

Superintendent's Office

**North Cascades National Park Service Complex,
810 State Route 20, Sedro Woolley, WA 98284**

To: Karen Taylor-Goodrich,

Superintendent, North Cascades National Park Service Complex

To: Eric Rickerson, State Supervisor, Washington Fish and Wildlife Office,
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

March 13, 2017

Re: Comments Concerning Draft Grizzly Bear Restoration Plan/
Environmental Impact Statement

Grizzly Bear "introduction" is a decision of far reaching magnitude and impact to the North Cascades Ecosystem, Washington State residents, thousands of visitors and users of public lands, and even to the imported Grizzly Bears, themselves.

Overall, the Draft EIS for Grizzly Bear Recovery fails to acknowledge the immensity of the scale of impact of alternatives B, C and D and lacks complete and scientific studies in most if not all, areas required by EIS guidelines. A 60 day comment period does not equal the time required for thoughtful study by the average Grizzly Bear Recovery supporter or opponent to make an educated response. A yay or nay vote on alternatives at this time would be based on shallow and misrepresentative data from a bare bones, incomplete EIS. Because of the erroneous information I have found in some areas of this Draft EIS, I am suspect of ALL areas of this Draft EIS. I have spent hours of fact checking and research to try and sift through what is presented. What I have found, is that which is NOT presented is far more important, and therefore disqualifies this Draft EIS as

valid. Hopefully my comments in the following pages will make clear the oversights.

I am surprised that the national agency(ies) that are considered forerunners in environmental leadership and are funded by American tax dollars would fail to demand a more detailed, exacting science and thorough study of the impacts of “Introducing” Grizzly Bears to a 6.1 million acre designated area, at the heart of which is the internationally renowned North Cascades National Park.

The region designated to be the “Recovery Area” is enormous and borders thousands of businesses, residences, acres of agricultural lands, and hundreds of thousands of people traveling through on major interstate routes and trails in Washington state. The area defined as the NCE deserves far more integrity as concerns “impacts” than what is provided in casual small paragraphs and inaccuracies, and generalizations. This document does not even begin to address the immense changes to regulations and management of every aspect of state and federal lands due to the presence of an endangered species (e.g. road and trail closures, contract rules, management plans) that will occur once Grizzly Bears are imported.

My recommendation is to discard this attempt at an EIS effort. If the special interest pressure continues by petition to keep this process in motion as it has continually done, then any future considerations and studies must improve and collaborate with non-biased wildlife experts, representatives from directly affected groups (such as hikers and visitors), residents on bordering lands, public land managers, county representatives, etc. for a broader spectrum of representation and input. Only then could a decision be reached fairly and consequences be weighed fully by the general public.

Otherwise, we are basically approving or disapproving of an experimental breeding program of introducing imported Grizzly bears to an area that is not proven to support their existence, based on special interest groups pushing the agenda with emotionalism and petition, with no guarantee of ongoing funding to support the effort. To me, this borders on exploitation of the Grizzly species.

My specific comments are found in the following pages attached below.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Courtney

Alternative A “No Action” is the best alternative to introducing Grizzly Bears to the NCE. All other alternatives (B, C and D) are exploitive to the Grizzly Bear Specie.

The Draft EIS/Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan is found lacking in:

- A) Accuracy of Historic Populations
- B) Mission of the Draft EIS not founded
- C) Study of why Grizzly Bear is not present in NCE
- D) Grizzly Bear Behavior and other Recovery Areas
- E) Vast Change of Character of NCE that impacts Visitors to the Region
- F) Impact of Shift of Regulations in the NCE once an endangered species is introduced

G) State of Washington Regulations Conflict

H) Funding Conflict and Uncertainties and Impact on Quality of Grizzly Bear Management

A) Have Grizzly Bears ever had an established population in the NCE?

1) Historical Population is in error and extrapolated

Pg. 42 states:

At the height of the fur trade from 1820 to 1860, the Hudson's Bay Company documented 3,788 grizzly bear hides shipped from trading posts in the North Cascades region."

