

Interior Region

(Region III)

Proposal Index

(Note: Please review the “Regional and Multiple Units” section, which may include proposals that also affect the regulations for other units).

Regional & Multiple Units

- 39 Allocate 90 percent of drawing permits to residents in Region III.
- 40 Allocate a small percent of game harvest for nonresidents in Units 24, 25 and 26B
- 41 Modify the season dates for Dall sheep in Region III.
- 42 Open resident sheep hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons in Region III.
- 43 Open resident sheep seasons ten days before nonresident seasons in Region III.
- 44 Change the nonresident general sheep hunts to draw hunts and cap the number of permits in Region III.
- 45 Allocate 90 percent of drawing permits to residents for big game hunts and distribute remaining permits in Region III.
- 46 Change nonresident sheep hunts to drawing permit hunts and limit permit distribution to ten percent of the annual ten-year average for Region III.
- 47 Create a bowhunting-only season for Dall sheep in Region III.
- 48 Change all nonresident general season Dall sheep hunts in Unit 20 to drawing permit hunts.
- 49 Open resident sheep seasons one week prior to nonresidents in Units 25 and 26.
- 50 Review the customary and traditional use worksheet for the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd and determine whether there are customary and traditional uses; if so, establish amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence.
- 51 Lengthen the wolf season in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 25.
- 52 Reauthorize resident grizzly bear tag fee exemptions throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska.

- 53 Change the bag limit for black bear in Units 25C and 25D
- 54 Allow the Department of Fish and Game to offer permits for trapping bears under their discretionary authority in Region III.
- 55 Prohibit the use of snares to take bears in Region III.
- 56 Remove salvage requirements for brown bear meat when taken over a bait station in Region III.
- 57 Remove the salvage requirements for brown bears taken at bait stations in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 22D.
- 58 Remove salvage requirements for brown bear meat when taken over a bait station in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 21D.

McGrath Area – Units 19, 21A & 21E

- 59 Lengthen the nonresident moose season in Unit 21A.
- 60 Modify moose hunt requirements in 21E.
- 61 Reallocate moose drawing permits in Unit 21E.
- 62 Reauthorize the Unit 19A predation control program.
- 63 Reauthorize the Unit 19D-East predation control program.
- 64 Extend the lynx trapping season in Unit 19.
- 65 Establish a registration sheep hunt for residents in Unit 19C.
- 66 Create a musk oxen hunt in Units 18 & 19.
- 67 Modify the game management unit boundaries for Units 18, 19, and 21.

Galena Area – Units 21 B, 21C, 21D & 24

- 68 Change the Unit 21D moose permit hunt, DM818, to a general season hunt.
- 69 Allow moose hunting guides in Units 21D and 24 to select a replacement client.
- 70 Reauthorize the winter moose registration hunt in Unit 24B, RM833.

- 71 Reinststate the previous dimensions of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area.
- 72 Allow the taking of brown bears at black bear bait stations in Units 24C and 24D.
- 73 Extend lynx trapping season in Unit 21.

Northeast Alaska – Units 25A, 25B, 25D, 26B & 26C

- 74 Increase resident-only hunting in the Dalton Highway Management Corridor Area caribou season and create a youth hunt.
- 75 Change the resident-only hunting periods in the Dalton Highway Management Corridor Area caribou season and create a youth hunt.
- 76 Allow sidelock muzzleloading rifles using round ball only in Dalton Highway Management Corridor Area.
- 77 Clarify the subunit boundary between Unit 26B and 26C.
- 78 Modify antler restriction bag limit for moose in Unit 25.
- 79 Create a new hunt area for moose in Unit 25A and establish season dates and bag limits.
- 80 Allow harvest of brown bears over black bear bait in Unit 25D

Tok Area – Units 12 & 20E

- 81 Establish a nonresident Dall sheep drawing permit hunt for the Tok Management Area in Units 12, 13C and 20D, with conditions.
- 82 Limit Glacier Valley Mountain Controlled Use Area to walk-in only for sheep hunting.
- 83 Limit guides to two black bear bait stands in Units 12 and 20E.
- 84 Allow permits to use inedible game meat for bear bait.
- 85 Establish a registration hunt for Nelchina caribou in Unit 12.
- 86 Modify resident bag limit for moose in portions of Units 12 and 20D.
- 87 Reauthorize the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Program.

- 88 Modify the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Program.
- 89 Establish a wolf control program in Unit 12.

Delta Area – Unit 20D

- 90 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20D.
- 91 Modify the season and bag limits for DM795 in Unit 20D and change the qualification for disabled hunters.
- 92 Modify the bag limit for bison in Unit 20D to one per lifetime; limit one permit per household.
- 93 Correct a discrepancy in bag limits for the Macomb caribou herd in Unit 12.
- 94 Modify the season and bag limits for the Macomb caribou herd registration hunt in Unit 20D.
- 95 Modify the Macomb caribou registration hunt season and bag limits in Units 12 and 20D, and require locking tags.
- 96 Include Johnson Slough Island Unit in a portion of Unit 20D moose hunt boundary.

Fairbanks Area – Units 20A, 20B, 20C, 20F & 25C

- 97 Reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20A.
- 98 Change bag limit for moose in Unit 20A to any bull.
- 99 Eliminate the Wood River Controlled Use Area.
- 100 Modify the boundaries of the Wood River Controlled Use Area.
- 101 Create targeted moose hunts in Units 20A and 20B.
- 102 Allow the taking of any bull by utilizing two harvest tickets in Unit 20A and portions of Unit 20B
- 103 Allow a hunter to proxy hunt only once per year for moose in Units 20A and 20B.
- 104 Allow incidental brown bear harvest over black bear bait in Units 20A and 20B.

- 105 Allow brown bear harvest over black bear bait in Units 20A and 20B.
- 106 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20B.
- 107 Create a nonresident moose season in Unit 20B within the Minto Flats Management Area.
- 108 Allow the use of air boats for moose hunting in the Minto Flats Management Area.
- 109 Create a muzzleloader registration hunt in DM 782, Unit 20B and modify season dates and hunt area.
- 110 Eliminate the muzzleloader hunt for bull moose in the Middle Fork of the Chena River and upper Salcha River in Unit 20B.
- 111 Lengthen the moose season in Salcha River Drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek in Unit 20B.
- 112 Create a youth hunt drawing permit for antlerless moose in Unit 20B and a create a Unit 20B Youth Hunt Management Area.
- 113 Create a drawing youth sheep hunt in Unit 20B Remainder.
- 114 Repeal the requirement for leaving evidence of sex (gender) on black bear until sealing has taken place in Unit 20B.
- 115 Change bag limit and season for moose in Unit 20C.
- 116 Establish a Controlled Use Area for the Nenana-Totchaket Resource Development Corridor.
- 117 Reinstate the Nenana Controlled Use Area.
- 118 Change season dates for fall moose in Unit 20F Yukon River and Tanana River Drainages.
- 119 Change season dates for winter moose in Unit 20F Yukon River and Tanana River Drainages.
- 120 Require trophy value of moose to be destroyed in Unit 20F Yukon River and Tanana River Drainages.
- 121 Create a Controlled Use Area along the Manley to Tanana road.

Antlerless Moose and Brown Bear Tags Outside of Regions III & V

- 122 Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemptions for Region IV.
- 123 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Berners Bay and Gustavus in Unit 1C.
- 124 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 5A.
- 125 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C.
- 126 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt area in Units 7 and 14C.
- 127 Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 13.
- 128 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 14C.
- 129 Reauthorize the drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 14A and the targeted winter hunt for antlerless moose in Units 14A and 14B.
- 130 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.
- 131 Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B.
- 132 Reauthorize the winter antlerless moose hunt in Unit 17A.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Interior Region Meeting
(Game Management Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B, and 26C)
February 14-23, 2014
Alpine Lodge
Fairbanks, 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, February 14, 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 prior to 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, February 15, 8:30 AM

PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY Continued

Sunday, February 16, 8:30 AM

BOARD DELIBERATIONS (Upon conclusion of public testimony)

Monday, February 17 – Sunday, February 23, 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 January 31, 2014 to make any necessary arrangements.

Regional and Multiple Units

PROPOSAL 39 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Allocate 90% drawing permits to residents for the Interior Region and distribute remaining permits on a first come basis as follows:

Alaska residents should receive 90% of all drawing permits and nonresidents should receive 10%. If any permits are left over then they could be sold over the counter on a first come basis.

ISSUE: The way that Alaska allocates hunting permits for residents and nonresidents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Currently Alaskan residents and nonresidents are on an equal footing when it comes to most permit drawings. If the current system continues, a nonresident applying for a permit will have the same chance as a resident. That means that even though you live here year round and support your state you have the same chance as a nonresident. This hardly seems fair. Many states give their residents an advantage. With many hunts going to a permit draw I think it is high time Alaska does the same.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. A system will be put in place to help the Alaskan resident harvest more of the resource. This system is in place in many other states and it rewards their residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskan residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution is acceptable unless a point system is established favoring residents.

PROPOSED BY: Leonard Jewkes EG043013841

PROPOSAL 40 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Allocate a small percent of game harvest for nonresidents in Units 24, 25 and 26B as follows:

Only allow a small or token percent of the most abundant game for nonresidents in Units 24, 25 and 26B.

