administration consider the possibility of providing additional facilities at Canyon. National Park Service funds were made available for renovating the Lamar Ranger Station and making it into a research center; however no provisions were made to improve our research station at Canyon which is located in the geographic center of the Park. Intensive long-range research directly related to the Park's management problems was being conducted by us at Canyon; little research was in progress at the Lamar Station and this facility has had relatively little use up to the present time.

We obtained discarded rental cabins from the Yellowstone Park Company and these were moved to our Canyon headquarters with permission of the Park Superintendent. These units were moved by the Yellowstone Park Company and renovated by the National Park Service. These provided housing facilities for students doing research work on elk and grizzly bear. No family living quarters were or have been available for senior research personnel. Some members have spent a total of five months a year in the Park and away from their families.

1963

Plans were made for beginning the elk migration and movement study. The Park Service agreed to trap and mark elk. Additional support for the grizzly bear research was received from the National Science Foundation and other supporting agencies.

Partly as a result of the Leopold Report, the National Park Service initiated its own research program. Relatively small funds were involved and most projects were short term and emphasis was placed on applied research. The annual contract with the National Park Service for the grizzly bear research was altered at the regional level, requiring specific research objectives, periodic reports during the year, and a final report. Freedom for individual investigation was curtailed and administrative paper work greatly increased. The loose flexible arrangement originally made was altered to conform to a very inflexible contract that emphasized routine outlines, reports, and stated research objectives. Freedom to seek knowledge and to do this with a minimum of red tape was discouraged.

1964

Approximately $99,900 of direct and indirect funds were expended in Yellowstone Park on grizzly bear research by the Craigheads during 1964. This support is detailed in the enclosure and is fairly representative of other years as well. The National Park Service grizzly bear contract became still more restrictive and considerable discussion took place before a contract was written that could be signed by both parties. Even so it was unsatisfactory to the researchers, whose major financial support came from organizations sponsoring research free from bureaucratic control.

A contract for conducting the elk migration and movement study was signed June 30th and the sum involved was $4,500. This was a rather loose contract making few demands on the researchers except to produce a final report in due time. A sum equal to the National Park Service contribution was provided by the Wildlife Research Unit. This was a cooperative research venture with equal contributions from both parties. It was to be student rather than staff conducted. The formidable physical problems were recognized by both parties to the contract.

A contract was negotiated with the Atomic Energy Commission for approximately $20,000 to perfect a radiotracking system to be used to study elk in Yellowstone National Park.

A Memorandum of Understanding was prepared between the Wildlife Research Unit and Yellowstone National Park in an attempt to overcome some of the red tape involved in National Park Service contracts. This Memorandum was finally approved in 1966, a year after research work began. It was satisfactory to both parties. The Park Service provided no funds.

Problems developed in meeting deadlines for reports on the elk movement study due to loss of students to the draft. Attempts were made to negotiate less demanding contracts and ones recognizing the special problems involved in student research. Some progress was made, but due to the lack of trained scientists or research-oriented personnel within the National Park Service, advances in this direction have been slow and painful. An educational program is needed.

1966

Submitted a proposed Memorandum of Understanding to the Superintendent of Yellowstone for the extension of grizzly bear research. This was done so that a renewal research proposal could be submitted to the National Science Foundation. The Superintendent informed the researchers that a Memorandum of Understanding extending the grizzly bear research would not be considered until a final report on the earlier phases of the project had been submitted. A deadline on this could not be met due to the press of other work and the magnitude of the data involved. It was necessary to submit a proposal to the National Science Foundation without confirmation of cooperation from the National Park Service.

The Fish and Wildlife Service provided funds to hire a student for summer employment on the grizzly bear study. The elk movement and migration study was renewed by contract; however because of the problems encountered in keeping graduate students on the project and because of unrealistic report deadlines, these funds were purposely not utilized so that the Wildlife Research Unit personnel would not be under further pressure and obligation to the National Park Service. The Atomic Energy Commission project was renewed for another year.

