

Southeast Region

Proposal Index

Juneau Area – Units 1C, 1D & 5

- 1 Increase the bag limit for deer in Unit 1C, mainland.
- 2 Open a youth only deer hunt in Unit 5A.
- 3 Extend the brown bear season and increase the bag limit for Berners Bay, Unit 1C.
- 4 Extend the brown bear season and increase the bag limit for Berners Bay, Unit 1C
- 5 Allow the resident harvest of one brown bear every two years in Unit 5A.
- 6 Shorten the black bear baiting season in Unit 1D.
- 7 Allow the incidental take of fisher in Unit 1C.
- 8 Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berners Bay.
- 9 Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in the Gustavus area.
- 10 Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench.

Ketchikan Area – Unit 2

- 11 Change the black bear hunting regulations for Prince of Wales Island, Unit 2.

Petersburg Area – Units 1B & 3

- 12 Modify the definition of a legal moose antler for Units 1B and 3.
- 13 Modify elk drawing hunt area in Unit 3 to exclude Zarembo Island, and close season on Zarembo and associated islands.
- 14 Decrease season length and bag limit for deer in Unit 3, Lindenberg Peninsula.
- 15 Prohibit the use of motorized vehicles by marten trappers on the Tonka Road System in Unit 3, the Lindenberg Peninsula.

Regional and Multiple Units

- 16 Modify the bag limit for goat in Units 1 and 4.
- 17 Close the taking of grouse hens in the spring for all Southeast Region Units.
- 18 Prohibit snaring bears in the Southeast Region.
- 19 Prohibit snaring bears in the Southeast Region.
- 20 Prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in the Southeast Region.
- 21 Align the trapping season dates for the Southeast Region.
- 22 Lengthen coyote trapping seasons in Units 1-5.
- 23 Open resident hunting seasons seven to ten days before nonresident seasons for Southeast Region Units.
- 24 Open resident hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Southeast Region Units.
- 25 Open resident hunting seasons ten days before nonresident seasons; allocate 90% harvest to residents, remove guide requirements and increase fees for Southeast Region Units.
- 26 Allocate 90% drawing permits to residents and eliminate nonresident participation in hunts with ten or less permits for Southeast Region Units.
- 27 Limit drawing permits to 10% for nonresidents for Southeast Region Units.
- 28 For Southeast Region Units, allocate a certain percentage of permits to nonresidents and eliminate nonresident participation for those hunts with a small number of permits.

Sitka Area- Unit 4

- 29 Allow hunters to harvest one antlerless deer on Pleasant Island, Unit 4.
- 30 Establish a three-day doe season for Chichagof Island, Unit 4.
- 31 Limit the harvest of nannies and prohibit the taking of nannies with kids in Unit 4.
- 32 Alternate spring and fall bear seasons for nonresidents in Unit 4.
- 33 Shorten the season for brown bear in Unit 4.

- 34 Restrict the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 4.
- 35 Modify the brown bear harvest allocation for residents in Unit 4.
- 36 Exclude wounding loss from the annual brown bear harvest for Unit 4.
- 37 Extend the otter trapping season in Unit 4.
- 38 Lengthen the trapping season for marten and mink in Unit 4.
- 39 Lengthen the furbearer trapping season on Chichagof Island, Unit 4.

Arctic & Western Regions – Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A

- 40 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 18.
- 41 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22C and the remainder of Unit 22D.
- 42 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23.
- 43 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 26A.
- 44 Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Southeast Region Meeting
(Game Management Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5)
January 11 - 15, 2013
Harrigan Centennial Hall
Sitka, Alaska

~TENTATIVE AGENDA~

NOTE: This Tentative Agenda is subject to change throughout the course of the meeting. This Tentative Agenda is provided to give a general idea of the board's anticipated schedule. The board will attempt to hold to this schedule; however, the board is not constrained by this Tentative Agenda. Persons wishing to testify must sign-up by the deadline. Public testimony will continue until those present at the meeting are heard; the board will continue working through its agenda immediately upon conclusion of public testimony. The following time blocks are only an estimate.

Friday, January 11, 8:30 AM

OPENING BUSINESS

- Call to Order
- Introductions of Board Members and Staff
- Board Member Ethics Disclosures
- Purpose of Meeting (overview)

STAFF AND OTHER REPORTS

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY (upon conclusion of staff reports)

THE DEADLINE FOR SIGN-UP TO TESTIFY will be announced at the meeting. Public testimony will continue until persons who have signed up before the deadline and who are present when called by the Chairman to testify, are heard.

Saturday, January 12, 8:30 AM

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued

BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)

Sunday, January 13 – Tuesday, January 15, 8:30 AM

BOARD DELIBERATIONS Continued

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS, including petitions, findings and policies, letters, and other business (Upon conclusion of deliberations)

ADJOURN

Special Notes

- A. This agenda is TENTATIVE and subject to change during the meeting. A list of staff reports and a roadmap will be available at the meeting. Scheduled updates will be available on the Board of Game website.
- B. Meeting materials are available at: www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo or by contacting the ADF&G Boards Support Office in Juneau at 465-4110.
- C. A live audio stream for the meeting is intended to be available at: www.boardofgame.adfg.alaska.gov
- D. The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Individuals with disabilities who may need auxiliary aids, services, and/or special modifications to participate in this hearing and public meeting should contact 465-4110 no later than December 28, 2012 to make any necessary arrangements.

Juneau Area – Units 1C, 1D & 5

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Modify the bag limit for hunting deer on Juneau mainland as follows:

The regulations would read: Douglas, Lincoln, Shelter and Sullivan Islands and the Juneau road system.

ISSUE: The mainland in Juneau is open for hunting bucks only. There are more miles of road to hunt from in Juneau than there is on Douglas Island where a person can take a total of four deer of either sex.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone who hunts deer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Gary Miller EG042212541

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer, and 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. Open a youth only deer hunt in Unit 5A as follows:

In Unit 5A, open a youth only, (18years of age or younger) hunt which would begin October 15th, two weeks ahead of the general hunt, which would begin as posted on November 1. Proxy hunts would not be permitted during the two week period for youth hunters.

ISSUE: The current general deer season opens November 1st for all ages and all areas. This makes for a somewhat congested hunt for everybody involved. We would like to have a two week head start hunt for youths only (18 years of age and under) to allow for a better chance for of our youths to experience a successful first hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The status quo will be everybody, all ages, hunts at the same time lowering the odds for the young hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Youths would have a better chance at a successful hunt, thereby instilling in them confidence to continue in the tradition of hunting, and family members will be able to experience the hunt with them.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered having special youth only areas, but decided it would make things more confusing than just having an earlier season.

PROPOSED BY: Yakutat Advisory Committee EG050112611

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Extend the brown bear season and increase the bag limit for Berners Bay, Unit 1C as follows:

Brown/Grizzly Bear: Berners Bay and all drainages draining into Berners Bay: One bear every regulatory year by registration permit: March 15 - June 20.

ISSUE: Brown bear season in the Berners Bay area. The current regulations have a season of March 15 - May 31. Many years the snow and ice persists well into June, the bears are not accessible to hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued increase in brown bear numbers, (estimated at approximately two per square mile), and a moose population that, while not limited by available browse or habitat, remains too low to support hunting opportunities, The bear population could easily withstand a two to three-fold increase in harvest, and of course the Department of Fish and Game, in the event of any concerns, can invoke an Emergency Order Closure.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The products produced would be moose. In time, a hunt that reflects the carrying capacity of this area could once again be provided.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Moose, moose hunters, brown bear hunters, and wildlife viewers would all benefit from a slight increase in brown bear harvest. It is presumed that an increased bear harvest would lead to a more robust moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? It is unlikely that anyone would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extending the spring season to run concurrently with black bear, open through June 30. This would be a viable option.

PROPOSED BY: Barry Brokken EG041612530

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Extend the brown bear season and increase the bag limit for Berners Bay, Unit 1C as follows:

In Berners Bay, portion of Unit 1C, season: March 15 to June 10, one bear ever year.

ISSUE: Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear in Unit 1C of Berners Bay: change bag limit to one bear every year; change season dates to end June 10 instead of May 31; up the percent for brown bear from four percent to fifteen percent.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There has not been a hunt in Berners Bay since 2006. The calves will not make it to the fall with over 75 brown bears and 150 black bears and wolves.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Increase brown bear hunting opportunity and possibly improve moose calf survival.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear hunters and possibly moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Repeal the \$25.00 resident tag fee.

PROPOSED BY: Horst Schramm

EG050312624

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Allow the resident harvest of one brown bear every two years in Unit 5 as follows:

One brown bear may be harvested every two years by an Alaskan resident in Unit 5. Nonresident will remain the same, one brown bear every four years in Unit 5.

ISSUE: We would like to change the current regulation of one brown bear per four years for an Alaskan resident, to one brown bear per two years for an Alaskan resident in Unit 5.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be an unnecessarily long waiting period for Alaskan residents between brown bear hunts in 5A and 5B, (the Yakutat area). Some will look at like we are already harvesting about as many bears as we should be, and would be less inclined to have more bears taken. Our point is, it's an open registration hunt, there already exists the possibility that you could have twice the number of bear hunters come out on any given year, there's just not that much interest for brown bears. The reality of it is, this change likely won't amount to more than one or two extra resident bears per year, and absolutely no more risk of too many bears being taken than already exists now with the current open registration hunt. Our bear population seems to be extremely healthy.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident brown bear hunters who want to harvest a bear more often than every four years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered including nonresident hunters, but decided against it based on the potential of possibly harvesting too many bears, and not seeing the need as nonresidents mostly are content with a bear every four years based on our guide input.

PROPOSED BY: Yakutat Advisory Committee EG050112607

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Shorten the black bear baiting season in Unit 1D as follows:

Open black bear baiting from June 1 (just after spring brown bear season closes) through June 31.

ISSUE: Brown bears being attracted to black bear baiting sites during spring brown bear season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Brown bears will be shot at black bear bait sites.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It eliminates the controversy and conflict between the two species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The public's perception of taking brown bears at baiting sites.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Black bear baiting season will be shortened to four weeks from 12 weeks.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A black bear hunter has eight weeks to get a spring bear; if unsuccessful he has four weeks to try baiting.

PROPOSED BY: Dave Werner EG053012712

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Allow the incidental take of fisher in Unit 1C as follows:

Allow for the incidental take and retention of fisher in Unit 1C.