The actual account of these numbered furs is found in this excerpt:

"Hudson Bay Company records list a large number of grizzly hides shipped from posts in Washington (e.g. 3,477 from Fort Colville, which was near Kettle Falls 1827–1859), but these trading posts received furs from a wider area that included the southeast corner of British Columbia, northern Idaho, and Montana west of the Continental Divide, as well as northeastern Washington." (Hudson's Bay Company Archives, Winnipeg; Mackie 1997:250).

2. Native American references are vague and unconfirmed in precise location of Grizzly hunting. Native Americans were known to travel hundreds of miles to their favorite hunting grounds. Needs confirmation if going to be used as evidence of Grizzly population in NCE.

3. Holocene Archeological Digs “somewhere” in Eastern Washington is extrapolation and non-specific.

4. Two reports from the 1990's, authors admit the error factor that still occurs today due to mistaken bear identity. Were the Grizzly bears actually Grizzly Bears, and were they residing or passing through, from the north? We do not know. Limited evidence.

5. Photograph from 1996 is not a proven Grizzly. No hair samples, no DNA as evidence.

Experts speculate at best, as picture is taken from a distance. Controversy due to another photo at same time period, same location, of large black bear.

6. The last identified and verifiable Grizzly Bear was in 1967, Fisher Creek Drainage, 50 years ago, killed less than 50 miles from the Canadian Border. North Cascades National Park established in 1968, prohibiting hunting. Grizzly Bear population has not made NCE their home in spite of 50 years of protection from hunting.

7. “During 2010-2012, the North Cascade Ecosystem was surveyed using barbed wire DNA hair corrals and cameras (USFWS 2011). During 2010, 191 hair corrals were placed in North Cascades National Park and adjacent national forests. No grizzlies were detected during surveys (.). During the three years, 2,500 hair samples have been retrieved; 2012 samples are still being analyzed, but no grizzlies have been detected from these samples which covered perhaps 25-30% of the North Cascades.http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/endangered/species/grizzly_bear.pdf

8. “There are no data regarding population size, trend, survival, and reproductive rates for grizzlies in the North Cascades in Washington.”

http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/endangered/species/grizzly_bear.pdf

ERRORS:

* Grizzly Bear Population History in this document is speculative and unproven.

* The Draft EIS Grizzly Bear Restoration Implies a Former Population of Grizzly Bears decimated by mankind in the NCE area

* Restoration is an incorrect term to the specific area of the proposed recovery (NCE. Importing bears would be an introduction.

*Grizzly Bear Populations have been extinct in the NCE for at least 50 years but portrayed as certain (below 20) based on one contested photo in 1996, and science that extrapolates from minimal data. EIS does not present the challenge to and controversy of the photo, but portrays it as truth.

* The former range of the Grizzly is stated to be all of the western America region, but this is unproven as far as residing in NCE. No facts, available numbers or counts of the population of Grizzly Bears “Ranging” in the NCE are ascertainable. How many Grizzly Bears “Ranged” in this area? We do not know.

B) “Purpose and Need” in the Draft EIS are Invalid and Misrepresentative to the Public

Pg 3:

The purpose of this draft plan/EIS is to determine how to restore the grizzly bear to the NCE, a portion of its historical range. (Restoration is not accurate. Grizzly Bears would be “Introduced”)

“Grizzly bears in the NCE are at risk of local extinction. As a result, the proposed action is necessary to accomplish the following: “(Grizzly Bears ARE extinct in the NCE, or never were a permanent population—false information)

“Avoid the permanent loss of grizzly bears in the NCE. Contribute to the restoration of biodiversity of the ecosystem for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations of people. “(The North Cascades NCE IS bio diverse and thriving. Restoration inaccurate term. The NCE Ecosystem is not proven to NEED Grizzly Bear presence).