1967

Received notice that our laboratory in Yellowstone Park would be destroyed in long-range plans to "beautify" the park. The laboratory at Canyon, according to the Assistant Superintendent of Yellowstone, detracted from visitor enjoyment of the area. The building is in better shape structurally than it was before we occupied it, and could be made attractive with a fraction of the funds that will be required to replace it. There has been no direct indication from the National Park Service that comparable facilities will be furnished. When and if they are, we will be charged for them. We are obligated under two major contracts - one with the Atomic Energy Commission and one with the National Science Foundation - but with no assurance that we will have a place from which to operate.

The Fish and Wildlife Service again has agreed to furnish funds for us to employ a student on the grizzly bear project during the summer. A final report on the management of the grizzly bear and a progress report on radiotracking elk have been prepared and are being submitted to the National Park Service and other cooperators.

The effort to keep a $100,000 a year research program operative within Yellowstone becomes greater each year. We can only conclude that there is little interest in non-service sponsored research by the present Yellowstone

staff. There is evidence that the Park Service wishes to exert strong control over research efforts in the Park and where this is not possible they are willing to sacrifice the research effort. This attitude toward both research and management can only serve to perpetuate mistakes similar to those that in the past have created the host of complex management problems that now exist in the Park.

Annual Financial Statement for the Grizzly Bear Ecology and Radiotracking Projects (1964)

Agency	1964 Contribution	Remarks
National Geographic	$10,000	Grant funds and photographic equipment
National Science Foundation	11,000	
Philco Corporation	40,000	To Environmental Research Institute for research and development of electronic equipment
University of Montana	2,000	
Montana Fish and Game	3,000	
Environmental Research Institute	9,000	
Boone and Crockett Club	2,300	
New York Zoological Society	1,000	
American Museum of Natural History	500	
Wildlife Management Institute	500	Over and above annual contribution to the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit
Yellowstone Park Company	2,000	Housing (Lab and utilities) in Yellowstone
National Park Service	6,800	Salary and transportation of research assistant and utilities in Yellowstone
Fish and Wildlife Service	4,000	Salary and transportation of Unit Leader
Fish and Wildlife Service	3,500	Radio development and maintenance
Penrose Hospital	2,000	Chemical analysis of blood. Micropathology.
University of Minnesota	300	Chemical analysis of milk
Hoke Franciscus	2,000	Electronic consulting
Total -	$99,900	

June 12, 1967

Met with Superintendent McLaughlin, John Good, and other staff members to discuss our research, housing at Canyon, and our report on management of the grizzly bear.

The Superintendent said they would destroy the Y.P. mess hall at Canyon that has served as our laboratory. It was evident that no arguments by us would prevail. He offered to consider our housing needs at Canyon but it is all too obvious that they cannot meet our needs. This is just another example of the type of cooperation we have had. A decision is made that involved us and our work and in spite of the Memorandum of Agreement we are told to comply, but never given an opportunity to present our case prior to the decision making. These unilateral decisions have been the basis of most of our problems.

We reviewed our management report and left a copy for review by the park staff indicating it was privileged material and not to be circulated. We were asked why we had taken so long to produce a report. The atmosphere of the talk was not friendly or constructive. Much of the discussion between ourselves and park personnel dwelt on why we had taken so long to do the research work and get out a report and why it was necessary to do further research. It was quite evident that the Superintendent and most of his staff do not understand the nature of ecological research. We could not help but feel from the remarks and conversation that we were being tolerated but not wanted. It seems that the park administration fears we may influence Washington to support our research with Park Service funds and that this will mean that monies appropriated for ranger activities will be diverted between research and ranger activities. Basically, however, the problem is that we cannot be

completely controlled by Park Service directive as can all park personnel, and this fact constitutes a threat to the power and authority of the Superintendent and his staff and also to the established bureaucracy. I believe we have conducted ourselves with propriety and restraint but overtures on our part for cooperation and understanding are ignored.