ISSUE: Trapping fisher.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The occasional fisher caught by a trapper incidental to marten trapping will continue to have to be surrendered to the Department of Fish and Game. This solves nothing. While this area is not considered fisher habitat, every once in a great while, one is harvested. While less than half a dozen are known to have been taken in the last 20 years, it is unknown if others were simply not reported. Allowing a season for trapping fisher, (with perhaps a limit of one), would allow the trapper to retain his catch, and with sealing or reporting requirements, could provide the Department of Fish and Game with any data that might be desired.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Under current regulation, any fisher caught must be surrendered. This provides no value to the trapper, and any value to the department could still be accommodated through sealing, hair and tissue sampling, etc. While it would likely prove futile to purposely attempt to target fisher in this area, any one captured incidentally should have value of some kind, be it monetary, or sentimental, to the harvester.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A trapper who is fortunate enough to take a fisher, and the department, as sealing compliance would be expected at 100%.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Unknown.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo. This does not address the issue.

PROPOSED BY: Barry Brokken EG041512527

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 085.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berners Bay as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season	Nonresident Open Season
	(Subsistence and General Hunts)	
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(C), Berners Bay drain-	Sept. 15–Oct.15	Sept. 15–Oct.15

ages

(General hunt only)

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 30 permits may be issued

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game. The Berners Bay strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt count of 90 moose, based on the estimated moose carrying capacity of this area. ADF&G has been very successful at maintaining this population level through the harvest of both bull and cow moose.

During 1998–2006, the number of drawing permits issued by the department for this herd ranged from 10 bull permits and 10 antlerless permits to 7 bull permits and 0 antlerless permits. The average annual harvest of bull moose during this period was seven, while cow harvests in years we issued antlerless permits was four. Although we have the latitude of issuing up to 30 permits annually, we haven't issued more than 20 permits annually during any of the past 10 years; and no permits were issued during the period 2007-2011.

The number of moose counted during the fall aerial surveys determines the number of drawing permits issued. Aerial counts during 1990–2006 ranged from a high of 108 moose in 1999 to a low of 59 in 2002. The fall 2006 count of 76 moose was just one lower than the mean annual count of 77 during 1990–2006. However, severe winter weather in 2006, 2007 and 2008 resulted in this population decreasing. The number of moose counted in replicate aerial surveys between 2007 and 2009 ranged between 33-62 moose. Surveys conducted in 2010 and 2011 detected 73 moose, including 10 calves each year. Based on the 2011 survey and sightability data from collared moose, the Berners Bay moose population is estimated to be near 108 animals indicating the population is slowly increasing.

As a result of the severe winters and the impacts they have had on this moose herd, we did not issue any permits in 2011 and due to the timing for drawing permit applications, there will not be a hunt in fall 2012. We will continue to monitor this population through annual composition and calving surveys, and use these numbers to decide whether or not we will issue any permits. In addition we will be collecting information on moose survival, mortality, and recruitment. If we begin to detect an increasing trend in moose numbers, and determine that this population is recovering, we can then decide whether a few permits can be issued. Very likely this would be only bull permits for the foreseeable future. In spite of this, we would prefer to keep the antlerless hunt available so we have this tool in the future if needed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population could increase and exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat as it has done in the past. The Berners Bay moose harvest will be restricted to bulls thereby limiting opportunity for hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex harvests that will balance the herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412659

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in the Gustavus area as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season	Nonresident Open Season
	(Subsistence and General Hunts)	
(1)		
...		
Unit 1(C), that portion west of Excursion Inlet and north of Icy Passage		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only; or	Sept. 15–Oct. 15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–Oct. 15
1 antlerless moose	Nov. 10–Dec. 10	Nov. 10–Dec. 10
by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued	(General hunt only)	

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game (board). The Gustavus moose population (Unit 1C) increased rapidly from just a few animals during the 1980's to a count of 185 animals in 1998, to a subsequent count of 404 animals in 2003. By 2002 ADF&G estimated the winter range moose density at Gustavus exceeded 5 moose per km², with

only a small portion of that area being productive winter range as identified by abundant stands of willow. Because of concerns with these high moose numbers, ADF&G biologists began conducting spring browse utilization surveys in 1999, and documented 85–95% of the current annual growth of willow twigs available to moose had been consumed.

Based on the browse utilization data and overall moose densities at Gustavus, an antlerless hunt was first authorized for the Gustavus area by the board in fall 2000. Between 2002 and 2008, hunters harvested 11 to 67 antlerless moose annually depending on the number of permits made available. A hunt was not held in fall 2007 due to high winter-related moose mortalities.

A goal of the Gustavus antlerless moose hunts is to control the number of moose on the available winter range to ensure the available habitat is adequate to support the animals utilizing it. Based on aerial survey data and the use of collared moose to determine sightability estimates it appears this strategy is working. During the period 2000-2009 aerial survey counts ranged from 207-404 moose; surveys in 2010 and 2011 counted 165 and 136 moose, respectively. In 2008, Gustavus calf survival decreased significantly to >10%. Surveys in 2010 and 2011 indicate calf numbers are increasing and the survival estimate for 2010 was near 20%, and better than 30% through summer 2011; the annual adult female survival estimate is 90% for the period 2004-2010. Improving calf numbers and stable adult female survival suggests the Gustavus moose population has the potential to increase. Sightability data from collared adult moose suggests the Gustavus moose population has stabilized at 250-300 animals.

Research was conducted on this moose population during 2003-2009 revealed cow moose in relatively poor body condition (as measured by rump fat thickness), and low reproductive indices (as measured by pregnancy and twinning rates) when compared to other coastal moose population in Yakutat and Berners Bay. Through the implementation of the antlerless hunts, the density of moose was lowered at Gustavus, resulting in improved body condition and reproductive indices and a more resilient moose population. The population is now at a level the department believes is sustainable with the available habitat.

Although an antlerless hunt was not held in 2011, biologists believe it is important to keep this tool available to implement should the moose population increase to a point where there is detrimental impacts to available habitat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This moose population could persist at a density too high for the habitat to support, thereby continuing the overutilization of winter browse. Ultimately biologists are concerned that the long range carrying capacity of this range could be compromised due to this over utilization of preferred winter browse species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All persons interested in having a healthy moose population, and one that does not compromise the health of the habitat they depend on. Also, an antlerless hunt can provide additional opportunity for those people interested in harvesting a moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050412660

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench as follows:.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
Unit 5(A), that portion south of Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park, north and east of Russell and Nunatak Fiords, and east of the east side of East Nunatak Glacier to the Canadian Border (Nunatak Bench)	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15
1 moose by registration permit only; up to 5 moose may be taken		

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game. The Nunatak Bench (Unit 5A) hunt area is separated from adjacent moose habitat by fiords and glaciers, allowing for little immigration or emigration by moose. Therefore we manage this population separately from the remainder of Unit 5A, with a much longer and later running hunting season that spans the period of November 15 - February 15. Because of the isolated nature of Nunatak Bench and the limited amount of moose habitat, we have traditionally allowed maximum hunter opportunity through an either sex hunt, thereby aiding in our goal of limiting herd growth to stay within the carrying capacity of this area. The either sex hunt strategy accommodates the timing of this hunt given that much of the hunt period occurs post antler drop making sex differentiation difficult.

The Nunatak Bench strategic moose management plan calls for a post-hunt population of a maximum of 50 moose. A high of 52 moose were counted on the Nunatak Bench in 2001, after

which a decline in moose numbers was observed. During the period 2005-2011 (no survey in 2010) the number of moose counted has ranged from 11 to 14, with only 1 to 2 calves observed on each flight. The decline in moose numbers may be related to the 68 foot rise in water level that flooded this area in 2003 when the advancing Hubbard Glacier created a dam. A similar situation occurred in 1986 that caused a similar decline in moose numbers. The cause of the moose declines post flooding appears to be due to the decimation of preferred willow browse by the high water, causing emigration of moose from the area.

During 1997-2004 hunting seasons an average of 12 permits were issued, with only four people actually hunted each season. An average of eight days of hunting was expended each year to kill 0-4 moose, with an average annual harvest of about two moose. Six cows and nine bulls made up the total harvest during this period. No moose have been harvested since 2004 and the department has not issued any permits for this area since then.

Although the moose numbers at this time do not support a harvest, the department would like to keep this antlerless authorization active should the moose numbers again reach a harvestable level (25 moose). To date moose have not recolonized the area as quickly as they did in the past, and it is unknown if moose numbers will increase sufficiently to provide hunting opportunity. The department will continue to monitor this moose population and again allow a harvest when the survey counts reach or exceed 25 moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The harvest of moose at Nunatak Bench will be limited to bulls without any biological reason to do so. In addition, since much of the season occurs post antler-drop restricting the harvest to bulls would make it difficult for hunters to select a legal animal. Moose habitat is not abundant in this area and if herd growth is not restricted by a limited cow harvest, carrying capacity of winter range may be exceeded.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Adopting this proposal will provide more moose hunting opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will continue to have more opportunity to hunt moose. The moose population will benefit from either-sex hunts that will help balance the herd in this area of limited moose range.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050412661

Ketchikan Area – Unit 2

Note: The Board of Game does not have the authority to change fees.

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Change the black bear hunting regulations on Prince of Wales Island, Unit 2 as follows:

- 1.) Season: Black bear hunting season shall be the month of May, i.e. starting May 1 and ending 6:00 p.m., May 31.
- 2.) Bag Limit: All black bear hunters will be limited to one bear per year. Bait stations shall be limited to two per hunter.
- 3.) Fee: All bear hunters using a bait station shall pay a baiting fee of \$100.
- 4.) Registration: Bait stations can be registered by mail using GPS coordinates.
- 5.) Senior Hunters: Hunters over age 65 shall be able to bait within 1/8 of a mile from a road.
- 6.) Tag Fee: Black bear sealing tags fees shall be increased by \$50.
- 7.) Permit Draw: Eliminate having to draw for a permit.

ISSUE: The intent of the proposal is to change black bear hunting regulations on Prince of Wales (POW) Island to preserve hunting opportunities for future generations and improve trophy quality by changing black bear hunting regulations. This proposal is especially for Prince of Wales but could be considered for other areas. This proposal has been reviewed by several nonresident hunters who have hunted on POW for more than ten years. Our hope and objective is to preserve hunting opportunities for future generations and to improve trophy quality.

The present requirement of having to go to an office to register a bait station is arbitrary and unreasonable. With today's technical capabilities, GPS coordinates can precisely locate a bait station. If anyone cannot provide GPS coordinates, then they can go to the local Department of Fish and Game office and put a dot on the appropriate map. Requiring hunters to go to the office requires an extra day of precious vacation time and require extra expenses, plus using gas to get to an office adds pollution to the environment. In this era, most hunters have limited time to spend on red tape. Visits to an office severely reduces available hunting time and does not provide any information. The requirement to draw is not realistic. In today's world where jobs are in flux, many people do not know what their schedules will be for the following year and planning is difficult for draws so far in advance. If hunting season is reduced, the need for a draw will be eliminated. It also seems to be a big imposition for hunters to buy a 2013 tag in 2012 when one does not know if he will be lucky in the draw.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Richard Ziminzki

EG050312637

Petersburg Area – Units 1B & 3

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 92.990. Definitions. Modify the definition of a legal moose antler for Units 1B and 3 as follows:

Points that grow out of the base of the antler, commonly referred to as burr points shall not be counted when determining antler legality in the RM038 moose hunt.

