
From: Jane Pierson
Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2017 9:23 AM
To: Helen Phillips
Subject: FW: House Bill 105 (Stampede Trail and Nenana Canyon Closed to Trapping/Snaring and Hunting of Wolves)

Helen,

Could you please distribute to members?

Thanks,

Jane

From: Rep. Andy Josephson
Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2017 9:18 AM
To: Jane Pierson <Jane.Pierson@akleg.gov>
Subject: FW: House Bill 105 (Stampede Trail and Nenana Canyon Closed to Trapping/Snaring and Hunting of Wolves)

Please distribute to HFIN committee members. Thanks, Rep. Josephson

From: Dale, Bruce W (DFG) [<mailto:bruce.dale@alaska.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2017 4:19 AM
To: Rep. Andy Josephson <Rep.Andy.Josephson@akleg.gov>
Subject: RE: House Bill 105 (Stampede Trail and Nenana Canyon Closed to Trapping/Snaring and Hunting of Wolves)

My pleasure. Please see my answers below and let me know if I can provide additional information.

Bruce

----- Original message -----

From: "Rep. Andy Josephson" <Rep.Andy.Josephson@akleg.gov>
Date: 5/2/2017 7:01 PM (GMT-07:00)
To: "Dale, Bruce W (DFG)" <bruce.dale@alaska.gov>
Subject: Re: House Bill 105 (Stampede Trail and Nenana Canyon Closed to Trapping/Snaring and Hunting of Wolves)

Dear Mr. Dale:

Thank you for taking some time to chat with me about the above-noted bill.

If one was trapping for small furbearers, or for animals other than wolves (and this non-wolf trapping were allowed and legal), would you expect there to be any incidental take of wolves in those traps?

I would expect incidental take of wolves to be rare. Wolves are difficult to trap and require specialized equipment. Wolves can also pull or break out of the smaller traps and snares effective on smaller animals.

I don't recall any incidental take of wolves during the closures implemented by the Board of Game near Denali.

On a second topic, an issue was raised in HFIN Committee on Friday, April 28th, 2017 about impacts of HB 105 on the practice of subsistence. Am I right that: (1) Unit 20(A) is closed to subsistence trapping at present and (2) Unit 20(C) would not be seriously restricted under the bill, as the consideration for subsistence allowance would weigh the entire unit or subunit, in total, and not just the portions closed by HB 105? Were there any subsistence concerns raised by the previous B.O.G. closure between 2002-2010 in Unit 20(C)?

Correct, the area encompassing the proposed wolf closure in Unit 20A is within the Fairbanks Non-subsistence area.

If there were any subsistence concerns raised for Unit 20C, the board must have concluded that reasonable subsistence opportunity existed when they implemented the previous wolf closures. Note that the 1980 park additions remain open to the taking of wolves for federally qualified users and the preserve areas remain open to all users.

Thanks in advance,

Andy Josephson