GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

During the January 14th and 15th, 2020, Grizzly Bear Advisory Council meeting, the Council members worked in four randomly appointed working groups to review and discuss a brainstorming document they individually contributed to in advance of the meeting (see Emerging Ideas and Recommendations Table, available at fwp.mt.gov/gbac). Council members decided to continue discussing these emerging ideas in their four working groups in between the January and February meeting and, where possible, refine and/or combine ideas, contribute new ideas, or provide additional comments/insights on the emerging ideas. This resulted in four small group working documents, which has been combined below (refer to the headers to distinguish each working group's efforts). Group 1 – Bret Barney, Caroline Byrd, Chuck Roady, Kristen Kipp, Robyn King Group 2 – Jonathan Bower, Darrin Boss, Kameron Kelsey, Cole Mannix Group 3 – Lorents Grosfield, Anne Schuschke, Erin Edge, Heath Martinell, Nick Gevock Group 4 – Greg Schock, Michele Dieterich, Chad Bauer, Trina Jo Bradley

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
Stay in existing WG? Noting that these color coding represent the view of small groups and not the group as a whole. Is the concept a good concept and can we go with it?		Encourage the courts, decision makers and lobbying groups to use sound science and the most knowledgeable grizzly bear research teams to drive management, translocation and conflict resolution.	all areas		Put in the preamble? Not a recommendation.
Liked concept, but implementing fees, etc., was difficult to sort out..		As there will be an ever increasing population base moving to Montana or traveling seasonally to enjoy the open space ecosystems of Montana that support both Grizzly Bear and humans (recreation, Farming/Ranching, Bear Viewing, National Park Visits), there could be a discussion about how to implement a fee or percent taken on all land or residences (built or sold) to preserve open spaces in Montana through example: conservation easements or wildlife (specifically Grizzly Bear) conflicts.	all areas	This could be on sales or builds as in first statement and/or, also on a "gas tax, rental car and bed tax" to take advantage of seasonal bear r,ecreational visits to see bears. This is a world issue not just Montana. How do we get those benefiting and enjoying our open spaces that allow Large carnivores to have increasing populations to help pay for conflict management, travel corridors over highways, or increased garbage costs as the population in Montana grows exponentislly, seasonally or as yearlong residents. Take the huge expansion of Big Sky and that habitat loss and travel corridor. Could be similar to a sin tax on cigarettes or alcohol, but just a bear fee. I hate to say tax since that has been voted down way too many times...BUT the crux of it is how do others help Montana foot the bills? People come to Montana and its open spaces with vast wildlife resources, because they live in area so developed and built with such large high rises and skyscrapers containing huge populations of people it would not be "socially acceptable" or be safe in their backyard to have large carnivores living. So why don't they also help pay for our social acceptance? Of course there are already some fees adn taxes but there could be a dissuion for alterantive ways to help Montana support the efforts, so they and their family can enjoy the open spaces that allows grizzly bear expansion.	Our group not in support of this idea to tax landowners.
		Recommend requiring the bear identification test be an annual requirement and couple this with bear spray outreach video (maybe a test on the bear spray video?)	Conflict Prevention	Varying degrees of support for this idea	Rework as a larger recommendation with education efforts.
		Encourage local municipalities to develop local sanitation ordinaces that include enforcement	Conflict Prevention	local support will be variable, funding support for compliance	
		Require that subdivisions or HOAs include restrictions on activities or behaviors that encourage human-bear conflicts. Provide conflict mitigtion policies.	Conflict Prevention		
		Create statewide standards and enforcements for containing attractants	Conflict Prevention		
Might have too much detail or this one and the next. Could have overarching recommendation with addendum that could expand upon the core idea and not be lost.		To enhance human safety and prevent conflicts, the Council should recommend a mandatory, state-wide K-12 curriculum on bears (both black bears and grizzlies). All ages would benefit from information and problem-solving workshops. The curriculum could be inserted in a variety of subject areas and create cross-curricular opportunities. The curriculum should be a part of each grade and it should include the intrinsic, social, biological, and economic benefits of bears as well as the social and economic challenges of living with an apex predator on the landscape. It should include the biology of bears, necessary habitat, habitat fragmentation, preventative measures, and co-existence strategies. It should include the role of grizzly bears as an umbrella species and the value of predators in the ecosystem. It should include information on measures to coexist with grizzlies, including proper handling and storage of attractants like garbage, pet and livestock foods, bird-feeders, chickens and other small domesticated animals. Fear of grizzlies should be acknowledged and put into perspective with factual risk assessment and risk management. It might also include home projects that could include parents in the learning process. Possible projects would be: making your backyard bear-wise, problem-solving projects that analyze methods of living with bears, surveying your street, preventing human/bear conflicts locally, creating bear tolerant habitat in human dominated zones, and encouraging connectivity between recovery areas.	Conflict Prevention	Addresses the goal of human safety and conservation of bears. Education is something everyone can get behind. It will lay the groundwork for the future. It would take some funding to create a curriculum that is easy to use and add to current curriculum.	

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
		The Information and Education team and/or other info outreach programs should design a board game to be used in schools and programs like the bear fairs. The game would resemble chutes and ladders and feature bears moving from one recovery area to another. Players roll the dice and land on squares like: “Lucky, you found a secluded huckleberry patch, take two steps forward,” or, “Oh no! you got into a chicken coop and were relocated 5 squares back,” or, “Yikes you got caught eating from the birdfeeder, two steps back.” The design of the game could be a part of a school project contest in the public schools. For the Bear Fairs and for kinesthetic learners, a physical, portable, maze could be created to make a game where young people work through a maze (it could be drawn out on a large tarp for portability). The participants come upon boxes to choose from as they move through the maze. When they lift the box, they find a hazard like free range chickens, or a grazing area and move back or to another place on the maze, or they lift a box and find cutworm moths and move forward. This disseminates information on bear biology and attractants in a fun way.	Conflict Prevention	This is easily added to I&E work. Might need funding and more folks on the ground to establish. It creates an opportunity to lay the groundwork for living with bears.	
Might be overly prescriptive		The state library association or the Information and Outreach entities or both should approach authors of grizzly publications for book donations to schools and local libraries throughout Montana. This should be accompanied by publicity so people know the books are available and the authors receive positive recognition and publicity for the donation.	Conflict Prevention	This would take time and little money other than promoting the program. Libraries are great local community centers and would be a good starting point for bear education.	
		WIthing FWP education: revamp the hunter education program to include more on bear identification and safety while in bear habitat.	Conflict Prevention	This could be done with the help of the bear education supervisor that was recommended in line 13.	
Comment on coloring for pages 4-6; not sure whether/how to apply a particular color on each idea/recommendation...		Require an online test on bear identification and safety every two years prior to recieving hunting license for MT	Conflict Prevention		
Recognizing that watershed groups might not be statewide.		The state should become much more pro-active in the creation of watershed groups to generate local work to prevent conflict and ensure human safety with grizzlies on the landscape. Extra effort should be made to encourage watershed groups in areas where grizzlies have been reported and could be present and on the front edge of where bears are expanding such as between the NCDE and SBE, but watershed groups would be pertinent state-wide. Systematic, local, conflict prevention measures are necessary for communities with grizzlies on the landscape, and community groups improve local communication and understanding. The Blackfoot challenge and other successful groups have come out of a grass roots interest. The state needs to cultivate this as these groups can help solve many local issues. It would be prudent to issue funding to the Blackfoot Challenge group to cultivate watershed groups in new areas. To qualify for funding, the watershed groups should include all groups in the areas that wish to be included so the interests of the entire local community is represented. Watershed groups should begin to design and implement co-existence measures before problems arise as grizzlies move through the area. Getting ahead of the game has shown to be a pre-requisite for success. They could be a part of the bear-wise community recommendation line 26.	Conflict Prevention	This has been a part of conservation plans, but was not implemented because of funding issues. This would increase human safety and conserve bears due to conflict prevention. Social tolerance will be cultivated if problem bears are avoided by being prepared.This would take funding, but ESA section 6 grants and other conflict management grants would be available. The state would also save money from livestock losses with sequestered composting of boneyards and electric fencing projects.	
Lots of detail that may not be necessary		A coexistence Summit or Academy should be established each year so that current co-existence workers and Watershed group representatives in new areas can brainstorm and discuss new challenges and ways to address them. The group should be supplied with a list of conflicts with locations and specific conflict issues so the group can pinpoint problem areas and focus efforts to mitigate attractants and formulate prevention measures. More detailed information on conflicts and removals should be made available. There is one list of bear relocations/removals but details are sparse. It lists human conflict, but what type? Residents, managers and co-existence workers can learn from the information. What type of conflict? Was it hunting related, a chicken coop, a cornfield, a livestock depredation? With this list, the group would be able to look at trends over time. This would be a great addition (next year) to the education summit that is being piloted in January of 2020. Having the two together would be more comprehensive and it would save money to do one instead of two. The Yellowstone subcommittee just did something similar in Cody Wyoming this past year and a number of solutions and ideas came from it including a rancher who has had great success of Airedales dogs as grizzly deterrents. The director of the Blackfoot Challenge just returned from an event looking at different breeds of grizzly dogs and what he learned would benefit all watershed and co-existence groups.	Conflict Prevention	This would be an invaluable place to share ideas and brainstorm solutions. It would be easy to find support for this and it would create publicity for the conservation program and the grizzly fund. It is an opportunity for communities to share on many levels not just grizzly conflict prevention. Bear managers are putting out fires and barely staying ahead. There is very little reflection or systematic learning going on, despite all the money being spent on management. This type of brainstorming session is long overdue. It will just take time, money and more folks on the ground.	

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
Like the concept and details but that should be further informed by the education community.		To add to the yearly bear identification quiz for hunting licenses recommendation, a quiz covering safety while hunting in bear country should be required each year for all hunting licenses. All hunters should be prepared for possible dispersal bears as bears are attracted to gut piles. There could be a required video summarizing safety precautions with a quiz afterward that would make it available for out of state licenses as well. The safety measures should come from the hunter education handout passed out at the December meeting as well as these great suggestions by a former Fish and Wildlife Commissioner who is an avid hunter Modify hunting tactics as necessary to avoid surprising grizzlies: 1. · In grizzly country, I usually don't walk into or out of my hunting area in the dark. I want to make sure I can see well enough to avoid walking into a bear. 2. · Be especially aware of your surroundings, and use caution when in areas where you may not be seen or heard easily, such as dense vegetation or along streams. In dense vegetation, I often go from the "stealth hunting mode" to making noise to avoid a bear. 3. · Pay attention to fresh bear tracks. If I see very fresh grizzly tracks and the terrain and vegetation is such that it would be easy to surprise a bear, I may abort the hunt and go to a different area. 4. · Try not to shoot game late in the afternoon. You want to have time to field dress and get the game out of the woods before dark. Once you have shot your game: 5. · Bears are attracted to game carcasses. Grizzlies have a very keen sense of smell, and can smell the fresh blood and other carcass odors from quite a distance. 6. · If your hunting partner is close enough, wait until they arrive before starting the field dressing process. While one person field dresses the animal, the other should "stand guard" to make sure a bear does not sneak up on the person doing the field dressing. 7. · If at all possible, field dress the animal in a relatively open spot that has good visibility. You may have to drag the animal a ways before field dressing it. This is for two reasons. First, it is easier to see an approaching bear if you are field dressing your game in an open area instead of a dense area. Second, you want to think about other hunters who may be in the area. If possible, leave the gut pile in an open location. If a bear comes in to feed upon it, you don't want other hunters to accidently surprise the bear, which may then react by defending its food source. There is less chance of that happening if the gut pile can be easily seen from a distance. 8. · If at all possible, do not leave your game in the woods overnight. Get it back to your vehicle or camp as soon as possible.	Conflict Prevention		Great idea, but not a recommendation.
		Fishing licenses should include a video and quiz each year using bear education safety info for anglers.	Conflict Prevention	The cost of this would only be for the creation of the video. It could be paid for with an extra .50 for licenses.	
Concept is good, but what does this look like?		There is a need for bear-resistant garbage containers and their continued maintenance for areas in and around recovery areas as well as linkage corridors and possibly present areas in Montana. Consider funding through ESA section 6 grants to create a matching funds program. There are many individuals who would purchase a bear resistant garbage can (I would be one), but that does not help others or assure long term maintenance of the cans. A matching grant program would be an interesting way to tackle the problem. Matching funds could come from the Grizzly Fund. A person donates enough money to purchase a can and the donation would be a tax write off, the money would then be matched so another can would be purchased, ownership would be in the hands of the disposal company. The disposal company would be responsible to keep up the cans. Owning the cans will give the company an incentive to be careful at garbage collection and they would have the option to fine individuals for lost parts etc.	Conflict Prevention	This allows an opportunity for public involvement and ownership of a solution.	State to develop and implement a state wide coordinated sanitation plan.
		All garbage transfer stations and other facilities in bear country and linkage zones should be analyzed for attractants and sequestered to prevent luring bears to the area. Counties that do not have residential garbage pickup should make their garbage transfer stations bear resistant. Areas that have the potential for grizzly-garbage conflicts should have bear-safe garbage storage in bear resistant cans or inside closed buildings like Missoula's current ordinance.	Conflict Prevention	This would take funding and would need enforcement.	
		Strict enforcement of poaching is necessary for the long-term conservation of bears. Malicious killing is a huge problem and was a cause of diminishing numbers of bears which brought about ESA listing. Fines for poaching should not change in the case of de-listing. Regardless of ESA status, the bear must be managed to preserve the population. Malicious killing is a huge threat to the future of grizzly bears. Stringent fines and enforcement should continue regardless of listing.	Conflict Prevention	Might be unpopular, but it is one area where numbers could be protected in the long term that is already in place.	

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
		Requiring bear spray to be carried while hunting would increase hunter safety, but would need to be part of a program to rent spray to out of state hunters and to provide inexpensive or discounted bear spray for in state hunters. If nothing else requiring outfitters to carry bear spray would be advised. In the Gravellies a regulation was enacted to require outfitters to carry bear spray. It went through with little pushback.	Conflict Prevention	Conflicts while hunting are occuring more and more as bears enter areas where they have not been seen before. There is a lot of room to improve safety and prevent conflict in this area.	Encourage bear spray for all those who recreate in Montana.
		Consider limits on commercial huckleberry picking operations to preserve food sources with tribal exceptions. Commercial foragers should also need to take a bear safety test each year with their licenses like hunters and anglers.	Conflict Prevention	This provides education for another group that spends time in bear country	Encourage and maintain healthy and sustainable Grizzly Bear habitat in the state.
		Look into occupational safety and health safety standards for businesses (outfitters, state employees, recreational tours, etc.) for requiring bear spray and other bear safety standards.	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts before they occur and address liability issues	Require and encourage practices and standards for business and organizations that are in Bear country.
		Add additional FWP bear management specialist staff able to focus on a very specific geography and required to hold community listening sessions, engage in local outreach, and trained/equipped to try creative techniques for preventing conflicts (remove carcasses with dynamite, deterrent treatments, technical expertise on electric fencing, help with bear proofing cow camps, etc.). Ensure any experiemntal deterrents include a research component/seek opportunity to partner with co-op/universities/IGBST/Arthur Middleton lab, etc. Bear management specialist positions need to be permanent, have better pay, etc.	Conflict Prevention	Build social tolerance, reduce conflicts, build trust	Fund additional resources and personnel that work within Grizzly Bear Conservation and Management, FWP, Tribal Fish and WIldlife programs, wildlife services, etc.
		Establish bearwise education program around bear behavior, ecology, recovery, safety, and living with bears; include program in schools. Precede with statewide summit to develop messaging and curriculum. See Missoula bear FB page, Bear Smart Canada, Bearwise Wyoming. Education programs could be led by volunteer staff, like ID (Master Naturalist Program). Include special emphasis on educating out of state hunters/development of programs to provide out of state visitors with bear spray.	Conflict Prevention	Build social tolerance, reduce conflicts, build trust	Create a larger recommendation for outreach and education
		FWP commit to building a culture of partnership with NGOs and communities in all areas of the state (explore developing a funding mechanism for NGO dollars directed to FWP through foundation with match)	Conflict Prevention	Leverage resources, build trust, prevent conflicts	Broader recommendation of all agencies and organizations to communicate and collaborate.
		Statewide coordination around bear resistant trash requirements (create a structure for local governments to coordinate on regulations and infrastructure)	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe	see statewide standards
		Implement food storage requirements on the Bitterroot NF and state lands	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe	see statewide standards
		Public/private partnership to install bear resistant infrastructure in all USFS campgrounds in the state and in BLM/state lands in connectivity areas	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe	see statewide standards
What would this accomplish? Not sure if I understand the intent of this recommendation.		Require homeowners to register goats, chickens, or other common livestock attractants.	Conflict Prevention / Funding	In July 2019, legislation was passed requiring all beekeepers to apply as a beekeeper and to annually register their hives in a variable fee structure	Do not support as a recommendation. Encourage small livestock owners to have access to the neccessary resources and education. ex. feed stores, co ops, etc.

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
Need consistency on both garbage/waste and food storage. And we needed to know if it was being applied to a given geography (state, federal, or private land). This has been helpful in terms of getting ideas on paper, but what is the structure/skeleton that this is being attached to? One way to get people to articulate this vision is to respond to specific scenarios ... use the Council's responses to draw that skeleton framework. Another idea is for four working groups to each articulate a whole / skeleton vision -- and then to have people share to move forward. Don't we need to spend some time on process/vision before we can look at some of the details? This effort pushes us toward the need for a broader set of process options.		Create consistancy around food storage orders on public lands and require food storage orders on all public lands in occupied grizzly bear habitat as well as expansion and connectivity habitat. Support enforcement, outreach and education around Food Storage Orders	Conflict Prevention, Connectivity	Many food storage orders are already in place but there are locations without food storage orders. There is debate around the need for consistancy. Multiple agencies have variable levels of funding for enforcement	see statewide standards
		It is difficult to walk into a hotel in Montana and not see pictures of grizzlies, paintings of grizzlies, or statues of grizzlies. When one crosses the state line at lost trail pass, one sees a grizzly on the Montana sign. Bears are an important part of our heritage and we need to understand them. A comprehensive state-wide program should be implemented to create Bear-wise communities (https://bearwise.org/bearwise-communities/) with a priority focus on the areas in Western Montana on the "possible presence of grizzlies" map from USFWS (https://drive.google.com/open?id=1bX00zAQS7ziMSaz1uIKhI0iaLqDeZXzi) The program should be state-wide. This could be done through local watershed organizations with agency assistance if the watershed groups so choose. This will prepare areas and reduce conflict as bear distribution expands and dispersal bears explore and colonize the linkage zones between recovery areas. This is the beginning of social tolerance for grizzlies throughout the state via education and will reduce black bear conflicts in areas where grizzlies are not present.	Conflict Prevention, Connectivity between ecosystems	This would take funding, but considering the map where bears have passed through, there are many communities that are not ready to encounter grizzlies, but encountering them is a growing possibility. Once again this can increase human safety and increase social tolerance. It would be worth the investment.	see 32
		Encourage governor and Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks to develop a state Bear Aware outreach and education program with a designated bear aware outreach supervisor. This supervisor could oversee seasonal technicians across the state to implement education programs including bear spray as well as work with tourism department to reach out of state visitors. This could include a bear aware campaign with social media and video content. Develop a website and/or app that allows for quick access to the multiple resources available to prevent conflicts with bears. Maybe this role could also oversee a conflict prevention grant program.	Conflict Prevention, Resources	Funding for an FTE in the legislature	Simplify to: Encourage governor and Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks to develop a state Bear Aware outreach and education program with a designated bear aware outreach supervisor.
		A potential way to create a conflict prevention grant program not coupled with Livestock Loss Board could be to reassess the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks Living with Wildlife grant program that was defunded. Potentially house a conflict prevention grant and a funding mechanism for conservation easements under this one program?	Conflict Prevention, Resources	Funding this program - need to better understand why it was defunded	

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
		Glacier Park has a low number of conflicts because they are very strict about attractant regulations and human activities that attract bears. They have individuals that regularly survey and fine campers and campgrounds for violations and make sure that the violations are cleaned up immediately. They are also available to haze bears that enter front country camps. Strict and consistent attractant regulations work well, but they are meaningless without funding to enforce the regulations. More bear managers on the ground would allow for more enforcement of attractant sequestration and immediate response to those first strike bears. We might also recommend neighborhoods to report conflicts and facilitate and speed up attractant clean up. Gerald Cobell blamed many problems encountered in his area on waste left behind by tourists often in campgrounds. Funding for more people there to enforce strict camping regulations would assist in that area. He said that once the bears get into garbage, their days are numbered. Taking that attractant out of the picture by creating and enforcing attractant regulations would help their situation.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols	Once again, this is an issue of more boots on the ground and more funding.	Share best practices and successes with other agencies, and organizations. See E) of guiding principles
		Revisit MOU with Wildlife Services and identify opportunities for improving efficiency, capacity and coordination around conflict prevention and response.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols	This MOU with Wildlife Services could be a mechanism for improving and addressing resource challenges around coexistence and response. Ideally, MT would have autonomy over grizzly bear management decisions in the event bears are delisted. Challenge is so much of the attention is focused on livestock conflicts and there are many other significant conflicts and responsibilities and trust of agencies that get blurred through the current agreement.	Need more information to understand this emerging idea.
		Look at assisting land trusts with funding for easements in connectivity areas at a state and federal level (one example could be to look at the Montana Sage Grouse Initiative and how funding comes through that specific to sage grouse habitat)	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Funding, Creation of a new program always poses challenges, Coordination with other states	Add to idea 37. Encourage Grizzly Bear habitat and connectivity by supporting land easements. ex. Habitat Montana
		A comprehensive plan to identify and protect linkage corridors for promoting natural migration between all recovery areas should be created and implemented to assure the long-term conservation of grizzly bears. Within these areas, potential conflicts to successful grizzly bear occupation and travel should be identified, and proactive steps taken to increase habitat security and reduce the potential for conflict when bears arrive. For instance, proactive livestock conflict prevention, attractant management, road density reductions should be all be planned and implemented. Additionally, FWP should partner with Montana Department of Transportation to identify and model potentially important grizzly bear (and other wildlife) crossing points on major highways, and seek funding and planning opportunities to incorporate wildlife crossing practices into the transportation system. As the 1993 grizzly recovery plan states, "Ideally, preserving linkage between populations is a more legitimate long-term conservation strategy than are attempts to manage separate island populations. Linkage zones are areas between currently separated populations that provide adequate habitat for low densities of individuals to exist and move between two or more larger areas of suitable habitat. The existence of individuals and habitats within linkage zones could act to provide a connection between larger populations. Linkage zones enhance the viability of populations that are separated by some distance by facilitating the exchange of individuals and maintaining demographic vigor and genetic diversity." 1993 revised Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan Pg 42. As Hanski and Gilpin 1991 states, "If no movement between populations can take place, and isolation becomes permanent, local extinction becomes more likely." The plan should focus on areas where bears have been known to have travelled as in the possibly present map (https://drive.google.com/open?id=1bX00zAQS7ziMSaz1uIKhI0iaLqDeZXzi) and currently protected areas like Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs), Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) and Wilderness Areas. Here is a map of these areas with possible linkage corridors. (https://drive.google.com/open?id=12QiuEsgKWsZQV8DVhVnxEo-v4OLFUL5z) Providing or securing linkage zones can be a practical solution to demographic dangers of fractured habitats for all species including elk, deer, pronghorns and native sheep. Current regulations should be strictly enforced and exceptions for road building should not be allowed for all IRAs, WSAs and Wilderness areas within the identified corridors. Public lands immediately in between these protected areas should adopt the amendment 19 policy from the previous Flathead Forest Plan. Unfragmented, roadless areas of forest are necessary to promote demographic connectivity and the long-term conservation of grizzly bears. Protecting and identifying these areas will provide more areas of colonization to re-locate bears and encourage natural migration and connectivity between recovery areas. Private lands in between the areas should be considered for conservation easements. Bear-	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This would promote long term conservation of grizzly bears and all of the other wildlife that Montana is famous for. This would not take too much funding. Many of the areas are already protected. This would take a concerted effort between agencies. Since this would also protect migration corridors for elk and deer, hunters could get behind it.	Great ideas, need to synthesize into a more focused recommendation

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
		Forests surrounding recovery areas and in designated linkage zones should adopt Amendment 19 from the previous Flathead Forest plan to limit fragmentation of habitat. This is important for all species including elk. New scientific studies on habitat fragmentation and climate change should be considered in all forest plans in the state. Forest Plans must incorporate standards that provide protection for grizzlies and other wildlife from habitat degradation and human conflicts.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This is an important amendment limiting roads in the forest which increases human safety because it offers less access to bears. It also decreases conflict because bears will have more adequate habitat and will not be displaced by increasing tourism and recreation. Bears are moving out of the parks at a much greater speed than their numbers are increasing. Park visits have more than doubled in the past years. Bears are being pressured to look for new habitat. If we can provide ample habitat, and decrease attractants in populated areas, conflict will be reduced.	See larger recommendation, Encourage all entities to support Grizzly Bear habitat.
Agree with concept / lots of work		The state should establish a partnership with insurance companies to build wildlife bridges. In 2015 this was found. “According to the insurance company, drivers have a one in 77 chance of hitting a deer in Montana. That’s considerably higher than in surrounding states. Wyoming drivers have only a one in 113 chance of hitting a deer, Idaho is 1 in 232 and North Dakota is 1 in 105.” This information comes from 2019, “Deer-car collisions cost an average of $8,190, an elk-vehicle collision is about $25,319, and a moose-vehicle collision is $44,546, taking into consideration human injuries and death, towing, vehicle repair, investigation of the accident by local authorities, and carcass disposal.” And this, “One of the most looked-to examples of successful wildlife overpasses is in Banff, over the Trans-Canada Highway. A study there shows that in just one two-mile stretch, wildlife-vehicle crashes reduced from an average of 12 a year to 2.5, reducing costs of crashes by 90 percent—over $100,000.” And in 1995, “Not only are the collisions harmful to wildlife, but according to a 1995 study they also caused 211 human fatalities, 29,000 human injuries and more than $1 billion in property damage. State Farm puts the number of collisions at 1.5 million annually causing 10,000 human injuries and 150 deaths along with $2,500 in property damage to vehicles.” It would serve insurance companies well both in costs and public relations if they became partners with MDOT to build wildlife bridges. Where side streets are a problem in wildlife crossing areas, electrified cattleguards should be considered to prevent wildlife from using side streets to cross instead of wildlife crossings. In Canada, they used to have a suggested night speed limit of 45 miles per hour. Canada has many wildlife crossings now, so they might not have the suggested speed limit anymore. It is possible that the suggested reduced speed caused more funding for the crossing structures.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This is an opportunity for the state to work with insurance companies. Opportunities for partnerships could be explored on many levels. Public safety is something that both the state and insurance companies can agree upon.	Enourage and support DOT and federal highways to implement successful tools such as wildlife crossings.
Great concept if there were a think tank to do this.		Voluntary Driving Restrictions would be an out of the box way to reduce wildlife mortality and human fatality/injury. Insurance companies are well aware and have created outreach campaigns to reduce drowsy driving which according to the CDC, “The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates that drowsy driving was responsible for 72,000 crashes, 44,000 injuries, and 800 deaths in 2013.3 However, these numbers are underestimated, and up to 6,000 fatal crashes each year may be caused by drowsy drivers.” According to drowsydriving.org 13% of crashes with hospitalizations and 21% of crashes with fatalities are caused by drowsy driving. Wildlife accidents contribute to many more fatalities and damages. One bear manager said that grizzlies (and I would imagine many other species) have adapted to crossing at night when traffic is minimized. Both drowsy driving and a majority of wildlife crossings or at least accidents due to diminished vision happen at night. Insurance companies could create financial incentives to vow not to drive between “2 and 5 am” (or a time line based on the timing of wildlife mortalities and drowsy driving) unless in an emergency. If those who take the pledge and receive those incentives get into an auto crash (not during an emergency) during those times, they would pay a higher deductible. This plan could be coupled with billboards pinpointing specific wildlife crossing areas with ads for nearby all-night diners or truck stops where drivers could go to take a break instead of driving through crossing areas between certain hours. Insurance companies could pledge a percentage of money saved through prevention to the construction of permanent wildlife crossings.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Again, slowing down at night or avoiding night driving conserves all wildlife. It is an inexpensive answer to a big mortality problem.	No
		A nationwide contest to come up with ways to reduce train/bear collisions to prevent grain spills and to remove carcasses quickly from train tracks with a large monetary incentive should be implemented. One of the problems with trains is that the grain cars dribble grain as they go along the tracks. All cars are weighed before they leave the station and when they arrive at the destination, so grain bins that are leaking are identified. The spills bring wildlife to the tracks where they are killed which attracts bears. How can we reduce the grain dribble on the tracks to preserve all wildlife? I believe a foundation like Gates who likes to solve problems would contribute to the incentive and possibly direct the contest. If this is successful, more contests for conflict prevention could be implemented.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Reducing grain spillage along the tracks benefits the shippers as well as grizzlies. Even small losses of grain add up to big losses.	Encourage and support the railroad industry to implement effective practices to prevent train/wildlife collisions.

