

NEW STRATEGIES FOR BEAR CONSERVATION: COLLABORATION BETWEEN RESOURCE AGENCIES AND ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

JOHN W. SCHOEN, Audubon Alaska, 308 G. Street, #217, Anchorage, AK 99516, USA, email: jschoen@audubon.org
STERLING D. MILLER, National Wildlife Federation, 240 North Higgins, #2, Missoula, MT 59802 USA, email: millers@nwf.org

Abstract: We contend that conservation of bear populations and their habitats requires alliances between resource agencies and environmentalists–conservationists from non-governmental environmental organizations (NGEO). Although agencies and NGOs usually have similar missions, collaboration is often the exception rather than the rule. This paper identifies the perspectives and constraints within agencies and NGOs that frequently lead to confrontation instead of cooperation. We review 2 case histories of grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) conservation efforts, discuss lessons learned, and offer recommendations regarding collaboration between agencies and environmental organizations. The first case involves the National Audubon Society's work (1999–2001) on the Kenai Brown Bear Conservation Strategy in Alaska, USA. The second involves the National Wildlife Federation and Defenders of Wildlife collaboration (1995–2001) on the plan to reintroduce grizzlies to the Selway–Bitterroot area of Montana and Idaho, USA.

Ursus 13:361–367 (2002)

Key words: collaboration, conservation, grizzly bears, Kenai Peninsula, Selway-Bitterroot, stakeholders, *Ursus arctos*

As humans continue to increase their abundance and distribution and brown (grizzly) bear habitat is degraded, we believe conservation efforts need alliances between agency scientists, managers, and environmentalists (or conservationists) from non-governmental environmental organizations (NGEOs). Unfortunately, many important conservation efforts in North America have a checkered history of polarization, confrontation, and suspicion between agencies and NGOs, even though they frequently share similar conservation goals. Considering the meager resources available to address numerous conservation issues, it is inefficient, if not irresponsible, for potential collaborators with overlapping interests to squander precious resources in conflict. As biologists with backgrounds in both resource agencies and NGOs, we believe there is an urgent need to develop more collaborative approaches for solving conservation problems.

In recognition of the importance of human dimensions in wildlife management (Manfredo et al. 1996, Decker and Chase 1997), resource managers are using new, collaborative approaches for solving complex management issues (Forester 1999, Yankelovich 1999, Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000, Brick et al. 2001). In this paper, we use the term collaboration to mean working together with other stakeholders to accomplish conservation goals. Our objectives are to discuss some of the challenges to collaboration, provide 2 case histories of agency–NGEO collaboration, and offer recommendations, based on our experiences with the collaborative process.

CHALLENGES TO COLLABORATIVE CONSERVATION

In our experience in North America, collaboration between resource agencies and environmental groups is the exception rather than the norm. Real and perceived prob-

lems stand in the way of more effective working relationships. For example, laws that agencies work under often require a substantial degree of interpretation in their implementation. Different agencies also develop distinctive identities, cultures, and traditional constituencies (Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000). Thus, incorporating new or competing values into agency agendas is often challenging. If citizens' interests are not addressed, some become dissatisfied and join, or form, NGOs to confront non-responsive agencies. Although this is part of natural dynamics between government and citizens, it can also be a barrier to collaboration.

Government agencies have management authority and administrative power, whereas environmentalists advocate for conservation but are seldom in position to make policy decisions. Many NGOs are focussed on a few specific issues, whereas resource agencies usually have broader responsibilities and a more diverse constituency. Although there is potential for effective and complementary alliances on many issues, conflict between agencies and NGOs often occurs. NGOs frequently target agencies using complex procedures mandated in the U.S. National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA; 42 U.S. Code 4321–4347). Legal actions against agencies are sometimes necessary but may also divert agency resources toward litigation instead of conservation. For example, one of the most problematic aspects of litigation, especially under the U.S. Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA; 16 U.S. Code 1531–1534), is that agency personnel working on species recovery can be re-directed to address litigation instead of assisting the needs of threatened and endangered species (C. Servheen, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Missoula, Montana, USA, personal communication, 2001). Conversely, we recognize that litigation may sometimes be necessary in order to assist these species.

