

**PROPOSAL 1**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would change the start date of black bear baiting in Unit 1A from April 15 to May 1.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: Black bear baiting seasons are established by the department, so no Board of Game action is warranted on this proposal.

The author of this proposal suggests that bear baiting interferes with wolf trapping and that the bear baiting season should therefore begin on May 1, after the wolf trapping season ends. April 15 is the accepted starting date of spring black bear baiting across the state in units where baiting is allowed, and it is common for these two seasons to overlap. The April portion of the baiting season is an important time for baiters as it often takes several days for bears to find and begin using bait sites. Based on historical data during the month of April (2000-2009), an average of 5.1 hunters registered black bear bait sites in Unit 1A (range, 2-11), and an average of 3.3 wolves were harvested (range, 0-9).

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 2**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would shorten the black bear hunting season near several bear viewing areas in Unit 1A.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: There are no officially recognized bear viewing areas in the locations the proponent describes. This area includes several large bodies of protected coastal water on Revillagigedo Island. The proponent is asking to close all the area within ¼ mile of the shoreline to black bear hunting. The department considers this as an allocation between viewers and hunters.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 3**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would close an area near Ketchikan at Whitman Hatchery and Herring Cove in the Eagle Creek drainage to bear hunting.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: The author of this proposal recommends this area be closed due to fewer bears being seen than in previous years, which affects his bear viewing business. Hunting in this area is already closed by state regulation within ¼ mile of the road. According to department bear sealing data, bear hunting has not increased in the general area of the proposed closure. The nearest black bear hunting is approximately five miles from this facility. This area is surrounded by residential development and the department

frequently receives complaints from the public that the black bear density is too high in this area. The department considers this is an allocation issue between viewers and hunters.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 4**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would close an area near Margaret Creek and Traitors Cove north of Ketchikan on Revilla Island to bear hunting.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This proposal has been submitted to the board several times during the past 10 years, following the U.S. Forest Service’s development of the Margaret Creek/Traitor’s Cove bear viewing site and the associated allowance for commercial tour use, starting in 1999. The floatplane/boat dock and the short stretch of road from the estuary to the viewing site were contentious areas in Southeast for several years after bear viewing developed, and additional tourism-based activities clashed with local deer and bear hunting. The dock at the site serves as an access point for several hundred miles of old logging roads not connected to the main Ketchikan road system. The Forest Service reconfigured the dock to accommodate a few boats, while also allowing floatplanes to simultaneously load and offload guests. This reconfiguration appears to have reduced friction between user groups at the site during the past few years.

The Margaret Creek/Traitor’s Cove site is approximately 18 miles from Ketchikan and access is by boat or aircraft. Tour operators deplane and board vans for a one-mile ride to the trailhead. The handicap accessible trail allows viewers to reach the platform in about 10 minutes. The Forest Service began staffing the site in 2002 after one tour operator exceeded the Forest Service Use Permit allocation by over 3,000 visitors. The site has a capacity of 54 guests per day, with a group size capacity of 12-15. The logging road crosses Margaret Creek ¼ mile below the platform and the bridge is often used as an alternate viewing area. The department considers this is an allocation issue between viewers and hunters.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 5**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would close an area in Misty Fjords National Monument near Ketchikan to brown bear hunting.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: The author of this proposal recommends closing this area to protect bear viewing opportunities. The department considers this is an allocation issue between viewers and hunters.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 6**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would change the ending date of the deer season in Unit 1A from December 31 to November 30.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Under Department Consideration**

RATIONALE: The department is aware that low numbers of deer exist in Subunit 1A and that consideration must be given to existing deer harvest objectives and the ability to meet them in these areas. At the same time, the department recognizes the complexity of Southeast Alaska’s archipelago ecosystems, with the existence of periodic severe weather, multiple predators (wolves, black bears, and brown bears in Unit 1A), and habitat alterations resulting from clearcut logging. The department will be reviewing available information on deer numbers, harvest, predation, and options for increasing deer numbers. The department will thoroughly review all available information with the Board at the November meeting and provide recommendations to the Board at that time.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 7**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would change the department’s methodology for setting permit numbers for DG 003 (Deer Mountain goat hunt).

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: This proposal does not require action by the board. Criteria for allocating permit numbers in drawing hunts is under the department’s authority and are not based on regulation.

The author of this proposal is concerned that the number of permits for the Deer Mountain goat hunt in Ketchikan (DG003) went from 25 in RY 2009 to 4 in RY 2010, and that these numbers may have been arbitrarily set. In 2007, aerial surveys of the Deer Mountain goat herd yielded 137 animals; however, only 58 animals were counted in 2009. This decline in observed goats prompted the department to take a conservative approach to the hunt for RY 2010. Goats, and isolated goat populations in particular, are very susceptible to over harvest.

It is clearly noted on the front page of Drawing Permit Hunt Supplements that the number of permits may be adjusted up or down depending on the outcome of recent population surveys, which may not be completed until after the publication of supplements. Permits issued for DG003 may be adjusted upwards for RY 2011 if it is determined that populations were underestimated earlier. Starting in fall 2011, the department intends to subdivide the Deer Mountain goat hunt area into three units to prevent all harvest from occurring in a single portion of the hunt area.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 8**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would lengthen the wolverine season in Unit 1A.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: The wolverine trapping season end date was changed in Units 1-5 during the 2008 board meeting from April 30 to February 15. This shorter season was recommended because of new information that indicates that higher sustainable harvests of wolverines could be achieved by avoiding the denning period (15 February to 15 March). A key component of viable wolverine populations is the survival of reproductive females. Recent genetic research on wolverines in Unit 1B indicates that recruitment of reproductive females is primarily from females that are born within the region and survive to reproductive age. Female wolverines do not produce young until at least three years of age and frequently only successfully raise one or two young every other year. To maintain sustainable populations, as well as provide for an optimal number of surplus animals for the longer term, the harvest of females with dependent young should be minimized. Wolverine kits are born in February and early March and remain in the den until late May. During this late winter period reproducing females are vulnerable to trapping because they travel extensively to obtain food while attempting to meet the energetic demands of lactation. Harvesting reproductive female wolverines during this period can have negative ramifications on future recruitment into the population.

