

222313 bear cubs with radio collars

Tuesday, November 27, 2018
12:51 PM

Subject	222313 bear cubs with radio collars
From	s.22
To	Minister, FLNR FLNR:EX
Sent	Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:15 PM

Sir

Please explain to me by what perverted logic it is acceptable to force the North Island Wildlife Recovery Centre to pay the \$10,000 - \$12,000 that it will take to purchase and install radio collars on the two bear cubs, when it is the government that is making this a requirement.

I am formally requesting a response to this letter.

s.22

FW: Government to cheap to help study bears??

Tuesday, November 27, 2018
12:50 PM

Subject	FW: Government to cheap to help study bears??
From	Thomson.MLA, Steve LASS:EX
To	Minister, FLNR FLNR:EX
Sent	Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:29 AM

From s.22

Sent: May 23, 2016 3:13 PM

To: Thomson.MLA, Steve <Steve.Thomson.MLA@leg.bc.ca>

Subject: Government to cheap to help study bears??

Mr. Thomson:

I am appalled and disgusted at this....and I can tell you I am not voting Liberal in the next election if for no other reason the way this government treats our wildlife. First it was disgusting Bryce Casavant was persecuted for SAVING BEARS and now you want the rescue to pay for tracking collars????

B.C. government orders wildlife rehabber to collar controversial bear cubs at own expense

Next election...I will be campaigning my butt off to ensure you people are out. Grizzly hunting, killing wolves, doing NOTHING to help save our wildlife. You are sickening. You are appalling.

And obviously our wildlife doesn't get treated any better than injured workers in that 'at arms length to government' corrupt and lying WorkSafe BC.

the Lieberals certainly prove this quote to be true:

If you have men who will exclude any of God's creatures from the shelter of compassion and pity, you will have men who will deal likewise with their fellow men.

Francis of Assisi

Sincerely,

s.22

222394 GPS collars for North Island Wildlife Recovery Centre cubs

Tuesday, November 27, 2018
12:52 PM

Subject	222394 GPS collars for North Island Wildlife Recovery Centre cubs
From	s.22
To	Minister, FLNR FLNR:EX
Cc	wildlife@niwra.org
Sent	Thursday, May 26, 2016 1:47 PM

To the Honourable Steve Thomson:

I recently read with disbelief that your ministry is requiring the non-profit organization North Island Wildlife Recovery Centre to pay for GPS collars for the two bear cubs Conservation Office Bryce Casavant refused to kill on July 5, 2015.

This move on your department's part appears extremely petty and vindictive.

As these collars are very expensive, if your ministry wants to collar these two cubs it should darn well pay for them instead of the NIWRC having to fund-raise for them.

I sincerely hope that you will reconsider this action, and show some maturity in dealing with this matter.

Sincerely,

s.22

Radio collars on 2 bears

Tuesday, November 27, 2018
12:53 PM

Subject	Radio collars on 2 bears
From	s.22
To	Minister, FLNR FLNR:EX
Sent	Friday, June 3, 2016 3:45 PM

Steve Thomson

After learning about the radio collars being ordered for the two bear cubs at the North Island Rehabilitation facility, I feel compelled to respond. It's blatantly obvious that the Ministry is still discriminating against these 2 cubs. If the province has a desire to track bears post release then create a policy and implement a plan of action. That would be the prudent thing to do. I strongly disagreed with your ministries handling of this incident right from the start. You hired experts and then tell them how to do their job. If you are just going to shoot every animal that ventures into human settlement areas then there won't be any black bears left to debate over. I do know the specifics of this case "file" and agree that Bryce Casavant made the appropriate professional call. His manager could have respected that decision because Bryce was the one in the field. It is infuriating that he was disciplined for being insubordinate for doing his job, which includes making judgement calls. The fact that he transferred out of your department speaks for itself. I admire him for sticking to his convictions. It cost him dearly. He changed jobs and moved to a new town. How strongly do you hold your own convictions?

I myself have wondered what happens to bears once they are released. I believe the province could manage this. Similar to the collaring of grizzlies. By failing to take on this responsibility the province remains blind to much important information that would most definitely help tailor future management practices.

They do put ear tags in so that there is some way to keep track of them. But, this only helps identify them if they come in to conflict with humans or are shot and killed. The government already has the expertise and system in place to deal with collaring wildlife. The argument that they are not endangered and so don't deserve monitoring is a mute point.

If you want the bears collared then take responsibility for it.

Its pathetic and embarrassing that your Ministry is willing to bully a non-profit that got stuck in the middle of this issue into collaring just those two bears. It's discrimination. Shame on you.

And what happens if the bears are successful? Will who ever made this call resign or be fired?

Unfortunately not likely.

Disgruntled voter,

s.22

Sent from my iPad

222394 - response from Sean Pendergast

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

1:34 PM

Subject	222394 - response from Sean Pendergast
From	Correspondence Serv. Sectn, FLNR:EX
To	
Sent	

From: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2016 3:12 PM

To: s.22

Subject: 222394 GPS collars for North Island Wildlife Recovery Centre cubs

Ref:222394

Good afternoon s.22

I have been forwarded your email for reply. Perhaps you would want to call me to discuss instead? If so my number is 250 751 3225. If you would still prefer a written response I can provide that instead.

Thank you,

Sean Pendergast RPBio

A/Section Head | Fish & Wildlife Section

From: s.22

Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2016 1:48 PM

To: Minister, FLNR FLNR:EX

Cc: wildlife@niwra.org

Subject: 222394 GPS collars for North Island Wildlife Recovery Centre cubs

To the Honourable Steve Thomson:

I recently read with disbelief that your ministry is requiring the non-profit organization North Island Wildlife Recovery Centre to pay for GPS collars for the two bear cubs Conservation Office Bryce Casavant refused to kill on July 5, 2015.

This move on your department's part appears extremely petty and vindictive.

As these collars are very expensive, if your ministry wants to collar these two cubs it should darn well pay for them instead of the NIWRC having to fund-raise for them.

I sincerely hope that you will reconsider this action, and show some maturity in dealing with this matter.

Sincerely,

s.22

222735 - response from Sean Pendergast

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

1:32 PM

Subject	222735 - response from Sean Pendergast
From	Correspondence Serv. Sectn, FLNR:EX
To	
Sent	

-----Original Message-----

From: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2016 3:10 PM

To: s.22

Subject: RE: Radio collars on 2 bears

Ref:222735

Good afternoon s.22

I have been forwarded your email for reply. Perhaps you would want to call me to discuss instead? If so my number is 250 751 3225. If you would still prefer a written response I can provide that instead.

Thank you,

Sean Pendergast RPBio

A/Section Head | Fish & Wildlife Section

-----Original Message-----

From: s.22

Sent: Friday, June 3, 2016 3:46 PM

To: Minister, FLNR FLNR:EX

Subject: Radio collars on 2 bears

Steve Thomson

After learning about the radio collars being ordered for the two bear cubs at the North Island Rehabilitation facility, I feel compelled to respond. It's blatantly obvious that the Ministry is still discriminating against these 2 cubs. If the province has a desire to track bears post release then create a policy and implement a plan of action. That would be the prudent thing to do. I strongly disagreed with your ministries handling of this incident right from the start. You hired experts and then tell them how to do their job. If you are just going to shoot every animal that ventures into human settlement areas then there won't be any black bears left to debate over. I do know the specifics of this case "file" and agree that Bryce Casavant made the appropriate professional call. His manager could have respected that decision because Bryce was the one in the field. It is infuriating that he was disciplined for being insubordinate for doing his job, which includes making judgement calls. The fact that he transferred out of your department speaks for itself. I admire him for sticking to his convictions. It cost him dearly. He changed jobs and moved to a new town. How strongly do you hold your own convictions?

I myself have wondered what happens to bears once they are released. I believe the province could manage this. Similar to the collaring of grizzlies. By failing to take on this responsibility the province

remains blind to much important information that would most definitely help tailor future management practices.

They do put ear tags in so that there is some way to keep track of them. But, this only helps identify them if they come in to conflict with humans or are shot and killed. The government already has the expertise and system in place to deal with collaring wildlife. The argument that they are not endangered and so don't deserve monitoring is a mute point.

If you want the bears collared then take responsibility for it.

Its pathetic and embarrassing that your Ministry is willing to bully a non-profit that got stuck in the middle of this issue into collaring just those two bears. It's discrimination. Shame on you.

And what happens if the bears are successful? Will who ever made this call resign or be fired?

Unfortunately not likely.

Disgruntled voter,

s.22

Sent from my iPad

222313 - incoming

Tuesday, November 27, 2018
1:33 PM

Subject	222313 - incoming
From	Correspondence Serv. Sectn, FLNR:EX
To	
Sent	

From: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2016 11:03 AM
To: s.22

Subject: bear cubs with radio collars

Ref 222313

Good Morning s.22

Your inquiry has been forwarded to me for a response. Perhaps you would like to discuss on the phone instead? If so my number is 250 751 3225. If you would still prefer a written response I can provide that instead.

Thank you,

Sean Pendergast RPBio

A/Section Head | Fish & Wildlife Section

From: s.22

Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:16 PM

To: Minister, FLNR FLNR:EX

Subject: 222313 bear cubs with radio collars

Sir

Please explain to me by what perverted logic it is acceptable to force the North Island Wildlife Recovery Centre to pay the \$10,000 - \$12,000 that it will take to purchase and install radio collars on the two bear cubs, when it is the government that is making this a requirement.

I am formally requesting a response to this letter.

s.22

s.22
222374 - and Pendergast June 10 email exchange

Tuesday, November 27, 2018
1:00 PM

Subject	222374 s.22 and Pendergast June 10 email exchange
From	Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX
To	s.22
Sent	Friday, June 10, 2016 1:04 PM

s.22

Thank you for your reply. You are obviously very passionate about the wellbeing of wildlife in our province. I applaud you for that. Perhaps if you could give me a call we can discuss this among other issues regarding wildlife in BC and how it is managed. In particular, the specifics around the raise and release programs that are established for orphaned wildlife and specifically black bears. The media has not done a good job presenting all the facts in this case. I would like to let you know that the Province provides money to study and monitor our wildlife resources in various ways, although it is often not sufficient in all cases.

I find phone conversations to be much more productive when discussing these issues rather than over email. If you are willing to provide your phone number I can call you if you would prefer.

Thank you again for your opinions on this matter,

Sean Pendergast RPBio

A/Section Head | Fish & Wildlife Section

From: s.22

Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 12:56 PM

To: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

Subject: RE: Bear cubs to radio collar

Hi Sean,

I feel very strongly that our government should be spending some money to help wildlife rescues like Northern Lights and paying for the radio collars to learn how these rescues and rehabs work out.

So thank you for responding to me email. But unless our government is willing to give some of our money to this, there is likely not much you can say.

This is our BC wildlife that **does bring in a lot of money in hunting licenses and tourism** and I feel some of that should be going to save wildlife and help them survive.

Scientists have signed the Cambridge Declaration that says all these animals are sentient and as with it as us....they are not just lifeless resources to be used and exploited.

I don't feel our government wildlife policies and exploitation reflects the science either.

"Prominent scientists sign declaration that animals have conscious awareness, just like us"

An international group of prominent scientists has signed The Cambridge Declaration on Consciousness in which they are proclaiming their support for the idea that animals are conscious and aware to the degree that humans are — a list of animals that includes all mammals, birds, and even the octopus. But will this make us stop treating these animals in totally inhumane ways?

<http://io9.gizmodo.com/5937356/prominent-scientists-sign-declaration-that-animals-have-conscious-awareness-just-like-us>

Sincerely,
s.22

From: Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca

To: Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca

Subject: Bear cubs to radio collar

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 2016 18:48:33 +0000

Good Morning,

I am sending this email to follow up on a letter you sent to the Minister of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations recently. In my previous email I raised the question of having a phone conversation to discuss the matter of collaring two bears that have gone through the raise and release program at the North Island Wildlife Recovery Association. I have not heard back from you with regards to having this discussion. If you would like to discuss this matter over the phone please call me on my direct line at 250 751 3225. If you would prefer a written response to your inquiry, please let me know at your earliest convenience and I will respond in writing.

Sincerely,

Sean

~~~~~



**Sean Pendergast, RPBio**

A/Section Head | Recreational Fisheries & Wildlife Programs

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations | West Coast Region

2080-A Labieux Road | Nanaimo, BC, V9T 6J6 | ☎ (250) 751-3225 | 📠 (250) 751-7224

Switch board (250) 751-7220 | ✉ [Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)

~~~~~

222394 FW: Bear cubs to radio collar

Tuesday, November 27, 2018
12:59 PM

Subject	222394 FW: Bear cubs to radio collar
From	Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX
To	s.22
Sent	Friday, June 10, 2016 12:52 PM

Good Morning,

I am sending this email to follow up on a letter you sent to the Minister of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations recently. In my previous email I raised the question of having a phone conversation to discuss the matter of collaring two bears that have gone through the raise and release program at the North Island Wildlife Recovery Association. I have not heard back from you with regards to having this discussion. If you would like to discuss this matter over the phone please call me on my direct line at 250 751 3225. If you would prefer a written response to your inquiry, please let me know at your earliest convenience and I will respond in writing.

Sincerely,
Sean



Sean Pendergast, RPBio

A/Section Head | Recreational Fisheries & Wildlife Programs
Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations | West Coast Region
2080-A Labieux Road | Nanaimo, BC, V9T 6J6 | ☎ (250) 751-3225 | 📠 (250) 751-7224
Switch board (250) 751-7220 | ✉ Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca

~~~~~

# bear cub in Rivers inlet

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

1:02 PM

|         |                                               |
|---------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>bear cub in Rivers inlet</b>               |
| From    | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX                      |
| To      | Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX |
| Cc      | Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX                      |
| Sent    | Friday, November 17, 2017 3:59 PM             |

Anyone feel like offering to pay for a flight to get a CO to Rivers inlet to retrieve a black bear cub that has been captured by members of the community and RCMP and is being housed in a dog crate at the moment? Apparently about \$900 to get a charter flight there, get it in an appropriate holding crate and get it to a rehab center for assessment.



## Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations | West Coast Region

2080-A Labieux Road | Nanaimo, BC, V9T 6J9 | ☎ (250) 751-3225 | 📠 (250) 751-3103

Switch board (250) 751-7220 | ✉ [Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)

~~~~~


FW: bear cub in Rivers inlet

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

1:04 PM

Subject	FW: bear cub in Rivers inlet
From	Barr, Larry FLNR:EX
To	Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX
Sent	Friday, November 17, 2017 4:02 PM

Do you believe that this is worthwhile?

Larry Barr P. Agr.

Director, Resource Management

West Coast Region

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development

2080 Labieux Road

Nanaimo BC V9T 6J9

ph: 250-751-7105

fax: 250-751-3103

Switch Board: 250-751-7220

Email: Larry.Barr@gov.bc.ca



From: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 3:59 PM

To: Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX

Cc: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

Subject: bear cub in Rivers inlet

Anyone feel like offering to pay for a flight to get a CO to Rivers inlet to retrieve a black bear cub that has been captured by members of the community and RCMP and is being housed in a dog crate at the moment? Apparently about \$900 to get a charter flight there, get it in an appropriate holding crate and get it to a rehab center for assessment.



Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations | West Coast Region

2080-A Labieux Road | Nanaimo, BC, V9T 6J9 | ☎ (250) 751-3225 | 📠 (250) 751-3103

Switch board (250) 751-7220 | 📧 Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca

RE: bear cub in Rivers inlet

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

1:04 PM

Subject	RE: bear cub in Rivers inlet
From	Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX
To	Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX
Sent	Friday, November 17, 2017 4:08 PM

The cub is captured and is going to be put into a shed for the weekend. Weather is not allowing flights from what Jon says.

From: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 3:59 PM

To: Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX

Cc: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

Subject: bear cub in Rivers inlet

Anyone feel like offering to pay for a flight to get a CO to Rivers inlet to retrieve a black bear cub that has been captured by members of the community and RCMP and is being housed in a dog crate at the moment? Apparently about \$900 to get a charter flight there, get it in an appropriate holding crate and get it to a rehab center for assessment.



Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations | West Coast Region

2080-A Labieux Road | Nanaimo, BC, V9T 6J9 | ☎ (250) 751-3225 | 📠 (250) 751-3103

Switch board (250) 751-7220 | 📧 Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca

~~~~~

## RE: bear cub in Rivers inlet

Tuesday, November 27, 2018  
1:12 PM

|         |                                                                         |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | RE: bear cub in Rivers inlet                                            |
| From    | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX                                                |
| To      | Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Friday, November 17, 2017 4:19 PM                                       |

OK – he is going to check with the float plane company and see what they say. I just spoke with him again as well.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, November 17, 2017 4:08 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: bear cub in Rivers inlet

The cub is captured and is going to be put into a shed for the weekend. Weather is not allowing flights from what Jon says.

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, November 17, 2017 3:59 PM

**To:** Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX

**Cc:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Subject:** bear cub in Rivers inlet

Anyone feel like offering to pay for a flight to get a CO to Rivers inlet to retrieve a black bear cub that has been captured by members of the community and RCMP and is being housed in a dog crate at the moment? Apparently about \$900 to get a charter flight there, get it in an appropriate holding crate and get it to a rehab center for assessment.



Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations | West Coast Region

2080-A Labieux Road | Nanaimo, BC, V9T 6J9 | ☎ (250) 751-3225 | 📠 (250) 751-3103

Switch board (250) 751-7220 | ✉ [Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)

~~~~~

RE: bear cub in Rivers inlet

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

1:03 PM

Subject	RE: bear cub in Rivers inlet
From	Wood, Mary E CSNR:EX
To	Barr, Larry FLNR:EX
Sent	Friday, November 17, 2017 4:01 PM

That would work

Mary Wood - Financial Analyst

West Coast Region, Nanaimo

Corporate Services for the Natural Resource Ministries

Phone: (250) 751-3192 Fax: (250) 751-3207

From: Barr, Larry FLNR:EX

Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 4:01 PM

To: Wood, Mary E CSNR:EX

Subject: FW: bear cub in Rivers inlet

My thoughts are to use the seed money.

Would that work?

Larry Barr P. Agr.

Director, Resource Management

West Coast Region

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development

2080 Labieux Road

Nanaimo BC V9T 6J9

ph: 250-751-7105

fax: 250-751-3103

Switch Board: 250-751-7220

Email: Larry.Barr@gov.bc.ca



From: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 3:59 PM

To: Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX

Cc: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

Subject: bear cub in Rivers inlet

Anyone feel like offering to pay for a flight to get a CO to Rivers inlet to retrieve a black bear cub that has been captured by members of the community and RCMP and is being housed in a dog crate at the moment? Apparently about \$900 to get a charter flight there, get it in an appropriate holding crate and get it to a rehab center for assessment.



Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations | West Coast Region

2080-A Labieux Road | Nanaimo, BC, V9T 6J9 | ☎ (250) 751-3225 | 📠 (250) 751-3103

Switch board (250) 751-7220 | ✉ Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca

RE: bear cub in Rivers inlet

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

1:13 PM

Subject	RE: bear cub in Rivers inlet
From	Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX
To	Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX
Cc	Barr, Larry FLNR:EX
Sent	Friday, November 24, 2017 10:30 AM

Hi Sean,

Is there an update regarding this bear cub?

Was the bear transported to an animal care facility? When? What CO was involved? Was there a health assessment? What is the final cost for transporting?

Thanks,

Mike

From: Barr, Larry FLNR:EX

Sent: Friday, November 24, 2017 10:24 AM

To: Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX

Subject: FW: bear cub in Rivers inlet

Do you have an update?

Larry Barr P. Agr.

Director, Resource Management

West Coast Region

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development

2080 Labieux Road

Nanaimo BC V9T 6J9

ph: 250-751-7105

fax: 250-751-3103

Switch Board: 250-751-7220

Email: Larry.Barr@gov.bc.ca



From: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 4:20 PM

To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX

Subject: RE: bear cub in Rivers inlet

OK – he is going to check with the float plane company and see what they say. I just spoke with him again as well.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 4:08 PM

To: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX

Subject: RE: bear cub in Rivers inlet

The cub is captured and is going to be put into a shed for the weekend. Weather is not allowing flights from what Jon says.

From: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 3:59 PM

To: Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX

Cc: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

Subject: bear cub in Rivers inlet

Anyone feel like offering to pay for a flight to get a CO to Rivers inlet to retrieve a black bear cub that

has been captured by members of the community and RCMP and is being housed in a dog crate at the moment? Apparently about \$900 to get a charter flight there, get it in an appropriate holding crate and get it to a rehab center for assessment.



Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations | West Coast Region

2080-A Labieux Road | Nanaimo, BC, V9T 6J9 | ☎ (250) 751-3225 | 📠 (250) 751-3103

Switch board (250) 751-7220 | ✉ Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca

~~~~~

## FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

1:14 PM

|         |                                               |
|---------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary</b>             |
| From    | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX                      |
| To      | Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Monday, November 27, 2017 2:41 PM             |

Should have sent this to each of you as well.

I believe the final cost to get there and back was around 1000 (taxes etc) . CO Paquin put it on his BMO and will JV accordingly.

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2017 9:46 AM

**To:** Newton, Mike C ENV:EX; Paquin, Jonathan ENV:EX

**Cc:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Guys, here is the update from the Rivers Inlet cub. We will have to wait and see if the eye is compromised to determine releasable or not.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** Sunday, November 19, 2017 7:00 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell'

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

On November 19, 2017, we immobilized and examined the orphaned male black bear cub which originated from Rivers Inlet and was presented to NIWRA on the evening of November 18, 2017. I suspect you are probably more familiar with this bear's prior history than I am.

The cub was in poor body condition (15.2 kg), but I would not describe him as being emaciated. He lacked fat reserves, but seemed to exhibit reasonable muscle mass. Despite being held for a period of time prior to initial presentation his hydration was good. Most significantly, the cub was suffering from facial injuries which included a 3 cm irregular, deep penetrating wound on the dorsal muzzle. This wound was probed and it appeared to affect the cranial portion of the nasal bones and the adjacent soft tissues . A very small (4 mm x 2mm) shard of bone was removed, but the remaining boney structure of the nasal and incisive bones appeared to be mostly intact or at least stabilized by the surrounding soft tissues. Lateral and DV radiographs of the skull possibly indicated some damage to the nasal bones, but this was not considered to be significant in terms of overt displacement or dysfunction at this time. There was also a 1 cm deep laceration over the left eye. The left upper and lower eyelids were significantly swollen (think Rocky Balboa), and there was also a very severe conjunctivitis. The left eyelid swelling and conjunctivitis prevented good assessment of the surface of the left eyeball, only 2 mm of which could be properly visualized. The crowns of the right upper and lower deciduous canines were also fractured. The CO's suspected that this cub had been attacked by dog(s). I think the injuries are consistent with this, I would imagine that bears would have inflicted much more damage.

The cub was treated with long acting antibiotics, ophthalmic ointment, and subcutaneous fluids, and marked with a transponder.

Once it had recovered from the effects of the immobilization drugs, the bear was quite active and inquisitive in its enclosure and ate as soon as it was presented with food.

The main concerns at this point are possible infection of its wounds, particularly the muzzle wound which is deep and poorly drained (contamination could result in osteomyelitis and devitalized pieces of bone could result in sequestra), and the integrity of the left eye. Hopefully the swelling will subside sufficiently for a better assessment of the eye in the days to come. If the integrity of the eye is compromised I would not consider this bear to be suitable for release. This cub will be keep

isolated until its wounds and left eye have been properly evaluated and / or resolved. If this bear is put with any other bears we will visually mark it (i.e. with hair dye), but we will consult with you before any decisions about this bear's management or future are made.

I will visually reassess this cub on Wednesday, and will let you know the results.

Cheers,

s.22

P.S. Mike Newton indicated that the CO's wanted to be updated, but I do not have their contact information.

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** November 16, 2017 11:46 PM

**To:** 'Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX' <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)>

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell' .s.22

**Subject:** NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

Here is an Excel spreadsheet summarizing the bear cubs that have been presented to NIWRA in 2017 (currently there are seven in total). All of these bears have been recently immobilized and examined and all are physically healthy. I have marked all but one with transponders. As it stands right now, six of the bears are release candidates (contingent upon continuation of their ongoing physical health and upon their display of appropriate behaviors). In the near future we will be confirming a budget for collars to monitor at least some of these bears post-release. I will keep you in the loop as this develops.

In my opinion, the seventh bear cub is non-releasable. Below is a summary of her history and clinical presentation. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

s.22

On the evening of July 10, 2017, the Campbell River Conservation Officer Service presented a female Black Bear cub to the North Island Wildlife Recovery Association. There was minimal history associated with this cub except that it was discovered alone along the Island Highway, approximately three kilometers south of Woss. At the time of initial presentation, she was extremely emaciated, unsteady on her feet, and demonstrated a slight head tilt with subtle tremors. The bear was obviously suffering from prolonged malnutrition, which may have been exacerbated by recent head trauma. Due to its poor condition, the cub was kept isolated and provided with supportive care by Robin Campbell (who acted as the bear's sole caregiver), which primarily involved intensive nutritional support. From the outset, the bear demonstrated a reasonable appetite and soon began regaining weight. However, its behavior was quite abnormal, and it seemed to exhibit some level of visual and cognitive impairment. The cub was markedly passive and unresponsive, and it failed to demonstrate any aggression or fear towards people, even when it was approached or touched. It would only vocalize when it was apparently hungry. It spent a lot of time recumbent and was often reluctant to move. Its movements were un-coordinated and sluggish, and it walked with a very slow, unbalanced, and exaggerated gait. Initially the cub also seemed to show limited interest in its immediate environment, including the enrichment items in its enclosure. In early August the cub, after being heat stressed, was observed to have a short (20 to 30 second) grand mal seizure in which she fell and exhibited limb extension and an arched back and neck. Following this episode, she was weak and ataxic for several hours. Another seizure was observed a week later when the cub was being herded into its inside enclosure. Although subsequent seizures were not observed, the bear did exhibit a few episodes of lethargy, inappetence, and ataxia, which may have signaled the aftermath of additional seizures.

I first observed this bear cub on September 1, and found her to be in good body condition, but relatively slow moving, almost clumsy, and poorly responsive to my presence. She did not demonstrate any aggression or fear. Her behavior and demeanor could best be described as that of a very old, visually and acoustically impaired, pet dog. Robin Campbell continued to work with this bear cub and over the next several weeks she seemed to exhibit improved co-ordination and activity, increased interest and interaction with in her surroundings (for example, chewing on furniture logs and using her water pool), and a more dynamic response to people. I re-examined this cub on November 20. Upon entering the enclosure, the cub's awareness and movements were noticeably improved (quicker and more fluid) and she behaved evasively. With more than anticipated difficulty (the bear struggled and vocalized throughout) it was captured in a net and



immobilized by hand injection. The cub was examined, identified with a transponder (00-07B0-F393, behind left pinna), and blood was taken for hematology and serology. The cub was in very good body condition and the physical examination and bloodwork did not reveal any specific abnormalities, except for an elevated creatine kinase attributed to her struggling during capture and subsequent intramuscular injections. The cub was moved to a larger enclosure and has been observed on camera showing increased interest and interaction with her surroundings and a greater range of behavioral repertoires including territorial marking and prolonged and self initiated play with apples, balls, water, logs, etc. No seizures or their aftermath have been recently observed. Although this bear has improved markedly from initial presentation, and appears to be fundamentally healthy and well adjusted to her current surroundings, I feel that her history of neurological problems, the possibility of residual cognitive impairment, and her high level of habituation while in care, preclude her from being released to the wild. However, I do feel that her current health and temperament make her a suitable candidate for being maintained as a non-releasable wildlife resident at NIWRA.

## Fwd: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Tuesday, November 27, 2018  
1:15 PM

|         |                                    |
|---------|------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>Fwd: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary</b> |
| From    | Barr, Larry FLNR:EX                |
| To      | Wood, Mary E CSNR:EX               |
| Sent    | Monday, November 27, 2017 3:00 PM  |

FYI

Sent from my iPhone  
Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX" <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)>  
**Date:** November 27, 2017 at 2:41:57 PM PST  
**To:** "Barr, Larry FLNR:EX" <[Larry.Barr@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Larry.Barr@gov.bc.ca)>, "Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX" <[Mike.Stalberg@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Mike.Stalberg@gov.bc.ca)>  
**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Should have sent this to each of you as well.  
I believe the final cost to get there and back was around 1000 (taxes etc) . CO Paquin put it on his BMO and will JV accordingly.

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX  
**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2017 9:46 AM  
**To:** Newton, Mike C ENV:EX; Paquin, Jonathan ENV:EX  
**Cc:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX  
**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Guys, here is the update from the Rivers Inlet cub. We will have to wait and see if the eye is compromised to determine releasable or not.

Sean Pendergast RPBio  
Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** s.22  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 19, 2017 7:00 PM  
**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX  
**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell'  
**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

On November 19, 2017, we immobilized and examined the orphaned male black bear cub which originated from Rivers Inlet and was presented to NIWRA on the evening of November 18, 2017. I suspect you are probably more familiar with this bear's prior history than I am. The cub was in poor body condition (15.2 kg), but I would not describe him as being emaciated. He lacked fat reserves, but seemed to exhibit reasonable muscle mass. Despite being held for a period of time prior to initial presentation his hydration was good. Most significantly, the cub was suffering from facial injuries which included a 3 cm irregular, deep penetrating wound on the dorsal muzzle. This wound was probed and it appeared to affect the cranial portion of the nasal bones and the adjacent soft tissues . A very small (4 mm x 2mm) shard of bone was removed, but the remaining boney structure of the nasal and incisive bones appeared to be mostly intact or at least stabilized by the surrounding soft tissues. Lateral and DV radiographs of the skull possibly indicated some damage to the nasal bones, but this was not considered to be significant in terms of overt displacement or dysfunction at this time. There was also a 1 cm deep laceration over the left eye. The left upper and lower eyelids were significantly swollen (think Rocky Balboa), and there was also a very severe conjunctivitis. The left eyelid swelling and conjunctivitis prevented good assessment of the surface of the left

eyeball, only 2 mm of which could be properly visualized. The crowns of the right upper and lower deciduous canines were also fractured. The CO's suspected that this cub had been attacked by dog(s). I think the injuries are consistent with this, I would imagine that bears would have inflicted much more damage.

The cub was treated with long acting antibiotics, ophthalmic ointment, and subcutaneous fluids, and marked with a transponder.

Once it had recovered from the effects of the immobilization drugs, the bear was quite active and inquisitive in its enclosure and ate as soon as it was presented with food.

The main concerns at this point are possible infection of its wounds, particularly the muzzle wound which is deep and poorly drained (contamination could result in osteomyelitis and devitalized pieces of bone could result in sequestra), and the integrity of the left eye.

Hopefully the swelling will subside sufficiently for a better assessment of the eye in the days to come. If the integrity of the eye is compromised I would not consider this bear to be suitable for release. This cub will be kept isolated until its wounds and left eye have been properly evaluated and / or resolved. If this bear is put with any other bears we will visually mark it (i.e. with hair dye), but we will consult with you before any decisions about this bear's management or future are made.

I will visually reassess this cub on Wednesday, and will let you know the results.

Cheers,

s.22

P.S. Mike Newton indicated that the CO's wanted to be updated, but I do not have their contact information.

**From** s.22

**Sent:** November 16, 2017 11:46 PM

**To:** 'Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX' <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)>

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell' s.22

**Subject:** NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

Here is an Excel spreadsheet summarizing the bear cubs that have been presented to NIWRA in 2017 (currently there are seven in total). All of these bears have been recently immobilized and examined and all are physically healthy. I have marked all but one with transponders. As it stands right now, six of the bears are release candidates (contingent upon continuation of their ongoing physical health and upon their display of appropriate behaviors). In the near future we will be confirming a budget for collars to monitor at least some of these bears post-release. I will keep you in the loop as this develops.

In my opinion, the seventh bear cub is non-releasable. Below is a summary of her history and clinical presentation. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

s.22

On the evening of July 10, 2017, the Campbell River Conservation Officer Service presented a female Black Bear cub to the North Island Wildlife Recovery Association. There was minimal history associated with this cub except that it was discovered alone along the Island Highway, approximately three kilometers south of Woss. At the time of initial presentation, she was extremely emaciated, unsteady on her feet, and demonstrated a slight head tilt with subtle tremors. The bear was obviously suffering from prolonged malnutrition, which may have been exacerbated by recent head trauma. Due to its poor condition, the cub was kept isolated and provided with supportive care by Robin Campbell (who acted as the bear's sole caregiver), which primarily involved intensive nutritional support. From the outset, the bear demonstrated a reasonable appetite and soon began regaining weight. However, its behavior was quite abnormal, and it seemed to exhibit some level of visual and cognitive impairment. The cub was markedly passive and unresponsive, and it failed to demonstrate any aggression or fear towards people, even when it was approached or touched. It would only vocalize when it was apparently hungry. It spent a lot of time recumbent and was often reluctant to move. Its movements were un-coordinated and sluggish, and it walked with a very slow, unbalanced, and exaggerated gait. Initially the cub also seemed to show limited interest in its immediate environment, including the enrichment items in its enclosure. In early August the cub, after being heat stressed, was observed to have a short (20 to 30 second) grand mal seizure in

which she fell and exhibited limb extension and an arched back and neck. Following this episode, she was weak and ataxic for several hours. Another seizure was observed a week later when the cub was being herded into its inside enclosure. Although subsequent seizures were not observed, the bear did exhibit a few episodes of lethargy, inappetence, and ataxia, which may have signaled the aftermath of additional seizures.

I first observed this bear cub on September 1, and found her to be in good body condition, but relatively slow moving, almost clumsy, and poorly responsive to my presence. She did not demonstrate any aggression or fear. Her behavior and demeanor could best be described as that of a very old, visually and acoustically impaired, pet dog. Robin Campbell continued to work with this bear cub and over the next several weeks she seemed to exhibit improved coordination and activity, increased interest and interaction with in her surroundings (for example, chewing on furniture logs and using her water pool), and a more dynamic response to people. I re-examined this cub on November 20. Upon entering the enclosure, the cub's awareness and movements were noticeably improved (quicker and more fluid) and she behaved evasively. With more than anticipated difficulty (the bear struggled and vocalized throughout) it was captured in a net and immobilized by hand injection. The cub was examined, identified with a transponder (00-07B0-F393, behind left pinna), and blood was taken for hematology and serology. The cub was in very good body condition and the physical examination and bloodwork did not reveal any specific abnormalities, except for an elevated creatine kinase attributed to her struggling during capture and subsequent intramuscular injections. The cub was moved to a larger enclosure and has been observed on camera showing increased interest and interaction with her surroundings and a greater range of behavioral repertoires including territorial marking and prolonged and self initiated play with apples, balls, water, logs, etc. No seizures or their aftermath have been recently observed. Although this bear has improved markedly from initial presentation, and appears to be fundamentally healthy and well adjusted to her current surroundings, I feel that her history of neurological problems, the possibility of residual cognitive impairment, and her high level of habituation while in care, preclude her from being released to the wild. However, I do feel that her current health and temperament make her a suitable candidate for being maintained as a non-releasable wildlife resident at NIWRA.

## RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Tuesday, November 27, 2018  
1:16 PM

|         |                                   |
|---------|-----------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary</b> |
| From    | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX          |
| To      | Barr, Larry FLNR:EX               |
| Sent    | Monday, November 27, 2017 3:02 PM |

It is getting another assessment tomorrow to see if its eye is damaged or not. The swelling looks to have gone down enough that the vet will be able to see it now. I will let you know what he finds out.  
Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Barr, Larry FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 27, 2017 3:00 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** Re: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Do you know how the cub is doing?

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 27, 2017, at 2:41 PM, Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

Should have sent this to each of you as well.

I believe the final cost to get there and back was around 1000 (taxes etc) . CO Paquin put it on his BMO and will JV accordingly.

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2017 9:46 AM

**To:** Newton, Mike C ENV:EX; Paquin, Jonathan ENV:EX

**Cc:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Guys, here is the update from the Rivers Inlet cub. We will have to wait and see if the eye is compromised to determine releasable or not.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** Sunday, November 19, 2017 7:00 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell'

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

On November 19, 2017, we immobilized and examined the orphaned male black bear cub which originated from Rivers Inlet and was presented to NIWRA on the evening of November 18, 2017. I suspect you are probably more familiar with this bear's prior history than I am. The cub was in poor body condition (15.2 kg), but I would not describe him as being emaciated. He lacked fat reserves, but seemed to exhibit reasonable muscle mass. Despite being held for a period of time prior to initial presentation his hydration was good. Most significantly, the cub was suffering from facial injuries which included a 3 cm irregular, deep penetrating wound on the dorsal muzzle. This wound was probed and it appeared to affect the cranial portion of the nasal bones and the adjacent soft tissues . A very small (4 mm x 2mm) shard of bone was removed, but the remaining boney structure of the nasal and incise bones appeared to be mostly intact or at least stabilized by the surrounding soft tissues. Lateral and DV radiographs of the skull possibly indicated some damage to the nasal bones, but this was not considered to be significant in terms of overt displacement or dysfunction at this time. There was also a 1 cm deep laceration over the left eye. The left upper and lower eyelids were

significantly swollen (think Rocky Balboa), and there was also a very severe conjunctivitis. The left eyelid swelling and conjunctivitis prevented good assessment of the surface of the left eyeball, only 2 mm of which could be properly visualized. The crowns of the right upper and lower deciduous canines were also fractured. The CO's suspected that this cub had been attacked by dog(s). I think the injuries are consistent with this, I would imagine that bears would have inflicted much more damage.

The cub was treated with long acting antibiotics, ophthalmic ointment, and subcutaneous fluids, and marked with a transponder.

Once it had recovered from the effects of the immobilization drugs, the bear was quite active and inquisitive in its enclosure and ate as soon as it was presented with food.

The main concerns at this point are possible infection of its wounds, particularly the muzzle wound which is deep and poorly drained (contamination could result in osteomyelitis and devitalized pieces of bone could result in sequestra), and the integrity of the left eye.

Hopefully the swelling will subside sufficiently for a better assessment of the eye in the days to come. If the integrity of the eye is compromised I would not consider this bear to be suitable for release. This cub will be kept isolated until its wounds and left eye have been properly evaluated and / or resolved. If this bear is put with any other bears we will visually mark it (i.e. with hair dye), but we will consult with you before any decisions about this bear's management or future are made.

I will visually reassess this cub on Wednesday, and will let you know the results.

Cheers,

s.22

P.S. Mike Newton indicated that the CO's wanted to be updated, but I do not have their contact information.

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** November 16, 2017 11:46 PM

**To:** 'Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX' <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)>

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell' <s.22>

**Subject:** NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

Here is an Excel spreadsheet summarizing the bear cubs that have been presented to NIWRA in 2017 (currently there are seven in total). All of these bears have been recently immobilized and examined and all are physically healthy. I have marked all but one with transponders. As it stands right now, six of the bears are release candidates (contingent upon continuation of their ongoing physical health and upon their display of appropriate behaviors). In the near future we will be confirming a budget for collars to monitor at least some of these bears post-release. I will keep you in the loop as this develops.

In my opinion, the seventh bear cub is non-releasable. Below is a summary of her history and clinical presentation. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

s.22

On the evening of July 10, 2017, the Campbell River Conservation Officer Service presented a female Black Bear cub to the North Island Wildlife Recovery Association. There was minimal history associated with this cub except that it was discovered alone along the Island Highway, approximately three kilometers south of Woss. At the time of initial presentation, she was extremely emaciated, unsteady on her feet, and demonstrated a slight head tilt with subtle tremors. The bear was obviously suffering from prolonged malnutrition, which may have been exacerbated by recent head trauma. Due to its poor condition, the cub was kept isolated and provided with supportive care by Robin Campbell (who acted as the bear's sole caregiver), which primarily involved intensive nutritional support. From the outset, the bear demonstrated a reasonable appetite and soon began regaining weight. However, its behavior was quite abnormal, and it seemed to exhibit some level of visual and cognitive impairment. The cub was markedly passive and unresponsive, and it failed to demonstrate any aggression or fear towards people, even when it was approached or touched. It would only vocalize when it was apparently hungry. It spent a lot of time recumbent and was often reluctant to move. Its movements were un-coordinated and sluggish, and it walked with a very slow, unbalanced, and exaggerated gait. Initially the cub also seemed to show limited interest in its immediate

environment, including the enrichment items in its enclosure. In early August the cub, after being heat stressed, was observed to have a short (20 to 30 second) grand mal seizure in which she fell and exhibited limb extension and an arched back and neck. Following this episode, she was weak and ataxic for several hours. Another seizure was observed a week later when the cub was being herded into its inside enclosure. Although subsequent seizures were not observed, the bear did exhibit a few episodes of lethargy, inappetence, and ataxia, which may have signaled the aftermath of additional seizures.

I first observed this bear cub on September 1, and found her to be in good body condition, but relatively slow moving, almost clumsy, and poorly responsive to my presence. She did not demonstrate any aggression or fear. Her behavior and demeanor could best be described as that of a very old, visually and acoustically impaired, pet dog. Robin Campbell continued to work with this bear cub and over the next several weeks she seemed to exhibit improved coordination and activity, increased interest and interaction with her surroundings (for example, chewing on furniture logs and using her water pool), and a more dynamic response to people. I re-examined this cub on November 20. Upon entering the enclosure, the cub's awareness and movements were noticeably improved (quicker and more fluid) and she behaved evasively. With more than anticipated difficulty (the bear struggled and vocalized throughout) it was captured in a net and immobilized by hand injection. The cub was examined, identified with a transponder (00-07B0-F393, behind left pinna), and blood was taken for hematology and serology. The cub was in very good body condition and the physical examination and bloodwork did not reveal any specific abnormalities, except for an elevated creatine kinase attributed to her struggling during capture and subsequent intramuscular injections. The cub was moved to a larger enclosure and has been observed on camera showing increased interest and interaction with her surroundings and a greater range of behavioral repertoires including territorial marking and prolonged and self initiated play with apples, balls, water, logs, etc. No seizures or their aftermath have been recently observed. Although this bear has improved markedly from initial presentation, and appears to be fundamentally healthy and well adjusted to her current surroundings, I feel that her history of neurological problems, the possibility of residual cognitive impairment, and her high level of habituation while in care, preclude her from being released to the wild. However, I do feel that her current health and temperament make her a suitable candidate for being maintained as a non-releasable wildlife resident at NIWRA.

# Re: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Tuesday, November 27, 2018  
1:16 PM

|         |                                   |
|---------|-----------------------------------|
| Subject | Re: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary        |
| From    | Barr, Larry FLNR:EX               |
| To      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX          |
| Sent    | Monday, November 27, 2017 3:04 PM |

Thanks Sean  
Appreciated

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 27, 2017, at 3:02 PM, Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

It is getting another assessment tomorrow to see if its eye is damaged or not. The swelling looks to have gone down enough that the vet will be able to see it now. I will let you know what he finds out.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Barr, Larry FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 27, 2017 3:00 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** Re: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Do you know how the cub is doing?

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 27, 2017, at 2:41 PM, Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

Should have sent this to each of you as well.

I believe the final cost to get there and back was around 1000 (taxes etc) . CO Paquin put it on his BMO and will JV accordingly.

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2017 9:46 AM

**To:** Newton, Mike C ENV:EX; Paquin, Jonathan ENV:EX

**Cc:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Guys, here is the update from the Rivers Inlet cub. We will have to wait and see if the eye is compromised to determine releasable or not.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** Sunday, November 19, 2017 7:00 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell'

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

On November 19, 2017, we immobilized and examined the orphaned male black bear cub which originated from Rivers Inlet and was presented to NIWRA on the evening of November 18, 2017. I suspect you are probably more familiar with this bear's prior history than I am.

The cub was in poor body condition (15.2 kg), but I would not describe him as being emaciated. He lacked fat reserves, but seemed to exhibit reasonable muscle mass.



Despite being held for a period of time prior to initial presentation his hydration was good. Most significantly, the cub was suffering from facial injuries which included a 3 cm irregular, deep penetrating wound on the dorsal muzzle. This wound was probed and it appeared to affect the cranial portion of the nasal bones and the adjacent soft tissues . A very small (4 mm x 2mm) shard of bone was removed, but the remaining boney structure of the nasal and incisive bones appeared to be mostly intact or at least stabilized by the surrounding soft tissues. Lateral and DV radiographs of the skull possibly indicated some damage to the nasal bones, but this was not considered to be significant in terms of overt displacement or dysfunction at this time. There was also a 1 cm deep laceration over the left eye. The left upper and lower eyelids were significantly swollen (think Rocky Balboa), and there was also a very severe conjunctivitis. The left eyelid swelling and conjunctivitis prevented good assessment of the surface of the left eyeball, only 2 mm of which could be properly visualized. The crowns of the right upper and lower deciduous canines were also fractured. The CO's suspected that this cub had been attacked by dog(s). I think the injuries are consistent with this, I would imagine that bears would have inflicted much more damage.

The cub was treated with long acting antibiotics, ophthalmic ointment, and subcutaneous fluids, and marked with a transponder.

Once it had recovered from the effects of the immobilization drugs, the bear was quite active and inquisitive in its enclosure and ate as soon as it was presented with food. The main concerns at this point are possible infection of its wounds, particularly the muzzle wound which is deep and poorly drained (contamination could result in osteomyelitis and devitalized pieces of bone could result in sequestra), and the integrity of the left eye. Hopefully the swelling will subside sufficiently for a better assessment of the eye in the days to come. If the integrity of the eye is compromised I would not consider this bear to be suitable for release. This cub will be kept isolated until its wounds and left eye have been properly evaluated and / or resolved. If this bear is put with any other bears we will visually mark it (i.e. with hair dye), but we will consult with you before any decisions about this bear's management or future are made.