The Superintendent terminated the meeting by requesting that we outline our research objectives for the coming year and submit a request for housing. We had already done the former and the latter appears to be a useless gesture since we have investigated the available housing at Canyon and there is nothing there that can serve our purposes. We will, however, comply with the request.

No action has been taken to review the Memorandum of Agreement I drew up months ago and submitted to the Superintendent. We have received no comments or acknowledgement of our AEC report. The Superintendent indicated he would not write the Audubon Society supporting our research although his staff admitted that Walt Berlet who had publicly critized our work had also caused them a lot of trouble and his position was known to be indefensible. He, instead, used this to illustrate why our research should not be continued longer. We reminded him that this sort of reasoning had not solved the Northern Yellowstone elk problem and that we had always supported his organization and their objectives and felt it would be in order for them to reciprocate.

June 27, 1967, Conversation between John J. Craighead and John McLaughlin and John Good, officials of Yellowstone National Park, recorded immediately following a phone conversation.

Superintendent McLaughlin contacted me by phone and informed me that he had received a copy of the script to the National Geographic TV show GRIZZLY. The script had been sent to him by Wolper Productions with no instructions or information whatsoever. The Superintendent asked me if I had been responsible for sending the script and if I was satisfied with the TV movie.

I told him I had not been responsible for sending the script and that although I had not seen the final version of the TV script nor had I seen the completed film, I was reasonably well satisfied with both the script and the film. I explained that there were many areas of compromise that we had had to negotiate but that I felt the overall impact of the film would be highly favorable.

He then expressed rather strong dissatisfaction that: 1. Yellowstone National Park had not been more prominently featured in the picture; 2. That it had not been sufficiently emphasized that the Park Service had been preserving the grizzly bear, and 3. That he felt the grizzly bear "came out second best to the Craigheads" in the film. I asked him if he would explain what he meant by this and he said that he felt that not enough emphasis had been given to the grizzly bear and its status as a threatened species, and too much attention had been given to John and Frank Craighead, the major researchers, and their families. Both he and John Good, in effect, stated they felt that it appeared we were using the grizzly bear and the Park as a means to publicize our work.

I told him this could hardly be further from the truth, and that we had made every attempt to present the Park Service and their problems in a favorable light and I felt he could not judge the film simply by the script which does not include the sound sync or the inter monologue. I then explained

to him that the purpose of the film was not solely to portray the grizzly bear, but using the grizzly bear to get across a conservation message to the general public - a message national rather than park-wide in scope.

I also mentioned that it was the practice of the National Geographic's Committee on Exploration and Research to select each year a scientist and feature his or her work and that such films were as much concerned with the people doing the work as with the animals or subjects they worked with. I mentioned that both Frank and I had been very apprehensive about being featured in a film of this kind and had agreed only after a great deal of soul searching and after we were convinced that such a film would serve as an important educational medium.

The Superintendent expressed the fear that the movie might reflect adversely on our image as scientists and this in turn on the image of the National Park Service. I assured him we had given a lot of consideration and thought to this and recognized that there would be colleagues and others who would interpret such a film as a publicity venture rather than as an important educational contribution, that we, however, felt that the risk that some would misinterpret our motives was worth whatever risk if we were able to produce a film that would explain problems in resource management and explicitly the need to protect threatened species and how this type of work is carried out by research biologists.

I stated that I appreciated his candid remarks but wished that he would pub them in writing so that I would have an opportunity to study his objections and present these to the staff of the National Geographic Society. The Superintendent then said he felt the film would only aggravate our research problems in the Park. I asked him if he could be more explicit on this and he said he was much concerned about the marking and handling of wild animals, that he had had innumerable letters inquiring about research

projects, and that he felt that the film would aggravate the situation.