Most wolverines in Southeast Alaska are harvested in December, January, and February. Based on this information we believe that shortening the wolverine season would not significantly impact trapping opportunity or the time period when most wolverines are trapped. While opportunity will be reduced for a relatively small number of trappers that continue to trap wolverines during late February through April, all trappers will benefit from the potential increase in recruitment of young into the population as result of increased survival and reproductive success of denning females. Maintaining the current wolverine trapping closure date of February 15 will contribute to long-term sustainable wolverine hunting and trapping opportunities.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 9**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would raise the management objective for wolves in Unit 1A from 25 to 30 wolves per year.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: This proposal does not require action by the board. Management objectives are established under the department’s authority. As part of its periodic review and update of wolf management objectives, the department recently revised its wolf harvest objective for 1A, increasing it from 25 to 40 wolves per year.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 10**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would designate the Juneau portion of Unit 1C as an area where discretionary trapping permit conditions could be applied.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: Alaska Administrative Code 5 AAC 92.051 specifically states that discretionary trapping conditions are applicable to registration permits. Registration permits are generally required where there are conservation concerns. There is currently no conservation concern for furbearers in Unit 1C and a registration permit is not required in any portion of the unit.

During the fall 2008 Board of Game meeting, a proposal addressing trapping in the Juneau area was considered. The resulting regulation added several trails to those where trapping was prohibited. However, as part of the same regulation, the ¼ mile closure became specific to only large traps, while small traps (those with a jaw spread of 5 inches or less) could be set within 50 yards of these trails providing they were elevated at least 5 feet above the ground/snow. With this regulation, a compromise was reached where those concerned with safety due to large traps near trails were accommodated and trappers gained opportunity for harvesting small furbearers nearer the trails. This regulation is an example of multiple user groups working cooperatively together to seek solutions that accommodate all uses of the trail system. Based on the lack of complaints received during the 2009 trapping season, it appears that the current regulations governing trapping in the Juneau area are adequate.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 11**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would add the Treadwell Ditch trail to a list of several Juneau area trails that are closed to trapping within one-quarter mile of the trail; except that elevated small traps with jaw spreads of 5 inches or less may be used if they are set 50 yards or more from the trail.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: In the mid 1980s a ¼ mile trapping closure was implemented on many Juneau area trails (5 AAC 92.550(1)(F)). This closure was implemented due to concerns about the possibility of children and domestic pets getting caught in traps. Trails were identified for closure based on their level of public use. During the fall 2008 Board of Game meeting, five additional trails were added to the list of trails with the ¼ mile closure for trapping. However, as part of the same regulation, the ¼ mile closure became specific to only large traps, while small traps (those with a jaw spread of 5 inches or less) could be set within 50 yards of these trails, providing they were elevated at least 5 feet above the ground/snow. With this regulation, a compromise was reached where those concerned with safety due to large traps near trails were accommodated, while trappers

gained opportunity for harvesting small furbearers nearer the trails. This proposal would add the Treadwell Ditch Trail to the list of trails with the above trapping stipulations.

Utilizing small jaw spread traps and moving them off the ground should reduce the potential for undesired trapping accidents or incidences. Other trapping regulations include a requirement to mark traps so anyone making illegal sets can be identified by enforcement personnel.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **PROPOSAL 12**

**EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL:** This proposal would allow the use of noose stop/breakaway snares fitted with diverter wires to take wolves in the Gustavus area of Unit 1C.

**DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:** **Amend and Adopt**

**RATIONALE:** In 2002, a proposal to prohibit wolf snaring on the Gustavus forelands was introduced at the fall Board of Game meeting. The proposal was in response to the incidental take of moose and domestic pets. The board adopted the proposal and large diameter land-based snares were prohibited beginning in RY 2003. During the 2002 board meeting, department staff reported that if educational efforts and development of breakaway snares could sufficiently reduce the risk of incidentally snaring non-target species, the department would propose resumption of land-based snaring.

In 2007, department staff published a report outlining techniques and results for developing and testing breakaway snares and diverter wires. Biologists experimenting with breakaway snares on captive moose found that both of the two moose caught were able to escape via the breakaway mechanism. Additional trials conducted by trappers resulted in 15 wild moose captures and all but one was able to escape via the breakaway. During the wild moose trials, trappers caught and held 37 wolves while only one escaped. Diverter wires were also tested on captive moose, and by trappers on wild moose. Biologists observed 23 captive moose encounters with snares with diverter wires; no moose were incidentally captured. Trappers using diverter wires had no incidental moose captures and were able to take 9 wolves. It appears then that these snare options are successful in addressing concerns with incidental catch of moose.

The department does not have population data for wolves in the Gustavus area. However, based on anecdotal information, it appears wolf numbers have increased in the Gustavus area, or the wolves that are present have become bolder and are regularly seen in town or on the outskirts of the community. Recent trail camera traps have documented wolves in the area but cannot provide abundance data. During the period 1990-2002, 9 wolves were taken in the Gustavus area, and during the period 2004-2009, 7 more wolves were taken. Prior to the prohibition on the use of snares, the majority of wolves were taken by snares (7); since the proposal was adopted most wolves (5) have been taken by ground shooting. Eleven trappers from Gustavus sealed wolf pelts during the last 10 years.