“ Enhance the probability of long-term survival of grizzly bears in the NCE and thereby contribute to overall grizzly bear recovery.”(Enhancement is a couched term for layers of regulations not covered later in this document. Vague purpose)

“Support the recovery of the grizzly bear to the point where it can be removed from the federal list of threatened and endangered wildlife species.”(This is happening in YCE and Selkirk areas reaching maximum levels of Grizzly Bears, and have reached enough numbers to be de-listed, nationally. Current status needs to be stated)

ERRORS:

The ESA is cited in this plan for the underlying mission to “restore an endangered species” to the NCE, under the assumption and pretense that they once ranged here. Until accurate science, portrayal and study of the history of their preferences as to where they actually historically lived and thrived is certain, the NPS and WDFWS are taking part in an experimental Grizzly Bear introduction.

Therefore, the foundations of Purpose and Need, and Objectives are not congruent with actions proposed in the alternatives. These actions would be introducing a specie, experimentally to the NCE and hoping they survive. Again, this is EXPLOITING Grizzly Bears.

A new document discovering the truth about North Cascade Grizzly Bear existence and historical habitat is needed, with all due respect to Grizzly Bear migrations, and whether bears just passed through this area, or resided. If they just passed through, this is an important element to their survival and success in the NCE, and should be considered FIRST!

ACCURATE PORTRAYAL OF THIS PROJECT IS: “EXPERIMENTAL INTRODUCTION OF IMPORTED GRIZZLY BEARS TO UNPROVEN HABITAT

C) WHY ARE GRIZZLY BEARS NOT HERE?

1) Where are the Grizzly bears? There are 15, 000 Grizzly Bears in British Columbia, adjacent and directly above the NCE. There are 30,000 Grizzly Bears in Alaska. There are “less than 20” in the North Cascades Ecosystem, designated at 6.1 million acres.

Pg 6 states:

“The main threat to grizzly bears in the NCE is the limited number of bears..”

Pg 5 states:

Direct killing, habitat destruction, habitat modification, and range curtailment were identified by the FWS as major contributing factors that led to the decline of the species (FWS 1993a).

The creation of a “Map” (NCE) does not mean we suddenly have suitable range lands. And yet this is NOW a suitable habitat as this EIS references in studies? Did it suddenly become suitable? Contradictory principles.

Bears have been protected for 50 years from hunters and have not made the NCE (specifically the North Cascades National Park) their home since that time. There is not habitat curtailment in the National Park Complex, or in the National Forest Lands in the NCE due to development. What is the curtailment, specifically? If it is trails, highways and everything in the periphery of the map, will this suddenly all be eliminated magically making the NCE a suitable habitat? Cannot have it both ways. Cannot point at

“curtailment” as a reason for no population of Grizzly Bears, and then proclaim it a suitable habitat.

2) Is there enough analysis as to why the Grizzly Bears have not chosen to live in the NCE area? Grizzly Bear introduction success MANDATES uncovering their choices to live and thrive north of the NCE, rather than reside here.

3) A paper study finding this area as a Suitable Habitat does not preclude and guarantee a Grizzly Bear will stay.

ERRORS:

1) Assumption that Grizzly Bears will prefer the NCE and survive there

2) Lack of Analysis as to why Grizzly Bears have not chosen to live in the NCE historically including:

Major influences of drought cycles and affect on wildlife, especially the eastern slopes of the Cascades

Drought induced lack of customary foods, where will the Grizzly Bears go for food?

Wildfire Trends in the last 20 years

Amount of Wetlands necessary for survival. Does the NCE contain the large range of wetlands that support the greens that Grizzlies crave in the spring?

Successive years of adequate food supply, in other words, stability in having enough to eat year after year (such as during the two or three years of raising cubs)

Because this impacts Grizzly Bear survival after release, these areas of analysis need to be included in the Draft EIS.

3) Food supply assumptions...looks good on paper, but black bears starve in the North Cascades area and run out of berries and visit homes and ranches in poor supply years for food sources. Why wouldn't a Grizzly do the same on a larger scale due to food requirements?