We believe much of the conflict between NGEOs and agencies is caused by years of adversarial relationships fostered by misperceptions about roles and functions and a lack of communication and trust. Our experience suggests that insufficient communication leads to major gaps in understanding between agency managers and environmentalists. Of course, it is difficult to work cooperatively if there is poor communication. Language contributes to this problem: many words have different meanings, and scientific jargon and agency acronyms are often indecipherable to most laypersons (Clark and Reading 1994). Prejudices also contribute to poor communication. We have seen some agency administrators and staff arrogantly treat all environmentalists the same, failing to acknowledge ones that have been, or wish to be, constructive partners. On the other hand, some environmentalists consider agency staff handmaidens of industry. Generalizations like these can lead to polarization and unnecessary conflict between organizations that may have more in common than not.

Funding is a major challenge for NGEOs. Most NGEOs are nonprofit organizations dependent on foundation grants, major donors, and individual contributions often generated through direct mail appeals and telemarketing. Unfortunately, the most successful fund raising is often generated by making headlines that exacerbates confrontation (Knudson 2001). As one environmental leader (A. Smith, The Wilderness Society, Anchorage, Alaska, USA, personal communication, 2001) told us, "The first rule of successful direct mail fundraising is that you have to have a devil." Although proactive efforts to prevent a crisis from occurring in the first place are more effective, it is much more difficult to interest donors in contributing to non-crisis issues.

Other obstacles to cooperation often include lack of understanding of biology and science by some NGEOs. An important aspect of science includes testing hypotheses and identifying levels of uncertainty, but too often scientific uncertainty is viewed as a target to exploit. This sometimes leads to reluctance on the part of agencies to fully acknowledge scientific uncertainty which may make them vulnerable to legal action. Unfortunately, some agencies have used science as a tool for obtaining predetermined objectives rather than as an objective tool to test hypotheses. Further exacerbating this issue is the barrier to effective communication between agency scientist and biologists and environmentalists (Clark and Reading 1994, Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000). Add to this mix scientific arrogance, agency command and control philosophy, and environmental combativeness and you have a recipe for confrontation.

Advocates from all sides of issues constantly besiege agencies with their desires and, sometimes, demands.

Under these pressures, agency officials may come to view all vocal advocates as holding extreme, uncompromising positions. If moderate voices in agencies and NGEOs are unwilling to communicate with one another, there will be little opportunity to refocus the search for resolution. This is a challenge all must address to achieve effective conservation.

Collaboration between agencies and NGEOs does occur (Guynn and Landry 1997, Chase et al. 2000, Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000) and we believe can have positive results for wildlife conservation. We illustrate this point with 2 case histories with which we have been involved. These are recent efforts, and measurable, long-term benefits to bears have yet to be achieved. However, we believe these cases are examples of collaboration that will benefit conservation of bears and other wildlife.

CASE HISTORIES

Kenai Peninsula Brown Bear Conservation

In 1998, Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) listed the Kenai Peninsula population of brown bears as a "Population of Special Concern" (Alaska Department of Fish and Game, 1998, Kenai brown bear: population of special concern listing, unpublished memo, Juneau, Alaska, USA.). This state administrative listing identifies species at risk due to low numbers, restricted distribution, and sensitivity to environmental disturbance. Located south of Anchorage, the Kenai Peninsula is 23,310 km² and connected to the Alaska mainland by a mountainous, 15 km-wide isthmus that restricts dispersal of bears between the peninsula and mainland. Although a scientific census has yet to be conducted, wildlife managers estimate the Kenai population to be approximately 250–300 bears. Conservation risks to this small, isolated population are similar to those facing Yellowstone grizzlies (Schoen 1999).

The Kenai Peninsula is one of Alaska's most developed and steadily growing regions (Suring et al. 1998). The dominant land managers on the Kenai include the Chugach National Forest, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, Kenai Fjords National Park, Alaska Department of Natural Resources, Alaska Native corporations, and private landowners. Many resource uses occur on the Kenai, including residential subdivisions, agriculture, mining, oil and gas exploration and production, forestry, and commercial fishing. The Kenai Peninsula is also one of Alaska's most popular tourism and recreation areas. The cumulative impact of these activities on bears has been identified as a significant conservation concern (Suring et al. 1998, Interagency Brown Bear Study Team 2001).