The department recommends adopting an amended version of this proposal to allow the change, with the requirements that snare cable diameters be greater than 1/32 inch and that they be set out of water, and that they are constructed with a noose stop/breakaway, specifically that the cable is cut at a point that is either 9.5 inches or 10.5 inches from the cable end stop and then reattached with a double ferrule. Snares must also be fitted with a diverter wire that is made of wire no larger than 11 gauge and that is attached to the top of the snare so that the wire extends no fewer than 28 inches perpendicular to the snare loop at an angle of 10-20 degrees downward. Snares must be checked every 72 hours (similar to the requirement already in place for trapping at Gustavus).

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 13**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would change the northwest boundary of the Juneau Road System Closed Area, 5 AAC 92.510(3), to be the north bank of Peterson Creek.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: The current regulatory language lists the Juneau Road System boundary as 23.3 Mile Glacier Highway and is locally recognized as the Peterson Creek Bridge. The true odometer distance at Peterson Creek Bridge is 23.7 Mile. By defining the boundary of the closed area as the north bank of Peterson Creek, resource users will be able to easily determine the boundary and ensure they are hunting and trapping in an open area. In addition, the creek bank will provide a clear boundary for enforcement purposes. Due to the meander of Peterson Creek and the belief that the bridge represents the boundary, the loss of area open to hunting is negligible and will not result in a significant reduction in hunting opportunity.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 14**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would extend the Berners Bay portion of Unit 1C spring brown bear hunting season to June 20, and change the bag limit to one brown bear every year.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: The author of this proposal recommends changes to provide more bear hunting opportunities by increasing the season length and by allowing the harvest of one brown bear every year. These changes are also proposed as a way to assist in removing bears that may be affecting moose calf survival. The proponent states that persistent winter weather conditions in Berners Bay makes it difficult to hunt bears there in the spring.

Southeast Alaska brown bear hunting seasons currently take into consideration differing environmental conditions. For example, Unit 1 (including Berners Bay) and portions of the outer coast of Unit 4 have a spring season that extends to May 31 to accommodate

bears emerging later from dens, while the eastern portion of Unit 4, with a more temperate climate, closes on May 20.

In 2008, a similar proposal was submitted to the board to lengthen the spring brown bear season in Berners Bay, and the proposal was not adopted by the board. The department's reasoning at that time, like today, is that the present season and bag limit for brown bears in Berners Bay provides sufficient opportunity to harvest bears. GPS collar location data from a recently completed department brown bear study in Berners Bay indicate that bears use the tidal flats and estuaries in the lower portions of the bay from mid to late May and are available to hunters during the existing season. The historical harvest of brown bears in Berners Bay supports these findings, with the peak brown bear harvest during 2000-2009 occurring during the week of May 8-15. Successful hunters during this period only expended 2.1 days to harvest a bear, suggesting that bears are available for those interested in pursuing them.

The brown bear harvest in Berners Bay is low. Over the last 10 years the mean annual harvest has been 1.4 bears, although when compiled with non-hunting mortality this increases to 2.1 bears per year. Annual mortality has generally been about 2-3% of the estimated population; however, it reached 11% in 2008.

Implications on moose survivorship due to the lengthening of the brown bear season and the allowance of one bear every year are unknown. Brown bears are one of three large predator species found in the bay. It is likely that brown bears, black bears, and wolves contribute to the predation of moose adults and calves in the bay. However, without moose calf mortality research, it is not possible to predict what effect a nominal increase in brown bear harvest will have on moose calf survival and recruitment.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 15**

**EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL:** This proposal would establish a requirement for black bear hunters to provide a GPS location to the department when registering for a bait station permit in Unit 1D.

**DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:** **Adopt**

**RATIONALE:** This proposal to require GPS coordinates for bear baiting sites is primarily for enforcement purposes. Alaska Wildlife Troopers (AWT) have difficulty locating bait stations under the current registration system. By improving AWT's ability to find and enforce bait station permit conditions, we expect to see an increase in compliance with bait station requirements (such as distance from roads or houses and retrieval of baiting debris), and thereby benefit the resource, those hunters who bait for black bears, and the general public.

Over the past 10 years, an average of 35 bait stations have been registered each year by 22 hunters in Unit 1D. During this same period, 113 black bears have been harvested over bait, averaging 11 bears per year. Harvest of black bears using bait represents approximately 1/3 of the 317 black bears hunted in Unit 1D during this timeframe.



\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 16**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would open the portion of Unit 1C between Mount McGinnis and Eagle Glacier to mountain goat hunting under a unique drawing permit, or by redefining the registration permit mountain goat hunt (RG012) to include the area described above. The current language for this hunt (RG012) reads: Unit 1C, that portion draining into Lynn Canal and Stephens Passage between Antler River and Eagle Glacier and River.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: This area was closed to goat hunting after the 1984 season due to low goat numbers. In response to a proposal to the board in 2006 the department conducted the first comprehensive aerial survey in many years of the proposed area in October 2006. At that time 156 goats were counted. The survey was repeated in 2010, and 114 goats were counted throughout this same area. This represents a decrease of 27% since 2006, and like a number of other nearby areas, the severe winters of 2006, 2007, and 2008 are likely responsible for this decline at least in part.

The department considers the goats within this proposed area to represent two different populations, and therefore the number of available goats is lower than represented by the comprehensive surveys. One population is on an isolated mountain between two glaciers and accounted for 23 of the 114 goats in 2010. We do not consider this isolated mountain capable of sustaining any harvest due to its' isolated nature. The 2<sup>nd</sup> portion of the proposed area contained 91 goats.