4) Habitat studies are just that. Studies. Even with a pronouncement of "suitable habitat," the NCE is obviously missing something in the defined NCE habitat that would have attracted Grizzly Bears to stay, long ago. The EIS needs to address this phenomena and look deeper into the why's of the lack of a Grizzly Bear population, here, instead of pointing fingers and misusing facts about European Hunting in the area as a cause.

5) Contradiction of proclaiming the NCE as "suitable habitat" while pointing at permanent features that will not change, as curtailment to Grizzly Bears.

D) GRIZZLY BEAR BEHAVIOR

Because Alternatives B, C and D suggest ultimately reaching a level of 200 Grizzly Bear population, the nearby Selkirk-Yakk and Yellowstone Recovery zones for Grizzly Bears are excellent models for current studies of impacts on environment and the Grizzly Bears themselves. The Draft EIS sweeps over the problematic realities found in these recovery zones that limit and conflict with natural Grizzly Bear behavior, and sadly bring on their demise, happening at this very moment.

In defense of the Grizzly Bear Specie, this Draft EIS must list the realities of Grizzly Bear Behavior. Euthanization of Grizzly Bears comes of lack of foresight and facing natural Grizzly behavior.

In addition, without coming to grips with the huge responsibility and threats of introduction of an apex predator to an area, including matters of life and death to people and livestock, the NPS and USFWS are seriously lacking in logistical judgment and foresight, and predicting situations and preventing natural Grizzly Bear disasters. The Draft EIS must bring this issue to the forefront as an impact to (humans/Grizzly Bears)in each alternative.

ERRORS

1) This Draft EIS does not acknowledge the level or severity of the threat of a surprised Grizzly, nor the danger of encountering a sow with cubs, or the deaths that occur because an unsuspecting human comes into a feeding territory. This is a DRAMATIC change and alteration to the NCE area and the impacts are vast. Grizzly Bear Behavior is an impact to the environment of the NCE, not addressed thoroughly in this EIS.

2) This recovery zone (NCE) interfaces with hundreds of thousands of people on a daily basis. This EIS does not adequately address this fact. Populations of humans inside the NCE (tourists, hikers, visitors) as well as the populations bordering private lands, ranches, roadways, need accounting in this Draft, as part of the environmental impact with introduction of apex predators to the area.

Impacts of human interaction are downplayed in this EIS by justification of remote drop offs (no guarantee of bears staying there), implying that Grizzly Bears are reclusive, that there will be few numbers of bears in a large space (no guarantees of where they will range). Grizzly Bear Behavior will not follow what is "wished" for. The Draft EIS should portray the expansiveness of the populations within and bordering the NCE to show accurate possibilities of human interaction with Grizzly Bears.

3) Where is the impact study of death of humans from Grizzly Bear attacks and reasons, and will these reasons exist in the NCE? Threats and loss of human life is an off-the-scale impact of enormity, and will exist in the NCE with introduction of Grizzly Bears ...where is it included in this Draft? Death of humans results in, besides tragedy, euthanization of the Grizzlies, themselves. Is this included in the impact to Grizzly Bears?

4) Where is the study of mauling incidents, frequency, outcome, and reasons...will these reasons exist in the NCE? Maulings by Grizzly Bears

are a fact, and need addressed as a threat and impact to the NCE, and again, the ultimate euthanization of Grizzly Bears.

5)) The Draft EIS needs to include a study of other recovery zones and common problems of:

Death and Maulings of Humans, reasons and outcomes

Grizzly Bears returning home after relocation

(Relocated for being troublesome, or relocated for mating purposes)

Frequency of Grizzly Bears ranging out of the Designated Recovery Zones and resulting mortality

Preference of livestock for a diet, once found, never changes

These are ultimately impacts upon the Grizzly Bear itself, and its predictable behavior that leads to euthanization.

*See appendix A for references to problems of Grizzly Bear Behavior in Recovery Zones

6) The Draft EIS needs studies of current recoveries and their success and downfalls as models for troubleshooting and identifying problems with Grizzly Bear introduction. Euthanization of Grizzly Bears is not an acceptable trend, but is happening in these other model areas at a high rate. This is not addressed in this draft.