I stated I thought that both he and we would get criticism of any program we might conduct in Yellowstone involving either research or management and cited the tremendous amount of public criticism of the management of the Northern Yellowstone elk herd. I stated I felt the solution to this was not less public education but more and that the TV medium was an excellent way to show the public what was going on and give them the reasons for the work, and that in the case of the National Geographic TV show, approximately 30,000,000 people would be exposed to it.

I said I fully felt the responsibility of producing a show that would bring credit on the National Geographic, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the National Park Service, and that it had been carefully reviewed by both Frank and myself and by other scientists, and that the script had been cleared by my own organization, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

John Good then mentioned that he felt the language of the script was very generalized and should be more scientific and more profound. I told him we have had our problems with the script writers in this regard but after working with them for many hours and recognizing their problems as well as ours, we compromised on the present script and we felt it would effectively do the job and that the movie film was not a scientific film in any sense of the word. It is designed primarily to feature how scientists and their work and precedent has been set for this with the National Geographic TV programs on Dr. Goodall, Dr. Costeau, and Dr. Leakey.

I mentioned it was important in a commercial TV venture to inject personalities and human interest, otherwise the TV viewers would not watch the program for an hour and that this was again another point where we had

had to compromise our personal feelings with the need to produce a show that would entertain, inform, and also carry a message.

It was difficult for me not to get the feeling that both Superintendent McLaughlin and John Good were primarily concerned because they felt the National Park Service had not been sufficiently featured, and I mentioned this. The Superintendent then said that my explanation was helpful to him and that in light of what I had said his earlier criticisms were not wholly justified.

I mentioned to him that the Park Service had recently produced two films in cooperation with the Animal Kingdom series illustrating research and management of the Northern elk herd and the black bear, and asked if he felt these had been of value to the National Park Service or whether they had been detrimental. I mentioned that both films had featured marked animals or the marking of animals. I did not get a clear-cut answer to this particular question.

I told the Superintendent I was very sorry that the script had been presented to him without any forewarning and that I was doing my best to get a copy of the completed film to show to University officials and Park Service officials prior to the release date of November 1st. I indicated to him, however, that the film was completed and that it would be difficult if not impossible to make changes and that both Frank and I were as concerned about this problem of making alterations in the film as certainly they would be, but that the nature of film making was such that it was very difficult and costly to make changes after the film had reached a certain stage of production.

I again requested the Superintendent to make an official report and send his criticisms to me, but he indicated that he probably would not make a written report on the matter. I concluded the conversation by telling

him that Frank and I felt the film would reflect credit on the Park Service and the University, that it would go a long way towards educating the general public to resource management problems, and in particular to the status of the grizzly bear, and that we would do everything in our power to alleviate any fears he might have that the film would discredit us or the National Park Service. This terminated our conversation on this particular subject.

Following this conversation I later phoned John Good and discussed the matter in greater detail with him and urged that they please not disseminate their thoughts and views on this matter until they had had an opportunity to view the film, that I thought it would only be a disservice to the Park Service, to us, and the National Geographic Society. He said the conversations would be kept confidential within the Service.

I told him I would contact the National Geographic Society and see what I could do to straighten out the situation.

June 28th.

I phoned Robert Doyle of the National Geographic explaining the situation to him and asked him to please provide me with a finished copy of the film and a finished copy of the script. I indicated to him that I felt we had a definite obligation to the University of Montana, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and to the National Park Service to let them view a film which featured these organizations so prominently. He agreed to get the film to me as early as possible.

Dr. Melvin Payne, president of the National Geographic Society, arranged a showing of the film GRIZZLY for the director of the National Park Service and twenty regional directors. The film was also shown to members of the University of Montana and the B ureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

All comments were enthusiastic including those from the Park Service as indicated from Dr. Payne's letter of August 9, 1967, which is attached.