Current harvest guidelines for goats in Southeast are based on 6 points per 100 observed goats (male=1 point and female=2 points), and new areas are not opened to hunting until a minimum of 100 goats are observed. Although the area as a whole exceeded this threshold, the functional populations that we would consider for management purposes were 23 and 91 animals.

The department not only has concerns about the decline in goat numbers in this area and possible lingering effects of the 3 severe winters, but also about the indirect effects of helicopter tourism and mineral exploration that are present in this area. The decline in goat numbers may be a function of one or all of these factors, and something the department is trying to understand through ongoing research. Due to these concerns, the department recommends against opening a hunting season in this area at this time.

Juneau area goat hunters currently have opportunities to hunt goats from the road system. A portion of RG012 and the archery only area (RG014) both occur on the road system. The portion of RG012 accessible by road has produced 1 goat annually, and the RG014 area has produced 1.6 goats annually, in the last 10 years.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 17**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would align the archery hunting season with adjacent areas in Unit 1D.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal, see issue statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 18**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would reduce the Unit 2 wolf bag limit from unlimited to 10 per year, and would require sealing within 14 days of taking a wolf.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: The department has concerns about numbers of wolves and the sustainability of wolf harvests in Unit 2. Also, wolves on Prince of Wales Island and adjacent islands have been identified as a distinct population segment of the Alexander Archipelago wolf that inhabits the islands of southern Southeast Alaska and British Columbia. Low population numbers could potentially trigger a listing under the Endangered Species Act. Harvests have declined significantly: researchers have noted substantial declines in the amount of sign (e.g., scats, tracks, denning activity), and local trappers have noted lower populations. Department biologists, local guides, U. S. Forest Service (USFS) personnel, and members of the public are encountering wolf snares and leg hold traps left in the field after seasons end. This is resulting in unreported wolf, bear, and deer mortality, furthering concerns.

In 1997, the board implemented a wolf harvest cap of 30% of the estimated fall population, which was 300-350 at the time. The harvest cap was reached in 1999, resulting in an emergency season closure. The department believes this has subsequently resulted in under-reporting of actual harvests. No reliable population estimate is available at this time, but it is probable the population is one-half of the earlier estimates of 300-350. Based on this, the department plans to revise the harvest cap to 45 wolves.

Reducing the state bag limit from unlimited to 10 wolves per year will have little immediate effect on wolf populations since most Unit 2 trappers operate under more liberal federal regulations. However, the department sees this proposal as a step toward recognition of a conservation concern and will begin collaborating with the USFS to recommend stricter federal regulations. Reducing the allotted time to get harvested wolves sealed from 30 to 14 days allows more responsive in-season management.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 19**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would close an area near Dog Salmon

Creek on Prince of Wales Island (Unit 2) to black bear hunting.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: The Dog Salmon Creek area was developed for bear viewing in 2003. This site is located on the main road system on the east side of Prince of Wales Island (POW) and is approximately 25 minutes by small plane from Ketchikan. This allows several tour companies to fly tourists (mostly from cruise ships that visit Ketchikan) to a U.S. Forest Service (USFS) dock in Polk Inlet (on POW), where they board a van for a 1.5 mile ride to the parking area and then walk 5 minutes to the creek. Currently, there is a two-car parking capacity and a limited USFS capacity of 10 persons at the site. During the peak season, tour companies guide 12 persons every two hours to the site. USFS personnel monitor the site during July and August and during 2010 the site had 1,200 visitors. Plans for next year include extending the parking capacity and developing a treated-wood viewing platform. The USFS posted signs at the trailhead, the stream crossing, and at the viewing platform, and issued a "No Shooting" buffer around the trail and platform by USFS order as well.

The department does not see this as a conservation issue, but rather allocation between viewers and hunters. Authority to make allocation decisions rests with the Board of Game.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 20**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would establish a drawing hunt for black bears in Unit 2.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See analysis and recommendation for Proposal 36.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 21**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would shift the start of the fall black bear season in Unit 2 from September 1 to October 1.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See analysis and recommendation for Proposal 36.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 22**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would eliminate the June portion of the spring black bear season.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See analysis and recommendation for Proposal 36.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 23**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would change the general-season black bear hunt in Unit 2 to a registration hunt and shorten season dates from September 1 – June 30 to October 1 – May 31.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See analysis and recommendation for Proposal 36.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 24**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would reduce the deer bag limit for non-residents from four to two antlered deer in Unit 2.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: The author of this proposal states that charter boat operators are beginning to use their outfitter option to take clients deer hunting. Charter boat operators cannot take clients deer hunting unless they are licensed hunting guides or licensed transporters. If charter operators are taking clients deer hunting without these licenses, they are operating illegally and there are already regulations in place through the Division of Occupational Licensing to address this issue. This is an enforcement issue, not a regulatory one.

Deer populations in Southeast Alaska are limited primarily by weather, habitat, and predation. Regulated bucks-only hunting has relatively little effect on populations. In Unit 2, deer populations are currently at high levels due to recent mild winters and low predator numbers. Over the last five regulatory years, non-resident deer harvests in Unit 2 have averaged 84 bucks per year (range 55-123), or less than 3% of the total harvest. There is no conservation concern or reason to reduce the non-resident bag limit in Unit 2 at this time.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 25**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would modify wolf trapping and hunting in Unit 2 to include one or more of the following: (1) require traps and snares to be marked, (2) reduce the harvest cap, (3) reduce trap check times, (4) reduce reporting times, or (5) introduce bag limits.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See analysis and recommendation for proposal 18.  
The proponent raises similar conservation concerns for the Alexander Archipelago wolf as the department did in Proposal 18 and suggests the following regulatory changes:

- 1) Require that traps and snares be marked with owner's name and contact information.