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
But not the purview of the Council		Consider making funding available for smaller conservation easements. At this time, small parcels in key areas are not considered for conservation easements because the focus is on larger parcel of land. Every little bit helps. It would be prudent to create an organization with grant money from the state and the ESA to offer conservation easements specifically for smaller parcels in locations near occupied habitat.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This would take funding and an understanding that every little bit helps. Small ranch operations could take advantage of this preserving open space into the future.	Encourage habitat in private lands. See other larger recommendation
Need to simplify. Would recommend ending after first sentence (encouraged)	Green	FWP define connectivity zones within Montana where natural/functional connectivity (i.e. occupancy, ecological function in connective areas) is proactively encouraged through: 1) no hunting allowed in connectivity zones, 2) management decisions (about lethal removal, relocation) include more conservative criteria, 3) work with IGBST to develop statewide mortality thresholds and statewide management removal quota with conservative sub thresholds (percentages of total allowable mortality) tied to connectivity zones (and all must be in synch with ecosystem wide mortality thresholds), 4) bears in connectivity zones will not be translocated back to recovery areas (need to develop areas in DMA outside of PCA that are tolerable relocation zones), 5) increase collaring efforts and monitoring of movements to prevent conflicts more proactively, with a focus on individual bears of high priority (dispersing young males, females with cubs, etc.), 6) work with local land users to reduce conflicts spatially/temporally real-time with monitoring info, i.e. modify grazing rotations, temporary hunting closures, trail closures, etc., 7) apply habitat standards and guidelines from Conservation Strategy to Wildlife Management Areas in connectivity zones, 8) evaluate federal land use planning processes and projects for impact to habitat requirements for natural connectivity- with focus on food storage and road management, and 9) establish interagency population monitoring program in connectivity zones	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	For long-term resilience of lower-48 grizzly bears, it's important that connectivity between ecosystems occur naturally. Natural connectivity-involving grizzly occupancy and fulfilment of ecological function in connectivity areas- is key to restoration and long-term persistence of grizzly bears in the Northern Rockies.	See larger recommendation, Identify connectivity zones and develop specific management to promote connectivity.
		FWP and MDT work with IGBST to identify priority crossing locations on I-90 and I-15. It's important that there is coordination with the Wildlife and Transportation Statewide Steering Committee on this issue; coordination on priorities could create compelling case for tapping into federal funding (e.g. BUILD grants, etc.)	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	The interstates are a potentially substantial barrier to natural connectivity and potential for vehicle collision with grizzly bears is a human safety concern	
		The state legislature should recommend that all Wilderness Study Areas in between recovery areas should be designated Wilderness.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems, conflict prevention	Creating secure, remote areas where bears can roam away from populations is essential for the long-term conservation of bears.	
		More funding should be made available to hire more bear management specialists to train with our experienced managers and take over when they retire. Tim Manley and Jamie Jonkel and others have a wealth of experience cannot be lost when they retire. We need more specialists on the ground and they should be training with our experienced managers. FWP must really support the experience they have and use it to move into the future. The specialists we have are overworked and residents are frustrated because the managers cannot be in more than one place at a time. Specialists must spend a lot of time on conflicts and have less time for prevention. Funding must include management specialists in areas in linkage zones now to get ahead of the moving edge of bear distribution. More managers on the ground would assist watershed groups and visit, build trust and educate residents. These areas must put co-existence measures in place before problems arise. Montana must recognize the wealth of experience on the ground and capitalize on it.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems, conflict prevention	This covers our goal of human safety and conservation of bears. Rewarding and making use of the talent we have and using that talent to build new experienced managers for the future will be one of the most important things the state legislature could fund.	See above recommendation
Don't want to tie hands of wildlife managers		Grizzly bears once roamed the entire state of Montana and non-conflict bears should never be removed simply for showing up in a place. We recognize that some areas of the state that were once historical suitable habitat are today inappropriate for grizzly bears. There is also a lot of quality grizzly bear habitat that is currently unoccupied, yet could be potentially occupied.	Grizzly Bear Distribution	There is a need to focus on areas where grizzlies could be with less conflict. These areas should be studied and utilized.	47-49, agree with but do not see as a recommendation.
		FWP develop a social science study to establish a baseline understanding of social acceptance in various communities across the state as an initial step in a process to create a statewide management plan.	Grizzly Bear Distribution	could yield important insights prior to creating a statewide management plan	
		Recognize all of Montana as biologically suitable habitat	Grizzly Bear Distribution	Acknowledging grizzlies could be anywhere in the state allows FWP to use conflict management as a tool for prioritizing occupancy in certain geographies	

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
Good concept. Lots of detail to work through.		The state and federal agencies should support and implement research to promote the long-term conservation of grizzly bears such as the following suggestions. This could be paid for through section 6 grants from the Endangered Species Act provisions and agency funding: Monitoring of food supplies is highly important. Look at the difference in 2018 in the Blackfoot area after a large fire. Food sources do influence bear movement and distribution. 1. A survey of the Bitterroot Recovery Area for bear presence/occupation. 2. A survey of the Sapphires, the Sapphire WSA and Anaconda Pintler Wilderness areas for bear distribution. 3. Impacts of snowmobiling on denning and post-den emergence 4. Impacts of trail use on bears 5. Map high caloric foods and/or seasonal important foods. This is happening in the GYE but needs to be conducted in the NCDE Cabinet Yaak, Selkirks, Bitterroot, and possible colonization areas between recovery areas. 6. Develop a functional habitat map that could be used to inform road closures and recreational use in the NCDE, Cabinet Yaak, Selkirks, Bitterroot, and possible colonization areas between recovery areas (Sapphires and Anaconda Pintler Wilderness to name a few). 7. Map habitat and food sources and analyze the effects of climate change on these areas to predict where grizzly bears will migrate in the future and to pinpoint areas for colonization in linkage zones.	Grizzly Bear Distribution, conflict prevention	The more knowledge we have about grizzlies and their habitat, the better we can provide for co-existence. This would take funding.	The state and federal agencies should support and implement research to promote the long-term conservation of grizzly bears
Are doing already to some extent. Can't say this in perpetuity.		Encourage Governor and the Legislature to celebrate the recovery of the Grizzly Bear in Montana though Montana's dedication to Vast Open Spaces. Those spaces are checkerboards of Public Lands, National Parks and Privately Owned working Agricultural lands. All open spaces in Montana not only promote increasing Grizzly bear populations but all wildlife, within forest and prairie ecosystems.	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity Between Ecosystems		Fully support this idea. Replace word "recovery" with "Conservation efforts and conservation success". Can we summarize this into a shortened recommendation?
		Encourage Governor, public officials and researchers to consistently refer to the GYE and NCDE as recovered with expanding pollutions	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Science supports this, however passions may not. How many other ecosystems in the lower 48 (other than the already designated recovery areas) have enough public lands to be the base for or to support viable recovered populations like GYE and NCDE successes? These base public lands allow safety and socially acceptable "anchor" acres for the populations. Since there is not complete agreement on whether these populations are recovered, maybe place that word with "are recovering populations"	Not a recommendation, see 51. (combine)
		Work with relevant agencies to create a streamlined way for public reporting of possible grizzly bear sightings outside of recovery zones	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity between ecosystems		Encourage public reporting of Grizzly Bear sightings to relevant agencies.
Recognized broader need to partner		Improve coordination and outreach on grizzly bears and bear awareness with the office of tourism, realtors, VRBO, etc.	Other	Capacity, Unknown concerns/roadblocks from realtors, tourism, etc.	Yes inlcude this in the education and outreach section.
Like concept. Need more discussion		A multiplier should be considered but as in Wyoming, it should only apply to heavily forested hard to manage livestock areas and measures of conflict prevention must be used to the best of the livestock grower's ability in order to qualify for the multiplier. Any reimbursement should include a requirement of conflict prevention measures after the second reimbursement.	Other	Many could get behind this especially if it were coupled with responsibility.	Yes, but edit to include a larger compensation program include crop loss and livestock loss. Do not limit to specifics.
		A grizzly bear PR person to promote the benefits and positive sides to having grizzlies on the landscape should be added to the folks on the ground working for grizzly conservation.	Other	Reminding folks of the benefits to having bears on the landscape would be helpful for creating bear-wise communities and co-existence measures.	See above emerging idea regarding a bear outreach and education specialist for the state. (combine)
		Establish cooperative monitoring programs – FWP, USFS, Permittees, NGOs on public allotments	Other	Enhance flexibility of public grazing allotment management in response to grizzly bear conflict	
Outside purview of Council		Ensure people can't be held liable if grizzly mauling occurs on their property.	Other	Create security for landowners, important for social tolerance	Agree with this concept.
Already discussions around wildlife movement		As roadways within the connectivity zone for the GYE and NCDE come up for repair bids over the next tens of years be prepared to write in wildlife crossing. Continue to utilize bear movement maps to predict areas of high movement	Other		See larger Connectivity recommendation
Value statement...		The grizzly bear is our state animal and an important piece of Montana's wildlife heritage. Most Montanans recognize that grizzly bears are an important part of what makes Montana the "Last Best Place" and unique from the rest of the Lower Forty-eight states. Therefore, Montana's grizzly bear populations—Yellowstone, NCDE and Cabinet-Yaak (and eventually the Bitterroot)—should be thriving, self-sustaining and interconnected	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Montana has the chance to make a stand and protect its status as the last best place in the lower 48. Conserving grizzlies will preserve the reputation for wildness that draws tourists, retirement incomes, and industry.	Encourage Connnectivity, include in larger recommendation, or possibly in the preamble.

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
Pages 10-12 start here. All need additional work/reworking. Green seems like it doesn't need a lot of additional work. Red may not ever reach consensus. Didn't like specific wording around Big Belts.		Facilitate recovering or recovered populations in all four MT Recovery Zones, as well as passability for grizzlies on the landscape that lies between Recovery Zones and west of the Big Belt mountains . East of the Big Belts, relocate minor offenders to augment unrecovered western Recovery Zones and euthenize problem bears. Wherever grizzlies exist in MT, facilitate livability for residents and property owners, and viability for production agriculture.	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	The council's individual recommendations need an overarching framework or vision, responding to Cecily Costello's comments in Missoula. I believe this may be something most or all council members can live with.	Facilitate recovering or recovered populations in all Recovery Zones and areas of connectivity.
		Initiate a statewide planning process that outlines a statewide vision for grizzly conservation and management. A statewide plan should include, A) Geographic specificity around conflict response (i.e. management zones that reflect conservation value of bears expanding into a given area) and B) Establish clear guidelines for lethal removal of a grizzly bear that are consistent with federal regulations, socially acceptable, and driven by 1) conservation value of the management zone, 2) demographics, 3) evidence of chronic depredation (in cases of livestock conflict) and 4) conflict severity (e.g. human safety issues)	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	create clarity, transparency, and predictability around grizzly conservation and conflict management in Montana. Opportunity to establish more specificity than currently vague definitions of social acceptability. Also, an opportunity to establish proactive approaches to ensuring connectivity occurs	Agree, however this is already happening.
		State work with grizzly council to determine important elements of a successful statewide planning process	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Grizzly council represents diverse interests and could provide valuable guidance to FWP that would ensure statewide planning process is successful	N/A
Erase?		State legislature cannot interfere with FWP management approaches post delisting. Is there a way to prevent legislative meddling (e.g. state bill ratifying Montana statewide plan in statute, or Governor's executive order on statewide plan?)	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Build trust between public and managers	No
			Resources		
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		A multimillion-dollar fund should be established in the next farm bill for grizzly conservation efforts. The interest generated from this permanent Grizzly Fund would pay for non-lethal, preventative measures for co-existence in the United States (MT, ID, WY, WA etc.). This creates long term funding for co-existence measures. It should be non-lethal so that national conservation groups and foundations for wildlife would be willing to contribute to the fund. Seed money from the farm bill would start the fund. It should include an option on taxes (one could choose to put a dollar or two into the fund from personal taxes) and a method for individuals to contribute to the fund like an adopt a grizzly program. This would allow national interest in grizzly bear conservation to contribute to the costs of living with grizzlies. This fund could contribute to incentives for living with grizzlies and all co-existence measures as well as research to create new measures for co-existence and conflict prevention.	Resources	This would take a commitment from Montana to push the idea of a fund to the federal government. It would be a long term solution for co-existence funding.	Support all levels of Grizzly Bear Conservation and Management funding on a local, state, and national level.
My understanding is this is a non issue. Until the recovery goals are met, they will continue to have ESA protections. Will take additional conversation with Council and Idaho.		The Bitterroot Ecosystem should be studied as a re-location area without the bears losing ESA protections. The bears should be able to be re-located in this habitat rich area without being considered experimental/non-essential to ensure protection for bears that move into and have been re-located in the area. It provides excellent habitat and could easily house many bears with minimal conflict giving managers more options for re-location of bears.	Resources	Creating more areas for bear re-location will take the pressure off other ecosystems.This is not a funding issue but a social issue and will take bear-wise programs and more managers on the ground to implement.	We recognize that the BE is good Grizzly Bear habitat.
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		Funding for grizzly bear conservation (and for all wildlife) is vitally important. All opportunities for grizzly bear conservation should continue to be explored, including federal, state and private funds. Additionally, given the amount of money that the USFWS invests in grizzly bear recovery, the state of Montana should consider the financial impacts that might result from a delisted grizzly bear population, and where and whether or not the state can find opportunities to replace those funds.	Resources	The need for funding has been prevelant during recent meetings.	Add to 66.
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		Consider a Montana recreation license that costs a minimal amount (1-2 dollars) for in state recreationists and more for out of state tourists (10 dollars). To apply for this license, one would also have to take the bear safety test. The test could also include backcountry safety tips, information on responsibly recreating on public lands, and how recreation can affect wildlife.	Resources	This provides a way to educate a large group of people who recreate in Montana and brings in a funding resource.	Combine into a funding recommendation with 70, 68, 66, etc. Support and ecnourage all avenues of funding for Grizzly Bear Conservation & Management
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		Establish new funding mechanism(s) for wildlife conservation and management in MT (ideas to consider: tourism tax like expanded resort tax, increased appropriation for Livestock Loss Board through general dollars (not sportsman), conservation fee associated with National Parks (re: WY resolution), support passage of Recovering Americas Wildlife Act, need new federal support for funding species post-delisting, through reauthorizing ESA?, look at NRCS and farm bill	Resources	Current resources are not adequate; establishing new sources of revenue for grizzly bear conflict prevention, conservation, and management is key to continuing the success story of grizzly recovery. New mechansims should tap into constituencies other than sportsmen.	Combine

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
Prevention/Funding/Resources Combine. Agree except for the tiered system.		Establish a tiered loss compensation multiplier that through contingencies incentivizes preventive techniqes and provides compensation for livestock loss (recognizing that compensation programs don't promote social tolerance, just make it economically viable for ranching operations to stay afloat in grizzly bear country). Important considerations for such a program: 1) state legislature needs to allocate more funds for livestock and other agricultural loss (general dollars to livestock loss board, not Sportsmen's/FWP $, 2) compensation program could also be tiered geographically (i.e. provide more compensation in certain portions of the MT landscape key for grizzly bear conservation/connectivity), 3) bring back the Living with Wildlife Grant program, and 4) explore Farm Bill opportunities and NRCS EQUIP	Resources	Ensure ranchers that provide important habitat in connective lands can remain economically viable; keep people safe and bears alive through incentivization of conflict prevention techniques	Combine with agricultural compensation program. 55
Prevention/Funding/Resources Combine.		Create a grizzly bear prevention fund that is not tied to the Livestock loss board that funds work and is dependent on a local match	Resources, prevention	Getting it through the Legislature and showing the broad support to get it done.	
Red due to hunting issues.		Contibute to bear conflict management funding through a mandatory Conflict Prevention Pass fee added to bear (black or grizzly) hunting license	Role of Hunting	The AIS Prevention Pass required with a fishing license has helped to contribute funds to prevent the spread of AIS. There may be an opportunity to implement a similar tool into bear hunting licenses to dedicate funding to conflict management or hunter education in bear country.	
Red due to hunting issues.		The grizzly bear is the slowest reproducing mammal on this planet. Any future hunting of grizzly bears should be avoided. Hunting is a contentious issue and could be easily resolved by honoring the recent Grizzly Treaty signed by over 200 tribes in Montana, Canada, and elsewhere. It asks that the bear never be hunted. Hunting does not increase human safety nor does it conserve the bear. MFWP seems determined to have a grizzly trophy hunt, if they do so it should be extremely limited in scope, should not allow hunting near the parks, should not allow hunting in vital linkage habitat, and should be easily suspended or cancelled during high mortality years. The Fish and Wildlife Commission recommended waiting after de-listing to consider any form of recreational hunting. A slow approach was suggested (waiting at least one year or more) to demonstrate to the public that MFWP's goal was to maintain a healthy, viable grizzly population not to kill as many as fast as they legally could. Management issues alone have killed a large number of grizzlies. In Wyoming, a take of 72 bears has been granted, 10% of the current population estimate in the GYE. Certainly, hunting should not be considered the best management tool for grizzly bears. Current management mortality measures target specific nuisance and habituated bears. Again, the tribes have been very clear about their wishes. This is a simple thing to give.	Role of Hunting	This is a difficult issue.	As a committee we each expressed our thoughts regarding the role of hunting with each other. Respectfully, we individually will share those with the council at the appropriate time.
		Define areas and circumstances where hunting is not appropriate: 1) not allowed in certain geographies- connectivity zones, core habitat/areas surrounding parks, 2) not considered a management tool for reducing conflicts- there is no science to support this, 3) delayed following de-listing; FWP should be a leader in coordination with other agencies on season/quota setting, 4) need to define mortality thresholds outside of DMAs/identify guidelines for cancellation of hunting season if a pre-determined portion of mortality threshold is met via management removals prior to beginning of the hunting season, 5) ecosystem based mortality quotas should not be seen as the equivalent of hunting-based mortality quotas. They are the quotas that trigger population change and hunting quotas should not be directly linked to population management.	Role of Hunting	Grizzly recovery under the ESA is a conservation success story and Montana could demonstrate leadership that ensures that success story continues	
		In the meetings in December, it was clear that managers are running out of places to re-locate bears. When they put them back in the recovery areas, they are putting them in already occupied territory, so they must look for a space. FWP should develop a protocol for translocating bears a) between ecosystems, b) within an ecosystem, c) outside of a designated ecosystem, which further the conservation, connection and recovery of grizzly bears in the state of Montana. Bears translocated due to previous conflict may need to be placed deeper into core habitat of a designated ecosystem, where they are less likely to continue to get into trouble. Having other areas like linkage zones and augmentation zones would be helpful to the managers and the bears who are getting pushed back into conflict areas. Using the 3 strike protocols, first strike bears should be available for augmentation programs and first and second-strike bears should be available for translocation to habitat rich linkage zones surrounded by bear-wise communities so the chance for conflict is minimized.	Transplant Protocols	This is a social tolerance issue. If areas are made "bear-wise" and understand that grizzlies are in the area, it will smooth the way for re-location to new areas in the linkage zones.	

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
Isn't this already being done? This is the bear managers job.		Relocate problem grizzlies with minor offenses to the most appropriate MT recovery zone	Transplant Protocols	What to do with bears in need of relocation	
		Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, the USFWS, the USFS and appropriate agencies partners should put in place agreements needed to allow for grizzly bears trapped inbetween recovery zones to be released onsite or in nearest secure habitat (likely public land) between ecosystems rather than taking grizzly bears back to recovery zone. Clarification is needed when communicating with the public about Transplant Protocols and the difference between releasing a bear that moved in that location on their own vs. reintroduction/augmentation	Transplant Protocols	Public concern over bears being where bears have not been in decades, potential state code issues, misinformation	
		Do not rely on human-assisted transplant protocols for establishing connectivity.	Transplant Protocols	Establishing a precedent of artificially assisting grizzly bears with movement into "new" or unoccupied habitat could create a slippery slope that ultimately undermines the importance of ensuring habitat conditions are conducive to natural expansion of grizzly bears into connective/linkage areas.	
Goes with one on top of page		FWP work with USFWS, IGBST, and USFS to identify 1.) connectivity zones and 2.) suitable areas within connectivity zones for relocating conflict bears occupying habitat between DMAs (in circumstances where relocation is deemed the appropriate management action).	Transplant Protocols	Important to consider what the translocation and/or relocation protocol will be when responding to a conflict bear in "new" or unoccupied habitat, especially connectivity zones. In these circumstances, current translocation or relocation back to occupied habitat (PCA) is a management approach that could potentially inhibit connectivity from ever occurring.	76-80, combine as a larger connectivity recommendation.
		Recreation in core grizzly habitat, recovery zones and connectivity zones presents challenges and opportunities for increased human bear interactions and conflicts. Bear Aware Recreation Zones need to be mapped to get ahead of the existing and potential conflicts as recreation increases in these areas.	Coexistence; conflict; connectivity	Recreation is going to play a big part in Montana economic development. We need to be forward thinking about how this will effect overall grizzly bear recovery and get ahead of it by creating smart recreation opportunities and recreation zones. Increase in human population in Montana will become an issue as big as our challenges and opportunities with livestock. We need to get ahead of the outreach and education about smart, bear aware recreation zones in recovery zones and connectivity zones.	Yes.
		There is an obvious need to continue to support and fully fund our bear specialists so they can continue the outreach and education programs; deal effectively, efficiently and quickly with conflict issues. Including recovery zones and connectivity zones.	Coexistence, conflict, connectivity	The opporutnity would be to create a long-term funding plan and revenue stream with state and Federal partners including creation of a habitat protection fund. A Smart Recreation Fund could be created to help fund these efforts.	Yes, include with a funding recommendation
Not in the Council's purview.		We can't consider delisting separate subpopulations until we develop a cohesive strategy and plan to create connectivity between all the recovery zones	All except hunting	Great opportunity to develop a statewide cohesive recovery strategy for Montana.	Support a cohesive strategy and plan to create and support connectivity between all recovery zones
Agree!		Review and update 1993 managment plan	All		Yes!
		FWP needs to better communicate with the public, especially with landowners and livestock producers, when it comes to trapping and relocating grizzlies for any reason.	Transplant Protocols	Most people would like to know when a grizzly is being dumped in their back yard.	Agencies communicate with the local public, landowners, ag producers, etc to inform of relocated Grizzly Bears.
		USFWS, FWP and WS need to work together with local landowners and county governments to identify new relocation sites outside of the designated management areas, especially in connectivity zones.	Transplant Protocols	This would avoid questions like what to do with the Stevensville bear, or any others that end up between ecosystems where populations are established.	
		MTFWP in partnership with USFWS and USFS as well as private land owners, trusts, should develop, map and model a state plan for connectivity between all subpopulations of grizzly bears.	Connectively between ecosystems		
		The state should develop a bear aware/smart tourism and recreation plan that celebrates grizzly bear recovery and addresses conflict zones.A tourism/recreation tax should be considered to support bear managers, conflict prevention, and secure habitat.			Yes, we support this statement.
		Livestock Loss Board adopt a multiplier compensation program for Grizzly Bear livestock depredations	Resources		See previous Agricultural Compensation program
		Zero tolerance policy for all food conditioned and livestock depredating Grizzly Bears.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols	YNP & GNP use this method and are extremely successful in their management and preventing conflict. Research shows that once food conditioned, Grizzly Bears do not "rehabilitate" but simply escalate with their conflicts.This would save $ and time, and prevent conflict.	Too restrictive to bear managers
		FWP/Tribal FW Programs implement the protocol of closing access to areas of likely or potential Grizzly Bear Conflicts, for a short period of time as neccessary.	Conflict Prevention	YNP & GNP as well as certain areas already implement this with success. Ex. Grizzly Bear feeding on elk carcass on a trail. Mating Grizzlies near high traffic area. Recent conflict situation with GB still in the area, etc.	Agree
		FWP amend the current Conservation License to include recreationists, with a proceed of this license fee allocated towards Montana Grizzly Bear Conservation and Management.	Resources		See previous funding recommendation
		Adopt the State Hunting Plan for areas			
		FWP implement depredation hunts when neccessary.	Role of Hunting	Source of income for FWP, for an action that will be carried out regardless.	

GROUP 1 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 1 - Comments
		State of Montana implement the Grizzly Bear Hunting Management Plan in the recovery areas where the Grizzly Bear population thresholds have been met.	Role of Hunting		
		FWP implement more effective hazing methods when necessary for habituated bears.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols		
		Identify gaps in intergovernmental, interagency, and tribal coordination and create an action plan to address the gaps and improve the comuunication and coordination	Distribution, connectivity, conflict,coexistence, transplant, recreation (all)		Agree.
		Artificially inseminate Grizzly Bears with genetic material from a different Recovery area to encourage genetic diversity.	Connectivity		No.
		Remove female Grizzly Bears for the same serious conflicts that males are removed for.	Conflict Protocols		Continue with existing guidelines.
		Allow landowners to use more aggressive, non-lethal methods to haze habituated bears away.	Conflict Prevention	Currently they can use pots and pans, and a squrt gun. ex. non lethal cracker shells, etc.	Find and support effective methods to deter and haze bears for public and bear managers.
		Support existing carcass removal programs in areas of Grizzly Bear Populations, and implement in areas where necessary and not currently in place.	Conflict Prevention		Yes!

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Stay in existing WG? Noting that these color coding represent the view of small groups and not the group as a whole. Is the concept a good concept and can we go with it?		Encourage the courts, decision makers and lobbying groups to use sound science and the most knowledgeable grizzly bear research teams to drive management, translocation and conflict resolution.	all areas		Encourage the courts, decision makers and lobbying groups to use sound science and the most knowledgeable grizzly bear research teams to drive management, translocation and conflict resolution.