I will visually reassess this cub on Wednesday, and will let you know the results.

Cheers,

s.22

P.S. Mike Newton indicated that the CO's wanted to be updated, but I do not have their contact information.

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** November 16, 2017 11:46 PM

**To:** 'Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX' <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)>

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell' s.22

**Subject:** NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

Here is an Excel spreadsheet summarizing the bear cubs that have been presented to NIWRA in 2017 (currently there are seven in total). All of these bears have been recently immobilized and examined and all are physically healthy. I have marked all but one with transponders. As it stands right now, six of the bears are release candidates (contingent upon continuation of their ongoing physical health and upon their display of appropriate behaviors). In the near future we will be confirming a budget for collars to monitor at least some of these bears post-release. I will keep you in the loop as this develops.

In my opinion, the seventh bear cub is non-releasable. Below is a summary of her history and clinical presentation. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

s.22

On the evening of July 10, 2017, the Campbell River Conservation Officer Service presented a female Black Bear cub to the North Island Wildlife Recovery Association. There was minimal history associated with this cub except that it was discovered alone along the Island Highway, approximately three kilometers south of Woss. At the time of initial presentation, she was extremely emaciated, unsteady on her feet, and demonstrated a slight head tilt with subtle tremors. The bear was obviously suffering

from prolonged malnutrition, which may have been exacerbated by recent head trauma. Due to its poor condition, the cub was kept isolated and provided with supportive care by Robin Campbell (who acted as the bear's sole caregiver), which primarily involved intensive nutritional support. From the outset, the bear demonstrated a reasonable appetite and soon began regaining weight. However, its behavior was quite abnormal, and it seemed to exhibit some level of visual and cognitive impairment. The cub was markedly passive and unresponsive, and it failed to demonstrate any aggression or fear towards people, even when it was approached or touched. It would only vocalize when it was apparently hungry. It spent a lot of time recumbent and was often reluctant to move. Its movements were un-coordinated and sluggish, and it walked with a very slow, unbalanced, and exaggerated gait. Initially the cub also seemed to show limited interest in its immediate environment, including the enrichment items in its enclosure. In early August the cub, after being heat stressed, was observed to have a short (20 to 30 second) grand mal seizure in which she fell and exhibited limb extension and an arched back and neck. Following this episode, she was weak and ataxic for several hours. Another seizure was observed a week later when the cub was being herded into its inside enclosure. Although subsequent seizures were not observed, the bear did exhibit a few episodes of lethargy, inappetence, and ataxia, which may have signaled the aftermath of additional seizures.

I first observed this bear cub on September 1, and found her to be in good body condition, but relatively slow moving, almost clumsy, and poorly responsive to my presence. She did not demonstrate any aggression or fear. Her behavior and demeanor could best be described as that of a very old, visually and acoustically impaired, pet dog. Robin Campbell continued to work with this bear cub and over the next several weeks she seemed to exhibit improved co-ordination and activity, increased interest and interaction with in her surroundings (for example, chewing on furniture logs and using her water pool), and a more dynamic response to people. I re-examined this cub on November 20. Upon entering the enclosure, the cub's awareness and movements were noticeably improved (quicker and more fluid) and she behaved evasively. With more than anticipated difficulty (the bear struggled and vocalized throughout) it was captured in a net and immobilized by hand injection. The cub was examined, identified with a transponder (00-07B0-F393, behind left pinna), and blood was taken for hematology and serology. The cub was in very good body condition and the physical examination and bloodwork did not reveal any specific abnormalities, except for an elevated creatine kinase attributed to her struggling during capture and subsequent intramuscular injections. The cub was moved to a larger enclosure and has been observed on camera showing increased interest and interaction with her surroundings and a greater range of behavioral repertoires including territorial marking and prolonged and self initiated play with apples, balls, water, logs, etc. No seizures or their aftermath have been recently observed.

Although this bear has improved markedly from initial presentation, and appears to be fundamentally healthy and well adjusted to her current surroundings, I feel that her history of neurological problems, the possibility of residual cognitive impairment, and her high level of habituation while in care, preclude her from being released to the wild. However, I do feel that her current health and temperament make her a suitable candidate for being maintained as a non-releasable wildlife resident at NIWRA.

## Re: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

1:14 PM

|         |                                   |
|---------|-----------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>Re: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary</b> |
| From    | Barr, Larry FLNR:EX               |
| To      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX          |
| Sent    | Monday, November 27, 2017 2:59 PM |

Do you know how the cub is doing?

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 27, 2017, at 2:41 PM, Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

Should have sent this to each of you as well.

I believe the final cost to get there and back was around 1000 (taxes etc) . CO Paquin put it on his BMO and will JV accordingly.

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2017 9:46 AM

**To:** Newton, Mike C ENV:EX; Paquin, Jonathan ENV:EX

**Cc:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Guys, here is the update from the Rivers Inlet cub. We will have to wait and see if the eye is compromised to determine releasable or not.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** Sunday, November 19, 2017 7:00 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell'

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

On November 19, 2017, we immobilized and examined the orphaned male black bear cub which originated from Rivers Inlet and was presented to NIWRA on the evening of November 18, 2017. I suspect you are probably more familiar with this bear's prior history than I am. The cub was in poor body condition (15.2 kg), but I would not describe him as being emaciated. He lacked fat reserves, but seemed to exhibit reasonable muscle mass. Despite being held for a period of time prior to initial presentation his hydration was good. Most significantly, the cub was suffering from facial injuries which included a 3 cm irregular, deep penetrating wound on the dorsal muzzle. This wound was probed and it appeared to affect the cranial portion of the nasal bones and the adjacent soft tissues . A very small (4 mm x 2mm) shard of bone was removed, but the remaining boney structure of the nasal and incisive bones appeared to be mostly intact or at least stabilized by the surrounding soft tissues. Lateral and DV radiographs of the skull possibly indicated some damage to the nasal bones, but this was not considered to be significant in terms of overt displacement or dysfunction at this time. There was also a 1 cm deep laceration over the left eye. The left upper and lower eyelids were significantly swollen (think Rocky Balboa), and there was also a very severe conjunctivitis. The left eyelid swelling and conjunctivitis prevented good assessment of the surface of the left eyeball, only 2 mm of which could be properly visualized. The crowns of the right upper and lower deciduous canines were also fractured. The CO's suspected that this cub had been attacked by dog(s). I think the injuries are consistent with this, I would imagine that bears would have inflicted much more damage.

The cub was treated with long acting antibiotics, ophthalmic ointment, and subcutaneous fluids, and marked with a transponder.

Once it had recovered from the effects of the immobilization drugs, the bear was quite active and inquisitive in its enclosure and ate as soon as it was presented with food. The main concerns at this point are possible infection of its wounds, particularly the muzzle wound which is deep and poorly drained (contamination could result in osteomyelitis and devitalized pieces of bone could result in sequestra), and the integrity of the left eye. Hopefully the swelling will subside sufficiently for a better assessment of the eye in the days to come. If the integrity of the eye is compromised I would not consider this bear to be suitable for release. This cub will be kept isolated until its wounds and left eye have been properly evaluated and / or resolved. If this bear is put with any other bears we will visually mark it (i.e. with hair dye), but we will consult with you before any decisions about this bear's management or future are made.

I will visually reassess this cub on Wednesday, and will let you know the results.

Cheers,

s.22

P.S. Mike Newton indicated that the CO's wanted to be updated, but I do not have their contact information.

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** November 16, 2017 11:46 PM

**To:** 'Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX' <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)>

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell' ·s.22

**Subject:** NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

Here is an Excel spreadsheet summarizing the bear cubs that have been presented to NIWRA in 2017 (currently there are seven in total). All of these bears have been recently immobilized and examined and all are physically healthy. I have marked all but one with transponders. As it stands right now, six of the bears are release candidates (contingent upon continuation of their ongoing physical health and upon their display of appropriate behaviors). In the near future we will be confirming a budget for collars to monitor at least some of these bears post-release. I will keep you in the loop as this develops.

In my opinion, the seventh bear cub is non-releasable. Below is a summary of her history and clinical presentation. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

s.22

On the evening of July 10, 2017, the Campbell River Conservation Officer Service presented a female Black Bear cub to the North Island Wildlife Recovery Association. There was minimal history associated with this cub except that it was discovered alone along the Island Highway, approximately three kilometers south of Woss. At the time of initial presentation, she was extremely emaciated, unsteady on her feet, and demonstrated a slight head tilt with subtle tremors. The bear was obviously suffering from prolonged malnutrition, which may have been exacerbated by recent head trauma. Due to its poor condition, the cub was kept isolated and provided with supportive care by Robin Campbell (who acted as the bear's sole caregiver), which primarily involved intensive nutritional support. From the outset, the bear demonstrated a reasonable appetite and soon began regaining weight. However, its behavior was quite abnormal, and it seemed to exhibit some level of visual and cognitive impairment. The cub was markedly passive and unresponsive, and it failed to demonstrate any aggression or fear towards people, even when it was approached or touched. It would only vocalize when it was apparently hungry. It spent a lot of time recumbent and was often reluctant to move. Its movements were un-coordinated and sluggish, and it walked with a very slow, unbalanced, and exaggerated gait. Initially the cub also seemed to show limited interest in its immediate environment, including the enrichment items in its enclosure. In early August the cub, after being heat stressed, was observed to have a short (20 to 30 second) grand mal seizure in which she fell and exhibited limb extension and an arched back and neck. Following this episode, she was weak and ataxic for several hours. Another seizure was observed a week later when the cub was being herded into its inside enclosure. Although subsequent seizures were not observed, the bear did exhibit a few episodes of lethargy, inappetence, and ataxia, which may have signaled the aftermath of additional seizures.

I first observed this bear cub on September 1, and found her to be in good body condition, but

relatively slow moving, almost clumsy, and poorly responsive to my presence. She did not demonstrate any aggression or fear. Her behavior and demeanor could best be described as that of a very old, visually and acoustically impaired, pet dog. Robin Campbell continued to work with this bear cub and over the next several weeks she seemed to exhibit improved coordination and activity, increased interest and interaction with in her surroundings (for example, chewing on furniture logs and using her water pool), and a more dynamic response to people. I re-examined this cub on November 20. Upon entering the enclosure, the cub's awareness and movements were noticeably improved (quicker and more fluid) and she behaved evasively. With more than anticipated difficulty (the bear struggled and vocalized throughout) it was captured in a net and immobilized by hand injection. The cub was examined, identified with a transponder (00-07B0-F393, behind left pinna), and blood was taken for hematology and serology. The cub was in very good body condition and the physical examination and bloodwork did not reveal any specific abnormalities, except for an elevated creatine kinase attributed to her struggling during capture and subsequent intramuscular injections. The cub was moved to a larger enclosure and has been observed on camera showing increased interest and interaction with her surroundings and a greater range of behavioral repertoires including territorial marking and prolonged and self initiated play with apples, balls, water, logs, etc. No seizures or their aftermath have been recently observed. Although this bear has improved markedly from initial presentation, and appears to be fundamentally healthy and well adjusted to her current surroundings, I feel that her history of neurological problems, the possibility of residual cognitive impairment, and her high level of habituation while in care, preclude her from being released to the wild. However, I do feel that her current health and temperament make her a suitable candidate for being maintained as a non-releasable wildlife resident at NIWRA.

## FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Tuesday, November 27, 2018  
1:17 PM

|         |                                                                   |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary</b>                                 |
| From    | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX                                          |
| To      | Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Newton, Mike C ENV:EX                   |
| Cc      | York, Ben A ENV:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX; Barr, Larry FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Wednesday, November 29, 2017 12:52 PM                             |

FYI on the Rivers Bear. hopefully Helen and I can discuss. It does not sound like this bear will be a candidate for release based on the behavioural assessment. We now have to consider options.

1. The bear could stay at Robins permanently if we desire (he has room). His permit would need to be amended to reflect this.
  - a. If there is concern that the public outcry will be great then this could be an option.  
However I do not want to establish this as a recurring option for cubs.
2. Euthanize bear as it is not a candidate for release based on behaviour.
3. Allow vet to do a thorough assessment of the cubs eye then follow through with options 1 or 2 above based on the diagnosis of the eye.

Let me know your thoughts and do not hesitate to ask any questions.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 28, 2017 6:26 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell'

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

We did a follow-up visual exam of the Rivers Inlet bear cub today (Tuesday). The wound on the dorsal muzzle appears to be healing well, and the left eyelid and facial swelling has diminished to the point where most of the left eye is visible. The eyeball appears to be intact, although full assessment will require us to re-immobilize the bear.

At this point, our greatest concern is the cub's behavior. Although it is not aggressive, it appears to be unafraid of people and will approach entry doors if someone is trying to enter its enclosure (it will be waiting right behind the door as soon as anyone is about to enter and investigate the door after they have left). The bear can also be heard sniffing at entry doors when it hears people on the other side. The cub is quite ravenous and will continue to feed even while being closely observed or approached, without any tendency to flee.

Based upon these responses, we feel that there is a strong likelihood that this bear has been previously conditioned to feeding in close proximity to people or close to human food sources.

Based upon our behavioral criteria we feel that it is not a good candidate for release.

We will immobilize the bear and re-assess it on Friday, December 1.

Cheers,

s.22

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** November 27, 2017 10:22 AM

**To:** 'Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX' <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)>

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell' s.22

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

Robin sent me pictures of the bear cub over the weekend and the swelling around the left eye appears to have subsided significantly (the wound on the dorsal muzzle also demonstrates good healing). We will be re-assessing the bear cub tomorrow (Tuesday). We will start with a visual exam. If we feel that the swelling is sufficiently reduced to allow proper evaluation of the eye, we will re-immobilize him and look at the eye more closely. I will update you tomorrow.

Cheers,  
s.22

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX [<mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca>]  
**Sent:** November 27, 2017 10:12 AM  
**To:** s.22

**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Just following up as to when you might be doing the reassessment of the cub from Rivers.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Newton, Mike C ENV:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 27, 2017 10:01 AM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Any update for the rivers cub?

Sgt. Mike Newton

Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy

Conservation Officer Service

North Island Zone

(250) 337-2408

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2017 9:46 AM

**To:** Newton, Mike C ENV:EX; Paquin, Jonathan ENV:EX

**Cc:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Guys, here is the update from the Rivers Inlet cub. We will have to wait and see if the eye is compromised to determine releasable or not.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** Sunday, November 19, 2017 7:00 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell'

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

On November 19, 2017, we immobilized and examined the orphaned male black bear cub which originated from Rivers Inlet and was presented to NIWRA on the evening of November 18, 2017. I suspect you are probably more familiar with this bear's prior history than I am.

The cub was in poor body condition (15.2 kg), but I would not describe him as being emaciated. He lacked fat reserves, but seemed to exhibit reasonable muscle mass. Despite being held for a period of time prior to initial presentation his hydration was good. Most significantly, the cub was suffering from facial injuries which included a 3 cm irregular, deep penetrating wound on the dorsal muzzle. This wound was probed and it appeared to affect the cranial portion of the nasal bones and the adjacent soft tissues. A very small (4 mm x 2mm) shard of bone was removed, but the remaining boney structure of the nasal and incise bones appeared to be mostly intact or at least stabilized by the surrounding soft tissues. Lateral and DV radiographs of the skull possibly indicated some damage to the nasal bones, but this was not considered to be significant in terms of overt displacement or dysfunction at this time. There was also a 1 cm deep laceration over the left eye. The left upper and lower eyelids were significantly swollen (think Rocky Balboa), and there was also a very severe conjunctivitis. The left eyelid swelling and conjunctivitis prevented good assessment of the surface of the left eyeball, only 2 mm of which could be properly visualized. The crowns of the right upper and lower deciduous canines were also fractured. The CO's suspected that this cub had been attacked by dog(s). I think the injuries are consistent with this, I would imagine that bears would have inflicted much more damage.

The cub was treated with long acting antibiotics, ophthalmic ointment, and subcutaneous fluids, and marked with a transponder.

Once it had recovered from the effects of the immobilization drugs, the bear was quite active and inquisitive in its enclosure and ate as soon as it was presented with food.

The main concerns at this point are possible infection of its wounds, particularly the muzzle wound

which is deep and poorly drained (contamination could result in osteomyelitis and devitalized pieces of bone could result in sequestra), and the integrity of the left eye. Hopefully the swelling will subside sufficiently for a better assessment of the eye in the days to come. If the integrity of the eye is compromised I would not consider this bear to be suitable for release. This cub will be kept isolated until its wounds and left eye have been properly evaluated and / or resolved. If this bear is put with any other bears we will visually mark it (i.e. with hair dye), but we will consult with you before any decisions about this bear's management or future are made.

I will visually reassess this cub on Wednesday, and will let you know the results.

Cheers,

s.22

P.S. Mike Newton indicated that the CO's wanted to be updated, but I do not have their contact information.

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** November 16, 2017 11:46 PM

**To:** 'Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX' <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)>

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell' <s.22>

**Subject:** NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

Here is an Excel spreadsheet summarizing the bear cubs that have been presented to NIWRA in 2017 (currently there are seven in total). All of these bears have been recently immobilized and examined and all are physically healthy. I have marked all but one with transponders. As it stands right now, six of the bears are release candidates (contingent upon continuation of their ongoing physical health and upon their display of appropriate behaviors). In the near future we will be confirming a budget for collars to monitor at least some of these bears post-release. I will keep you in the loop as this develops.

In my opinion, the seventh bear cub is non-releasable. Below is a summary of her history and clinical presentation. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

s.22

On the evening of July 10, 2017, the Campbell River Conservation Officer Service presented a female Black Bear cub to the North Island Wildlife Recovery Association. There was minimal history associated with this cub except that it was discovered alone along the Island Highway, approximately three kilometers south of Woss. At the time of initial presentation, she was extremely emaciated, unsteady on her feet, and demonstrated a slight head tilt with subtle tremors. The bear was obviously suffering from prolonged malnutrition, which may have been exacerbated by recent head trauma. Due to its poor condition, the cub was kept isolated and provided with supportive care by Robin Campbell (who acted as the bear's sole caregiver), which primarily involved intensive nutritional support. From the outset, the bear demonstrated a reasonable appetite and soon began regaining weight. However, its behavior was quite abnormal, and it seemed to exhibit some level of visual and cognitive impairment. The cub was markedly passive and unresponsive, and it failed to demonstrate any aggression or fear towards people, even when it was approached or touched. It would only vocalize when it was apparently hungry. It spent a lot of time recumbent and was often reluctant to move. Its movements were un-coordinated and sluggish, and it walked with a very slow, unbalanced, and exaggerated gait. Initially the cub also seemed to show limited interest in its immediate environment, including the enrichment items in its enclosure. In early August the cub, after being heat stressed, was observed to have a short (20 to 30 second) grand mal seizure in which she fell and exhibited limb extension and an arched back and neck. Following this episode, she was weak and ataxic for several hours. Another seizure was observed a week later when the cub was being herded into its inside enclosure. Although subsequent seizures were not observed, the bear did exhibit a few episodes of lethargy, inappetence, and ataxia, which may have signaled the aftermath of additional seizures.

I first observed this bear cub on September 1, and found her to be in good body condition, but relatively slow moving, almost clumsy, and poorly responsive to my presence. She did not demonstrate any aggression or fear. Her behavior and demeanor could best be described as that of a very old, visually and acoustically impaired, pet dog. Robin Campbell continued to work with this bear cub and over the next several weeks she seemed to exhibit improved co-ordination and activity, increased interest and interaction with in her surroundings (for example, chewing on



furniture logs and using her water pool), and a more dynamic response to people. I re-examined this cub on November 20. Upon entering the enclosure, the cub's awareness and movements were noticeably improved (quicker and more fluid) and she behaved evasively. With more than anticipated difficulty (the bear struggled and vocalized throughout) it was captured in a net and immobilized by hand injection. The cub was examined, identified with a transponder (00-07B0-F393, behind left pinna), and blood was taken for hematology and serology. The cub was in very good body condition and the physical examination and bloodwork did not reveal any specific abnormalities, except for an elevated creatine kinase attributed to her struggling during capture and subsequent intramuscular injections. The cub was moved to a larger enclosure and has been observed on camera showing increased interest and interaction with her surroundings and a greater range of behavioral repertoires including territorial marking and prolonged and self initiated play with apples, balls, water, logs, etc. No seizures or their aftermath have been recently observed. Although this bear has improved markedly from initial presentation, and appears to be fundamentally healthy and well adjusted to her current surroundings, I feel that her history of neurological problems, the possibility of residual cognitive impairment, and her high level of habituation while in care, preclude her from being released to the wild. However, I do feel that her current health and temperament make her a suitable candidate for being maintained as a non-releasable wildlife resident at NIWRA.

# Re: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Tuesday, November 27, 2018  
1:18 PM

|         |                                                                                          |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | Re: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary                                                               |
| From    | Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX                                                                 |
| To      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX                                                                 |
| Cc      | Newton, Mike C ENV:EX; York, Ben A ENV:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX; Barr, Larry FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Wednesday, November 29, 2017 8:01 PM                                                     |

I would suggest 3 if they are willing

Helen

On Nov 29, 2017, at 12:52 PM, Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

FYI on the Rivers Bear. hopefully Helen and I can discuss. It does not sound like this bear will be a candidate for release based on the behavioural assessment. We now have to consider options.

1. The bear could stay at Robins permanently if we desire (he has room). His permit would need to be amended to reflect this.
  - a. If there is concern that the public outcry will be great then this could be an option. However I do not want to establish this as a recurring option for cubs.
2. Euthanize bear as it is not a candidate for release based on behaviour.
3. Allow vet to do a thorough assessment of the cubs eye then follow through with options 1 or 2 above based on the diagnosis of the eye.

Let me know your thoughts and do not hesitate to ask any questions.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 28, 2017 6:26 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell'

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

We did a follow-up visual exam of the Rivers Inlet bear cub today (Tuesday). The wound on the dorsal muzzle appears to be healing well, and the left eyelid and facial swelling has diminished to the point where most of the left eye is visible. The eyeball appears to be intact, although full assessment will require us to re-immobilize the bear.

At this point, our greatest concern is the cub's behavior. Although it is not aggressive, it appears to be unafraid of people and will approach entry doors if someone is trying to enter its enclosure (it will be waiting right behind the door as soon as anyone is about to enter and investigate the door after they have left). The bear can also be heard sniffing at entry doors when it hears people on the other side. The cub is quite ravenous and will continue to feed even while being closely observed or approached, without any tendency to flee.

Based upon these responses, we feel that there is a strong likelihood that this bear has been previously conditioned to feeding in close proximity to people or close to human food sources.

Based upon our behavioral criteria we feel that it is not a good candidate for release.

We will immobilize the bear and re-assess it on Friday, December 1.

Cheers,

s.22

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** November 27, 2017 10:22 AM

**To:** 'Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX' <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)>

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell' s.22

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

Robin sent me pictures of the bear cub over the weekend and the swelling around the left eye appears to have subsided significantly (the wound on the dorsal muzzle also demonstrates good healing). We will be re-assessing the bear cub tomorrow (Tuesday). We will start with a visual exam. If we feel that the swelling is sufficiently reduced to allow proper evaluation of the eye, we will re-immobilize him and look at the eye more closely. I will update you tomorrow.

Cheers,

s.22

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX [<mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca>]

**Sent:** November 27, 2017 10:12 AM

**To:** 's.22

**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Just following up as to when you might be doing the reassessment of the cub from Rivers.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Newton, Mike C ENV:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 27, 2017 10:01 AM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Any update for the rivers cub?

Sgt. Mike Newton

Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy

Conservation Officer Service

North Island Zone

(250) 337-2408

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2017 9:46 AM

**To:** Newton, Mike C ENV:EX; Paquin, Jonathan ENV:EX

**Cc:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Guys, here is the update from the Rivers Inlet cub. We will have to wait and see if the eye is compromised to determine releasable or not.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From** s.22

**Sent:** Sunday, November 19, 2017 7:00 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell'

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

