



2012 Yukon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan Implementation Review

2022 Summary Report





Executive summary

The 2012 Yukon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan (the 2012 Plan) recommended an implementation review with appropriate agencies five years after approval. In 2017, the Government of Yukon conducted a progress assessment of what actions and tasks had been accomplished since the Plan was created. The Progress Assessment Report was used to engage Indigenous governments, boards and councils and interest groups. Of those, 11 Indigenous governments, nine boards and councils, and seven interest groups and societies participated to discuss what parts of the plan were working in their communities and what priorities for future implementation were emerging. From the extensive meetings and conversations held to create this document, it is apparent that attitudes toward wolves in the Yukon have not changed much since 2012. There is general agreement with and support for the goals and principles in the 2012 Plan; many of the recommended measures are complete, with others in progress or further needing attention.

This summary report summarizes the feedback from the meetings held between November 2019 and September 2020. It includes a section on frequently asked questions and a path forward section, which recommends an increased focus on education—particularly Indigenous rights—and on initiating further action toward community-based programs described under Goal 4 of the 2012 Plan.





Contents

Executive summary.....	1
Implementation review.....	3
Implementation review process.....	3
The management context.....	4
What we heard.....	6
Complexity in wildlife management.....	6
Voices from Indigenous government and groups.....	7
Voices from Renewable Resources Councils.....	8
Voices from identified interest groups.....	9
Frequently asked questions.....	11
Path forward.....	17
Appendix A: Engagement.....	19
Appendix B: Details on the Southern Lakes Wolf Study.....	20





Implementation review

Plan implementation requires ongoing collaboration and communication between the Government of Yukon, First Nation governments, the Inuvialuit, and boards and councils with a responsibility for wolf conservation and management.

In 2012 the Government of Yukon and the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board developed a renewed *Yukon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan* (the 2012 Plan). The 2012 Plan shifted management of wolves in the Yukon to a more holistic approach centered around respect and an acknowledgement of the complexity of predator-prey dynamics. The primary tool enabled in the 2012 Plan is the community-based local wolf harvest program under Goal 4, which mobilizes trapping as a way to reduce wolf predation on ungulates. Other priorities of the 2012 Plan are around education, the use of Traditional Knowledge, and numerous regulation changes. The 2012 Plan recommends that its implementation measures should be reviewed with appropriate agencies, which this document summarizes.

Implementation review process

The review process began in 2017 but gained momentum in early 2019 with the Government of Yukon and the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board jointly reviewing the Progress Assessment Report. The assessment concluded that 13 recommended implementation measures (“measures”) were complete or ‘up to date’, eight measures were still being worked on or were in progress, and six measures required attention.

Engagement with Indigenous governments and groups was a priority for the Government of Yukon and the first meetings focused there. The Director of Fish and Wildlife sent letters to all 14 Yukon First Nations, Acho Dene Koe First Nation, Dease





Government of Yukon

River First Nation, Gwich'in Tribal Council, Kwadacha Nation, Tahltan Central Government, Taku River Tlingit First Nation, Tetlit Gwich'in Council and the Inuvialuit followed by letters to Renewable Resources Councils (RRCs) and the Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board. Meetings were held, as requested, between November 2019 and September 2020. Subsequent letters were sent to identified interest groups for meetings held between February and September 2020. In March, in-person meetings were postponed due to COVID-19 protocols and concern for vulnerable communities. From July to September 2020, meetings were re-scheduled, where possible. In total, 11 meetings were held with Indigenous governments and groups, nine meetings were held with boards and councils, and seven meetings were held with interest groups (see Appendix A). Some First Nations and RRCs chose to meet together. Specific questions were responded to directly, while general questions that came up often are captured in the frequently asked questions (FAQ) section below.

The management context

The Government of Yukon has a responsibility to uphold Aboriginal and Treaty rights, as affirmed in Section 35(1) of the *Constitution Act of Canada (1982)* and specific land claim agreements. The Yukon has a unique land claim and self-governing context, and specific agreements define rights related to subsistence harvest, development of and participation in fish and wildlife management within a particular traditional territory.





Land claim agreements also mandate boards and councils, some of which guarantee representation for local people, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, in the communities so that traditional and local knowledge are used in local wildlife management. There are provisions for public participation in the development of most fish and wildlife recommendations by these boards and councils.