Some Park Service personnel, however, still continue to belittle the film and our efforts. My letter of June 28, 1967, to Superintendent John McLaughlin following our phone conversation is attached.

moved to the top throw their system of promomotion. Many such men were put in highly technical position with little to but years of service, to qualify them. When I was ~~active~~ chiefe of the F.C.I. & active in cooperative work with the P.S., a ~~cliche~~ cliche that was a common expression among the lower grades was - "From buss-boy to supt. say yes & smile."

#A First let me say that I have come to know Bob and have a great deal of admiration & respect for his ability and good judgment. I cant believe he composed that letter. It is part of the Park system that in his position he would have to take the responsibility for an administrative decision to supress the facts to defend those that failed on a responsibility.

he stuck his neck out that [illegible]

I need no expenses. Since 1961 I have had available for travel & helper about 1000 per year. I have spent over 10000 of my personal funds in the past 18 years. I have had a number of ~~fine~~ nice letters on my contributions but rarely any acknowledgement from within. from scientists outside the park

I have seen a number of capable young men come into the ~~Park~~ Service here at Everglades with just out of college their degrees to start a career as naturalists. Within a year they were disillusioned and left. However I can see that the qualification.

The primary role of the alligator in the ecology of these vast swamps of the Everglades result from his need for a home. This, the "gator hole", is a very simple structure. The essentials of a "gator hole" are first a depression of almost any size or shape in the limestone bedrocks which outcrops or shallowly underlies the soil of all of south Florida. This basic frame work was made by erosion many thousands of years ago when the sea was many feet lower than it is today. During the past 4,000 years, the sea has been gradually rising. This has backed up the fresh water covering the flat glades and filled the solution holes.

These provides the basic structure for the alligators home. In addition, it requires a slide or runway where the gator can bask in the sun most of the day. One more feature is essential, a cave into which the animal retreats when disturbed or when the north winter winds lower the air temperature below that of the water. In much of the alligator country, the bedrocks is so extensively eroded that a convenient cave is at hand. Where the soil is deeper as on many tree islands, the cave is excavated by the gator, the roof supported by tree roots.

Alligator housekeeping requires constant attention. The pond is continually filling from the action of organisms that precipitate marl from the waters highly charged with calcium and from the plants that are continuously pushing inward. A vacant gator hole can be completely filled and covered with vegetation in 2 or 3 years.

The muck that filled the "gator hole" is of a soupy consistancy becoming firmer toward the bottom. When wet during the floods period it will not support a mans weight. However, during the droughts of the past few years it becomes firm enough to walk across.

The required housekeeping is accomplished by actually pulling loose the plants, and dragging them out of the pool and by pushing and carrying the thick muck, a mixture of marl and organic matter onto the perimeter of the pond. This bank is built higher over the cave site.

This excavation is kept open to near the bedrock, usually about 4 feet, but in many cases, it is as much as 6 or 8, with an occassional lead going into the extensive caves beneath.

I have had much the same experience here. As you aptly put it the attitude toward private research is one of tolerance, ~~not~~ not cooperation. As my knowledge of the ecological situation in the area was gradually recognized my opinion was sought informally but rarely any confidence on these subjects and all information on park action was kept from me. On the occasion in the past 3 years reports of submitted on critical situations pertaining to the water managment were ignored & outside agencies paid large sums to get the same information and not my reports in hand. The first 10 years I was in the park, serving as a collaborator

June 68

Dear John — I stretched out in a comfortable chair and read the exchange of correspondence on the grizzly report between you & the N.P.S. from end to end. I am not at all surprised at these developments. It clearly depicts a deplorable characteristic of the N.P.S. that I have been up against for over 40 years. Basically it is a matter of too many little men in big mens shoes. Lacking adequet understanding of the responsibilities they have fallen heir to they permit an inferiority complex of tenure personal jealousies to shape their decision. The low salaries that Park Service that plagued the for years could not attract capable men with adequate educational requirments. Consequently many men with only high school education or less

#7 A insert #