ISSUE: In Units 1B and 3, there is currently inconsistency in how the Departments of Fish and Game and Public Safety deal with moose antler burr or rosette points. Sometimes these points are ignored if they tend to make an antler illegal and sometimes they are counted if they will make an antler legal. These antler burr points, which come out of the base of the antler and are either in the moose hair or very close to the hair are very difficult to impossible to see when hunting and judging moose and they should not count when determining the legality of the moose. Many of these points are very short, less than two inches, but they do meet the definition of a point.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be inconsistency in how antlers are judged in the RM038 moose hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters, managers and enforcement personnel will all benefit by having a consistent way to determine the legality of moose antlers in RM038. Hunters will benefit by not being surprised by a point, which would make a moose illegal that they were not able to see because of its location.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some hunters may suffer if they need one of these points to count to make a moose legal, however these points are difficult if not impossible to see when judging a live moose and probably were not seen before the moose was killed.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered the status quo but I think it would be good for everyone if these points are dealt with in a consistent manner.

PROPOSED BY: Brennon Eagle EG043012583

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk. Modify elk drawing hunt area in Unit 3 to exclude Zarembo Island, and close season on Zarembo and associated islands as follows:

5 AAC 85.035. Hunting seasons and bag limits for elk.

Resident

Units and Bag Limits

Open Season
(Subsistence and
General Hunts)

Nonresident
Open Season

(1)

Unit 3, that portion bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of **Stikine** [SUMNER] Strait and Clarence Strait, running Southeast following the midline of Clarence Strait, [DOWN THE MIDLINE OF SNOW PASSAGE, THEN EAST OF THE KASHEVAROF ISLANDS BACK TO THE MIDLINE OF CLARENCE STRAIT] down to its intersection with Ernest Sound, then northeast following the midline of Ernest Sound, excluding Niblack Islands, to its intersection with Zimovia Strait, then northwest following the western shoreline of Zimovia Strait to its intersection with Chichagof Passage, then west along the midline of Chichagof Passage to its intersection with Stikine Strait, then **west and south** [NORTHERLY] along the midline of Stikine Strait, [WEST OF VANK ISLAND, TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH SUMNER STRAIT, THEN NORTHWEST ALONG THE MIDLINE OF SUMNER STRAIT] back to the point of beginning

1 bull by drawing

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30

Sept. 1 - Sept. 30

permit only, and by bow and arrow only; up to 50 permits will be issued; or

(General hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 250 permits will be issued; or

Oct. 1 - Oct. 31
(General hunt only)

Oct. 1 - Oct. 31

1 bull by registration permit only

Nov. 15 - Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

Nov. 15 - Nov. 30

Unit 3, Zarembo, Bushy, Shrubby and the Kashevarof islands

No open season.

No open season.

Units 1, 2, and the remainder of Unit 3

1 elk

Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

ISSUE: Since the inception of the elk hunt in Unit 3, both Etolin and Zarembo Island have been included within the draw hunt boundaries, and considered capable of sustaining elk harvest. In the mid 2000s however, the Department of Fish and Game became concerned with the lack of elk being seen by hunters on Zarembo Island. Precise population estimates for elk on Etolin and Zarembo islands are not available and are difficult to obtain due to difficulty in sightability due to rough terrain, dense vegetation, and elusive behavior by elk. Prior to the initiation of Unit 3 elk research in 2008, the department estimated the Zarembo Island elk population at roughly 75-100 elk in two distinct herds. This was based on anecdotal information from hunters as well as department survey flights. However, elk radiocollaring efforts initiated in 2008 led department biologists to suspect that the Zarembo Island elk population was likely lower than previously estimated. Few elk were seen during capture sessions, and little sign was seen along the beaches where elk usually reside during winter. Although only a single cow elk was collared on this island, the GPS locations and sightings during radio tracking efforts convinced department biologists that Zarembo Island supports just a single elk herd numbering approximately 35 animals. As a result, the elk hunting season on Zarembo Island was closed by emergency order in 2008 and has remained closed since.

Given that the Zarembo Island elk hunt has remained closed by emergency order since 2008, and is unlikely to reopen in the near future, we recommend that Zarembo Island be closed to elk hunting, and that the boundaries of the Unit 3 elk drawing permit be redrawn to exclude Zarembo Island until such time that the elk population on the island increases to a level capable of providing a harvestable surplus.

Concern exists that elk are being illegally harvested on Zarembo Island during the Region I general season elk hunt and falsely reported as having been taken on nearby Bushy and Shrubby islands, which are outside the drawing permit hunt area but open to elk hunting under the general season.

Therefore, to reduce the likelihood of elk being bootlegged from Zarembo Island during the general season elk hunt, we recommend that Zarembo, Bushy, Shrubby and the Kashevarof islands in GMU 3 be closed to the taking of elk (no open season).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will be necessary to prolong the closure of the Zarembo Island elk hunt using discretionary authority. Bootlegging of Zarembo Island elk will likely continue to the detriment of the Zarembo Island elk population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of the resource harvested or products produced will be unaffected by this proposal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Consumptive and non-consumptive users of the Zarembo Island elk resource who would like to see the Zarembo elk population increase to a level capable of providing a harvestable surplus.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who seek to use the Region I general season elk hunt as a means of exploiting the Zarembo Island elk population.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the general season elk hunt throughout Units 1-3. This was rejected because it conflicts with the department's Elk Management Plan which seeks to restrict the distribution of non-native elk to only the Etolin and Zarembo island complex.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412643

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Decrease season length and bag limit for deer in Unit 3, Lindenberg Peninsula as follows:

5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
<u>Unit 3, that portion of Kupreanof Island on the Lindenberg Peninsula east of the Portage Bay –</u>	<u>Oct. 15 – Oct. 31</u>	<u>No open season.</u>

Duncan Canal Portage

1 buck

Remainder of Unit 3

Aug. 1 - Nov. 30 Aug. 1 - Nov. 30

2 bucks

...

ISSUE: The combined effects of habitat loss, three consecutive deep snow winters (2006/2007, 2007/2008 and 2008/2009) and predation by wolves and black bears has reduced deer populations to low levels on the Lindenberg Peninsula, Kupreanof Island. Presently the United States Forest Service (USFS) is finalizing plans to harvest 2,085 acres of productive old growth forest on the Lindenberg Peninsula. This harvest will be supported by up to 1.7 miles of new USFS road and an additional 7.6 miles of temporary road. The reduction of important forest habitat along with the increased access from proposed roads adds additional management concerns to this area that already has low deer numbers. We believe management action is necessary to prevent overexploitation of deer in this area.

From 1993 to 2002 the Lindenberg Peninsula was managed under a very restrictive 2-week deer season (Oct 15-31) with a 1-buck bag limit. In the wake of increased deer density, the deer season and bag limit on Lindenberg Peninsula were increased in 2003 to match the remainder of GMU 3 (4-month season (Aug 1 to Nov 30) with a 2-buck limit).

The Department of Fish and Game recommends that the deer season and bag limit on the Lindenberg Peninsula be returned to pre-2003 levels to mitigate (through conservative management) the effects of low deer numbers, additional winter habitat loss and increased access the proposed forest management activities will have on this area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The deer population on the Lindenberg Peninsula may be harvested at unsustainable levels due to already low deer numbers that will be exacerbated by additional loss of winter habitat and increased access for hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of the resource harvested or products produced will be unaffected by this proposal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who are concerned with possible overexploitation of deer in this area due to the effects of proposed forest management practices.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Residents of Petersburg who do not have the means to travel greater distances to areas where deer are more abundant, and where seasons are longer and bag limits are higher.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo. This was rejected because low deer numbers, continued reductions in carrying capacity on the Lindenberg Peninsula, and increased access for hunters require immediate conservation measures.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412645

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping and 5 AAC 92.540, Controlled Use areas. Prohibit the use of motorized vehicles by marten trappers on the Tonka Road System in Unit 3, the Lindenberg Peninsula as follows:

The Department of Fish and Game recommends that a Controlled Use Area (CUA) prohibiting the use of motorized land vehicles for marten trapping be implemented for the Tonka Road System on the southern Lindenberg Peninsula. The Tonka road system is isolated from other road systems and has only one point of vehicle access, so this regulation would be easily interpreted by trappers and enforceable by the Department of Public Safety. Marten trapping along the southern Lindenberg Peninsula shoreline would be allowed to continue and would be unaffected by this proposal.

ISSUE: The US forest Service (FS) is finalizing plans (Tonka Timber Sale) to harvest up to 2,085 acres of productive old growth forest from the southern Lindenberg Peninsula in Game Management Unit 3. This will require construction of up to 1.7 miles of new FS road and an additional 7.6 miles of temporary road. Some of these areas are important marten habitats. In addition, increased road construction associated with forest management activities will increase trapper access and make the area’s marten population increasingly vulnerable to harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Due to reduced carrying capacity and increased access, martens could be harvested at unsustainable levels on southern Lindenberg Peninsula.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fur trappers who would like continued, if somewhat reduced, access to the marten resource on the southern Lindenberg Peninsula.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A limited number of marten trappers who currently use motorized vehicles to access marten trap lines along the Tonka Road system.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close the marten trapping season within that portion of Lindenberg Peninsula located south of Petersburg Creek drainage. This was rejected as unnecessarily restricting shoreline access to the marten resource

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050412644

Regional and Multiple Units

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Modify the bag limit for goat in Units 1 and 4 as follows:

If a nanny mountain goat is taken, the hunter is prohibited from hunting any goats in Units 1 and/or 4 for five regulatory years.

ISSUE: Reduce and discourage the harvest of female (nanny) goats in Units 1 and 4.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Possible Emergency Order or Board of Game season restrictions.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Reduced nanny harvest, therefore increased population recruitment.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both hunters and viewers will benefit from stable and/or increasing goat populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A hunter that fails to take a closer look and harvests a nanny.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A nanny is a legal goat and some hunters seem compelled to fill their tag at any cost.

PROPOSED BY: Zach Decker EG050312626

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 85.065. Hunting seasons and bag limits for small game. Close the taking of grouse hens in the spring for all Southeast Region Units as follows:

Units 1-5: Five per day except hens may not be taken after March 1.