On the Yukon North Slope, the Inuvialuit have the exclusive right to harvest furbearers, including wolves. The Wildlife Management Advisory Council (North Slope) was established under the *Inuvialuit Final Agreement* and advises the appropriate minister on all matters related to wildlife policy, and the management, regulation and administration of wildlife, habitat and harvesting

When it comes to conservation and management planning for species, Renewable Resources Councils (RRCs) and the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board play a substantial role in public engagement: hosting meetings, collecting public input, and supporting plan creation. This was the case with the 2012 Plan. Although the 2012 Plan directs integration of wolf and ungulate management, developing a plan for one species given the complexities of predator-prey dynamics and self-regulating ecosystems, comes with inherent challenges.

For example, there are ongoing concerns in the Yukon about moose and caribou populations in certain areas. Efforts are being made to better understand wolf-ungulate systems through a collaborative, scientifically-robust wolf collaring program underway in the Southern Lakes region that is supported by traditional and local knowledge (see Appendix B). As Yukoners continue to enjoy the privileges of hunting opportunities for many species, everybody's participation and contributions to all species' long-term conservation is valued. The planning processes and plans associated with species management provide a direction to strive towards and reflect the importance of working together.





What we heard

In 2019 and 2020, a total of 27 meetings were held with Indigenous governments and groups, boards and councils, and interest groups. This document strives to reflect all the values as they were communicated.

The Yukon's wolf conservation and management has a long and, at times, divided history. The 2012 Plan describes how the broader public sentiments shifted, resulting in the current goals and measures that guide wolf conservation and management today. Certain management techniques were no longer tolerated, and more importantly a desire for a more complete range of tools was reflected.

Complexity in wildlife management

Yukoners often have impassioned views about wildlife management. Wolf management is no exception, particularly in areas where ungulate harvest opportunities do not meet the demand. In these areas, perspectives on how predators are managed can be more polarizing, especially for those who think that community-based wolf harvest programs are insufficiently resourced or inaccessible. As expressed in the 2012 Plan, several predator management options are no longer supported by the public and respect for wolves continues to be strongly reflected in the engagement for this document. Given this, aerial control of wolves, surgical sterilization, and poison continue not to be recommended tools to meet management goals. Wolves are an integral part of Yukon ecosystems where the land is able to support fully-functioning predator-prey dynamics.

By collecting the input from Indigenous governments and groups, boards and councils and interest groups, representative voices are reflected in this document. The following sections document the median perspective or the middle way from those who provided



input or participated in discussions. These voices should not be interpreted as universal, but rather as the perspectives that were most common in discussions.

Voices from Indigenous government and groups

Many Indigenous representatives are concerned about impacts to the environment. From placer mining to climate change, those out on the land are experiencing numerous changes, captured by keen observation and communicated as Traditional Knowledge. On the whole, there is a reluctance to assign blame for ungulate decline solely on wolves (or to any one cause) with the general consensus being that so many things are uncertain and constantly changing and wolves are a part of the bigger environmental picture.

Many Yukon First Nations embrace the wolf as culturally significant, being the crest for their moieties or clans and having a certain sanctity as such. For them, respect for wolves continues to exist in the Yukon as it has for thousands of years.

The recurrent themes from meetings with Indigenous governments and groups were:

- Future generations have a right to experience wilderness with all animals present. Wolves must be considered part of the land and not viewed as a nuisance or pest. All animals have their role (see FAQ¹ 1);
- Humans have been active participants on the landscape since time immemorial, and denning wolves (the practice of removing pups from dens to reduce numbers) was a traditional way of inserting control into local predator numbers (see FAQ 2);
- There appears to be ample support for mineral exploration, there should be more funding for fish and wildlife studies and on-the-ground monitoring;
- There are a lot of hunters on the landscape, with particular areas of concern being Whitehorse hunters, bison hunters, and inexperienced hunters and their lack of respect for the land, land claim agreements, and for the animals;

¹ Frequently asked questions—Section starts on page 11.



- The *Wildlife Act* needs to be modernized to reflect the land claim agreements – First Nation people gave up much for those agreements and both sides need to uphold their commitments (see FAQ 3);
- There is too much access on the land – too many roads and trails are bringing more impacts to the land;
- There are still outstanding issues with traplines in overlap areas (see FAQ 4); and;
- Traditional Knowledge collection remains a challenge, as there is much uncertainty around how this is collected, stored and used. Collection and use of Traditional and local knowledge requires a clear approach to how it supports conservation and management plans alongside scientific knowledge systems (see FAQ 5).

“The wolf is the doctor of the wild animals”.