E) CHANGE OF CHARACTER TO NCE

The draft EIS does not acknowledge the vast impact upon the character of the NCE, particularly recreational aspects and visitation, with the introduction of Grizzly Bears.

There are 400,000 visitors per year to the North Cascades National Park Complex. The North Cascades National Park has a reputation for serene and peaceful hiking, climbing, visitation, boating, fishing, etc. Visit any internet site or visitor center for a grand description and public appeal factor for this national area WITHOUT threat of encounter with an apex predator.

This alteration of character to the area with introduction of Grizzly Bears would be of huge impact for businesses that border the area or work within (such as Stehekin Outfitters with back country pack trips). The changes are not limited to the National Park. Any public land with trails and roads, and recreational activities will face an altered environment, and ultimately a more dangerous one. What does the public think of this?

ERRORS

1) The Draft EIS lacks visitor surveys and their preferences of presence of Grizzly population in NCE. What is representing hikers, climbers, campers, boaters, hobbyists, day travelers, group use, in this Draft EIS?

2) Lack of acknowledging changes for families hiking with young people in the NCE, as well as single hikers(people hiking alone), or those who do not carry defense.

3) Survey is needed of Pacific Crest Trail Hikers and their views on Grizzly Bear presence

4) Local businesses will face economic changes with character change resulting from the presence of Grizzly Bears and possible limitations that follow endangered species introduction (such as road closures, vehicle restrictions). Where is the impact listed or studied to bordering and local businesses that depend on the NCE area traffic and visitation?

5)Where are the gateway communities of Stehekin, Holden Village, Lake Wenatchee, which reside in the heartlands of the Cascades, and the impact to their lives?

6) Recreationists of all types need more representation in this EIS study. Not only hikers, and backcountry users, but hunters in recreation areas and beyond, fishermen, pilots, four wheelers, ...the list is long.

7 To suggest that people wish to see a Grizzly Bear in the NCE and this will improve their experience is an assumption, not validated.

8) The suggestion that Grizzly Bears will draw more visitation to the NCE is an assumption, not validated.

F) REGULATIONS SURROUNDING ENDANGERED SPECIES

The Draft EIS does little to acknowledge the altering of management within designated recovery areas. Again we can learn from models from Yellowstone and especially the Selkirk -Yakk Recovery area which interfaces with Forest Service lands.

Numerous regulations are added and overlay areas to protect the introduced specie to the point of changing seasonal work times (to protect denning sows), motorized travel within the area, ROAD CLOSURES, etc.... to the point of new management plans being revised and rewritten at high expense to the tax payer. Endangered Species come with high costs of maintenance, protection, staffing, monitoring, and rulings.

ERROR

The Draft EIS fails to address the enormity of changes in regulations in managing areas with introduced endangered species such as the Grizzly Bear. This impacts all public lands in the 6.1 million acre designated NCE. New management plans are required. This is an astounding and staggering responsibility to all ready burdened public agencies and costs to the state and federal coffers, which is ultimately the tax payer.

The Draft EIS needs to address this impact in terms of time, cost, expectation, law and impact to all governing agencies within the NCE. This is an impact on the area, just as important as environmental factors and worthy of inclusion in this plan.

The Draft EIS needs to address the Stehekin Road issue. Environmentalist pressures can construe regulations to their special interest to keeping the road closed due to endangered specie protection. This is a negative use of regulation for special interest groups.

G) WASHINGTON STATE POSITION/CONFLICT

RCW 77.12.035

Protection of grizzly bears—Limitation on transplantation or introduction—Negotiations with federal and state agencies.

The commission shall protect grizzly bears and develop management programs on publicly owned lands that will encourage the natural

regeneration of grizzly bears in areas with suitable habitat. Grizzly bears shall not be transplanted or introduced into the state. Only grizzly bears that are native to Washington state may be utilized by the department for management programs. The department is directed to fully participate in all discussions and negotiations with federal and state agencies relating to grizzly bear management and shall fully communicate, support, and implement the policies of this section.