ISSUE: Shooting hen grouse in the spring.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nothing.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? There would be more grouse for hunting if the hens are protected in the spring.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This will benefit everyone who hunts grouse because there would be a larger population. Those who currently hunt hens would be harmed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Gary Miller

EG042212542

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans. Prohibit snaring bears in the Southeast Region as follows:

Snaring of bears is illegal in Southeast Alaska Region (Game Management Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5).

ISSUE: The 2010 decision to list bears as furbearers and the recent escalation of bear control policies concern many Alaskans of all user groups and walks of life, as demonstrated by tremendous ongoing public outcry. Authorizing a bear trapping season in Southeast Alaska is completely inappropriate and detrimental to the welfare of Southeast Alaskans. Bear trapping presents an unacceptable safety risk to the public. Bear snaring is inhumane. Bear snaring is an ineffective use of the resource and is scientifically/biologically/ecologically unsound. Bear snaring is bad for the economy of Southeast Alaska. Bear snaring presents law enforcement difficulties.

SAFETY ISSUES: Allowing bear snaring stations in the vicinity of residences, roads, and trails is irresponsible and unsafe. The public cannot know where bear snaring is occurring. The Department of Fish Game currently does not provide a map or locations where bear snaring bait stations are located; this puts the public at risk of inadvertently encountering a free-roaming adult, cub, or sibling of a bear caught in a snare. The only time of year conducive to snaring bears corresponds directly with other activities such as fishing, hiking, dog walking, camping, and berry picking. As bear snaring areas expand, the danger increases that someone will be hurt - either a trapper, his/her child (since children of at least 10 years old are allowed to accompany the adult who is trapping), or an innocent passerby. Because snaring is indiscriminate, young bears with mothers can be trapped, mothers of cubs can be trapped, and siblings can be trapped. The resulting danger presented, for example, by a free roaming sow whose cub is caught in a snare, is both tremendous and unacceptable. Additionally, bears can become food-conditioned (which is illegal in most circumstances), thus posing additional threats to people, including law enforcement officials and pets.

HUMANE ISSUES: Unless someone who can kill a snared bear immediately upon its capture is constantly attending a bear snaring site - which is not required, it is unlikely that a bear would not suffer as a result of being snared. Indeed, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) had to kill a brown bear due to injuries received from struggling to free itself in just a few hours of being caught in a snare in Unit 16. Despite the rhetoric of ADF&G, the fair chase ethic by which most Alaskans abide is affronted by the practice of bear snaring. Bears have been - and remain - an iconic species to Alaskans and visitors alike; bears deserve better treatment than this.

SCIENTIFIC/BIOLOGICAL/ECOLOGICAL ISSUES: Bear snares are indiscriminate, allowing the capture of all bears, including sows with cubs, cubs, and siblings. This method of take is not only socially and ethically unacceptable, but is also inconsistent with prudent scientific wildlife management practices. Because bears have a relatively low reproductive rate, the taking of sows with cubs and the taking of cubs have both been discouraged over the years. In fact, the productivity of brown bears is the lowest of any terrestrial mammal in North America. Bears play a vital role in Southeast Alaska's ecosystems by distributing nutrients brought from the sea by the five species of Pacific salmon that die after spawning; vegetation and other wildlife species in Southeast Alaska rely on the role that bears play. If too many bears are taken, it is difficult to bring the populations back up; as a result, entire ecosystems can suffer. ADF&G cannot insure that bears will not be overharvested by the use of snaring. At the 2010 Board of Game meeting in Ketchikan, there was much discussion and concern from ADF&G regarding the decrease in the black bear population in the southern Southeast panhandle, including Prince of Wales. The allowance of bear snaring in the southern Southeast panhandle on that account alone is unwarranted and inappropriate. There was also concern regarding the decrease of the black bear population in some northern Southeast panhandle game management units, including southern portions of Unit 1C. Additionally, there is still little evidence that intensive management even works over the long term.

ECONOMIC ISSUES: The negative impact on the bear populations that bear snaring would have is totally unacceptable and inappropriate in Southeast Alaska. This is a region which relies more and more on the strong and growing wildlife tourism industry, particularly given that the timber industry is no longer viable here. Wildlife viewing is an important and growing part of this region's and our state's economy and brings valuable economic development and benefits to many communities and businesses in Southeast Alaska. This has been clearly illustrated by the numerous proposals included in the 2011/2012 proposal book, particularly from the Ketchikan and Prince of Wales areas, requesting that this resource be conserved for the growing and thriving wildlife tourism businesses.

LAW ENFORCEMENT ISSUES: Alaska has fewer than 100 Wildlife Troopers to cover a state that is roughly 1/5 the size of the continental US, and with far more remote areas in it. Bear snaring would add a huge and unnecessary burden to our Wildlife Troopers, using resources, including time and money, that are already overburdened.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It is likely that bears will become a diminished resource as a result of bear snaring. More people and pets will be faced with a public safety issue. The tourism industry will suffer, and thus the economy in Southeast Alaska will suffer. Southeast Alaska's ecosystems could suffer. Bears could become food-conditioned, thereby creating an additional hazard for people and pets. Enforcement of bear snaring regulations is problematic. The classification of bears as furbearers is a wasteful and inappropriate use of this resource. Alaska's already tarnished reputation for wildlife management will suffer even more, causing unrest in our state and damaging our tourism industry even more. Alaska's wildlife management policies will lose credibility with citizens, visitors, and potential visitors alike.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Bear snaring is an indiscriminate method of take. A trapper can still harvest a bear under a trapping license by using a firearm and bait station to attract a free roaming bear. Under this method, a trapper can be selective in harvesting a bear, thereby avoiding taking species not targeted, cubs, and females with cubs. Bear snaring is a wanton waste of our resources; prohibiting it benefits us all.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans - including all user groups, and visitors who value wildlife and prudent science-based management of our wildlife resources will benefit. Ethical hunters who abide by the rules of fair chase will benefit. All Alaskans and visitors who want the opportunity to view bears and other wildlife will benefit. All Alaskans and visitors who want the opportunity to visit and/or live in intact ecosystems will benefit. The strong and growing Southeast Alaskan wildlife tourism industry will benefit, and thus the economy of Southeast Alaska will benefit. The reputation of Alaska and Alaskans will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. Trappers will still be able to trap.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Declassify black bears as furbearers.

PROPOSED BY: Greg Brown

EG043012602

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping, and 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans. Prohibit snaring bears in the Southeast Region as follows:

Snaring of bears, black and grizzly, would be prohibited in the Southeast Region. The only exceptions would be for state wildlife personnel under specific emergency situations where a bear or bears have become a public nuisance or danger. Even then, it should be used only as a means of relocating the bears.

ISSUE: Snaring of bears, both black and grizzly, is being instituted in various areas of the state either on a public-activity basis or an experimental basis. With the classification of black bears as a furbearer subject to trapping, there is an incentive to take them in large numbers regardless of gender or the presence of dependent offspring. The result for an species with an extremely low reproductive rate is that both the present and the next generation are subject to removal from the population without any real regard to management. Bears caught in snares will be killed and any management changes to that situation would only take place after the damage is done.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? For one thing, wildlife management in Alaska as viewed by both residents and nonresidents will decline further in credibility and public acceptance. There is no real justification for this method or increased take, a position held by many Alaskans. Yet, it is being proposed by a handful of interested parties who have no reason other than yet another way to kill bears. Bear baiting, which is repugnant to many, both hunters and non-hunters, gives enough opportunity that snaring is not justified. To, enforcement by the wildlife division of the Alaska State Troopers is apt to be spotty at best. Presently, we have less than 100 wildlife troopers for the entire state. They are already stretched very thinly in terms of

manpower and resources just trying to maintain the hunting/trapping regulations already in effect. To expect them to additionally take on the burden of having to inspect a flood of snaring sites is likely to overwhelm their capabilities and lead to poorly-maintained sites without any real enforcement.

Additionally, there are the dangers to hikers and other non-consumers using the land who may come upon a situation where one bear is caught while its siblings or mother remain free in the area, creating the very real possibility of severe injuries or fatalities. The humaneness often touted as a feature of these snares is debatable. For an animal that has never been restrained to suddenly be unable to move more than a few feet in any direction is very likely to produce a considerable and stressful reaction. As the present proposals allow three days between checking snares, this means any bear caught will be going that entire period without water or food or the ability to protect itself against any other predator. That's assuming the snares are checked according to schedule. Therein again rises the problem of enforcement. Should a sow with cubs be caught, the cubs will be stressed severely by their mother's response. Equally, if a cub is caught, there will be an extremely stressed bear sow roaming the area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? With liberal bear hunting seasons and bag limits, the widespread use of bait-stations, the onslaught against bears in Alaska has been increasing. This is a species with a low reproductive rate yet it has high value as a tourism draw with bears being one of the big three species most often cited as viewing opportunities. Rather than indiscriminate killing of bears, they should be managed with a view towards their vital role in a healthy environment. It is much easier not to create problems at the onset as opposed to trying to repair damage after it has been done.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Viewers of wildlife, both resident and nonresident, will benefit from the opportunities these animals present. In 2008, the entire revenue from hunting/trapping fees and licenses totaled \$124 million while the revenue from tourism was over \$538 million. Additionally, the ethical hunter that believes in fair chase will benefit by not having to deal with snare sites and the attendant problems and dangers thereof. The indiscriminate killing of bears would negatively impact healthy, sustainable bear populations, a situation affecting both hunters and non-hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Remove bears from the furbearer classification. I do not reject this; I heartily endorse it. With snaring in place, the opportunity for a black market in bear gall bladders is greatly enhanced as is the waste of bears. There is not a huge demand for bear pelts and not all bears taken by this method will have suitable pelts. The probability of wastage is high.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance

EG042912576

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping; 5 AAC 85.056. Hunting seasons and bag limits for wolf; and 5 AAC 92.125. Intensive management plans. Prohibit the taking of wolves March through November in the Southeast Region as follows.

Wolf take is prohibited in all Southeast Region Units prior to November 1 and after March 1. That is, wolf take is prohibited between March 1 and November 1.