- First Nation Elder

Voices from Renewable Resources Councils

Renewable Resources Councils (RRCs) were established under First Nation Final Agreements as local advisories to make recommendations on fish and wildlife conservation to the Minister of Environment, the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board, and/or the affected First Nation. Because of their involvement at the community-level, RRCs are an important source of local and Traditional Knowledge. Overall RRCs are hearing a lot of local concerns about moose and caribou populations, especially related to potential changes in management regimes for hunters. The general themes from RRCs included:

- Predator management should be done holistically. We cannot manage moose and caribou without understanding and addressing the impacts of wolves and bears (and other predators);





- We need better data on wolf, moose, and caribou populations including harvest of those species (groups were interested in updates on the Southern Lakes Wolf Study; see Appendix B);
- There is general support for local wolf harvest programs (as described in the Plan) and an eagerness to get more of these programs initiated. There is an understanding and desire for these programs to be sustainably supported and established for long-term operation;
- There is a lack of clarity on who and how criteria to fulfill local wolf harvest programs are satisfied and there are concerns that requirements are too onerous to get initiation;
- There is a request for all tools available to be deployed to reduce predation rates of moose and caribou in priority areas;
- The Government of Yukon should keep offering support for trapper training, including succession planning for trappers. Training should also be offered and supported through community-based instructors;
- Trapping wolves is not lucrative in the Yukon, there needs to be better incentives for people to trap wolves (see FAQ 6);
- More needs to be done to improve allocation and use of trapping concessions; and
- The Yukon would benefit from having a dedicated wolf harvest program implementation coordinator to help liaise between the Government of Yukon, RRCs and First Nations. The role would enable multiple programs to be deployed simultaneously within a consistent framework that still allows for local adaptations based on community preferences.

Voices from identified interest groups

Interest groups that had a direct interest in wolf conservation and management were invited to participate, including: the Yukon Trappers Association, the Wild Sheep Foundation, the Yukon Fish and Game Association, the Yukon Outfitters Association, the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society-Yukon Chapter, the Wildlife Conservation Society Canada, and the Yukon Conservation Society. These groups represent a broad





constituency of the Yukon public and are important to understanding community support for and perspectives on how fish and wildlife management is done in the territory. Across these groups, one consistency lies in the integrated approach to understanding predator-prey systems, particularly those that are ecosystem-based and include wolves, bears, moose, and caribou. Some key messages from these groups include:

- Relationships between the Government of Yukon, RRCs, Indigenous governments and groups, interest groups, and the public would benefit from a more consistent, transparent information exchange – consider more frequent but less onerous reporting (e.g. 1-page infographics, dashboards, etc.)
- For those wishing to support wolf reduction efforts, it would be helpful for the Government of Yukon to clarify a range of options for where interest groups or other external resources can be directed;
- Industry should be supporting research;
- The location of den sites should be part of environmental impact assessments, however locations should remain masked from public;
- While true adaptive management is desirable, the resources are not available to fully understand the systems—how can we get real about this and seek to do better?;
- Decision-makers cannot ignore that one of the primary factors influencing moose populations is the rate of predation;
- The Government of Yukon should consider how to fully evaluate management efforts, including not only how well did implementation go (see Progress Assessment Report), but also whether implementation had the desired effects (how can we measure success?);
- Any harvest programs implemented under Goal 4 must be sustainable and the longevity of incentives needs to be ensured and evaluated over time;
- Harvest programs should look at moose population in relation to wolf numbers and attempt to determine thresholds for local harvest pressure. Evaluations





should examine both the local trapping areas but also the larger surrounding area for effects on ungulate populations;

- Locations of harvest programs should take a wholesome perspective of where caribou populations may be vulnerable to cumulative effects (e.g. climate change/wildfire) and consider avoiding those areas;
- We must acknowledge the importance of public perception and that education is a key tool in shaping community support or opposition;
- The Yukon should have enduring hunting and other experiential opportunities for the next generations (today's children and those yet born) to live in a world with moose and wolves; and
- Interest groups are generally supportive of the plan as it strikes an acceptable compromise of conservation and management.

Frequently asked questions

FAQ 1. How can we better manage human-wildlife relationships, particularly educating agricultural and rural residents about managing attractants and respect for wolves?

Human-wildlife relationships will be difficult anywhere humans have impacted and displaced the natural environment. The Conservation Officer Services Branch enforces laws prohibiting wildlife attractants on private property, and also provides education on attractant management and responds to human-wildlife conflicts. First Nation governments interested in working with the Conservation Officer Services Branch to improve human-wildlife relationships within their Traditional Territory should contact the Conservation Officer First Nation Liaison.