*This requirement is already in place under state trapping regulations. However, it is not required of local residents who choose to operate under federal regulations, which creates enforcement challenges.*

- 2) Reduce the harvest cap.

*The department intends to lower the harvest cap from 90 to 45 wolves per year. This adjustment can be done without a regulatory change or board action.*

- 3) Reduce the time limit for checking traps and snares.

*There are currently no trap check time requirements in regulation for wolves in Unit 2, although the department would support a trap check requirement. The temperate weather of Unit 2 is conducive to spoilage and/or scavenging of trapped animals by birds and other animals, although the timeframe for spoilage and scavenging varies depending on local conditions. Trapped animals in these instances are likely not recovered or reported. If the department reduces the harvest cap for wolves, a trap check requirement may result in fewer wasted wolves, more accurate reporting, and timelier in-season management. The department has been reluctant to require mandatory trap checks in the past because weather conditions may preclude trappers from safely checking traps within specified allotted times.*

- 4) Reduce time to report harvested animals for sealing.

*The department supports this aspect of the proposal because it would facilitate better in-season management, particularly with a reduced harvest cap (see the department's comments on Proposal 18).*

- 5) Introduce bag limits.

*The department supports this aspect of the proposal and submitted a similar proposal which calls for a reduction in wolf bag limits from unlimited to 10 per year (see the department's comments for Proposal 18).*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **PROPOSAL 26**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would modify the boundaries of the Southern Southeast Islands Controlled Use Area (CUA) for fall black bear hunting in

Unit 3 by excluding from the regulation those islands not served by the Alaska Marine Highway System.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **TAKE NO ACTION** – in the event that a preceding Board action eliminates the fall CUA for black bear in Units 2 and 3, and if the CUA has a sunset of June 30, 2012. **Adopt** if the CUA remain in place.

RATIONALE: From 2000 to 2009, approximately 93% of the black bears taken in Unit 3 came from Kuiu and Kupreanof Islands, combined, with 50% and 43% of the harvest, respectively. The remainder of the Unit 3 islands accounted for less than 7% of the unit-wide harvest. Kupreanof is among the islands served by the Alaska Marine Highway System; therefore, it would remain within the boundaries of the CUA and would not be directly affected by the proposed regulatory change. Although Kuiu would be outside the CUA, the 120 bear harvest guideline for nonresident hunters on Kuiu Island, which was enacted by the board in 2001, alleviates concern that harvest on this island would rise significantly. Additionally, the number of guides authorized to conduct black bear hunts on Kuiu Island, and the number of hunts each guide-outfitter is allowed to conduct annually, has remained frozen at 2002 levels. And finally, the commercial use of motorized land vehicles for big game hunting on Kuiu is regulated by the U. S. Forest Service and can only be conducted under a special use permit. For these reasons, the department believes this regulation will not be detrimental to black bear management in Unit 3.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 27**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would extend the wolf hunting season in Unit 3 by 31 days to include the month of May: August 1- **May 31** [APRIL 30]

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Under Department Consideration**

RATIONALE: The department is aware that low numbers of deer exist in Unit 3, as well as in Subunit 1A, and that consideration must be given to existing deer harvest objectives and the ability to meet them in these areas. At the same time, the department recognizes the complexity of Southeast Alaska’s archipelago ecosystems, with the existence of periodic severe weather, multiple predators (wolves and black bears in Unit 3), and habitat alterations resulting from logging. The department will be reviewing available information on deer numbers, harvest, predation, and options for increasing deer numbers in Unit 3. The department will thoroughly review all available information with the Board at the November meeting and provide recommendation to the Board. Recommendations may include expanding the wolf season if the expansion will be part of a wolf management program that can be expected to result in increased deer numbers.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 28**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would modify the department policy for setting allowable harvest levels for brown bears in Unit 4. Specifically, bears killed in defense of life and property (DLP) would not count against the allowable harvest.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: This proposal does not require action by the board. Setting mortality level guidelines are under the authority of the department and can be set without regulatory action. The department manages brown bears in Unit 4 from the guidelines established under the Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Strategy (BBMS), adopted in 2000. The specifics of the plan set a mortality level by island, with Admiralty, Baranof, and Chichagof islands each having a guideline mortality level, averaged over a three-year period. This mortality takes into account all mortality: hunting, agency kill, illegal kill, and DLP.

Brown bear sealing records for Unit 4 have been tallied since 1960. From then to 2009 the number of bears killed by all causes is 5,424. DLPs make up 235 of that total (~ 4%). Hunter harvest (both resident and non-resident) is 5,052 (~93%).

The Unit 4 BBMS acknowledged that development activities and solid waste disposal can contribute to an increase in brown bear DLPs. The planning team identified reducing, where possible, “the kinds of situations that lead to dangerous bear/human encounters and to improve public information on learning to live with bears as development and encroachment occurs.” Following the Board of Game’s formal support of the Unit 4 BBMS at its November 2000 meeting, department staff have distributed bear safety/behavior videos, given presentations, and provided public service announcements, press releases, and educational training to a wide variety of the general public, including school students, sister agency staffs, businesses, municipal public safety personnel, and remote commercial business operators. Many of these contacts are on a regular, often annual, basis. DLP numbers vary considerably from year to year due to a number of factors but the long-term trend does not appear to significantly affect how many bears are available for annual hunter harvests.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 29**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would change the opening date for beaver trapping in Units 1-5 from December 1 to November 1.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Amend and Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal, see issue statement. The department intended to propose a November 10 starting date rather than a November 1 date printed in the proposal book, to be consistent with Game Management Units 5, 6, 7, 8 and 15.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 30**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would establish a season and bag limit for fishers in Units 1-5.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: This proposal would create the first fisher trapping season in Alaska. There may be a growing population of fishers or frequent dispersal of fishers into in the Juneau area of Unit 1C. The first documented harvest of a fisher in Southeast Alaska occurred on the Juneau road system in RY 1996. Additionally, a fisher skull was found on the United States' side of the border in 1994. From regulatory years 1996 to 2009, six fishers have been reported harvested in the Juneau area. All known fisher harvests have been incidental to marten and wolverine trapping. Because there is not an open fisher season, any fisher caught incidentally must be surrendered to the state.