ISSUE: In my 50 years in Alaska the number of nonresident hunters and big game guides has increased dramatically which has diminished a resident's opportunities, mainly on sheep but certainly includes all big game, now we even have nonresident guides. Opening sheep hunting for residents early is the only way I see to give residents a fair opportunity at success, especially older residents. I have observed guides putting their camps in and locating sheep and other big game weeks before the season and manning these camps to discourage and chase away hunters

that might compete. Other states give priority to residents but here nonresidents have equal footing and now the most sought after hunt of Delta bison nonresidents are increasing every year, this hunt should be residents only. I have spoken at Board of Game meetings about these very issues in the past and members that are big game guides have laughed me out of the room. It's time to man up and do the right thing, reduce nonresident hunting and let them have only a small percent of what is available. Thank you.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less opportunities for residents and more opportunities for nonresidents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Will definitely improve the quality, more and bigger sheep, in the 1960s and 1970s I harvested nine rams over 41" that cannot happen anymore.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents of Alaska will benefit, our constitution says that the big game should be managed for sustained yield for all ALASKANS, to my knowledge it says nothing about nonresidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don't think nonresidents will suffer, just less opportunities, it will reduce the number of big game guides which will help all residents and therefore the State of Alaska.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo is not an option.

PROPOSED BY: Norman Pickus

EG042113751

PROPOSAL 41 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Modify season dates for Dall sheep in the Interior Region as follows:

Resident hunting season for Dall sheep shall be August 3rd to September 20th. Nonresident hunting season shall be from August 10th to September 20th. Drawing permit areas will start seven days earlier for Alaska residents and if there is a split season, the second half will be shortened by seven days for non-residents such that residents can start the second half seven days prior to non-residents.

ISSUE: The Board of Game (board) needs to address the lack of full curl legal rams available to Alaska residents. While sheep populations have been stable to slightly declining, the availability of legal rams, much less trophy rams, has been significantly reduced and is in serious decline. Success rates for resident sheep hunters will never be on par with nonresidents if not allowed an earlier jump from the efficiency of their guides.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskan resident hunters will continue to suffer from the mismanagement of this species by the Board of Game. Alaskan youth will never have the opportunity afforded to their parents and grandparents to successfully hunt healthy populations of Dall sheep with ample populations of large rams. Alaska wildlife belongs to all Alaskans and these resources should be managed as such.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Resident hunters will have an improved quality of hunt and avoid conflicts with guides and their clients. Nonresident hunters will have an improved quality of hunt by avoiding conflicts with resident hunters. Transport services associated with sheep hunting will improve as this will lessen the bottleneck on transporters seen at the beginning of each season, especially during poor weather. This may also increase the safety of hunters and transporters by spreading out the season and users more. Current Alaska residents and future Alaskans may be more interested in hunting Dall sheep, its management, and the future of Dall sheep hunting if they had greater opportunity to locate and harvest a legal ram, much less quality rams.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents, Alaska youth, and future Alaskans. Dall sheep populations may also improve as more people may feel like they have a chance at successfully harvesting a quality ram and will be more interested in the management of the resource. This benefits Alaska, all of Alaska's game resources, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, though some will say nonresident hunters, non-resident guides, and resident guides may suffer. Harvest records, however, show that resident sheep hunters are much less successful than nonresidents because of their guides. This is largely due to time guides can give to pre-season scouting, which is done mostly by fixed wing aircraft. While success rates for resident hunters will hopefully increase, there is little reason to think that nonresident success rates will decline significantly. Pre-season scouting will still be available to guides. Sheep populations will not suffer directly, again because resident hunter success rates are consistently low. Future sheep populations, however, may suffer and receive little support or interest, if today's youth and future generations cannot hunt healthy populations of sheep, as is currently the case. You will be hard pressed to find any Alaska resident who is not a guide or associated with a guiding business who does not favor this proposal. If not sure whether to favor Alaska residents over nonresidents, please look at any other state and how they manage their resources for the benefit of their residents and not for the financial benefit of a few.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close non-resident hunting of Dall sheep for five years or until healthy populations of sheep with sufficient populations of legal rams is re-established. Charge resident hunters nonresident harvest fees during this interim to offset any loss of funding from loss of nonresident tags. This would be the best management practice the board could do, as it would best serve current and future Alaska residents, and most of all best serve the Dall sheep population as a whole. I rejected this solution based on past performance of the board where political and financial interests of a few, trumped the best interests of Alaska residents, Alaska game resources, and Alaska itself.

PROPOSED BY: Jake Sprankle

EG042913813

PROPOSAL 42 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open resident sheep hunting seasons seven days before nonresident seasons in the Interior Region as follows:

Sheep season dates in Region III:

Alaska residents:	August 5 – September 20
Nonresidents:	August 12 – September 20

Alaska residents may only hunt sheep in regions with similar start dates. This will keep hunters from trying to get an early start in one region (which would cause overcrowding) and then shift to another area. If a resident hunter picks Region III or V those are the only regions they may hunt sheep for that season. If the Board of Game would have passed the early start dates at the last statewide meeting we wouldn't have to make more rules. We need to start this region by region so Alaskans will have this statewide preference by 2016. A different colored sheep tag for Region III & V would make it easy to see if the resident hunter is in the appropriate area and legal. (*Note: This proposal was also submitted for the Arctic/Western Region.*)

ISSUE: Overcrowding, lack of quality experiences, and low allocations of sheep for Alaska residents. Nonresidents harvest over 40% of Alaska's sheep and that number keeps increasing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The quality of the hunt has been diminished by overcrowding and this is the best way to separate the number of hunters in the field. This is not a new idea and resident sheep hunters have supported this concept in the past. The resident has had to compete against the infrastructure of the guiding industry and everyone is trying to enter the mountains at the same time. Air services could spread out their charters and many residents would be returning when the nonresident hunters would be heading out to hunt with their chosen guide. Getting a legal ram is a difficult task and this would give our young Alaska resident hunters a much better opportunity to be successful. This should be a statewide proposal but the Board of Game failed to pass any of the 23 proposals presented to them requesting some preferences for Alaska residents. This statewide issue won't come up again until 2016 so now we need to adjust the dates in different regions.

The only other solution is to put all nonresidents on permits. The number of permits given to nonresidents would be 15% of the total sheep harvest of the previous year. Example: 1000 sheep harvested = 150 permits for nonresidents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will make it much easier to get hunters in and out of the field – both resident and nonresident. Both groups will have a better experience due to less crowded conditions. Guides want people to think that nonresidents will quite coming to Alaska to hunt if any preference is given to Alaska residents and this is not the case. Nonresidents can come to Alaska and buy over the counter tags for most species cheaper than a deer tag can be purchased in many of the western states. The nonresident tag fees are a big boost to the Department of Fish and Game but the Board of Game and the Alaska Legislature needs to keep resident Alaskans as their number one priority.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska resident sheep hunters and nonresident sheep hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Commercial operators (guides) will complain but they are making money off a public resource we (all Alaskans) own and many of these guides are nonresidents who can't legally harvest sheep, goats, or brown bears but they can guide other nonresidents. The price of the tag is cheap but the cost of a guided hunt is expensive.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

EG042913829

PROPOSAL 43 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open resident sheep seasons ten days before nonresident seasons in the Interior Region as follows:

In Region III (Interior Region), change the dates for sheep hunting to:

- Alaska residents: August 1 to September 20
- Nonresidents: August 10 to September 20

ISSUE: The quality, safety and crowded conditions of sheep hunting at the start of the season.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The overall quality and safety of sheep hunting in Alaska will continue to deteriorate due to the large number of people trying to get into the field at the start of the season. This will put a big strain on all of the resources and parties involved.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would increase the overall quality and safety of sheep hunting for both the residents and nonresidents by eliminating overcrowding and the competition for available resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both the residents and nonresidents would benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, although the guides and some nonresidents may disagree.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There is no other solution to this problem. I think that the guiding industry is doing a good job for their customers using a public resource to make a very good living. I welcome nonresident to come to Alaska and hunt but a quality hunt is very important for everyone and unless something is done this will not be the case.

PROPOSED BY: Leonard Jewkes

EG043013842

PROPOSAL 44 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep and 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts. Change the nonresident general sheep hunts to draw hunts for the Interior Region, and cap the number of permits based on sheep density as follows:

All nonresident sheep hunts in Region III (Interior Region), where we have general open season hunts for nonresidents (excluding subunits within U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Park Service (NPS) lands) become draw only, and the total number of permits is capped based on sheep density and population estimates and/or recent historical sheep harvest data for each subunit, to try to achieve a balance whereby nonresident guided sheep hunter harvest rates are lowered, more full curl rams are left on the mountain, and the conflicts afield greatly reduced.

(If the Board of Game (board) prefers, this regulation if passed could have a sunset clause added should the proposed Department of Natural Resources (DNR) guide concession program ever be implemented.)

We recognize that not all areas in Region III are experiencing the problems outlined in this proposal. However, if the board only works to “fix” the problem areas, that presents the real possibility that some guides will shift to areas still open to general season nonresident sheep hunting where the same type of problems will occur.

There are various ways the board could decide permit allocation levels. One way would be to look at the sheep harvest statistics for federal lands where the federal guide concession program is in place. It has been widely promoted that the proposed DNR guide concession program the board favors as a solution to these issues was supposed to mirror or be similar to the federal concession program. Just using the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as an example, nonresident sheep harvest rates have tended to average between 25-30%. Below are the statistics from 2011 for subunits 26B and 26C within the Refuge:

**Interim Reports GS000 Sheep - Year 2011 Unit 26B, 26C
Current File Statistics (110)**

	Successful		Unsuccessful		Did Not Hunt		Total Hunters	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Residents	95	36.8% <i>36.8% of all overlays</i>	163	63.2% <i>63.2% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	258	100%
Non Res	37	72.5% <i>72.5% of all overlays</i>	14	27.5% <i>27.5% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	51	100%
Unspecified	7	41.2% <i>41.2% of all overlays</i>	10	58.8% <i>58.8% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	17	100%

No Overlay	0	0% <i>0% of all tickets</i>	1	100% <i>100% of all tickets</i>	0	0%	1	100%
Total	139	42.5%	188	57.5%	0	0%	327	100%

Nonresident guided hunters took 37 of 139 total sheep for a 27% harvest rate. Nonresident guided hunters comprised 15% of the total hunters.

