

## Jeb Barzen, International Crane Foundation

### Analysis of KDFWR 6/2/11 presentation

1. There are no data that I know of supporting the estimates for the EP numbering 80–100,000 birds. These numbers should be challenged unless they can be supported and defended or unless the data for these estimates can be examined and vetted.
2. No population model has been developed so it is not a defensible statement to say that the EP will continue to grow if hunted.
3. No data support the statement that the most conservative estimates of reproduction suggest 0.32 chicks are produced per nesting pair.
  - a) The label of conservative (vs. liberal) is mis-applied and there is no way to defend the connotation implied. Conservative as compared to what? Data always have error associated with them and there are different types of error. Here conservative seems to be used to say that, if 0.32 chicks per breeding territory is incorrect, the number for productivity will be higher. Upon what data is this description of our data based? If the Commonwealth of Kentucky is to say that they are using science-based population management as a part of this hunting proposal then they should be able to provide data to substantiate their claims. I am aware of no such data.
  - b) They are presumably citing our data when they cite a productivity rate of 0.32 chicks per nesting pair and we clearly state that, though the 10-year average is 0.32 chicks per year, that average does not represent the trend in productivity. There is a clear, linear decrease in productivity illustrated over an 18 year period so to use the 10 year average is a statistically improper metric to use in estimating productivity in this population. It is a mis-representation of our data and of our analysis to apply this estimate to their calculations. Our best estimate of productivity is half the estimate that they use and this analysis has not been countered with any other independent data.
4. The statement that there is little likelihood that the EP population will stop growing whether it is hunted or not is not supported by any fact other than the observation that the population has quadrupled since the 1970's. Our data suggest that some parts of the population may already be ceasing their growth.
5. In no place are the simple questions posed: Do we want to use the crane resource by hunting them? and What are the costs, as well as benefits, of using our crane resource in this manner? Subjectively, it seems odd that the state is not taking a more neutral position on this question as they are important guarantors of that resource.

I do believe that the Commonwealth of Kentucky has considered and implemented some important aspects that would make the implementation of a hunt more safe and more expedient.