National Audubon Society's concern about Kenai brown bears was heightened in 1997 when the Forest Service (USFS) and State of Alaska proposed major salvage logging after a spruce bark beetle (*Dendroctonus rufipennis*) infestation. Conservation concerns centered on expanded road infrastructure that would occur throughout roadless bear habitats as a result of logging. At that time, Audubon encouraged ADFG to list the Kenai population as a "Population of Special Concern." Audubon also asked the USFS and Alaska's Governor to defer additional road building in roadless bear habitat until a comprehensive brown bear conservation strategy was developed for the peninsula. In 1999, Audubon received a 3-year grant from the Alaska Conservation Foundation and the Goldman Fund that enabled Audubon to focus conservation efforts on Kenai brown bears.

At the same time, several national and regional NGEOs considered petitioning for an Endangered Species Act (ESA) listing of Kenai brown bears. Audubon, working with agency bear biologists, encouraged the NGEOs to defer a listing petition until ADFG had an opportunity to address this problem by developing a collaborative conservation strategy. Audubon and state and federal wildlife agencies believed that an ESA action, at that time, was premature and would needlessly increase polarization and conflict and would be detrimental to long-term bear conservation. Thus, getting local buy-in to conservation was considered fundamental for achieving the long-term conservation of Kenai brown bears. The NGEOs that considered a listing petition agreed to defer their plans to petition and give this approach a chance.

In spring 1999, state and federal agencies and the Kenai Borough Mayor formally established a Kenai Brown Bear Stakeholder process. The purpose of the stakeholder process, coordinated by ADFG, was to represent government agencies and private interests who had a stake in brown bear conservation on the peninsula. The stakeholder process used on the Kenai was a transactional approach as defined by Decker and Chase (1997). The 13-member stakeholder group represented interests of timber, sport fishing, hunting, Native Alaskans, residential property owners, conservation, oil and gas, mining, and tourism and recreation. The senior author was selected by an interagency steering group to represent conservation interests on the stakeholder group. Public agencies involved in the group included ADFG, Alaska Department of Natural Resources, USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), USFS, and Kenai Peninsula Borough. Eleven stakeholder meetings and 6 public workshops were held from October 1999 through May 2000 in communities across the Kenai and in Anchorage.

In June 2000, the Kenai Brown Bear Conservation Strategy was finalized and approved (Alaska Department of

Fish and Game 2000). The strategy included recommendations for conserving bears, with chapters on human-bear interactions, land planning and management, future research, and public education. All recommendations were developed by consensus. Throughout this process, there was a clear recognition by all stakeholders that it made sense to apply reasonable conservation measures now to avoid a conservation crisis and the need for a more restrictive endangered species listing in the future. The greatest strength of this project has been forging partnerships and a spirit of collaboration among various stakeholders.

NGEO Contributions.—After completing the conservation strategy, Audubon implemented several of the key recommendations. These included publishing an educational booklet on bear safety and conservation, developing an elementary school curriculum on bears, developing and presenting a slide program throughout the Kenai Peninsula about brown bears and the conservation strategy, hiring community coordinators to inform Kenai residents about brown bear conservation, and coordinating an annual Alaska Bear Festival.

Agency Contributions.—In recognition of their vulnerable status, ADFG listed Kenai brown bears as a population of special concern. This action resulted in increasing the department's research and management efforts on this population. The ADFG also conducted a survey of public attitudes about brown bears, funded and coordinated the stakeholder participation process, and published the conservation strategy (Alaska Department of Fish and Game 2000). State and federal resource agencies involved in Kenai brown bear conservation supported bear research and developed a conservation assessment (Interagency Brown Bear Study Team 2001). Resource agencies also supported the bear festival and publication of the bear booklet. The USFWS funded additional bear education outreach, teacher workshops, a bear extension service, and garbage management efforts.

Shortcomings of this Process.—A new Kenai Peninsula Borough administration delayed the process and created temporary confusion and divisiveness. At the beginning of the stakeholder processes, the facilitator failed to clearly define the details of the consensus process, which later resulted in difficulty dealing with non-consensus issues. Half way through the stakeholder process, a new facilitator took over. Although changing facilitators worked out well in the end, it delayed the process during the transition.