ISSUE: Currently, state law allows taking of wolves in some Units prior to November 1, while pups remain dependent on their parents. As well, state law in some Units allows taking of wolves after March 1, after mating has usually occurred and while females may be pregnant. The Board of Game should end this practice, as take prior to November 1 and after March 1 can result in substantially higher numbers of wolves lost to the population - pups - than are accounted for in harvest statistics. This unaccounted for loss of pups and breeding adults - which is likely very significant - causes a loss of additional recruitment to the population. As well, wolf hides are not in prime marketable condition prior to November in most areas, and thus taking wolves prior to November constitutes a waste of the resource.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If wolves continue to be taken prior to November 1, while pups remain dependent on parents; or after March 1, when many adult females are pregnant, wolf populations will continue to lose reproductive capacity and recruitment, causing an overall loss of population and erosion of family structure. This is a waste of a valuable resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. As stated above, hides of wolves taken prior to November 1 are of lower market value, and this is a clear waste of the resource. As well, the loss of dependent pups prior to November 1, or unborn pups from females taken after March 1, constitutes a clear and unnecessary loss of recruitment to wolf populations in all Units.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wolf populations, wolf family structure and integrity, viewers of wolves, and science. As well, trappers and hunters will benefit as the proposal will result in an increase in wolf populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Few, if any. The proposal will enhance wolf populations, which would then be more available for harvest by hunters/trappers from November - March.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Rick Steiner EG043012605

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Align the trapping season dates in the Southeast Region as follows:

Essentially, beaver, coyote, red fox, lynx, marten, mink, weasel, muskrat, river otter, squirrel, marmot, wolf, and wolverine would have an opening day of trapping season of November 10.

ISSUE: Align the trapping season opening dates. Currently there are three different dates allowing the trapping of various furbearers in this area. This creates dilemmas for enforcement as well.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued challenges for law enforcement, the surrender of furbearers taken incidentally, resulting in little or no value.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Animals harvested incidentally out of season currently must be surrendered, giving them little or no value. With a simultaneous opening, the harvester can process the take responsibly, and receive the maximum value of the furbearer at the time harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers who currently have to surrender an incidental take of an otherwise valuable furbearer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Having all seasons begin November 1, the current opening for wolves. This was rejected allowing an additional ten days for fur to reach prime.

PROPOSED BY: Barry Brokken EG041512528

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Lengthen coyote trapping seasons in Units 1-5 as follows.

Species and Units	Open Season	Bag Limit
(2) Coyote		
Units 1 – <u>5</u> [4]	<u>Nov. 1 - April 30</u> [DEC. 1 - FEB. 15]	No limit.
[UNIT 5]	[NOV. 10 - FEB. 15]	[NO LIMIT.]

ISSUE: Anecdotally, the coyote population appears to be increasing in Unit 1C. Over the past 5-10 years, coyote sightings have increased steadily to where reports of these animals are now common, and during the past few years sightings of coyotes have escalated. The Department of Fish and Game does not have an accurate assessment of their distribution, population size, or the number taken by trappers and hunters because sealing of coyote hides is not required. However, based on anecdotal information we do not have any concerns regarding coyote populations in these units. The current coyote trapping season closes on February 15 while the wolf trapping season extends to April 30. Wolf trappers have incidentally captured at least five coyotes in the past few years after

the close of the coyote season, and had to surrender them to the department. We expect this trend to continue given the surprising abundance of coyotes in recent years.

This proposal would extend the coyote-trapping season to match that for wolves in Unit 1C. However, we believe it is most practical to be consistent with the coyote-trapping season across the region, and therefore propose this change for all of Region I. Additionally, if this proposal is adopted, sealing should be required to allow the department to track harvest numbers and to gain insight into coyote distribution in the region.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Trappers will have to surrender coyote hides taken incidentally to wolf trapping.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No. Coyote fur will be prime by the suggested start date of November 1. The ability to take coyotes concurrent with wolves will provide trappers with additional fur for personal use and/or the sale of fur.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers who would like to retain coyotes that were taken incidentally to wolf trapping.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals who would like to see trapping curtailed rather than expanding opportunity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Only extend the coyote trapping season end date. This solution is only partly useful if the intent is to allow trappers to retain coyotes taken incidental to wolf trapping; the wolf trapping season opens November 1 and the current coyote season opens December 1.

Extend both the coyote trapping and hunting season. This solution was rejected in favor of lengthening the coyote trapping season because current hunting regulations provides substantial opportunity (September 1-April 30) to hunt coyotes.

PROPOSED BY: The Department of Fish and Game EG050412646

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Open resident hunting seasons seven to ten days before nonresident seasons for Southeast Region Units as follows:

Resident hunting seasons begin seven to ten days before nonresident seasons in the Southeast Region Units.

ISSUE: Inequitable hunting opportunities for Alaskan residents. Most hunting states provide an early and/or extended hunting season for resident hunters. Alaska does not. We need to keep our residents fed and active in the management of our game, not depend nor allow the high dollar hunters from outside who support a very small portion of our economy through the use of guide

services. The local hunters are the folks who live here year around and keep the dollars local. We need to focus our game management on Alaskans.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskan hunters will become disenchantred and revolt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, just the quality of the hunt

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There really isn't any other solution, except to ban nonresident hunters completely, and that is probably not going to fly

PROPOSED BY: Shaune O'Neil EG042712557

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Open resident hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons for Southeast Region Units as follows:

Whatever opening date is determined for any species the new regulation would indicate the opening for nonresidents would be seven days later.

ISSUE: Big game hunting seasons in Region 1, open seven days before nonresidents for all species of big game.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This will allow residents to have access to game populations without interference from nonresident hunters who may be utilizing professional guide services or hunting on their own. Opening day numbers will be thinned out, hunter transporters will be able to cater to more people, or at least spread the movement of people over more days and primarily allow residents a less chaotic hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would improve the quality of the hunting experience for the Alaskan resident. Our State Constitution indicates the wildlife resources belong to the people of Alaska. It should only be considered as fair for the people to have access to our wildlife resource without interference from nonresidents. Other states have the same limitations on nonresident hunters. The regulations should be no different in Alaska.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit from this proposal. Residents will have an opportunity to access game populations in a less crowded field. Nonresidents would share the same type of experience. With the opening day rush thinned out the remainder of all hunting seasons would be much smoother.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I can't see any group suffering from this proposal. Hunting pressure would be thinned, commercial services would be spread out and Alaska would be in line with many of the other hunting states.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solutions considered.

PROPOSED BY: Terry Marquette EG042812561

Note: The Board of Game does not have authority to remove the guide requirement for hunting certain big game animals nor to increase permit and tag fees.

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits. Open resident hunting seasons ten days before nonresident seasons, allocate 90% harvest to residents, remove guide requirements, and increase fees for Southeast Region Units as follows.

Start ALL resident hunting seasons for ALL species ten days prior to nonresident hunters. Remove the guiding requirement for sheep, goats, and brown bears. Raise ALL nonresident harvest tags and permit fees significantly! Allocate 90% of harvests to residents and 10% to nonresidents.

ISSUE: I would like the Board of Game to address the problem of favoring guides and their nonresident clients over the needs of Alaskan residents. Specifically, I would like the Board of Game to address the declining hunting opportunities residents are facing and the competition we face from the guiding industry in filling our freezers.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents will continue to see their hunting opportunities diminish. The Board of Game and the guiding industry will continue to claim that nonresident hunters provide monies for the management of our game and bring in much needed dollars to the State when in fact they don't. Residents live here, spend their money YEAR round, buy services and goods YEAR round and support a multitude of businesses in their pursuit of game. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game spends about \$42 million dollars per year in support of the commercial fishing industry, yet only receives about \$16 million in revenue from the commercial fishing industry. Clearly, if the Department of Fish and Game--and the Board of Game --were concerned about much needed dollars, we can find savings in other avenues.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? You bet. We live here and these are OUR resources. Not the feds, not nonresidents, and surely not the guides. The Board of Game needs to start to manage our wildlife for Alaskan residents and we have seen for too long now, declining populations of our game and most especially, declining hunting opportunities for us and our children. The future does not look bright if we continue--if the Board of Game continues to manage our wildlife species the way you have. We have an excellent Department of Fish and Game--some of the best and brightest biologists in the world--yet your actions, and in many cases, lack of action--has made them ineffective as managers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan residents--and that's all that really matters. That and our game resources. This should be the metric for each and every decision you make. Does it help the Alaskan resident--current and future? Your last meeting on the Interior failed in this regard on several fronts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides and the guiding industry and that is fine with the vast majority of ALASKANS.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Continue on the same management path as you have--and that is unacceptable. It is time to put Alaskans First. It is time to think of Future Alaskans--specifically, our children. These are our game resources--we expect you to manage them for our benefit and for our children's benefit. The Board of Game--current and past-- has failed to do this, and I reject this as being acceptable.

PROPOSED BY: Jake Sprankle

EG042912572

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits. Allocate 90% drawing permits to residents and eliminate nonresident participation in hunts with ten or less permits for Southeast Region Units as follows:

For Southeast Region Units, a minimum of 90% of drawing permits will go to Alaskan residents for all species. If a certain Unit has less than 10 permits available nonresidents are not eligible to participate in that drawing.

ISSUE: Drawing permit preference for Alaska Residents – All species.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued conflict between resident hunters and commercial operators, degraded experience in the field for Alaska resident hunters. Alaska needs to put a cap of 10% on nonresident participation in drawing permits. This will put us in line with the other western states that have preferences for their residents which is usually 90% for drawing permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? An Alaskan preference for drawing permits will improve the quality of the hunt for resident hunters and give more opportunities to our youth. This will take away a lot of the conflict with sheep, goats, and brown bear where nonresidents are forced to hire a guide.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaskans.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The commercial operators (guides) will complain on sheep, goats, and brown bears but the other western states don't force nonresidents to use a guide for any specie. The guides don't support preference points for residents or a high allocation of permits going to resident hunters. The commercial operators are using a resource we all own and

residents would like the Board of Game to adopt proposals that reduce conflict in the field between guides and resident hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The Board of Game has been very kind to the guiding industry at the expense of the resident hunter. Nonresident tag fees bring a lot of money to the state and this helps support the Department of Fish and Game. How do other western states survive giving their residents high allocations of game? Other western states require nonresidents to apply for drawing permits (elk, deer, antelope, bear, sheep, goat, moose, cougar, etc.) Six to eight months in advance of the season, they have a preference point system, and high tag fees with no guide requirements. They make money to support their programs and give their residents very (usually 90%) high allocations of game. Nonresidents can come to Alaska the day before hunting season and buy a nonresident tag over the counter the day before the season at a fraction of the price other states charge. Why doesn't Alaska manage game for residents and our Fish & Game Department like other states? If the Board of Game doesn't start showing some preference to residents, Alaskans need to contact the governor and their representatives asking them to confirm board members who put residents as priority #1 or vote for politicians that support a preference for Alaska residents.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal and Darcy Etcheverry EG043012580

PROPOSAL 27 – 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits. Limit drawing permits to 10% for nonresidents for Southeast Region Units as follows:

Nonresidents will only be granted 10% of the hunting permits offered for any big game hunting permit drawing.