On November 19, 2017, we immobilized and examined the orphaned male black bear cub which originated from Rivers Inlet and was presented to NIWRA on the evening of November 18, 2017. I suspect you are probably more familiar with this bear's prior history than I am. The cub was in poor body condition (15.2 kg), but I would not describe him as being emaciated. He lacked fat reserves, but seemed to exhibit reasonable muscle mass. Despite being held for a period of time prior to initial presentation his hydration was good. Most significantly, the cub was suffering from facial injuries which included a 3 cm irregular, deep penetrating wound on the dorsal muzzle. This wound was probed and it appeared to affect the cranial portion of the nasal bones and the adjacent soft tissues. A very small (4 mm x 2mm) shard of bone was removed, but the remaining boney structure of the nasal and incisive bones appeared to be mostly intact or at least stabilized by the surrounding soft tissues. Lateral and DV radiographs of the skull possibly indicated some damage to the nasal bones, but this was not considered to be significant in terms of overt displacement or dysfunction at this time. There was also a 1 cm deep laceration over the left eye. The left upper and lower eyelids were significantly swollen (think Rocky Balboa), and there was also a very severe conjunctivitis. The

left eyelid swelling and conjunctivitis prevented good assessment of the surface of the left eyeball, only 2 mm of which could be properly visualized. The crowns of the right upper and lower deciduous canines were also fractured. The CO's suspected that this cub had been attacked by dog(s). I think the injuries are consistent with this, I would imagine that bears would have inflicted much more damage.

The cub was treated with long acting antibiotics, ophthalmic ointment, and subcutaneous fluids, and marked with a transponder.

Once it had recovered from the effects of the immobilization drugs, the bear was quite active and inquisitive in its enclosure and ate as soon as it was presented with food.

The main concerns at this point are possible infection of its wounds, particularly the muzzle wound which is deep and poorly drained (contamination could result in osteomyelitis and devitalized pieces of bone could result in sequestra), and the integrity of the left eye.

Hopefully the swelling will subside sufficiently for a better assessment of the eye in the days to come. If the integrity of the eye is compromised I would not consider this bear to be suitable for release. This cub will be kept isolated until its wounds and left eye have been properly evaluated and / or resolved. If this bear is put with any other bears we will visually mark it (i.e. with hair dye), but we will consult with you before any decisions about this bear's management or future are made.

I will visually reassess this cub on Wednesday, and will let you know the results.

Cheers,

s.22

P.S. Mike Newton indicated that the CO's wanted to be updated, but I do not have their contact information.

**From** s.22

**Sent:** November 16, 2017 11:46 PM

**To:** 'Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX' <Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca>

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell' <s.22@niwra.ca>

**Subject:** NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

Here is an Excel spreadsheet summarizing the bear cubs that have been presented to NIWRA in 2017 (currently there are seven in total). All of these bears have been recently immobilized and examined and all are physically healthy. I have marked all but one with transponders. As it stands right now, six of the bears are release candidates (contingent upon continuation of their ongoing physical health and upon their display of appropriate behaviors). In the near future we will be confirming a budget for collars to monitor at least some of these bears post-release. I will keep you in the loop as this develops.

In my opinion, the seventh bear cub is non-releasable. Below is a summary of her history and clinical presentation. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

Malcolm

On the evening of July 10, 2017, the Campbell River Conservation Officer Service presented a female Black Bear cub to the North Island Wildlife Recovery Association. There was minimal history associated with this cub except that it was discovered alone along the Island Highway, approximately three kilometers south of Woss. At the time of initial presentation, she was extremely emaciated, unsteady on her feet, and demonstrated a slight head tilt with subtle tremors. The bear was obviously suffering from prolonged malnutrition, which may have been exacerbated by recent head trauma. Due to its poor condition, the cub was kept isolated and provided with supportive care by Robin Campbell (who acted as the bear's sole caregiver), which primarily involved intensive nutritional support. From the outset, the bear demonstrated a reasonable appetite and soon began regaining weight. However, its behavior was quite abnormal, and it seemed to exhibit some level of visual and cognitive impairment. The cub was markedly passive and unresponsive, and it failed to demonstrate any aggression or fear towards people, even when it was approached or touched. It would only vocalize when it was apparently hungry. It spent a lot of time recumbent and was often reluctant to move. Its movements were un-coordinated and sluggish, and it walked with a very slow, unbalanced, and exaggerated gait. Initially the cub also seemed to show limited interest in its immediate environment, including the enrichment items in its enclosure. In early August the cub, after

being heat stressed, was observed to have a short (20 to 30 second) grand mal seizure in which she fell and exhibited limb extension and an arched back and neck. Following this episode, she was weak and ataxic for several hours. Another seizure was observed a week later when the cub was being herded into its inside enclosure. Although subsequent seizures were not observed, the bear did exhibit a few episodes of lethargy, inappetence, and ataxia, which may have signaled the aftermath of additional seizures.

I first observed this bear cub on September 1, and found her to be in good body condition, but relatively slow moving, almost clumsy, and poorly responsive to my presence. She did not demonstrate any aggression or fear. Her behavior and demeanor could best be described as that of a very old, visually and acoustically impaired, pet dog. Robin Campbell continued to work with this bear cub and over the next several weeks she seemed to exhibit improved coordination and activity, increased interest and interaction with in her surroundings (for example, chewing on furniture logs and using her water pool), and a more dynamic response to people. I re-examined this cub on November 20. Upon entering the enclosure, the cub's awareness and movements were noticeably improved (quicker and more fluid) and she behaved evasively. With more than anticipated difficulty (the bear struggled and vocalized throughout) it was captured in a net and immobilized by hand injection. The cub was examined, identified with a transponder (00-07B0-F393, behind left pinna), and blood was taken for hematology and serology. The cub was in very good body condition and the physical examination and bloodwork did not reveal any specific abnormalities, except for an elevated creatine kinase attributed to her struggling during capture and subsequent intramuscular injections. The cub was moved to a larger enclosure and has been observed on camera showing increased interest and interaction with her surroundings and a greater range of behavioral repertoires including territorial marking and prolonged and self initiated play with apples, balls, water, logs, etc. No seizures or their aftermath have been recently observed. Although this bear has improved markedly from initial presentation, and appears to be fundamentally healthy and well adjusted to her current surroundings, I feel that her history of neurological problems, the possibility of residual cognitive impairment, and her high level of habituation while in care, preclude her from being released to the wild. However, I do feel that her current health and temperament make her a suitable candidate for being maintained as a non-releasable wildlife resident at NIWRA.

## FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Tuesday, November 27, 2018  
1:19 PM

|         |                                                                              |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary</b>                                            |
| From    | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX                                                     |
| To      | Thomas, Vivian P GCPE:EX; Affleck, Lindsey A GCPE:EX; Lowther, Brett GCPE:EX |
| Cc      | Barr, Larry FLNR:EX; Stalberg, Mike X FLNR:EX                                |
| Sent    | Thursday, November 30, 2017 11:00 AM                                         |

Good morning all,

I am sending this email to give you a heads up on a bear cub that was captured and transported from Rivers Inlet to North Island Wildlife Recovery Association (NIWRA) on November 18, 2017. The cub had been attacked by dogs in the village and was captured by concerned residents and the RCMP on November 17, 2017 and placed in a plastic dog crate. COS then transported the cub via float plane to Vancouver Island. West Coast Region paid for the plane ride. Upon admission the cub was observed to have a wound on its muzzle and its eye swollen shut. The wound has been healing and the eye is now more visible, however the cub has exhibited behaviours to indicate that it has significant habituation to humans. This habituation makes the cub unsuitable for release back to the wild and it has been recommended by regional staff and the Prov wildlife vet that the cub be euthanized. NIWRA has been getting periodic calls from the individuals involved in the capture as to the status of the cub. To date they have only been able to provide updates regarding eating and the injuries. As per the email updates from NIWRA's Vet below, the cub will be examined tomorrow and euthanized as per FLNRO recommendation. A post mortem will be conducted in Nanaimo by the Provincial Vet.

I don't anticipate much for backlash in this instance but there is always the possibility. The cub is clearly not able to be released back to the wild due to habituation levels and the assessments illustrate this. I wanted to give your department a heads up.

Feel free to contact me if you have any further questions regarding this bear cub.

Thank you,

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 28, 2017 6:26 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell'

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

We did a follow-up visual exam of the Rivers Inlet bear cub today (Tuesday). The wound on the dorsal muzzle appears to be healing well, and the left eyelid and facial swelling has diminished to the point where most of the left eye is visible. The eyeball appears to be intact, although full assessment will require us to re-immobilize the bear.

At this point, our greatest concern is the cub's behavior. Although it is not aggressive, it appears to be unafraid of people and will approach entry doors if someone is trying to enter its enclosure (it will be waiting right behind the door as soon as anyone is about to enter and investigate the door after they have left). The bear can also be heard sniffing at entry doors when it hears people on the other side. The cub is quite ravenous and will continue to feed even while being closely observed or approached, without any tendency to flee.

Based upon these responses, we feel that there is a strong likelihood that this bear has been previously conditioned to feeding in close proximity to people or close to human food sources.

Based upon our behavioral criteria we feel that it is not a good candidate for release.

We will immobilize the bear and re-assess it on Friday, December 1.

Cheers,

s.22

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** November 27, 2017 10:22 AM

**To:** 'Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX' <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)>

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell' s.22

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

Robin sent me pictures of the bear cub over the weekend and the swelling around the left eye appears to have subsided significantly (the wound on the dorsal muzzle also demonstrates good healing). We will be re-assessing the bear cub tomorrow (Tuesday). We will start with a visual exam. If we feel that the swelling is sufficiently reduced to allow proper evaluation of the eye, we will re-immobilize him and look at the eye more closely. I will update you tomorrow.

Cheers,

s.22

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX [<mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca>]

**Sent:** November 27, 2017 10:12 AM

**To:** s.22

**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Just following up as to when you might be doing the reassessment of the cub from Rivers.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Newton, Mike C ENV:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 27, 2017 10:01 AM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Any update for the rivers cub?

Sgt. Mike Newton

Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy

Conservation Officer Service

North Island Zone

(250) 337-2408

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Monday, November 20, 2017 9:46 AM

**To:** Newton, Mike C ENV:EX; Paquin, Jonathan ENV:EX

**Cc:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Subject:** FW: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Guys, here is the update from the Rivers Inlet cub. We will have to wait and see if the eye is compromised to determine releasable or not.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** s.22

**Sent:** Sunday, November 19, 2017 7:00 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Cc:** 'Robin Campbell'

**Subject:** RE: NIWRA Bear Cub Summary

Hi Sean:

On November 19, 2017, we immobilized and examined the orphaned male black bear cub which originated from Rivers Inlet and was presented to NIWRA on the evening of November 18, 2017. I suspect you are probably more familiar with this bear's prior history than I am.

The cub was in poor body condition (15.2 kg), but I would not describe him as being emaciated. He lacked fat reserves, but seemed to exhibit reasonable muscle mass. Despite being held for a period of time prior to initial presentation his hydration was good. Most significantly, the cub was suffering from facial injuries which included a 3 cm irregular, deep penetrating wound on the dorsal muzzle. This wound was probed and it appeared to affect the cranial portion of the nasal bones and the adjacent soft tissues. A very small (4 mm x 2mm) shard of bone was removed, but the remaining boney structure of the nasal and incisive bones appeared to be mostly intact or at least stabilized by the surrounding soft tissues. Lateral and DV radiographs of the skull possibly indicated some damage to the nasal bones, but this was not considered to be significant in terms of overt displacement or dysfunction at this time. There was also a 1 cm deep laceration over the left eye. The left upper and lower eyelids were significantly swollen (think Rocky Balboa), and there was also a very severe

conjunctivitis. The left eyelid swelling and conjunctivitis prevented good assessment of the surface of the left eyeball, only 2 mm of which could be properly visualized. The crowns of the right upper and lower deciduous canines were also fractured. The CO's suspected that this cub had been attacked by dog(s). I think the injuries are consistent with this, I would imagine that bears would have inflicted much more damage.

The cub was treated with long acting antibiotics, ophthalmic ointment, and subcutaneous fluids, and marked with a transponder.

Once it had recovered from the effects of the immobilization drugs, the bear was quite active and inquisitive in its enclosure and ate as soon as it was presented with food.

The main concerns at this point are possible infection of its wounds, particularly the muzzle wound which is deep and poorly drained (contamination could result in osteomyelitis and devitalized pieces of bone could result in sequestra), and the integrity of the left eye. Hopefully the swelling will subside sufficiently for a better assessment of the eye in the days to come. If the integrity of the eye is compromised I would not consider this bear to be suitable for release. This cub will be kept isolated until its wounds and left eye have been properly evaluated and / or resolved. If this bear is put with any other bears we will visually mark it (i.e. with hair dye), but we will consult with you before any decisions about this bear's management or future are made.

I will visually reassess this cub on Wednesday, and will let you know the results.

Cheers,

s.22


P.S. Mike Newton indicated that the CO's wanted to be updated, but I do not have their contact information.



# Orphaned black bear rehab and release study

Thursday, December 6, 2018

2:10 PM

|             |                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject     | <b>Orphaned black bear rehab and release study</b>                                                                                     |
| From        | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                                                                |
| To          | Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX |
| Cc          | <b>s.22</b>                                                                                                                            |
| Sent        | Wednesday, January 31, 2018 12:48 PM                                                                                                   |
| Attachments | <br>Information<br>Note_Trac...                       |

My apologies for not getting this together sooner. I have attached a very draft briefing note regarding a proposed orphaned bear cub study based on our discussions a couple of weeks ago. Could I ask you each to please give it a quick review and see if I have hit the mark?

I included a fair bit of information on Beecham's work in the background so executive have an idea of what is already "known" – not sure if it is necessary.

And I really ball parked the time and budget estimates. I estimated 150 data points per collar at \$50/point. Are monitoring costs really that high? That takes half the budget.

Any costs I forgot to include?

Thanks for your help on this.

Mike

Mike Badry

Wildlife Conflict Manager

Conservation Officer Service | Ministry of Environment

PO Box 9376 Stn Prov Govt

Victoria British Columbia Canada V8W 9M1

Phone (778) 698-4276 Fax (250) 356-9197

Cell (250) 213-1944

<mailto:mike.badry@gov.bc.ca>

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT  
INFORMATION NOTE

Date: January 30, 2018

File: [arcs/orcs #]

CLIFF: NRS [cliff #]

PREPARED FOR: Jim Standen, Assistant Deputy Minister, BC Parks and Conservation Officer Service

ISSUE: Research options for tracking orphaned black bear cubs, reared in rehabilitation facilities in BC, and released into the wild.

BACKGROUND:

The rehabilitation and release of orphaned young of the year Black bears has been contentious in British Columbia. Of concern is the lack of scientific studies within the province to assess the outcome of releasing captive-reared bears back onto the landscape.

Over the last 5 years the BC Conservation Officer Service has transferred on average 43 young of the year Black bears to one of three permitted rehabilitation facilities in the province.

In 2008 the province contracted Christopher Parker to develop the report: "Recommendations for Black Bear-Human Conflict Management and Black Bear Rehabilitation in British Columbia". A priority recommendation included in the report was: "Improve bear data management—collection, cross-referencing, analysis, and sharing, including conflict, mortality, and rehabilitation data".

Beecham et al. (2015) evaluated the potential management and conservation implications of releasing captive-reared bears by documenting post-release survival, cause specific mortality, human conflict activity, movements, and reproduction for 550 American black, brown and Asiatic black bears reared in 12 captive-rearing programs around the world. They defined post-release success in 2 hierarchical levels: the primary level of success was achieved when captive-reared bears were able to survive in the wild and avoided negative interactions with humans; the secondary level of success was defined as bears demonstrating life-history traits similar to wild bears, including post-release movements and reproduction. Conclusions included:

- Captive-reared bears released to the wild met the primary and secondary definitions of success; survival rates, human conflict levels, and reproduction by captive-reared and released bears in this study were comparable to those reported for wild bears.
- The lack of large data sets illustrates the need for better monitoring of released bears. Several monitoring efforts have been conducted over short time frames with small sample sizes by either relying on capture and kill information from tagged animals or by following radio-collared bears (primarily American black bears and European brown bears) for a few months after their release.
- Concerns expressed about behavioral deficiencies in rehabilitated bears are more difficult to address because bears are difficult to observe after they are released back to the wild. Gathering these data is also complicated by the length of time bears must be monitored to obtain information about their reproductive status.

1 of 3

- Ascertaining the critical factors that determine the success or failure of individual releases is often difficult. Bears apparently are genetically equipped to survive in the wild without the benefit of learning essential survival skills from their mothers, but other factors may play an important role in determining the success or failure of any given release.
- Increased cooperation among rehabilitators to document methods for raising and releasing bears, in addition to monitoring bears' fates after release, is needed to better understand the dynamics between successful and failed release efforts. Evaluating short- and long-term success indicators for all aspects of the rehabilitation process would be helpful in revising release protocols to increase the potential success of future releases.

There is a current program (since 2007) in place to track released grizzly cubs and collect information regarding success of this activity in British Columbia. Approximately 1-2 grizzly orphans per year have been radio-collared at release but drop-away collars prevent long term monitoring. To date 5 have been shot due to conflict, 1 confirmed road kill, and the rest are unknown. The data so far are equivocal, neither strongly supporting nor rejecting rearing and release as an appropriate management response to grizzly orphans.

#### DISCUSSION:

The province currently has a significant amount of data regarding orphaned bear rehabilitation and release but it has not been properly organized or analyzed. Rehabilitation facilities complete comprehensive intake sheets and submit information summaries to regional office as a condition of their permits. Black bear collaring and tracking has occurred over the years in an adhoc fashion and all released bears are permanently marked with eartags and/or tatoos and can be identified if killed through hunting, MVA's or conflict response.

It would be useful to review and analyze current information regarding outcomes of released bears, identify data gaps and produce a recommendations report.

The Northern Lights Rehabilitation Facility in Smithers has over 40 Black bears in captivity and release takes place in June-July. The majority of these bears are from the Kamloops and Southern Interior regions.

It is proposed that 5 released and 5 wild bears be collared in each region as a pilot to test the feasibility of a tracking study. Tracking wild young of the year bears in the same area and at the same time as released bears would allow us to identify and compare behavior and survivorship. Bears would be tracked through to hibernation, then retrapped and recollared to provide continuous data into the subsequent year.

A tracking study could also potentially look at differences between orphaned bears that did not experience habituation or food conditioning (i.e., sow killed in MVA) and bears that did experience habituation and/or food conditioning (i.e., sow was destroyed due to conflict behavior).

Northern Lights can solicit for additional funding and likely to raise at least 50K to support a tracking study.

Following recommendations from the pilot and adequate funding available, collaring could continue in subsequent years to increase sample size and produce a robust dataset to analyse outcomes of orphaned bear releases.

Collecting and analyzing DNA of all collared bears would provide greater ability to track bears, particularly when collars are lost, and to potentially identify parentage of cubs in subsequent years, through hair snagging.

Estimated Budget:

|                                      |                                       |                  |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| Data review and analysis - Biologist | 10 days @ \$350/day                   | \$3500           |
| Collaring study - Biologist          | 200 days @ \$350/day                  | \$70,000         |
| Satellite collars                    | 20 collars @ \$2500 ea.               | \$50,000         |
| Monitoring Costs                     | 3000 data points @ \$50/point         | \$150,000        |
| Materials and Supplies               | Trapping equipment, travel costs, etc | \$20,000         |
| DNA analysis                         | 100 samples @ \$150/sample            | \$15,000         |
| Data analysis and report             | 10 days @ \$350/day                   | \$3,500          |
| <b>Total</b>                         |                                       | <b>\$312,000</b> |

Contact:  
*Jim Standen*  
 Assistant Deputy Minister  
 BC Parks and Conservation  
 Officer Service Division  
 250-387-1288

Alternate Contact:  
*Aaron Canuel*  
 Deputy Chief Conservation  
 Officer  
 BC Parks and Conservation  
 Officer Service Division

Prepared by:  
*Mike Badry*  
 Wildlife Conflict Manager  
 BC Parks and Conservation  
 Officer Service Division  
 250-356-9134

| Reviewed by | Initials | Date |
|-------------|----------|------|
| DM          |          |      |
| DMO         |          |      |
| ADM         |          |      |
| Dir./Mgr.   |          |      |
| Author      |          |      |

# RE: Orphaned black bear rehab and release study

Thursday, December 6, 2018

2:26 PM

|         |                                                                                                                                        |
|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>RE: Orphaned black bear rehab and release study</b>                                                                                 |
| From    | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                                                                |
| To      | Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX |
| Cc      | s.22                                                                                                                                   |
| Sent    | Wednesday, January 31, 2018 1:17 PM                                                                                                    |

You did decline that call. The COS exec was interested in some preliminary information regarding an orphaned bear tracking study. They feel the funding could be found and were interested in what we would propose.

Mike

**From:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 31, 2018 1:05 PM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Cc:** s.22

**Subject:** RE: Orphaned black bear rehab and release study

I must have missed this call. Why are we proposing over 300 K for this when we have yet to put the existing data together?

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 31, 2018 12:49 PM

**To:** Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Cc:** s.22

**Subject:** Orphaned black bear rehab and release study

My apologies for not getting this together sooner. I have attached a very draft briefing note regarding a proposed orphaned bear cub study based on our discussions a couple of weeks ago.

Could I ask you each to please give it a quick review and see if I have hit the mark?

I included a fair bit of information on Beecham's work in the background so executive have an idea of what is already "known" – not sure if it is necessary.

And I really ball parked the time and budget estimates. I estimated 150 data points per collar at \$50/point. Are monitoring costs really that high? That takes half the budget.

Any costs I forgot to include?

Thanks for your help on this.

Mike

Mike Badry

Wildlife Conflict Manager

Conservation Officer Service | Ministry of Environment

PO Box 9376 Stn Prov Govt

Victoria British Columbia Canada V8W 9M1

Phone (778) 698-4276 Fax (250) 356-9197

Cell (250) 213-1944

<mailto:mike.badry@gov.bc.ca>

# RE: Orphaned black bear rehab and release study

Thursday, December 6, 2018

2:26 PM

|         |                                                                                                                                        |
|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | RE: Orphaned black bear rehab and release study                                                                                        |
| From    | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                                                                |
| To      | Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX |
| Cc      | s.22                                                                                                                                   |
| Sent    | Wednesday, January 31, 2018 4:30 PM                                                                                                    |

Thanks Brent. Good point about the DNA portion.

For the cost estimate of collaring and monitoring I used the \$2500 per collar estimate that was mentioned on the call and found a paper that discussed monitoring costs.

I looked at a couple of equipment websites but the pricing information was not included.

I did not put a whole lot of thought into all the other equipment that would be required but we would provide COS support so traps, capture gear and manpower may be available.

Mike

**From:** Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 31, 2018 3:37 PM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Cc:** s.22

**Subject:** RE: Orphaned black bear rehab and release study

Mike,

My comments are within. Looks good enough for a BN. The benefits of the DNA work are highly dependent on (i) monitoring of dead bears (which we don't do, so more \$\$) or (ii) an expensive DNA study. In the absence of these, ear tags and tattoos are likely more cost effective. A DNA study is possible, but (in this region) more likely to target grizzly bears, with black bear hair a side benefit. May be better to hold the DNA samples for later analysis if there is a dataset to compare them to. Hard to know if \$20K is enough for materials and supplies. Depending on the contractor, rates for equipment can be high. Are we talking purchasing bear traps and other capture gear?

What type of collars and monitoring have you priced out?

Brent

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 31, 2018 12:49 PM

**To:** Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Cc:** s.22

**Subject:** Orphaned black bear rehab and release study

My apologies for not getting this together sooner. I have attached a very draft briefing note regarding a proposed orphaned bear cub study based on our discussions a couple of weeks ago.

Could I ask you each to please give it a quick review and see if I have hit the mark?

I included a fair bit of information on Beecham's work in the background so executive have an idea of what is already "known" – not sure if it is necessary.

And I really ball parked the time and budget estimates. I estimated 150 data points per collar at \$50/point. Are monitoring costs really that high? That takes half the budget.

Any costs I forgot to include?

Thanks for your help on this.

Mike

Mike Badry

Wildlife Conflict Manager

Conservation Officer Service | Ministry of Environment

PO Box 9376 Stn Prov Govt

Victoria British Columbia Canada V8W 9M1

Phone (778) 698-4276 Fax (250) 356-9197

Cell (250) 213-1944

<mailto:mike.badry@gov.bc.ca>

## RE: Orphaned black bear rehab and release study

Thursday, December 6, 2018

2:27 PM

|         |                                                                                              |
|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>RE: Orphaned black bear rehab and release study</b>                                       |
| From    | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                      |
| To      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX                                                |
| Cc      | Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX s.22 |
| Sent    | Friday, February 2, 2018 5:20 PM                                                             |

Thanks for all the help with this everyone. I incorporated the comments and sent as a draft to my supervisor. I will let you know where it goes from there.

Have a good weekend.

Mike

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, February 2, 2018 2:11 PM

**To:** Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX

**Cc:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; s.22

**Subject:** Re: Orphaned black bear rehab and release study

NIWRA is full up with 10 bears from all over the island.

Sean Pendergast

Senior Wildlife Biologist

West Coast Region

Sent from my iPad

On Feb 2, 2018, at 11:55 AM, Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX <[Brent.Gurd@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Brent.Gurd@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

There are only three cubs in care at Critter Care this year, which is down from previous years:

1. A pair of siblings from Belcarra.
2. One male from Powell River.

Brent

