Proposal 86 Fortymile Predator Control: Slide 1

Proposal 86

Submitted by: ADF&G

Effect of the proposal: Reauthorize the Intensive Management Plan in 92.113(a)(1) for predation control in Upper Yukon Tanana Predation Control Area through June 2026

ADF&G Position: Support

Upper Tanana–Fortymile AC: Supports

Proposal 86 Fortymile Predator Control: Slide 2 **Current vs. Proposed comparison:** Current regulation: Proposed regulation: Re-authorize the Upper An Intensive Management Plan Yukon/Tanana exists for Upper **Intensive Management** Yukon/Tanana Plan (92.113) Predation Control Retain FCH and Wolves Area and expires in For 6 years, expiring June 2020 June 30, 2026

History of program2004Program first authorized2005–2009Grizzly bear baiting included2005–2014Moose northern Unit 12 and 20E included2005–2018Public Aerial Wolf Control2006Expanded wolf control area to include FCH2009–2018Department Helicopter Wolf Control2012–2018Department Control focused in FCH calving rangeMay 1, 2018Wolf Control suspended for evaluation

Proposal 86 Fortymile Predator Control: Slide 3













Proposal 86 Fortymile Predator Control: Slide 10

FCH Non-human Mortality Factors

Calf predation by wolves

- First 6 weeks of life
- Primary Factor Limiting Growth
 - Boertje and Gardner (1998, 2000)
 - Boertje et al. 2008

Other Predators - minor relative to wolf predation

• Boertje and Gardner (1998, 2000), Boertje et al. 2008

Disease – not limiting

• Zarnke 2001, 2012 Disease Survey

Weather – not identified as limiting

• Boertje and Gardner (1998, 2000), Boertje et al. 2008, Boertje et al. 2012







Proposal 86 Fortymile Predator Control: Slide 14 Wolf Removal/Reduction (Entire 18,750 mi² Control Area)

RY	Hunt	Public	Dept	Total	Spring	%
	Trap	control	Control	removal	abundance	reduction
					(range)	from pre-
						control
2006	73	23	N/A	96	259 (197-322)	32%
2007	57	27	N/A	84	284 (268-300)	25%
2008	82	49	84	215	146	62%
2009	31	10	15	56	175	54%
2010	26	25	0	51	212 (200-223)	44%
2011	62	8	56	126	184 (170-197)	52%
2012	41	78	40	159	215 (197-232)	43%
2013	54	31	31	116	240 (222-257)	37%
2014	48	24	33	105	269 (252-288)	29%
2015	69	29	19	117	291 (273-309)	23%
2016	130	18	88	236	215 (195-235)	42%
2017	71	19	50	140	251 (232-269)	34%
AVG	62	28	42	132	228	40 %

Proposal 86 Fortymile Predator Control: Slide 15 Wolf Reductions in Packs Overlapping FCH Calving/Post-Calving Range (4 646 mi ²)				
Reg. Year (July 1- June 30)	% reduction			
2006–2007 2007–2008	_a _a	No		
2008–2009 2009–2010	69% 71%	– Focus Area		
2010–2011 2011–2012	_ª 62%	•		
2012–2013 2013-2014	84% >70%	Focus		
2014-2015 2015-2016	>70% >65%	on Post Calving		
2016-2017 2017-2018	>80% >80%	Range		
^a Inadequate information availabl	e to estimate wolf numbers and % re	duction.		































Fortymile Caribou Herd Management Strategy

Drawing Hunt

- > Unlimited drawing permits would be needed
- Long seasons

- > Hunter Crowding and Safety issues will persist
- > Emergency Orders could still be used



Proposal 87 Fortymile Caribou: Slide 32

Proposal 87 – Fortymile Caribou

32

Subsistence statute (AS 16.05.258 (b)(2)(A) and (f):

- The board "shall adopt regulations that provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses" defined as an opportunity that allows "a normally diligent person with a reasonable expectation of success"
- Drawing permit hunts do not provide reasonable opportunity for subsistence users under Alaska Statute 16.05.258(f).



Submitted by: Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC

Effect of the proposal: Implement wolf control under an Intensive Management (IM) program to benefit moose within portions of Units 12, 20D, and 20E

> Feasibility assessment

ADF&G Recommendation: Neutral

AC Recommendations:

- > Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC: Support
- > Eagle AC:
- > Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road AC:
- > Delta AC:



33



Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control <u>Proposal goals</u>
<u>Use wolf control to maintain moose</u>:
1. Population at or above current levels
2. Bull-to-cow ratios above objectives
> Avoid restrictive hunting regulations
3. Harvest/success rates near current levels

Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control						
	IN popul objec	A ation ctive	IM har objec	rvest tive		Harvestable surplus exceeds
Unit	Obj.	Met?	Obj.	Met?	ANS	ANS?
12	4,000- 6,000	\checkmark	250-450	×	60-70	Yes
20D	8,000- 10,000	✓	500-700	×	5-15 (north)* 5 (south)*	Yes
20E	8,000- 10,000	√?	500- 1,000	×	50-75	Yes
*Outsi ANS =	*Outside of the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area ANS = Amount reasonably necessary for subsistence uses					
27	37					

Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control IM population objectives

<u>Unit 12:</u>

- > Objective = 4,000-6,000 moose
 - Current estimate = 6,394 (5,280-7,509)
 - 1.1 (0.9-1.3) moose/mi²

Unit 20E:

38

- > Objective = 8,000-10,000 moose
 - Current estimate = 7,262 (6,207-8,318)
 - 0.7 (0.6-0.8) moose/mi²

Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control

IM harvest objectives

<u>Unit 12:</u>

- \triangleright Objective = 250-450 moose
 - RY14-RY18 average = 154 (range 108-191)
 - Includes potlatch
 - Challenges = land ownership, access

Unit 20E:

- Objective = 500-1,000 moose
 - RY14-RY18 average = 224 (range 199-245)
 - Challenges = access

































Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control Summary

- 1. IM population objectives
 - Close to or exceed minimum
- 2. IM harvest objectives
 - Not being met

56

- Land ownership, access
- Current IM harvest objective
 - Unit 12 = 6.2-7.5%; Unit 20E = 6.3-10%
- Change for Unit 12 and 20E?



Proposal 88 – Units 12, 20D, and 20E wolf control Conclusions

1. ADF&G recommendation = NEUTRAL

No biological concerns

2. Conflicting proposed goals

- Maintain moose:
 - Population

58

- Bull:cow ratios > objectives
- Harvest/success rates

3. Antlerless harvest – help meet goals

IM harvest objectives



Proposal 89 – Unit 20E Caribou and Moose Registration Permits

Submitted by: Public

Effect of the proposal: Allow hunters to simultaneously possess registration permits for both caribou (RC860) and moose (RM865) in Unit 20E

ADF&G Recommendation:

- Support Additional opportunity
- > Neutral Allocation

AC Recommendations:

- > Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC: Oppose
- > Eagle AC:

60







Proposal 89 – Unit 20E moose and caribou <u>Background</u> Permit restriction implemented in 2001

> Concerns with moose population

- Low density (0.4-0.6 moose/mi²)
- moose harvest
- bull:cow ratio in accessible areas
- # caribou hunters
 - Incidental moose harvest

BOG proposal – discretionary permit authority
 Purpose - reduce incidental moose harvest by caribou hunters

Proposal 89	9 – Uni	t 20E moo	ose and c	aribou			
Since 2001	Since 2001 – Unit 20E moose:						
 Densities increased 0.6-0.8 moose/mi² unitwide Southern Unit 20E 1.5 moose/mi² 							
Hunting Aver	Hunting pressure increased Average # Unit 20F moose hunters/harvest						
	0	2001-2003	2016-2018				
	Hunters	779	955				
	Harvest	141	217				
➢ Bull:cow	Bull:cow ratio near objective in accessible areas						
65				65			







Proposal 89 – Unit 20E Caribou and Moose Registration Permits Submitted by: Public Effect of the proposal: Allow hunters to simultaneously possess registration permits for both caribou (RC860) and moose (RM865) in Unit 20E ADF&G Recommendations: Neutral – Additional opportunity Neutral – Allocation Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC: Oppose

> Eagle AC:

Proposal 90 – Sheep Tok Management Area (TMA)

Submitted by:

Public

<u>Effect of the proposal:</u> Reduce the proportion of TMA sheep draw permits awarded to nonresidents hunting with relatives within second-degree of kindred (SDK)

ADF&G Recommendation: Neutral - Allocation

AC Recommendations:

- > Upper Tanana-Fortymile AC: Oppose
- > Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road:

69











Total	Nonresident	Maximum SDK allocation (%)		
permits	(10%)	<u>Current (50%)</u>	Proposed (25%)	
60	6	2 - (33%)		
80	8	4 - (50%)		
100	10	4 - (40%)		
120	12	6 - (50%)		

P	roposal 9	0 – Tok M	anagement A	rea Sheep		
	Current vs. proposed allocation					
	Total Nonresident Maximum SDK allocation (%)					
	permits	allocation (10%)	<u>Current (50%)</u>	<u>Proposed (25%)</u>		
	60	6	2 - (33%)	0 - (0%)		
	80	8	4 - (50%)	2 - (25%)		
	100	10	4 - (40%)	2 - (20%)		
	120	12	6 - (50%)	2 - (17%)		

Proposal 90 – Tok Management Area Sheep Summary

- 1. Currently SDK \leq 50% nonresident permits
 - Received 35% during 2015-2019

2. Proposal – reduce SDK allocation to $\leq 25\%$

- Actual % depend on total # permits
- No biological concerns
 - Guided success > SDK success
 - Small # permits minimal impact

3. ADF&G recommendation – NEUTRAL

Allocation issue

78