FAQ 2. Is the traditional practice of denning wolves allowed?

Denning wolves refers to removing pups from dens to reduce predator numbers. Typically a couple pups would be left in the den, so that wolves would not abandon the location and den sites would continue to be known. Generally speaking, without harvesting the pups for subsistence (see FAQ 8), a harvester would require a license and be bound by the laws of general application and regulations associated with trapping and hunting wolves in the identified area.

FAQ 3. When will the *Wildlife Act* be modernized to reflect the spirit and intent of the land claim agreements? How might bylaws be enacted?

The Government of Yukon has a long-standing commitment to update the *Wildlife Act*, but amending the Act is a much larger undertaking than just conforming to the Wolf Conservation and Management Plan. As indicated in the Progress Assessment Report, there is agreement that amendments to the *Wildlife Act* are required. To this end, in 2012, the Government of Yukon consulted on a draft framework to allow RRCs to establish bylaws, among other amendments, for consistency with final agreements. However, it did not proceed as there was not agreement from all Parties on some key principles.

The Department of Environment requires a mandate to amend the *Wildlife Act* and will look to work with Indigenous governments and groups, land claim advisory boards and councils, and interest groups to determine how best to reflect the agreements in wildlife legislation. This process will include enabling RRC trapping bylaws as per First Nation Final Agreements.

FAQ 4. There are unused traplines in overlap areas – how can they become available for use?

Provisions related to trapline assignment in overlap areas are suspended until they can be dealt with by creating the overlap agreements between the affected First





Nations, as described in chapter two of Yukon First Nation Final Agreements. The Government of Yukon is working with First Nations in implementing overlap agreements and amending regulations that could result in more opportunities to trap.

FAQ 5. How can we improve the collection and use of local and Traditional Knowledge?

The collection, storage and use of local and Traditional Knowledge are important to supporting wolf conservation and management. The Government of Yukon has a mandate to develop a new corporate approach to respecting and reflecting Indigenous knowledge, values and perspectives in government actions and decisions. Work that has been completed to-date in scoping this initiative was shared at the December 2019 Yukon Forum. The pandemic has delayed progress under this initiative, beginning with the cancellation of a gathering of First Nations government representatives, Elders and youth that was planned for spring 2020. Bilateral conversations with First Nations contacts, and recruitment of Intergovernmental Working Group members have continued in the interim, where possible given capacity constraints and competing urgent priorities. An initiating meeting with the Intergovernmental Working Group was held on September 14, 2022, setting the stage for next steps, including the establishment of guiding principles that can guide our collaboration on wolf conservation and management. Concurrently, the Government of Yukon is working collaboratively on a closely related project that proposes the development of a tracking solution; policy directive and information sharing agreement template for data and information received from Yukon First Nations and Transboundary Indigenous organizations. This work is in early stages, with introductory sessions currently being scheduled for internal and external contacts.





FAQ 6. Why don't we have bounties for wolves in the Yukon?

Significant time, effort and investment in equipment is required to catch wolves, and proper care of the pelt is labour-intensive. Although bounties for wolves are not supported by the Government of Yukon, there are wolf pelt handling incentives in the territory that encourage hunters and trappers to better prepare the hide for market. The local wolf harvest programs (also known as Goal 4 programs) are another way to get financial support for community-based wolf harvest.

FAQ 7. How do we get a community trapping project or 'Goal 4 program' in our community?

To-date there has only been one implementation of a community trapping project. The Aisek Project was a pilot to understand what Goal 4 programs could look like, and was supported by Champagne and Aishihik First Nations, the Aisek RRC and the Government of Yukon. Many lessons were learned over the course of the Aisek project that are important for future initiatives, including:

- Need for buy-in at all community levels and governments;
- Importance of implementing harvest management plan for moose and caribou;
- Importance of a system for harvest data collection for all users;
- Frequent engagement with trappers and trapline concession holders; and
- Collaboration between communities and the Government of Yukon and shared in-kind financial costs.

The requirements to establish local wolf harvest programs are provided on page 19 of the Plan. The Government of Yukon recommends that the first steps would be to establish a process, (e.g., captured in a community-based fish and wildlife workplan) that outlines conditions for success and how, when, and by whom they will be achieved. Regional biologists and the wolf program coordinator are available to support this process. It should be understood that programs need to be led and sustained by the community with the Government of Yukon's assistance.