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Thursday, February 1, 2018 10:57 AM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Cc:** Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX s.22

**Subject:** Re: Orphaned black bear rehab and release study

I will try to look at this today. I am pretty sure I was away at the time of the call and unable to attend. The cost per GPS location seems high at \$50 per location. Once you get the collar (2500 and possibly more like 1500) and pay for the air time fees of 200-400/year per collar it will take as many locations as you want it to so this could vary immensely in the cost per location.

It should also be pointed out that we have been encouraging Rehab centres to purchase their own collars for the bears and on the Island at least they have been willing to do so this year.

Sean Pendergast

Senior Wildlife Biologist

West Coast Region

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 31, 2018, at 12:48 PM, Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX <[Mike.Badry@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Mike.Badry@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

My apologies for not getting this together sooner. I have attached a very draft briefing note regarding a proposed orphaned bear cub study based on our discussions a couple of weeks ago. Could I ask you each to please give it a quick review and see if I have hit the mark?

I included a fair bit of information on Beecham's work in the background so executive have an idea of what is already "known" – not sure if it is necessary.

And I really ball parked the time and budget estimates. I estimated 150 data points per collar at \$50/point. Are monitoring costs really that high? That takes half the budget.

Any costs I forgot to include?

Thanks for your help on this.

Mike

Mike Badry

Wildlife Conflict Manager

Conservation Officer Service | Ministry of Environment

PO Box 9376 Stn Prov Govt

Victoria British Columbia Canada V8W 9M1

Phone (778) 698-4276 Fax (250) 356-9197

Cell (250) 213-1944

<mailto:mike.badry@gov.bc.ca>



## RE: COY Research Objectives

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:22 PM

|         |                                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | RE: COY Research Objectives                                                                                                                                       |
| From    | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                                                                                           |
| To      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:53 AM                                                                                                                                 |

Business as usual for now Sean. Any information regarding releases done this season will we captured by the contractor, including any collaring data if you track bears this year. The plan is to initiate a structured collaring and monitoring study next spring following development of the study design.

Mike

**From:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:41 AM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

I have bears on the island that need to be released at the end of the month. Are we supposed to wait until this is all done? Can I just stick to the standard protocols we have used in the past until the data has all been brought together? I have collars and bears are released back to close to where they were found. GPS collars will monitor post release activity.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:28 AM

**To:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

I incorporated Helen's last comments and would like to have BCCF send this out to possible applicants and solicit estimates to complete this phase of the project.

BCCF can put out a general RFP or they can target biologists that we suggest. I recall we discussed sending this to individuals that we considered qualified to do this work. Mentioned were s.22

s.22

Any other suggestions? I would like to have this to BCCF before the end of the week and ask for estimates by July 3.

Thanks

Mike

**From:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, June 8, 2018 2:52 PM

**To:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Nice. I am good with it.

Bill Jex, RPBio.

Wildlife Biologist,

Skeena Region. FLNRORD

s.22

**From:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, June 8, 2018 2:47 PM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Much simpler, looks like you have a schedule A now.

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Friday, June 8, 2018 2:12 PM

**To:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Hi all,

Sorry to take so long with the next draft of this. Thanks for all the comments. That was very helpful.

I have incorporated all of the "track changes" suggestions into the latest draft. I did not include recommendations regarding specific details of the research component but those discussions will definitely take place during development of the study design.

If this looks good I would like to start discussions with BCCF regarding the process for contracting a bear biologist to begin this work.

Mike

**From:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 22, 2018 9:03 AM

**To:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

In some areas, and for many years, cubs were not necessarily 'returned' to their place of origin. This has been much better over the past little bit with the permit directions, but I am not familiar with the other regions nowadays, that do not receive NLWS bears. Perhaps it's a non-issue, but I am glad we are at least discussing it and forming a position on the merits of the release relationships within the original home-range; we will at least be able to now say that it has been contemplated and that will be informational for the contractor.

Bill Jex, RPBio.

Wildlife Biologist,

Skeena Region, FLNRORD

s.22

**From:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 22, 2018 8:54 AM

**To:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Morning

Admitting my newness to BC rehab, my understanding is that rehabbed bears were returned to their source population (not necessarily near site of capture because that's often in town or some equally undesirable location). As such, released bears are perhaps a little chubbier and more habituated compared to their wild counterparts but should have no issues with being placed in a population that isn't where they are from. Just trying to better understand the comments below. Are rehabbed bears not being released into their source population? Or are you thinking the study design should incorporate trials where some bears are released outside their source population?

Cheers

Shelley

**From:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Monday, May 21, 2018 2:30 PM

**To:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Very much agree Shell, re. not wanting to constrain or over-prescribe actions, but for those of us who have been part of the debate for well over a decade, there are specific answers that 'we' as gov't continue to fail on when trying to contextualize the science associated with rehabbed and reared, orphaned cubs and their benefits and liabilities to the environment in general... or when we are challenged with questions from the public and goal-oriented NGOs.

In preliminary work I have done I am pretty confident that an observed 10% 're-offending' rate is a minimum estimate and if we evaluated those outcomes from across the bear rehab industry, we may see that those rehabbed bears that require a second intervention by COS, are generally involved in a more aggressive conflict (e.g., home invasions); this would be great to have better info on.

In the wild sheep world where translocations in the US have been plentiful, biologist there have found that while bighorns may be the same species, their behavioural and ecotypic variation makes one source-herd a better choice than another (we saw this in the outcomes of the caribou translocation from Dease Lake to the South Purcells as well). In a study where 2 seemingly comparable source herds were used to augment a local declining population, the one area-cohort of source animals greatly outperformed the other in terms of positive population contribution and effect. My comment about wanting to understand the response from the receiving population is related to having a better understanding of the relevance of this wild sheep observation (and caribou observation) in the bear world. If we are supporting the introduction of inferior ecotypes (e.g., behaviour and physiological) into a receiving population that is otherwise healthy, could we actually be damaging that wild population?

I recognize that somewhere along this path of determining what instruction to give to a contractor, and what product that the contractor may produce, will rub up against a budget cap. All I am offering is a few 'big picture' consideration type comments should at least enter the conversation, in the event that there is an opportunity to harmonize the initial work into a subsequent follow-up study.

Thanks a bunch all.

Bill Jex, RPBio.

Wildlife Biologist,

Skeena Region, FLNRORD

(s.22

**From:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Saturday, May 19, 2018 7:46 PM

**To:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

I think this is something that would be considered by the person contracted to develop the study design. As Mike notes, this person would be working closely with key folks in gov to ensure that we will get what we need – though we don't want to constrict the contractors thinking to a particular path.

I don't have anything else to add to the draft.

Cheers

Shelley

**From:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, May 18, 2018 8:57 PM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Hey Mike (and all),

I had understood that when we chatted that we also needed to understand the receiving population's responses. The jeopardy to not investing in that study is that the research may show that reared cubs do great... but them doing great may be at the expense of resident, natural cubs, so what the releases may have done is alter the resident composition of the population and that may result in negative impacts to the viability and sustainability of it in future.

If you only wanted to look at reared cubs post-release, then I'd suggest a comparative study on survivorship between facilities. If you want to look at reared-released and receiving populations (which I would suggest is a higher priority for managers), then you may want to focus on just 1 facility's released cubs and the drainages where they release into.

ISSUE:

BC currently allows rearing and release of orphaned black bear cubs in BC at permitted facilities; however the efficacy of this activity is unknown because the ultimate fate of these individuals is unknown post-release.

Funds are available to develop and deliver a research-based approach for assessing the fate of released orphaned black bear cubs that were reared in rehabilitation facilities in BC and subsequently released. The goal of this project will be to assess the fate of released orphaned cubs to improve and revise rehabilitation standards for black bears in BC and to develop an understanding of outcomes and responses observed in the receiving, natural population of bears. Two main components of this work are a review of available information relating to

rearing and release of orphaned cubs and development of a study design to monitor the fate of orphaned black bear cubs released back into the wild with measured effect on the natural resident population of bears through emote sensing and genetic analyses.

FYI, all cubs are micro-chipped as soon as they enter NLWS; they are also ear-tagged but sometimes that tag gets pulled so another has to be installed prior to release (this is why we went to microchip installation upon intake, to ensure we can track all cubs through care); tattooing is also a requirement and they mostly do this... NLWS has asked if they could halt tattooing since they feel it is unnecessary harm given the ear tags and microchips.

Hope this helps.

Bill Jex, RPBio.

Wildlife Biologist,

Skeena Region, FLNRORD

s.22

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Friday, May 18, 2018 3:02 PM

**To:** Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** COY Research Objectives

Thanks everyone for your input on this. I have created a second draft based on your revisions and feedback.

I don't think it answers in any detail your comments below Brent, or similar ones others have made, but I envision them being addressed when building the study design (deliverable 3) with input from each of us and based largely on what comes from the review of current data and literature (deliverables 1 and 2). I agree there will have to be good communication throughout and I hope to facilitate that.

Further comments welcome (by June 2 please).

Mike

**From:** Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 9, 2018 4:01 PM

**To:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Sorry for the slow response to this.

There are more than enough comments on the draft itself, so I will provide some more general comments.

I think we need to better define the purpose of this project. What management decision(s) is this work going to inform? Are we contemplating the over-all value of captive rearing and release, better defining the suitability of cubs for rearing based on their history (or other information), the specific methods used to rear the cubs or the compliance of rehabs with current policy? These are very different questions that would be answered using different data and methods. I see elements of all of these in different places in the document, which is fine, but we should state them clearly so the contractor actually answers them to the extent possible with the available data and provides a study design that will provide more insight.

Specifically, what is meant by:

1. '...develop a study design to assess outcomes of released orphan black bear cubs'? What exactly do we want to assess and what are the 'outcomes' that we are interested in?
2. '...understand the dynamics between successful and failed release efforts'? What is a successful and a failed outcome? What are the 'dynamics' we want to understand? We could identify a sizeable list of factors that could influence success, but we have a very limited sample of bears, so it will be necessary to focus on one or two priorities.

We could have the contractor do this thinking for us, but we might be disappointed with the end product. It depends a lot on who the contractor will be and how often they engage us.

Brent

**From:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 1, 2018 10:26 AM

**To:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Added a bit to the previously reviewed draft... Helen and Shelley hit most of what I could add, so just added a couple comments...

Also attached the WRNBC document in case you hadn't seen it; Reference standards document, page 22-23.

Thanks.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Bill Jex, RPBio.*

*Regional Wildlife Biologist,*

*Skeena Region,*

*British Columbia Ministry of Forest, Lands,*

*Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development*

*Mail to:*

*Bag 5000*

*3726 Alfred Avenue*

*Smithers, BC V0J 2N0*

*Phone:*

*(250) 847-7804*

*Fax:*

*(250) 847-7728*

**From:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, April 27, 2018 4:28 PM

**To:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

My suggestions are attached – mostly structural, some content. Happy to review another version if that would be helpful.

Have a good weekend!

Shelley

**From:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, April 27, 2018 11:18 AM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

A first crack at it. Once we have a second version I'd like to run it by <sup>s.22</sup> (my auxiliary vet) who has an excellent health protocol and lots of experience with bears. I'd say loose as much wordiness as possible and make it bullets like a Schedule A for a contract.

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:47 PM

**To:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Hi All,

I have attached the objectives document for the first phase of the orphaned black bear research project (review of existing data and development of a tracking study design). Feel free to hack it apart.

If I could get comments back in the next couple weeks (by May 11) that would be great. I am meeting with BCCF the week after and would like to start discussing the next steps with them.

Thanks

Mike

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2018 3:00 PM

**To:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

No, this was just an FYI. Alberta was not looking for our feedback. That said, this will be good information for our eventual contractor doing the research. I hope to have the objectives document out to you by tomorrow.

Mike

**From:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2018 2:39 PM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

I made some comments on this, is this what you wanted Mike?

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 24, 2018 3:00 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Subject:** FW: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

FYI

**From:** Forsdick, Doug O ENV:EX

**Sent:** Monday, April 23, 2018 11:25 AM

**To:** Canuel, Aaron ENV:EX

**Subject:** Fwd: Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Psyllakis, Jennifer FLNR:EX" <[Jennifer.Psullakis@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Psullakis@gov.bc.ca)>

**Date:** April 23, 2018 at 11:22:07 AM PDT

**To:** "Van Damme, Kevin ENV:EX" <[Kevin.Vandamme@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Kevin.Vandamme@gov.bc.ca)>

**Cc:** "Forsdick, Doug O ENV:EX" <[Doug.Forsdick@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Doug.Forsdick@gov.bc.ca)>

**Subject:** FW: Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Hi Kevin,

It was nice to meet you this weekend and get a chance to talk for a bit 😊

I reached out to Alberta to let them know that there were new guidelines under development for responding to carnivores. They sent back their current draft orphaned bear protocol.

You may already have this or been in touch, but I thought I would pass it along.

Jen

## RE: COY Research Objectives

Thursday, December 6, 2018

2:23 PM

|         |                                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | RE: COY Research Objectives                                                                                                                                       |
| From    | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                                                                                           |
| To      | Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:27 AM                                                                                                                                 |

I incorporated Helen's last comments and would like to have BCCF send this out to possible applicants and solicit estimates to complete this phase of the project.

BCCF can put out a general RFP or they can target biologists that we suggest. I recall we discussed sending this to individuals that we considered qualified to do this work. Mentioned were s.22

s.22

Any other suggestions? I would like to have this to BCCF before the end of the week and ask for estimates by July 3.

Thanks

Mike

**From:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, June 8, 2018 2:52 PM

**To:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Nice. I am good with it.

Bill Jex, RPBio.

Wildlife Biologist,

Skeena Region, FLNRORD

js.22

**From:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, June 8, 2018 2:47 PM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Much simpler, looks like you have a schedule A now.

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Friday, June 8, 2018 2:12 PM

**To:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Hi all,

Sorry to take so long with the next draft of this. Thanks for all the comments. That was very helpful.

I have incorporated all of the "track changes" suggestions into the latest draft. I did not include recommendations regarding specific details of the research component but those discussions will definitely take place during development of the study design.

If this looks good I would like to start discussions with BCCF regarding the process for contracting a bear biologist to begin this work.

Mike

**From:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 22, 2018 9:03 AM

**To:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

In some areas, and for many years, cubs were not necessarily 'returned' to their place of origin. This has been much better over the past little bit with the permit directions, but I am not familiar with

the other regions nowadays, that do not receive NLWS bears. Perhaps it's a non-issue, but I am glad we are at least discussing it and forming a position on the merits of the release relationships within the original home-range; we will at least be able to now say that it has been contemplated and that will be informational for the contractor.

Bill Jex, RPBio.

Wildlife Biologist,

Skeena Region, FLNRORD

s.22

**From:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 22, 2018 8:54 AM

**To:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Morning

Admitting my newness to BC rehab, my understanding is that rehabbed bears were returned to their source population (not necessarily near site of capture because that's often in town or some equally undesirable location). As such, released bears are perhaps a little chubbier and more habituated compared to their wild counterparts but should have no issues with being placed in a population that isn't where they are from. Just trying to better understand the comments below. Are rehabbed bears not being released into their source population? Or are you thinking the study design should incorporate trials where some bears are released outside their source population?

Cheers

Shelley

**From:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Monday, May 21, 2018 2:30 PM

**To:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Very much agree Shell, re. not wanting to constrain or over-prescribe actions, but for those of us who have been part of the debate for well over a decade, there are specific answers that 'we' as gov't continue to fail on when trying to contextualize the science associated with rehabbed and reared, orphaned cubs and their benefits and liabilities to the environment in general... or when we are challenged with questions from the public and goal-oriented NGOs.

In preliminary work I have done I am pretty confident that an observed 10% 're-offending' rate is a minimum estimate and if we evaluated those outcomes from across the bear rehab industry, we may see that those rehabbed bears that require a second intervention by COS, are generally involved in a more aggressive conflict (e.g., home invasions); this would be great to have better info on.

In the wild sheep world where translocations in the US have been plentiful, biologist there have found that while bighorns may be the same species, their behavioural and ecotypic variation makes one source-herd a better choice than another (we saw this in the outcomes of the caribou translocation from Dease Lake to the South Purcells as well). In a study where 2 seemingly comparable source herds were used to augment a local declining population, the one area-cohort of source animals greatly outperformed the other in terms of positive population contribution and effect. My comment about wanting to understand the response from the receiving population is related to having a better understanding of the relevance of this wild sheep observation (and caribou observation) in the bear world. If we are supporting the introduction of inferior ecotypes (e.g., behaviour and physiological) into a receiving population that is otherwise healthy, could we actually be damaging that wild population?

I recognize that somewhere along this path of determining what instruction to give to a contractor, and what product that the contractor may produce, will rub up against a budget cap. All I am offering is a few 'big picture' consideration type comments should at least enter the conversation, in the event that there is an opportunity to harmonize the initial work into a subsequent follow-up study.

Thanks a bunch all.

Bill Jex, RPBio.

Wildlife Biologist,

Skeena Region, FLNRORD



s.22

**From:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Saturday, May 19, 2018 7:46 PM

**To:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

I think this is something that would be considered by the person contracted to develop the study design. As Mike notes, this person would be working closely with key folks in gov to ensure that we will get what we need – though we don't want to constrict the contractors thinking to a particular path.

I don't have anything else to add to the draft.

Cheers

Shelley

**From:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, May 18, 2018 8:57 PM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: COY Research Objectives

Hey Mike (and all),

I had understood that when we chatted that we also needed to understand the receiving population's responses. The jeopardy to not investing in that study is that the research may show that reared cubs do great... but them doing great may be at the expense of resident, natural cubs, so what the releases may have done is alter the resident composition of the population and that may result in negative impacts to the viability and sustainability of it in future.

If you only wanted to look at reared cubs post-release, then I'd suggest a comparative study on survivorship between facilities. If you want to look at reared-released and receiving populations (which I would suggest is a higher priority for managers), then you may want to focus on just 1 facility's released cubs and the drainages where they release into.

ISSUE:

BC currently allows rearing and release of orphaned black bear cubs in BC at permitted facilities; however the efficacy of this activity is unknown because the ultimate fate of these individuals is unknown post-release.

Funds are available to develop and deliver a research-based approach for assessing the fate of released orphaned black bear cubs that were reared in rehabilitation facilities in BC and subsequently released. The goal of this project will be to assess the fate of released orphaned cubs to improve and revise rehabilitation standards for black bears in BC and to develop an understanding of outcomes and responses observed in the receiving, natural population of bears. Two main components of this work are a review of available information relating to rearing and release of orphaned cubs and development of a study design to monitor the fate of orphaned black bear cubs released back into the wild with measured effect on the natural resident population of bears through remote sensing and genetic analyses.

FYI, all cubs are micro-chipped as soon as they enter NLWS; they are also ear-tagged but sometimes that tag gets pulled so another has to be installed prior to release (this is why we went to microchip installation upon intake, to ensure we can track all cubs through care); tattooing is also a requirement and they mostly do this... NLWS has asked if they could halt tattooing since they feel it is unnecessary harm given the ear tags and microchips.

Hope this helps.

Bill Jex, RPBio.

Wildlife Biologist,

Skeena Region, FLNRORD

s.22

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Friday, May 18, 2018 3:02 PM

**To:** Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** COY Research Objectives

Thanks everyone for your input on this. I have created a second draft based on your revisions and feedback.

I don't think it answers in any detail your comments below Brent, or similar ones others have made,

but I envision them being addressed when building the study design (deliverable 3) with input from each of us and based largely on what comes from the review of current data and literature (deliverables 1 and 2). I agree there will have to be good communication throughout and I hope to facilitate that.

Further comments welcome (by June 2 please).

Mike

**From:** Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 9, 2018 4:01 PM

**To:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Sorry for the slow response to this.

There are more than enough comments on the draft itself, so I will provide some more general comments.

I think we need to better define the purpose of this project. What management decision(s) is this work going to inform? Are we contemplating the over-all value of captive rearing and release, better defining the suitability of cubs for rearing based on their history (or other information), the specific methods used to rear the cubs or the compliance of rehabs with current policy? These are very different questions that would be answered using different data and methods. I see elements of all of these in different places in the document, which is fine, but we should state them clearly so the contractor actually answers them to the extent possible with the available data and provides a study design that will provide more insight.

Specifically, what is meant by:

1. '...develop a study design to assess outcomes of released orphan black bear cubs'? What exactly do we want to assess and what are the 'outcomes' that we are interested in?
2. '...understand the dynamics between successful and failed release efforts'? What is a successful and a failed outcome? What are the 'dynamics' we want to understand? We could identify a sizeable list of factors that could influence success, but we have a very limited sample of bears, so it will be necessary to focus on one or two priorities.

We could have the contractor do this thinking for us, but we might be disappointed with the end product. It depends a lot on who the contractor will be and how often they engage us.

Brent

**From:** Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 1, 2018 10:26 AM

**To:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Added a bit to the previously reviewed draft... Helen and Shelley hit most of what I could add, so just added a couple comments...

Also attached the WRNBC document in case you hadn't seen it; Reference standards document, page 22-23.

Thanks.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Bill Jex, RPBio.*

*Regional Wildlife Biologist,*

*Skeena Region,*

*British Columbia Ministry of Forest, Lands,*

*Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development*

*Mail to:*

*Bag 5000*

*3726 Alfred Avenue*

*Smithers, BC V0J 2N0*

*Phone:*

*(250) 847-7804*

*Fax:*

*(250) 847-7728*

**From:** Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, April 27, 2018 4:28 PM

**To:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

My suggestions are attached – mostly structural, some content. Happy to review another version if that would be helpful.

Have a good weekend!

Shelley

**From:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Friday, April 27, 2018 11:18 AM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

A first crack at it. Once we have a second version I'd like to run it by <sup>s.22</sup> (my auxiliary vet) who has an excellent health protocol and lots of experience with bears. I'd say loose as much wordiness as possible and make it bullets like a Schedule A for a contract.

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:47 PM

**To:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Hi All,

I have attached the objectives document for the first phase of the orphaned black bear research project (review of existing data and development of a tracking study design). Feel free to hack it apart.

If I could get comments back in the next couple weeks (by May 11) that would be great. I am meeting with BCCF the week after and would like to start discussing the next steps with them.

Thanks

Mike

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2018 3:00 PM

**To:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

No, this was just an FYI. Alberta was not looking for our feedback. That said, this will be good information for our eventual contractor doing the research. I hope to have the objectives document out to you by tomorrow.

Mike

**From:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 25, 2018 2:39 PM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Subject:** RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

I made some comments on this, is this what you wanted Mike?

**From:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 24, 2018 3:00 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

**Subject:** FW: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

FYI

**From:** Forsdick, Doug O ENV:EX

**Sent:** Monday, April 23, 2018 11:25 AM

**To:** Canuel, Aaron ENV:EX

**Subject:** Fwd: Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Psyllakis, Jennifer FLNR:EX" <[Jennifer.Psullakis@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Psullakis@gov.bc.ca)>

**Date:** April 23, 2018 at 11:22:07 AM PDT

**To:** "Van Damme, Kevin ENV:EX" <[Kevin.Vandamme@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Kevin.Vandamme@gov.bc.ca)>

**Cc:** "Forsdick, Doug O ENV:EX" <[Doug.Forsdick@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Doug.Forsdick@gov.bc.ca)>

**Subject: FW: Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol**

Hi Kevin,

It was nice to meet you this weekend and get a chance to talk for a bit 😊

I reached out to Alberta to let them know that there were new guidelines under development for responding to carnivores. They sent back their current draft orphaned bear protocol.

You may already have this or been in touch, but I thought I would pass it along.

Jen

## RE: COY Research Objectives

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:21 PM

|         |                                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>RE: COY Research Objectives</b>                                                                                                                                |