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Liked concept, but implementing fees, etc., was difficult to sort out..		As there will be an ever increasing population base moving to Montana or traveling seasonally to enjoy the open space ecosystems of Montana that support both Grizzly Bear and humans (recreation, Farming/Ranching, Bear Viewing, National Park Visits), there could be a discussion about how to implement a fee or percent taken on all land or residences (built or sold) to preserve open spaces in Montana through example: conservation easements or wildlife (specifically Grizzly Bear) conflicts.	all areas	This could be on sales or builds as in first statement and/or, also on a "gas tax, rental car and bed tax" to take advantage of seasonal bear r,ecreational visits to see bears. This is a world issue not just Montana. How do we get those benefiting and enjoying our open spaces that allow Large carnivores to have increasing populations to help pay for conflict management, travel corridors over highways, or increased garbage costs as the population in Montana grows exponentislly, seasonally or as yearlong residents. Take the huge expansion of Big Sky and that habitat loss and travel corridor. Could be similar to a sin tax on cigarettes or alcohol, but just a bear fee. I hate to say tax since that has been voted down way too many times...BUT the crux of it is how do others help Montana foot the bills? People come to Montana and its open spaces with vast wildlife resources, because they live in area so developed and built with such large high rises and skyscrapers containing huge populations of people it would not be "socially acceptable" or be safe in their backyard to have large carnivores living. So why don't they also help pay for our social acceptance? Of course there are already some fees adn taxes but there could be a dissuion for alterantive ways to help Montana support the efforts, so they and their family can enjoy the open spaces that allows grizzly bear expansion.	Spread the funding responsibility - Encourage state to pursue any and all options for increased funding opportunities and
		Recommend requiring the bear identification test be an annual requirement and couple this with bear spray outreach video (maybe a test on the bear spray video?)	Conflict Prevention	Varying degrees of support for this idea	Improved outreach and education resources - Develop a recreating in bear country educational video
		Encourage local municipalities to develop local sanitation ordinaces that include enforcement	Conflict Prevention	local support will be variable, funding support for compliance	Bear-Wise Communities
		Require that subdivisions or HOAs include restrictions on activities or behaviors that encourage human-bear conflicts. Provide conflict mitigtion policies.	Conflict Prevention		Bear-Wise Communities
		Create statewide standards and enforcements for containing attractants	Conflict Prevention		Bear-Wise Communities

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Might have too much detail or this one and the next. Could have overarching recommendation with addendum that could expand upon the core idea and not be lost.		To enhance human safety and prevent conflicts, the Council should recommend a mandatory, state-wide K-12 curriculum on bears (both black bears and grizzlies). All ages would benefit from information and problem-solving workshops. The curriculum could be inserted in a variety of subject areas and create cross-curricular opportunities. The curriculum should be a part of each grade and it should include the intrinsic, social, biological, and economic benefits of bears as well as the social and economic challenges of living with an apex predator on the landscape. It should include the biology of bears, necessary habitat, habitat fragmentation, preventative measures, and co-existence strategies. It should include the role of grizzly bears as an umbrella species and the value of predators in the ecosystem. It should include information on measures to coexist with grizzlies, including proper handling and storage of attractants like garbage, pet and livestock foods, bird-feeders, chickens and other small domesticated animals. Fear of grizzlies should be acknowledged and put into perspective with factual risk assessment and risk management. It might also include home projects that could include parents in the learning process. Possible projects would be: making your backyard bear-wise, problem-solving projects that analyze methods of living with bears, surveying your street, preventing human/bear conflicts locally, creating bear tolerant habitat in human dominated zones, and encouraging connectivity between recovery areas.	Conflict Prevention	Addresses the goal of human safety and conservation of bears. Education is something everyone can get behind. It will lay the groundwork for the future. It would take some funding to create a curriculum that is easy to use and add to current curriculum.	Develop curriculum guide for teachers to implement grizzly education into learning objectives
		The Information and Education team and/or other info outreach programs should design a board game to be used in schools and programs like the bear fairs. The game would resemble chutes and ladders and feature bears moving from one recovery area to another. Players roll the dice and land on squares like: “Lucky, you found a secluded huckleberry patch, take two steps forward,” or, “Oh no! you got into a chicken coop and were relocated 5 squares back,” or, “Yikes you got caught eating from the birdfeeder, two steps back.” The design of the game could be a part of a school project contest in the public schools. For the Bear Fairs and for kinesthetic learners, a physical, portable, maze could be created to make a game where young people work through a maze (it could be drawn out on a large tarp for portability). The participants come upon boxes to choose from as they move through the maze. When they lift the box, they find a hazard like free range chickens, or a grazing area and move back or to another place on the maze, or they lift a box and find cutworm moths and move forward. This disseminates information on bear biology and attractants in a fun way.	Conflict Prevention	This is easily added to I&E work. Might need funding and more folks on the ground to establish. It creates an opportunity to lay the groundwork for living with bears.	
Might be overly prescriptive		The state library association or the Information and Outreach entities or both should approach authors of grizzly publications for book donations to schools and local libraries throughout Montana. This should be accompanied by publicity so people know the books are available and the authors receive positive recognition and publicity for the donation.	Conflict Prevention	This would take time and little money other than promoting the program. Libraries are great local community centers and would be a good starting point for bear education.	
		WIthing FWP education: revamp the hunter education program to include more on bear identification and safety while in bear habitat.	Conflict Prevention	This could be done with the help of the bear education supervisor that was recommended in line 13.	Expand and improve bear safety information to non-hunting outdoor user groups

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Comment on coloring for pages 4-6; not sure whether/how to apply a particular color on each idea/recommendation...		Require an online test on bear identification and safety every two years prior to recieving hunting license for MT	Conflict Prevention		Expand and improve bear safety information to non-hunting outdoor user groups
Recognizing that watershed groups might not be statewide.		The state should become much more pro-active in the creation of watershed groups to generate local work to prevent conflict and ensure human safety with grizzlies on the landscape. Extra effort should be made to encourage watershed groups in areas where grizzlies have been reported and could be present and on the front edge of where bears are expanding such as between the NCDE and SBE, but watershed groups would be pertinent state-wide. Systematic, local, conflict prevention measures are necessary for communities with grizzlies on the landscape, and community groups improve local communication and understanding. The Blackfoot challenge and other successful groups have come out of a grass roots interest. The state needs to cultivate this as these groups can help solve many local issues. It would be prudent to issue funding to the Blackfoot Challenge group to cultivate watershed groups in new areas. To qualify for funding, the watershed groups should include all groups in the areas that wish to be included so the interests of the entire local community is represented. Watershed groups should begin to design and implement co-existence measures before problems arise as grizzlies move through the area. Getting ahead of the game has shown to be a pre-requisite for success. They could be a part of the bear-wise community recommendation line 26.	Conflict Prevention	This has been a part of conservation plans, but was not implemented because of funding issues. This would increase human safety and conserve bears due to conflict prevention. Social tolerance will be cultivated if problem bears are avoided by being prepared.This would take funding, but ESA section 6 grants and other conflict management grants would be available. The state would also save money from livestock losses with sequestered composting of boneyards and electric fencing projects.	Increase partnership, funding and support for local watershed collaborative groups (CDs, NGOs, Associations)

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Lots of detail that may not be necessary		A coexistence Summit or Academy should be established each year so that current co-existence workers and Watershed group representatives in new areas can brainstorm and discuss new challenges and ways to address them. The group should be supplied with a list of conflicts with locations and specific conflict issues so the group can pinpoint problem areas and focus efforts to mitigate attractants and formulate prevention measures. More detailed information on conflicts and removals should be made available. There is one list of bear relocations/removals but details are sparse. It lists human conflict, but what type? Residents, managers and co-existence workers can learn from the information. What type of conflict? Was it hunting related, a chicken coop, a cornfield, a livestock depredation? With this list, the group would be able to look at trends over time. This would be a great addition (next year) to the education summit that is being piloted in January of 2020. Having the two together would be more comprehensive and it would save money to do one instead of two. The Yellowstone subcommittee just did something similar in Cody Wyoming this past year and a number of solutions and ideas came from it including a rancher who has had great success of Airedales dogs as grizzly deterrents. The director of the Blackfoot Challenge just returned from an event looking at different breeds of grizzly dogs and what he learned would benefit all watershed and co-existence groups.	Conflict Prevention	This would be an invaluable place to share ideas and brainstorm solutions. It would be easy to find support for this and it would create publicity for the conservation program and the grizzly fund. It is an opportunity for communities to share on many levels not just grizzly conflict prevention. Bear managers are putting out fires and barely staying ahead. There is very little reflection or systematic learning going on, despite all the money being spent on management. This type of brainstorming session is long overdue. It will just take time, money and more folks on the ground.	Recommend Montana to move towards consistent management plan for conflict response, education and outreach across habitat areas given the diversity of economies, environments, and land uses Continue annual conference hosted by FWP to create consistent messaging, reporting, and to share effective strategies

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Like the concept and details but that should be further informed by the education community.		To add to the yearly bear identification quiz for hunting licenses recommendation, a quiz covering safety while hunting in bear country should be required each year for all hunting licenses. All hunters should be prepared for possible dispersal bears as bears are attracted to gut piles. There could be a required video summarizing safety precautions with a quiz afterward that would make it available for out of state licenses as well. The safety measures should come from the hunter education handout passed out at the December meeting as well as these great suggestions by a former Fish and Wildlife Commissioner who is an avid hunter Modify hunting tactics as necessary to avoid surprising grizzlies: 1. · In grizzly country, I usually don't walk into or out of my hunting area in the dark. I want to make sure I can see well enough to avoid walking into a bear. 2. · Be especially aware of your surroundings, and use caution when in areas where you may not be seen or heard easily, such as dense vegetation or along streams. In dense vegetation, I often go from the "stealth hunting mode" to making noise to avoid a bear. 3. · Pay attention to fresh bear tracks. If I see very fresh grizzly tracks and the terrain and vegetation is such that it would be easy to surprise a bear, I may abort the hunt and go to a different area. 4. · Try not to shoot game late in the afternoon. You want to have time to field dress and get the game out of the woods before dark. Once you have shot your game: 5. · Bears are attracted to game carcasses. Grizzlies have a very keen sense of smell, and can smell the fresh blood and other carcass odors from quite a distance. 6. · If your hunting partner is close enough, wait until they arrive before starting the field dressing process. While one person field dresses the animal, the other should "stand guard" to make sure a bear does not sneak up on the person doing the field dressing. 7. · If at all possible, field dress the animal in a relatively open spot that has good visibility. You may have to drag the animal a ways before field dressing it. This is for two reasons. First, it is easier to see an approaching bear if you are field dressing your game in an open area instead of a dense area. Second, you want to think about other hunters who may be in the area. If possible, leave the gut pile in an open location. If a bear comes in to feed upon it, you don't want other hunters to accidently surprise the bear, which may then react by defending its food source. There is less chance of that happening if the gut pile can be easily seen from a distance. 8. · If at all possible, do not leave your game in the woods overnight. Get it back to your vehicle or camp as soon as possible.	Conflict Prevention		Expand and improve bear safety information to non-hunting outdoor user groups
		Fishing licenses should include a video and quiz each year using bear education safety info for anglers.	Conflict Prevention	The cost of this would only be for the creation of the video. It could be paid for with an extra .50 for licenses.	Expand and improve bear safety information to non-hunting outdoor user groups

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Concept is good, but what does this look like?		There is a need for bear-resistant garbage containers and their continued maintenance for areas in and around recovery areas as well as linkage corridors and possibly present areas in Montana. Consider funding through ESA section 6 grants to create a matching funds program. There are many individuals who would purchase a bear resistant garbage can (I would be one), but that does not help others or assure long term maintenance of the cans. A matching grant program would be an interesting way to tackle the problem. Matching funds could come from the Grizzly Fund. A person donates enough money to purchase a can and the donation would be a tax write off, the money would then be matched so another can would be purchased, ownership would be in the hands of the disposal company. The disposal company would be responsible to keep up the cans. Owning the cans will give the company an incentive to be careful at garbage collection and they would have the option to fine individuals for lost parts etc.	Conflict Prevention	This allows an opportunity for public involvement and ownership of a solution.	Bear-Wise Communities Funding needed
		All garbage transfer stations and other facilities in bear country and linkage zones should be analyzed for attractants and sequestered to prevent luring bears to the area. Counties that do not have residential garbage pickup should make their garbage transfer stations bear resistant. Areas that have the potential for grizzly-garbage conflicts should have bear-safe garbage storage in bear resistant cans or inside closed buildings like Missoula's current ordinance.	Conflict Prevention	This would take funding and would need enforcement.	Bear-Wise Communities Funding needed
		Strict enforcement of poaching is necessary for the long-term conservation of bears. Malicious killing is a huge problem and was a cause of diminishing numbers of bears which brought about ESA listing. Fines for poaching should not change in the case of de-listing. Regardless of ESA status, the bear must be managed to preserve the population. Malicious killing is a huge threat to the future of grizzly bears. Stringent fines and enforcement should continue regardless of listing.	Conflict Prevention	Might be unpopular, but it is one area where numbers could be protected in the long term that is already in place.	Continue to enforce law
		Requiring bear spray to be carried while hunting would increase hunter safety, but would need to be part of a program to rent spray to out of state hunters and to provide inexpensive or discounted bear spray for in state hunters. If nothing else requiring outfitters to carry bear spray would be advised. In the Gravellies a regulation was enacted to require outfitters to carry bear spray. It went through with little pushback.	Conflict Prevention	Conflicts while hunting are occuring more and more as bears enter areas where they have not been seen before. There is a lot of room to improve safety and prevent conflict in this area.	Expand and improve bear safety information to non-hunting outdoor user groups
		Consider limits on commercial huckleberry picking operations to preserve food sources with tribal exceptions. Commercial foragers should also need to take a bear safety test each year with their licenses like hunters and anglers.	Conflict Prevention	This provides education for another group that spends time in bear country	
		Look into occupational safety and health safety standards for businesses (outfitters, state employees, recreational tours, etc.) for requiring bear spray and other bear safety standards.	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts before they occur and address liability issues	Expand and improve bear safety information to non-hunting outdoor user groups

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
		Add additional FWP bear management specialist staff able to focus on a very specific geography and required to hold community listening sessions, engage in local outreach, and trained/equipped to try creative techniques for preventing conflicts (remove carcasses with dynamite, deterrent treatments, technical expertise on electric fencing, help with bear proofing cow camps, etc.). Ensure any experiemntal deterrents include a research component/seek opportunity to partner with co-op/universities/IGBST/Arthur Middleton lab, etc. Bear management specialist positions need to be permanent, have better pay, etc.	Conflict Prevention	Build social tolerance, reduce conflicts, build trust	Continue to increase agency capacity on-the-ground in areas with bear management needs
		Establish bearwise education program around bear behavior, ecology, recovery, safety, and living with bears; include program in schools. Precede with statewide summit to develop messaging and curriculum. See Missoula bear FB page, Bear Smart Canada, Bearwise Wyoming. Education programs could be led by volunteer staff, like ID (Master Naturalist Program). Include special emphasis on educating out of state hunters/development of programs to provide out of state visitors with bear spray.	Conflict Prevention	Build social tolerance, reduce conflicts, build trust	Expand and improve bear safety information to non-hunting outdoor user groups
		FWP commit to building a culture of partnership with NGOs and communities in all areas of the state (explore developing a funding mechanism for NGO dollars directed to FWP through foundation with match)	Conflict Prevention	Leverage resources, build trust, prevent conflicts	Increase partnership, funding and support for local watershed collaborative groups (CDs, NGOs, Associations)
		Statewide coordination around bear resistant trash requirements (create a structure for local governments to coordinate on regulations and infrastructure)	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe	Bear-Wise Communities
		Implement food storage requirements on the Bitterroot NF and state lands	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe	Recommend Montana to move towards consistent management plan for conflict response, education and outreach across habitat areas given the diversity of economies, environments, and land uses
		Public/private partnership to install bear resistant infrastructure in all USFS campgrounds in the state and in BLM/state lands in connectivity areas	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe	Recommend Montana to move towards consistent management plan for conflict response, education and outreach across habitat areas given the diversity of economies, environments, and land uses
		Require homeowners to register goats, chickens, or other common livestock attractants.	Conflict Prevention / Funding	In July 2019, legislation was passed requiring all beekeepers to apply as a beekeeper and to annually register their hives in a variable fee structure	Spread the funding responsibility - Encourage state to pursue any and all options for increased funding opportunities

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Need consistency on both garbage/waste and food storage. And we needed to know if it was being applied to a given geography (state, federal, or private land). This has been helpful in terms of getting ideas on paper, but what is the structure/skeleton that this is being attached to? One way to get people to		Create consistancy around food storage orders on public lands and require food storage orders on all public lands in occupied grizzly bear habitat as well as expansion and connectivity habitat. Support enforcement, outreach and education around Food Storage Orders	Conflict Prevention, Connectivity	Many food storage orders are already in place but there are locations without food storage orders. There is debate around the need for consistancy. Multiple agencies have variable levels of funding for enforcement	Recommend Montana to move towards consistent management plan for conflict response, education and outreach across habitat areas given the diversity of economies, environments, and land uses

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
		It is difficult to walk into a hotel in Montana and not see pictures of grizzlies, paintings of grizzlies, or statues of grizzlies. When one crosses the state line at lost trail pass, one sees a grizzly on the Montana sign. Bears are an important part of our heritage and we need to understand them. A comprehensive state-wide program should be implemented to create Bear-wise communities (https://bearwise.org/bearwise-communities/) with a priority focus on the areas in Western Montana on the "possible presence of grizzlies" map from USFWS (https://drive.google.com/open?id=1bX00zAQS7ziMSaz1uIKhI0iaLqDeZXzi) The program should be state-wide. This could be done through local watershed organizations with agency assistance if the watershed groups so choose. This will prepare areas and reduce conflict as bear distribution expands and dispersal bears explore and colonize the linkage zones between recovery areas. This is the beginning of social tolerance for grizzlies throughout the state via education and will reduce black bear conflicts in areas where grizzlies are not present.	Conflict Prevention, Connectivity between ecosystems	This would take funding, but considering the map where bears have passed through, there are many communities that are not ready to encounter grizzlies, but encountering them is a growing possibility. Once again this can increase human safety and increase social tolerance. It would be worth the investment.	Bear-Wise Communities
		Encourage governor and Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks to develop a state Bear Aware outreach and education program with a designated bear aware outreach supervisor. This supervisor could oversee seasonal technicians across the state to implement education programs including bear spray as well as work with tourism department to reach out of state visitors. This could include a bear aware campaign with social media and video content. Develop a website and/or app that allows for quick access to the multiple resources available to prevent conflicts with bears. Maybe this role could also oversee a conflict prevention grant program.	Conflict Prevention, Resources	Funding for an FTE in the legislature	Bear-Wise Communities
		A potential way to create a conflict prevention grant program not coupled with Livestock Loss Board could be to reassess the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks Living with Wildlife grant program that was defunded. Potentially house a conflict prevention grant and a funding mechanism for conservation easements under this one program?	Conflict Prevention, Resources	Funding this program - need to better understand why it was defunded	Separate compensation for depredation from funding for conflict response so each can be adequately funded
		Glacier Park has a low number of conflicts because they are very strict about attractant regulations and human activities that attract bears. They have individuals that regularly survey and fine campers and campgrounds for violations and make sure that the violations are cleaned up immediately. They are also available to haze bears that enter front country camps. Strict and consistent attractant regulations work well, but they are meaningless without funding to enforce the regulations. More bear managers on the ground would allow for more enforcement of attractant sequestration and immediate response to those first strike bears. We might also recommend neighborhoods to report conflicts and facilitate and speed up attractant clean up. Gerald Cobell blamed many problems encountered in his area on waste left behind by tourists often in campgrounds. Funding for more people there to enforce strict camping regulations would assist in that area. He said that once the bears get into garbage, their days are numbered. Taking that attractant out of the picture by creating and enforcing attractant regulations would help their situation.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols	Once again, this is an issue of more boots on the ground and more funding.	boots-on-the ground

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
		Revisit MOU with Wildlife Services and identify opportunities for improving efficiency, capacity and coordination around conflict prevention and response.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols	This MOU with Wildlife Services could be a mechanism for improving and addressing resource challenges around coexistence and response. Ideally, MT would have autonomy over grizzly bear management decisions in the event bears are delisted. Challenge is so much of the attention is focused on livestock conflicts and there are many other significant conflicts and responsibilities and trust of agencies that get blurred through the current agreement.	Improved interagency coordination for consistent protocols
		Look at assisting land trusts with funding for easements in connectivity areas at a state and federal level (one example could be to look at the Montana Sage Grouse Initiative and how funding comes through that specific to sage grouse habitat)	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Funding, Creation of a new program always poses challenges, Coordination with other states	Spread the funding responsibility - Encourage state to pursue any and all options for increased funding opportunities

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
		A comprehensive plan to identify and protect linkage corridors for promoting natural migration between all recovery areas should be created and implemented to assure the long-term conservation of grizzly bears. Within these areas, potential conflicts to successful grizzly bear occupation and travel should be identified, and proactive steps taken to increase habitat security and reduce the potential for conflict when bears arrive. For instance, proactive livestock conflict prevention, attractant management, road density reductions should be all be planned and implemented. Additionally, FWP should partner with Montana Department of Transportation to identify and model potentially important grizzly bear (and other wildlife) crossing points on major highways, and seek funding and planning opportunities to incorporate wildlife crossing practices into the transportation system. As the 1993 grizzly recovery plan states, "Ideally, preserving linkage between populations is a more legitimate long-term conservation strategy than are attempts to manage separate island populations. Linkage zones are areas between currently separated populations that provide adequate habitat for low densities of individuals to exist and move between two or more larger areas of suitable habitat. The existence of individuals and habitats within linkage zones could act to provide a connection between larger populations. Linkage zones enhance the viability of populations that are separated by some distance by facilitating the exchange of individuals and maintaining demographic vigor and genetic diversity." 1993 revised Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan Pg 42. As Hanski and Gilpin 1991 states, "If no movement between populations can take place, and isolation becomes permanent, local extinction becomes more likely." The plan should focus on areas where bears have been known to have travelled as in the possibly present map (https://drive.google.com/open?id=1bX00zAQS7ziMSaz1uIKhI0iaLqDeZXzi) and currently protected areas like Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs), Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) and Wilderness Areas. Here is a map of these areas with possible linkage corridors. (https://drive.google.com/open?id=12QiuEsgKWsZQV8DVhVnxEo-v4OLFUL5z) Providing or securing linkage zones can be a practical solution to demographic dangers of fractured habitats for all species including elk, deer, pronghorns and native sheep. Current regulations should be strictly enforced and exceptions for road building should not be allowed for all IRAs, WSAs and Wilderness areas within the identified corridors. Public lands immediately in between these protected areas should adopt the amendment 19 policy from the previous Flathead Forest Plan. Unfragmented, roadless areas of forest are necessary to promote demographic connectivity and the long-term conservation of grizzly bears. Protecting and identifying these areas will provide more areas of colonization to re-locate bears and encourage natural migration and connectivity between recovery areas. Private lands in between the areas should be considered for conservation easements. Bear-	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This would promote long term conservation of grizzly bears and all of the other wildlife that Montana is famous for. This would not take too much funding. Many of the areas are already protected. This would take a concerted effort between agencies. Since this would also protect migration corridors for elk and deer, hunters could get behind it.	Develop statewide conservation plan that incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
		Forests surrounding recovery areas and in designated linkage zones should adopt Amendment 19 from the previous Flathead Forest plan to limit fragmentation of habitat. This is important for all species including elk. New scientific studies on habitat fragmentation and climate change should be considered in all forest plans in the state. Forest Plans must incorporate standards that provide protection for grizzlies and other wildlife from habitat degradation and human conflicts.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This is an important amendment limiting roads in the forest which increases human safety because it offers less access to bears. It also decreases conflict because bears will have more adequate habitat and will not be displaced by increasing tourism and recreation. Bears are moving out of the parks at a much greater speed than their numbers are increasing. Park visits have more than doubled in the past years. Bears are being pressured to look for new habitat. If we can provide ample habitat, and decrease attractants in populated areas, conflict will be reduced.	Develop statewide conservation plan that incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones
Agree with concept / lots of work		The state should establish a partnership with insurance companies to build wildlife bridges. In 2015 this was found. “According to the insurance company, drivers have a one in 77 chance of hitting a deer in Montana. That’s considerably higher than in surrounding states. Wyoming drivers have only a one in 113 chance of hitting a deer, Idaho is 1 in 232 and North Dakota is 1 in 105.” This information comes from 2019, “Deer-car collisions cost an average of $8,190, an elk-vehicle collision is about $25,319, and a moose-vehicle collision is $44,546, taking into consideration human injuries and death, towing, vehicle repair, investigation of the accident by local authorities, and carcass disposal.” And this, “One of the most looked-to examples of successful wildlife overpasses is in Banff, over the Trans-Canada Highway. A study there shows that in just one two-mile stretch, wildlife-vehicle crashes reduced from an average of 12 a year to 2.5, reducing costs of crashes by 90 percent—over $100,000.” And in 1995, “Not only are the collisions harmful to wildlife, but according to a 1995 study they also caused 211 human fatalities, 29,000 human injuries and more than $1 billion in property damage. State Farm puts the number of collisions at 1.5 million annually causing 10,000 human injuries and 150 deaths along with $2,500 in property damage to vehicles.” It would serve insurance companies well both in costs and public relations if they became partners with MDOT to build wildlife bridges. Where side streets are a problem in wildlife crossing areas, electrified cattleguards should be considered to prevent wildlife from using side streets to cross instead of wildlife crossings. In Canada, they used to have a suggested night speed limit of 45 miles per hour. Canada has many wildlife crossings now, so they might not have the suggested speed limit anymore. It is possible that the suggested reduced speed caused more funding for the crossing structures.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This is an opportunity for the state to work with insurance companies. Opportunities for partnerships could be explored on many levels. Public safety is something that both the state and insurance companies can agree upon.	Work with MDOT on wildlife safety campaign

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Great concept if there were a think tank to do this.		Voluntary Driving Restrictions would be an out of the box way to reduce wildlife mortality and human fatality/injury. Insurance companies are well aware and have created outreach campaigns to reduce drowsy driving which according to the CDC, "The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates that drowsy driving was responsible for 72,000 crashes, 44,000 injuries, and 800 deaths in 2013.3 However, these numbers are underestimated, and up to 6,000 fatal crashes each year may be caused by drowsy drivers." According to drowsydriving.org 13% of crashes with hospitalizations and 21% of crashes with fatalities are caused by drowsy driving. Wildlife accidents contribute to many more fatalities and damages. One bear manager said that grizzlies (and I would imagine many other species) have adapted to crossing at night when traffic is minimized. Both drowsy driving and a majority of wildlife crossings or at least accidents due to diminished vision happen at night. Insurance companies could create financial incentives to vow not to drive between "2 and 5 am" (or a time line based on the timing of wildlife mortalities and drowsy driving) unless in an emergency. If those who take the pledge and receive those incentives get into an auto crash (not during an emergency) during those times, they would pay a higher deductible. This plan could be coupled with billboards pinpointing specific wildlife crossing areas with ads for nearby all-night diners or truck stops where drivers could go to take a break instead of driving through crossing areas between certain hours. Insurance companies could pledge a percentage of money saved through prevention to the construction of permanent wildlife crossings.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Again, slowing down at night or avoiding night driving conserves all wildlife. It is an inexpensive answer to a big mortality problem.	Work with MDOT on wildlife safety campaign
		A nationwide contest to come up with ways to reduce train/bear collisions to prevent grain spills and to remove carcasses quickly from train tracks with a large monetary incentive should be implemented. One of the problems with trains is that the grain cars dribble grain as they go along the tracks. All cars are weighed before they leave the station and when they arrive at the destination, so grain bins that are leaking are identified. The spills bring wildlife to the tracks where they are killed which attracts bears. How can we reduce the grain dribble on the tracks to preserve all wildlife? I believe a foundation like Gates who likes to solve problems would contribute to the incentive and possibly direct the contest. If this is successful, more contests for conflict prevention could be implemented.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Reducing grain spillage along the tracks benefits the shippers as well as grizzlies. Even small losses of grain add up to big losses.	
But not the purview of the Council		Consider making funding available for smaller conservation easements. At this time, small parcels in key areas are not considered for conservation easements because the focus is on larger parcel of land. Every little bit helps. It would be prudent to create an organization with grant money from the state and the ESA to offer conservation easements specifically for smaller parcels in locations near occupied habitat.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This would take funding and an understanding that every little bit helps. Small ranch operations could take advantage of this preserving open space into the future.	