[2000 c 107 § 211; 1995 c 370 § 1.]

ERROR:

Washington State Law prohibits importation of Grizzly bears. Only native bears are to be utilized.

See following letter from 13 legislators in 2015 opposing importation of Grizzly Bears:

*<http://lindaevansparlette.src.wastateleg.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2015/03/Grizzly-Bears-in-the-North-Cascades>.

Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife rates the Grizzly Bear at “9”

in a scale of 1-18. Other endangered species preclude the funding for the Grizzly Bear recovery in this state. Grizzly Bears are not listed high on the priority list. The Draft EIS does not include this information, especially concerning how this rating affects funding.

H) FUNDING

Funding for Grizzly Bear importation and management is not clear or certain. I will cite several articles here to showcase what I believe is a good example of “Belling the Cat” type of management. Ultimately, agencies who believe Grizzly Bear additives to the Ecosystem to be a great idea, and support it through rhetoric and public meetings and Draft EIS projects, will have to realize how to pay for and support the now and forever aspects of Grizzly Bear management.

For instance:

“Grizzly bear recovery costs a lot because of the expense involved in monitoring bears and their habitat using all of the requisite radio-collars, airplanes, field checking, etc. Also, it is not cheap to prevent and manage human-bear conflicts, including buying bear-resistant dumpsters and replacing them when they wear out, as well as educating the many thousands of Yellowstone’s visitors about how to recreate safely in bear country. Adequate funding is especially important in the case of Yellowstone’s grizzly bears because this population is genetically so vulnerable that it will require perpetual life support in the form of expensive importation of bears to address genetic concerns. <http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/03/18/money-politics-and-the-future-of-the-grizzly/>

The following conversation is a good example about how difficult it is to find financial support for Grizzly Bear Recovery, ultimately relying on PRIVATE INTEREST GROUPS as partners:

“But money has been harder to come by. Grizzlies must compete with many other imperiled species; in the Northwest that includes salmon and spotted owls, plus hundreds of endangered species in Hawaii that are funded from the same federal pot.

Though federal funding has tightened over the past decade, the state of Washington stepped up in 2007, when the Legislature offered almost half a million dollars for a Cascades grizzly EIS. That money was matched by another \$250,000 from the nonprofit Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission, which funds cross-border conservation efforts. But the feds balked. The grizzly recovery office in Missoula could offer only staff time; another critical player, Fish and Wildlife's Region 1 headquarters in Portland, was silent. Agency officials say they didn't ask for grizzly funding because the Washington state office couldn't afford to take it on. The state money, unused, went back to the coffers.

In 2009, Washington Congressman Rick Larsen requested \$1 million for grizzly recovery in a federal budget request; that too was ignored in D.C.

"There was a lot of political capital spent to raise that money and nothing came of it," says Scott. "It's a shame."

But money has been harder to come by. Grizzlies must compete with many other imperiled species; in the Northwest that includes salmon and spotted owls, plus hundreds of endangered species in Hawaii that are funded from the same federal pot.

Though federal funding has tightened over the past decade, the state of Washington stepped up in 2007, when the Legislature offered almost half a million dollars for a Cascades grizzly EIS. That money was matched by another \$250,000 from the nonprofit Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission, which funds cross-border conservation efforts. But the feds balked. The grizzly recovery office in Missoula could offer only staff time; another critical player, Fish and Wildlife's Region 1 headquarters in Portland, was silent. Agency officials say they didn't ask for grizzly funding because the Washington state office couldn't afford to take it on. The state money, unused, went back to the coffers.

In 2009, Washington Congressman Rick Larsen requested \$1 million for grizzly recovery in a federal budget request; that too was ignored in D.C.