Based on population data provided by Canadian biologists, it appears fishers occur in low densities in the Taku River drainage. From habitat capability models, biologists estimate there are 15-50 fishers in the Canadian portion of the Taku River drainage. Canadian harvest records indicate there were 13 fishers harvested during the period July 1985-June 2008. A fisher trapping season is open from Nov. 1-Feb. 15 in British Columbia; there is no bag limit, and trappers are required to report fisher harvests within 15 days of the close of the season.

The existing, small, incidental harvest of fishers in the Juneau area may mean that dispersing fishers have or may be establishing a breeding population. Of the six fishers harvested, 3 were female, one was a male, and two were of unknown sex. The documentation of both male and female fishers in the Juneau area suggests a breeding population is likely in the Juneau area. Fishers are not known to occur outside the Taku River drainage and the Juneau portion of Unit 1C.

The lack of captures during ongoing department wolverine research, which includes boxtraps and cameras, and the lack of harvest records south of Juneau, suggest their range is very narrow and likely limited to the area between the Taku River and Berners Bay. Because of the small population of fishers that exists, the department is concerned that an open season might lead to trappers deliberately targeting fishers and could delay the establishment of a breeding population if one does not already exist. If a breeding population does exist, additional harvest may not be sustainable.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **PROPOSAL 31**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would prohibit the use of traps with an inside jaw spread of less than 5 7/8" when mink and marten trapping is closed.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal, see issue statement.



\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 32**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would change the opening date for waterfowl hunting in Southeast Alaska from the present September 16 to September 1.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This proposal, and similar proposals from previous years, illustrates the fact that season dates for waterfowl hunting in Southeast Alaska do not have unanimous consensus among hunters. Hunters have suggested that shifts in season dates affect opportunities differently in different parts of the region. For instance, in northern areas, such as Haines and Juneau, many hunters prefer the early September season start because some migratory species are more abundant at this time. In southern Southeast, with warmer conditions, this is not as likely to be the case, so a mid September opening still provides opportunity to harvest these species and also provides the advantage of allowing hunters to hunt through the winter holiday season.

As shared at the 2008 Board of Game meeting, the department conducted a survey of resident waterfowl hunters in Southeast Alaska during 2008 to determine preferences for season dates, including the possibility of implementing split seasons. Results showed a pattern of preference for an earlier season in the northern portion of the region and a later season in the southern portion. Across the entire region, the majority of hunters indicated a preference for shifting to later season dates. This finding played a part in the board's decision to adopt a proposal in 2008 that changed the season opening date from September 1 to September 16.

Only about 25% of the surveyed waterfowl hunters supported a split hunting season as a means to accommodate both early and late hunting preferences. However, even if supported, implementing a split season has drawbacks. At present, Alaska has 5 waterfowl hunting zones. If Alaska were to implement split seasons, there would be a significant risk reducing these to 3 zones, which would likely be considered undesirable to many waterfowl hunters across the state.

The current U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) framework for the waterfowl season limits the season to a maximum of 107 consecutive days, and entire zones must use the same starting and ending dates. Proposals for creating split seasons or to subdivide zones are only entertained by the USFWS every 5 years; the next proposal cycle will be in 2011. Any proposals for creating separate zones would need sufficient justification and evidence that the differentiated areas contrasted sufficiently in geography, climate, and bird migration to warrant different season dates.

This is an allocation issue. The proposed change in season dates is not related to conservation issues or concerns.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 33**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would prohibit black bear trapping and the sale of black bear meat, hides, skulls, and other parts in Units 1-5.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: The sale of black bear hides and skulls taken as furbearers was recently allowed statewide, including Southeast Alaska, effective July 1, 2010. The department has not yet had time to assess the implications of this allowance and its effects and influence on bear harvests and conservation. The sale of black bear meat is only allowed under trapping seasons, and no trapping seasons currently exist outside predator control areas in Units 16 and 19. For conservation reasons, the department opposes establishing trapping seasons for bears in southeast Alaska and the Board is not expected to allow black bear trapping anywhere in southeast Alaska currently illegal, although the board may consider this allowance for some parts of the state for black bears taken as furbearers at its meetings for the 2010-2011 regulatory cycle. Actions from that meeting, with the associated discussion and rationale for decisions, may have implications for Region I and its black bear regulations. Only those areas where trapping seasons are established will allow the sale of meat. As with meat, the sale of gall bladders is currently not allowed. The department recommends continuing this disallowance.