FAQ 8. Why are wolves not a subsistence species?

Indigenous peoples in the Yukon have rights to subsistence harvest. Subsistence harvest means hunting, gathering, fishing and trapping:

- To feed yourself, your family or your community;
- For ceremonial purposes such as potlatches; and
- For use in non-edible by-products for domestic purposes.

Harvest of wolves would need to meet the listed criteria or otherwise require a hunting license and be bound to the laws of general application.

FAQ 9. Why is it called a conservation plan when there is no threat to wolves?

Conservation is a defined term in First Nation Final Agreements which guides wildlife management in the Yukon. In the Final Agreements, conservation means the management of fish and wildlife populations and habitats, and the regulation of users, with the primary goal of ensuring a sustainable harvest and its proper utilization. Similar definitions can be found in the Inuvialuit Final Agreement and the Gwich'in Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement. The 2012 Plan is not about protecting wolves specifically, rather, it addresses the need to view all wildlife comprehensively and ensure their continuity in the Yukon's ecology for future generations.

FAQ 10. Why not just protect ungulate habitat to increase moose populations?

The bottom line is that moose populations in the Yukon are predator-limited, not habitat-limited. This means that significant long-term wolf (and possibly bear) reductions are required to see any changes in moose density in an area. Licensed hunters are managed through various mechanisms including hunting regulations and restrictions to some areas such as parks and other special management areas. The Government of Yukon conducts annual surveys to estimate moose population





abundance and composition². The Government of Yukon needs to balance resources to conduct the many needed fish and wildlife population surveys across the territory, and in recent years there has been a considerable effort to better understand predator-prey populations. For more information on the research study that is currently underway in the Southern Lakes see Appendix B.

FAQ 11. Who provided input to this document?

All Indigenous governments and groups, including the 14 Yukon First Nations, Acho Dene Koe First Nation, Dease River First Nation, Gwich'in Tribal Council, Kwadacha Nation, Tahltan Central Government, Taku River Tlingit First Nation, Tetlit Gwich'in Council and the Inuvialuit, as well as all land claim boards and councils were provided the opportunity to participate in the review between November 2019 and October 2020. Additionally, identified interest groups, including the Yukon Trappers Association, the Wild Sheep Foundation, the Yukon Fish and Game Association, the Yukon Outfitters Association, the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society-Yukon Chapter, the Wildlife Conservation Society Canada, and the Yukon Conservation Society, were invited to participate. All comments, whether heard or submitted, were given full and fair consideration, resulting in this document, the Progress Assessment Report, and a clear picture of where we need to focus implementation efforts (path forward). Appendix A provides a list of engagement meetings.

² For details see the Science-based Guidelines for Management of Moose in Yukon: <https://yukon.ca/en/science-based-guidelines-management-moose-yukon>



Path forward

A plan retains its relevance when the vision and values that drove it persist.

Indigenous governments and groups, boards and councils, and interest groups understand the challenges to managing wolves. While every goal and its measures were evaluated for completeness, it is the sum of all recommendations that will enable effective wolf conservation and management. Below are recommended activities to further implement the existing goals in the 2012 Plan and to improve the outcomes of ongoing implementation:

1. Renew emphasis on education with a shift toward outcomes that seek to understand holistic perspectives on predator-prey systems. Emphasis should be placed on learning about the dynamic nature of natural ecosystems and how humans participate in it.
2. Increase education on Indigenous rights, the history and contemporary implementation of our settled agreements, with emphasis on Indigenous perspectives on wildlife management and our path to reconciliation.
3. Outreach to support 1) and 2) through the Service Desk, Yukon.ca, and associated print or social media material, including the following existing resources:
 - Subsistence hunting, fishing and trapping by First Nations, Inuvialuit and other Indigenous Peoples in Yukon (2021);
 - The Hunt Wisely Booklet (2021);
 - The Yukon Hunting Regulations Summary (July annually).
4. Launch at least one new community-driven wolf harvest program (also known as a Goal 4 program) by 2023. The criteria listed under Goal 4 of the 2012 Plan are intended to guide prospective programs to success. The criteria ensure the rigor of program design, implementation, and evaluation and can be fulfilled through community-based collaboration where all parties agree as to how those





criteria are met. The local approach to meeting the criteria can be detailed in a community-based fish and wildlife work plan or similar collaborative approach (see FAQ 7).