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Need to simplify. Would recommend ending after first sentence (encouraged)	Green	FWP define connectivity zones within Montana where natural/functional connectivity (i.e. occupancy, ecological function in connective areas) is proactively encouraged through: 1) no hunting allowed in connectivity zones, 2) management decisions (about lethal removal, relocation) include more conservative criteria, 3) work with IGBST to develop statewide mortality thresholds and statewide management removal quota with conservative sub thresholds (percentages of total allowable mortality) tied to connectivity zones (and all must be in synch with ecosystem wide mortality thresholds), 4) bears in connectivity zones will not be translocated back to recovery areas (need to develop areas in DMA outside of PCA that are tolerable relocation zones), 5) increase collaring efforts and monitoring of movements to prevent conflicts more proactively, with a focus on individual bears of high priority (dispersing young males, females with cubs, etc.), 6) work with local land users to reduce conflicts spatially/temporally real-time with monitoring info, i.e. modify grazing rotations, temporary hunting closures, trail closures, etc., 7) apply habitat standards and guidelines from Conservation Strategy to Wildlife Management Areas in connectivity zones, 8) evaluate federal land use planning processes and projects for impact to habitat requirements for natural connectivity- with focus on food storage and road management, and 9) establish interagency population monitoring program in connectivity zones	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	For long-term resilience of lower-48 grizzly bears, it's important that connectivity between ecosystems occur naturally. Natural connectivity-involving grizzly occupancy and fulfilment of ecological function in connectivity areas- is key to restoration and long-term persistence of grizzly bears in the Northern Rockies.	Develop statewide conservation plan that incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones
		FWP and MDT work with IGBST to identify priority crossing locations on I-90 and I-15. It's important that there is coordination with the Wildlife and Transportation Statewide Steering Committee on this issue; coordination on priorities could create compelling case for tapping into federal funding (e.g. BUILD grants, etc.)	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	The interstates are a potentially substantial barrier to natural connectivity and potential for vehicle collision with grizzly bears is a human safety concern	Work wiht MDT to enhance understanding of priority areas Include wildlife migration corridors into infrastructure improvement plans
		The state legislature should recommend that all Wilderness Study Areas in between recovery areas should be designated Wilderness.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems, conflict prevention	Creating secure, remote areas where bears can roam away from populations is essential for the long-term conservation of bears.	
		More funding should be made available to hire more bear management specialists to train with our experienced managers and take over when they retire. Tim Manley and Jamie Jonkel and others have a wealth of experience cannot be lost when they retire. We need more specialists on the ground and they should be training with our experienced managers. FWP must really support the experience they have and use it to move into the future. The specialists we have are overworked and residents are frustrated because the managers cannot be in more than one place at a time. Specialists must spend a lot of time on conflicts and have less time for prevention. Funding must include management specialists in areas in linkage zones now to get ahead of the moving edge of bear distribution. More managers on the ground would assist watershed groups and visit, build trust and educate residents. These areas must put co-existence measures in place before problems arise. Montana must recognize the wealth of experience on the ground and capitalize on it.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems, conflict prevention	This covers our goal of human safety and conservation of bears. Rewarding and making use of the talent we have and using that talent to build new experienced managers for the future will be one of the most important things the state legislature could fund.	Continue to increase agency capacity on-the-ground in areas with bear management needs
Don't want to tie hands of wildlife managers		Grizzly bears once roamed the entire state of Montana and non-conflict bears should never be removed simply for showing up in a place. We recognize that some areas of the state that were once historical suitable habitat are today inappropriate for grizzly bears. There is also a lot of quality grizzly bear habitat that is currently unoccupied, yet could be potentially occupied.	Grizzly Bear Distribution	There is a need to focus on areas where grizzlies could be with less conflict. These areas should be studied and utilized.	Develop statewide conservation plan that incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
		FWP develop a social science study to establish a baseline understanding of social acceptance in various communities across the state as an initial step in a process to create a statewide management plan.	Grizzly Bear Distribution	could yield important insights prior to creating a state	Good idea
		Recognize all of Montana as biologically suitable habitat	Grizzly Bear Distribution	Acknowledging grizzlies could be anywhere in the state allows FWP to use conflict management as a tool for prioritizing occupancy in certain geographies	Identify acceptable range for bears
Good concept. Lots of detail to work through.		The state and federal agencies should support and implement research to promote the long-term conservation of grizzly bears such as the following suggestions. This could be paid for through section 6 grants from the Endangered Species Act provisions and agency funding: Monitoring of food supplies is highly important. Look at the difference in 2018 in the Blackfoot area after a large fire. Food sources do influence bear movement and distribution. 1. A survey of the Bitterroot Recovery Area for bear presence/occupation. 2. A survey of the Sapphires, the Sapphire WSA and Anaconda Pintler Wilderness areas for bear distribution. 3. Impacts of snowmobiling on denning and post-den emergence 4. Impacts of trail use on bears 5. Map high caloric foods and/or seasonal important foods. This is happening in the GYE but needs to be conducted in the NCDE Cabinet Yaak, Selkirks, Bitterroot, and possible colonization areas between recovery areas. 6. Develop a functional habitat map that could be used to inform road closures and recreational use in the NCDE, Cabinet Yaak, Selkirks, Bitterroot, and possible colonization areas between recovery areas (Sapphires and Anaconda Pintler Wilderness to name a few). 7. Map habitat and food sources and analyze the effects of climate change on these areas to predict where grizzly bears will migrate in the future and to pinpoint areas for colonization in linkage zones.	Grizzly Bear Distribution, conflict prevention	The more knowledge we have about grizzlies and their habitat, the better we can provide for co-existence. This would take funding.	Good Idea
Are doing already to some extent. Can't say this in perpetuity.		Encourage Governor and the Legislature to celebrate the recovery of the Grizzly Bear in Montana though Montana's dedication to Vast Open Spaces. Those spaces are checkerboards of Public Lands, National Parks and Privately Owned working Agricultural lands. All open spaces in Montana not only promote increasing Grizzly bear populations but all wildlife, within forest and prairie ecosystems.	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity Between Ecosystems		Recognize grizzly bear conservation success at the state level

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
		Encourage Governor, public officials and researchers to consistently refer to the GYE and NCDE as recovered with expanding pollutions	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Science supports this, however passions may not. How many other ecosystems in the lower 48 (other than the already designated recovery areas) have enough public lands to be the base for or to support viable recovered populations like GYE and NCDE successes? These base public lands allow safety and socially acceptable "anchor" acres for the populations.	Recognize grizzly bear conservation success at the state level
		Work with relevant agencies to create a streamlined way for public reporting of possible grizzly bear sightings outside of recovery zones	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity between ecosystems		Work with relevant agencies to create a streamlined way for public reporting of possible grizzly bear sightings outside of recovery zones
Recognized broader need to partner		Improve coordination and outreach on grizzly bears and bear awareness with the office of tourism, realtors, VRBO, etc.	Other	Capacity, Unknown concerns/roadblocks from realtors, tourism, etc.	Bear-Wise Communities
Like concept. Need more discussion		A multiplier should be considered but as in Wyoming, it should only apply to heavily forested hard to manage livestock areas and measures of conflict prevention must be used to the best of the livestock grower's ability in order to qualify for the multiplier. Any reimbursement should include a requirement of conflict prevention measures after the second reimbursement.	Other	Many could get behind this especially if it were coupled with responsibility.	Review Livestock Loss compensation for multiplier
		A grizzly bear PR person to promote the benefits and positive sides to having grizzlies on the landscape should be added to the folks on the ground working for grizzly conservation.	Other	Reminding folks of the benefits to having bears on the landscape would be helpful for creating bear-wise communities and co-existence measures.	Continue to increase agency capacity on-the-ground in areas with bear management needs
		Establish cooperative monitoring programs – FWP, USFS, Permittees, NGOs on public allotments	Other	Enhance flexibility of public grazing allotment manag	Continue to increase capacity on-the-ground in areas with bear management needs
Outside purview of Council		Ensure people can't be held liable if grizzly mauling occurs on their property.	Other	Create security for landowners, important for social tolerance	
Already discussions around wildlife movement		As roadways within the connectivity zone for the GYE and NCDE come up for repair bids over the next tens of years be prepared to write in wildlife crossing. Continue to utilize bear movement maps to predict areas of high movement	Other		Work wiht MDT to enhance understanding of priority areas Include wildlife migration corridors into infrastructure improvement plans
Value statement...		The grizzly bear is our state animal and an important piece of Montana's wildlife heritage. Most Montanans recognize that grizzly bears are an important part of what makes Montana the "Last Best Place" and unique from the rest of the Lower Forty-eight states. Therefore, Montana's grizzly bear populations—Yellowstone, NCDE and Cabinet-Yaak (and eventually the Bitterroot)—should be thriving, self-sustaining and interconnected	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Montana has the chance to make a stand and protect its status as the last best place in the lower 48. Conserving grizzlies will preserve the reputation for wildness that draws tourists, retirement incomes, and industry.	Greater Vision, needs council direction

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Pages 10-12 start here. All need additional work/reworking. Green seems like it doesn't need a lot of additional work. Red may not ever reach consensus. Didn't like specific wording around Big Belts.		Facilitate recovering or recovered populations in all four MT Recovery Zones, as well as passability for grizzlies on the landscape that lies between Recovery Zones and west of the Big Belt mountains . East of the Big Belts, relocate minor offenders to augment unrecovered western Recovery Zones and euthenize problem bears. Wherever grizzlies exist in MT, facilitate livability for residents and property owners, and viability for production agriculture.	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	The council's individual recommendations need an overarching framework or vision, responding to Cecily Costello's comments in Missoula. I believe this may be something most or all council members can live with.	Greater Vision, needs council direction
		Initiate a statewide planning process that outlines a statewide vision for grizzly conservation and management. A statewide plan should include, A) Geographic specificity around conflict response (i.e. management zones that reflect conservation value of bears expanding into a given area) and B) Establish clear guidelines for lethal removal of a grizzly bear that are consistent with federal regulations, socially acceptable, and driven by 1) conservation value of the management zone, 2) demographics, 3) evidence of chronic depredation (in cases of livestock conflict) and 4) conflict severity (e.g. human safety issues)	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	create clarity, transparency, and predictability around grizzly conservation and conflict management in Montana. Opportunity to establish more specificity than currently vague definitions of social acceptability. Also, an opportunity to establish proactive approaches to ensuring connectivity occurs	Recommend Montana to move towards consistent management plan for conflict response, education and outreach across habitat areas given the diversity of economies, environments, and land uses
		State work with grizzly council to determine important elements of a successful statewide planning process	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Grizzly council represents diverse interests and could provide valuable guidance to FWP that would ensure statewide planning process is successful	
		State legislature cannot interfere with FWP management approaches post delisting. Is there a way to prevent legislative meddling (e.g. state bill ratifying Montana statewide plan in statute, or Governor's executive order on statewide plan?)	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Build trust between public and managers	
			Resources		

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		A multimillion-dollar fund should be established in the next farm bill for grizzly conservation efforts. The interest generated from this permanent Grizzly Fund would pay for non-lethal, preventative measures for co-existence in the United States (MT, ID, WY, WA etc.). This creates long term funding for co-existence measures. It should be non-lethal so that national conservation groups and foundations for wildlife would be willing to contribute to the fund. Seed money from the farm bill would start the fund. It should include an option on taxes (one could choose to put a dollar or two into the fund from personal taxes) and a method for individuals to contribute to the fund like an adopt a grizzly program. This would allow national interest in grizzly bear conservation to contribute to the costs of living with grizzlies. This fund could contribute to incentives for living with grizzlies and all co-existence measures as well as research to create new measures for co-existence and conflict prevention.	Resources	This would take a commitment from Montana to push the idea of a fund to the federal government. It would be a long term solution for co-existence funding.	Spread the funding responsibility - Encourage state to pursue any and all options for increased funding opportunities
Will take additional conversation with Council and Idaho		The Bitterroot Ecosystem should be studied as a re-location area without the bears losing ESA protections. The bears should be able to be re-located in this habitat rich area without being considered experimental/non-essential to ensure protection for bears that move into and have been re-located in the area. It provides excellent habitat and could easily house many bears with minimal conflict giving managers more options for re-location of bears.	Resources	Creating more areas for bear re-location will take the pressure off other ecosystems.This is not a funding issue but a social issue and will take bear-wise programs and more managers on the ground to implement.	
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		Funding for grizzly bear conservation (and for all wildlife) is vitally important. All opportunities for grizzly bear conservation should continue to be explored, including federal, state and private funds. Additionally, given the amount of money that the USFWS invests in grizzly bear recovery, the state of Montana should consider the financial impacts that might result from a delisted grizzly bear population, and where and whether or not the state can find opportunities to replace those funds.	Resources	The need for funding has been prevelant during recent meetings.	Spread the funding responsibility - Encourage state to pursue any and all options for increased funding opportunities
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		Consider a Montana recreation license that costs a minimal amount (1-2 dollars) for in state recreationists and more for out of state tourists (10 dollars). To apply for this license, one would also have to take the bear safety test. The test could also include backcountry safety tips, information on responsibly recreating on public lands, and how recreation can affect wildlife.	Resources	This provides a way to educate a large group of people who recreate in Montana and brings in a funding resource.	Spread the funding responsibility - Encourage state to pursue any and all options for increased funding opportunities
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		Establish new funding mechanism(s) for wildlife conservation and management in MT (ideas to consider: tourism tax like expanded resort tax, increased appropriation for Livestock Loss Board through general dollars (not sportsman), conservation fee associated with National Parks (re: WY resolution), support passage of Recovering Americas Wildlife Act, need new federal support for funding species post-delisting, through reauthorizing ESA?, look at NRCS and farm bill	Resources	Current resources are not adequate; establishing new sources of revenue for grizzly bear conflict prevention, conservation, and management is key to continuing the success story of grizzly recovery. New mechansims should tap into constituencies other than sportsmen.	Spread the funding responsibility - Encourage state to pursue any and all options for increased funding opportunities

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Prevention/ Funding/Resources Combine		Establish a tiered loss compensation multiplier that through contingencies incentivizes preventive techniqes and provides compensation for livestock loss (recognizing that compensation programs don't promote social tolerance, just make it economically viable for ranching operations to stay afloat in grizzly bear country). Important considerations for such a program: 1) state legislature needs to allocate more funds for livestock and other agricultural loss (general dollars to livestock loss board, not Sportsmen's/FWP $, 2) compensation program could also be tiered geographically (i.e. provide more compensation in certain portions of the MT landscape key for grizzly bear conservation/connectivity), 3) bring back the Living with Wildlife Grant program, and 4) explore Farm Bill opportunities and NRCS EQUIP	Resources	Ensure ranchers that provide important habitat in connective lands can remain economically viable; keep people safe and bears alive through incentivization of conflict prevention techniques	Review Livestock Loss compensation for multiplier
Prevention/ Funding/Resources Combine		Create a grizzly bear prevention fund that is not tied to the Livestock loss board that funds work and is dependent on a local match	Resources, prevention	Getting it through the Legislature and showing the broad support to get it done.	Separate compensation for depredation from funding for conflict response so each can be adequately funded
Red due to hunting issues.		Contibute to bear conflict management funding through a mandatory Conflict Prevention Pass fee added to bear (black or grizzly) hunting license	Role of Hunting	The AIS Prevention Pass required with a fishing license has helped to contribute funds to prevent the spread of AIS. There may be an opportunity to implement a similar tool into bear hunting licenses to dedicate funding to conflict management or hunter education in bear country.	Spread the funding responsibility - Encourage state to pursue any and all options for increased funding opportunities Duck Stamp example
Red due to hunting issues.		The grizzly bear is the slowest reproducing mammal on this planet. Any future hunting of grizzly bears should be avoided. Hunting is a contentious issue and could be easily resolved by honoring the recent Grizzly Treaty signed by over 200 tribes in Montana, Canada, and elsewhere. It asks that the bear never be hunted. Hunting does not increase human safety nor does it conserve the bear. MFWP seems determined to have a grizzly trophy hunt, if they do so it should be extremely limited in scope, should not allow hunting near the parks, should not allow hunting in vital linkage habitat, and should be easily suspended or cancelled during high mortality years. The Fish and Wildlife Commission recommended waiting after de-listing to consider any form of recreational hunting. A slow approach was suggested (waiting at least one year or more) to demonstrate to the public that MFWP's goal was to maintain a healthy, viable grizzly population not to kill as many as fast as they legally could. Management issues alone have killed a large number of grizzlies. In Wyoming, a take of 72 bears has been granted, 10% of the current population estimate in the GYE. Certainly, hunting should not be considered the best management tool for grizzly bears. Current management mortality measures target specific nuisance and habituated bears. Again, the tribes have been very clear about their wishes. This is a simple thing to give.	Role of Hunting	This is a difficult issue.	

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
		Define areas and circumstances where hunting is not appropriate: 1) not allowed in certain geographies- connectivity zones, core habitat/areas surrounding parks, 2) not considered a management tool for reducing conflicts- there is no science to support this, 3) delayed following de-listing; FWP should be a leader in coordination with other agencies on season/quota setting, 4) need to define mortality thresholds outside of DMAs/identify guidelines for cancellation of hunting season if a pre-determined portion of mortality threshold is met via management removals prior to beginning of the hunting season, 5) ecosystem based mortality quotas should not be seen as the equivalent of hunting-based mortality quotas. They are the quotas that trigger population change and hunting quotas should not be directly linked to population management.	Role of Hunting	Grizzly recovery under the ESA is a conservation success story and Montana could demonstrate leadership that ensures that success story continues	
		In the meetings in December, it was clear that managers are running out of places to re-locate bears. When they put them back in the recovery areas, they are putting them in already occupied territory, so they must look for a space. FWP should develop a protocol for translocating bears a) between ecosystems, b) within an ecosystem, c) outside of a designated ecosystem, which further the conservation, connection and recovery of grizzly bears in the state of Montana. Bears translocated due to previous conflict may need to be placed deeper into core habitat of a designated ecosystem, where they are less likely to continue to get into trouble. Having other areas like linkage zones and augmentation zones would be helpful to the managers and the bears who are getting pushed back into conflict areas. Using the 3 strike protocols, first strike bears should be available for augmentation programs and first and second-strike bears should be available for translocation to habitat rich linkage zones surrounded by bear-wise communities so the chance for conflict is minimized.	Transplant Protocols	This is a social tolerance issue. If areas are made "bear-wise" and understand that grizzlies are in the area, it will smooth the way for re-location to new areas in the linkage zones.	Develop statewide conservation plan that incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones
		Relocate problem grizzlies with minor offenses to the most appropriate MT recovery zone	Transplant Protocols	What to do with bears in need of relocation	Develop statewide conservation plan that incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones
		Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, the USFWS, the USFS and appropriate agencies partners should put in place agreements needed to allow for grizzly bears trapped inbetween recovery zones to be released onsite or in nearest secure habitat (likely public land) between ecosystems rather than taking grizzly bears back to recovery zone. Clarification is needed when communicating with the public about Transplant Protocols and the difference between releasing a bear that moved in that location on their own vs. reintroduction/augmentation	Transplant Protocols	Public concern over bears being where bears have not been in decades, potential state code issues, misinformation	Develop statewide conservation plan that incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones
		Do not rely on human-assisted transplant protocols for establishing connectivity.	Transplant Protocols	Establishing a precedent of artificially assisting grizzly bears with movement into "new" or unoccupied habitat could create a slippery slope that ultimately undermines the importance of ensuring habitat conditions are conducive to natural expansion of grizzly bears into connective/linkage areas.	Develop statewide conservation plan that incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones

GROUP 2 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 2 Recommendation
Goes with one on top of page		FWP work with USFWS, IGBST, and USFS to identify 1.) connectivity zones and 2.) suitable areas within connectivity zones for relocating conflict bears occupying habitat between DMAs (in circumstances where relocation is deemed the appropriate management action).	Transplant Protocols	Important to consider what the translocation and/or relocation protocol will be when responding to a conflict bear in "new" or unoccupied habitat, especially connectivity zones. In these circumstances, current translocation or relocation back to occupied habitat (PCA) is a management approach that could potentially inhibit connectivity from ever occurring.	Develop statewide conservation plan that incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones
		Recreation in core grizzly habitat, recovery zones and connectivity zones presents challenges and opportunities for increased human bear interactions and conflicts. Bear Aware Recreation Zones need to be mapped to get ahead of the existing and potential conflicts as recreation increases in these areas.	Coexistence; conflict; connectivity	Recreation is going to play a big part in Montana economic development. We need to be forward thinking about how this will effect overall grizzly bear recovery and get ahead of it by creating smart recreation opportunities and recreation zones. Increase in human population in Montana will become an issue as big as our challenges and opportunities with livestock. We need to get ahead of the outreach and education about smart, bear aware recreation zones in recovery zones and connectivity zones.	Develop statewide conservation plan that incorporates open space, connectivity and linkage zones
		There is an obvious need to continue to support and fully fund our bear specialists so they can continue the outreach and education programs; deal effectively, efficiently and quickly with conflict issues. Including recovery zones and connectivity zones.	Coexistence, conflict, connectivity	The opporutnity would be to create a long-term funding plan and revenue stream with state and Federal partners including creation of a habitat protection fund. A Smart Recreation Fund could be created to help fund these efforts.	Continue to increase agency capacity on-the-ground in areas with bear management needs
Not in the Council's purview.		We can't consider delisting separate subpopulations until we develop a cohesive strategy and plan to create connectivity between all the recovery zones	All except hunting	Great opportunity to develop a statewide cohesive recovery strategy for Montana.	Recommend Montana to move towards consistent management plan for conflict response, education and outreach across habitat areas given the diversity of economies, environments, and land uses
		Review and update 1993 managment plan	All		Review and update 1993 managment plan
		FWP needs to better communicate with the public, especially with landowners and livestock producers, when it comes to trapping and relocating grizzlies for any reason.	Transplant Protocols	Most people would like to know when a grizzly is being dumped in their back yard.	
		USFWS, FWP and WS need to work together with local landowners and county governments to identify new relocation sites outside of the designated management areas, especially in connectivity zones.	Transplant Protocols	This would avoid questions like what to do with the Stevensville bear, or any others that end up between ecosystems where populations are established.	

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
Stay in existing WG? Noting that these color coding represent the view of small groups and not the group as a whole. Is the concept a good concept and can we go with it?		Encourage the courts, decision makers and lobbying groups to use sound science and the most knowledgeable grizzly bear research teams to drive management, translocation and conflict resolution.	all areas		Incomplete thought - this idea could be incorporated or needs revision
Liked concept, but implementing fees, etc., was difficult to sort out..		As there will be an ever increasing population base moving to Montana or traveling seasonally to enjoy the open space ecosystems of Montana that support both Grizzly Bear and humans (recreation, Farming/Ranching, Bear Viewing, National Park Visits), **there could be a discussion about how to implement a fee or percent taken on all land or residences (built or sold) to preserve open spaces in Montana through example: conservation easements or wildlife (specifically Grizzly Bear) conflicts.**	all areas	This could be on sales or builds as in first statement and/or, also on a "gas tax, rental car and bed tax" to take advantage of seasonal bear r,ecreational visits to see bears. This is a world issue not just Montana. How do we get those benefiting and enjoying our open spaces that allow Large carnivores to have increasing populations to help pay for conflict management, travel corridors over highways, or increased garbage costs as the population in Montana grows exponentislly, seasonally or as yearlong residents. Take the huge expansion of Big Sky and that habitat loss and travel corridor. Could be similar to a sin tax on cigarettes or alcohol, but just a bear fee. I hate to say tax since that has been voted down way too many times...BUT the crux of it is how do others help Montana foot the bills? People come to Montana and its open spaces with vast wildlife resources, because they live in area so developed and built with such large high rises and skyscrapers containing huge populations of people it would not be "socially acceptable" or be safe in their backyard to have large carnivores living. So why don't they also help pay for our social acceptance? Of course there are already some fees adn taxes but there could be a dissuion for alterantive ways to help Montana support the efforts, so they and their family can enjoy the open spaces that allows grizzly bear expansion.	Under a larger discussion on funding and one of maybe many ideas of funding - combine into a funding discussion/recommendation Needs identification of where funding would go
		Recommend requiring the **bear identification test be an annual requirement and couple this with bear spray outreach video** (maybe a test on the bear spray video?)	Conflict Prevention	Varying degrees of support for this idea	education outreach
		Encourage **local municipalities to develop local sanitation ordinaces that include enforcement**	Conflict Prevention	local support will be variable, funding support for compliance	Sanitation Group - Combine and Discuss
		Require that **subdivisions or HOAs include restrictions on activities or behaviors that encourage human-bear conflicts. Provide conflict mitigtion policies.**	Conflict Prevention		Sanitation/Attractants Group - Combine and Discuss Would require regulation
		Create **statewide standards and enforcements for containing attractants**	Conflict Prevention		Sanitation/Attractants Group - Combine and Discuss Would require regulation
Might have too much detail or this one and the next. Could have overarching recommendation with addendum that could expand upon the core idea and not be lost.		To enhance human safety and prevent conflicts, the Council should recommend a mandatory, **state-wide K-12 curriculum on bears (both black bears and grizzlies)**. All ages would benefit from information and problem-solving workshops. The curriculum could be inserted in a variety of subject areas and create cross-curricular opportunities. The curriculum should be a part of each grade and it should include the intrinsic, social, biological, and economic benefits of bears as well as the social and economic challenges of living with an apex predator on the landscape. It should include the biology of bears, necessary habitat, habitat fragmentation, preventative measures, and co-existence strategies. It should include the role of grizzly bears as an umbrella species and the value of predators in the ecosystem. It should include information on measures to coexist with grizzlies, including proper handling and storage of attractants like garbage, pet and livestock foods, bird-feeders, chickens and other small domesticated animals. Fear of grizzlies should be acknowledged and put into perspective with factual risk assessment and risk management. It might also include home projects that could include parents in the learning process. Possible projects would be: making your backyard bear-wise, problem-solving projects that analyze methods of living with bears, surveying your street, preventing human/bear conflicts locally, creating bear tolerant habitat in human dominated zones, and encouraging connectivity between recovery areas.	Conflict Prevention	Addresses the goal of human safety and conservation of bears. Education is something everyone can get behind. It will lay the groundwork for the future. It would take some funding to create a curriculum that is easy to use and add to current curriculum.	Education Outreach - Recommend creation of a school curriculum that can be used by any school under a larger education outreach program

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
		The Information and Education team and/or other info outreach programs should **design a board game to be used in schools and programs like the bear fairs.** The game would resemble chutes and ladders and feature bears moving from one recovery area to another. Players roll the dice and land on squares like: "Lucky, you found a secluded huckleberry patch, take two steps forward," or, "Oh no! you got into a chicken coop and were relocated 5 squares back," or, "Yikes you got caught eating from the birdfeeder, two steps back." The design of the game could be a part of a school project contest in the public schools. For the Bear Fairs and for kinesthetic learners, a physical, portable, maze could be created to make a game where young people work through a maze (it could be drawn out on a large tarp for portability). The participants come upon boxes to choose from as they move through the maze. When they lift the box, they find a hazard like free range chickens, or a grazing area and move back or to another place on the maze, or they lift a box and find cutworm moths and move forward. This disseminates information on bear biology and attractants in a fun way.	Conflict Prevention	This is easily added to I&E work. Might need funding and more folks on the ground to establish. It creates an opportunity to lay the groundwork for living with bears.	Education Outreach idea
Might be overly prescriptive		The state library association or the Information and Outreach entities or both should **approach authors of grizzly publications for book donations to schools and local libraries throughout Montana.** This should be accompanied by publicity so people know the books are available and the authors receive positive recognition and publicity for the donation.	Conflict Prevention	This would take time and little money other than promoting the program. Libraries are great local community centers and would be a good starting point for bear education.	Education Outreach idea but presumes authors should donate - suggest red
		WIthing FWP education: **revamp the hunter education program to include more on bear identification and safety while in bear habitat.**	Conflict Prevention	This could be done with the help of the bear education supervisor that was recommended in line 13.	Hunter Safety Education Outreach - Need for consistency and came up at Education Outreach Summit
Comment on coloring for pages 4-6; not sure whether/how to apply a particular color on each idea/recommendation...		Require an **online test on bear identification and safety every two years prior to recieving hunting license for MT**	Conflict Prevention		Similar to #4 Hunter Safety and Education Outreach - group together and discuss
Recognizing that watershed groups might not be statewide.		T**he state should become much more pro-active in the creation of watershed groups to generate local work to prevent conflict and ensure human safety with grizzlies on the landscape.** Extra effort should be made to encourage watershed groups in areas where grizzlies have been reported and could be present and on the front edge of where bears are expanding such as between the NCDE and SBE, but watershed groups would be pertinent state-wide. Systematic, local, conflict prevention measures are necessary for communities with grizzlies on the landscape, and community groups improve local communication and understanding. The Blackfoot challenge and other successful groups have come out of a grass roots interest. The state needs to cultivate this as these groups can help solve many local issues. It would be prudent to issue funding to the Blackfoot Challenge group to cultivate watershed groups in new areas. To qualify for funding, the watershed groups should include all groups in the areas that wish to be included so the interests of the entire local community is represented. Watershed groups should begin to design and implement co-existence measures before problems arise as grizzlies move through the area. Getting ahead of the game has shown to be a pre-requisite for success. They could be a part of the bear-wise community recommendation line 26.	Conflict Prevention	This has been a part of conservation plans, but was not implemented because of funding issues. This would increase human safety and conserve bears due to conflict prevention. Social tolerance will be cultivated if problem bears are avoided by being prepared.This would take funding, but ESA section 6 grants and other conflict management grants would be available. The state would also save money from livestock losses with sequestered composting of boneyards and electric fencing projects.	Red the way this is written currently. This has to happen organically. The state cannot "make" this happen. Encourage support local partnerships?