Information from other states (e.g., Maine, Idaho, Utah, and Montana) and Canada indicates the sale of bear hides has not created conservation concerns in those areas. In Southeast Alaska, all bears are required to be sealed. With this requirement in place, the department believes it will be able to monitor black bear harvests closely enough to determine if the sale of bear hides and skulls creates any conservation concerns. No black bear trapping seasons are proposed for Units 1-5 at this time, so that part of the proposal appears to be moot.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 34**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would prohibit black bear trapping and the sale of black bear meat in the Southeast Region, Units 1-5.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See rationale for Proposal 33.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 35**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would reduce the resident black bear bag limit in Southeast Alaska from two bears per year to one bear per year.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal, see issue statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 36**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would make one or more of the following changes to the black bear seasons in Units 1-3 and 5:

- implement a draw hunt for non-residents
- close the fall (Sept. 1 – Dec. 31) hunting season for non-residents
- close the June portion of the spring hunting season for non-residents
- extend the Controlled Use Area for Units 2 and 3 through October
- close bear baiting in Units 1A, 1B, 2, and 3

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Amend and Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal, see issue statement. This proposal provides a number of possible actions to reduce black bear harvests to sustainable levels in Southeast Alaska. The department’s “Amend and Adopt” recommendation is made in recognition of the board’s prerogative to select none, one, or multiple potential options.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 37**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would require a drawing permit for unguided non-resident black bear hunters in Units 1, 2, 3, and 5.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See department proposal 36.

The department agrees with the authors of this proposal in regards to the conservation concerns for black bears in parts of Southeast Alaska, and recommends that requiring a drawing permit for non-resident hunters is one of several possible options for addressing this issue. However, the department would prefer that the board take no action on this proposal and instead address the concept of a drawing permit for non-resident hunters in the myriad of options provided in department proposal 36.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 38**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would require GPS coordinates for bear baiting stations in Units 1-5 to be submitted to the department.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: This proposal was submitted by the Alaska Wildlife Troopers (AWT) to

address the need for troopers to be able to locate bear baiting sites. Bear baiting permits come with a number of conditions associated with them, including requirements that they be placed away from roads and residences for public safety, and that the sites be cleaned up after the season ends. In order for AWT to check bait sites for permit compliance, troopers need to be able to locate the sites in a safe and efficient manner. As is, troopers often spend hours looking for a single site, which wastes their time and does not allow them to perform other important enforcement aspects of their jobs. By requiring GPS locations, AWT could use the waypoints to quickly and efficiently check sites for compliance, which would ensure bear baiting is conducted in a safe and responsible manner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 39**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would disallow the hunting of black bears over bait in Units 1, 2, and 3.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Take No Action**

RATIONALE: See department proposal 36.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 40**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would require black bear meat to be salvaged during the month of June.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: When the board instituted the requirement to salvage spring black bear meat several years ago, it was after hearing testimony from several hunters who were defending the legitimacy of bear baiting and asking that the board to retain it as a legal practice. These bear baiters claimed that they regularly salvaged black bear meat during the spring season, although some hunters claimed that the palatability of black bear meat denigrated after May. The board therefore acted to implement a spring meat salvage requirement that excluded the month of June.

While the department does not see the salvage of black bear meat as a conservation issue, some hunters are known to wait until June to hunt black bears as a way to avoid the meat salvage requirement. Given the increasing harvest of bears in the region and the desire to reduce harvests, in at least some areas, a requirement to salvage meat in June may result in a reduction in the numbers of spring black bear hunters.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 41**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would replace the deer harvest survey with a deer harvest report in Units 1-5.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Adopt**

RATIONALE: Department proposal, see issue statement.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 42**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would modify the moose antler restrictions within the RM038 hunt area (Units 1B, 3, and southern 1C) by either entirely prohibiting the harvest of bulls with spike-fork antlers, or by establishing allowable harvest quota(s) for spike-fork bulls and closing the season for spike-fork bulls when the quota is reached.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do not adopt**

RATIONALE: The proponent's stated primary concern with the current antler regulation is that it is not possible to positively identify legal spike-fork moose because of the inability to detect broken or damaged antlers. 5 AAC 92.150 (c) states that within the RM038 hunt area a broken, damaged, or altered antler is not considered a spike-fork antler. The proponent suggests that eliminating the spike-fork provision in the current antler regulation would eliminate potential pitfalls it presents for some hunters.

While the proposed changes may have merit in addressing the frustration associated with the broken antler regulation, the result of implementing the proposed action would be to protect what the department considers to be surplus bulls, and would thereby unnecessarily decrease hunter opportunity. While the department regrets that some hunters do not harvest a moose due to this regulation (6 of 300 during 2007-2009), the need for this regulation was demonstrated to the board in 2006 when it was adopted.

Moose with spike-fork antlers typically represent a relatively high percentage of the annual RM038 harvest. From 1995 to 2008, bulls with spike-forked antlers comprised approximately 62% of the overall RM038 moose harvest. In fall 2009, following liberalization of the moose antler restrictions to allow the harvest of bulls with 2 brow tines on both antlers, the percentage of spike-fork bulls in the overall harvest declined to 44%, but was still a substantial portion of the overall harvest. Establishing harvest quotas for spike-fork bulls or entirely disallowing the harvest of spike-fork bulls would unnecessarily restrict the allowable harvest that presently provides for an adequate bull:cow ratio.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 43**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would shorten the wolf hunting season in Units 1, 3, 4, and 5 from August 1-April 30 to September 1-March 31.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: The department recommends leaving the dates for the wolf hunting season as they are, with the possible exceptions of Units 1A and 3. Wolf populations throughout most of Units 1, 3, and 5 are widely distributed and considered healthy and stable. Wolves occur rarely, if at all, in Unit 4. There is no indication that the wolf populations in these areas are being negatively impacted by the present season. Shortening the fall season would take away opportunity from early season hunters who might want to harvest a wolf while deer or mountain goat hunting. While in the spring, the April wolf season allows early season bear hunters a chance to harvest a wolf should they encounter one. Given that there is no conservation concern at this time, the department does not believe a shortening of the season is warranted.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 44**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would modify the second degree of kindred approval procedures for nonresidents in Units 1-5.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: This is not a conservation issue, but rather a policy and enforcement issue. The requirements for second degree of kindred allowances are listed in state statute [16.05.408(2)], and therefore are not subject to regulatory change.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 45**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would retain, repeal, or modify discretionary hunt conditions and procedures applied by the department to permit hunts in the Southeast Region, Units 1-5.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This is a Board of Game proposal. The board has requested that the department review all discretionary permit conditions for each of the permit hunts in Units 1-5. Permit conditions can be found in the proposal and use of those authorities are included in a list of Region I permit hunts on the Board of Game website at <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us/gameinfo/meetinfo/gcal.php>.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 46**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: Establish a bonus system for specific drawing hunts.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **No Recommendation**