ISSUE: Unlimited nonresident sheep hunting opportunities and unlimited guide numbers in parts of Region III.

In many parts of Region III (excluding USFWS and NPS lands) where we have open general season sheep hunts, there are no limits on the number of nonresident hunters or the guides they are required to hire to hunt sheep. Because nonresident guided hunters have such a higher success rate than resident hunters, this has led to concerns of localized diminished populations and future restrictions on resident general open season sheep hunting opportunities. Some areas are also experiencing crowding, conflicts between guides and resident hunters and conflicts between guides licensed for the same area.

Our primary concerns are sheep conservation and continued resident general season sheep hunting opportunities. We firmly believe that we can't allow any areas to have nearly every full-curl ram harvested each season, which is what we fear may happen in some areas if we continue to allow unlimited guiding and nonresident sheep hunting opportunities. We also believe, just on a matter of fairness to Alaskan resident sheep hunters, that nonresident sheep harvest rates of 40% across much of Region III, and 50-80% in some subunits, is unacceptable.

For example, below are the 2011 statistics for two subunits (2012 data not yet available):

**Interim Reports Sheep - Year 2011 Unit 19C
Current File Statistics (110)**

	Successful		Unsuccessful		Did Not Hunt		Total Hunters	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Residents	10	16.7% <i>16.7% of all overlays</i>	50	83.3% <i>83.3% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	60	100%
Non Res	66	82.5% <i>82.5% of all overlays</i>	14	17.5% <i>17.5% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	80	100%
Unspecified	2	100% <i>100% of all overlays</i>	0	0% <i>0% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	2	100%
No Overlay	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%

		<i>100% of all tickets</i>		<i>0% of all tickets</i>				
Total	81	55.9%	64	44.1%	0	0%	145	100%

For subunit 19C, there were 80 confirmed nonresident guided hunters and 60 resident hunters who hunted Dall sheep in 2011. Guided nonresident hunters took 66 of 81 total sheep, resulting in 81% of the total overall harvest.

**Interim Reports GS000 Sheep - Year 2011 Unit 20A
Current File Statistics (110)**

	Successful		Unsuccessful		Did Not Hunt		Total Hunters	
	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct	Number	Pct
Residents	40	25.2% <i>25.2% of all overlays</i>	119	74.8% <i>74.8% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	159	100%
Non Res	62	72.1% <i>72.1% of all overlays</i>	24	27.9% <i>27.9% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	86	100%
Unspecified	1	16.7% <i>16.7% of all overlays</i>	5	83.3% <i>83.3% of all overlays</i>	0	0%	6	100%
No Overlay	1	100% <i>100% of all tickets</i>	0	0% <i>0% of all tickets</i>	0	0%	1	100%
Total	104	41.3%	148	58.7%	0	0%	252	100%

For Unit 20A, a subunit known to have the type of crowding and conflicts described in this proposal, in 2011 there were 86 confirmed nonresident guided sheep hunters and 159 resident hunters. Guided nonresident sheep hunters took 62 of 104 total sheep, resulting in 60% of the total harvest. (Note that even though resident sheep hunters were nearly double the nonresidents, guided nonresident hunters still took 60% of the sheep)

While we certainly support and respect the guiding profession and encourage nonresident hunting and want to share our wildlife resources with our nonresident hunting brethren, we believe there needs to be new limits applied to nonresident sheep hunting opportunity.

This proposal is similar to the one we put before the board in 2012, and at that time the board expressed great displeasure when the Department of Fish and Game presented data on the high nonresident sheep harvest rates in some subunits, like those above. The board is well aware of these ongoing problems, but has put off acting on them using the rationale that the proposed DNR Guide Concession Program that would limit guides (and thus their nonresident clients)

would be implemented on state and Bureau of Land Management lands. But as of this writing, the proposed DNR guide concession program has not been funded and has been declared “dead” by DNR sources. Even if it were to be revived and be implemented, the earliest implementation keeps getting pushed farther and farther ahead on the calendar.

With all due respect to the board, we feel strongly it is well past time to act now in ways that will better conserve our sheep populations, prevent the loss of resident general open season sheep hunting opportunities, and curb the ongoing conflicts that surround nonresident guided sheep hunting in much of Region III.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued localized diminished populations of full-curl rams that threaten population sustainability and resident general open season sheep hunting opportunities, continued user conflicts and crowding, and continued inequitable nonresident sheep harvest rates of 40% annually in much of Region III, and 50-80% in some subunits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By limiting nonresident sheep hunting opportunities in much of Region III we thus limit the number of guides they must hire, thereby reducing total sheep harvests, better conserving sheep populations, as well as improving the quality of sheep hunts for both guided and unguided hunters by reducing crowding and conflicts afield.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All those who put the resource first and wish to see our Region III sheep populations conserved and sustained. All resident hunters who want to see their general open season sheep hunting opportunities retained, and their success rates go up. All guided nonresident hunters who don’t want to compete with so many other guided hunters and who favor a more quality sheep hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some guides would suffer monetarily because of the lower number of nonresident clients. Division of Wildlife Conservation funding would decrease because of a decrease in nonresident sheep tags being sold, and some local economies could see a decrease in nonresident hunting-related tourism, but it’s important to emphasize that these same things would happen if the DNR proposed guide concession program, which the board supports, was implemented.

Nonresident sheep hunters would lose the guarantee to be able to hunt Dall sheep in parts of Region III, and would have to take their chances with a draw-only hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1) Waiting for the DNR proposed guide concession program to be implemented. Rejected because we have already waited too long for this proposed concession program to be implemented, and it now appears it will never come about. 2) Only trying to “fix” the known problem areas in Region III, not making all of Region III draw-only for nonresident sheep hunters. Rejected because it has the potential to spread the problems to the areas still open to general season nonresident sheep hunting. 3) Including Region III registration sheep hunts for residents in all general (non-draw) open season areas, mandatory harvest reporting period, Alaska Department of Fish and Games discretionary authority to close some

sheep hunts based on harvest reports, in conjunction with our proposed solution. Rejected because we don't believe we need that at this time, but our concern is to conserve sheep so that sheep hunting by all can continue, and we do believe it is important that resident sheep hunters are fully cognizant this may be necessary down the line and preferable to a draw-only hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Chapter Backcountry Hunters & Anglers EG050113878

PROPOSAL 45 - 5 AAC Chapter 85. Hunting seasons and bag limits. Allocate 90% drawing permits to residents for the Interior Region big game hunts, and distribute remaining permits as follows:

Alaska residents will receive a minimum of 90% of all drawing permits and nonresidents will receive a maximum of 10% of permits, but 10% is not guaranteed. If Alaskans don't apply for particular permits, the extra or leftover permits may be issued to nonresidents (higher tag fees), sold over the counter to residents and nonresidents on a first come first serve basis, or do another drawing. Any hunt with less than ten permits for an area is not open for nonresident drawings but if there are permits leftover, nonresidents may purchase the permits over the counter.

ISSUE: Allocation of permits for Alaska residents.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? All of the western states have a high allocation of their drawing permits reserved for their residents. Most of the drawing permits in Alaska don't have any preference for the Alaska resident. A resident can put in for a drawing for 20 years and next year he is on equal footing with a nonresident putting in for the first time. Since Alaska doesn't have preference points (has to be funded by the legislature) the Board of Game needs to give a high allocation of the permits to resident hunters. The commercial operators (guides) don't want either because it is in their best interests not to give Alaska residents any advantage. We're not too far away from having many of our sheep hunts go on permits and moose and caribou are a possibility in certain areas. In many of the western states it is a 90/10 split with 90%+ going to residents and a maximum of 10% going to nonresidents, but 10% is not guaranteed.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Alaskans will receive the same respect other states give their residents and the majority of permit hunted game will go in the freezers of Alaska residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides and their nonresident clients.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

EG042913830

PROPOSAL 46 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Change nonresident sheep hunts to drawing permit hunts and limit the permit distribution to ten percent of the annual ten year average for the Interior Region as follows:

Nonresidents wanting to participate in sheep hunting in Alaska will have to enter by drawing permit. The drawing permit will be limited to a maximum of 10% of the annual ten year historical average sheep harvest.

ISSUE: Because of our decreasing resident hunter success and falling sheep populations, I would like the Board of Game to limit, by drawing permit, all nonresident hunters of Alaska's Dall sheep to a maximum of 10% of the preceding ten year average historical harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Alaskans limited natural resources will continue to be taken by increasing number of nonresidents. Ignoring this fact, and the fact of our shrinking sheep population, will soon force drawing permits on Alaska residents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal not only protects our natural resources from the ever increasing pressure of the guide industry, but also places Alaska on EQUAL footing with ALL western states who have long ago, limited the nonresident hunters to a maximum of 10% of the sheep permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All Alaska residents, and the natural resources we are entrusted with.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Some nonresident hunters and some in the guide industry.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Trying, yet again, to express to the Board of Game that we have a statewide problem with our Dall sheep populations. I am not blaming the guide industry for the decreasing sheep populations, I am saying that the increased percentage nonresident harvest, shows an increased pressure on our sheep.

The first step in restricting access of our limited game resources, should be to place our nonresident hunters on EQUAL footing with the nonresident hunters in other states.

