

Having read the proposed Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan, do you believe the primary threats to grizzly bear recovery (pg. 6) have been adequately identified and assessed?

[CPAWS] No, because:

- a) The new plan proposes increasing what is acceptable for human-caused mortality rates in Bear Management Areas 5 and 6 (Castle, Livingstone, Kananaskis and the Bow Valley.)
- b) Downgrading Porcupine Hills from 'Core' habitat to merely 'Support' habitat is not acceptable. The Porcupine Hills area is important for facilitating the movement of bears.
- c) It is critical to limit disturbances and provide a safe habitat for recovering grizzly bears. However, by focusing on limits to public roads only and excluding the effects of off-highway vehicle trails, the new plan actually increases the number of roads and trails that can be built in core grizzly habitat

The 2008 grizzly bear plan identified Bear Management Areas that correspond to seven different populations of grizzly bear in Alberta. The external boundaries of the Bear Management Areas and the Core and Secondary Zones have been refined in the proposed plan and three additional management zones have been identified (see p. 2). Do you think that the new zones, (Recovery, Support and Habitat Linkage), sufficiently clarify grizzly management and recovery priorities?

[CPAWS] No:

- We support objectives of the Recovery Zone; however, as the last vestiges of public grassland habitat for grizzly bears it is important that the Porcupine Hills remain in the Recovery Zone.
- The Support Zone is a positive step toward acknowledging grizzly use of these areas and enabling support for communities in this zone
- The Habitat Linkage Zone is recognizes the need to connect grizzly bear populations across major highways, but it needs to be better defined about where it is and what management actions will be implemented in this zone.

Do you think that the recovery goal and associated objectives (see p. 30) are appropriate given the threats to the grizzly bear distribution and population size?

[CPAWS] Yes: Overall, we support the goals and objectives of the Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone. However, we do not support the increased mortality limits for Bear Management Areas 5 and 6 (Castle, Livingstone, Kananaskis and the Bow Valley).

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?

[CPAWS] Yes: The proposed recovery strategies are positive steps toward addressing threats to grizzly bears with the key exception of excluding off-highway vehicle trails from consideration in road density planning. The real threat to grizzly bear mortality is humans in grizzly bear habitat (human-bear conflict) and considering public roads only when planning for appropriate road density does not address this major issue. If this threat is not adequately addressed, other strategies will likely be less effective.