

Engagement and Response Summary Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan

JUNE 2020

Alberta 

Engagement and Response Summary for Public Comments on Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan

Published by Alberta Agriculture and Forestry

Date of publication: July 2020

ISBN 978-1-4601-4810-5

© 2020 Government of Alberta.

This publication is issued under the Open Government Licence – Alberta (<http://open.alberta.ca/licence>).

This publication is available online at <https://open.alberta.ca/publications/9781460148105>

For more information regarding this content visit: <https://open.alberta.ca/documentation/pubguidedraft>

Engagement and Response Summary

On June 1, 2016, the draft Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan was posted online and the public was invited to participate in an online survey.

The online survey had 1350 submissions, although only 489 fully completed the survey. In addition to the survey, there were 19 written submissions from individuals and stakeholder groups.

A summary of what we heard and how it was used to re-draft the plan is provided in the table below.

What we asked	What we heard	What we did
<p>Do you believe the primary threats to grizzly bear recovery been adequately identified and assessed?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While people felt that the threats to grizzly bear recovery were identified, it was clear from people's comments that they did not always understand what the important points in the data summary meant for grizzly bear conservation. 2. There were many comments about Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs) being a bigger threat than indicated. Other people felt that disturbance of grizzly bears by humans was a bigger threat than indicated in the plan. 3. There were a few comments expressing concern about climate change. 4. Many comments pointed out that the plan was not current on some recent 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rewrote this section with just the most relevant data presented, used more graphical representations, and provided a synopsis at the beginning of each threat description. 2. Added a new section in the plan that discusses the effect of human disturbance. 3. Added a new section discussing likely effects of climate change. 4. Population status section updated including a table summarizing all the population information for each BMA.

	population results from population surveys in BMA 3 Yellowhead and BMA 6 Castle.	
Do you think that the new zones, (Recovery, Support and Habitat Linkage) sufficiently clarify grizzly management and recovery priorities?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. People generally did not agree with the changes proposed for the Porcupine Hills. 2. The point was made that there is privately owned land within the boundaries of the Recovery Zone. 3. People seemed confused about why there are so many zones. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kept the zoning for the Porcupine Hills the same. Determination of the Support Zone boundary will be done as part of plan implementation in consultation with affected stakeholders. 2. A statement has been added to the plan making it clear that privately owned or privately managed land within the boundaries of the Recovery Zone are to be managed similar to land within the Support Zone. 3. Added clarification that Core and Secondary refers to areas within the Recovery Zone that are to be managed for open road densities.
Do you think that the proposed recovery strategies and actions (see p. 35-55) are adequate and will help address the threats to grizzly bears?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns were raised about a lack of an enforcement strategy and the need for increased enforcement and penalties. 2. Feedback indicated that there should be more restrictions on public access with OHVs specifically mentioned 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A strategy for reducing poaching was added. 2. The rationale for the need for managing open road density was enhanced.
What do you believe are additional timetable and implementation	No clear pattern in the comments.	A new implementation section has been added to the plan.

<p>considerations that have not been identified in the recovery plan?</p>		
<p>Additional Socio-economic considerations</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong recognition of the positive benefits of grizzly bears to society and ecotourism. 2. Requests for more cost-benefit analysis. 3. Concerns about what effect expanding bear population will have on public safety and private property. 	<p>A socio-economic scan has been added to the plan.</p>
<p>General Comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearer communication on the status of the bears in each BMA. 2. Found the plan to be quite large and difficult to get through. 3. Some people wanted more specific survey questions. 4. There were many comments both for and against, hunting grizzly bears throughout the survey. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A table summarizing the population status in each BMA was added to the Situation Analysis 2. Plan was rewritten, simplified, and shortened (about 25 per cent shorter). 3. Will be considered in the design of future surveys 4. Since hunting is not a conservation issue right now it was not addressed in the plan.