PROPOSED BY: Vern Fiehler EG042813810

PROPOSAL 47 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open a bowhunting only season for Dall sheep in Interior Region as follows:

Add a new bowhunting only sheep season in all northern and northcentral units where there is a current general sheep season. Dates would be August 1-9; the bag limit would be one full curl ram. Open only to International Bowhunter Education Program (IBEP) certified bowhunters.

ISSUE: Overcrowding of hunters seeking Dall sheep is reducing the quality of the sheep hunting experience.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The problem will continue to increase and eventually all sheep hunting will need to be by drawing permit.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would improve the quality of the outdoor experience which qualifies as a resource. It would not improve the quality of the products produced.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bowhunters by being given a chance to hunt sheep with less direct competition from rifle hunters. Firearm sheep hunters by not seeing quite as many hunters in the field when they were actually hunting because the bowhunters who wanted to hunt sheep would probably utilize the bow season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one really. Bowhunters for Dall sheep have a very low success rate even when they are allowed to take any sheep. This hunt would be much more difficult because it would be for full curl rams only. This proposal would serve to spread out utilization with very little effect on the sheep population. Multiple parties on the mountain at the same time significantly reduces the quality and enjoyment of the hunting experience for all involved.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Have the new archery season be after the regular sheep season, September 21-30. This is the model which has been in effect for over 30 years in Unit 14C. However the northern units (especially the Brooks Range) have very short cold days in late September and weather could be a safety issue. Long warm days are important to bowhunters who must be patient waiting for an opportunity to get close to sheep.

PROPOSED BY: Alaskan Bowhunters Association EG050113876

PROPOSAL 48 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep and 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts. Change all nonresident sheep hunts to drawing permit hunts in Unit 20 with a 75% distribution of nonresident permits as follows:

Turn all nonresident Dall sheep tags in Unit 20 to drawing only and limit the number to 75% of the number of nonresident tags based on historic average.

ISSUE: The overcrowding/overlapping of guides in Unit 20, conflicts between guides, their clients and residents and also an overharvest of rams that have not yet reached their full potential trophy value.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If this issue is not addressed, a conflict will continue to exist and potentially increase between guides who are currently overcrowding one another during the current Dall sheep season. This overcrowding during Dall sheep season has also lead to reports to the Big Game Commercial Services Board of registered guides violating Alaska Statute 08.54.720 as well as more disturbing conflicts between guides and resident hunters.

The overcrowding of guides in Unit 20 has also led to an overharvest of rams in a means that does not allow them to reach their full potential trophy value. This is a major issue especially in Unit 20 where recent genetics have shown many rams take over eight years to reach the full curl requirement. If this issue is not addressed, we as a committee fear resident and nonresident hunters will never again have the opportunity to harvest a true trophy ram, which Unit 20 has been historically known to hold. As of 2011, over 70% of the Dall sheep harvested in Unit 20 have been by nonresidents, who are all required to have a registered guide accompany them. By simply reducing this number by a small fraction, harvest will in turn drop and many more rams will have the opportunity to reach older age. Nonresident hunters will still have the opportunity to hunt in other less pressured portions of Alaska, which is the only state in the United States to not require all nonresidents to apply for a drawing tag for wild sheep.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By reducing the number of hunters in the field, the overall harvest numbers would decrease while at the same time give hunters the opportunity to disperse. This would in turn lessen the impact of harvest on individual herds and allow for rams to reach greater trophy value. The smaller harvest would also allow these higher trophy value rams to breed more ewes, spreading their genes while also increasing the overall Dall sheep population in Unit 20.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both resident and nonresident hunters alike as well as law-abiding guides.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A small percentage of nonresident hunters as well as a portion of the guiding industry.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Turn all nonresident sheep tags in Unit 20 to drawing only tags and reduce the number of tags to 80% of average. We believe as an Advisory Committee that this is not a sufficient enough percentage to reduce the overall harvest and guide conflicts in the unit.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050113877

PROPOSAL 49 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Open resident sheep seasons one week prior to nonresidents in Units 25 and 26 as follows:

Residents have the first week of sheep season without the presence of guides and their hunters.

ISSUE: Open sheep season one week for residents only in Units 25 and 26.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides think that they own the areas I know of one in particular in Unit 25 that comes over with his whole crew to try to scare off a resident hunter.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This helps separate the competition that guides have with hunters. The guides charge such a high price these days that it puts a lot of pressure on them to give there hunters a quality hunt. It would be better for all hunters because a lot of resident sheep hunters would be done hunting by the time the guides arrive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? I think everybody would.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would because the experience is what counts less competition is a better experience.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Chris Gossen EG042813811

PROPOSAL 50 - 5 AAC 99.025. Customary and traditional uses of game populations.
 Review the customary and traditional use worksheet for the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd and determine whether there are customary and traditional uses; if so, establish amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence (ANS), as follows:

5 AAC 99.025(a)(4)

SPECIES & UNIT	FINDING	AMOUNT REASONABLY NECESSARY FOR SUBSISTENCE USES
(4) Caribou		
<u>Units 22, 23, 24, 26(A), 26(B)</u> <u>(Teshekpuk Lake herd)</u>	<u>XXXXX</u>	<u>XXX – XXX</u>

ISSUE: The Alaska Board of Game (board) was first presented a customary and traditional use (C&T) worksheet for consideration of the customary and traditional uses of the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd in 1990. The administrative record does not capture if a C&T determination was made at the 1990 board meeting. This same C&T worksheet was revised for the 1993 board meeting and stated:

“[B]ecause the Teshekpuk Caribou Herd is not specifically identified in current hunting regulations, there is no specific harvest ticket for this herd, and because so little is actually known about its seasonal movements over time, little information on any hunting of this herd is actually available. Based on caribou harvest ticket returns from GMU 26A, it appears that there is little hunting of the herd by non-North Slope residents (within its central range around the Teshekpuk Lake) because of difficult access.

It remains unclear whether the board made a C&T determination at the 1993 board meeting, so the Department of Fish and Game will provide an updated C&T worksheet for this herd, in addition to a written report with ANS options for the board's consideration.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The requirements of AS 16.05.258 will go unaddressed to determine whether there are customary and traditional uses of the Teshekpuk Lake caribou herd and if so, there will be no ANS to ensure that reasonable opportunities for customary and traditional uses are provided to Alaska residents.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of the Teshekpuk Lake caribou resource will benefit from decisions based upon the best available information, which provides the board with an unambiguous metric for assessing reasonable opportunities for subsistence uses of this caribou herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No action. However, this proposal provides the board with the opportunity to fulfill its statutory mandate to identify game populations that are customarily and traditionally taken or used for subsistence. If a harvestable surplus exists, the board "shall determine the amount of the harvestable portion that is reasonably necessary for subsistence uses" (AS 16.05.258(b)) and promulgate regulations that ensure reasonable opportunities for this herd are provided.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613909

PROPOSAL 51 - 5 AAC 85.060. Hunting seasons and bag limits for fur animals. Lengthen the wolf season in Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 25 as follows:

Wolf season: August 5 - June 15.

ISSUE: Start wolf hunting season August 5 and increase wolf season to June 15. There are many hunters out and about hunting and baiting black bears in June. These hunters are in the field during moose calving times and during the critical first month of a moose calf's life. This is an excellent time to hunt wolves opportunistically by predator calling or hunting over a fresh moose kill site. In the fall many hunters arrive to set up camp and prepare to hunt before August 10, which is opening day for sheep and caribou in some areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be restricted to a wolf closing date of May 31 and opening date of August 10.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wolf hunters will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered a closing date of June 10. I rejected because many bear hunters are still in the field.

PROPOSED BY: Smokey Don Duncan

EG050113873

PROPOSAL 52 – 5 AAC 92.015(a)(4). Brown bear tag fee exemptions. Reauthorize resident grizzly bear tag fee exemptions throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska as follows:

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

...

(4) Units 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26(B), and 26(C)

...

ISSUE: Resident brown bear tag fees were put in place statewide during the mid-1970s to discourage incidental harvest, elevate the status of brown and grizzly bears to trophies, and to provide revenue. Today, Region III populations are healthy, grizzly bears are highly regarded as trophies, and revenue can be generated from non-tag fee sources. The Board of Game (board) must annually reauthorize all resident tag fee exemptions.

Eliminating resident grizzly bear tag fees throughout Interior and Eastern Arctic Alaska (Region III) simplifies regulations, increases resident hunter opportunity, and is not likely to cause declines in these grizzly bear populations. This reauthorization would assist with our objective of managing Region III grizzly bear populations for hunter opportunity and would continue to allow hunters to take grizzlies opportunistically. During regulatory years 2006–2009, 35% of grizzlies harvested by resident hunters in Region III were taken incidentally to other activities (compared to 4% incidental take in regions I and II and 17% statewide).

We estimate that a kill rate of at least 6%, composed primarily of males, is sustainable. Human-caused mortality in most of Region III has been consistently less than 6% of the population. Where harvests are elevated (i.e. Units 20D, 20B, 20A, and portions of 26B), grizzly populations are managed through changes in seasons and bag limits. Resident tag fees that were in place prior to 2010 appeared to have no effect on harvest in these areas.

As part of this request to reauthorize exemption of grizzly tag fee throughout Region III, we recommend that the board, at a minimum, continue to reauthorize the tag fee exemptions for subsistence registration permit hunts in Units 19A and 19B (downstream of and including the Aniak River drainage), 21D, and 24.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Harvest opportunity will be lost and hunters will be required to obtain the \$25 resident tag. Subsistence users in areas where tag fees are currently exempt will be required to purchase a tag to harvest grizzly bears for food.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents who are unable to purchase the \$25 tag before hunting, due to lack of vendors or economic reasons, will be able to opportunistically and legally harvest grizzly bears.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who believe the \$25 resident tag fee is useful in managing grizzly bear populations and those who believe grizzly bears should not be harvested to provide food for subsistence hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Decrease the Region III grizzly tag fee to \$10. This would require legislative action.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613946

PROPOSAL 53 - 5 AAC 85.015. Hunting seasons and bag limits for black bear. Change the bag limit for black bear in Units 25C and 25D as follows:

Set the harvest limit of black bear to five black bear per year.