5. Increase awareness about the function of the First Nation Liaison in Conservation Officer Services Branch – what services and supports can be expected, particularly when it comes to First Nation human-wildlife relationships and harvest rights.
6. Develop reporting indicators for the implementation measures in the 2012 Plan that do not have definite outcomes (e.g. measures to collect and share traditional, local and scientific knowledge, recommendations to local and regional land use planning and environmental assessment processes must address the effects of access, the combined effects of multiple developments, etc.).
7. Review the implementation measures with appropriate agencies 10 years after the release of this document. The review should evaluate the progress on each of the measures and determine if the overall goals and principles of the 2012 Plan are being met. At that time, or if an earlier necessity arises, a decision can be made to continue the life of the 2012 Plan through a subsequent implementation review or to renew it at an agreed-upon date.

Thanks to all those who have contributed to the implementation review process and provided their time and input!





Appendix A: Engagement

The following is a list of engagement meetings that contributed to this document.

First Nations & Inuvialuit

Inuvialuit Game Council & WMAC-North Slope	December 10, 2019
Champagne and Aishihik First Nations	February 26, 2020
Kluane First Nation	January 10, 2020
Little Salmon/Carmacks First Nation	February 12, 2020
First Nation of Na-Cho Nyäk Dun	January 20, 2020
Ta'an Kwäch'än Council	February 4, 2020
Tetlit Gwich'in Council	December 11, 2019
Teslin Tlingit Council	September 30, 2020
Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in First Nation	January 21, 2020
White River First Nation	January 29, 2020
Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation	September 24, 2020

Boards and councils

Alsek Renewable Resources Council	January 10, 2020
Carmacks Renewable Resources Council	February 12, 2020
Dän Keyi Renewable Resources Council	January 10, 2020
Dawson Renewable Resources Council	January 21, 2020
Gwitch'in Renewable Resources Board	December 11, 2019
Laberge Renewable Resources Council	February 4, 2020
Mayo Renewable Resources Council	January 20, 2020
Teslin Renewable Resources Council	September 30, 2020
Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board	November 5, 2019 April 26, 2022

Interest groups

Canadian Parks and Wilderness Yukon Society	February 27, 2020
Wildlife Conservation Society Canada	September 23, 2020
Yukon Conservation Society	February 28, 2020
Yukon Fish and Game Association	August 26, 2020
Yukon Outfitters Association	September 30, 2020
Yukon Trappers Association	January 10, 2020
Yukon Wild Sheep Foundation	August 6, 2020





Appendix B: Details on the Southern Lakes Wolf Study

Why are we doing this?

- We want to update wolf population information in the Southern Lakes area.
- Locals are concerned about the impact of wolf predation on recovering caribou.
- We want to learn about wolves, caribou, and moose to help inform conservation and species management.
- We want to build a community-based monitoring program working with First Nations game guardians and local trappers.

How did we do it?

- In winter 2019-2020 and 2020–2021, we conducted wolf tracking and trapping efforts with Carcross/Tagish First Nation, Kwanlin Dün First Nation, Taku River Tlingit First Nation, Teslin Tlingit Council, Ta'an Kwäch'än Council and local trappers.
- Between Nov 2019 and Dec 2021, we collared 13 wolves from seven different wolf packs.
- In winter 2021 and 2022, we investigated 50 wolf kill sites to determine species / age and sex of killed prey.
- We completed an aerial wolf population survey in February 2022.

What have we learned so far?

- The wolf population trend in the Southern Lakes study area appears stable over the last 20 years.
- In winter, prey composition included moose, caribou, dall sheep, and elk. The prey composition varied across wolf packs, as did kill rates.
- On average, wolf packs killed about 60 per cent moose, 30 per cent caribou, and 10 per cent of other species.
- Wolves were found to be killing more caribou compared to in the 1990's when caribou herds were much smaller³, however current populations trends for the Ibex herd

³ R. D. Hayes, A. M. Bayer, and D. G. Larson. 1991. Population dynamics and prey relationships of an exploited and recovering wolf population in the southern Yukon. Yukon Fish and Wildlife Branch Final Rep. TR-91-1. 67pp



continue to indicate a substantial increase over the last 3 decades, and the Carcross herd appears stable or slightly increasing.

Next steps

The field component of the program is now complete. Further analysis and reporting will be completed by winter 2023.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT:

Peter Knamiller, Wolf Program Coordinator, Project Lead – 867.332.5469 | 867.332.1499 | peter.knamiller@gov.yk.ca