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
Lots of detail that may not be necessary		**A coexistence Summit or Academy should be established each year so that current co-existence workers and Watershed group representatives in new areas can brainstorm and discuss new challenges and ways to address them.** The group should be supplied with a list of conflicts with locations and specific conflict issues so the group can pinpoint problem areas and focus efforts to mitigate attractants and formulate prevention measures. More detailed information on conflicts and removals should be made available. There is one list of bear relocations/removals but details are sparse. It lists human conflict, but what type? Residents, managers and co-existence workers can learn from the information. What type of conflict? Was it hunting related, a chicken coop, a cornfield, a livestock depredation? With this list, the group would be able to look at trends over time. This would be a great addition (next year) to the education summit that is being piloted in January of 2020. Having the two together would be more comprehensive and it would save money to do one instead of two. The Yellowstone subcommittee just did something similar in Cody Wyoming this past year and a number of solutions and ideas came from it including a rancher who has had great success of Airedales dogs as grizzly deterrents. The director of the Blackfoot Challenge just returned from an event looking at different breeds of grizzly dogs and what he learned would benefit all watershed and co-existence groups.	Conflict Prevention	This would be an invaluable place to share ideas and brainstorm solutions. It would be easy to find support for this and it would create publicity for the conservation program and the grizzly fund. It is an opportunity for communities to share on many levels not just grizzly conflict prevention. Bear managers are putting out fires and barely staying ahead. There is very little reflection or systematic learning going on, despite all the money being spent on management. This type of brainstorming session is long overdue. It will just take time, money and more folks on the ground.	Education and Outreach Summit just occured. Encourage continuation of this type of collaborative discussion
Like the concept and details but that should be further informed by the education community.		To add to the yearly bear identification quiz for hunting licenses recommendation, a quiz covering safety while hunting in bear country should be required each year for all hunting licenses. All hunters should be prepared for possible dispersal bears as bears are attracted to gut piles. There could be a required video summarizing safety precautions with a quiz afterward that would make it available for out of state licenses as well. The safety measures should come from the hunter education handout passed out at the December meeting as well as these great suggestions by a former Fish and Wildlife Commissioner who is an avid hunter Modify hunting tactics as necessary to avoid surprising grizzlies: 1. · In grizzly country, I usually don't walk into or out of my hunting area in the dark. I want to make sure I can see well enough to avoid walking into a bear. 2. · Be especially aware of your surroundings, and use caution when in areas where you may not be seen or heard easily, such as dense vegetation or along streams. In dense vegetation, I often go from the "stealth hunting mode" to making noise to avoid a bear. 3. · Pay attention to fresh bear tracks. If I see very fresh grizzly tracks and the terrain and vegetation is such that it would be easy to surprise a bear, I may abort the hunt and go to a different area. 4. · Try not to shoot game late in the afternoon. You want to have time to field dress and get the game out of the woods before dark. Once you have shot your game: 5. · Bears are attracted to game carcasses. Grizzlies have a very keen sense of smell, and can smell the fresh blood and other carcass odors from quite a distance. 6. · If your hunting partner is close enough, wait until they arrive before starting the field dressing process. While one person field dresses the animal, the other should "stand guard" to make sure a bear does not sneak up on the person doing the field dressing. 7. · If at all possible, field dress the animal in a relatively open spot that has good visibility. You may have to drag the animal a ways before field dressing it. This is for two reasons. First, it is easier to see an approaching bear if you are field dressing your game in an open area instead of a dense area. Second, you want to think about other hunters who may be in the area. If possible, leave the gut pile in an open location. If a bear comes in to feed upon it, you don't want other hunters to accidently surprise the bear, which may then react by defending its food source. There is less chance of that happening if the gut pile can be easily seen from a distance. 8. · If at all possible, do not leave your game in the woods overnight. Get it back to your vehicle or camp as soon as possible. 9. · If you are taking your game back to camp (as opposed to your vehicle), instead of dragging it, use a game cart or sled. Dragging the animal will leave an enticing blood and scent trail that a bear could follow back to	Conflict Prevention	Hunter Safety Education Outreach - Need for consistency. Need to combine some of this with the other hu	Hunter Safety Education Outreach - Need for consistency. Need to combine some of this with the other hunter education group
		Fishing licenses should include a video and quiz each year using bear education safety info for anglers.	Conflict Prevention	The cost of this would only be for the creation of the video. It could be paid for with an extra .50 for licenses.	FWP Education Outreach - Fishing Safely in Bear Country. May require legislative approval. Various videos could be made for education outreach with multiple funding or pooling of dollars

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
Concept is good, but what does this look like?		**There is a need for bear-resistant garbage containers and their continued maintenance for areas in and around recovery areas as well as linkage corridors and possibly present areas in Montana.** Consider funding through ESA section 6 grants to create a matching funds program. There are many individuals who would purchase a bear resistant garbage can (I would be one), but that does not help others or assure long term maintenance of the cans. A matching grant program would be an interesting way to tackle the problem. Matching funds could come from the Grizzly Fund. A person donates enough money to purchase a can and the donation would be a tax write off, the money would then be matched so another can would be purchased, ownership would be in the hands of the disposal company. The disposal company would be responsible to keep up the cans. Owning the cans will give the company an incentive to be careful at garbage collection and they would have the option to fine individuals for lost parts etc.	Conflict Prevention	This allows an opportunity for public involvement and ownership of a solution.	Sanitation Group - Combine and Discuss. Also identifies a funding mechanism or mechanisms. Part of a broader funding discussion around multiple possible funding mechnisms
		All garbage transfer stations and other facilities in bear country and linkage zones should be analyzed for attractants and sequestered to prevent luring bears to the area. Counties that do not have residential garbage pickup should make their garbage transfer stations bear resistant. Areas that have the potential for grizzly-garbage conflicts should have bear-safe garbage storage in bear resistant cans or inside closed buildings like Missoula's current ordinance.	Conflict Prevention	This would take funding and would need enforcement.	Sanitation Group - long term outcome potential but lots of pieces at play - discuss as a long term goal
		Strict enforcement of poaching is necessary for the long-term conservation of bears. Malicious killing is a huge problem and was a cause of diminishing numbers of bears which brought about ESA listing. Fines for poaching should not change in the case of de-listing. Regardless of ESA status, the bear must be managed to preserve the population. Malicious killing is a huge threat to the future of grizzly bears. **Stringent fines and enforcement should continue regardless of listing.**	Conflict Prevention	Might be unpopular, but it is one area where numbers could be protected in the long term that is already in place.	Poaching is enforced - discuss fee increase?
		Requiring bear spray to be carried while hunting would increase hunter safety, but would need to be part of a program to rent spray to out of state hunters and to provide inexpensive or discounted bear spray for in state hunters. If nothing else requiring outfitters to carry bear spray would be advised. In the Gravellies a regulation was enacted to require outfitters to carry bear spray. It went through with little pushback.	Conflict Prevention	Conflicts while hunting are occuring more and more as bears enter areas where they have not been seen before. There is a lot of room to improve safety and prevent conflict in this area.	Hunter Safety Education Outreach - need to discuss liability issues around requiring bear spray and enforcement. Need to improve education around bear spray and that may also help with the number of people carrying bear spray
		Consider limits on commercial huckleberry picking operations to preserve food sources with tribal exceptions. Commercial foragers should also need to take a bear safety test each year with their licenses like hunters and anglers.	Conflict Prevention	This provides education for another group that spends time in bear country	Potential education outreach. Would this be a federal regulation around permitting? Look to the Flathead Reservation for what they did.
		Look into occupational safety and health safety standards for businesses (outfitters, state employees, recreational tours, etc.) for requiring bear spray and other bear safety standards.	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts before they occur and address liability issues	Education and liability. Also something about bearspray training by employers.\
		Add additional FWP bear management specialist staff able to focus on a very specific geography and required to hold community listening sessions, engage in local outreach, and trained/equipped to try creative techniques for preventing conflicts (remove carcasses with dynamite, deterrent treatments, technical expertise on electric fencing, help with bear proofing cow camps, etc.). Ensure any experiemntal deterrents include a research component/seek opportunity to partner with co-op/universities/IGBST/Arthur Middleton lab, etc. Bear management specialist positions need to be permanent, have better pay, etc.	Conflict Prevention	Build social tolerance, reduce conflicts, build trust	Identify needs for new bear management staff and support FWP FTE bear manager with a paid tech/apprentice - can this come forward as a recommendation?
		Establish bearwise education program around bear behavior, ecology, recovery, safety, and living with bears; include program in schools. Precede with statewide summit to develop messaging and curriculum. See Missoula bear FB page, Bear Smart Canada, Bearwise Wyoming. Education programs could be led by volunteer staff, like ID (Master Naturalist Program). Include special emphasis on educating out of state hunters/development of programs to provide out of state visitors with bear spray.	Conflict Prevention	Build social tolerance, reduce conflicts, build trust	Education Outreach - Group
		FWP commit to building a culture of partnership with NGOs and communities in all areas of the state (explore developing a funding mechanism for NGO dollars directed to FWP through foundation with match)	Conflict Prevention	Leverage resources, build trust, prevent conflicts	We might need to group some of these under encouraging partnerships at a broad level
		Statewide coordination around bear resistant trash requirements (create a structure for local governments to coordinate on regulations and infrastructure)	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe	Sanitation and Attractant Group

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
		Implement food storage requirements on the Bitterroot NF and state lands	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe	Federal requires federal action and public comment Sanitation and Attractant Group
		Public/private partnership to install bear resistant infrastructure in all USFS campgrounds in the state and in BLM/state lands in connectivity areas	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe	Sanitation and Attractant Group
		Require homeowners to register goats, chickens, or other common livestock attractants.	Conflict Prevention / Funding	In July 2019, legislation was passed requiring all beekeepers to apply as a beekeeper and to annually register their hives in a variable fee structure	red due to wording. How would this be enforced? This occurs now and people do not comply
Need consistency on both garbage/waste and food storage. And we needed to know if it was being applied to a given geography (state, federal, or private land). This has been helpful in terms of getting ideas on paper, but what is the structure/skeleton that this is being attached to? One way to get people to articulate this vision is to respond to specific scenarios ... use the Council's responses to draw that skeleton framework. Another idea is for four working groups to each articulate a whole / skeleton vision -- and then to have people share to move forward. Don't we need to spend some time on process/vision before we can look at some of the details? This effort pushes us toward the		Create consistancy around food storage orders on public lands and require food storage orders on all public lands in occupied grizzly bear habitat as well as expansion and connectivity habitat. Support enforcement, outreach and education around Food Storage Orders	Conflict Prevention, Connectivity	Many food storage orders are already in place but there are locations without food storage orders. There is debate around the need for consistancy. Multiple agencies have variable levels of funding for enforcement	Sanitation and Attractant Group - Federal
		It is difficult to walk into a hotel in Montana and not see pictures of grizzlies, paintings of grizzlies, or statues of grizzlies. When one crosses the state line at lost trail pass, one sees a grizzly on the Montana sign. Bears are an important part of our heritage and we need to understand them. **A comprehensive state-wide program should be implemented to create Bear-wise communities** (https://bearwise.org/bearwise-communities/) with a priority focus on the areas in Western Montana on the "possible presence of grizzlies" map from USFWS (https://drive.google.com/open?id=1bX00zAQS7ziMSaz1uIKhI0iaLqDeZXzi) The program should be state-wide. **This could be done through local watershed organizations with agency assistance if the watershed groups so choose.** This will prepare areas and reduce conflict as bear distribution expands and dispersal bears explore and colonize the linkage zones between recovery areas. This is the beginning of social tolerance for grizzlies throughout the state via education and will reduce black bear conflicts in areas where grizzlies are not present.	Conflict Prevention, Connectivity between ecosystems	This would take funding, but considering the map where bears have passed through, there are many communities that are not ready to encounter grizzlies, but encountering them is a growing possibility. Once again this can increase human safety and increase social tolerance. It would be worth the investment.	Education Outreach and Partnerships - similar to other recommendations - combine

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
		Encourage governor and Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks to develop a state Bear Aware outreach and education program with a designated bear aware outreach supervisor. This supervisor could oversee seasonal technicians across the state to implement education programs including bear spray as well as work with tourism department to reach out of state visitors. This could include a bear aware campaign with social media and video content. Develop a website and/or app that allows for quick access to the multiple resources available to prevent conflicts with bears. Maybe this role could also oversee a conflict prevention grant program.	Conflict Prevention, Resources	Funding for an FTE in the legislature	Education Outreach - comprehensive state program. Combine with similar recomendations (ex. #24)
		A potential way to create a conflict prevention grant program not coupled with Livestock Loss Board could be to reassess the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks Living with Wildlife grant program that was defunded. Potentially house a conflict prevention grant and a funding mechanism for conservation easements under this one program?	Conflict Prevention, Resources	Funding this program - need to better understand why it was defunded	Group under funding discussion/mechanisms - easements may or may not fit under this specific idea
		Glacier Park has a low number of conflicts because they are very strict about attractant regulations and human activities that attract bears. They have individuals that regularly survey and fine campers and campgrounds for violations and make sure that the violations are cleaned up immediately. They are also available to haze bears that enter front country camps. Strict and consistent attractant regulations work well, but they are meaningless without funding to enforce the regulations. **More bear managers on the ground would allow for more enforcement of attractant sequestration and immediate response to those first strike bears. We might also recommend neighborhoods to report conflicts and facilitate and speed up attractant clean up.** Gerald Cobell blamed many problems encountered in his area on waste left behind by tourists often in campgrounds. Funding for more people there to enforce strict camping regulations would assist in that area. He said that once the bears get into garbage, their days are numbered. Taking that attractant out of the picture by creating and enforcing attractant regulations would help their situation.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols	Once again, this is an issue of more boots on the ground and more funding.	Bear Manager Group idea and Sanitation Group
		Revisit MOU with Wildlife Services and identify opportunities for improving efficiency, capacity and coordination around conflict prevention and response.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols	This MOU with Wildlife Services could be a mechanism for improving and addressing resource challenges around coexistence and response. Ideally, MT would have autonomy over grizzly bear management decisions in the event bears are delisted. **Challenge is so much of the attention is focused on livestock conflicts and there are many other significant conflicts and responsibilities and trust of agencies that get blurred through the current agreement.**	Not sure how an MOU between WS and FWP would impact non-livestock related issues
		Look at assisting land trusts with funding for easements in connectivity areas at a state and federal level (one example could be to look at the Montana Sage Grouse Initiative and how funding comes through that specific to sage grouse habitat)	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Funding, Creation of a new program always poses challenges, Coordination with other states	Funding Group - another idea ((federal)

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
		A **comprehensive plan to identify and protect linkage corridors for promoting natural migration between all recovery areas should be created and implemented to assure the long-term conservation of grizzly bears.** Within these areas, potential conflicts to successful grizzly bear occupation and travel should be identified, and proactive steps taken to increase habitat security and reduce the potential for conflict when bears arrive. For instance, proactive livestock conflict prevention, attractant management, road density reductions should be all be planned and implemented. **Additionally, FWP should partner with Montana Department of Transportation to identify and model potentially important grizzly bear (and other wildlife) crossing points on major highways, and seek funding and planning opportunities to incorporate wildlife crossing practices into the transportation system.** As the 1993 grizzly recovery plan states, "Ideally, preserving linkage between populations is a more legitimate long-term conservation strategy than are attempts to manage separate island populations. Linkage zones are areas between currently separated populations that provide adequate habitat for low densities of individuals to exist and move between two or more larger areas of suitable habitat. The existence of individuals and habitats within linkage zones could act to provide a connection between larger populations. Linkage zones enhance the viability of populations that are separated by some distance by facilitating the exchange of individuals and maintaining demographic vigor and genetic diversity." 1993 revised Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan Pg 42. **As Hanski and Gilpin 1991 states, "If no movement between populations can take place, and isolation becomes permanent, local extinction becomes more likely." The plan should focus on areas where bears have been known to have travelled as in the possibly present map** (https://drive.google.com/open?id=1bX00zAQS7ziMSaz1uIKhI0iaLqDeZXzi) and currently protected areas like Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs), Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) and Wilderness Areas. Here is a map of these areas with possible linkage corridors. (https://drive.google.com/open?id=12QiuEsgKWsZQV8DVhVnxEo-v4OLFUL5z) Providing or securing linkage zones can be a practical solution to demographic dangers of fractured habitats for all species including elk, deer, pronghorns and native sheep. Current regulations should be strictly enforced and exceptions for road building should not be allowed for all IRAs, WSAs and Wilderness areas within the identified corridors. Public lands immediately in between these protected areas should adopt the amendment 19 policy from the previous Flathead Forest Plan. Unfragmented, roadless areas of forest are necessary to promote demographic connectivity and the long-term conservation of grizzly bears. P**rotecting and identifying these areas will provide more areas of colonization to re-locate bears and encourage natural migration and connectivity between recovery areas. Private lands in between the areas should be considered for conservation easements.** Bear-wise communities and Watershed groups should be encouraged around these areas.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This would promote long term conservation of grizzly bears and all of the other wildlife that Montana is famous for. This would not take too much funding. Many of the areas are already protected. This would take a concerted effort between agencies. Since this would also protect migration corridors for elk and deer, hunters could get behind it.	Red with current wording Additional Science Group - linkage. Linkage science occuring with MT FWP and others. Would need to discuss as a group any "requirements" as stated in this paragraph
		Forests surrounding recovery areas and in designated linkage zones should adopt Amendment 19 from the previous Flathead Forest plan to limit fragmentation of habitat. This is important for all species including elk. New scientific studies on habitat fragmentation and climate change should be considered in all forest plans in the state. Forest Plans must incorporate standards that provide protection for grizzlies and other wildlife from habitat degradation and human conflicts.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This is an important amendment limiting roads in the forest which increases human safety because it offers less access to bears. It also decreases conflict because bears will have more adequate habitat and will not be displaced by increasing tourism and recreation. Bears are moving out of the parks at a much greater speed than their numbers are increasing. Park visits have more than doubled in the past years. Bears are being pressured to look for new habitat. If we can provide ample habitat, and decrease attractants in populated areas, conflict will be reduced.	Federal action specific to one forest

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
Agree with concept / lots of work		The state should establish a partnership with insurance companies to build wildlife bridges. In 2015 this was found. "According to the insurance company, drivers have a one in 77 chance of hitting a deer in Montana. That's considerably higher than in surrounding states. Wyoming drivers have only a one in 113 chance of hitting a deer, Idaho is 1 in 232 and North Dakota is 1 in 105." This information comes from 2019, "Deer-car collisions cost an average of $8,190, an elk-vehicle collision is about $25,319, and a moose-vehicle collision is $44,546, taking into consideration human injuries and death, towing, vehicle repair, investigation of the accident by local authorities, and carcass disposal." And this, "One of the most looked-to examples of successful wildlife overpasses is in Banff, over the Trans-Canada Highway. A study there shows that in just one two-mile stretch, wildlife-vehicle crashes reduced from an average of 12 a year to 2.5, reducing costs of crashes by 90 percent—over $100,000." And in 1995, "Not only are the collisions harmful to wildlife, but according to a 1995 study they also caused 211 human fatalities, 29,000 human injuries and more than $1 billion in property damage. State Farm puts the number of collisions at 1.5 million annually causing 10,000 human injuries and 150 deaths along with $2,500 in property damage to vehicles." It would serve insurance companies well both in costs and public relations if they became partners with MDOT to build wildlife bridges. Where side streets are a problem in wildlife crossing areas, electrified cattleguards should be considered to prevent wildlife from using side streets to cross instead of wildlife crossings. In Canada, they used to have a suggested night speed limit of 45 miles per hour. Canada has many wildlife crossings now, so they might not have the suggested speed limit anymore. It is possible that the suggested reduced speed caused more funding for the crossing structures.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This is an opportunity for the state to work with insurance companies. Opportunities for partnerships could be explored on many levels. Public safety is something that both the state and insurance companies can agree upon.	
Great concept if there were a think tank to do this.		Voluntary Driving Restrictions would be an out of the box way to reduce wildlife mortality and human fatality/injury. Insurance companies are well aware and have created outreach campaigns to reduce drowsy driving which according to the CDC, "The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates that drowsy driving was responsible for 72,000 crashes, 44,000 injuries, and 800 deaths in 2013.3 However, these numbers are underestimated, and up to 6,000 fatal crashes each year may be caused by drowsy drivers." According to drowsydriving.org 13% of crashes with hospitalizations and 21% of crashes with fatalities are caused by drowsy driving. Wildlife accidents contribute to many more fatalities and damages. One bear manager said that grizzlies (and I would imagine many other species) have adapted to crossing at night when traffic is minimized. Both drowsy driving and a majority of wildlife crossings or at least accidents due to diminished vision happen at night. Insurance companies could create financial incentives to vow not to drive between "2 and 5 am" (or a time line based on the timing of wildlife mortalities and drowsy driving) unless in an emergency. If those who take the pledge and receive those incentives get into an auto crash (not during an emergency) during those times, they would pay a higher deductible. This plan could be coupled with billboards pinpointing specific wildlife crossing areas with ads for nearby all-night diners or truck stops where drivers could go to take a break instead of driving through crossing areas between certain hours. Insurance companies could pledge a percentage of money saved through prevention to the construction of permanent wildlife crossings.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Again, slowing down at night or avoiding night driving conserves all wildlife. It is an inexpensive answer to a big mortality problem.	
		A nationwide contest to come up with ways to reduce train/bear collisions to prevent grain spills and to remove carcasses quickly from train tracks with a large monetary incentive should be implemented. One of the problems with trains is that the grain cars dribble grain as they go along the tracks. All cars are weighed before they leave the station and when they arrive at the destination, so grain bins that are leaking are identified. The spills bring wildlife to the tracks where they are killed which attracts bears. How can we reduce the grain dribble on the tracks to preserve all wildlife? I believe a foundation like Gates who likes to solve problems would contribute to the incentive and possibly direct the contest. If this is successful, more contests for conflict prevention could be implemented.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Reducing grain spillage along the tracks benefits the shippers as well as grizzlies. Even small losses of grain add up to big losses.	
But not the purview of the Council		Consider making funding available for smaller conservation easements. At this time, small parcels in key areas are not considered for conservation easements because the focus is on larger parcel of land. Every little bit helps. It would be prudent to create an organization with grant money from the state and the ESA to offer conservation easements specifically for smaller parcels in locations near occupied habitat.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This would take funding and an understanding that every little bit helps. Small ranch operations could take advantage of this preserving open space into the future.	

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
Need to simplify. Would recommend ending after first sentence (encouraged)	Green	FWP define connectivity zones within Montana where natural/functional connectivity (i.e. occupancy, ecological function in connective areas) is proactively encouraged through: 1) no hunting allowed in connectivity zones, 2) management decisions (about lethal removal, relocation) include more conservative criteria, 3) work with IGBST to develop statewide mortality thresholds and statewide management removal quota with conservative sub thresholds (percentages of total allowable mortality) tied to connectivity zones (and all must be in synch with ecosystem wide mortality thresholds), 4) bears in connectivity zones will not be translocated back to recovery areas (need to develop areas in DMA outside of PCA that are tolerable relocation zones), 5) increase collaring efforts and monitoring of movements to prevent conflicts more proactively, with a focus on individual bears of high priority (dispersing young males, females with cubs, etc.), 6) work with local land users to reduce conflicts spatially/temporally real-time with monitoring info, i.e. modify grazing rotations, temporary hunting closures, trail closures, etc., 7) apply habitat standards and guidelines from Conservation Strategy to Wildlife Management Areas in connectivity zones, 8) evaluate federal land use planning processes and projects for impact to habitat requirements for natural connectivity- with focus on food storage and road management, and 9) establish interagency population monitoring program in connectivity zones	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	For long-term resilience of lower-48 grizzly bears, it's important that connectivity between ecosystems occur naturally. Natural connectivity-involving grizzly occupancy and fulfilment of ecological function in connectivity areas- is key to restoration and long-term persistence of grizzly bears in the Northern Rockies.	
		FWP and MDT work with IGBST to identify priority crossing locations on I-90 and I-15. It's important that there is coordination with the Wildlife and Transportation Statewide Steering Committee on this issue; coordination on priorities could create compelling case for tapping into federal funding (e.g. BUILD grants, etc.)	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	The interstates are a potentially substantial barrier to natural connectivity and potential for vehicle collision with grizzly bears is a human safety concern	
		The state legislature should recommend that all Wilderness Study Areas in between recovery areas should be designated Wilderness.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems, conflict prevention	Creating secure, remote areas where bears can roam away from populations is essential for the long-term conservation of bears.	
		More funding should be made available to hire more bear management specialists to train with our experienced managers and take over when they retire. Tim Manley and Jamie Jonkel and others have a wealth of experience cannot be lost when they retire. We need more specialists on the ground and they should be training with our experienced managers. FWP must really support the experience they have and use it to move into the future. The specialists we have are overworked and residents are frustrated because the managers cannot be in more than one place at a time. Specialists must spend a lot of time on conflicts and have less time for prevention. Funding must include management specialists in areas in linkage zones now to get ahead of the moving edge of bear distribution. More managers on the ground would assist watershed groups and visit, build trust and educate residents. These areas must put co-existence measures in place before problems arise. Montana must recognize the wealth of experience on the ground and capitalize on it.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems, conflict prevention	This covers our goal of human safety and conservation of bears. Rewarding and making use of the talent we have and using that talent to build new experienced managers for the future will be one of the most important things the state legislature could fund.	
Don't want to tie hands of wildlife managers		Grizzly bears once roamed the entire state of Montana and non-conflict bears should never be removed simply for showing up in a place. We recognize that some areas of the state that were once historical suitable habitat are today inappropriate for grizzly bears. There is also a lot of quality grizzly bear habitat that is currently unoccupied, yet could be potentially occupied.	Grizzly Bear Distribution	There is a need to focus on areas where grizzlies could be with less conflict. These areas should be studied and utilized.	
		FWP develop a social science study to establish a baseline understanding of social acceptance in various communities across the state as an initial step in a process to create a statewide management plan.	Grizzly Bear Distribution	could yield important insights prior to creating a statewide management plan	
		Recognize all of Montana as biologically suitable habitat	Grizzly Bear Distribution	Acknowledging grizzlies could be anywhere in the state allows FWP to use conflict management as a tool for prioritizing occupancy in certain geographies	

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
Good concept. Lots of detail to work through.		The state and federal agencies should support and implement research to promote the long-term conservation of grizzly bears such as the following suggestions. This could be paid for through section 6 grants from the Endangered Species Act provisions and agency funding: Monitoring of food supplies is highly important. Look at the difference in 2018 in the Blackfoot area after a large fire. Food sources do influence bear movement and distribution. 1. A survey of the Bitterroot Recovery Area for bear presence/occupation. 2. A survey of the Sapphires, the Sapphire WSA and Anaconda Pintler Wilderness areas for bear distribution. 3. Impacts of snowmobiling on denning and post-den emergence 4. Impacts of trail use on bears 5. Map high caloric foods and/or seasonal important foods. This is happening in the GYE but needs to be conducted in the NCDE Cabinet Yaak, Selkirks, Bitterroot, and possible colonization areas between recovery areas. 6. Develop a functional habitat map that could be used to inform road closures and recreational use in the NCDE, Cabinet Yaak, Selkirks, Bitterroot, and possible colonization areas between recovery areas (Sapphires and Anaconda Pintler Wilderness to name a few). 7. Map habitat and food sources and analyze the effects of climate change on these areas to predict where grizzly bears will migrate in the future and to pinpoint areas for colonization in linkage zones.	Grizzly Bear Distribution, conflict prevention	The more knowledge we have about grizzlies and their habitat, the better we can provide for co-existence. This would take funding.	
Are doing already to some extent. Can't say this in perpetuity.		Encourage Governor and the Legislature to celebrate the recovery of the Grizzly Bear in Montana though Montana's dedication to Vast Open Spaces. Those spaces are checkerboards of Public Lands, National Parks and Privately Owned working Agricultural lands. All open spaces in Montana not only promote increasing Grizzly bear populations but all wildlife, within forest and prairie ecosystems.	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity Between Ecosystems		
		Encourage Governor, public officials and researchers to consistently refer to the GYE and NCDE as recovered with expanding pollutions	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Science supports this, however passions may not. How many other ecosystems in the lower 48 (other than the already designated recovery areas) have enough public lands to be the base for or to support viable recovered populations like GYE and NCDE successes? These base public lands allow safety and socially acceptable "anchor" acres for the populations.	
		Work with relevant agencies to create a streamlined way for public reporting of possible grizzly bear sightings outside of recovery zones	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity between ecosystems		
Recognized broader need to partner		Improve coordination and outreach on grizzly bears and bear awareness with the office of tourism, realtors, VRBO, etc.	Other	Capacity, Unknown concerns/roadblocks from realtors, tourism, etc.	
Like concept. Need more discussion		A multiplier should be considered but as in Wyoming, it should only apply to heavily forested hard to manage livestock areas and measures of conflict prevention must be used to the best of the livestock grower's ability in order to qualify for the multiplier. Any reimbursement should include a requirement of conflict prevention measures after the second reimbursement.	Other	Many could get behind this especially if it were coupled with responsibility.	
		A grizzly bear PR person to promote the benefits and positive sides to having grizzlies on the landscape should be added to the folks on the ground working for grizzly conservation.	Other	Reminding folks of the benefits to having bears on the landscape would be helpful for creating bear-wise communities and co-existence measures.	
		Establish cooperative monitoring programs – FWP, USFS, Permittees, NGOs on public allotments	Other	Enhance flexibility of public grazing allotment management in response to grizzly bear conflict	
Outside purview of Council		Ensure people can't be held liable if grizzly mauling occurs on their property.	Other	Create security for landowners, important for social tolerance	
Already discussions around wildlife movement		As roadways within the connectivity zone for the GYE and NCDE come up for repair bids over the next tens of years be prepared to write in wildlife crossing. Continue to utilize bear movement maps to predict areas of high movement	Other		