| From    | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                                                                                           |
| To      | Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Wednesday, June 13, 2018 11:42 AM                                                                                                                                 |

Yes. BCCF will follow whatever direction we provide regarding hiring. There are no restrictions or requirements on their part.

-----Original Message-----

From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 11:32 AM  
To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

If you have bccf approach a few folks for quotes, how are their qualifications evaluated? Some folks on the list below are much more qualified than others. Can we select 1 person without soliciting bids from a few folks?

---

From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
Sent: June-13-18 10:53 AM  
To: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

Business as usual for now Sean. Any information regarding releases done this season will we captured by the contractor, including any collaring data if you track bears this year.

The plan is to initiate a structured collaring and monitoring study next spring following development of the study design.

Mike

From: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX  
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:41 AM  
To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

I have bears on the island that need to be released at the end of the month. Are we supposed to wait until this is all done? Can I just stick to the standard protocols we have used in the past until the data has all been brought together? I have collars and bears are released back to close to where they were found. GPS collars will monitor post release activity.

Sean Pendergast RPBio  
Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:28 AM

To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

I incorporated Helen's last comments and would like to have BCCF send this out to possible applicants and solicit estimates to complete this phase of the project.

BCCF can put out a general RFP or they can target biologists that we suggest. I recall we discussed sending this to individuals that we considered qualified to do this work. Mentioned were ~~is~~  
s.22

Any other suggestions? I would like to have this to BCCF before the end of the week and ask for estimates by July 3.

Thanks

Mike

From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX  
Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 2:52 PM  
To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

Nice. I am good with it.

Bill Jex, RPBio.  
Wildlife Biologist,  
Skeena Region, FLNRORD  
s.22

From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX  
Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 2:47 PM  
To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

Much simpler, looks like you have a schedule A now.

From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 2:12 PM  
To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

Hi all,

Sorry to take so long with the next draft of this. Thanks for all the comments. That was very helpful.

I have incorporated all of the "track changes" suggestions into the latest draft. I did not include recommendations regarding specific details of the research component but those discussions will definitely take place during development of the study design.

If this looks good I would like to start discussions with BCCF regarding the process for contracting a bear biologist to begin this work.

Mike

From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 9:03 AM

To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

In some areas, and for many years, cubs were not necessarily 'returned' to their place of origin. This has been much better over the past little bit with the permit directions, but I am not familiar with the other regions nowadays, that do not receive NLWS bears. Perhaps it's a non-issue, but I am glad we are at least discussing it and forming a position on the merits of the release relationships within the original home-range; we will at least be able to now say that it has been contemplated and that will be informational for the contractor.

Bill Jex, RPBio.

Wildlife Biologist,

Skeena Region, FLNRORD

s.22

From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 8:54 AM

To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

Morning

Admitting my newness to BC rehab, my understanding is that rehabbed bears were returned to their source population (not necessarily near site of capture because that's often in town or some equally undesirable location). As such, released bears are perhaps a little chubbier and more habituated compared to their wild counterparts but should have no issues with being placed in a population that isn't where they are from. Just trying to better understand the comments below. Are rehabbed bears not being released into their source population? Or are you thinking the study design should incorporate trials where some bears are released outside their source population?

Cheers

Shelley

From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 2:30 PM

To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

Very much agree Shell, re. not wanting to constrain or over-prescribe actions, but for those of us who have been part of the debate for well over a decade, there are specific answers that 'we' as gov't continue to fail on when trying to contextualize the science associated with rehabbed and reared, orphaned cubs and their benefits and liabilities to the environment in general... or when we are challenged with questions from the public and goal-oriented NGOs.

In preliminary work I have done I am pretty confident that an observed 10% 're-offending' rate is a minimum estimate and if we evaluated those outcomes from across the bear rehab industry, we may see that those rehabbed bears that require a second intervention by COS, are generally involved in a more aggressive conflict (e.g., home invasions); this would be great to have better info on.

In the wild sheep world where translocations in the US have been plentiful, biologist there have

found that while bighorns may be the same species, their behavioural and ecotypic variation makes one source-herd a better choice than another (we saw this in the outcomes of the caribou translocation from Dease Lake to the South Purcells as well). In a study where 2 seemingly comparable source herds were used to augment a local declining population, the one area-cohort of source animals greatly outperformed the other in terms of positive population contribution and effect. My comment about wanting to understand the response from the receiving population is related to having a better understanding of the relevance of this wild sheep observation (and caribou observation) in the bear world. If we are supporting the introduction of inferior ecotypes (e.g., behaviour and physiological) into a receiving population that is otherwise healthy, could we actually be damaging that wild population?

I recognize that somewhere along this path of determining what instruction to give to a contractor, and what product that the contractor may produce, will rub up against a budget cap. All I am offering is a few 'big picture' consideration type comments should at least enter the conversation, in the event that there is an opportunity to harmonize the initial work into a subsequent follow-up study.

Thanks a bunch all.

Bill Jex, RPBio.  
Wildlife Biologist,  
Skeena Region, FLNRORD  
s.22 )

From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
Sent: Saturday, May 19, 2018 7:46 PM  
To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

I think this is something that would be considered by the person contracted to develop the study design. As Mike notes, this person would be working closely with key folks in gov to ensure that we will get what we need – though we don't want to constrict the contractors thinking to a particular path.

I don't have anything else to add to the draft.

Cheers  
Shelley

From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX  
Sent: Friday, May 18, 2018 8:57 PM  
To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

Hey Mike (and all),

I had understood that when we chatted that we also needed to understand the receiving population's responses. The jeopardy to not investing in that study is that the research may show that reared cubs do great... but them doing great may be at the expense of resident, natural cubs, so what the releases may have done is alter the resident composition of the population and that may result in negative impacts to the viability and sustainability of it in future.

If you only wanted to look at reared cubs post-release, then I'd suggest a comparative study on survivorship between facilities. If you want to look at reared-released and receiving populations (which I would suggest is a higher priority for managers), then you may want to focus on just 1 facility's released cubs and the drainages where they release into.



ISSUE:

BC currently allows rearing and release of orphaned black bear cubs in BC at permitted facilities; however the efficacy of this activity is unknown because the ultimate fate of these individuals is unknown post-release.

Funds are available to develop and deliver a research-based approach for assessing the fate of released orphaned black bear cubs that were reared in rehabilitation facilities in BC and subsequently released. The goal of this project will be to assess the fate of released orphaned cubs to improve and revise rehabilitation standards for black bears in BC and to develop an understanding of outcomes and responses observed in the receiving, natural population of bears. Two main components of this work are a review of available information relating to rearing and release of orphaned cubs and development of a study design to monitor the fate of orphaned black bear cubs released back into the wild with measured effect on the natural resident population of bears through remote sensing and genetic analyses.

FYI, all cubs are micro-chipped as soon as they enter NLWS; they are also ear-tagged but sometimes that tag gets pulled so another has to be installed prior to release (this is why we went to microchip installation upon intake, to ensure we can track all cubs through care); tattooing is also a requirement and they mostly do this... NLWS has asked if they could halt tattooing since they feel it is unnecessary harm given the ear tags and microchips.

Hope this helps.

Bill Jex, RPBio.  
Wildlife Biologist,  
Skeena Region, FLNRORD

s.22

From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
Sent: Friday, May 18, 2018 3:02 PM  
To: Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: COY Research Objectives

Thanks everyone for your input on this. I have created a second draft based on your revisions and feedback.

I don't think it answers in any detail your comments below Brent, or similar ones others have made, but I envision them being addressed when building the study design (deliverable 3) with input from each of us and based largely on what comes from the review of current data and literature (deliverables 1 and 2). I agree there will have to be good communication throughout and I hope to facilitate that.

Further comments welcome (by June 2 please).

Mike

From: Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX  
Sent: Wednesday, May 9, 2018 4:01 PM  
To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Sorry for the slow response to this.

There are more than enough comments on the draft itself, so I will provide some more general comments.

I think we need to better define the purpose of this project. What management decision(s) is this work going to inform? Are we contemplating the over-all value of captive rearing and release, better defining the suitability of cubs for rearing based on their history (or other information), the specific methods used to rear the cubs or the compliance of rehabs with current policy? These are very different questions that would be answered using different data and methods. I see elements of all of these in different places in the document, which is fine, but we should state them clearly so the contractor actually answers them to the extent possible with the available data and provides a study design that will provide more insight.

Specifically, what is meant by:

1. '...develop a study design to assess outcomes of released orphan black bear cubs'? What exactly do we want to assess and what are the 'outcomes' that we are interested in?
2. '...understand the dynamics between successful and failed release efforts'? What is a successful and a failed outcome? What are the 'dynamics' we want to understand? We could identify a sizeable list of factors that could influence success, but we have a very limited sample of bears, so it will be necessary to focus on one or two priorities.

We could have the contractor do this thinking for us, but we might be disappointed with the end product. It depends a lot on who the contractor will be and how often they engage us.

Brent

From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX  
Sent: Tuesday, May 1, 2018 10:26 AM  
To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Added a bit to the previously reviewed draft... Helen and Shelley hit most of what I could add, so just added a couple comments... Also attached the WRNBC document in case you hadn't seen it; Reference standards document, page 22-23.  
Thanks.

.....  
Bill Jex, RPBio.  
Regional Wildlife Biologist,  
Skeena Region,  
British Columbia Ministry of Forest, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development  
Mail to:  
Bag 5000  
3726 Alfred Avenue  
Smithers, BC V0J 2N0  
Phone:  
(250) 847-7804  
Fax:  
(250) 847-7728

From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 4:28 PM

To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

My suggestions are attached – mostly structural, some content. Happy to review another version if that would be helpful.

Have a good weekend!

Shelley

From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX  
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 11:18 AM  
To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

A first crack at it. Once we have a second version I'd like to run it by <sup>9.22</sup> (my auxiliary vet) who has an excellent health protocol and lots of experience with bears. I'd say loose as much wordiness as possible and make it bullets like a Schedule A for a contract.

From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:47 PM  
To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Hi All,

I have attached the objectives document for the first phase of the orphaned black bear research project (review of existing data and development of a tracking study design). Feel free to hack it apart.

If I could get comments back in the next couple weeks (by May 11) that would be great. I am meeting with BCCF the week after and would like to start discussing the next steps with them.

Thanks

Mike

From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 3:00 PM  
To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

No, this was just an FYI. Alberta was not looking for our feedback. That said, this will be good information for our eventual contractor doing the research. I hope to have the objectives document out to you by tomorrow.

Mike

From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX  
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 2:39 PM  
To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

I made some comments on this, is this what you wanted Mike?

From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 3:00 PM  
To: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
Subject: FW: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

FYI

From: Forsdick, Doug O ENV:EX  
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 11:25 AM  
To: Canuel, Aaron ENV:EX  
Subject: Fwd: Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:  
From: "Psyllakis, Jennifer FLNR:EX"  
<Jennifer.Psullakis@gov.bc.ca<mailto:Jennifer.Psullakis@gov.bc.ca>>  
Date: April 23, 2018 at 11:22:07 AM PDT  
To: "Van Damme, Kevin ENV:EX"  
<Kevin.Vandamme@gov.bc.ca<mailto:Kevin.Vandamme@gov.bc.ca>>  
Cc: "Forsdick, Doug O ENV:EX" <Doug.Forsdick@gov.bc.ca<mailto:Doug.Forsdick@gov.bc.ca>>  
Subject: FW: Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol Hi Kevin,

It was nice to meet you this weekend and get a chance to talk for a bit 😊

I reached out to Alberta to let them know that there were new guidelines under development for responding to carnivores. They sent back their current draft orphaned bear protocol.

You may already have this or been in touch, but I thought I would pass it along.

Jen

## RE: COY Research Objectives

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:21 PM

|         |                                                                                                              |
|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>RE: COY Research Objectives</b>                                                                           |
| From    | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                                      |
| To      | Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX                                                          |
| Cc      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Thursday, June 14, 2018 8:58 AM                                                                              |

Too soon? Sorry Helen.

So if everyone agrees, I will ask BCCF to approach<sup>s.22</sup> with this.

Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX  
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 9:45 PM  
To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
Cc: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: Re: COY Research Objectives

I have fairly strong opinions on this and most of you know them...

Helen

> On Jun 13, 2018, at 3:20 PM, Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX <Shelley.Marshall@gov.bc.ca> wrote:  
>  
s.13,s.22

> \_\_\_\_\_  
> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
> Sent: June-13-18 11:42 AM  
> To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A  
> FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate  
> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives  
>  
> Yes. BCCF will follow whatever direction we provide regarding hiring. There are no restrictions or  
requirements on their part.  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
> Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 11:32 AM  
> To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A  
> FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate  
> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> If you have bccf approach a few folks for quotes, how are their qualifications evaluated? Some folks on the list below are much more qualified than others. Can we select 1 person without soliciting bids from a few folks?

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: June-13-18 10:53 AM

> To: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate

> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> Business as usual for now Sean. Any information regarding releases done this season will we captured by the contractor, including any collaring data if you track bears this year.

>

> The plan is to initiate a structured collaring and monitoring study next spring following development of the study design.

>

> Mike

>

> From: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

> Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:41 AM

> To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate

> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> I have bears on the island that need to be released at the end of the month. Are we supposed to wait until this is all done? Can I just stick to the standard protocols we have used in the past until the data has all been brought together? I have collars and bears are released back to close to where they were found. GPS collars will monitor post release activity.

>

> Sean Pendergast RPBio

> Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:28 AM

> To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley

> FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate

> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> I incorporated Helen's last comments and would like to have BCCF send this out to possible applicants and solicit estimates to complete this phase of the project.

>

> BCCF can put out a general RFP or they can target biologists that we suggest. I recall we discussed sending this to individuals that we considered qualified to do this work. Mentioned weres.22

s.22

<

> Any other suggestions? I would like to have this to BCCF before the end of the week and ask for estimates by July 3.

>

> Thanks

>

> Mike

>

> From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

> Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 2:52 PM

> To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> Nice. I am good with it.

>

> Bill Jex, RPBio.

> Wildlife Biologist,

> Skeena Region, FLNRORD

> s.22

>

> From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

> Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 2:47 PM

> To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> Much simpler, looks like you have a schedule A now.

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 2:12 PM

> To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> Hi all,

>

> Sorry to take so long with the next draft of this. Thanks for all the comments. That was very helpful.

>

> I have incorporated all of the "track changes" suggestions into the latest draft. I did not include recommendations regarding specific details of the research component but those discussions will definitely take place during development of the study design.

>

> If this looks good I would like to start discussions with BCCF regarding the process for contracting a bear biologist to begin this work.

>

> Mike

>

> From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

> Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 9:03 AM

> To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> In some areas, and for many years, cubs were not necessarily 'returned' to their place of origin. This has been much better over the past little bit with the permit directions, but I am not familiar with the other regions nowadays, that do not receive NLWS bears. Perhaps it's a non-issue, but I am glad we are at least discussing it and forming a position on the merits of the release relationships within the original home-range; we will at least be able to now say that it has been contemplated

and that will be informational for the contractor.

>

> Bill Jex, RPBio.

> Wildlife Biologist,

> Skeena Region, FLNRORD

>s.22

>

> From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 8:54 AM

> To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX;

> Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate

> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> Morning

>

> Admitting my newness to BC rehab, my understanding is that rehabbed bears were returned to their source population (not necessarily near site of capture because that's often in town or some equally undesirable location). As such, released bears are perhaps a little chubbier and more habituated compared to their wild counterparts but should have no issues with being placed in a population that isn't where they are from. Just trying to better understand the comments below. Are rehabbed bears not being released into their source population? Or are you thinking the study design should incorporate trials where some bears are released outside their source population?

>

> Cheers

> Shelley

>

> From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

> Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 2:30 PM

> To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent

> FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig,

> Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> Very much agree Shell, re. not wanting to constrain or over-prescribe actions, but for those of us who have been part of the debate for well over a decade, there are specific answers that 'we' as gov't continue to fail on when trying to contextualize the science associated with rehabbed and reared, orphaned cubs and their benefits and liabilities to the environment in general... or when we are challenged with questions from the public and goal-oriented NGOs.

> In preliminary work I have done I am pretty confident that an observed 10% 're-offending' rate is a minimum estimate and if we evaluated those outcomes from across the bear rehab industry, we may see that those rehabbed bears that require a second intervention by COS, are generally involved in a more aggressive conflict (e.g., home invasions); this would be great to have better info on.

> In the wild sheep world where translocations in the US have been plentiful, biologist there have found that while bighorns may be the same species, their behavioural and ecotypic variation makes one source-herd a better choice than another (we saw this in the outcomes of the caribou translocation from Dease Lake to the South Purcells as well). In a study where 2 seemingly comparable source herds were used to augment a local declining population, the one area-cohort of source animals greatly outperformed the other in terms of positive population contribution and effect. My comment about wanting to understand the response from the receiving population is related to having a better understanding of the relevance of this wild sheep observation (and caribou observation) in the bear world. If we are supporting the introduction of inferior ecotypes (e.g., behaviour and physiological) into a receiving population that is otherwise healthy, could we actually be damaging that wild population?

> I recognize that somewhere along this path of determining what instruction to give to a contractor, and what product that the contractor may produce, will rub up against a budget cap. All I am



offering is a few 'big picture' consideration type comments should at least enter the conversation, in the event that there is an opportunity to harmonize the initial work into a subsequent follow-up study.

> Thanks a bunch all.

>

> Bill Jex, RPBio.

> Wildlife Biologist,

> Skeena Region, FLNRORD

> s.22

>

> From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Sent: Saturday, May 19, 2018 7:46 PM

> To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX;

> Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate

> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> I think this is something that would be considered by the person contracted to develop the study design. As Mike notes, this person would be working closely with key folks in gov to ensure that we will get what we need – though we don't want to constrict the contractors thinking to a particular path.

>

> I don't have anything else to add to the draft.

>

> Cheers

> Shelley

>

> From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

> Sent: Friday, May 18, 2018 8:57 PM

> To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley

> FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig,

> Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> Hey Mike (and all),

> I had understood that when we chatted that we also needed to understand the receiving population's responses. The jeopardy to not investing in that study is that the research may show that reared cubs do great... but them doing great may be at the expense of resident, natural cubs, so what the releases may have done is alter the resident composition of the population and that may result in negative impacts to the viability and sustainability of it in future.

> If you only wanted to look at reared cubs post-release, then I'd suggest a comparative study on survivorship between facilities. If you want to look at reared-released and receiving populations (which I would suggest is a higher priority for managers), then you may want to focus on just 1 facility's released cubs and the drainages where they release into.

>

>

>

> ISSUE:

>

>

>

> BC currently allows rearing and release of orphaned black bear cubs in BC at permitted facilities; however the efficacy of this activity is unknown because the ultimate fate of these individuals is unknown post-release.

>

>

>

> Funds are available to develop and deliver a research-based approach for assessing the fate of released orphaned black bear cubs that were reared in rehabilitation facilities in BC and subsequently released. The goal of this project will be to assess the fate of released orphaned cubs to improve and revise rehabilitation standards for black bears in BC and to develop an understanding of outcomes and responses observed in the receiving, natural population of bears. Two main components of this work are a review of available information relating to rearing and release of orphaned cubs and development of a study design to monitor the fate of orphaned black bear cubs released back into the wild with measured effect on the natural resident population of bears through emotive sensing and genetic analyses.

>  
> FYI, all cubs are micro-chipped as soon as they enter NLWS; they are also ear-tagged but sometimes that tag gets pulled so another has to be installed prior to release (this is why we went to microchip installation upon intake, to ensure we can track all cubs through care); tattooing is also a requirement and they mostly do this... NLWS has asked if they could halt tattooing since they feel it is unnecessary harm given the ear tags and microchips.

>  
> Hope this helps.  
>  
> Bill Jex, RPBio.  
> Wildlife Biologist,  
> Skeena Region, FLNRORD  
> s.22

>  
> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
> Sent: Friday, May 18, 2018 3:02 PM  
> To: Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley  
> FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig,  
> Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
> Subject: COY Research Objectives

>  
> Thanks everyone for your input on this. I have created a second draft based on your revisions and feedback.

>  
> I don't think it answers in any detail your comments below Brent, or similar ones others have made, but I envision them being addressed when building the study design (deliverable 3) with input from each of us and based largely on what comes from the review of current data and literature (deliverables 1 and 2). I agree there will have to be good communication throughout and I hope to facilitate that.

>  
> Further comments welcome (by June 2 please).

>  
> Mike  
>  
> From: Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX  
> Sent: Wednesday, May 9, 2018 4:01 PM  
> To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen  
> FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig,  
> Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>  
> Sorry for the slow response to this.

>  
> There are more than enough comments on the draft itself, so I will provide some more general comments.

>  
> I think we need to better define the purpose of this project. What management decision(s) is this work going to inform? Are we contemplating the over-all value of captive rearing and release, better

defining the suitability of cubs for rearing based on their history (or other information), the specific methods used to rear the cubs or the compliance of rehabs with current policy? These are very different questions that would be answered using different data and methods. I see elements of all of these in different places in the document, which is fine, but we should state them clearly so the contractor actually answers them to the extent possible with the available data and provides a study design that will provide more insight.

>

> Specifically, what is meant by:

>

> 1. '...develop a study design to assess outcomes of released orphan black bear cubs'? What exactly do we want to assess and what are the 'outcomes' that we are interested in?

>

> 2. '...understand the dynamics between successful and failed release efforts'? What is a successful and a failed outcome? What are the 'dynamics' we want to understand? We could identify a sizeable list of factors that could influence success, but we have a very limited sample of bears, so it will be necessary to focus on one or two priorities.

>

> We could have the contractor do this thinking for us, but we might be disappointed with the end product. It depends a lot on who the contractor will be and how often they engage us.

>

> Brent

>

> From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

> Sent: Tuesday, May 1, 2018 10:26 AM

> To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry,

> Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd,

> Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> Added a bit to the previously reviewed draft... Helen and Shelley hit

> most of what I could add, so just added a couple comments... Also attached the WRNBC document in case you hadn't seen it; Reference standards document, page 22-23.

> Thanks.

>

> .....

> Bill Jex, RPBio.

> Regional Wildlife Biologist,

> Skeena Region,

> British Columbia Ministry of Forest, Lands, Natural Resource

> Operations and Rural Development Mail to:

> Bag 5000

> 3726 Alfred Avenue

> Smithers, BC V0J 2N0

> Phone:

> (250) 847-7804

> Fax:

> (250) 847-7728

>

> From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 4:28 PM

> To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast,

> Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent

> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> My suggestions are attached – mostly structural, some content. Happy to review another version if that would be helpful.

>

> Have a good weekend!

>

> Shelley

>

> From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

> Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 11:18 AM

> To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A

> FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> A first crack at it. Once we have a second version I'd like to run it by<sup>s.22</sup> (my auxiliary vet) who has an excellent health protocol and lots of experience with bears. I'd say loose as much wordiness as possible and make it bullets like a Schedule A for a contract.

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:47 PM

> To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A

> FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> Hi All,

>

> I have attached the objectives document for the first phase of the orphaned black bear research project (review of existing data and development of a tracking study design). Feel free to hack it apart.

>

> If I could get comments back in the next couple weeks (by May 11) that would be great. I am meeting with BCCF the week after and would like to start discussing the next steps with them.

>

> Thanks

>

> Mike

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 3:00 PM

> To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A

> FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> No, this was just an FYI. Alberta was not looking for our feedback. That said, this will be good information for our eventual contractor doing the research. I hope to have the objectives document out to you by tomorrow.

>

> Mike

>

> From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

> Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 2:39 PM

> To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A

> FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> I made some comments on this, is this what you wanted Mike?

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 3:00 PM

> To: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen  
 > FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua  
 > FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Subject: FW: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> FYI

>

> From: Forsdick, Doug O ENV:EX

> Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 11:25 AM

> To: Canuel, Aaron ENV:EX

> Subject: Fwd: Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

> Begin forwarded message:

> From: "Psyllakis, Jennifer FLNR:EX"

> <Jennifer.Psyllakis@gov.bc.ca<mailto:Jennifer.Psyllakis@gov.bc.ca>>

> Date: April 23, 2018 at 11:22:07 AM PDT

> To: "Van Damme, Kevin ENV:EX"

> <Kevin.Vandamme@gov.bc.ca<mailto:Kevin.Vandamme@gov.bc.ca>>

> Cc: "Forsdick, Doug O ENV:EX"

> <Doug.Forsdick@gov.bc.ca<mailto:Doug.Forsdick@gov.bc.ca>>

> Subject: FW: Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol Hi Kevin,

>

> It was nice to meet you this weekend and get a chance to talk for a

> bit 😊

>

> I reached out to Alberta to let them know that there were new guidelines under development for responding to carnivores. They sent back their current draft orphaned bear protocol.

>

> You may already have this or been in touch, but I thought I would pass it along.

>

> Jen

## RE: COY Research Objectives

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:24 PM

|         |                                                                                                              |
|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>RE: COY Research Objectives</b>                                                                           |
| From    | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                                      |
| To      | Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX                                                          |
| Cc      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Friday, June 15, 2018 3:10 PM                                                                                |

Does anyone have the contact information for s.22

Mike

-----Original Message-----

From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX  
Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 9:45 PM  
To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
Cc: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
Subject: Re: COY Research Objectives

I have fairly strong opinions on this and most of you know them...

Helen

> On Jun 13, 2018, at 3:20 PM, Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX <Shelley.Marshall@gov.bc.ca> wrote:  
>  
s.13,s.22

> \_\_\_\_\_  
> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
> Sent: June-13-18 11:42 AM  
> To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A  
> FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate  
> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives  
>  
> Yes. BCCF will follow whatever direction we provide regarding hiring. There are no restrictions or  
requirements on their part.  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
> Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 11:32 AM  
> To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A  
> FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate  
> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives  
>  
> If you have bccf approach a few folks for quotes, how are their qualifications evaluated? Some

folks on the list below are much more qualified than others. Can we select 1 person without soliciting bids from a few folks?

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: June-13-18 10:53 AM

> To: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate

> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> Business as usual for now Sean. Any information regarding releases done this season will we captured by the contractor, including any collaring data if you track bears this year.

>

> The plan is to initiate a structured collaring and monitoring study next spring following development of the study design.

>

> Mike

>

> From: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

> Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:41 AM

> To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate

> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> I have bears on the island that need to be released at the end of the month. Are we supposed to wait until this is all done? Can I just stick to the standard protocols we have used in the past until the data has all been brought together? I have collars and bears are released back to close to where they were found. GPS collars will monitor post release activity.

>

> Sean Pendergast RPBio

> Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: Wednesday, June 13, 2018 10:28 AM

> To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley

> FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate

> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> I incorporated Helen's last comments and would like to have BCCF send this out to possible applicants and solicit estimates to complete this phase of the project.

>

> BCCF can put out a general RFP or they can target biologists that we suggest. I recall we discussed sending this to individuals that we considered qualified to do this work. Mentioned were s.22 |

s.22

>

> Any other suggestions? I would like to have this to BCCF before the end of the week and ask for estimates by July 3.

>

> Thanks

>

> Mike

>

> From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

> Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 2:52 PM  
 > To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Marshall,  
 > Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig,  
 > Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
 > Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives  
 >  
 > Nice. I am good with it.  
 >  
 > Bill Jex, RPBio.  
 > Wildlife Biologist,  
 > Skeena Region, FLNRORD  
 > s.22  
 >  
 > From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX  
 > Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 2:47 PM  
 > To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley  
 > FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate  
 > FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
 > Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives  
 >  
 > Much simpler, looks like you have a schedule A now.  
 >  
 > From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
 > Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 2:12 PM  
 > To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent  
 > FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig,  
 > Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
 > Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives  
 >  
 > Hi all,  
 >  
 > Sorry to take so long with the next draft of this. Thanks for all the comments. That was very helpful.  
 >  
 > I have incorporated all of the "track changes" suggestions into the latest draft. I did not include recommendations regarding specific details of the research component but those discussions will definitely take place during development of the study design.  
 >  
 > If this looks good I would like to start discussions with BCCF regarding the process for contracting a bear biologist to begin this work.  
 >  
 > Mike  
 >  
 > From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX  
 > Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 9:03 AM  
 > To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent  
 > FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig,  
 > Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
 > Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives  
 >  
 > In some areas, and for many years, cubs were not necessarily 'returned' to their place of origin. This has been much better over the past little bit with the permit directions, but I am not familiar with the other regions nowadays, that do not receive NLWS bears. Perhaps it's a non-issue, but I am glad we are at least discussing it and forming a position on the merits of the release relationships within the original home-range; we will at least be able to now say that it has been contemplated and that will be informational for the contractor.  
 >



> Bill Jex, RPBio.  
 > Wildlife Biologist,  
 > Skeena Region. FLNRORD  
 > s.22  
 >  
 > From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
 > Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2018 8:54 AM  
 > To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX;  
 > Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate  
 > FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
 > Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives  
 >  
 > Morning  
 >  
 > Admitting my newness to BC rehab, my understanding is that rehabbed bears were returned to their source population (not necessarily near site of capture because that's often in town or some equally undesirable location). As such, released bears are perhaps a little chubbier and more habituated compared to their wild counterparts but should have no issues with being placed in a population that isn't where they are from. Just trying to better understand the comments below. Are rehabbed bears not being released into their source population? Or are you thinking the study design should incorporate trials where some bears are released outside their source population?  
 >  
 > Cheers  
 > Shelley  
 >  
 > From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX  
 > Sent: Monday, May 21, 2018 2:30 PM  
 > To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent  
 > FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig,  
 > Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX  
 > Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives  
 >  
 > Very much agree Shell, re. not wanting to constrain or over-prescribe actions, but for those of us who have been part of the debate for well over a decade, there are specific answers that 'we' as gov't continue to fail on when trying to contextualize the science associated with rehabbed and reared, orphaned cubs and their benefits and liabilities to the environment in general... or when we are challenged with questions from the public and goal-oriented NGOs.  
 > In preliminary work I have done I am pretty confident that an observed 10% 're-offending' rate is a minimum estimate and if we evaluated those outcomes from across the bear rehab industry, we may see that those rehabbed bears that require a second intervention by COS, are generally involved in a more aggressive conflict (e.g., home invasions); this would be great to have better info on.  
 > In the wild sheep world where translocations in the US have been plentiful, biologist there have found that while bighorns may be the same species, their behavioural and ecotypic variation makes one source-herd a better choice than another (we saw this in the outcomes of the caribou translocation from Dease Lake to the South Purcells as well). In a study where 2 seemingly comparable source herds were used to augment a local declining population, the one area-cohort of source animals greatly outperformed the other in terms of positive population contribution and effect. My comment about wanting to understand the response from the receiving population is related to having a better understanding of the relevance of this wild sheep observation (and caribou observation) in the bear world. If we are supporting the introduction of inferior ecotypes (e.g., behaviour and physiological) into a receiving population that is otherwise healthy, could we actually be damaging that wild population?  
 > I recognize that somewhere along this path of determining what instruction to give to a contractor, and what product that the contractor may produce, will rub up against a budget cap. All I am offering is a few 'big picture' consideration type comments should at least enter the conversation, in the event that there is an opportunity to harmonize the initial work into a subsequent follow-up

study.

> Thanks a bunch all.

>

> Bill Jex, RPBio.

> Wildlife Biologist,

> Skeena Region, FLNRORD

;s.22

>

> From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Sent: Saturday, May 19, 2018 7:46 PM

> To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX;

> Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate

> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> I think this is something that would be considered by the person contracted to develop the study design. As Mike notes, this person would be working closely with key folks in gov to ensure that we will get what we need – though we don't want to constrict the contractors thinking to a particular path.

>

> I don't have anything else to add to the draft.

>

> Cheers

> Shelley

>

> From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

> Sent: Friday, May 18, 2018 8:57 PM

> To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley

> FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig,

> Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: COY Research Objectives

>

> Hey Mike (and all),

> I had understood that when we chatted that we also needed to understand the receiving population's responses. The jeopardy to not investing in that study is that the research may show that reared cubs do great... but them doing great may be at the expense of resident, natural cubs, so what the releases may have done is alter the resident composition of the population and that may result in negative impacts to the viability and sustainability of it in future.

> If you only wanted to look at reared cubs post-release, then I'd suggest a comparative study on survivorship between facilities. If you want to look at reared-released and receiving populations (which I would suggest is a higher priority for managers), then you may want to focus on just 1 facility's released cubs and the drainages where they release into.

>

>

>

> ISSUE:

>

>

>

> BC currently allows rearing and release of orphaned black bear cubs in BC at permitted facilities; however the efficacy of this activity is unknown because the ultimate fate of these individuals is unknown post-release.

>

>

>

> Funds are available to develop and deliver a research-based approach for assessing the fate of released orphaned black bear cubs that were reared in rehabilitation facilities in BC and

subsequently released. The goal of this project will be to assess the fate of released orphaned cubs to improve and revise rehabilitation standards for black bears in BC and to develop an understanding of outcomes and responses observed in the receiving, natural population of bears. Two main components of this work are a review of available information relating to rearing and release of orphaned cubs and development of a study design to monitor the fate of orphaned black bear cubs released back into the wild with measured effect on the natural resident population of bears through emotive sensing and genetic analyses.

>

> FYI, all cubs are micro-chipped as soon as they enter NLWS; they are also ear-tagged but sometimes that tag gets pulled so another has to be installed prior to release (this is why we went to microchip installation upon intake, to ensure we can track all cubs through care); tattooing is also a requirement and they mostly do this... NLWS has asked if they could halt tattooing since they feel it is unnecessary harm given the ear tags and microchips.

>

> Hope this helps.

>

> Bill Jex, RPBio.

> Wildlife Biologist,

> Skeena Region, FLNRORD

> s.22

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: Friday, May 18, 2018 3:02 PM

> To: Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley

> FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig,

> Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: COY Research Objectives

>

> Thanks everyone for your input on this. I have created a second draft based on your revisions and feedback.

>

> I don't think it answers in any detail your comments below Brent, or similar ones others have made, but I envision them being addressed when building the study design (deliverable 3) with input from each of us and based largely on what comes from the review of current data and literature (deliverables 1 and 2). I agree there will have to be good communication throughout and I hope to facilitate that.

>

> Further comments welcome (by June 2 please).

>

> Mike

>

> From: Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX

> Sent: Wednesday, May 9, 2018 4:01 PM

> To: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen

> FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig,

> Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> Sorry for the slow response to this.

>

> There are more than enough comments on the draft itself, so I will provide some more general comments.

>

> I think we need to better define the purpose of this project. What management decision(s) is this work going to inform? Are we contemplating the over-all value of captive rearing and release, better defining the suitability of cubs for rearing based on their history (or other information), the specific methods used to rear the cubs or the compliance of rehabs with current policy? These are very

different questions that would be answered using different data and methods. I see elements of all of these in different places in the document, which is fine, but we should state them clearly so the contractor actually answers them to the extent possible with the available data and provides a study design that will provide more insight.

>

> Specifically, what is meant by:

>

> 1. '...develop a study design to assess outcomes of released orphan black bear cubs'? What exactly do we want to assess and what are the 'outcomes' that we are interested in?

>

> 2. '...understand the dynamics between successful and failed release efforts'? What is a successful and a failed outcome? What are the 'dynamics' we want to understand? We could identify a sizeable list of factors that could influence success, but we have a very limited sample of bears, so it will be necessary to focus on one or two priorities.

>

> We could have the contractor do this thinking for us, but we might be disappointed with the end product. It depends a lot on who the contractor will be and how often they engage us.

>

> Brent

>

> From: Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX

> Sent: Tuesday, May 1, 2018 10:26 AM

> To: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry,

> Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd,

> Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> Added a bit to the previously reviewed draft... Helen and Shelley hit

> most of what I could add, so just added a couple comments... Also attached the WRNBC document in case you hadn't seen it; Reference standards document, page 22-23.

> Thanks.

>

> .....

> Bill Jex, RPBio.

> Regional Wildlife Biologist,

> Skeena Region,

> British Columbia Ministry of Forest, Lands, Natural Resource

> Operations and Rural Development Mail to:

> Bag 5000

> 3726 Alfred Avenue

> Smithers, BC V0J 2N0

> Phone:

> (250) 847-7804

> Fax:

> (250) 847-7728

>

> From: Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 4:28 PM

> To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast,

> Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent

> FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> My suggestions are attached – mostly structural, some content. Happy to review another version if that would be helpful.

>

> Have a good weekend!

>

> Shelley

>

> From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

> Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 11:18 AM

> To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A

> FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> A first crack at it. Once we have a second version I'd like to run it by s.22 (my auxiliary vet) who has an excellent health protocol and lots of experience with bears. I'd say loose as much wordiness as possible and make it bullets like a Schedule A for a contract.

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:47 PM

> To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A

> FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> Hi All,

>

> I have attached the objectives document for the first phase of the orphaned black bear research project (review of existing data and development of a tracking study design). Feel free to hack it apart.

>

> If I could get comments back in the next couple weeks (by May 11) that would be great. I am meeting with BCCF the week after and would like to start discussing the next steps with them.

>

> Thanks

>

> Mike

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 3:00 PM

> To: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A

> FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> No, this was just an FYI. Alberta was not looking for our feedback. That said, this will be good information for our eventual contractor doing the research. I hope to have the objectives document out to you by tomorrow.

>

> Mike

>

> From: Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

> Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 2:39 PM

> To: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A

> FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua

> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX

> Subject: RE: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol

>

> I made some comments on this, is this what you wanted Mike?

>

> From: Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

> Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 3:00 PM  
> To: Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen  
> FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua  
> FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX  
> Subject: FW: AB Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol  
>  
> FYI  
>  
> From: Forsdick, Doug O ENV:EX  
> Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 11:25 AM  
> To: Canuel, Aaron ENV:EX  
> Subject: Fwd: Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol  
>  
>  
> Sent from my iPhone  
>  
> Begin forwarded message:  
> From: "Psyllakis, Jennifer FLNR:EX"  
> <Jennifer.Psullakis@gov.bc.ca<mailto:Jennifer.Psullakis@gov.bc.ca>>  
> Date: April 23, 2018 at 11:22:07 AM PDT  
> To: "Van Damme, Kevin ENV:EX"  
> <Kevin.Vandamme@gov.bc.ca<mailto:Kevin.Vandamme@gov.bc.ca>>  
> Cc: "Forsdick, Doug O ENV:EX"  
> <Doug.Forsdick@gov.bc.ca<mailto:Doug.Forsdick@gov.bc.ca>>  
> Subject: FW: Orphaned bear cub policy / protocol Hi Kevin,  
>  
> It was nice to meet you this weekend and get a chance to talk for a  
> bit 😊  
>  
> I reached out to Alberta to let them know that there were new guidelines under development for  
responding to carnivores. They sent back their current draft orphaned bear protocol.  
>  
> You may already have this or been in touch, but I thought I would pass it along.  
>  
> Jen

# Orphaned Black Bear Research Proposals

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:11 PM

|             |                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject     | Orphaned Black Bear Research Proposals                                                                                                                            |
| From        | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                                                                                           |
| To          | Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX |
| Cc          | Iredale, Francis FLNR:EX; Trina Radford (tradford@bccf.com)                                                                                                       |
| Sent        | Monday, July 9, 2018 4:30 PM                                                                                                                                      |
| Attachments | s.13,s.21<br><br><br>Re Assessing<br>the Efficac...                              |

We have received proposals from both s.22 for the orphaned black bear research. I have attached them both here.

I have not had a chance to review them but will take a look tomorrow. I am hoping to convene a conference call prior to July 20 a:s.22  
s.22 so look for a calendar invite in the near future to discuss these two submissions.

Thanks

Mike

**Bullard, Dan FLNR:EX**

---

**From:** s.22  
**Sent:** Monday, July 9, 2018 3:56 PM  
**To:** 'Trina Radford'  
**Cc:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
**Subject:** Aklak Wildlife Proposal: Assessing the Efficacy of Rearing and Release of Orphaned Black Bear Cubs  
**Attachments:** BC\_BB\_Rehab\_Proposal\_Aklak\_2018.pdf

Dear Trina and Mike,

I am pleased to provide (attached) Aklak Wildlife Consulting's response to BCCF's Request for Proposals for Assessing the Efficiency of Rearing and Release of Orphaned Black Bear Cubs in BC.

I am happy to discuss any aspect of the proposal. As a note, I did not specifically address the possibility for this project to continue into a multi-year project with a field study component; however, if I am successful in this proposal I would definitely be interested in carrying out the research work. Thank you for asking me to bid on this important work. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any comments or questions.

Please acknowledge receipt of the attached proposal to conduct work.

Sincerely,

s.22

\*\*\*\*\*

*Do you really need to print this email? Please consider the loss of bear habitat before you do.*

---

**From:** Trina Radford [<mailto:tradford@bccf.com>]  
**Sent:** June-19-18 10:04 AM  
**To:** s.22  
**Cc:** Mike Badry ([Mike.Badry@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Mike.Badry@gov.bc.ca))  
**Subject:** Assessing the Efficacy of Rearing and Release of Orphaned Black Bear Cubs - Proposal

Hi s.22

Following up from our discussion today, please find attached proposed objectives for the Assessing the Efficacy of Rearing and Release of Orphaned Black Bear Cubs project. It briefly outlines the current issue to be addressed and three detailed objectives to be completed in the current fiscal year of which ends on March 31, 2019.

As discussed, there is a possibility for this project to continue into a multi-year project with a field study component.



If this proposal is an area of interest to you, please provide a detailed proposal of the costs to complete each of the objectives outlined by July 9, 2018.

If you have any questions regarding the project and the objectives please contact Mike Badry. He can be reached at:

Email: [Mike.badry@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Mike.badry@gov.bc.ca)

Office: (778) 698-4276

Cell: (250) 231-1944

It was great speaking to you today.

Thank-you,

Trina

Trina Radford

Project Coordinator

British Columbia Conservation Foundation

1B - 1445 McGill Rd, Kamloops BC, V2C 6K7

Email: [tradford@bccf.com](mailto:tradford@bccf.com)

Tel: 250-828-2551 ext. 104

---



BC\_BB\_Reha  
b\_Proposa...

Inserted from: <file:///C:/Users/dbullard\AppData/Local/Temp/{01E01E42-73D5-48C9-807D-999D133CCEE0}.pdf>

Page 095 to/à Page 101

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.21

**Bullard, Dan FLNR:EX**

---

**From:** s.22  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 8, 2018 3:55 PM  
**To:** Trina Radford  
**Cc:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
**Subject:** Re: Assessing the Efficacy of Rearing and Release of Orphaned Black Bear Cubs - Proposal  
**Attachments:** BCCF Orphaned Cub Bid s.22 July 2018.pdf

Dear Trina and Mike,  
Please find attached my proposal and bid for the project to assess the efficacy of rearing and releasing black bear cubs in British Columbia.

I have prepared the document in two parts: 1) the proposal and bid, and 2) my CV. They are merged together in the attached .pdf file.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to hearing from you and further discussing this project.

Thank you for considering me for the work.

Sincerely,  
s.22

On Tue, Jun 19, 2018 at 1:38 PM, Trina Radford <[tradford@bccf.com](mailto:tradford@bccf.com)> wrote:

Hi s.22

Following up from our discussion today, please find attached proposed objectives for the Assessing the Efficacy of Rearing and Release of Orphaned Black Bear Cubs project. It briefly outlines the current issue to be addressed and three detailed objectives to be completed in the current fiscal year of which ends on March 31, 2019.

As discussed, there is a possibility for this project to continue into a multi-year project with a field study component.

If this proposal is an area of interest to you, please provide a detailed proposal of the costs to complete each of the objectives outlined by July 9, 2018.

If you have any questions regarding the project and the objectives please contact Mike Badry. He can be reached at:

Email: [Mike.badry@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Mike.badry@gov.bc.ca)

Office: (778) 698-4276

Cell: (250) 231-1944

It was great speaking to you today.

Thank-you,

Trina

Trina Radford  
Project Coordinator  
British Columbia Conservation Foundation  
1B - 1445 McGill Rd, Kamloops BC, V2C 6K7  
Email: [tradford@bccf.com](mailto:tradford@bccf.com)  
Tel: 250-828-2551 ext. 104



BCCF  
Orphaned ...

Inserted from: <file:///C:/Users/dbullard/AppData/Local/Temp/{895F24D7-5294-4B2A-A43F-B55B9956E06C}.pdf>

Page 105 to/à Page 118

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.21

Page 119 to/à Page 134

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.22



# FW: Introductions to the BC Rehab Facilities

Thursday, December 6, 2018

2:00 PM

|         |                                                                                               |
|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>FW: Introductions to the BC Rehab Facilities</b>                                           |
| From    | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                       |
| To      | Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX                            |
| Cc      | Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Tuesday, September 4, 2018 8:49 AM                                                            |

Hi Brent, Sean and Bill,

I think it would be best if each of the rehab centres were given an introduction to Ramona by each of you before she contacts them regarding the orphaned cub study.

Could you please pass on an introduction for her (see below)?

Thanks

Mike

**From:** Ramona Maraj [<mailto:ramona@ualberta.net>]

**Sent:** Sunday, September 2, 2018 8:02 PM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Subject:** Introductions to the BC Rehab Facilities

Hi Mike,

Do you think you could get the regional staff to send out a note to the three rehab facilities in BC to let them know I will be contacting them. Alternatively, and perhaps a bit more arms length, I could ask the BCCF to introduce me to these facilities. Here is some information on who I am and what I will be discussing with them when I call:

---

Ramona is being contract by the BCCF to look at a broad set of objectives relating to orphaned black bear cubs in BC. She has a PhD in bear ecology and studied bears in Yukon for over 20 years. Through her time in Yukon, she dealt with orphaned cubs and worked with rehab facilities and bear husbandry specialists (e.g., the late Else Poulsen) to look at options for those cubs. She also worked for rehab facilities prior to moving to Yukon and is keenly aware of the many issues these facilities are up against for successful rehabilitation.

Ramona will be after information on:

- 1) Current husbandry practices in your facility for rearing orphaned cubs
- 2) Information on best practices, standards, and enrichment practices you may use
- 3) Information on permitting and challenges, if any, to meeting permit requirements
- 4) Any information/data on post release success/failure

---

I tried to do up something that walks the line of neutrality. I also worded the compliance piece in number three to relate to obstacles and open the door for facilities to provide examples of what works with current permitting.

This is just a template, so feel free to edit it if there is something else you would like to see. Let me know if you think it should go through regional programs or BCCF.

Best,

Ramona

## RE: Introductions to the BC Rehab Facilities

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:25 PM

|         |                                                                                                                                         |
|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>RE: Introductions to the BC Rehab Facilities</b>                                                                                     |