ISSUE: In the Southeast Region (Region I), nonresidents will be limited to receiving no more than 10% of the permits issued for any hunt drawing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The wildlife resources of Alaska belong to the Alaska residents first and foremost. It is only fair that the bulk of hunting draw permits go to Alaskan residents first and a smaller portion be extended to nonresidents. Extending 10% of any hunting draw coincides with the percentage extended by other states for hunting permit draws. Without this nonresident limitation Alaskans who desire to use this resource, pay the application fee (which is non-refundable) and consequently get bumped by a nonresident are being denied access to their own resource.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal secures the Alaska resident as having first priority status for acquiring big game hunting permits through the drawing process.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Alaska resident will benefit from this proposal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No others considered.

PROPOSED BY: Terry Marquette

EG042812562

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Seasons and bag limits. For Southeast Region Units, allocate a certain percentage of permits to nonresidents, and eliminate nonresident participation for those hunts with a small number of permits as follows:

I'd like to see a maximum number, say 15%, placed on nonresidents, allowed for all permitted hunts of all species. In those units with small numbers of permits, only residents should be allowed.

ISSUE: Nonresident hunters are allowed the same chance of drawing permits as Alaskan residents. This allows nonresident hunters to gain permits ahead of Alaskan residents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nonresidents will continue to get permits ahead of residents. Alaskan residents are discouraged by this process which gives nonresidents an undue advantage.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I see improving Alaskan residents' hunting experiences as ADF&G's first priority. Hunting privileges for nonresidents is secondary, regardless of the financial aspects of permits and tags sold to hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who are Alaskan residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I am sure that guides and commercial operators will oppose this as this will diminish their nonresident hunt numbers. Let us fully understand the primary consideration of the proposed change, which is to improve and preserve the Alaskan resident's privilege to hunt Alaska's game animals.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I commend the Board of Game for their efforts to help us all participate in the good stewardship of Alaska's great resources. I am however, offended that the guiding industry in Alaska is given unfair consideration at the expense of the resident hunter. It is time for changes in Alaska's hunting regulations that will preserve our resident privileges and make our permit regulations consistent with other states.

PROPOSED BY: Steven Bunkowski

EG043012595

Sitka Area – Unit 4

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Allow hunters to harvest one antlerless deer on Pleasant Island, Unit 4 as follows:

We propose that hunters be allowed to harvest one antlerless deer per season on Pleasant Island, Unit 4.

ISSUE: Deer are being harvested in unsustainable numbers on Pleasant Island.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The quantity and quality of the deer herd will continue to decline to a point where recovery will be very difficult and take many years. Additional pressure on the Pleasant Island deer population due to a reduction in moose available for harvest in the Gustavus area will also contribute to further decline as effort shifts from moose to deer.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of the resource will improve by allowing more deer to reach and sustain reproductive age, giving more opportunity to reproduce. This would improve the quantity and quality of the herd, improving the quality of the hunting experience and still allow hunting opportunities for all hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters will benefit from a larger breeding population of deer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The beach “hunters” who kill every animal they see and determine size and sex afterwards are not going to like this change. It will require them to get out of their boats and actually stalk animals in the woods. If that is “suffering” then they’ll suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered shortening the season, but that would concentrate the hunting pressure over a shorter period of time, lowering the quality of the hunting experience and not really address the issue of overharvesting pre-reproductive animals and reproductive females.

PROPOSED BY: Icy Straits Advisory Committee EG053112720

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 85.030. Hunting seasons and bag limits for deer. Establish a three day doe season on Chichagof Island, in Unit 4 as follows:

Within the boundaries of the Northeast Chichagof Special Use Area, and available only to those hunters that reside within the boundaries of the NE Chichagof Special Use Area (must possess both a physical and postal address), a 3-day doe season, limit one doe per hunter, to commence the Friday immediately following the November Thanksgiving holiday.

ISSUE: To create, within the boundaries of the NE Chichagof Special Use Area, and available only to those hunters that reside within the boundaries of the NE Chichagof Special Use Area (must possess both a physical and postal address), a 3-day doe season, limit one doe per hunter, to commence the Friday immediately following the November Thanksgiving Holiday. This proposal is intended to be in effect only if there is a closure of the regular doe season in the NE Chichagof Special Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Largely because the venison of the late-season Blacktail buck deer is considered very poor table fare, and in spite of an emergency closure of the harvest of Blacktail doe, the practice continues. An authorized season will perhaps help to curtail this unauthorized harvest.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The venison of the late-season Blacktail doe is of much better quality than that of the late-season rutting Blacktail buck deer. This proposal might also help to address the problem of wanton waste regarding the harvest of late-season Blacktail deer.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The entire family of the successful hunter will benefit, as venison of the late-season Blacktail doe is of much better quality than that of the late-season rutting Blacktail buck deer. Also, as a result of this proposal, the less physically able hunters and the elderly hunters will have an increased chance of late-season success, as most buck deer in the more easily accessible areas have long since succumbed to early-season hunting pressure and are either in the deep woods or in the deep freeze.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? From a human perspective, we can see no negative impact as a result of this proposal. However, we do believe that hunters need to be made more aware of the role of emergency closures in protecting the sustainability of game animal populations.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A longer special doe season was considered. It is, however, our belief that a shorter season might better address management concerns and provide a more controlled harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Icy Straits Advisory Committee EG050312636

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 85.040. Hunting seasons and bag limits for goat. Limit the harvest of nannies and prohibit the taking of nannies with kids in Unit 4 as follows:

Limit a hunter's ability to harvest a female mountain goat (nanny) in consecutive seasons after harvesting one. One goat by registration permit only, however, if a nanny is taken the hunter is prohibited from taking a goat in Unit 4 for five regulatory years; the taking of nannies with kids is prohibited.

ISSUE: Despite repeated departmental educational efforts to aid the hunter (mountain goat ID handbooks, quizzes, public forums) in determining the difference between billies and nannies, a

high nanny harvest continues. This proposal would allow us to directly affect those hunters unwilling to help reduce high nanny harvests that currently affect our declining goat population. This also is an effective mechanism to dissuade a hunter who mistakenly harvests a nanny to leave it on the mountain rather than risk a citation in a no-nanny harvest strategy.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A small group of residents will likely continue to harvest a high percentage of nannies which can have significant impacts on declining goat populations for all hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Reduction in the nanny harvest will aid the reproductive potential of the population providing greater hunter opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both consumptive and non-consumptive users will benefit from increased goat populations (harvest and viewing).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters unwilling to take the time and effort to identify the sex of the goat.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? More closure areas, reduced overall hunting opportunity, goat ID quizzes.

PROPOSED BY: Max Russell EG050312639

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Alternate spring and fall bear seasons for nonresidents in Unit 4 as follows:

Modify the existing brown bear registration hunt for nonresidents in Unit 4 by allowing a hunting season on an every other year basis, with fall seasons being open in (odd years only) and spring seasons being open in (even years only).

5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(3)		
Unit 4, Chichagof Island south and west of a line that follows the crest of the island from Rock Point	Sept. 15 - Dec. 31 Mar. 15 - May 31	Sept. 15 - Dec. 31 <u>(Odd years only)</u> Mar. 15 - May 31 <u>(Even years only)</u>

(58° N. lat., 136° 21' W. long.) to Rodgers Point (57° 35' N. lat., 135° 33' W. long.), including Yakobi and other adjacent islands; Baranof Island south and west of a line that follows the crest of the island from Nismeni Point (57° 34' N. lat., 135° 25' W. long.) to the entrance of Gut Bay (56° 44' N. lat., 134° 38' W. long.), including the drainages into Gut Bay and including Kruzof and other adjacent islands

1 bear every 4
regulatory years
by registration
permit only

Unit 4, that portion
within the Northeast
Chichagof Controlled
Use Area

Sept. 15 - Dec. 31
Mar. 15 - May 20

Sept. 15 - Dec. 31
(Odd years only)
Mar. 15 - May 20
(Even years only)

1 bear every 4
regulatory years
by registration
permit only

Remainder of Unit 4

Sept. 15 - Dec. 31
Mar. 15 - May 20

Sept. 15 - Dec. 31
(Odd years only)
Mar. 15 - May 20
(Even years only)

1 bear every 4
regulatory years
by registration
permit only

ISSUE: The Unit 4 management of brown bears is guided by the Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Strategy (BBMS), adopted in 2000. The strategy was designed by a broad group of citizens and agency representatives; sponsored by the Board of Game and the Department of Fish and Game - Division of Wildlife Conservation. From 1998-2000, the group, known as the Brown Bear Management Team (BBMT) discussed a wide variety of issues concerning brown bears in Unit 4 to arrive at a consensus for the strategy. The BBMS has framed brown bear management in Unit 4 for over a decade. Brown bear populations in the Unit are currently

believed to be stable, but upward trends of human-caused mortality are a cause for concern/caution. Hunting harvest, primarily from non-resident hunters (more than 60%), is the largest, sustained, component of the mortality. Three-year average mortality guidelines (including high percentages of female bear harvest) established as part of the strategy, have been exceeded on two occasions and led to Emergency Order closures on Admiralty, Baranof, and Chichagof islands during the fall 2011 season.

Within the BBMS, recommended solutions toward addressing human-caused mortality that exceeds the recommended guidelines were focused on:

- Mandatory adjustment of number of guided hunters
- Season adjustments
- Institution of drawing permits

Little progress has been made in the past dozen years to adjust the primary cause of the majority of human-caused mortality, either in hunt numbers or in the number of guides as recommended by the BBMS. It would seem appropriate to initiate action to implement a season adjustment, specifically to restrict the harvest of brown bears by nonresident hunters in Unit 4 to every other regulatory year. In the meantime, a careful analysis should be conducted to examine why components of the BBMS have been ignored. The resident bear season would not be affected by this proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The established hunt mortality guidelines will continue to be exceeded, resulting in emergency orders and disrupted hunts, and a loss of hunting opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The brown bear hunt for residents and nonresidents would be improved by implementing this regulatory change that would minimize the possibility of Emergency Order closures that disrupt hunts and take away harvest opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All bear hunters and nonconsumptive users-stakeholders in the BBMS who agreed to a balance between consumptive-nonconsumptive uses of brown bears for the overall benefit of a sustainable, healthy bear population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters and commercial guides who prefer to hunt every year.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1.) Request that the USFS to make adjustments to the number of recommended guides (20) and number of allowable hunts by Guide Use Area by any combination of guides, thereby limiting the number of nonresident guided hunters. 2.) Establish a nonresident drawing permit hunt with limited permits. 3.) Change the fall brown bear season opening date from September 15 to October 15.

PROPOSED BY: Anthony Perkins EG050912719

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 85.020 Seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Shorten the season for brown bear in Unit 4 as follows:

Open season (RB0770 **September 8-31** [SEPTEMBER 15-DECEMBER 31]).
Open season (RB088 and RB089)- no change.