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
Value statement...		The grizzly bear is our state animal and an important piece of Montana's wildlife heritage. Most Montanans recognize that grizzly bears are an important part of what makes Montana the "Last Best Place" and unique from the rest of the Lower Forty-eight states. Therefore, Montana's grizzly bear populations—Yellowstone, NCDE and Cabinet-Yaak (and eventually the Bitterroot)—should be thriving, self-sustaining and interconnected	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Montana has the chance to make a stand and protect its status as the last best place in the lower 48. Conserving grizzlies will preserve the reputation for wildness that draws tourists, retirement incomes, and industry.	
Pages 10-12 start here. All need additional work/reworking. Green seems like it doesn't need a lot of additional work. Red may not ever reach consensus. Didn't like specific wording around Big Belts.		Facilitate recovering or recovered populations in all four MT Recovery Zones, as well as passability for grizzlies on the landscape that lies between Recovery Zones and west of the Big Belt mountains . East of the Big Belts, relocate minor offenders to augment unrecovered western Recovery Zones and euthenize problem bears. Wherever grizzlies exist in MT, facilitate livability for residents and property owners, and viability for production agriculture.	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	The council's individual recommendations need an overarching framework or vision, responding to Cecily Costello's comments in Missoula. I believe this may be something most or all council members can live with.	
		Initiate a statewide planning process that outlines a statewide vision for grizzly conservation and management. A statewide plan should include, A) Geographic specificity around conflict response (i.e. management zones that reflect conservation value of bears expanding into a given area) and B) Establish clear guidelines for lethal removal of a grizzly bear that are consistent with federal regulations, socially acceptable, and driven by 1) conservation value of the management zone, 2) demographics, 3) evidence of chronic depredation (in cases of livestock conflict) and 4) conflict severity (e.g. human safety issues)	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	create clarity, transparency, and predictability around grizzly conservation and conflict management in Montana. Opportunity to establish more specificity than currently vague definitions of social acceptability. Also, an opportunity to establish proactive approaches to ensuring connectivity occurs	
		State work with grizzly council to determine important elements of a successful statewide planning process	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Grizzly council represents diverse interests and could provide valuable guidance to FWP that would ensure statewide planning process is successful	
Erase?		State legislature cannot interfere with FWP management approaches post delisting. Is there a way to prevent legislative meddling (e.g. state bill ratifying Montana statewide plan in statute, or Governor's executive order on statewide plan?)	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Build trust between public and managers	
			Resources		
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		A multimillion-dollar fund should be established in the next farm bill for grizzly conservation efforts. The interest generated from this permanent Grizzly Fund would pay for non-lethal, preventative measures for co-existence in the United States (MT, ID, WY, WA etc.). This creates long term funding for co-existence measures. It should be non-lethal so that national conservation groups and foundations for wildlife would be willing to contribute to the fund. Seed money from the farm bill would start the fund. It should include an option on taxes (one could choose to put a dollar or two into the fund from personal taxes) and a method for individuals to contribute to the fund like an adopt a grizzly program. This would allow national interest in grizzly bear conservation to contribute to the costs of living with grizzlies. This fund could contribute to incentives for living with grizzlies and all co-existence measures as well as research to create new measures for co-existence and conflict prevention.	Resources	This would take a commitment from Montana to push the idea of a fund to the federal government. It would be a long term solution for co-existence funding.	
Will take additional conversation with Council and Idaho		The Bitterroot Ecosystem should be studied as a re-location area without the bears losing ESA protections. The bears should be able to be re-located in this habitat rich area without being considered experimental/non-essential to ensure protection for bears that move into and have been re-located in the area. It provides excellent habitat and could easily house many bears with minimal conflict giving managers more options for re-location of bears.	Resources	Creating more areas for bear re-location will take the pressure off other ecosystems.This is not a funding issue but a social issue and will take bear-wise programs and more managers on the ground to implement.	
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		Funding for grizzly bear conservation (and for all wildlife) is vitally important. All opportunities for grizzly bear conservation should continue to be explored, including federal, state and private funds. Additionally, given the amount of money that the USFWS invests in grizzly bear recovery, the state of Montana should consider the financial impacts that might result from a delisted grizzly bear population, and where and whether or not the state can find opportunities to replace those funds.	Resources	The need for funding has been prevelant during recent meetings.	

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		Consider a Montana recreation license that costs a minimal amount (1-2 dollars) for in state recreationists and more for out of state tourists (10 dollars). To apply for this license, one would also have to take the bear safety test. The test could also include backcountry safety tips, information on responsibly recreating on public lands, and how recreation can affect wildlife.	Resources	This provides a way to educate a large group of people who recreate in Montana and brings in a funding resource.	
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		Establish new funding mechanism(s) for wildlife conservation and management in MT (ideas to consider: tourism tax like expanded resort tax, increased appropriation for Livestock Loss Board through general dollars (not sportsman), conservation fee associated with National Parks (re: WY resolution), support passage of Recovering Americas Wildlife Act, need new federal support for funding species post-delisting, through reauthorizing ESA?, look at NRCS and farm bill	Resources	Current resources are not adequate; establishing new sources of revenue for grizzly bear conflict prevention, conservation, and management is key to continuing the success story of grizzly recovery. New mechansims should tap into constituencies other than sportsmen.	
Prevention/Funding/Resources Combine		Establish a tiered loss compensation multiplier that through contingencies incentivizes preventive techniqes and provides compensation for livestock loss (recognizing that compensation programs don't promote social tolerance, just make it economically viable for ranching operations to stay afloat in grizzly bear country). Important considerations for such a program: 1) state legislature needs to allocate more funds for livestock and other agricultural loss (general dollars to livestock loss board, not Sportsmen's/FWP $, 2) compensation program could also be tiered geographically (i.e. provide more compensation in certain portions of the MT landscape key for grizzly bear conservation/connectivity), 3) bring back the Living with Wildlife Grant program, and 4) explore Farm Bill opportunities and NRCS EQUIP	Resources	Ensure ranchers that provide important habitat in connective lands can remain economically viable; keep people safe and bears alive through incentivization of conflict prevention techniques	
Prevention/Funding/Resources Combine		Create a grizzly bear prevention fund that is not tied to the Livestock loss board that funds work and is dependent on a local match	Resources, prevention	Getting it through the Legislature and showing the broad support to get it done.	
Red due to hunting issues.		Contibute to bear conflict management funding through a mandatory Conflict Prevention Pass fee added to bear (black or grizzly) hunting license	Role of Hunting	The AIS Prevention Pass required with a fishing license has helped to contribute funds to prevent the spread of AIS. There may be an opportunity to implement a similar tool into bear hunting licenses to dedicate funding to conflict management or hunter education in bear country.	
Red due to hunting issues.		The grizzly bear is the slowest reproducing mammal on this planet. Any future hunting of grizzly bears should be avoided. Hunting is a contentious issue and could be easily resolved by honoring the recent Grizzly Treaty signed by over 200 tribes in Montana, Canada, and elsewhere. It asks that the bear never be hunted. Hunting does not increase human safety nor does it conserve the bear. MFWP seems determined to have a grizzly trophy hunt, if they do so it should be extremely limited in scope, should not allow hunting near the parks, should not allow hunting in vital linkage habitat, and should be easily suspended or cancelled during high mortality years. The Fish and Wildlife Commission recommended waiting after de-listing to consider any form of recreational hunting. A slow approach was suggested (waiting at least one year or more) to demonstrate to the public that MFWP's goal was to maintain a healthy, viable grizzly population not to kill as many as fast as they legally could. Management issues alone have killed a large number of grizzlies. In Wyoming, a take of 72 bears has been granted, 10% of the current population estimate in the GYE. Certainly, hunting should not be considered the best management tool for grizzly bears. Current management mortality measures target specific nuisance and habituated bears. Again, the tribes have been very clear about their wishes. This is a simple thing to give.	Role of Hunting	This is a difficult issue. ***Grizzly is not the slowest reproducing mammal, the great ape or forest elephant is. They reproduce once every 6-7 years. But bears do reproduce quite slowly.	
		Define areas and circumstances where hunting is not appropriate: 1) not allowed in certain geographies- connectivity zones, core habitat/areas surrounding parks, 2) not considered a management tool for reducing conflicts- there is no science to support this, 3) delayed following de-listing; FWP should be a leader in coordination with other agencies on season/quota setting, 4) need to define mortality thresholds outside of DMAs/identify guidelines for cancellation of hunting season if a pre-determined portion of mortality threshold is met via management removals prior to beginning of the hunting season, 5) ecosystem based mortality quotas should not be seen as the equivalent of hunting-based mortality quotas. They are the quotas that trigger population change and hunting quotas should not be directly linked to population management.	Role of Hunting	Grizzly recovery under the ESA is a conservation success story and Montana could demonstrate leadership that ensures that success story continues	

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
		In the meetings in December, it was clear that managers are running out of places to re-locate bears. When they put them back in the recovery areas, they are putting them in already occupied territory, so they must look for a space. FWP should develop a protocol for translocating bears a) between ecosystems, b) within an ecosystem, c) outside of a designated ecosystem, which further the conservation, connection and recovery of grizzly bears in the state of Montana. Bears translocated due to previous conflict may need to be placed deeper into core habitat of a designated ecosystem, where they are less likely to continue to get into trouble. Having other areas like linkage zones and augmentation zones would be helpful to the managers and the bears who are getting pushed back into conflict areas. Using the 3 strike protocols, first strike bears should be available for augmentation programs and first and second-strike bears should be available for translocation to habitat rich linkage zones surrounded by bear-wise communities so the chance for conflict is minimized.	Transplant Protocols	This is a social tolerance issue. If areas are made "bear-wise" and understand that grizzlies are in the area, it will smooth the way for re-location to new areas in the linkage zones.	
		Relocate problem grizzlies with minor offenses to the most appropriate MT recovery zone	Transplant Protocols	What to do with bears in need of relocation	
		Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, the USFWS, the USFS and appropriate agencies partners should put in place agreements needed to allow for grizzly bears trapped inbetween recovery zones to be released onsite or in nearest secure habitat (likely public land) between ecosystems rather than taking grizzly bears back to recovery zone. Clarification is needed when communicating with the public about Transplant Protocols and the difference between releasing a bear that moved in that location on their own vs. reintroduction/augmentation	Transplant Protocols	Public concern over bears being where bears have not been in decades, potential state code issues, misinformation	
		Do not rely on human-assisted transplant protocols for establishing connectivity.	Transplant Protocols	Establishing a precedent of artificially assisting grizzly bears with movement into "new" or unoccupied habitat could create a slippery slope that ultimately undermines the importance of ensuring habitat conditions are conducive to natural expansion of grizzly bears into connective/linkage areas.	
Goes with one on top of page		FWP work with USFWS, IGBST, and USFS to identify 1.) connectivity zones and 2.) suitable areas within connectivity zones for relocating conflict bears occupying habitat between DMAs (in circumstances where relocation is deemed the appropriate management action).	Transplant Protocols	Important to consider what the translocation and/or relocation protocol will be when responding to a conflict bear in "new" or unoccupied habitat, especially connectivity zones. In these circumstances, current translocation or relocation back to occupied habitat (PCA) is a management approach that could potentially inhibit connectivity from ever occurring.	
		Recreation in core grizzly habitat, recovery zones and connectivity zones presents challenges and opportunities for increased human bear interactions and conflicts. Bear Aware Recreation Zones need to be mapped to get ahead of the existing and potential conflicts as recreation increases in these areas.	Coexistence; conflict; connectivity	Recreation is going to play a big part in Montana economic development. We need to be forward thinking about how this will effect overall grizzly bear recovery and get ahead of it by creating smart recreation opportunities and recreation zones. Increase in human population in Montana will become an issue as big as our challenges and opportunities with livestock. We need to get ahead of the outreach and education about smart, bear aware recreation zones in recovery zones and connectivity zones.	
		There is an obvious need to continue to support and fully fund our bear specialists so they can continue the outreach and education programs; deal effectively, efficiently and quickly with conflict issues. Including recovery zones and connectivity zones.	Coexistence, conflict, connectivity	The opporutnity would be to create a long-term funding plan and revenue stream with state and Federal partners including creation of a habitat protection fund. A Smart Recreation Fund could be created to help fund these efforts.	
Not in the Council's purview.		We can't consider delisting separate subpopulations until we develop a cohesive strategy and plan to create connectivity between all the recovery zones	All except hunting	Great opportunity to develop a statewide cohesive recovery strategy for Montana.	
		Review and update 1993 managment plan	All		
		FWP needs to better communicate with the public, especially with landowners and livestock producers, when it comes to trapping and relocating grizzlies for any reason.	Transplant Protocols	Most people would like to know when a grizzly is being dumped in their back yard.	
		USFWS, FWP and WS need to work together with local landowners and county governments to identify new relocation sites outside of the designated management areas, especially in connectivity zones.	Transplant Protocols	This would avoid questions like what to do with the Stevensville bear, or any others that end up between ecosystems where populations are established.	

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
		by recommending this celebration of conservation success and work we are also opening the door for continued education through the media and interest in the community. It gives us a chance to talk about the years of research, advances in technology and bear management strategies, but importantly it gives an avenue to talk about bear wise communites, the struggles for the CYE, and the importance of private landowners and their roll in keeping land wild rather than being developed. I also feel this could be a way to start talking to the broad recreation community about the need for them to step up with conservation and funding. The outdoor industry and retailers publish quarterly magazines, stories and even short films about success in the conservation world. This celebration could bring a lot of awareness to people from out of state and help the conversation of bear education spread.			
		Finally, on the topic of recreation and tourism I feel strongly that we start to address and discuss the issues around sanitation and attractions that are not livestock related at our next meeting. I know we've touched on it a bit at the earlier meetings but I think we have large problem in the gateway communities that boarder national parks. Most tourists are unaware that these communities do not have the same sanitation protocols as the national parks and we see all their trash left behind, blowing across the land, and bringing animals into towns.			
		There is nothing biologically suitable or socially acceptable about having grizzly bears: in the yard of anyone's home, in any city or town, in any farmer's or rancher's farmstead, or close to any rural school, church or campground. There needs to be research and development of practical, dependable and affordable tools to prevent these things from happening. That could be physical barriers of some kind (bear-proof fence, electric shock collars or other devices activated by a grizzly's proximity to something like a ground wire, etc,). It could also be the effective training of bears not to wander near these places (using something like sonic, laser, automatic bear spray release, taser, stun device, gps electric shock collars, etc.). **There has got to be a way.** In the meantime (while developing these tools, grizzlies approaching these areas should be hazed away in a manner the bear will remember as a negative experience (and will not just immediately come back), or captured and returned deep into the RZ/PCA. Repeat offenders should be considered as candidates for removal. [YNP rules try to prevent people from coming closer that 100 yards to any grizzly. This could be a good target for limiting grizzly bear proximity to the above listed locations.]	Grizzly Bear Distribution; Conflict Prevention; Social Acceptability	Until something like this is successful, social acceptability will be tenuous at best, especially in new areas, and especially as more and more grizzlies from an increasing population get into trouble (which a successful approach like this would help minimize).	
		FWS should encourage FWP to relocate captured male grizzlies from the GYE area to the NCDE PCA, and from the NCDE area to the GYE PCA. Making this a common practice should eliminate any lingering concerns about genetic diversity.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Relocating females in the same manner would probably not be necessary.	
		GBAC needs to discuss the terms "connectivity zones" and "connectivity corridors" both of which imply ***specific*** routes between Recovery Zones that grizzlies can use to get from one RZ/PCA to another. These terms **do not** imply the entire area between RZs/PCAs (in other words the entire western third or so of Montana). To consider the entire area between RZs/PCAs a connectivity "zone" is really to consider it an area of colonization. That is not the Governor's charge to us, nor is it necessary for ESA compliance. FWP and FWS should designate (on maps) the specific Connectivity Zones and manage them for grizzlies differently than adjacent lands not designated or approved for grizzly connectivity.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	If we're to have natural connectivity, FWS and FWP should designate specific zones that grizzlies can use unrestricted for connectivity between RZs. These zones should be designated considering social acceptability as well as biological suitability within the zone area. These zone areas must not include any existing: cities, towns, rural schools, rural churches, farmsteads or campgrounds. These zones should mostly or entirely exist on public land.	
		So far GBAC has not directly discussed the Governor's number one "critical topic," namely "Grizzly bear distribution within Montana (including outside of established recovery zones)". This topic implies, especially outside of RZs, that distribution need not be everywhere and also need not be just any place grizzlies might happen to wander. There's nothing in the ESA that requires statewide or even large-scale colonization. What's required is that the Recovery Zones/Primary Conservation Areas have and maintain a well-defined grizzly bear population minimum (which minimum Montana will rightly always want to maintain a significant buffer above).	Grizzly Bear Distribution	Are there areas of the state where there should not be grizzly bears at all? I have talked to no one in eastern Montana that wants grizzlies in their area. Social acceptability is a political reality that GBAC and the agencies need to acknowledge and consider. There is nothing in the Governor's EO that even hints at any need for colonization of all of Montana, of eastern Montana, of Zone 3 in the NCED, or even of the entire area between the GYE and the NCDE.	

GROUP 3 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?	Group 3 Notes
		Another of the Governor's "critical topics" that GBAC has not directly discussed is: "Response protocols to grizzly conflict in different parts of the state." This topic implies that responses may be different in different parts of the state.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols	Montana needs GBAC to make sensible recommendations in this regard.	
		ADDITIONAL IDEAS FROM GROUP 1:			
		MTFWP in partnership with USFWS and USFS as well as private land owners, trusts, should develop, map and model a state plan for connectivity between all subpopulations of grizzly bears.	Connectively between ecosystems		
		The state should develop a bear aware/smart tourism and recreation plan that celebrates grizzly bear recovery and addresses conflict zones.A tourism/recreation tax should be considered to support bear managers, conflict prevention, and secure habitat.			
		Livestock Loss Board adopt a multiplier compensation program for Grizzly Bear livestock depredations	Resources		
		Zero tolerance policy for all food conditioned and livestock depredating Grizzly Bears.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols	YNP & GNP use this method and are extremely successful in their management and preventing conflict. Research shows that once food conditioned, Grizzly Bears do not "rehabilitate" but simply escalate with their conflicts.This would save $ and time, and prevent conflict.	
		FWP/Tribal FW Programs implement the protocol of closing access to areas of likely or potential Grizzly Bear Conflicts, for a short period of time as neccessary.	Conflict Prevention	YNP & GNP as well as certain areas already implement this with success. Ex. Grizzly Bear feeding on elk carcass on a trail. Mating Grizzlies near high traffic area. Recent conflict situation with GB still in the area, etc.	
		FWP amend the current Conservation License to include recreationists, with a proceed of this license fee allocated towards Montana Grizzly Bear Conservation and Management.	Resources		
		Adopt the State Hunting Plan for areas			
		FWP implement depredation hunts when neccessary.	Role of Hunting	Source of income for FWP, for an action that will be carried out regardless.	
		State of Montana implement the Grizzly Bear Hunting Management Plan in the recovery areas where the Grizzly Bear population thresholds have been met.	Role of Hunting		
		FWP implement more effective hazing methods when necessary for habituated bears.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols		
		Identify gaps in intergovernmental, interagency, and tribal coordination and create an action plan to address the gaps and improve the comuunication and coordination	Distribution, connectivity, conflict,coexistence, transplant, recreation (all)		
		Artificially inseminate Grizzly Bears with genetic material from a different Recovery area to encourage genetic diversity.	Connectivity		
		Remove female Grizzly Bears for the same serious conflicts that males are removed for.	Conflict Protocols		
		Allow landowners to use more aggressive, non-lethal methods to haze habituated bears away.	Conflict Prevention	Currently they can use pots and pans, and a squrt gun. ex. non lethal cracker shells, etc.	
		Support existing carcass removal programs in areas of Grizzly Bear Populations, and implement in areas where necessary and not currently in place.	Conflict Prevention		
		ADDITIONAL IDEAS FROM GROUP 4:			
		NEW RECOMMENDATION		Expanding people populations and development with zoning regs for new developments that require the clustering of homes together leaving open space for willdlife corridors and fire breaks where developments border public lands. COUNCIL DISCUSSION - PROBABLY WON'T COME TO CONSENSUS.	
		NEW RECOMMENDATION		Agencies should not use helicopters to re-locate, collar or do research on grizzlies in Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas. Collar tolemitry should be limited to fixed wing planes. It should limit the use of helicopters to re-locate bears in other areas. CHAD AND TRINA VOTE NO, MICHELE VOTES YES.	

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
Stay in existing WG? Noting that these color coding represent the view of small groups and not the group as a whole. Is the concept a good concept and can we go with it?		Encourage the courts, decision makers and lobbying groups to use sound science and the most knowledgeable grizzly bear research teams to drive management, ~~translocation~~ relocation and conflict resolution.	POSSIBLE overall vision:The grizzly bear is our state animal and an important piece of Montana's wildlife heritage. Most Montanans recognize that grizzly bears are an important part of what makes Montana the "Last Best Place" and unique from the rest of the Lower Forty-eight states. Therefore, Montana's grizzly bear populations—Yellowstone, NCDE, Cabinet-Yaak, Selkirks, and the Bitterroot should be thriving, self-sustaining and interconnected. Initiate a statewide planning process that outlines a statewide vision for grizzly conservation and management. Facilitate recovering populations by protecting areas between occupied areas to allow for natural migration. Decision making should be based on the best available science. Establish a long term fund for non-lethal conflict prevention measures and consistent long term funding for bear management and research. COUNCIL DISCUSSION NEEDED.	all areas	
Liked concept, but implementing fees, etc., was difficult to sort out.. TRINA'S NOTE: THERE ARE ALREADY SEVERAL THINGS IN THE WORKS. NOT SURE WE EVEN NEED TO BE INVOLVED.		As there will be an ever increasing population base moving to Montana or traveling seasonally to enjoy the open space ecosystems of Montana that support both Grizzly Bear and humans (recreation, Farming/Ranching, Bear Viewing, National Park Visits), there could be a discussion about how to implement a fee or percent taken on all land or residences (built or sold) to preserve open spaces in Montana through example: conservation easements or wildlife (specifically Grizzly Bear) conflicts.	SEE 65.	all areas	This could be on sales or builds as in first statement and/or, also on a "gas tax, rental car and bed tax" to take advantage of seasonal bear r,ecreational visits to see bears. This is a world issue not just Montana. How do we get those benefiting and enjoying our open spaces that allow Large carnivores to have increasing populations to help pay for conflict management, travel corridors over highways, or increased garbage costs as the population in Montana grows exponentislly, seasonally or as yearlong residents. Take the huge expansion of Big Sky and that habitat loss and travel corridor. Could be similar to a sin tax on cigarettes or alcohol, but just a bear fee. I hate to say tax since that has been voted down way too many times...BUT the crux of it is how do others help Montana foot the bills? People come to Montana and its open spaces with vast wildlife resources, because they live in area so developed and built with such large high rises and skyscrapers containing huge populations of people it would not be "socially acceptable" or be safe in their backyard to have large carnivores living. So why don't they also help pay for our social acceptance? Of course there are already some fees adn taxes but there could be a dissuion for alterantive ways to help Montana support the efforts, so they and their family can enjoy the open spaces that allows grizzly bear expansion.
TRINA'S ADDITIONS ARE RED.		Recommend requiring the bear identification test be an annual requirement FOR ALL OUTDOOR RECREATIONISTS and couple this with bear spray outreach video (maybe a test on the bear spray video?)	SEE 16.	Conflict Prevention	Varying degrees of support for this idea
I FEEL LIKE 5, 6, AND 7 CAN BE COMBINED INTO ONE RECOMMENDATION.		Encourage local municipalities to develop local sanitation ordinaces that include enforcement	SEE 18.	Conflict Prevention	local support will be variable, funding support for compliance
		Require that subdivisions or HOAs include restrictions on activities or behaviors that encourage human-bear conflicts. Provide conflict mitigation policies.	SEE 29.	Conflict Prevention	
		Create statewide standards and enforcements for containing attractants	SEE 29.	Conflict Prevention	
Might have too much detail or this one and the next. Could have overarching recommendation with addendum that could expand upon the core idea and not be lost. THIS RECOMMENDATION COULD END AFTER THE FIRST SENTENCE.		To enhance human safety and prevent conflicts, the Council should recommend a mandatory, state-wide K-12 curriculum on bears (both black bears and grizzlies). All ages would benefit from information and problem-solving workshops. The curriculum could be inserted in a variety of subject areas and create cross-curricular opportunities. The curriculum should be a part of each grade and it should include the intrinsic, social, biological, and economic benefits of bears as well as the social and economic challenges of living with an apex predator on the landscape. It should include the biology of bears, necessary habitat, habitat fragmentation, preventative measures, and co-existence strategies. It should include the role of grizzly bears as an umbrella species and the value of predators in the ecosystem. It should include information on measures to coexist with grizzlies, including proper handling and storage of attractants like garbage, pet and livestock foods, bird-feeders, chickens and other small domesticated animals. Fear of grizzlies should be acknowledged and put into perspective with factual risk assessment and risk management. It might also include home projects that could include parents in the learning process. Possible projects would be: making your backyard bear-wise, problem-solving projects that analyze methods of living with bears, surveying your street, preventing human/bear conflicts locally, creating bear tolerant habitat in human dominated zones, and encouraging connectivity between recovery areas.	A state-wide K-12 curriculum that includes the best available science, bear biology, and conflict prevention methods should be created and implemented including games and activities that appeal to all learning styles. RECOMMENDATION NEEDS TO BE GIVEN TO I & E COMMITTEE.	Conflict Prevention	Addresses the goal of human safety and conservation of bears. Education is something everyone can get behind. It will lay the groundwork for the future. It would take some funding to create a curriculum that is easy to use and add to current curriculum.
COMBINE WITH 8.		The Information and Education team and/or other info outreach programs should design a board game to be used in schools and programs like the bear fairs. The game would resemble chutes and ladders and feature bears moving from one recovery area to another. Players roll the dice and land on squares like: "Lucky, you found a secluded huckleberry patch, take two steps forward," or, "Oh no! you got into a chicken coop and were relocated 5 squares back," or, "Yikes you got caught eating from the birdfeeder, two steps back." The design of the game could be a part of a school project contest in the public schools. For the Bear Fairs and for kinesthetic learners, a physical, portable, maze could be created to make a game where young people work through a maze (it could be drawn out on a large tarp for portability). The participants come upon boxes to choose from as they move through the maze. When they lift the box, they find a hazard like free range chickens, or a grazing area and move back or to another place on the maze, or they lift a box and find cutworm moths and move forward. This disseminates information on bear biology and attractants in a fun way.	REMOVE - COMBINED WITH 8.	Conflict Prevention	This is easily added to I&E work. Might need funding and more folks on the ground to establish. It creates an opportunity to lay the groundwork for living with bears.