| From    | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                                                                 |
| To      | Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX                                                                                                                |
| Cc      | Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Tuesday, September 4, 2018 3:55 PM                                                                                                      |

I didn't hear anyone complain so I shared it with Ramona. Thanks Helen.

Mike

**From:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 4, 2018 9:06 AM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Cc:** Gurd, Brent FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate FLNR:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX

**Subject:** Re: Introductions to the BC Rehab Facilities

And Mike

Can you ask her to wrap in a question about health as some facilities and COs have seen issues with hepatic sarcocystosis causing illness and death in black cubs

We've written up a drop dead case in a grizzly COY too

I'm sure the others would see too if more pms were done

It's such a good opportunity to learn more

Really like to know more about distribution of this condition that appears to be associated with the coast?

If you all are ok with this pls just cc Ramona

Helen

On Sep 4, 2018, at 8:49 AM, Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX <[Mike.Badry@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Mike.Badry@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

Hi Brent, Sean and Bill,

I think it would be best if each of the rehab centres were given an introduction to Ramona by each of you before she contacts them regarding the orphaned cub study.

Could you please pass on an introduction for her (see below)?

Thanks

Mike

**From:** Ramona Maraj [<mailto:ramona@ualberta.net>]

**Sent:** Sunday, September 2, 2018 8:02 PM

**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Subject:** Introductions to the BC Rehab Facilities

Hi Mike,

Do you think you could get the regional staff to send out a note to the three rehab facilities in BC to let them know I will be contacting them. Alternatively, and perhaps a bit more arms length, I could ask the BCCF to introduce me to these facilities. Here is some information on who I am and what I will be discussing with them when I call:

Ramona is being contract by the BCCF to look at a broad set of objectives relating to orphaned black bear cubs in BC. She has a PhD in bear ecology and studied bears in Yukon for over 20 years. Through her time in Yukon, she dealt with orphaned cubs and worked with rehab facilities and bear husbandry specialists (e.g., the late Else Poulsen) to look at options for those cubs. She also worked for rehab facilities prior to moving to Yukon and is keenly aware of the many issues these facilities are up against for successful rehabilitation.

Ramona will be after information on:

- 1) Current husbandry practices in your facility for rearing orphaned cubs
- 2) Information on best practices, standards, and enrichment practices you may use
- 3) Information on permitting and challenges, if any, to meeting permit requirements
- 4) Any information/data on post release success/failure

---

I tried to do up something that walks the line of neutrality. I also worded the compliance piece in number three to relate to obstacles and open the door for facilities to provide examples of what works with current permitting.



This is just a template, so feel free to edit it if there is something else you would like to see. Let me know if you think it should go through regional programs or BCCF.

Best,

Ramona

# Orphaned Bear Cub Project

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:03 PM

|             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject     | <b>Orphaned Bear Cub Project</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| From        | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| To          | Jex, Bill A FLNR:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Evans, Jack FLNR:EX                                                                    |
| Sent        | Friday, October 19, 2018 2:57 PM                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Attachments | <div><br/>Re Black<br/>Bear Orph...</div> <div><br/>Update 2</div> |

Helen was kind enough to remind me that I have been negligent in forwarding the updates from Ramona regarding the orphaned cub project so I have attached the two updates so far.

I will also set up a conference call in the next couple of weeks if everyone is available to have a discussion with Ramona about progress and findings.

Have a good weekend.

Mike

**Bullard, Dan FLNR:EX**

---

**From:** Ramona Maraj <ramona@ualberta.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 4, 2018 8:35 AM  
**To:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
**Subject:** Re: Black Bear Orphaned Cub Project - Update 1  
**Attachments:** Orphaned Cub Policy Status Table - Sept 4.xlsx

Hi Mike,  
I am assuming you haven't read through my email yet! So am sending a slightly updated version of the excel table. Current as of this morning.

Cheers,  
Ramona

On Sun, Sep 2, 2018 at 10:15 PM, Ramona Maraj <ramona@ualberta.net> wrote:  
Hi Mike,

I just wanted to provide you with an update on the contract.

**With respect to Objective 1:**

- I have completed approximately 70% of the literature search, and read about 40% of what I have found, to-date. Outstanding literature is the grey literature not readily available at the University library, electronic databases or on-line. Some of the literature is being sent to me, while I am trying to sort out where other grey literature pieces may be. I can't give you a great timeline for completion on the search because I am at the mercy of agencies and individuals. There are also some key pieces that are not available yet, but should be available soon (e.g., s.22 Master's thesis, a legal review done through Cochrane Wildlife Institute).

- I have contacted most relevant agencies across Canada and some of the pertinent agencies across the US. I contact all agencies that neighbour BC (Alberta, Yukon, Alaska and Washington). I am still trying to sort out the most relevant contact for SK, NB, and NS. My success in responses is noted in the attached spreadsheet. Please note that many folks are not around, in the field, on holidays, etc... or I only just contacted them. So the response rate will increase over the next few weeks.

- I have also been trying to track down a jurisdiction review completed by the Canadian Wildlife Directors Committee. I sent you a note about this earlier, to see if you had access to a copy or could connect me to the BC director that sits on this committee. Also, if I could get BCs current policies or directives on this, that would be helpful. I sent you an email yesterday about this (which you will probably read only minutes before you read this one!).

- I have contacted several facilities, including all non-BC facilities in Canada to get information on their husbandry and release practices, permitting issues, and availability of data (see attached spreadsheet). I have been seeking information from these facilities to determine what literature or science was used to establish their rehabilitation centre policies. I still have two facilities in Ontario to make contact with.

**With respect to Objective 2**

- While contacting some of the above agencies and facilities, I have also discussed the following: compliance issues, and availability of data for *ad hoc* meta analysis, collar types used on tracked bears

- I sent a note to you earlier tonight about introducing me/the project to the facilities.

I hope to continue to work on Objective 1 for the next few weeks and will slowly transition into Objective 2.

If there are any specific jurisdictions or facilities you would like me to contact, please let me know. Let me know if you have any questions or thoughts.

Cheers,  
Ramona



Orphaned  
Cub Policy ...

Inserted from: <file:///\\SFP.IDIR.BCGOV\\U164\\DBULLARD\$\\Profile\\Desktop\\FNR-2018-86425\\Orphaned Cub Policy Status  
Table - Sept 4.pdf>

Orphaned Cub Policy Status Table

|                                        | Contact                                 | Contacted | No Response | In Discussion | Policy Provided | No Official Policy | Waiting Approval | Other                                                                                                              |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>USA</b>                             |                                         |           |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Washington                             | Richard Bussard                         | X         |             | X             |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Idaho                                  | John Gillette                           | X         | X           |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Tennessee                              | Don Gilley/Walter Cook                  | X         | X           |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Idaho                                  |                                         |           |             | X             |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Alaska                                 | Ned Bartens/Tom Schumaker               | X         |             | X             |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Arizona                                | Andrew Tarrisms                         | X         |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| New Hampshire                          | Pat Powers, Frank Lewis, Kerry Gaultier | X         |             | X             |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| UT/PO                                  | Don Wright                              | X         |             |               | X               |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Canada</b>                          |                                         |           |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Alberta                                | Paul Frame/Douglas Frame                | X         |             |               | X               |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| British Columbia                       | Bruce Kennedy/Bruce Adams               | X         |             |               | X               |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| BC/WT                                  | Mark Crampton/Robert Eden               | X         |             |               |                 |                    |                  | Looking into what they have in field                                                                               |
| Manitoba                               | Markus Dyck                             | X         |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Saskatchewan                           | Janine Stewart                          | X         |             |               |                 | X                  |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Ontario                                | Jeremy Tigger/Tamara Grouse             | X         |             |               |                 |                    |                  | Looking to see what they have in field, will discuss more once out                                                 |
| Quebec                                 | Robert Gaudet/Robert Gaudet             | X         |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Newfoundland                           | John Prinspie                           | X         |             |               | X               |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| New Brunswick                          |                                         |           |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| PEI                                    | No Bears                                | No Bears  |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Atlantic Canada                        | Steve Mitchell                          | X         |             |               | X               |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Facilities</b>                      |                                         |           |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Appalachian Bear Rescue (Tennessee)    | Cory Blair                              | X         |             |               |                 |                    |                  | Will return next week                                                                                              |
| Bear Club Effort (New Hampshire)       | Bruce Wilson                            | X         |             | X             |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Black Bear Project (New York)          | John Boudreau                           | X         |             | X             |                 |                    |                  | Will return next week                                                                                              |
| Wildlife Centre of Virginia (Virginia) | Bob Hudson                              | X         |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Carbone Wildlife Institute (Alberta)   | Chris Swenson                           | X         |             |               | X               |                    |                  | Computer crashed, waiting repair, will send after fixed, noted that they standards are based on Bechman Guidelines |
| Manitoba Black Bear Rescue (Manitoba)  | Julie                                   | X         |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Bear With Us (Ontario)                 | Mike MacIsaac                           | X         | X           |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Black Bear Project (Manitoba)          |                                         |           |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |
| Wild at Heart Wildlife (Ontario)       |                                         |           |             |               |                 |                    |                  |                                                                                                                    |



**Bullard, Dan FLNR:EX**

---

**From:** Ramona Maraj <ramona@ualberta.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 15, 2018 9:59 PM  
**To:** Trina Radford; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX  
**Subject:** Update 2

Hi Mike and Trina,

I wanted to provide another quick update as to where things are at, and solicit some help with getting information from the BC COs.

In Canada, New Brunswick is the only jurisdiction that has not responded to my request for information on policies. It has been interesting to see the vast diversity across agencies as to how the relevant policy and best practice documents are housed. Some agencies use human-wildlife conflict as the policy vehicle, while others use legislation on captive wildlife.

I have completed a very rough draft summarizing the practices across jurisdictions, excluding jurisdictions I have not been able to make contact with.

I contacted all rehab facilities across Canada. The facility from Saskatchewan and the three facilities from Ontario have not responded. I have completed a rough draft summarizing what I received from Manitoba, plus any US facilities.

I contacted the three facilities in BC for information. I received a response from the facility in the lower mainland, indicating that she s.22 would need several weeks or more to put the information together. She is s.22 was down a staff member s.22 ), and s.22 . I received a response from the facility on the Island acknowledging my request, but noting that the request needed to work its way to other folks. I have not heard from s.22 in Smithers.

I have largely completed the literature search and have found all but a handful of documents that I wanted to review. I've collected a large breadth of information, representing issues and research on husbandry, disease, rehabilitation, artificial denning, and many other topics. There are a handful of documents from Europe and two grey literature pieces that I was unable to track down. I still have some contacts in Europe trying to chase some of these down, but I am going ahead with the write up of these documents.

I have started to amalgamate information on the various options for collars. I spoke with the various rehab facilities and agencies that do collar bears upon release and got information on what they are using. However, there are many options out there and only a handful of agencies that collar, so I am compiling information from collar companies directly. This is my main area of focus at the moment.

I need to solicit information from the Conservation Officer Service. I am wondering if you can advise who the best contacts are for this. I am specifically looking to address the objectives relating to compliance and possible data on release of rehabbed orphans.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Cheers,  
Ramona



## Fwd: Bear Rehab Info

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:01 PM

|         |                                                   |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>Fwd: Bear Rehab Info</b>                       |
| From    | <a href="#">Ramona Maraj</a>                      |
| To      | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX |
| Cc      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX                          |
| Sent    | Saturday, November 17, 2018 2:50 PM               |

Hi Mike and Helen -

As I mentioned on the phone, this is what I received from north Island Wildlife Recovery Centre (see below). I have told her that I will connect on Thursday by phone and asked her to suggest a time.  
s.22

I haven't heard back from s.22 but I will try the numbe s.2 gave me on Thursday.  
I will let you know how my conversation with s.22 goes.  
Cheers,  
Ramona

----- Forwarded message -----

From: s.22  
Date: Wed, Nov 7, 2018 at 2:09 PM  
Subject: Bear Rehab Info  
To: <[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)>

Hi Ramona,

Unfortunately at this time we are extremely busy to respond to your request. Could you please call us to discuss more. s.22

Thank you  
s.22

Sent from my iPhone

## Re: Bear Rehab Info

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:19 PM

|         |                                                   |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>Re: Bear Rehab Info</b>                        |
| From    | <a href="#">Ramona Maraj</a>                      |
| To      | Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX |
| Cc      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX                          |
| Sent    | Saturday, November 17, 2018 2:54 PM               |

I should add that the request(s) for information from them went in well over a month ago.

On Sat, Nov 17, 2018 at 3:50 PM Ramona Maraj <[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)> wrote:

Hi Mike and Helen -

As I mentioned on the phone, this is what I received from north Island Wildlife Recovery Centre (see below). I have told her that I will connect on Thursday by phone and asked her to suggest a time.

s.22

I haven't heard back from s.22 but I will try the number s.22 gave me on Thursday.

I will let you know how my conversation with s.22 goes.

Cheers,

Ramona

----- Forwarded message -----

From: s.22

Date: Wed, Nov 7, 2018 at 2:09 PM

Subject: Bear Rehab Info

To: <[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)>

Hi Ramona,

Unfortunately at this time we are extremely busy to respond to your request. Could you please call us to discuss more. s.22

Thank you

s.22

Sent from my iPhone

## Re: Bear Rehab Info

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:20 PM

|         |                                                   |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>Re: Bear Rehab Info</b>                        |
| From    | <a href="#">Ramona Maraj</a>                      |
| To      | Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX                          |
| Cc      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX |
| Sent    | Tuesday, November 20, 2018 11:40 AM               |

Thanks Helen. will let you know how Thursday goes.

On Tue, Nov 20, 2018 at 12:35 PM Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX <[Helen.Schwantje@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Helen.Schwantje@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:  
I have been pushing her in person as she was a bit up in arms. I told her if she wants the support for her program she needs to be proactive and that government is investing through this contract. No need for anyone else

**From:** Ramona Maraj [<mailto:ramona@ualberta.net>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 20, 2018 11:32 AM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Cc:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX

**Subject:** Re: Bear Rehab Info

Hi Sean,

I am chatting with her at 11AM on Thursday. She just got back and is around today and tomorrow. If you want to chat with her before I call her and let her know the value of this exercise, that would probably grease the wheels a little more for me.

I did ask her for her timeline if she was unable to provide me data now. I mentioned that I would have to communicate the timeline back to the Ministry. It seems using the word 'Ministry' has engendered a bit more cooperation. So I suspect hearing from you will also help.

Let me know if that can happen.

Thanks,

Ramona

On Mon, Nov 19, 2018 at 5:44 PM Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:  
I could always contact them as well and see if I can nudge them to provide info.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Sunday, November 18, 2018 7:47 AM

**To:** Ramona Maraj

**Cc:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** Re: Bear Rehab Info

s.22

Let me know if you need more numbers

Helen

On Nov 17, 2018, at 2:51 PM, Ramona Maraj <[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)> wrote:

Hi Mike and Helen -

As I mentioned on the phone, this is what I received from north Island Wildlife Recovery Centre (see below). I have told her that I will connect on Thursday by phone and asked her to suggest a time.

s.22

I haven't heard back from s.22 but I will try the number s.2 gave me on Thursday.

I will let you know how my conversation with s.22 goes. ^

Cheers,  
Ramona

----- Forwarded message -----

From: s.22

Date: Wed, Nov 7, 2018 at 2:09 PM

Subject: Bear Rehab Info

To: <[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)>

Hi Ramona,

Unfortunately at this time we are extremely busy to respond to your request. Could you please call us to discuss more. s.22

Thank you  
s.22

Sent from my iPhone

## Re: Bear Rehab Info

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:19 PM

|         |                                                   |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>Re: Bear Rehab Info</b>                        |
| From    | <a href="#">Ramona Maraj</a>                      |
| To      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX                          |
| Cc      | Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX; Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX |
| Sent    | Tuesday, November 20, 2018 11:32 AM               |

Hi Sean,

I am chatting with her at 11AM on Thursday. She just got back and is around today and tomorrow. If you want to chat with her before I call her and let her know the value of this exercise, that would probably grease the wheels a little more for me.

I did ask her for her timeline if she was unable to provide me data now. I mentioned that I would have to communicate the timeline back to the Ministry. It seems using the word 'Ministry' has engendered a bit more cooperation. So I suspect hearing from you will also help.

Let me know if that can happen.

Thanks,  
Ramona

On Mon, Nov 19, 2018 at 5:44 PM Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:  
I could always contact them as well and see if I can nudge them to provide info.

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Schwantje, Helen FLNR:EX

**Sent:** Sunday, November 18, 2018 7:47 AM

**To:** Ramona Maraj

**Cc:** Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** Re: Bear Rehab Info

s.22

Let me know if you need more numbers

Helen

On Nov 17, 2018, at 2:51 PM, Ramona Maraj <[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)> wrote:

Hi Mike and Helen -

As I mentioned on the phone, this is what I received from north Island Wildlife Recovery Centre (see below). I have told her that I will connect on Thursday by phone and asked her to suggest a time.

s.22

I haven't heard back from s.22 but I will try the number s.22 gave me on Thursday.

I will let you know how my conversation with s.22 goes.

Cheers,

Ramona

----- Forwarded message -----

From: s.22

Date: Wed, Nov 7, 2018 at 2:09 PM

Subject: Bear Rehab Info

To: <[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)>

Hi Ramona,

Unfortunately at this time we are extremely busy to respond to your request. Could you please call us to discuss more s.22

Thank you  
s.22

Sent from my iPhone



# Orphaned Cub Data

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:18 PM

|         |                                      |
|---------|--------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>Orphaned Cub Data</b>             |
| From    | <a href="#">Ramona Maraj</a>         |
| To      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX             |
| Sent    | Thursday, November 22, 2018 11:26 AM |

Hi Sean,

s.22 mentioned that you have the collar data and some other information from one of the cubs that was released through their facility this year.

Would you be able to provide this to me?

And are there any other cubs you have information for? Is it possible to get these data from you?

Thanks for your help with this!

Ramona

## Re: Orphaned Cub Data

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:28 PM

|         |                                   |
|---------|-----------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>Re: Orphaned Cub Data</b>      |
| From    | <a href="#">Ramona Maraj</a>      |
| To      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX          |
| Sent    | Friday, November 23, 2018 8:24 AM |

Hey Sean,

Thanks. CSV format would be easiest for me to work with. Maybe a quick chat today if you have a minute. Let me know.

Cheers,

Ramona

On Thu, Nov 22, 2018 at 3:31 PM Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:  
I do have some. It is housed on our secure user access with the collar company. I think I can export a .csv file with the UTM data or even a .kml file if that would work?

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Ramona Maraj [<mailto:ramona@ualberta.net>]

**Sent:** Thursday, November 22, 2018 11:26 AM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** Orphaned Cub Data

Hi Sean,

s.22 mentioned that you have the collar data and some other information from one of the cubs that was released through their facility this year.

Would you be able to provide this to me?

And are there any other cubs you have information for? Is it possible to get these data from you?

Thanks for your help with this!

Ramona

## Re: Orphaned Cub Data

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:28 PM

|         |                                   |
|---------|-----------------------------------|
| Subject | Re: Orphaned Cub Data             |
| From    | Ramona Maraj                      |
| To      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX          |
| Sent    | Friday, November 30, 2018 3:22 PM |

try my cell. s.22

On Fri, Nov 30, 2018 at 4:20 PM Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:  
Hey Ramona – just need your phone number. I haven't found it yet...

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Ramona Maraj [mailto:[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)]

**Sent:** Friday, November 30, 2018 3:09 PM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** Re: Orphaned Cub Data

Hi Sean,

Just tried calling. Just drop me a line and let me know what might work for you next week.

I am in the field on Monday, and head to Jasper Wednesday night, Tied up Thursday but back on Friday. So Tuesday and Friday afternoon definitely work for me. May also be able to swing Monday afternoon if there is a break in things.

Cheers,

Ramona

On Fri, Nov 23, 2018 at 2:47 PM Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:  
Hi Ramona, give me a call. I have a few minute s.22

250 751 3225

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Ramona Maraj [mailto:[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)]

**Sent:** Friday, November 23, 2018 8:25 AM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** Re: Orphaned Cub Data

Hey Sean,

Thanks. CSV format would be easiest for me to work with. Maybe a quick chat today if you have a minute. Let me know.

Cheers,

Ramona

On Thu, Nov 22, 2018 at 3:31 PM Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:  
I do have some. It is housed on our secure user access with the collar company. I think I can export a .csv file with the UTM data or even a .kml file if that would work?

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Ramona Maraj [mailto:[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)]

**Sent:** Thursday, November 22, 2018 11:26 AM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** Orphaned Cub Data

Hi Sean,

s.22 mentioned that you have the collar data and some other information from one of the cubs that was released through their facility this year.

Would you be able to provide this to me?

And are there any other cubs you have information for? Is it possible to get these data from you?

Thanks for your help with this!

Ramona

## Re: Orphaned Cub Data

Thursday, December 6, 2018  
2:27 PM

|         |                                   |
|---------|-----------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>Re: Orphaned Cub Data</b>      |
| From    | <a href="#">Ramona Maraj</a>      |
| To      | Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX          |
| Sent    | Friday, November 30, 2018 3:09 PM |

Hi Sean,

Just tried calling. Just drop me a line and let me know what might work for you next week.

I am in the field on Monday, and head to Jasper Wednesday night, Tied up Thursday but back on Friday. So Tuesday and Friday afternoon definitely work for me. May also be able to swing Monday afternoon if there is a break in things.

Cheers,

Ramona

On Fri, Nov 23, 2018 at 2:47 PM Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

Hi Ramona, give me a call. I have a few minutes s.22

250 751 3225

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Ramona Maraj [mailto:[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)]

**Sent:** Friday, November 23, 2018 8:25 AM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** Re: Orphaned Cub Data

Hey Sean,

Thanks. CSV format would be easiest for me to work with. Maybe a quick chat today if you have a minute. Let me know.

Cheers,

Ramona

On Thu, Nov 22, 2018 at 3:31 PM Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX <[Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Sean.Pendergast@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

I do have some. It is housed on our secure user access with the collar company. I think I can export a .csv file with the UTM data or even a .kml file if that would work?

Sean Pendergast RPBio

Senior Wildlife Biologist | Fish & Wildlife Section

**From:** Ramona Maraj [mailto:[ramona@ualberta.net](mailto:ramona@ualberta.net)]

**Sent:** Thursday, November 22, 2018 11:26 AM

**To:** Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX

**Subject:** Orphaned Cub Data

Hi Sean,

s.22 mentioned that you have the collar data and some other information from one of the cubs that was released through their facility this year.

Would you be able to provide this to me?

And are there any other cubs you have information for? Is it possible to get these data from you?

Thanks for your help with this!

Ramona

## Re: Update and discussion with Ramona re:orphaned cub project

Thursday, December 6, 2018

2:29 PM

|         |                                                                                                                                              |
|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | <b>Re: Update and discussion with Ramona re:orphaned cub project</b>                                                                         |
| From    | <a href="#">Ramona Maraj</a>                                                                                                                 |
| To      |                                                                                                                                              |
| Cc      | Marshall, Shelley FLNR:EX; Pendergast, Sean FLNR:EX; Craig, Kate ENV:EX; Malt, Joshua FLNR:EX; Evans, Jack FLNR:EX; Iredale, Francis FLNR:EX |
| Sent    | Friday, November 30, 2018 10:11 PM                                                                                                           |

Hey Folks,

I am wondering if any of you has kept records or pulled records from the HWCR or COORS, related to orphaned black bear cub intake and release, or fate. I chatted with Bill Jex and he had a database from his region. I am wondering if any other folks have kept records?

Thanks for any help you can give.

Ramona

On Mon, Nov 5, 2018 at 5:21 PM Badry, Micheal J ENV:EX <[Mike.Badry@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Mike.Badry@gov.bc.ca)> wrote:

As promised, I have booked a time for us to have a discussion with Ramona regarding progress on the orphaned cub project. Hopefully it will work for most of us.

And attached is a new update. Talk to you soon.

Mike

Dial-in 1-877-353-9184

Participant Conference ID: 17