The Selway–Bitterroot Grizzly Bear Reintroduction Effort

Grizzly bears are classified as a threatened species in the United States south of Canada. Two large and 3 small populations include about 1,000 bears and occupy less

than 2% of their former range. The Selway–Bitterroot Ecosystem (BE) was identified as a recovery area for grizzly bears in the *Grizzly bear recovery plan* (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1993). The BE is the largest block of unoccupied grizzly bear habitat south of Canada. In spite of USFWS and NGEO efforts since 1995, grizzly bears have not been reintroduced into the BE. However, we believe significant progress toward this goal has been made, and this progress resulted from collaboration between 2 NGEOs (National Wildlife Federation and Defenders of Wildlife) and the USFWS Grizzly Bear Recovery Coordinator. During 1995 and 1996, the 2 NGEOs negotiated a plan for grizzly reintroduction with timber and labor interests (the Intermountain Forest Association and the Resource Organization on Timber Supply). These interests were concerned that a reintroduced grizzly population would preclude all logging in the forests surrounding the wilderness areas, but were willing to negotiate a plan for grizzly reintroduction that was acceptable to them as well as to conservation interests (France 1994, Fischer and Roy 1998). The USFWS adopted this consensus plan as its preferred alternative in both the draft and final Environmental Impact Statements (EIS; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1997, 2000a). With some modifications based on the comments received on the EIS, this plan was adopted by the USFWS in its final rule (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2000b).

Two key elements of the negotiated consensus plan related to populations status of reintroduced bears and management of the reintroduced population.

Bears would be reintroduced as an “Experimental Non-essential Population” under Section 10(j) of the U.S. Endangered Species Act. Section 10(j) was designed to reduce local opposition to reintroduction of threatened and endangered species to portions of their range from which they had been extirpated. The non-essential part of the designation means the reintroduced experimental population is not required to prevent extinction of the species. Experimental populations can only be established in portions of a species’ former range from which it has been extirpated and have a lower level of federal protection under the ESA; therefore, agencies and individuals are not required to consult with the USFWS prior to undertaking actions, such as logging, in areas occupied by experimental populations. These consultations are required under Section 7 of the ESA for populations of listed species not classified as experimental. The resulting findings sometimes inhibit other uses of land and are resented by advocates for these uses.

The reintroduced bears would be managed not by USFWS but by a Citizens’ Management Committee (CMC). The CMC would be composed of 7 representatives nominated by the Governor of Idaho, 5 nominated

by the Governor of Montana, 1 nominated by the Nez Perce Tribe, 1 representative of the USFWS, and 1 from the USFS. The U.S. Secretary of Interior would appoint the CMC from these nominations. The CMC process would be considered a co-managerial or delegational approach as defined by Decker and Chase (1997). Key attributes of the CMC as laid out in the Final EIS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2000a:2–11) are:

- The CMC is to consist of a cross-section of interests reflecting a balance of viewpoints; members will be selected for their diversity of knowledge and experience in natural resource issues and for their commitment to collaborative decision making.
- The CMC would be responsible for recommending changes in land-use standards and guidelines as necessary for grizzly bear management. Recommendations made by the CMC to land and wildlife management agencies would be subject to review, and final decisions on implementation would be made by the responsible agency. All decisions of the CMC including components of its management plans must lead toward recovery of the grizzly bear and minimize social and economic impacts to the extent practicable within the context of the existing recovery goals for the species (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2000a:2–8).

Under the ESA, the flexibility provided by designating a reintroduced population as experimental and non-essential provided an innovative opportunity to implement a CMC. The philosophical concept behind the CMC is that local citizens will be more accepting and tolerant of grizzly bears if decisions about their management are being made by local citizens rather than by federal bureaucracies that are frequently viewed as remote and uncaring about local problems (Fischer and Roy 1998). Grizzly bears can sustain only low levels of human-caused mortality (Miller 1990). Therefore, the NGEO’s that negotiated the agreement considered acceptance of the reintroduced grizzlies by local users (hunters and recreationists) of the BE as being essential to the long-term viability of the reintroduced population. Safeguards were included that allowed dismissal of the CMC by the Secretary of Interior if CMC decisions did not contribute to recovery of the grizzly bear in the BE.

The CMC Alternative, negotiated by 2 NGEOs and timber interests, was adopted as the preferred alternative by USFWS in the Draft and Final EISs. In addition to the CMC Alternative (Alternative 1), the Final EIS contained the following additional alternatives:

1. Alternative 1A was the same as Alternative 1 but with management by the USFWS instead of by a

CMC.