ISSUE: Reduce harvest of female brown bear in Unit 4. Most females are taken in the fall. Males leave creeks before females in the fall. Earlier fall opening and closing would result in fewer females taken.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Possible Emergency Order or Board of Game season restriction.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Fewer female brown bears harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All brown bear hunters and viewers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Late fall and winter bear hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? One week earlier opening will provide higher ratio of male bears. Very limited, if any, brown bear hunting occurs between October and December.

PROPOSED BY: Jimmie Rosenbruch EG050312625

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Restrict the bag limit for brown bear in Unit 4 as follows:

Hunters would lose hunting opportunity for eight regulatory years if female with under 20-inch skull is taken. Guides would lose one hunt allocation in one of the next two regulatory years after two females are taken under 20-inch skulls in one regulatory year.

ISSUE: Harvest of female brown bear with skull size under 20-inches combined length and width, including lower jaw.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Possible Emergency Order or Board of Game season restriction.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Reduced female brown bear harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown bear hunters and viewers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who take female bears with under 20-inch skull size. Guides may lose hunt quota.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Female bears with under 20-inch skull is 'legal'. Some hunters insist to take a 'legal' bear despite a guide telling them “Do not shoot.”

PROPOSED BY: Jimmie Rosenbruch

EG050312627

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Modify the brown bear harvest allocation for residents in Unit 4 as follows:

Any increase in the brown bear, 4% harvest guideline for Unit 4 would go to resident hunters only.

ISSUE: Brown bear harvest guidelines as recommended by the Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Strategy is set at a 4% annual harvest basis. As such, it represents the most conservative harvest guideline in Alaska regarding hunting of brown bears. Kodiak, Alaska Peninsula and several other Units have brown bear conservation programs that have higher annual harvest guidelines which have proven to be sustainable.

We recognize that brown bears within Southeast Alaska may have special conservation needs that differ from these other regions and because of this, we would like for the Board of Game to understand that we feel that if you make any decisions regarding increasing the allocation above the existing four percent level, that the additional allocation would go to resident hunters only. There are plenty of guides and nonresident hunters in the field already and additional allocation for nonresident hunters would create additional conflict in the field concerns.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Possible emergency closures of brown bear hunting opportunity for all hunters who wish to hunt in this region. Also, additional conflicts in the field between guide service providers as well as resident hunters would increase if additional nonresident opportunity is created.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Increase in resident hunter effort is growing within this region. It would provide additional resident hunter opportunity if the Board of Game and the Department of Fish and Game find that conservation based opportunity exists.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresident hunters and any professional hunting guides who would like to see a higher level of allocation without knowing if a conservation basis does exist.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo but felt that the Board of Game may be inclined to increase opportunity and wanted them to understand our recommendations for resident hunters only.

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 85.020. Hunting seasons and bag limits for brown bear. Exclude wounding loss from the annual brown bear harvest for Unit 4 as follows:

In keeping with the Unit 4 Brown Bear Management Strategy, wounding loss will not be calculated within the annual harvest.

ISSUE: All wounded brown bears are currently being counted as dead female bears within annual harvest summaries.

Wounding loss of brown bears in Unit 4 was well recognized at the time the Brown Bear Management Strategy (BBMS) was developed but was recognized as an indeterminate factor and one which probably has no measureable effect on bear populations. Quoting from BBMS, “ADG&G has no credible information on the magnitude of wounding loss and so does not typically include it as a factor in management equations or population modeling.”

The newly implemented practice of counting every wounded bear as a dead bear as well as a female bear is a deviation from the plan and one which unfairly raises the total human caused mortality figure. In many cases, when a hunter wounds and does not retrieve a bear it escapes and survives, and was not a female bear. It is unreasonable to consider every wounded bear as a dead bear and then also consider it a female bear.

We recommend that the wounding loss factor go away entirely in keeping with the BBMS and the historical harvest summary be adjusted to reflect this.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The annual Human Caused Harvest Summary will continue to be unfairly calculated and hunting opportunities will continue to be lost for all brown bear hunters in Unit 4.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. As it is being calculated currently, wounding loss is unfairly contributing to the overall harvest level and is thus contributing to the Emergency Closures that have occurred. If calculated as prescribed within the BBMS, the Emergency Closures would not have happened and more hunting opportunities would have been and will be provided in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who want to participate within conservation based hunting opportunity for brown bears in Unit 4 will have a better opportunity.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered suggesting a ratio for consideration regarding what wounding actually results in mortality and what the mortality may be regarding female versus male bears. However, we found that the recommendations within the BBMS

regarding wounding loss were more appropriate and that those recommendations had been well vetted through development with the many user groups that were involved in its development.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Professional Hunters Association Inc. EG050412642

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Extend the otter trapping season in Unit 4 as follows:

Unit 4 otter season would extend November 10 - April 30.

ISSUE: Currently, trapping seasons don't align, incidental species that are caught, must be turned over to the Department of Fish and Game. For example, a spring beaver trapper must turn in all otters caught while beaver trapping, after February 15. While beaver season runs to May 15. Since beaver ponds are good otter habitat, a certain amount of incidental harvest will occur. Trappers want to have the ability to legally retain and sell these otters. Otters throughout Southeast Alaska are found in high densities, but current seasons are so short, as to impede possible harvest, during the times fur is prime.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A renewable resource will continue to be under-utilized, and incidental catches will have no value to trappers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, otters that are currently turned over to Department of Fish and Game, would be sellable, thus gaining more income for trappers. Otters are a consistently underutilized resource, due to season restrictions. Extending the season would allow both incidental otters to be sold, and otter to be targeted over a longer time frame, for higher harvest numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All otter and/or beaver trappers in Unit 4.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Leaving the current seasons, as is. I rejected this, because as stated above, I believe otter are an underutilized species, due to season restrictions. I know of no biological reason otter season shouldn't be extended, as otters are at extremely high population levels, and densities, throughout Unit 4.

PROPOSED BY: Uriah Strong EG042512553

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Lengthen the trapping season for marten and mink in Unit 4 as follows.

Marten and mink season open November 10 - March 15.

ISSUE: Short marten and mink season in Unit 4. Currently the Northeast portion of Chichagof Island is only open the month of December. The rest of the Unit is only December 1- February 15.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Marten and mink will continue to be an under-utilized species in Unit 4.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, trappers will be able to produce more fur, due to a longer season. Current seasons are unacceptably short, and limit a trappers ability to make a living.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Trappers in Unit 4.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Maintaining current seasons. I rejected this, as I find December 1 - December 31 is far too short of a season for any realistic trapping effort. Marten and mink are in very high abundance throughout Unit 4, so I see no biological reason that the season should not be extended. Thus allowing trappers to put in more effort, and produce more fur during a longer season.

PROPOSED BY: Uriah Strong EG042512554

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC 84.270. Furbearer trapping. Lengthen the furbearer trapping season on Chichagof Island, Unit 4 as follows:

The regulation would move the start date of trapping season on state and federal lands on Chichagof Island to November 1. This would allow for an extra month of targeted efforts on marten in areas of the island not accessible later in the winter due to heavy snowfall closing the road system to all but snow machine travel.

ISSUE: We would like the board to extend the small furbearer trapping season on Chichagof Island by one month, beginning the season on November 1, rather than December 1. This extension would allow for the targeting of marten for a longer period of time and hopefully result in reduction of their numbers to a level that would allow the local bird populations to recover. The introduction of marten on Chichagof Island over 50 years ago has contributed to a serious decline in the grouse and ptarmigan populations on the island to the point that they are few and far between. This proposal would also afford local residents the opportunity to harvest fur for use in regalia and traditional dress where fur quality is not of primary concern but ease of access is.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The decline in bird populations will continue the result being a potential eradication of these game birds and other bird species from the island where they have been a traditional food source for island residents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposal will improve the quality of the bird population and give individuals without access to snowmobiles the opportunity to harvest some of these furbearers. The potential for reduced fur quality at the earlier time in the season is not of major concern as the primary goal of this proposal is to reduce the pressure on the game bird species.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who customarily eat game birds will have access to greater populations. Individuals who cannot access the forest by boat or snowmobile will have a window to trap before snow closes the roads.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individual trappers who already have established lines may find themselves facing competition from increased effort. A potential reduction in fur quality in the earlier part of the season may reduce prices at market for the fur. To some extent, the mink population may be affected but as they are primarily marine animals, this proposal would not change the numbers being harvested significantly.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extending the season on state land to match the federal season doesn't afford the improved access as the roads are already closed.

PROPOSED BY: Icy Straits Advisory Committee EG050312635

Arctic & Western Regions – Units 18, 22, 23, & 26A

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(16). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 18 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(16)		
...		
Unit 18, Lower Yukon Area, that portion north and west of the Kashunuk River including the north bank from the mouth of the river upstream to the old village of Chakaktolik, west of a line from Chakaktolik to Mountain Village, and excluding all Yukon River drainages upriver from Mountain Village		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 2 moose; only one may be an antlered bull; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 1-Sept. 30	
2 antlerless moose	Oct. 1 – Last Day of Feb.	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 antlered bull		Sept 1-Sept 30
Remainder of Unit 18		
1 antlered bull; or	Aug. 10 - Sept. 30	Sept. 1 - Sept. 30

1 moose

Dec. 20 – Last Day of Feb.

No open season

...

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 18 require reauthorizations: Lower Yukon River hunt area and Remainder of Unit 18.

In November 2011, the Board of Game authorized antlerless moose hunts in the respective hunt areas through 'any moose' and antlerless moose bag limits. This follows a trend of increased opportunity at board meetings in 2007 and 2009, where regulations were adopted to liberalize bag limits and length of season. At proposal submission deadline in April 2012, the antlerless seasons in 2012-2013 are forthcoming and harvest information is not available. Based on the recent trend of substantial moose population growth and population parameters in the requested areas, the department recommends continuation of antlerless moose bag limit.

The Lower Yukon area is the most densely populated moose habitat in Unit 18. From 2002 to 2008, the population has doubled every three years and is now estimated at 3,320 moose in an area of about 1,100 square miles. The most recent data (Nov 2010) indicates calf:cow ratios of 69:100, twinning rates at 50%, and estimated minimum density of 2.8 moose/mi². Anecdotal evidence suggests that calf survival rates remain high.

Lower Yukon harvest data for 2011-2012 has not been finalized prior to the proposal submission deadline. Due to increased opportunity, we expect harvests to be slightly higher than 2010-2011 when 255 moose were harvested, including 60 moose in the winter season of December 20 to February 28 (season extended by emergency order). The winter harvest included 25 antlerless moose (cows). Continuing antlerless moose harvest opportunity will benefit hunters and also help slow the growth rate of the population.