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
Might be overly prescriptive. FEEL LIKE WE'RE GETTING INTO THE WEEDS ON THIS ONE.		The state library association or the Information and Outreach entities or both should approach authors of grizzly publications for book donations to schools and local libraries throughout Montana. This should be accompanied by publicity so people know the books are available and the authors receive positive recognition and publicity for the donation.	REMOVE: SEND DIRECTLY TO I & E COMMITTEE.	Conflict Prevention	This would take time and little money other than promoting the program. Libraries are great local community centers and would be a good starting point for bear education.
COMBINE WITH 4.		Wthing FWP education: revamp the hunter education program to include more on bear identification and safety while in bear habitat.	SEE 16. HUNTER'S ED DOESN'T NEED MORE TRAINING.	Conflict Prevention	This could be done with the help of the bear education supervisor that was recommended in line 13.
Comment on coloring for pages 4-6; not sure whether/how to apply a particular color on each idea/recommendation...COMBINE WITH 4.		Require an online test on bear identification and safety every two years prior to recieving hunting license for MT	SEE 16.	Conflict Prevention	
Recognizing that watershed groups might not be statewide. NO RANCHER, FARMER, OR LANDOWNER IS GOING TO CREATE A WATERSHED IF THE GOVERNMENT TELLS THEM TO. THIS ONE NEEDS TO BE REMOVED AND FORGOTTEN ABOUT IMMEDIATELY.		The state should become much more pro-active in the creation of watershed groups to generate local work to prevent conflict and ensure human safety with grizzlies on the landscape. Extra effort should be made to encourage watershed groups in areas where grizzlies have been reported and could be present and on the front edge of where bears are expanding such as between the NCDE and SBE, but watershed groups would be pertinent state-wide. Systematic, local, conflict prevention measures are necessary for communities with grizzlies on the landscape, and community groups improve local communication and understanding. The Blackfoot challenge and other successful groups have come out of a grass roots interest. The state needs to cultivate this as these groups can help solve many local issues. It would be prudent to issue funding to the Blackfoot Challenge group to cultivate watershed groups in new areas. To qualify for funding, the watershed groups should include all groups in the areas that wish to be included so the interests of the entire local community is represented. Watershed groups should begin to design and implement co-existence measures before problems arise as grizzlies move through the area. Getting ahead of the game has shown to be a pre-requisite for success. They could be a part of the bear-wise community recommendation line 26.	Governor should encourage local communities to embrace bear-wise practices by supporting local grass roots and watershed community groups who work together on becoming bear-wise communities.This should originate in local communities but state and federal governemnts can encourage through funding and other support. CHAD AND TRINA VOTE NO, MICHELE VOTES YES.	Conflict Prevention	This has been a part of conservation plans, but was not implemented because of funding issues. This would increase human safety and conserve bears due to conflict prevention. Social tolerance will be cultivated if problem bears are avoided by being prepared.This would take funding, but ESA section 6 grants and other conflict management grants would be available. The state would also save money from livestock losses with sequestered composting of boneyards and electric fencing projects.
Lots of detail that may not be necessary. THIS LITERALLY JUST HAPPENED. SO DELETE.		A coexistence Summit or Academy should be established each year so that current co-existence workers and Watershed group representatives in new areas can brainstorm and discuss new challenges and ways to address them. The group should be supplied with a list of conflicts with locations and specific conflict issues so the group can pinpoint problem areas and focus efforts to mitigate attractants and formulate prevention measures. More detailed information on conflicts and removals should be made available. There is one list of bear relocations/removals but details are sparse. It lists human conflict, but what type? Residents, managers and co-existence workers can learn from the information. What type of conflict? Was it hunting related, a chicken coop, a cornfield, a livestock depredation? With this list, the group would be able to look at trends over time. This would be a great addition (next year) to the education summit that is being piloted in January of 2020. Having the two together would be more comprehensive and it would save money to do one instead of two. The Yellowstone subcommittee just did something similar in Cody Wyoming this past year and a number of solutions and ideas came from it including a rancher who has had great success of Airedales dogs as grizzly deterrents. The director of the Blackfoot Challenge just returned from an event looking at different breeds of grizzly dogs and what he learned would benefit all watershed and co-existence groups.	This is an important component and our group supported it. Trina felt it was already being done after attending the education summit. We did not agree to remove it.	Conflict Prevention	This would be an invaluable place to share ideas and brainstorm solutions. It would be easy to find support for this and it would create publicity for the conservation program and the grizzly fund. It is an opportunity for communities to share on many levels not just grizzly conflict prevention. Bear managers are putting out fires and barely staying ahead. There is very little reflection or systematic learning going on, despite all the money being spent on management. This type of brainstorming session is long overdue. It will just take time, money and more folks on the ground.

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
Like the concept and details but that should be further informed by the education community. COMBINE WITH 4.		To add to the yearly bear identification quiz for hunting licenses recommendation, a quiz covering safety while hunting in bear country should be required each year for all hunting licenses. All hunters should be prepared for possible dispersal bears as bears are attracted to gut piles. There could be a required video summarizing safety precautions with a quiz afterward that would make it available for out of state licenses as well. The safety measures should come from the hunter education handout passed out at the December meeting as well as these great suggestions by a former Fish and Wildlife Commissioner who is an avid hunter Modify hunting tactics as necessary to avoid surprising grizzlies: 1. · In grizzly country, I usually don't walk into or out of my hunting area in the dark. I want to make sure I can see well enough to avoid walking into a bear. 2. · Be especially aware of your surroundings, and use caution when in areas where you may not be seen or heard easily, such as dense vegetation or along streams. In dense vegetation, I often go from the "stealth hunting mode" to making noise to avoid a bear. 3. · Pay attention to fresh bear tracks. If I see very fresh grizzly tracks and the terrain and vegetation is such that it would be easy to surprise a bear, I may abort the hunt and go to a different area. 4. · Try not to shoot game late in the afternoon. You want to have time to field dress and get the game out of the woods before dark. Once you have shot your game: 5. · Bears are attracted to game carcasses. Grizzlies have a very keen sense of smell, and can smell the fresh blood and other carcass odors from quite a distance. 6. · If your hunting partner is close enough, wait until they arrive before starting the field dressing process. While one person field dresses the animal, the other should "stand guard" to make sure a bear does not sneak up on the person doing the field dressing. 7. · If at all possible, field dress the animal in a relatively open spot that has good visibility. You may have to drag the animal a ways before field dressing it. This is for two reasons. First, it is easier to see an approaching bear if you are field dressing your game in an open area instead of a dense area. Second, you want to think about other hunters who may be in the area. If possible, leave the gut pile in an open location. If a bear comes in to feed upon it, you don't want other hunters to accidently surprise the bear, which may then react by defending its food source. There is less chance of that happening if the gut pile can be easily seen from a distance. 8. · If at all possible, do not leave your game in the woods overnight. Get it back to your vehicle or camp as soon as possible.	SEE 16.	Conflict Prevention	
COMBINE WITH 4.		Fishing licenses should include a video and quiz each year using bear education safety info for anglers.	All people who use public lands in Montana should be required to watch a video and take a test concerning safety in bear country.	Conflict Prevention	The cost of this would only be for the creation of the video. It could be paid for with an extra .50 for licenses.
Concept is good, but what does this look like? COMBINE WITH 5, 6, AND 7.		There is a need for bear-resistant garbage containers and their continued maintenance for areas in and around recovery areas as well as linkage corridors and possibly present areas in Montana. Consider funding through ESA section 6 grants to create a matching funds program. There are many individuals who would purchase a bear resistant garbage can (I would be one), but that does not help others or assure long term maintenance of the cans. A matching grant program would be an interesting way to tackle the problem. Matching funds could come from the Grizzly Fund. A person donates enough money to purchase a can and the donation would be a tax write off, the money would then be matched so another can would be purchased, ownership would be in the hands of the disposal company. The disposal company would be responsible to keep up the cans. Owning the cans will give the company an incentive to be careful at garbage collection and they would have the option to fine individuals for lost parts etc.	SEE 18.	Conflict Prevention	This allows an opportunity for public involvement and ownership of a solution.
COMBINE WITH 17 AND OTHERS.		All garbage transfer stations and other facilities in bear country and linkage zones should be analyzed for attractants and sequestered to prevent luring bears to the area. Counties that do not have residential garbage pickup should make their garbage transfer stations bear resistant. Areas that have the potential for grizzly-garbage conflicts should have bear-safe garbage storage in bear resistant cans or inside closed buildings like Missoula's current ordinance.	THE GOVERNOR SHOULD ENCOURAGE ALL COUNTY AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO ASSESS GARBAGE DISPOSAL NEEDS AND TAKE STEPS TO ENSURE ALL ARE DOING THEIR BEST TO MITIGATE GRIZZLY BEAR CONFLICTS.	Conflict Prevention	This would take funding and would need enforcement.
THIS IS NOT SOMETHING WE CAN CONTROL. FEELS PRETTY PERSONAL.		Strict enforcement of poaching is necessary for the long-term conservation of bears. Malicious killing is a huge problem and was a cause of diminishing numbers of bears which brought about ESA listing. Fines for poaching should not change in the case of de-listing. Regardless of ESA status, the bear must be managed to preserve the population. Malicious killing is a huge threat to the future of grizzly bears. Stringent fines and enforcement should continue regardless of listing.	FINES SHOULD BE INCREASED FOR POACHING CHARGES.	Conflict Prevention	Might be unpopular, but it is one area where numbers could be protected in the long term that is already in place.
THIS WAS ALREADY TRIED AND SHUT DOWN. NO USE BEATING A DEAD HORSE. IT AIN'T GOING ANYWHERE.		Requiring bear spray to be carried while hunting would increase hunter safety, but would need to be part of a program to rent spray to out of state hunters and to provide inexpensive or discounted bear spray for in state hunters. If nothing else requiring outfitters to carry bear spray would be advised. In the Gravellies a regulation was enacted to require outfitters to carry bear spray. It went through with little pushback.	SEE 22.	Conflict Prevention	Conflicts while hunting are occuring more and more as bears enter areas where they have not been seen before. There is a lot of room to improve safety and prevent conflict in this area.

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
WHY? ALSO, COMMERCIAL FORAGERS SENTENCE SHOULD GO WITH OTHER TESTING RECOMMENDATIONS.		Consider limits on commercial huckleberry picking operations to preserve food sources with tribal exceptions. Commercial foragers should also need to take a bear safety test each year with their licenses like hunters and anglers.	Foraging and Recreation should be SEASONALLY limited in areas with high grizzly concentrations. Trails and OTHER PUBLIC areas should be subject to closures when necessary.	Conflict Prevention	This provides education for another group that spends time in bear country
MERICA.		Look into occupational safety and health safety standards for businesses (outfitters, state employees, recreational tours, etc.) for requiring bear spray and other bear safety standards.	Require hunters and ourfitters to carry bear spray realizing this would be difficult to enforce. CHAD AND TRINA VOTE NO, MICHELE VOTES YES.	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts before they occur and address liability issues
DEFINITELY A NEED, BUT HOW?		Add additional FWP bear management specialist staff able to focus on a very specific geography and required to hold community listening sessions, engage in local outreach, and trained/equipped to try creative techniques for preventing conflicts (remove carcasses with dynamite, deterrent treatments, technical expertise on electric fencing, help with bear proofing cow camps, etc.). Ensure any experiemntal deterrents include a research component/seek opportunity to partner with co-op/universities/IGBST/Arthur Middleton lab, etc. Bear management specialist positions need to be permanent, have better pay, etc.	COMBINED WITH 56.	Conflict Prevention	Build social tolerance, reduce conflicts, build trust
THIS IS BASICALLY A REPEAT OF THE OTHER RECOMMENDATION FOR SCHOOL PROGRAMS.		Establish bearwise education program around bear behavior, ecology, recovery, safety, and living with bears; include program in schools. Precede with statewide summit to develop messaging and curriculum. See Missoula bear FB page, Bear Smart Canada, Bearwise Wyoming. Education programs could be led by volunteer staff, like ID (Master Naturalist Program). Include special emphasis on educating out of state hunters/development of programs to provide out of state visitors with bear spray.	This is happening with FWP and Forest Service. We support their work. Chad and Trina don't feel this needs to be a recommendation	Conflict Prevention	Build social tolerance, reduce conflicts, build trust
ALREADY HAPPENING.		FWP commit to building a culture of partnership with NGOs and communities in all areas of the state (explore developing a funding mechanism for NGO dollars directed to FWP through foundation with match)	SEE 57.	Conflict Prevention	Leverage resources, build trust, prevent conflicts
AGAIN, ADD TO GARBAGE RECOMMENDATION.		Statewide coordination around bear resistant trash requirements (create a structure for local governments to coordinate on regulations and infrastructure)	SEE 18.	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe
THERE ALREADY ARE FOOD STORAGE ORDERS.		Implement food storage requirements on the Bitterroot NF and state lands	Food storage orders should be implemented in all forests that have or could have grizzlies. Consistency should be encouraged to create convenience in movement between forests but flexibility must also allow for different needs in different areas.	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe
AGAIN, GOING DOWN A RABBIT HOLE WITH THIS ONE.		Public/private partnership to install bear resistant infrastructure in all USFS campgrounds in the state and in BLM/state lands in connectivity areas	BEAR RESISTENT INFRASTRUCTURE SHOULD BE AVAILABLE AT ALL FEDERAL AND LOCAL CAMPGROUNDS AND OTHER PUBLIC AREAS.	Conflict Prevention	Prevent conflicts, keep people safe
WOULDN'T THIS JUST BE THE PER CAP TAX?		Require homeowners to register goats, chickens, or other common livestock attractants.	This should be implemented on a local level but Governor could support and look for funding for state-wide attractant regulations and enforcement. This might include registering small livestock and chickens, coordinating with HOAs and county governments. CHAD AND TRINA VOTE NO, MICHELE VOTES YES.	Conflict Prevention / Funding	In July 2019, legislation was passed requiring all beekeepers to apply as a beekeeper and to annually register their hives in a variable fee structure
Need consistency on both garbage/waste and food storage. And we needed to know if it was being applied to a given geography (state, federal, or private land). This has been helpful in terms of getting ideas on paper, but what is the structure/skeleton that this is being attached to? One way to get people to articulate this vision is to respond to specific scenarios ... use the Council's responses to draw that skeleton framework. Another idea is for four working groups to each articulate a whole / skeleton vision -- and then to have people share to move forward. Don't we need to spend some time on process/vision before we can look at some of the details? This effort pushes us toward the need for a broader set of process options.		Create consistancy around food storage orders on public lands and require food storage orders on all public lands in occupied grizzly bear habitat as well as expansion and connectivity habitat. Support enforcement, outreach and education around Food Storage Orders	SEE 27.	Conflict Prevention, Connectivity	Many food storage orders are already in place but there are locations without food storage orders. There is debate around the need for consistancy. Multiple agencies have variable levels of funding for enforcement

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
		It is difficult to walk into a hotel in Montana and not see pictures of grizzlies, paintings of grizzlies, or statues of grizzlies. When one crosses the state line at lost trail pass, one sees a grizzly on the Montana sign. Bears are an important part of our heritage and we need to understand them. A comprehensive state-wide program should be implemented to create Bear-wise communities (https://bearwise.org/bearwise-communities/) with a priority focus on the areas in Western Montana on the "possible presence of grizzlies" map from USFWS (https://drive.google.com/open?id=1bX00zAQS7ziMSaz1uIKhI0iaLqDeZXzi) The program should be state-wide. This could be done through local watershed organizations with agency assistance if the watershed groups so choose. This will prepare areas and reduce conflict as bear distribution expands and dispersal bears explore and colonize the linkage zones between recovery areas. This is the beginning of social tolerance for grizzlies throughout the state via education and will reduce black bear conflicts in areas where grizzlies are not present.	UP TO LOCAL PEOPLE, NOT GOVERNMENT. SEE 13.	Conflict Prevention, Connectivity between ecosystems	This would take funding, but considering the map where bears have passed through, there are many communities that are not ready to encounter grizzlies, but encountering them is a growing possibility. Once again this can increase human safety and increase social tolerance. It would be worth the investment.
31 AND 32 SEEM SIMILAR, AND WAY TOO LONG. MAYBE THEY CAN BE COMBINED WITH THE I,E, AND O RECOMMENDATION FROM ABOVE.		Encourage governor and Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks to develop a state Bear Aware outreach and education program with a designated bear aware outreach supervisor. This supervisor could oversee seasonal technicians across the state to implement education programs including bear spray as well as work with tourism department to reach out of state visitors. This could include a bear aware campaign with social media and video content. Develop a website and/or app that allows for quick access to the multiple resources available to prevent conflicts with bears. Maybe this role could also oversee a conflict prevention grant program.	This is happening with FWP and Forest Service. We support their work. Chad and Trina don't feel this needs to be a recommendation	Conflict Prevention, Resources	Funding for an FTE in the legislature
AGAIN, ALREADY BEING DONE		A potential way to create a conflict prevention grant program not coupled with Livestock Loss Board could be to reassess the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks Living with Wildlife grant program that was defunded. Potentially house a conflict prevention grant and a funding mechanism for conservation easements under this one program?	Recommend that the legislature revive the LWGP program.	Conflict Prevention, Resources	Funding this program - need to better understand why it was defunded
I THINK THIS ONE IS COVERED BY SEVERAL OF THE OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.		Glacier Park has a low number of conflicts because they are very strict about attractant regulations and human activities that attract bears. They have individuals that regularly survey and fine campers and campgrounds for violations and make sure that the violations are cleaned up immediately. They are also available to haze bears that enter front country camps. Strict and consistent attractant regulations work well, but they are meaningless without funding to enforce the regulations. More bear managers on the ground would allow for more enforcement of attractant sequestration and immediate response to those first strike bears. We might also recommend neighborhoods to report conflicts and facilitate and speed up attractant clean up. Gerald Cobell blamed many problems encountered in his area on waste left behind by tourists often in campgrounds. Funding for more people there to enforce strict camping regulations would assist in that area. He said that once the bears get into garbage, their days are numbered. Taking that attractant out of the picture by creating and enforcing attractant regulations would help their situation.	SEE 29.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols	Once again, this is an issue of more boots on the ground and more funding.
THE ONLY WAY TO DO THAT IS FIND THEM FUNDING FOR MORE EMPLOYEES, WHICH IS ALREADY HAPPENING.		Revisit MOU with Wildlife Services and identify opportunities for improving efficiency, capacity and coordination around conflict prevention and response.	REMOVE: ALREADY HAPPENING.	Conflict Response/Conflict Protocols	This MOU with Wildlife Services could be a mechanism for improving and addressing resource challenges around coexistence and response. Ideally, MT would have autonomy over grizzly bear management decisions in the event bears are delisted. Challenge is so much of the attention is focused on livestock conflicts and there are many other significant conflicts and responsibilities and trust of agencies that get blurred through the current agreement.
AGAIN, WHO IS GOING TO PAY FOR IT?		Look at assisting land trusts with funding for easements in connectivity areas at a state and federal level (one example could be to look at the Montana Sage Grouse Initiative and how funding comes through that specific to sage grouse habitat)	SEE 42.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Funding, Creation of a new program always poses challenges, Coordination with other states

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
		A comprehensive plan to identify and protect linkage corridors for promoting natural migration between all recovery areas should be created and implemented to assure the long-term conservation of grizzly bears. Within these areas, potential conflicts to successful grizzly bear occupation and travel should be identified, and proactive steps taken to increase habitat security and reduce the potential for conflict when bears arrive. For instance, proactive livestock conflict prevention, attractant management, road density reductions should be all be planned and implemented. Additionally, FWP should partner with Montana Department of Transportation to identify and model potentially important grizzly bear (and other wildlife) crossing points on major highways, and seek funding and planning opportunities to incorporate wildlife crossing practices into the transportation system. As the 1993 grizzly recovery plan states, "Ideally, preserving linkage between populations is a more legitimate long-term conservation strategy than are attempts to manage separate island populations. Linkage zones are areas between currently separated populations that provide adequate habitat for low densities of individuals to exist and move between two or more larger areas of suitable habitat. The existence of individuals and habitats within linkage zones could act to provide a connection between larger populations. Linkage zones enhance the viability of populations that are separated by some distance by facilitating the exchange of individuals and maintaining demographic vigor and genetic diversity." 1993 revised Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan Pg 42. As Hanski and Gilpin 1991 states, "If no movement between populations can take place, and isolation becomes permanent, local extinction becomes more likely." The plan should focus on areas where bears have been known to have travelled as in the possibly present map (https://drive.google.com/open?id=1bX00zAQS7ziMSaz1uIKhI0iaLqDeZXzi) and currently protected areas like Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs), Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) and Wilderness Areas. Here is a map of these areas with possible linkage corridors. (https://drive.google.com/open?id=12QiuEsgKWsZQV8DVhVnxEo-v4OLFUL5z) Providing or securing linkage zones can be a practical solution to demographic dangers of fractured habitats for all species including elk, deer, pronghorns and native sheep. Current regulations should be strictly enforced and exceptions for road building should not be allowed for all IRAs, WSAs and Wilderness areas within the identified corridors. Public lands immediately in between these protected areas should adopt the amendment 19 policy from the previous Flathead Forest Plan. Unfragmented, roadless areas of forest are necessary to promote demographic connectivity and the long-term conservation of grizzly bears. Protecting and identifying these areas will provide more areas of colonization to re-locate bears and encourage natural migration and connectivity between recovery areas. Private lands in between the areas should be considered for conservation easements. Bear-	THE RECOVERY AREAS AND OUTSIDE ZONES SHOULD BE REMOVED, AND WESTERN MONTANA SHOULD BE DESIGNATED AS GRIZZLY BEAR HABITAT, KEEPING IN MIND THAT BIOLOGICALLY SUITABLE DOES NOT MEAN SOCIAL ACCEPTABLE OR APPROPRIATE. TALK ABOUT AS A GROUP.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This would promote long term conservation of grizzly bears and all of the other wildlife that Montana is famous for. This would not take too much funding. Many of the areas are already protected. This would take a concerted effort between agencies. Since this would also protect migration corridors for elk and deer, hunters could get behind it.
ALREADY HAPPENING.		Forests surrounding recovery areas and in designated linkage zones should adopt Amendment 19 from the previous Flathead Forest plan to limit fragmentation of habitat. This is important for all species including elk. New scientific studies on habitat fragmentation and climate change should be considered in all forest plans in the state. Forest Plans must incorporate standards that provide protection for grizzlies and other wildlife from habitat degradation and human conflicts.	In order to promote natural migration, habitat should be protected especially in remote areas like WSAs and IRAs. Road density measures like Amendment 19 should be considered. TALK ABOUT AS A GROUP - PROBABLY WON'T COME TO CONSENSUS.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This is an important amendment limiting roads in the forest which increases human safety because it offers less access to bears. It also decreases conflict because bears will have more adequate habitat and will not be displaced by increasing tourism and recreation. Bears are moving out of the parks at a much greater speed than their numbers are increasing. Park visits have more than doubled in the past years. Bears are being pressured to look for new habitat. If we can provide ample habitat, and decrease attractants in populated areas, conflict will be reduced.
Agree with concept / lots of work		The state should establish a partnership with insurance companies to build wildlife bridges. In 2015 this was found. "According to the insurance company, drivers have a one in 77 chance of hitting a deer in Montana. That's considerably higher than in surrounding states. Wyoming drivers have only a one in 113 chance of hitting a deer, Idaho is 1 in 232 and North Dakota is 1 in 105." This information comes from 2019, "Deer-car collisions cost an average of $8,190, an elk-vehicle collision is about $25,319, and a moose-vehicle collision is $44,546, taking into consideration human injuries and death, towing, vehicle repair, investigation of the accident by local authorities, and carcass disposal." And this, "One of the most looked-to examples of successful wildlife overpasses is in Banff, over the Trans-Canada Highway. A study there shows that in just one two-mile stretch, wildlife-vehicle crashes reduced from an average of 12 a year to 2.5, reducing costs of crashes by 90 percent—over $100,000." And in 1995, "Not only are the collisions harmful to wildlife, but according to a 1995 study they also caused 211 human fatalities, 29,000 human injuries and more than $1 billion in property damage. State Farm puts the number of collisions at 1.5 million annually causing 10,000 human injuries and 150 deaths along with $2,500 in property damage to vehicles." It would serve insurance companies well both in costs and public relations if they became partners with MDOT to build wildlife bridges. Where side streets are a problem in wildlife crossing areas, electrified cattleguards should be considered to prevent wildlife from using side streets to cross instead of wildlife crossings. In Canada, they used to have a suggested night speed limit of 45 miles per hour. Canada has many wildlife crossings now, so they might not have the suggested speed limit anymore. It is possible that the suggested reduced speed caused more funding for the crossing structures.	Encourage wildlife crossings and search for funding and planning that includes wildlife crossings in future road repair plans. Consider out of the box solutions like voluntary driving restrictions at night or suggested reduced speed limits at night. TRINA AND CHAD VOTE NO, MICHELE VOTES YES.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This is an opportunity for the state to work with insurance companies. Opportunities for partnerships could be explored on many levels. Public safety is something that both the state and insurance companies can agree upon.

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
Great concept if there were a think tank to do this.		Voluntary Driving Restrictions would be an out of the box way to reduce wildlife mortality and human fatality/injury. Insurance companies are well aware and have created outreach campaigns to reduce drowsy driving which according to the CDC, "The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates that drowsy driving was responsible for 72,000 crashes, 44,000 injuries, and 800 deaths in 2013.3 However, these numbers are underestimated, and up to 6,000 fatal crashes each year may be caused by drowsy drivers." According to drowsydriving.org 13% of crashes with hospitalizations and 21% of crashes with fatalities are caused by drowsy driving. Wildlife accidents contribute to many more fatalities and damages. One bear manager said that grizzlies (and I would imagine many other species) have adapted to crossing at night when traffic is minimized. Both drowsy driving and a majority of wildlife crossings or at least accidents due to diminished vision happen at night. Insurance companies could create financial incentives to vow not to drive between "2 and 5 am" (or a time line based on the timing of wildlife mortalities and drowsy driving) unless in an emergency. If those who take the pledge and receive those incentives get into an auto crash (not during an emergency) during those times, they would pay a higher deductible. This plan could be coupled with billboards pinpointing specific wildlife crossing areas with ads for nearby all-night diners or truck stops where drivers could go to take a break instead of driving through crossing areas between certain hours. Insurance companies could pledge a percentage of money saved through prevention to the construction of permanent wildlife crossings.	SEE 39.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Again, slowing down at night or avoiding night driving conserves all wildlife. It is an inexpensive answer to a big mortality problem.
TOO FAR IN TO THE WEEDS.		A nationwide contest to come up with ways to reduce train/bear collisions to prevent grain spills and to remove carcasses quickly from train tracks with a large monetary incentive should be implemented. One of the problems with trains is that the grain cars dribble grain as they go along the tracks. All cars are weighed before they leave the station and when they arrive at the destination, so grain bins that are leaking are identified. The spills bring wildlife to the tracks where they are killed which attracts bears. How can we reduce the grain dribble on the tracks to preserve all wildlife? I believe a foundation like Gates who likes to solve problems would contribute to the incentive and possibly direct the contest. If this is successful, more contests for conflict prevention could be implemented.	We encourage all types of problem solving including think tanks and contests to find solutions to complicated problems like train mortalities. CHAD AND TRINA VOTE REMOVE, MICHELE WANTS TO KEEP.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Reducing grain spillage along the tracks benefits the shippers as well as grizzlies. Even small losses of grain add up to big losses.
But not the purview of the Council. NOT OUR JOB.		Consider making funding available for smaller conservation easements. At this time, small parcels in key areas are not considered for conservation easements because the focus is on larger parcel of land. Every little bit helps. It would be prudent to create an organization with grant money from the state and the ESA to offer conservation easements specifically for smaller parcels in locations near occupied habitat.	Make funding available for smaller easements. This is in the works but could be recommended. TRINA AND CHAD VOTE NO, MICHELE VOTES YES.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	This would take funding and an understanding that every little bit helps. Small ranch operations could take advantage of this preserving open space into the future.
Need to simplify. Would recommend ending after first sentence (encouraged)	Green	FWP define connectivity zones within Montana where natural/functional connectivity (i.e. occupancy, ecological function in connective areas) is proactively encouraged through: 1) no hunting allowed in connectivity zones, 2) management decisions (about lethal removal, relocation) include more conservative criteria, 3) work with IGBST to develop statewide mortality thresholds and statewide management removal quota with conservative sub thresholds (percentages of total allowable mortality) tied to connectivity zones (and all must be in synch with ecosystem wide mortality thresholds), 4) bears in connectivity zones will not be translocated back to recovery areas (need to develop areas in DMA outside of PCA that are tolerable relocation zones), 5) increase collaring efforts and monitoring of movements to prevent conflicts more proactively, with a focus on individual bears of high priority (dispersing young males, females with cubs, etc.), 6) work with local land users to reduce conflicts spatially/temporally real-time with monitoring info, i.e. modify grazing rotations, temporary hunting closures, trail closures, etc., 7) apply habitat standards and guidelines from Conservation Strategy to Wildlife Management Areas in connectivity zones, 8) evaluate federal land use planning processes and projects for impact to habitat requirements for natural connectivity- with focus on food storage and road management, and 9) establish interagency population monitoring program in connectivity zones	SEE 37.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	For long-term resilience of lower-48 grizzly bears, it's important that connectivity between ecosystems occur naturally. Natural connectivity-involving grizzly occupancy and fulfilment of ecological function in connectivity areas- is key to restoration and long-term persistence of grizzly bears in the Northern Rockies.
ALREADY HAPPENING.		FWP and MDT work with IGBST to identify priority crossing locations on I-90 and I-15. It's important that there is coordination with the Wildlife and Transportation Statewide Steering Committee on this issue; coordination on priorities could create compelling case for tapping into federal funding (e.g. BUILD grants, etc.)	SEE 39.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems	The interstates are a potentially substantial barrier to natural connectivity and potential for vehicle collision with grizzly bears is a human safety concern
MERICA.		The state legislature should recommend that all Wilderness Study Areas in between recovery areas should be designated Wilderness.	COUNCIL DISCUSSION - PROBABLY WON'T COME TO CONSENSUS.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems, conflict prevention	Creating secure, remote areas where bears can roam away from populations is essential for the long-term conservation of bears.