2. Alternative 2 was a no action alternative that would depend on natural expansion from existing populations.
3. Alternative 3 would prevent grizzly bear recovery in the Bitterroot Ecosystem.
4. Alternative 4 would reintroduce grizzly bears as a threatened population with full protections of the ESA, a recovery zone that included the wilderness areas as well as the surrounding national forests, and management by the USFWS. This alternative would require changes in federal laws and revision of existing forest management plans for 9 national forests in the expanded recovery area. A similar alternative (4A) was also provided with a different recovery area and less specificity about land use restrictions.

Alternative 1 (the preferred alternative) received the greatest number of supportive public comments (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1998). The State of Montana and all professional wildlife organizations that commented (International Association for Bear Research and Management, Idaho Chapter of The Wildlife Society, Montana Chapter of The Wildlife Society, Wildlife Management Institute, and American Society of Mammalogists), also favored Alternative 1. The State of Idaho, however, opposed any effort to reestablish grizzlies in the BE. One national and several local NGEOs opposed Alternative 1 because they considered it had inadequate habitat protections for bears. Most NGEOs opposed to Alternative 1 supported Alternative 4, which provided full protection under the ESA. Most of the same NGEOs opposing Alternative 1 for grizzly bears also opposed experimental population status for wolves (*Canis lupus*) reintroduced into the BE and Yellowstone. Wolf populations with experimental status have become well established in both areas (Bangs et al. 1998). We do not suggest that experimental status is appropriate for recovery of listed species in all cases; full protection and Section 7 consultation may be essential to assure recovery of some species.

The USFWS worked collaboratively with the National Wildlife Federation and Defenders of Wildlife to develop this plan. The complimentary actions by the USFWS and 2 NGEOs in developing the CMC plan resulted in the CMC plan as the Record of Decision (ROD; USFWS 2000b)

However, on 19 January 2001, the State of Idaho filed a lawsuit to block implementation of the ROD. After the 2000 U.S. Presidential election, the newly-appointed Secretary of Interior entered into negotiations with Idaho, and in February 2001 she proposed to substitute a "no action" alternative for the existing ROD. A 60-day comment period on the proposed substitution drew unfavorable com-

ments from the public and scientific organizations (98% opposed, including 98% of 3,130 comments from Idaho and 93% of 2,964 comments from Montana; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2001). All 8 of the scientific organizations commenting urged the Secretary of Interior to implement the existing ROD based on CMC and to abandon the proposed substitution of no action to restore grizzly bears to this area. These organizations included The Wildlife Society, the Idaho and Montana Chapters of The Wildlife Society, the International Association for Bear Research and Management, the Society for Conservation Biology, the American Society of Mammalogists, the Wildlife Management Institute, and Bear Specialists Group of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. No scientist or scientific organization who commented supported the proposed change. A final decision on the proposed change has not been made, but we do not expect grizzly reintroduction during the current administration.

NGEO Contributions (see also Fischer and Roy 1998).—The 2 NGEOs openly negotiated with representatives of interests concerned about the impacts on their uses of the area in an attempt to find common ground and build a consensus plan. The NGEOs generated public and scientific support for the consensus agreement through outreach to their members, other conservationists, scientists, and scientific organizations. They also lobbied state and federal governments for the consensus agreement, sponsored an information tour and slide show on grizzly bears in communities adjacent to the recovery area, produced a video documentary that described the reintroduction effort, and contracted public opinion polls (Duda et al. 1998) on grizzly bear reintroduction and attitudes toward the various alternatives.

Agency Contributions.—The USFWS Grizzly Bear Recovery Coordinator was key to the successful development of the reintroduction proposal. His efforts included nurturing and informing the negotiations between industry and NGEOs as well as shepherding the resulting agreement through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service bureaucracy. The complex EIS process required 4 years of effort, including public meetings at which opponents of grizzly recovery expressed rancorous opposition against grizzlies and the government. The EIS process cost approximately \$700,000 (C. Servheen, USFWS, Missoula, Montana, USA, personal communication, 2001). The recovery coordinator maintained technical and political communications within the federal and state agencies that comprised the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC) and the Bitterroot Ecosystem Subcommittee of the IGBC (Fischer and Roy 1998).