ISSUE: Increase the bag limit of black bear in Units 25C and 25D to five black bear per hunter per year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There are a limited number of hunters willing to expend the resources to harvest this species, and we believe we should allow maximum harvest opportunity to offset the high economy of effort required to target this species in this area. The Yukon Flats have some of the highest bear densities and lowest moose densities in the state, yet we have not been successful in implementing any regulation aimed at correcting this issue. Locals have objected to allowing foot snaring of bears in these game units because it is not in keeping with the methods and means they have used to control the nuisance bears around their fish camps in years past (the preferred method is to target bears at the head and neck with a snare, causing death versus keeping them alive until the trapper comes to check the snare). So for safety reasons they have opposed all attempts to exploit this population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The common belief is that we may reduce the black bear population to a level where the moose population may escape predation and flourish, but reality is we likely will not harvest enough bears with this bag limit to even stabilize the black bear population let alone cause growth in the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The sportsmen and subsistence users of the area who are willing to target black bear in the game units.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer, this population can be exploited even higher levels than recommended here with no chance of harming the resource.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG042613797

PROPOSAL 54 - 5 AAC 92.051. Discretionary trapping permit conditions and procedures.

Allow the Department of Fish and Game to issue permits in the Interior Region for trapping bears under their discretional authority as follows:

No change in the regulation. The Board of Game (board) has already approved, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) has discretional authority to issue permits for trapping furbearers per conditions outlined in 5 AAC92.051.

We are only asking the board to approve, that department could issue permits for the trapping (foot hold snares) of bears at their discretion and in compliance of 5 AAC 92.051.

ISSUE: Allow the department to issue discretionary trapping permits in Region III for the taking of black bears with foot hold snares.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Loss of opportunity (both in a subsistence harvest opportunity and in a general resident season opportunity) to harvest black bears using foot hold snares as another method and means through the issuance of discretionary permits by the department in Region III.

We also believe there are areas in Region III where ADF&G could issue such discretional permits. Region III has remote areas of high bear densities where these trapping activities will not produce social issues, but are sufficiently accessible to provide a reasonable opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. We have confidence that the department will and has managed bears in Region III on a sustained yield bases (as mandated). This proposal would provide additional opportunity for both the subsistence user and also the resident nonsubsistence users. We also believe Region III managers have a proven track record of providing for high yields of harvest and opportunity for residents of the region and for other Alaskans traveling to Region III for an opportunity to harvest their wild food needs.

The region still has a harvestable surplus of black bears even with a no closed hunting season, a three black bear limit, plus a 45 day black bear baiting season though out the region. We believe Region III is a good place to test a new “method and means” under a controlled permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Both subsistence users and the resident nonsubsistence users. Both could have additional opportunity through other methods and means for take. Having this additional permitted opportunity will provide a very controlled harvest, accountability, and opportunity. Currently the department has any of 13 conditions they can apply to the permit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, as the board is mandated through the constitution and statutes to manage wildlife resources on sustain yield harvest. We would also state that the conditions specified on the permit would avoid areas where social issues could be confrontational.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Add a new line under 5 AAC 92.044 using bait to take black bears. (A) To allow the use of foot hold snares. But this is more of a statewide issue, and we like this region to be a test area, because we have remote areas that other users don't recreate, but are accessible. 2. Create a new section 5 AAC 92.XXX permit for taking bears with the use of foot hold snares. At this time we believe that the current regulation that allows ADF&G to issue discretionary permits for taking furbearers is already codified. Maybe after we see the success in this new opportunity, we could address a new section in the future.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks and Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committees EG042913827

PROPOSAL 55 - 5 AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions.
Prohibit the use of snares to take bears in the Interior Region as follows:

The new regulation would forbid the use of snares to take bears in the Interior Region.

5AAC 92.095. Unlawful methods of taking furbearers; exceptions

2. The following methods and means of taking furbearers under a trapping license are prohibited, in addition to the prohibitions in 5AAC 92.080:

(20) The taking of a bear by trap or snare

ISSUE: The 2010 decision to list black bears as a furbearer paved the way to allow bear snaring for the first time since statehood.

In Unit 16B, an experimental bear snaring program is in place allowing the snaring of both black and brown bears. Bear snaring is indiscriminate, allowing the capture and death of brown and black bears, cubs and sows with cubs.

The Department of Fish and Game (department) is quoted as saying "The effectiveness of reducing both bear species through harvest methods to increase moose calf survival has not been demonstrated." This conclusion was confirmed by the department in a report to the Board of Game (board) at the Central/Southwest Region Meeting February 8-15, 2012 showing no correlation between high harvest levels of bears and moose calf survivability in Unit 16B.

The McGrath predator control poster child that the board references time and time again resulted in higher moose calf survivability only after killing 97% of the black bears in the area, 75% of the wolves and 50% of the brown bears. This program has cost the state untold hundreds of thousands of dollars (more likely millions), and still only 50% of the moose calves survived to weaning-not even to adult recruitment. At least one member of the board has offered the suggestion that the board needs to ramp up their efforts in Unit 16B to achieve the results they are looking for.

The McGrath model is not a program to emulate elsewhere. The consequences of ridding the landscape of predators to enhance moose numbers is an expensive experiment that disregards the impacts of disturbing the natural balance of functioning ecosystems.

The department and the board have significantly liberalized regulations for the killing of predators in recent years. State regulations and policies now allow snaring of brown and black bears, baiting of brown bears, killing sows with cubs and cubs, year-round seasons, unlimited bag limits, and killing animals in their dens and from aircraft. In conjunction with these changes, the board has also reauthorized land and shoot hunting, and has vastly expanded predator control areas. All of this has been done with little scientific or social justification.

The bottom line is bear snaring is indiscriminate, wasteful, and cruel and poses a danger to the public. With unlimited numbers of snares and long open seasons, snaring may kill more bears than is sustainable. Snaring and killing of bears regardless of age, species, and gender is incompatible with the scientific principles and the ethics of modern wildlife management.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A scientific article published in 2011 in *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, (Trends in Intensive Management of Alaska's Grizzly Bears, 1980–2010), documents the board's liberalization of hunting regulations for grizzly bears. The four highly-respected scientists concluded in their report that "*Current attitudes, policies and absence of science-based management of grizzly bears in Alaska are increasingly similar to those that resulted in near extirpation of grizzly bears south of Canada in the 19th and 20th centuries. If current trends continue, they increase risk to portions of the most intact population of grizzly bears in North America*".

Additionally, as bear populations diminish, the viewing public will have fewer opportunities to see bears in the wild which could have significant economic impacts for the wildlife viewing businesses around the state.

More bears will become food-conditioned causing a danger to people, families and communities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Bear snaring is wasteful and requires no salvage of meat, only the hide and skull. Trappers will still be allowed to harvest a bear under trapping licenses by using a firearm and bait stations. Under this method, a trapper can be selective in harvesting a bear and avoid taking non target species and cubs or females with cubs.

Managing bear populations using modern wildlife management practices will result in healthier ecosystems including the tendency for ungulates to over browse areas if predators are absent.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaskans and visitors who value wildlife and sound biological management of our wildlife resources and who want to view wildlife will benefit. Tourism-related businesses will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer as a result of this proposal being adopted. The practice of bear snaring only promotes waste and disrespect for wildlife.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There are no other solutions. The snaring of bears must be halted.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Wildlife Alliance EG042913826

PROPOSAL 56 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Remove the salvage requirements for brown bear meat taken at bait stations in the Interior Region as follows:

Repeal the meat salvage requirement for brown bear over bait in the Interior Region.

ISSUE: Brown bear salvage requirements that force hunters to salvage meat that may be inedible. Also it is confusing to hunters because salvage requirements are different for brown bears and black bears.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unreasonable salvage requirement for meat that may be inedible.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Keeps hunters from being required to salvage poor quality meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those hunters who harvest brown bears over bait who do not wish or are unable to eat the meat that has been harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? None. Meat may still be salvaged if it is determined to be of good quality.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Require same salvage criteria as black bear. Rejected because brown bear are more likely to be consuming rotten meat prior to harvest, rendering their meat inedible.

PROPOSED BY: Joel Doner EG042313754

PROPOSAL 57 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Remove the salvage requirement for brown bear meat taken at bait stations in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 22D as follows:

For brown bears taken over bait in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 22D the edible meat **does not need to be salvaged.**

ISSUE: Salvage for brown/grizzly bears taken in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 21D. All of the meat must be salvaged. There is no exemption for brown or grizzly bears in the definitions of edible meat like there is for black bear. Also black bears have a time line for meat salvage requirements which says the meat must be salvaged between January 1 and May 31. There is currently no timeline for grizzly/brown bear meat salvage like there is for black bear. Establishing a similar timeline for brown/grizzly bear meat salvage is the minimum action needed. However, I propose to eliminate the requirement to salvage meat from brown/grizzly bears taken over bait. When the Board of Game discussed the issue of baiting grizzlies in Unit 20C the vast majority of the discussion was on whether to allow it or not. The meat salvage requirement was more of an afterthought that was not discussed. Eliminating any salvage requirements for brown/grizzly bear whether taken over bait or not on a sport hunt (nonsubsistence hunt) will align all areas of the state and make the salvage requirements uniform.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Confusion will remain when brown/grizzly bear meat must be salvaged and how much must be salvaged.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Brown/grizzly bear hunters who are in remote locations where meat salvage requirements will affect whether they choose to shoot a grizzly. The Board of Game has been liberalizing the brown/grizzly seasons and the methods and means restrictions but then places a salvage requirement that has the opposite effect.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Placing a separate definition for grizzly salvage that listed only the hind quarters as edible meat. I rejected it because I would like to see the salvage requirement eliminated entirely because I do not know anyone to give the meat to.