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
COVERED THIS IN A PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATION. CAN'T REMEMBER WHICH ONE.		More funding should be made available to hire more bear management specialists to train with our experienced managers and take over when they retire. Tim Manley and Jamie Jonkel and others have a wealth of experience cannot be lost when they retire. We need more specialists on the ground and they should be training with our experienced managers. FWP must really support the experience they have and use it to move into the future. The specialists we have are overworked and residents are frustrated because the managers cannot be in more than one place at a time. Specialists must spend a lot of time on conflicts and have less time for prevention. Funding must include management specialists in areas in linkage zones now to get ahead of the moving edge of bear distribution. More managers on the ground would assist watershed groups and visit, build trust and educate residents. These areas must put co-existence measures in place before problems arise. Montana must recognize the wealth of experience on the ground and capitalize on it.	SEE 56.	Connectivity Between Ecosystems, conflict prevention	This covers our goal of human safety and conservation of bears. Rewarding and making use of the talent we have and using that talent to build new experienced managers for the future will be one of the most important things the state legislature could fund.
Don't want to tie hands of wildlife managers. THIS IS A STATEMENT, NOT A RECOMMENDATION.		Grizzly bears once roamed the entire state of Montana and non-conflict bears should never be removed simply for showing up in a place. We recognize that some areas of the state that were once historical suitable habitat are today inappropriate for grizzly bears. There is also a lot of quality grizzly bear habitat that is currently unoccupied, yet could be potentially occupied.	Recognize that natural migration is happening and will continue to happen in Montana. no agreement to remove. TRINA AND CHAD VOTE NO, MICHELE VOTES YES.	Grizzly Bear Distribution	There is a need to focus on areas where grizzlies could be with less conflict. These areas should be studied and utilized.
LET'S NOT WASTE MONEY ON SOMETHING THAT IS GOING TO BE OBVIOUS DURING OUTREACH EFFORTS.		FWP develop a social science study to establish a baseline understanding of social acceptance in various communities across the state as an initial step in a process to create a statewide management plan.	We agree to and encourage the concept. TRINA AND CHAD VOTE REMOVE, MICHELE VOTES KEEP.	Grizzly Bear Distribution	could yield important insights prior to creating a statewide management plan
NOPE.		Recognize all of Montana as biologically suitable habitat	SEE 37.	Grizzly Bear Distribution	Acknowledging grizzlies could be anywhere in the state allows FWP to use conflict management as a tool for prioritizing occupancy in certain geographies
Good concept. Lots of detail to work through. MOST OF THIS IS ALREADY HAPPENING.		The state and federal agencies should support and implement research to promote the long-term conservation of grizzly bears such as the following suggestions. This could be paid for through section 6 grants from the Endangered Species Act provisions and agency funding: Monitoring of food supplies is highly important. Look at the difference in 2018 in the Blackfoot area after a large fire. Food sources do influence bear movement and distribution. 1. A survey of the Bitterroot Recovery Area for bear presence/occupation. 2. A survey of the Sapphires, the Sapphire WSA and Anaconda Pintler Wilderness areas for bear distribution. 3. Impacts of snowmobiling on denning and post-den emergence 4. Impacts of trail use on bears 5. Map high caloric foods and/or seasonal important foods. This is happening in the GYE but needs to be conducted in the NCDE Cabinet Yaak, Selkirks, Bitterroot, and possible colonization areas between recovery areas. 6. Develop a functional habitat map that could be used to inform road closures and recreational use in the NCDE, Cabinet Yaak, Selkirks, Bitterroot, and possible colonization areas between recovery areas (Sapphires and Anaconda Pintler Wilderness to name a few). 7. Map habitat and food sources and analyze the effects of climate change on these areas to predict where grizzly bears will migrate in the future and to pinpoint areas for colonization in linkage zones.	WE ENCOURAGE THE CONTINUATION OF GRIZZLY research and HABITAT STUDIES, ESPECIALLY IN CURRENTLY UNOCCUPIED AREAS THAT ARE LIKELY TO BE REPOPULATED.	Grizzly Bear Distribution, conflict prevention	The more knowledge we have about grizzlies and their habitat, the better we can provide for co-existence. This would take funding.
Are doing already to some extent. Can't say this in perpetuity. WE'LL GO WITH THE ONE JONATHAN WROTE.		Encourage Governor and the Legislature to celebrate the recovery of the Grizzly Bear in Montana though Montana's dedication to Vast Open Spaces. Those spaces are checkerboards of Public Lands, National Parks and Privately Owned working Agricultural lands. All open spaces in Montana not only promote increasing Grizzly bear populations but all wildlife, within forest and prairie ecosystems.	JONATHAN'S RESOLUTION: We would like to formally recognize the relationship between bears and humans that has existed in our shared landscape from time immemorial to the present day. For thousands of years, our tribal neighbors have lived alongside grizzly bears in their native homelands and have learned valuable lessons of coexistence from one another. For hundreds of years, explorers and settlers of European descent have lived and worked in these lands alongside grizzly bears. We have seen many changes to the relationship between bears and humans since that time. Today, we, the Grizzly Bear Advisory Council, recognize the work that has been put forth by all Montanans that has resulted in the continuation of this long relationship.	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity Between Ecosystems	
I LOVE THE ACCIDENTAL USE OF POLLUTIONS INSTEAD OF POPULATIONS.		Encourage Governor, public officials and researchers to consistently refer to the GYE and NCDE as recovered with expanding pollutions	This is still being decided in the courts, it seems pre-mature to require language that might not be recognized legally. ALL AGENCIES NEED TO RELAY A CONSISTENT MESSAGE ABOUT THE STATUS OF THE GYE AND NCDE POPULATION RECOVERY STATUS.	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity Between Ecosystems	Science supports this, however passions may not. How many other ecosystems in the lower 48 (other than the already designated recovery areas) have enough public lands to be the base for or to support viable recovered populations like GYE and NCDE successes? These base public lands allow safety and socially acceptable "anchor" acres for the populations.
IN THE WORKS.		Work with relevant agencies to create a streamlined way for public reporting of possible grizzly bear sightings outside of recovery zones	Encourage a consistent messaging system between bear managers, residents and livestock producers. This would also include encouraging neighborhood watch systems.	Grizzly Bear Distribution, Connectivity between ecosystems	
Recognized broader need to partner. ALREADY HAPPENING.		Improve coordination and outreach on grizzly bears and bear awareness with the office of tourism, realtors, VRBO, etc.	We support this as a concept, but agree it is already happening. Michele would like to keep it on list. Trina and Chad think it should be removed.	Other	Capacity, Unknown concerns/roadblocks from realtors, tourism, etc.

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
Like concept. Need more discussion. IN THE WORKS. MAYBE WE DON'T NEED THE DETAILS - LET THE OTHER PEOPLE FIGURE THAT OUT. WE COULD JUST RECOMMEND THE MULTIPLIER.		A multiplier should be considered but as in Wyoming, it should only apply to heavily forested hard to manage livestock areas and measures of conflict prevention must be used to the best of the livestock grower's ability in order to qualify for the multiplier. Any reimbursement should include a requirement of conflict prevention measures after the second reimbursement.	THE GOVERNOR SHOULD SUPPORT THE CREATION OF A LIVESTOCK LOSS MULTIPLIER, AND WORK TO SECURE ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE LIVESTOCK LOSS BOARD. Multiplier should have limits pertaining to type of operation, geography, and personal responsibility concerning prevention. GROUP DISCUSSION - TRINA DOESN'T AGREE WITH ADDED SENTENCE.	Other	Many could get behind this especially if it were coupled with responsibility.
THERE ARE LITERALLY NO BENEFITS TO HAVING GRIZZLIES ON THE LANDSCAPE.		A grizzly bear PR person to promote the benefits and positive sides to having grizzlies on the landscape should be added to the folks on the ground working for grizzly conservation.	More bear specialists/managers are needed on the ground to manage bears and create relationships and trust with local communities and livestock producers.	Other	Reminding folks of the benefits to having bears on the landscape would be helpful for creating bear-wise communities and co-existence measures.
NOT SURE WHAT THEY MEAN BY THIS.		Establish cooperative monitoring programs – FWP, USFS, Permittees, NGOs on public allotments	Encourage cooperation between livestock owners, NGOs, FS, BLM and Bear Specialists/managers on livestock allotments. NOT SURE HOW THIS COULD BE ENFORCED.	Other	Enhance flexibility of public grazing allotment management in response to grizzly bear conflict
Outside purview of Council. AGREED.		Ensure people can't be held liable if grizzly mauling occurs on their property.	SEE 2.	Other	Create security for landowners, important for social tolerance
Already discussions around wildlife movement. ALREADY HAPPENING.		As roadways within the connectivity zone for the GYE and NCDE come up for repair bids over the next tens of years be prepared to write in wildlife crossing. Continue to utilize bear movement maps to predict areas of high movement	SEE 39.	Other	
Value statement... NOT A RECOMMENDATION.		The grizzly bear is our state animal and an important piece of Montana's wildlife heritage. Most Montanans recognize that grizzly bears are an important part of what makes Montana the "Last Best Place" and unique from the rest of the Lower Forty-eight states. Therefore, Montana's grizzly bear populations—Yellowstone, NCDE and Cabinet-Yaak (and eventually the Bitterroot)—should be thriving, self-sustaining and interconnected	SEE 2.	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Montana has the chance to make a stand and protect its status as the last best place in the lower 48. Conserving grizzlies will preserve the reputation for wildness that draws tourists, retirement incomes, and industry.
Pages 10-12 start here. All need additional work/reworking. Green seems like it doesn't need a lot of additional work. Red may not ever reach consensus. Didn't like specific wording around Big Belts. THIS IS ALREADY HAPPENING, AND THE BIG BELTS NEED NO AUGMENTATION. WE CAN REMOVE THIS RECOMMENDATION.		Facilitate recovering or recovered populations in all four MT Recovery Zones, as well as passability for grizzlies on the landscape that lies between Recovery Zones and west of the Big Belt mountains . East of the Big Belts, relocate minor offenders to augment unrecovered western Recovery Zones and euthenize problem bears. Wherever grizzlies exist in MT, facilitate livability for residents and property owners, and viability for production agriculture.	SEE 62.	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	The council's individual recommendations need an overarching framework or vision, responding to Cecily Costello's comments in Missoula. I believe this may be something most or all council members can live with.
ALREADY HAPPENING.		Initiate a statewide planning process that outlines a statewide vision for grizzly conservation and management. A statewide plan should include, A) Geographic specificity around conflict response (i.e. management zones that reflect conservation value of bears expanding into a given area) and B) Establish clear guidelines for lethal removal of a grizzly bear that are consistent with federal regulations, socially acceptable, and driven by 1) conservation value of the management zone, 2) demographics, 3) evidence of chronic depredation (in cases of livestock conflict) and 4) conflict severity (e.g. human safety issues)	INITIATE A STATEWIDE PLANNING PROCESS THAT OUTLINES A VISON FOR GRIZZLY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT. THE PLAN SHOULD INCLUDE: A) GEOGRAPHIC SPECIFICITY AROUND CONFLICT RESPONSE, AND B) ESTABLISH CLEAR GUIDELINES FOR LETHAL REMOVAL OF GRIZZLY BEARS THAT ARE CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL REGULATIONS. THE GUIDELINES SHOULD BE DRIVE BY: 1) THE CONSERVATION VALUE OF THE MANAGEMENT ZONE; 2) DEMOGRAPHICS; 3) EVIDENCE OF CHRONIC LIVESTOCK DEPREDATION; AND 4) CONFLICT SEVERITY. WHEREVER GRIZZLIES EXIST IN MONTANA, FWP SHOULD FACILITATE LIVEABILITY FOR RESIDENTS, PROPERTY OWNERS, AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS, AND VIABILITY FOR PRODUCTION AGRICULTURE. FWP SHOULD ALSO DEVELOP A PROTOCL FOR RELOCATING GRIZZLY BEARS TO APPROPRIATE AREAS, AGAIN, DEPENDING ON THEIR OFFENSE.	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	create clarity, transparency, and predictability around grizzly conservation and conflict management in Montana. Opportunity to establish more specificity than currently vague definitions of social acceptability. Also, an opportunity to establish proactive approaches to ensuring connectivity occurs
THAT IS LITERALLY WHAT WE'RE DOING RIGHT NOW.		State work with grizzly council to determine important elements of a successful statewide planning process	REMOVE: THAT'S LITERALLY WHAT WE'RE DOING.	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Grizzly council represents diverse interests and could provide valuable guidance to FWP that would ensure statewide planning process is successful
Erase? DEFINITELY ERASE.		State legislature cannot interfere with FWP management approaches post delisting. Is there a way to prevent legislative meddling (e.g. state bill ratifying Montana statewide plan in statute, or Governor's executive order on statewide plan?)	REMOVE: CAN'T LIMIT THE REPUBLIC.	Overarching Idea for Goal or Vision	Build trust between public and managers

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
Combine with others marked with Funding (*) AGAIN, I THINK WE'RE STEPPING OUTSIDE OF OUR JOBS HERE. THIS IS FOR LOBBYISTS, NOT THE GOVERNOR, TO DO.		A multimillion-dollar fund should be established in the next farm bill for grizzly conservation efforts. The interest generated from this permanent Grizzly Fund would pay for non-lethal, preventative measures for co-existence in the United States (MT, ID, WY, WA etc.). This creates long term funding for co-existence measures. It should be non-lethal so that national conservation groups and foundations for wildlife would be willing to contribute to the fund. Seed money from the farm bill would start the fund. It should include an option on taxes (one could choose to put a dollar or two into the fund from personal taxes) and a method for individuals to contribute to the fund like an adopt a grizzly program. This would allow national interest in grizzly bear conservation to contribute to the costs of living with grizzlies. This fund could contribute to incentives for living with grizzlies and all co-existence measures as well as research to create new measures for co-existence and conflict prevention.	Encourage the establishment of a multi-million dollar grizzly fund that would support non-lethal conflict prevention measures in the long term. OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE COUNCIL. THIS IS FOR LOBBYISTS, NOT THE GOVERNOR, TO DO. CHAD AND TRINA DO NOT SUPPORT.	Resources	This would take a commitment from Montana to push the idea of a fund to the federal government. It would be a long term solution for co-existence funding.
Will take additional conversation with Council and Idaho. NOT FOR US TO DECIDE.		The Bitterroot Ecosystem should be studied as a re-location area without the bears losing ESA protections. The bears should be able to be re-located in this habitat rich area without being considered experimental/non-essential to ensure protection for bears that move into and have been re-located in the area. It provides excellent habitat and could easily house many bears with minimal conflict giving managers more options for re-location of bears.	Encourage FWS to declare ESA protections for bears re-located in the Bitterroot Ecosystem if they were trapped near the area. MICHELE VOTES KEEP, CHAD AND TRINA VOTE REMOVE.	Resources	Creating more areas for bear re-location will take the pressure off other ecosystems.This is not a funding issue but a social issue and will take bear-wise programs and more managers on the ground to implement.
Combine with others marked with Funding (*) ALREADY HAPPENING.		Funding for grizzly bear conservation (and for all wildlife) is vitally important. All opportunities for grizzly bear conservation should continue to be explored, including federal, state and private funds. Additionally, given the amount of money that the USFWS invests in grizzly bear recovery, the state of Montana should consider the financial impacts that might result from a delisted grizzly bear population, and where and whether or not the state can find opportunities to replace those funds.	SEE 65.	Resources	The need for funding has been prevelant during recent meetings.
Combine with others marked with Funding (*) THESE ARE ALL CONVERSATIONS ALREADY TAKING PLACE. I THINK WE NEED TO MOVE AWAY FROM FUNDING AND COME UP WITH MORE MANAGEMENT IDEAS FOR WHEN THAT FUNDING COMES IN.		Consider a Montana recreation license that costs a minimal amount (1-2 dollars) for in state recreationists and more for out of state tourists (10 dollars). To apply for this license, one would also have to take the bear safety test. The test could also include backcountry safety tips, information on responsibly recreating on public lands, and how recreation can affect wildlife.	MT ALREADY SELLS A CONSERVATION LICENSE - JUST NEEDS TO BE SOLD TO MORE PEOPLE APPARENTLY. REMOVE.	Resources	This provides a way to educate a large group of people who recreate in Montana and brings in a funding resource.
Combine with others marked with Funding (*)		Establish new funding mechanism(s) for wildlife conservation and management in MT (ideas to consider: tourism tax like expanded resort tax, increased appropriation for Livestock Loss Board through general dollars (not sportsman), conservation fee associated with National Parks (re: WY resolution), support passage of Recovering Americas Wildlife Act, need new federal support for funding species post-delisting, through reauthorizing ESA?, look at NRCS and farm bill	SEE 65.	Resources	Current resources are not adequate; establishing new sources of revenue for grizzly bear conflict prevention, conservation, and management is key to continuing the success story of grizzly recovery. New mechansims should tap into constituencies other than sportsmen.
Prevention/Funding/Resources Combine		Establish a tiered loss compensation multiplier that through contingencies incentivizes preventive techniqes and provides compensation for livestock loss (recognizing that compensation programs don't promote social tolerance, just make it economically viable for ranching operations to stay afloat in grizzly bear country). Important considerations for such a program: 1) state legislature needs to allocate more funds for livestock and other agricultural loss (general dollars to livestock loss board, not Sportsmen's/FWP $, 2) compensation program could also be tiered geographically (i.e. provide more compensation in certain portions of the MT landscape key for grizzly bear conservation/connectivity), 3) bring back the Living with Wildlife Grant program, and 4) explore Farm Bill opportunities and NRCS EQUIP	SEE 55.	Resources	Ensure ranchers that provide important habitat in connective lands can remain economically viable; keep people safe and bears alive through incentivization of conflict prevention techniques
Prevention/Funding/Resources Combine. THIS NEEDS TO COME FROM PRIVATE ENTITIES/NGOS, NOT THE GOVERNMENT.		Create a grizzly bear prevention fund that is not tied to the Livestock loss board that funds work and is dependent on a local match	SEE 65.	Resources, prevention	Getting it through the Legislature and showing the broad support to get it done.
Red due to hunting issues. HUNTERS FUND ENOUGH ALREADY. CHARGE SOMEONE ELSE.		Contibute to bear conflict management funding through a mandatory Conflict Prevention Pass fee added to bear (black or grizzly) hunting license	REMOVE.	Role of Hunting	The AIS Prevention Pass required with a fishing license has helped to contribute funds to prevent the spread of AIS. There may be an opportunity to implement a similar tool into bear hunting licenses to dedicate funding to conflict management or hunter education in bear country.

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
Red due to hunting issues. THIS WILL NEVER COME TO CONSENSUS.		The grizzly bear is the slowest reproducing mammal on this planet. Any future hunting of grizzly bears should be avoided. Hunting is a contentious issue and could be easily resolved by honoring the recent Grizzly Treaty signed by over 200 tribes in Montana, Canada, and elsewhere. It asks that the bear never be hunted. Hunting does not increase human safety nor does it conserve the bear. MFWP seems determined to have a grizzly trophy hunt, if they do so it should be extremely limited in scope, should not allow hunting near the parks, should not allow hunting in vital linkage habitat, and should be easily suspended or cancelled during high mortality years. The Fish and Wildlife Commission recommended waiting after de-listing to consider any form of recreational hunting. A slow approach was suggested (waiting at least one year or more) to demonstrate to the public that MFWP's goal was to maintain a healthy, viable grizzly population not to kill as many as fast as they legally could. Management issues alone have killed a large number of grizzlies. In Wyoming, a take of 72 bears has been granted, 10% of the current population estimate in the GYE. Certainly, hunting should not be considered the best management tool for grizzly bears. Current management mortality measures target specific nuisance and habituated bears. Again, the tribes have been very clear about their wishes. This is a simple thing to give.	SAVE FOR GROUP DISCUSSION - PROBABLY WON'T COME TO A CONSENSUS.	Role of Hunting	This is a difficult issue.
THERE ARE ALREADY PEOPLE THAT DO THIS FOR A LIVING.		Define areas and circumstances where hunting is not appropriate: 1) not allowed in certain geographies- connectivity zones, core habitat/areas surrounding parks, 2) not considered a management tool for reducing conflicts- there is no science to support this, 3) delayed following de-listing; FWP should be a leader in coordination with other agencies on season/quota setting, 4) need to define mortality thresholds outside of DMAs/identify guidelines for cancellation of hunting season if a pre-determined portion of mortality threshold is met via management removals prior to beginning of the hunting season, 5) ecosystem based mortality quotas should not be seen as the equivalent of hunting-based mortality quotas. They are the quotas that trigger population change and hunting quotas should not be directly linked to population management.	COMBINE WITH 73.	Role of Hunting	Grizzly recovery under the ESA is a conservation success story and Montana could demonstrate leadership that ensures that success story continues
AGREE, BUT WITH FEWER WORDS.		In the meetings in December, it was clear that managers are running out of places to re-locate bears. When they put them back in the recovery areas, they are putting them in already occupied territory, so they must look for a space. FWP should develop a protocol for translocating bears a) between ecosystems, b) within an ecosystem, c) outside of a designated ecosystem, which further the conservation, connection and recovery of grizzly bears in the state of Montana. Bears translocated due to previous conflict may need to be placed deeper into core habitat of a designated ecosystem, where they are less likely to continue to get into trouble. Having other areas like linkage zones and augmentation zones would be helpful to the managers and the bears who are getting pushed back into conflict areas. Using the 3 strike protocols, first strike bears should be available for augmentation programs and first and second-strike bears should be available for translocation to habitat rich linkage zones surrounded by bear-wise communities so the chance for conflict is minimized.	SEE 61.	Transplant Protocols	This is a social tolerance issue. If areas are made "bear-wise" and understand that grizzlies are in the area, it will smooth the way for re-location to new areas in the linkage zones.
COMBINE WITH 75.		Relocate problem grizzlies with minor offenses to the most appropriate MT recovery zone	SEE 37.	Transplant Protocols	What to do with bears in need of relocation
COMBINE WITH 75 AND 76.		Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, the USFWS, the USFS and appropriate agencies partners should put in place agreements needed to allow for grizzly bears trapped inbetween recovery zones to be released onsite or in nearest secure habitat (likely public land) between ecosystems rather than taking grizzly bears back to recovery zone. Clarification is needed when communicating with the public about Transplant Protocols and the difference between releasing a bear that moved in that location on their own vs. reintroduction/augmentation	SEE 37.	Transplant Protocols	Public concern over bears being where bears have not been in decades, potential state code issues, misinformation
COMBINE WITH CONNECTIVITY/RELOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS.		Do not rely on human-assisted transplant protocols for establishing connectivity.	GRIZZLY BEAR POPULATIONS SHOULD NOT BE AUGMENTED BY MOVING BEARS TO PREVIOUSLY UNOCCUPIED AREAS. INSTEAD, THE BEARS SHOULD NATURALLY MOVE TO NEW AREAS ON THEIR OWN. If bears are already in or near unoccupied areas allow for flexibility and allow moving bears to the nearest remote habitat rather than returned to recovery areas.	Transplant Protocols	Establishing a precedent of artificially assisting grizzly bears with movement into "new" or unoccupied habitat could create a slippery slope that ultimately undermines the importance of ensuring habitat conditions are conducive to natural expansion of grizzly bears into connective/linkage areas.
Goes with one on top of page		FWP work with USFWS, IGBST, and USFS to identify 1.) connectivity zones and 2.) suitable areas within connectivity zones for relocating conflict bears occupying habitat between DMAs (in circumstances where relocation is deemed the appropriate management action).	SEE 61.	Transplant Protocols	Important to consider what the translocation and/or relocation protocol will be when responding to a conflict bear in "new" or unoccupied habitat, especially connectivity zones. In these circumstances, current translocation or relocation back to occupied habitat (PCA) is a management approach that could potentially inhibit connectivity from ever occurring.
COMBINE WITH EDUCATION.		Recreation in core grizzly habitat, recovery zones and connectivity zones presents challenges and opportunities for increased human bear interactions and conflicts. Bear Aware Recreation Zones need to be mapped to get ahead of the existing and potential conflicts as recreation increases in these areas.	New trails should not be constructed in core grizzly habitat. TRINA VOTES NO, MICHELE VOTES YES.	Coexistence; conflict; connectivity	Recreation is going to play a big part in Montana economic development. We need to be forward thinking about how this will effect overall grizzly bear recovery and get ahead of it by creating smart recreation opportunities and recreation zones. Increase in human population in Montana will become an issue as big as our challenges and opportunities with livestock. We need to get ahead of the outreach and education about smart, bear aware recreation zones in recovery zones and connectivity zones.

GROUP 4 WORKING DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Comments/concerns	Green - Yellow - Red	Emerging Idea or Recommendation	GROUP 4 REWRITES (CHAD, TRINA, MICHELE, GREG)	Focus Area of Idea or Recommendation	What challenge or opportunity does this idea/recommendation address? Why is it important?
ALREADY COVERED.		There is an obvious need to continue to support and fully fund our bear specialists so they can continue the outreach and education programs; deal effectively, efficiently and quickly with conflict issues. Including recovery zones and connectivity zones.	SEE 56.	Coexistence, conflict, connectivity	The opporutnity would be to create a long-term funding plan and revenue stream with state and Federal partners including creation of a habitat protection fund. A Smart Recreation Fund could be created to help fund these efforts.
Not in the Council's purview. NOT OUR JOB.		We can't consider delisting separate subpopulations until we develop a cohesive strategy and plan to create connectivity between all the recovery zones	Protect habitat to promote natural migration. COUNCIL DISCUSSION - PROBABLY WON'T COME TO CONSENSUS.	All except hunting	Great opportunity to develop a statewide cohesive recovery strategy for Montana.
HENCE THE RECOMMENDATIONS.		Review and update 1993 managment plan	REMOVE. THAT'S LITERALLY WHAT WE'RE DOING.	All	
I WROTE THIS, BUT I'M STILL NOT SURE IT NEEDS TO BE A RECOMMENDATION. I ALREADY TALKED WITH FWP ABOUT IT.		FWP needs to better communicate with the public, especially with landowners and livestock producers, when it comes to trapping and relocating grizzlies for any reason.	SEE 53.	Transplant Protocols	Most people would like to know when a grizzly is being dumped in their back yard.
COMBINE WITH OTHER RELOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS.		USFWS, FWP and WS need to work together with local landowners and county governments to identify new relocation sites outside of the designated management areas, especially in connectivity zones.	SEE 61.	Transplant Protocols	This would avoid questions like what to do with the Stevensville bear, or any others that end up between ecosystems where populations are established.
I WROTE THIS, SO OBVIOUSLY ITS PERFECT.		USFWS, FWP, and WS should work together to use their expertise, science, and experience to establish a hunting season(s) in Montana that will both maintain and help control the population.	USFWS, FWP, AND WS SHOULD WORK TOGETHER TO USE THEIR EXPERTISE, SCIENCE, AND EXPERIENCE TO ESTABLISH A HUNTING SEASON OR SEASON IN MONTANA THAT WILL BOTH MAINTAIN AND HELP CONTROL THE POPULATION. CHAD AND TRINA VOTE YES, MICHELE VOTES NO. WILL NEED COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND WILL PROBABLY NOT COME TO CONSENSUS.	Role of Hunting	
		NEW RECOMMENDATION	Expanding people populations and development with zoning regs for new developments that require the clustering of homes together leaving open space for willdlife corridors and fire breaks where developments border public lands. COUNCIL DISCUSSION - PROBABLY WON'T COME TO CONSENSUS.		
		NEW RECOMMENDATION	Agencies should not use helicopters to re-locate, collar or do research on grizzlies in Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas. Collar tolemitry should be limited to fixed wing planes. It should limit the use of helicopters to re-locate bears in other areas. CHAD AND TRINA VOTE NO, MICHELE VOTES YES.		