RATIONALE: This proposal was developed by the Board of Game during the March 2009 board meeting and was submitted for review at the request of the Board of Game. This board proposal will create a system for some drawing hunts whereby a hunter who

pays careful attention to the application rules will increase his or her chances of being drawn in subsequent years when he or she accumulates more points (chances). How much a hunter's probability of being drawn in a subsequent year will increase will depend on: (1) the number of applicants, (2) the number of bonus points he or she has, and (3) the established rules.

The department has no recommendation because these systems and the way they could be implemented represent a myriad of allocation decisions. A number of state fish and game agencies in the U. S. have preference or bonus point systems for allocating hunting opportunities that vary from moose in Maine to bighorn sheep in many western states. The degree to which the hunting public likes or dislikes these systems varies. Most are expensive and administratively complicated to maintain. All have fees to maintain the respective program apart from other license and tag fees that support wildlife management programs.

The department is neutral on the many allocation decisions associated with implementation of this system. The department remains concerned about the cost to implement and maintain a bonus point system. Whether the Board adopts bonus points for a few or many hunts is largely irrelevant to the computer programming work necessary to implement the system. However, if pursued, the department would prefer starting small, with a few hunts, so that inevitable "bugs" in a new system can be more easily and efficiently identified and addressed.

State fish and game agencies that have bonus or preference point systems charge additional fees to maintain these systems, with any additional funds being used for big game management and conservation. The department is unable to subsidize development and maintenance of this system by taking away hunter dollars from other game management programs. Testimony from proponents of bonus points (avid Alaskan hunters) has consistently indicated a willingness to pay a modest increase in application fees to offset the cost of this system. This will require legislation allowing the department to recoup the cost to operate a bonus point system, at which time the department would institute the bonus point system.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **PROPOSAL 47**

**EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL:** This proposal would identify areas closed to trapping with large killer-style traps (e.g., 330 Conibears) and snares near the city of Yakutat and along popular Yakutat trails.

**DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:** **Amend and Adopt**

**RATIONALE:** During trapping seasons, Yakutat residents use local trails, roads, and beaches for hiking and walking their pets. Trapper logistics are sometimes limited by weather and snow conditions and they may therefore use the same areas to set traps. An estimated 10 trappers actively trap in the Yakutat area annually.

There have been occasions where pets have been trapped or caught in snares. Three dogs and a cat are known to have been caught in the areas listed in the proposal, with at least one resulting in mortality. Trapping in and near urban areas has been an issue in the past and several municipalities have promulgated ordinances to prohibit trapping for public safety purposes.

One of the statutory duties of the Commissioner of the Department of Fish and Game is to support hunting, fishing and trapping. Serious user conflicts, such as the capture of pets along popular trails, are reducing trapping opportunities. The department recommends that the Board find ways to mitigate these conflicts and therefore supports an amended version of this proposal, where 330 Conibear traps and snares would be prohibited in the following areas: (1) within 500 yards of permanent residences in Yakutat city limits as well as a portion of the Cannon Beach Recreation Area; (2) 500 yards inland from the mean high tide line from the junction of Coast Guard Beach Road - #9967, along the Inner Beach Road-Forest Road #9968, to a point ½ mile south of the Junction of Cannon Beach Road and the Inner Beach Road #9968, locally known as “the barge; (3) 150 yards on either side of Cannon Beach Road; and (4) 50 yards on either side of the Train Trail.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PROPOSAL 48**

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSAL: This proposal would extend the current wolf hunting season an additional 31 days, to May 31, in Units 5A and 5B. The current wolf hunting season is open from August 1 to April 30.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: **Do Not Adopt**

RATIONALE: The wolf harvest from Unit 5 has been 80 wolves over the last 10 years, or a mean harvest of 8.0 wolves per year. By subunit, 63 wolves were taken in 5A, and 17 were taken in 5B. Alaska residents, mostly from Yakutat, harvested the majority of these wolves in Unit 5 (61). Hunting accounts for approximately 56% of the unit’s wolf harvest. Although the exact number of wolves in Unit 5 is unknown, anecdotal information gathered from trappers, hunters, pilots, and department personnel suggest the population is stable to increasing. This proposal would provide additional opportunity to harvest wolves, mainly by spring bear hunters.

The department recommends against adoption of this proposal because the additional 31 days to harvest wolves in spring will extend the season beyond the period that wolf hides are useable and into the pupping period, when wolf pups are dependent on adults. The existing 9 month hunting season and 5 ½ months of trapping provide ample opportunity to harvest wolves and extending the season will not significantly increase wolf harvesting opportunities. Wolves are only one of three large predator species that likely contribute to moose calf mortality. Brown and black bears also occur in the unit. Extending the wolf season would not likely result in much additional moose calf survival and recruitment. Increased trapping effort by the public during the winter trapping season would be a more effective way to local moose and deer populations.



\*\*\*\*\*