Shortcomings of this Process.—Grizzly bears have not been reintroduced to the BE. Important political leaders

at state (Idaho) and federal levels (in the administration elected in 2000) were not convinced that the proposed process for reintroducing grizzly bears into the BE represented an important innovation in implementing ESA recovery while reducing controversy and adverse impacts to local residents. Some NGEOs who developed and supported Alternative 4 (full protection) were not convinced that Alternative 1 was adequate to protect the grizzlies and were unwilling to give it a chance. The schism between grizzly advocates regarding the "most effective" plan for grizzly restoration clearly undercut potential political and public support for either plan. Political leaders and many of the public were unconvinced of the benefits of grizzly bear reintroduction and unwilling to counter arguments about the dangers posed to people by a reintroduced grizzly bear population. Finally, the reintroduction program was not initiated during an administration that had earlier publicly supported restoration of ESA-listed species.

ENHANCING COLLABORATIVE CONSERVATION

Our experience with Kenai brown bear conservation and BE grizzly restoration provided us with some important lessons. We believe that when organizational territory and personal egos are minimized, cooperation can flourish and resource agencies and NGEOs can work collaboratively to benefit conservation. Their contributions are often complementary, and each entity can accomplish objectives the other cannot. When people work together to communicate their differences and understand a problem, the probability of finding solutions for the problem increases.

We believe key elements for a successful stakeholder process include: a skilled and neutral facilitator, an interview process to select reasonable and objective stakeholders, the support of policy makers, and effective public outreach. When diverse interests collaborate on a solution, the results are likely to be robust and lasting. On the other hand, when differences become the primary focus — even among groups with similar goals — it is often difficult to find acceptable and lasting solutions.

Communication is fundamental to people's understanding of each other's perspectives on complex issues. Resource agencies and NGEOs need to emphasize improving communication skills. Good communication is a 2-way street and requires clearly defining terms, a willingness to listen, a desire to understand, and mutual respect. When people understand other's perspectives, it becomes easier to identify agreement and disagreement and seek reasonable solutions.

Agencies and NGEOs could benefit from personnel who understand human dimensions of wildlife management. Environmental organizations could benefit by having biologists and scientists on their staffs who understand biological issues and who can also communicate with agency scientists. Agencies should identify members of their staffs who have interest and ability to communicate with and understand the issues and concerns of NGEOs. Agencies and NGEOs could enhance cooperation by scheduling regular meetings to discuss issues of mutual concern.

Diversity of thought, rather than being divisive, will often strengthen and stabilize relationships and increase effectiveness of conservation in the long run. Agencies and NGEOs should recognize and encourage participation by diverse interests that are also willing to collaborate. A challenge will be for people to break out of their unique organizational culture. If people don't talk to their perceived adversaries, they likely will never find lasting solutions to conservation challenges. Organizations should reach out and build new relationships and constructive alliances where appropriate. Stakeholder processes offer opportunities to gain new perspectives on issues and find new solutions not previously considered.

Environmentalists can advocate for conservation more aggressively than agency staff. For example, NGEOs can help advocate for budgets and conservation actions that wildlife managers and scientists need but that top administrators may be unwilling to aggressively support. Environmental advocates and agency scientists and managers need to understand their respective responsibilities and constraints in defining their relationship. Again, honesty, communication, and mutual trust and respect are keys for an effective relationship that benefits conservation. There is a clear need for agency scientists and managers and NGEO staff to learn how to communicate more effectively.

Recognition and credit are important for people and organizations. For NGEOs, in particular, recognition will enhance fund raising abilities. Recognition also reinforces collaborative behavior and willingness to reach outside the organizational culture. This applies to resource agencies and NGEOs. Agencies continually face pressure by industry interests and politicians to allow greater development opportunities. Resource agencies need to get credit when they implement effective conservation policies.

The best models of collaborative conservation are those that demonstrate communication and broad support from diverse interests. Real examples people can relate to will encourage more support for this approach. We believe that collaboration can benefit conservation by focusing more resources on solving problems than on fighting battles.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank S. Farley, J. Hughes, C. Loker, and D. Stonorov for their roles in the Kenai stakeholder process and conservation strategy. We also thank D. Johnson, B. Mulligan, J. Riley, T. France, H. Fischer, and M. Roy for their work during the collaborative process on the Bitterroot grizzly project. C. Loker, B. Peyton, S. Primm, and S. Riley provided editorial suggestions for improving the manuscript. Support for Audubon's Kenai brown bear project was provided by the Goldman Fund, Alaska Conservation Foundation, and the USFWS.