The Remainder of Unit 18 has under-utilized moose habitat and a growing moose population. Based on counts in 2006 and 2010, the population is estimated at above 4,000 moose. The most recent data (Nov 2010) indicates calf:cow ratios of 61:100 and twinning rates at 50%. Anecdotal evidence suggests that calf survival rates remain high.

Remainder of Unit 18 harvest data for 2011-2012 has not been finalized prior to the proposal submission deadline. Due to increased opportunity, we expect harvests to be slightly higher than 2010-2011 when 291 moose were harvested, including 115 moose in the winter season of December 20 to February 28 (season extended by emergency order). The winter harvest included 65 antlerless moose (cows). Continuing antlerless moose harvest opportunity will benefit hunters and also help slow the growth rate of the population.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for antlerless moose in portions of Unit 18 will be needlessly lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who wish to harvest an antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712675

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(20). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22C and the remainder of Unit 22D as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(20) ... Unit 22(C)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull by registration permit only, or	Sept. 1-Sept. 14	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; or	Sept. 15-Sept. 30	
1 antlered bull by registration permit only; during the period Jan. 1 – Jan. 31, a season may be announced by emergency order	Jan. 1 – Jan. 31 (to be announced)	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by registration permit only		Sept. 1-Sept. 14
... Remainder of Unit 22(D)		
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 moose; however, antlerless	Aug. 10 - Sept. 14	

moose may be taken only from
Dec. 1—Dec. 31; a person may
not take a calf or a cow
accompanied by a calf; only antlered
moose may be taken from
Jan. 1—Jan. 31

Oct. 1 - Jan. 31

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch antlers
or antlers with 4 or more brow
tines on one side, by registration
permit only.

Sept. 1 - Sept. 14

...

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 22 require reauthorization: Unit 22C, and the Remainder of Unit 22D.

In October 1999, the Board of Game authorized a registration hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 22C and the department manages this hunt with a quota of up to 30 permits annually. The intent of the hunt is stabilization of the Unit 22C moose population, which is believed to be at or near carrying capacity of its winter range.

The Unit 22C moose population has grown 2% annually during the period 2000-2010 and the current population is estimated at approximately 660 moose, which exceeds the departments' management goal of 450-525 moose. Calf:adult ratios vary annually from 16-34ca:100ad with an average of 24ca:100ad since 1990. However, the bull:cow ratio is low, varying between 10-20 bulls:100 cows. The low bull:cow ratio makes additional bull harvest ill-advised. The antlerless hunt has helped stabilize moose numbers in Unit 22C and we recommend reauthorizing the antlerless moose hunt to achieve the moose population objectives for this unit.

In most other parts of Unit 22, low recruitment rates are believed to be causing moose population declines. However, in the Remainder of Unit 22D we recommend continued authorization of antlerless moose hunting where moose populations are stable and hunting pressure is low. This portion of Unit 22D is relatively remote with difficult access and these factors contribute to limited hunting pressure in the area. The moose population has grown 1% annually during the period 1997-2011 and the estimated number of moose has increased from 578 in 1997 to 700 in 2011. This area typically shows higher calf:cow and calf:adult ratios than other parts of Unit 22, annually ranging from 14-35ca:100ad with an average of 23ca:100ad since 1988. The reported cow harvest in this area has been low, averaging one cow moose per year since 2000. Village harvest survey data (collected only in 2000-2001) shows five cow moose were harvested from Unit 22D Remainder, which is a more realistic estimate of annual cow harvest compared to harvest ticket reports. Low harvest rates of antlerless moose support our recommendation to reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in the Remainder of Unit 22D.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for antlerless moose in portions of Unit 22 will be needlessly lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters who wish to harvest an antlerless moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712677

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(21). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(21)		
Unit 23, that portion north of and including the Singoalik River drainage		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:	July 1 - Dec. 31	
1 moose by registration permit only; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Nov. 1-Dec. 31; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or		
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side	Sept. 1 - Sept. 20	
NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:		Sept. 1 - Sept. 20
1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; up to 125 permits may be issued in all of Unit 23		

Remainder of Unit 23

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

Aug. 1 - Dec. 31

1 moose by registration permit only; however, antlerless moose may be taken only from Nov. 1-Dec. 31; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

Sept. 1 - Sept. 20

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; up to 125 permits may be issued in all of Unit 23

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Moose density is currently low in large portions of Unit 23. As a result, in November 2003 the Board of Game restricted moose hunting for resident and nonresident hunters. These restrictions substantially shortened the resident antlerless moose season and limited the harvest of antlerless moose to hunters who register for registration permit hunt RM880. The seasons and bag limits have not changed since they were adopted in regulatory year 2004-2005 and the reported harvest of cow moose has been low throughout Unit 23 despite generous antlerless seasons. We do not think maintaining an antlerless season during November and December, when moose harvests tend to be low, will endanger Unit 23 moose populations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? NA.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who need to harvest an antlerless moose when caribou or other game is unavailable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 85.045(a)(24). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 26A as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
<u>(24)</u>		
Unit 26(A), that portion in the Colville River drainage upstream from and including the Anaktuvuk River drainage		
1 bull; or	Aug. 1 – Sept. 14	No open season.
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits may be issued; up to 20 percent of the permits may be issued to nonresident hunters; or	Sept 1 – Sept. 14	Sept 1 – Sept. 14
1 moose; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf.	Feb. 15 – Apr. 15	No open season.
Unit 26(A), that portion west of 156° 00' W. longitude excluding the Colville River drainage		
1 moose; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf.	July 1 – Sept 14	No open season.

...

ISSUE: To be retained, antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. Two areas in Unit 26A are considered by this proposal: 1) the Colville River drainage upstream from and including the Anaktuvuk River drainage; and 2) the portion of Unit 26A west of 156 00' W longitude and north of the Colville drainage.

Within the ‘upstream’ portion of the Colville River drainage, a winter hunt was established by the Board in November 2005 and opened in the 2005-2006 regulatory year to provide more hunting opportunity in an area where the moose population was, at that time, increasing in Unit 26(A). Since most bull moose shed their antlers before the established season opening of February 15, the bag limit for this hunt is one moose, except a calf or cow accompanied by a calf may not be taken. Currently, this remote and inaccessible antlerless hunt area has a moose population that is decreasing primarily due to nutrition and predation rather than hunting pressure. In the past winter seasons, low numbers of cows have been harvested: two cows in 2006, three cows in 2007, one cow in 2008, one in 2009, and no cows in 2010 and 2011. A similar low harvest is anticipated for the current regulatory year. The low rate of antlerless moose harvest (0-3 per year) in the Colville River drainage should not prevent the population from recovering and we recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this area.

The portion of Unit 26A west of 156 00’ W longitude and north of the Colville drainage has a sparse distribution of moose. Each year a small percentage of moose (primarily bulls and cows without calves) disperse away from the major river drainages and across the coastal plain. These moose provide the only opportunities for harvest in the northwestern portion of Unit 26A. The Unit 26A moose population is currently declining, but the small number of dispersing cow moose that could be harvested under this reauthorization proposal will have very little impact on the size of the population. To date, after several years of hunting, few antlerless moose have been harvested in this portion of the unit. One cow was harvested in 2006, none in 2007, one in 2008, and none in 2009 -2011 during this hunt. We recommend reauthorization of the antlerless moose season in this portion of Unit 26A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be needlessly lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Resident hunters who need to harvest an antlerless moose when caribou or other game is unavailable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050712679

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 92.015(a)(4), (8), (9) & (13), and 92.015 (b) (4), (7), (8) & (10)

Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A as follows:

(a) A resident tag is not required for taking a brown bear in the following units:

- ...
- (4) Units... 26;
- ...
- (8) Unit 22;
- (9) Unit 23;
- ...
- (13) Unit 18;
- ...

(b) In addition to the units as specified in (a) of this section, if a hunter obtains a subsistence registration permit before hunting, that hunter is not required to obtain a resident tag to take a brown bear in the following units:

- ...
- (4) Unit 18;
- ...
- (7) Unit 22;
- (8) Unit 23;
- ...
- (10) Unit 26(A).

ISSUE: The Board of Game must reauthorize brown bear tag fee exemptions annually or the fee automatically becomes reinstated. We recommend continuing resident tag fee exemptions for the general season and subsistence season hunts in Region V (Units 18, 22, 23, and 26A).

General Season Hunts: Reauthorizations are needed for: Unit 18, where the tag fee has been exempted for 1 year; Unit 22, where the tag fee has been exempted for 11 years; Unit 23, where the tag fee has been exempted for 6 years; and Unit 26A, where the tag fee has been exempted for 1 year. Tag fee exemptions are desired to allow: 1) incremental increase in annual harvest, 2) opportunistic harvest by resident hunters, and 3) harvest by a wide range of users. Increased harvest is allowable because portions of these units have high bear populations.

General season brown bear harvest rates are within sustained yield limits and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused dramatic or unexpected increases in overall harvest. In Units 18 and 26A, tag exemptions have been newly authorized for 2012-2013 and summaries of harvest are not possible at time of proposal submission. In these GMUs, reported harvest has been with sustained yield for the preceding 10-year period. In Unit 22, during the tag-free period resident harvest has a 10-year average annual harvest of approximately 50 brown bears. In Unit 23, general harvests have increased slowly since 1961 although there has been substantial annual variability in harvest levels. The increasing trend in overall harvest is probably most influenced by the increasing human population in Alaska rather than the result of regulatory changes. Annual variability in harvests is probably most affected by weather. Harvest data for Unit 23

show no trend in the sex ratio, age or size of bears harvested under all types of hunts.

Subsistence Season Hunts: Reauthorizations are needed for Units 18, 22, 23, and 26(A) where brown bear subsistence hunt requirements include: 1) registration permit, 2) tag fee exemption, 3) salvaging meat for human consumption, 4) no use of aircraft in Units 22, 23 and 26(A), 5) no sealing requirement unless hide and skull are removed from subsistence hunt area, and 6) if sealing is required, the skin of the head and front claws must be removed and retained by the department at the time of sealing. Continuing the tag fee exemption helps facilitate participation in the associated brown bear harvest programs maintained by the department for subsistence hunts.

In all Units, subsistence brown bear harvest rates are low and well within sustained yield limits and exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence harvest. In Unit 18, we estimate 1-3 bears are taken annually in subsistence hunts. In Unit 22, about 6 bears are taken during a 10-year period and this is <1 % of the total brown bear harvest in the unit. In Unit 23, an average of <5 bears have been harvested annually since 1992 and this is ≤10 % of the total brown bear harvest. In Unit 26A, very few bears are taken annually by subsistence hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tag fee exemption will lapse and hunters will be required to purchase \$25 tags for general season and subsistence hunts. The brown bear harvest by residents will probably decline.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who are reluctant or unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting will be able to opportunistically and legally harvest a brown bear.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050712682