PROPOSED BY: Smokey Don Duncan

EG050113869

PROPOSAL 58 - 5 AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides. Remove the salvage requirement for brown bear taken over bait stations in Units 12, 20C, 20E, and 21D as follows:

5AAC 92.220. Salvage of game meat, furs, and hides.

(5) all edible meat of a brown bear taken under a subsistence registration permit in Unit 9(B), all drainages in Unit 9(E) that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of

Unit 9(D) and 9(E), Unit 17, Unit 18, that portion of Units 19(A) and 19(B) downstream and including the Aniak River drainage, Unit 21(D), Unit 22, Unit 23, Unit 24, and Unit 26(A) shall be salvaged for human consumption; salvage of the hide or skull are optional; [ALL EDIBLE MEAT OF A BROWN BEAR TAKEN UNDER A PERMIT ISSUED UNDER 5AAC 92.044 IN UNITS 12, 20(C), 20(E), AND 21(D) SHALL BE SALVAGED;]

ISSUE: The requirement to salvage all edible meat from a brown bear if the bear is taken at a black bear bait site in Region III. Note: This regulation change should be applied to units in Regions II and IV if adopted.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Salvage of brown bear meat is only required when bears are taken in a brown bear subsistence area under a special permit. Applying this condition to brown bears taken at a black bear bait site is unnecessary and confusing to hunters since meat salvage in all other general season hunts is not required.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The quality of the resource harvested will be improved by allowing those hunters that harvest brown bears for the meat to salvage as much of the animal as they desire, while hunters that do not consider brown bear meat edible will not be unnecessarily obligated to retrieve all the edible meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters that do not consider brown bear meat edible. Additionally, by repealing this regulation enforcement will benefit by less confusing regulations imposed on hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one should be impacted by repealing this regulation. Individuals wanting brown bear meat could make arrangements to salvage the meat from a harvested bear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Changing the meat salvage requirements for brown bear, all edible meat, to match the regulation for black bear, meat from the four quarters and backstrap. This was rejected because most hunters do not consider brown bear meat edible compared to other big game animals such as moose or caribou. It would also still be confusing to hunters since black bear meat salvage is only required from January 1 to May 31 but brown bear meat salvage is required any time a black bear baiting season is open.

PROPOSED BY: Bob Ermold

EG042213753

McGrath Area – Units 19, 21A & 21E

PROPOSAL 59 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Lengthen the nonresident moose season in Unit 21A as follows:

Moose season for Unit 21A would be September 5-25 for both residents and nonresidents, with residents being able to take any bull and nonresidents restricted to moose with 50-inch antlers or four brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: I would like the nonresident moose season in Unit 21A changed from September 5-20 to September 5-25. I have been hunting in Unit 21A since 1990 and I saw the moose population slowly decline, which is why the season was shortened several years ago. However, in the past five years, or so, while flying over the unit during the month of September, I have seen a steady increase in moose numbers. There are a lot of bulls and I am seeing a lot of young bulls and many cows with calves. I think the moose have turned a corner and are on the increase. The bull-to-cow ratio seems to be very good also. The only thing this proposal would do is give the nonresidents an additional 5 days to hunt when the rut was on. Nonresidents are limited to 50-inch plus bulls so that is the only moose that would be affected and that would not affect the overall moose population at all. Residents are now able to hunt to September 25 and they can harvest any bull, where nonresidents are restricted to 50-in bulls. I think the overall harvest would increase by approximately five bulls if this regulation was changed and they would be big mature bulls, which do not affect the overall population. It might even save some of the smaller bulls that are killed by residents hunting with nonresident partners and are forced to end their hunt on September 20 and harvest a small bull instead of hunting until September 25 and holding out for a big, mature bull. There was a moose count done this spring but the data has not been studied yet. By the time this proposal is looked at this data will be in and can be considered when making a decision on this proposal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Potentially, more conflicts between local residents from Shageluk and Grayling and nonresident hunters who continue to push down into Unit 21E since the season there is September 5-25 for both residents and nonresidents.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Nonresidents would be able to pass up some smaller 50-inch bulls when it is hot there is little opportunity to harvest mature bulls much before September 20. I think there would be less chance of nonresidents shooting sub-legal bulls if they were able to hunt until September 25. Many resident hunters have friends come up from the lower 48 and hunt with them and they are also forced to end their hunt on September 20. These resident hunters often harvest young bulls under 50 inches since residents are allowed any bull some of these residents are after trophy mature bulls and if they were allowed to hunt till September 25 with their nonresident friends they might be able to hold out for a trophy mature bull.

The quality of guided hunts would also increase since nonresident guided hunters would have the opportunity to hunt later and have a much better chance at a mature bull instead of going home without a bull or settling for a barely legal 50-inch bull.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? I think not only will nonresidents hunters and resident hunters hunting with nonresident partners benefit, but the local hunters out of Shageluk and Grayling will have better hunting in Unit 21E. Many nonresident hunters are now hunting in Unit 21E since it has a longer season ending September 25. There are more conflicts between the local hunters and the hunters that are from outside the area than ever before. Some of these conflicts are residents that have a nonresident with them and they are hunting Unit 21E because of the later season.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer as Unit 21A is far up river from any towns and very few hunters in 21A are local. Almost all hunters in Unit 21A are flying in.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered moving the nonresident season from September 5-20 to September 10-25, so it would be later but the same number of days. I think this would not be much different than September 5-25 since most hunters do not harvest bulls early and would have little or no effect on total harvest in Unit 21A.

PROPOSED BY: Steve White

EG043013840

PROPOSAL 60 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify hunt requirements in Unit 21E as follows:

Unit 21E: Resident Hunters: 1 antlered bull **by registration permit only** September 5-25. We prefer a 7 day reporting period for successful hunters and a 15 day reporting period after September 25 for unsuccessful hunters.

ISSUE: The Grayling Shageluk Anvik and Holy Cross Advisory Committee (GASH AC) believes there is a significant number of unreported moose being harvested in Unit 21E. Hunters will get the green harvest ticket and harvest a moose, and not validate their harvest ticket. They do not send in the report, but instead return to the field and harvest another moose using the same harvest ticket, then another and another. Not only is that practice illegal, but the reported harvest is not accurate. It is also problematic to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) in assessing anything involving moose and documenting the subsistence requirements for the people of Unit 21E.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The GASH AC has been a very proactive advisory committee and has worked hard with the department over the last couple of decades to develop the *Yukon-Innoko Moose Management Plan* designed to ensure the long term stability of the moose in Unit 21E and still provide for the needs of the people who hunt them. There will continue to be many more unreported moose harvested. The department will not have correct data to help assess the amount of moose the people of Unit 21E require for subsistence needs. Furthermore the *Yukon-Innoko Moose Management Plan* that both our advisory committee and the department have worked so hard on to create and maintain will be in jeopardy.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. By requiring a registration permit, there will be a definite reporting period for both successful and unsuccessful hunters. We believe that accurate harvest data are necessary to successfully manage the moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of this resource will benefit. When an accurate count of the number of moose that is needed for the people of Unit 21E, all local and nonlocal hunters will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who chose to hunt illegally by harvesting more than one moose on a harvest ticket. Some people might believe that they are suffering by having to fill out and turn in the registration permit, but actually they should have been doing that with a harvest ticket already. Reporting requirements are a bit more stringent, thus inconvenient.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? There was discussion of making a requirement to display the notched harvest ticket on the animal while transporting it out of the field like they do in other states, but this idea was rejected since we did not believe that it would help as much as the registration hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Grayling Anvik Shageluk Holy Cross Fish and Game Advisory Committee
EG042613803

PROPOSAL 61 - 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts.
Reallocate moose drawing permits in Unit 21E as follows:

Move five DM837 transport permits over to DM839 guided permits. The new regulation would read: 15 DM839 guided moose permits (30% guided) and 35 DM837 transport moose permits (70% transport).

ISSUE: I would like the Board of Game to address the following: At this point there are 50 total permits for Unit 21E, ten DM839 guided permits and 40 DM837 transport permits. There are far more hunters wanting a guided hunt instead of a transport hunt. The number in the DM837 transport hunts have never been filled since put in place. It is desired to move five DM837 transport permits to the DM839 guided permits slot. This would make available 15 DM839 guided permits and 35 DM837 transport permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The DM839 guided hunting permits will suffer from numbers of lost guided hunts while the DM837 transport hunt permits will remain unfilled like in the past 10 years.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would improve the quality of the resource harvested by balancing out the permits between guided and transport hunts. The demands for guided hunts are steadily increasing versus the transport hunts. This proposal would make available more hunts in the field instead of lost hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? We will have more hunters in the field and put an end to lost hunts. A regulated balance of guided permits and transport permits will happen as the types of hunts are changing more than ever.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer with this new solution.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered making all 50 permits, if drawn, as either guided or transported hunts. There will be no conflict on how the permit(s) may be used. This would cause an impact of more guides in an area and local people may not want this.

PROPOSED BY: Bruce Werba

EG042913815

PROPOSAL 62 – 5 AAC 92.123(a)(1). Intensive Management Plans VII. Reauthorize the Unit 19A predation control program as follows:

5AAC 92.123. Intensive Management Plans VII.