"There was a lot of political capital spent to raise that money and nothing came of it," says Scott. "It's a shame." <http://www.conservationnw.org/news/pressroom/press-clips/the-forgotten-north-cascades-grizzly-bear>

ERROR:

The Draft EIS fails to acknowledge the uncertainty of monies for maintaining alternatives B, C, and D as denoted in the above citations. Monies, or lack of, impact the quality of maintaining Grizzly Bear management and ultimately whether Grizzly Bears survive. Once introduced, the program never ends. Where will these monies come from? The Draft EIS needs to list accounting of donations from private groups as well as requirements from public agencies to maintain this project. This is an impact to the Grizzly Bear Specie, as far as how successful the recovery will be, once introduced.

CONCLUSION

Personal Comment:

In my many hours of study of this issue, I have gained a greater respect for the Grizzly. And with that respect, I have found this Draft EIS fails to address their core needs, their habits, their preferred habitats (no matter what the ESA directs for the NCE, or what is determined to be sustainable by studies). Grizzly Bears are animals, and do not respond to borders, paper plans, or assumptions. I am deeply saddened by how it becomes necessary to kill them when they don't adhere to paper plans. It is truly a defect in the overall so-called moral and ethical mission to return them to their homelands which ignores their very nature and demands they live where they do not choose to.

With that said, I feel this Draft EIS does this amazing animal no justice by suggesting we bring them to an area that has not had adequate study or contemplation by so called Grizzly Bear experts, leaving them to survive, questionably. We are experimenting.

I am also devastated that the Grizzly Bear “Recovery” machinery rolls on, and we are not learning from models nearby that these same bears that we are bringing in and trying to maintain for a noble cause, are so often euthanized or required to be eliminated for just being “Grizzly Bears” and finding food sources they “aren’t supposed to eat” outside of the plan.

Again, I feel we are exploiting the Grizzly Bear Specie if we engage in alternatives such as B, C and D, by ultimately dropping them off in unproven habitat (in helicopters no less) waiting to see if they survive by expensive and impinging monitoring. There is NOTHING natural about it.

Leave them to their choices: British Columbia and Alaska, where they are THRIVING.

Thank you for considering my comments.

The only respectable choice for the Grizzly Bear is Alternative A: No Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Elizabeth Courtney

Appendix A:

Bear Behavior – Needs addressed

Incidence of two Grizzly Bears returning home:

http://missoulian.com/news/state-and-regional/grizzly-bears-transplanted-to-cabinet-mountains-return-to-whitefish-area/article_bfb02c3c-ac03-11df-9eae-001cc4c03286.html

“The Cabinet-Yaak has received 17 transplanted bears since 1990. Four of those have left the area (typically heading back to the Northern Continental Divide), while four more have died. “

http://missoulian.com/news/local/northwest-montana-grizzly-bear-numbers-rising-but-still-small/article_7ce99b87-134e-5e7c-b207-50979710710e.html

“The challenge for wildlife managers is that while the Yellowstone Ecosystem is large, it has only limited release sites for problem grizzlies,” wrote Greg Losinski, of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, in a news release. “Once a bear has learned a negative behavior, it is extremely difficult to relocate that animal to a place where it cannot get into a similar problem situation or even head back to where it originally was trapped.”

http://missoulian.com/news/state-and-regional/sow-shows-unexpected-range-adaptability-of-grizzlies/article_0641b6d6-813e-5b67-a30c-17e7119d93b3.html

“So far this year, 43 grizzly bears in the GYE have died, 20 of them removed for conflicts with humans such as cattle depredation.” Same source as above

“But at the center of the increasing number of management removals is a larger population of bears pushing to the fringes of its core recovery area and a reduction in the availability of natural food sources.” http://billingsgazette.com/lifestyles/recreation/yellowstone-ecosystem-grizzly-management-removals-up-in/article_e27540e9-3d4f-5007-8d99-38c76c78473e.html

“In the past five years, including 2015, a total of 72 grizzly bears have been euthanized by managers in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem after they killed cattle, destroyed property or became a nuisance by seeking food at homes and ranches. Those bears accounted for about one-third of all grizzly bear deaths in the GYE between 2011 and 2015.” Same source as above