LITERATURE CITED

- ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME. 2000. Kenai Peninsula brown bear conservation strategy. Final Report. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, Alaska, USA.
- BANGS, E.E., S.H. FRITS, J.A. FONTAINE, D.W. SMITH, K.M. MURPHY, C.M. MACK, AND C.C. NIEMEYER. 1998. Status of gray wolf restoration in Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 26:785–798.
- BRICK, P., D. SNOW, AND S. VAN DE WETERING, EDITORS. 2001. *Across the great divide: explorations in collaborative conservation and the American West*. Island Press, Washington, D.C., USA.
- CHASE, L.C., T.M. SCHUSTER, AND D.J. DECKER. 2000. Innovations in stakeholder involvement: what's the next step? *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 28:208–217.
- CLARK, T.W., AND R.P. READING. 1994. A professional perspective: improving problem solving, communication and effectiveness. Pages 351–369 in T.W. Clark, R.P. Reading, and A.L. Clarke, editors. *Endangered species recovery: finding the lessons, improving the process*. Island Press, Washington, D.C., USA.
- DECKER, D.J., AND L.C. CHASE. 1997. Human dimensions of living with wildlife—a management challenge for the 21st century. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 25:788–795.
- DUDA, M.D., S.J. BISSELL, AND K.C. YOUNG. 1998. *Wilderness and the American mind: public opinion on and attitudes toward fish and wildlife management*. Responsive Management, Harrisonburg, Virginia, USA.
- FISCHER, H., AND M. ROY. 1998. New approaches to citizen participation in endangered species management: recovery in the Bitterroot Ecosystem. *Ursus* 10:603–606.
- FORESTER, J. 1999. *The deliberative practitioner: encouraging participatory planning processes*. MIT Press, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.
- FRANCE, T. 1994. Politics, forest management, and bears. *International Conference Bear Research and Management* 9(1):523–528.
- GUYNN, D.E., AND M.K. LANDRY. 1997. A case study of citizen participation as a success model for innovative solutions for natural resource problems. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 25:392–398.
- INTERAGENCY BROWN BEAR STUDY TEAM. 2001. A conservation assessment of the Kenai Peninsula brown bear. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, Alaska, USA.
- KNUDSON, T. 2001. Green machine: mission adrift in a frenzy of fund raising. *Sacramento Bee* 23 April 2001:A1.
- MANFREDO, M.J., J.J. VASKE, AND L. SIKOROWSKI. 1996. Human dimensions of wildlife management. Pages 53–72 in A.W. Ewert, editor. *Natural resource management: the human dimension*. Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, USA.
- MILLER, S.D. 1990. Population management of bears in North America. *International Conference Bear Research and Management* 8:357–373.
- SCHOEN, J. 1999. The brown bears of Kenai: a population at risk. *Endangered Species Bulletin* 24(2):14–15.
- SURING, L., K. BARBER, C. SCHWARTZ, T. BAILEY, W. SHUSTER, AND M. TETREAU. 1998. Analysis of cumulative effects on brown bears on the Kenai Peninsula, southcentral Alaska. *Ursus* 10:107–117.
- U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 1993. *Grizzly bear recovery plan*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Missoula, Montana, USA.
- . 1997. *Grizzly bear recovery in the Bitterroot Ecosystem, Draft Environmental Impact Statement*. U.S. Department of Interior, Washington D.C., USA.
- . 1998. *Summary of public comments on the draft environmental impact statement for grizzly bear recovery in the Bitterroot ecosystem*. U.S. Department of Interior, Washington D.C., USA.
- . 2000a. *Grizzly bear recovery in the Bitterroot Ecosystem, final environmental impact statement*. U.S. Department of Interior, Washington D.C., USA.
- . 2000b. *Record of decision and statement of findings for the environmental impact statement on grizzly bear recovery in the Bitterroot Ecosystem and final rule on establishment of a nonessential experimental population of grizzly bears in the Bitterroot area of Idaho and Montana*. U.S. Department of Interior, Washington D.C., USA.
- . 2001. *Bitterroot notice of intent to reevaluate ROD: summary of all comments received 6/21/2001–8/21/2001*. U.S. Department of Interior, Washington D.C., USA.
- WONDOLLECK, J.M., AND S.L. YAFFEE. 2000. *Making collaboration work: lessons from innovation in natural resource management*. Island Press, Washington, D.C., USA.
- YANKOLOVICH, D. 1999. *The magic of dialogue: transforming conflict into cooperation*. Simon and Schuster, New York, New York, USA.

Received: 21 May 2001.

Accepted: 19 March 2002.

Associate Editor: Riley.