(a) **Plans established.** Intensive management plans for the following areas are established in this section:

(1) Unit 19(A) Predation Control Area;

...

(b) Unit 19(A) Predation Control Area: the Unit 19(A) Predation Control Area is established and consists of those portions of the Kuskokwim River drainage within Unit 19(A), encompassing approximately 10,048 square miles; this predator control program does not apply within National Park Service or National Wildlife Refuge lands unless approved by the federal agencies; notwithstanding any other provision in this title, and based on the following information contained in this section, the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may conduct a wolf and black bear and brown bear population reduction or a wolf and black bear and brown bear population regulation program in Unit 19(A) to benefit moose:

(1) the following Wolf and Bear Predation Control Focus Areas are established in the Unit 19(A) Predation Control Area; the areas do not delineate a moose, wolf, or bear population and are not intended to distinguish animals within the areas from populations in Unit 19(A); the purpose is to focus wolf and bear control in a relatively small area where moose numbers can be better estimated, where moose are accessible to hunters, and where harvest can be closely monitored;

(A) the Wolf Predation Control Focus Area (WCFA) encompasses approximately 3,905 square miles within all Unit 19(A) drainages of the Kuskokwim River upstream from and including the Holitna River Drainage; wolf control will be conducted only within the WCFA; the department has

the discretion to adjust the area's size and shape to include up to approximately 4,000 square miles of Unit 19(A);

(B) the Black Bear and Brown Bear Predation Control Focus Area (BCFA) encompasses approximately 534 square miles consisting of those portions of the Kuskokwim River drainage within the area starting at Sleetmute at 61° 42.00' N. lat., 157° 10.00' W. long., then east to 61° 42.00' N. lat., 157° 00.00' W. long., then north to 61° 44.00' N. lat., 157° 00.00' W. long., then east to 61° 44.00' N. lat., 156° 55.00' W. long., then north to 61° 46.00' N. lat., 156° 55.00' W. long., then east to 61° 46.00' N. lat., 156° 50.00' W. long., then north to 61° 48.00' N. lat., 156° 50.00' W. long., then east to 61° 48.00' N. lat., 156° 45.00' W. long., then north to 61° 50.00' N. lat., 156° 45.00' W. long., then east to 61° 50.00' N. lat., 156° 30.00' W. long., then south to 61° 40.00' N. lat., 156° 30.00' W. long., then west to 61° 40.00' N. lat., 156° 45.00' W. long., then south to 61° 18.00' N. lat., 156° 45.00' W. long., then west to 61° 18.00' N. lat., 157° 15.00' W. long., then north to 61° 24.00' N. lat., 157° 15.00' W. long., then east to 61° 24.00' N. lat., 157° 10.00' W. long., then north to 61° 42.00' N. lat., 157° 10.00' W. long.; bear control will be conducted only within the BCFA; the department has the discretion to adjust the area's size and shape up to approximately 800 square miles of Unit 19(A); the BCFA is mostly within the WCFA;

(2) this is a continuing control program that was first authorized by the board in 2004 for wolf control, with bear control added by the board in 2012; it is currently designed to increase moose numbers and harvest in the WCFA and BCFA by reducing predation on moose and is expected to make a contribution to achieving the intensive management (IM) objectives in Unit 19(A);

(3) moose, wolf, black bear, and brown bear objectives are as follows:

(A) the IM population objective established by the board for Units 19(A) and 19(B) is 13,500–16,500 moose; based on the relative sizes of the two units, the proportional population objective for Unit 19(A) alone is 7,600–9,300 moose; the IM moose harvest objective for Units 19(A) and 19(B) is 750–950 moose annually; the proportional harvest objective for Unit 19(A) alone is 400–550 moose annually;

(B) the density objective for moose in the BCFA is 2.0 per square mile (corrected for sightability) during late winter surveys; the annual moose harvest objective for the BCFA is 4 percent of the estimated total number present in late winter surveys;

(C) the post-control wolf population objective for Unit 19(A) is 25–30; the pre-control wolf population in Unit 19(A) was estimated in winter 2006–2007 at 125–150; the minimum of 25 wolves is approximately an 80 percent

reduction from the pre-control population and will ensure that wolves persist in the plan area;

(D) the wolf control objective in the WCFA is to reduce wolf numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control estimate within the WCFA in winter 2006–2007 was 75–100;

(E) the black bear control objective in the BCFA is to reduce black bear numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control black bear population in Unit 19(A) was estimated at 2,500–3,000; the pre-control estimate within the BCFA was 135–160; because the BCFA is a relatively small geographic area, removing black bears from within it will have only a minor effect on the black bear population in Unit 19(A);

(F) the brown bear control objective in the BCFA is to reduce brown bear numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control brown bear population in Unit 19(A) was estimated at 180–210; the pre-control estimate within the BCFA in was 10–15; because the BCFA is a relatively small geographic area, removing brown bears from within it will have only a minor effect on the brown bear population in Unit 19(A);

(4) board findings concerning populations and human use are as follows:

(A) the Unit 19(A) moose population and harvest IM objectives have not been achieved;

(B) the BCFA objectives for moose density and moose harvest have not been achieved;

(C) predation by wolves and bears is an important cause of the failure to achieve population and harvest objectives;

(D) a reduction of wolf and bear predation within the WCFA and BCFA can reasonably be expected to make progress towards achieving the Unit 19(A) IM objectives;

(E) reducing predation is likely to be effective and feasible using recognized and prudent active management techniques and based on scientific information;

(F) reducing predation is likely to be effective given land ownership patterns;

(5) authorized methods and means are as follows:

(A) hunting and trapping of wolves and hunting of black bears and brown bears by the public in Unit 19(A) during the term of this program may occur

as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including use of motorized vehicles;

(B) notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may allow department employees to conduct aerial, land and shoot, or ground based lethal removal of wolves and black bears and brown bears using state owned, privately owned, or chartered equipment, including helicopters, under AS 16.05.783;

(C) notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land and shoot permits using fixed-wing aircraft as a method of wolf removal under AS 16.05.783;

(6) time frame is as follows:

(A) through June 30, 2020, the commissioner may authorize removal of wolves and black bears and brown bears in Unit 19(A);

(B) annually, the department shall, to the extent practicable, provide to the board a report of program activities conducted during the preceding 12 months, including implementation activities, the status of the moose, wolf and bear populations, and recommendations for changes, if necessary to achieve the objectives of the plan;

(7) the commissioner will review, modify or suspend program activities as follows:

(A) when wolf surveys or accumulated information from department personnel, hunters, trappers, and permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers in Unit 19(A) below the control objective of 25–30 wolves specified in this subsection;

(B) when the moose density and harvest objectives within the BCFA specified in this subsection are achieved.

ISSUE: The Unit 19A Intensive Management Plan will expire on June 30, 2014. The program was first authorized by the Board of Game (board) in 2004 for wolf control only; bear control was added in 2012. The department recommends reauthorization of the plan to increase the moose population and make progress towards achieving the intensive management (IM) objectives for moose.

This placeholder proposal will reauthorize the program for a six year period from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2020 and will simplify codified language. It includes options for aerial wolf control conducted by public permittees and the Department of Fish and Game (department), and aerial black and brown bear control conducted by the department only. Changes to this proposal will be included in the department's analyses and recommendations of proposals that will be

made available for public review prior to the board meeting. Additional details will also be made available for public review in a separate IM operational plan prior to the board meeting.

IM objectives for Unit 19A have not been achieved. Only wolf control was conducted between December 2004 and April 2013. Progress towards achieving unit-wide IM objectives was monitored in a 3,853 mi² Wolf Control Focus Area (WCFA). Public permittees using fixed-wing aircraft reduced wolves in the WCFA by at least 60% below the pre-control level during most years since control started in 2004. However, no measurable increase in moose numbers has been detected within the WCFA, and the moose hunting season has been closed in the area (except in the Lime Village Management Area) since fall 2006. Research conducted in nearby Unit 19D-East indicates that control of both wolves and bears will be required to achieve an increase in the number of moose. The department plans to conduct black and brown bear control within a 534 mi² Bear Control Focus Area (BCFA) in May 2013. The objective is to reduce bear numbers to the lowest level possible.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The existing predation control programs will expire and predation control will stop in Unit 19A.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The number of moose available for harvest should increase with reauthorization.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and others interested in higher moose numbers will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those philosophically opposed to predator control are the most vocal group likely to oppose this proposal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The department considered allowing this control program to expire due to lack of any detectable increase in number of moose. This was rejected because we expect an increase in moose numbers if bear control is implemented and control of both wolves and bears continues during the proposed life of this program.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613914

PROPOSAL 63 – 5 AAC 92.123(a)(2). Intensive Management Plans VII. Reauthorize the Unit 19D-East predation control program as follows:

5 AAC 92.123. Intensive Management Plans VII. (c) is entirely deleted and replaced by the following:

...
(2) Unit 19(D)-East Predation Control Area:

...
(c) Unit 19(D)-East Predation Control Area: the Unit 19(D) East Predation Control Area is established and consists of those portions of the Kuskokwim River drainage within Unit

19(D) upstream from the Selatna River drainage and the Black River drainage, encompassing approximately 8,513 square miles; this predation control program does not apply to any National Park Service or National Wildlife Refuge lands unless approved by the federal agencies; notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, and based on the following information contained in this section, the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may conduct a wolf and a black bear and a brown bear population reduction or a wolf and black bear and brown bear population regulation program in Unit 19(D)-East to benefit moose:

(1) the following Wolf and Bear Predation Control Focus Areas are established in the Unit 19(D)-East Predation Control Area; the areas do not delineate a moose, wolf, or bear population and are not intended to distinguish animals within the zones from populations in Unit 19(D)-East; the purpose is to focus wolf and bear control in a relatively small area where moose numbers can be better estimated, where moose are accessible to hunters, and where harvest can be closely monitored;

(A) the Wolf Predation Control Focus Area (WCFA) encompasses approximately 4,500 square miles within that portion of Unit 19(D) upstream of, but not including, the Black River drainage and upstream of and including the Little Selatna River drainage and downstream of, but not including, Fourth of July Creek, Soda Creek, Slow Fork, and Tonzona River drainages, surrounding the villages of McGrath, Takotna, Medfra and Nikolai; wolf control will be conducted only within the WCFA; the department will have the discretion to adjust its size and shape to include up to approximately 5,100 square miles of Unit 19(D)-East;

(B) the Black Bear and Brown Bear Predation Control Focus Area (BCFA) encompasses approximately 528 square miles consisting of those portions of the Kuskokwim River drainage starting northwest of McGrath at 63° 04.00' N. lat., 155° 50.00' W. long., then east to 63° 04.00' N. lat., 154° 50.00' W. long., then south to 62° 54.00' N. lat., 154° 50.00' W. long., then west to 62° 54.00' N. lat., 155° 25.00' W. long., then south to 62° 50.00' N. lat., 155° 25.00' W. long., then west to 62° 50.00' N. lat., 155° 30.00' W. long., then south to 62° 48.00' N. lat., 155° 30.00' W. long., then west to 62° 48.00' N. lat., 155° 35.00' W. long., then south to 62° 42.00' N. lat., 155° 35.00' W. long., then west to 62° 42.00' N. lat., 155° 55.00' W. long., then north to 62° 50.00' N. lat., 155° 55.00' W. long., then east to 62° 50.00' N. lat., 155° 50.00' W. long., then north to the point of beginning at 63° 04.00' N. lat., 155° 50.00' W. long., surrounding the village of McGrath; bear control will be conducted only within the BCFA; the department will have the discretion to adjust its size and shape up to approximately 680 square miles of Unit 19(D)-East; the BCFA is within the WCFA;

(2) this is a continuing control program that was first authorized by the board in 1995; wolf control began in winter 2003–2004 and bear control began with nonlethal removal of bears in the BCFA during May 2003 and 2004; the control program is currently designed to increase moose numbers and harvest in the WCFA and BCFA

by reducing predation on moose and is expected to make a contribution to achieving the intensive management (IM) objectives in Unit 19(D)-East;

(3) moose, wolf, black bear, and brown bear objectives are as follows:

(A) moose IM objectives established by the board for Unit 19(D)-East are for a population of 6,000–8,000 and an annual harvest of 400–600 ;

(B) the moose density objective for the BCFA is 2.0 per square mile (corrected for sightability) in fall surveys; the moose harvest objective for the BCFA is 4 percent of the estimated total number present in fall surveys;

(C) the post-control wolf population control objective for Unit 19(D)-East is 40 wolves remaining; the pre-control wolf population in Unit 19(D)-East was estimated in February 2001 at 198 wolves; a minimum population of 40 wolves is approximately an 80 percent reduction for the pre-control population and will ensure that wolves persist in the plan area;

(D) the wolf control objective in the WCFA is to reduce wolf numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control estimate within the WCFA in 2001 was 68;

(E) the black bear control objective in the BCFA is to reduce black bear numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control black bear population in Unit 19(D)-East was estimated at 1,700; the pre-control estimate within the BCFA was approximately 130; because the BCFA is a relatively small geographic area, removing black bears from within it will have only a minor effect on the black bear population in Unit 19(D)-East;

(F) the brown bear control objective in the BCFA is to reduce brown bear numbers to the lowest level possible; the pre-control brown bear population in Unit 19(D)-East was 128; the pre-control estimate within the BCFA was 9; because the BCFA is a relatively small geographic area, removing brown bears from within it will have only a minor effect on the brown bear population in Unit 19(D)-East;

(4) board findings concerning populations and human use are as follows:

(A) the Unit 19(D)-East moose population and harvest objectives have not been achieved;

(B) the BCFA objectives for moose density and moose harvest have not been achieved;

(C) predation by wolves and bears is an important cause of the failure to achieve population and harvest objectives;

(D) a reduction of wolf and bear predation within the WCFA and BCFA can reasonably be expected to make progress towards achieving the Unit 19(D)-East intensive management objectives;

(E) reducing predation is likely to be effective and feasible using recognized and prudent active management techniques and based on scientific information;

(F) reducing predation is likely to be effective given land ownership patterns;

(5) authorized methods and means are as follows:

(A) hunting and trapping of wolves and hunting of black bears and brown bears by the public in Unit 19(D)-East during the term of this program may occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title, including use of motorized vehicles;

(B) notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may allow department employees to conduct aerial, land and shoot, or ground based lethal removal of wolves and black bears and brown bears using state owned, privately owned, or chartered equipment, including helicopters, under AS 16.05.783;

(C) notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may issue public aerial shooting permits or public land and shoot permits using fixed-wing aircraft as a method of wolf removal under AS 16.05.783;

(6) time frame is as follows:

(A) through June 30, 2020, the commissioner may authorize removal of wolves and black and brown bears in Unit 19(D)-East;

(B) annually, the department shall, to the extent practicable, provide to the board a report of program activities conducted during the preceding 12 months, including implementation activities, the status of the moose, wolf,

and bear populations, and recommendations for changes, if necessary to achieve the objectives of the plan;

(7) the commissioner will review, modify or suspend program activities as follows:

(A) when the wolf surveys or accumulated information from department personnel, hunters, trappers, and permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers in Unit 19(D)-East below the control objective of 40 wolves specified in this subsection;

(B) when the moose density and harvest objectives within the BCFA specified in this subsection are achieved.

ISSUE: The Unit 19D-East Intensive Management Plan will expire on June 30, 2014. The program was first authorized by the Board of Game (board) in 1995. Wolf control began in 2003. Bear control began with nonlethal removal of bears by the Department of Fish and Game (department) during May 2003 and 2004, and continued with lethal, public removal starting in 2010. The department recommends reauthorization of the plan to increase the moose population and continue progress towards achieving intensive management (IM) objectives established for this area.

This placeholder proposal will reauthorize the program for a six year period from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2020 and will simplify codified language. It includes options for aerial wolf control conducted by public permittees and the department, and aerial black and brown bear control conducted by the department only. Changes to this proposal will be included in the department's analyses and recommendations of proposals that will be made available for public review prior to the board meeting. Additional details will also be made available for public review in a separate IM operational plan prior to the board meeting.

Unit-wide IM objectives for Unit 19D-East have not been achieved, but progress has been made. Within the 1,118 mi² Upper Kuskokwim Villages Moose Management Area (MMA) where wolf and bear control have been conducted, the number of moose increased from 868 in fall 2001 to 1,820 in fall 2009. However, numbers declined to 1,337 by 2012. The decline may be due to combination of deep snow winters and increased bear predation. Harvest of moose increased in the MMA from 29 in 2001 to 69 in 2012. However, the present harvest will not be sustainable if moose numbers continue to decline.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The existing predation control programs will expire.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The number of moose available for harvest should increase with reauthorization.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and others interested in higher moose numbers will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those philosophically opposed to predator control are the most likely to oppose this proposal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered allowing this control program to expire. This was rejected because ongoing predator control will likely be necessary to achieve prey objectives.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613915

PROPOSAL 64 - 5 AAC 84.270. Fur bearer trapping. Extend the lynx trapping season in Unit 19 as follows:

Extend the lynx trapping season in Unit 19 to run concurrently with the open season on wolverine in Unit 19; November 1-March 31.

ISSUE: Currently in Unit 19, lynx trapping ends after February 28. The proposal is to extend the season through March creating easier and more practical enforcement by the troopers; no waste of lynx from incidental catches and more accurate sealing data.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Enforcement by troopers is very difficult because lynx and wolverine sets are very similar. There is bound to be incidental catches resulting in the potential waste of the animal, more work for the state, and some trappers may not turn in their March catches making sealing data inaccurate.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Potentially increased harvest of lynx may reduce pressure on hare population resulting in a greater prey base over a longer period of time. This could benefit all predator populations by smoothing out some of the peaks and crashes on population numbers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Department of Fish and Game, troopers and trappers.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered the idea of making sets that would only target wolverine but it would not be a viable solution because any set that a wolverine is susceptible to a lynx is also susceptible to.

PROPOSED BY: Rhone Baumgartner EG050113880

PROPOSAL 65 - 5 AAC 85.055 Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a registration sheep hunt for residents in Unit 19C as follows:

Establish a residents-only registration hunt for sheep in 19C with a limit of one sheep with $\frac{3}{4}$ -curl or less, excluding lambs and ewes accompanied by lambs, and excluding rams with broomed horns, from October 1-April 30. Prohibit use of aircraft for access to hunt sheep except into and out of the McGrath, Nikolai, and Telida airports. Hunters are required to call-in to the area management biologist within three days of the beginning and the end of each hunt, and hunters must report any sheep harvested after each hunt. The number of hunters in the field may be limited at the discretion of the area management biologist in order to prevent overharvest. Hunt will be closed by emergency order when the total harvest reaches ten sheep, or prior to this at the discretion of area management biologist. Standard horn sealing requirements do not apply for this hunt: horns must be sealed within 30 days of the close of season rather than 30 days after kill. This hunt is eligible for proxy hunting for elders over 65 years old.

ISSUE: Current regulations for harvesting Dall sheep in Unit 19 do not provide Alaska residents living in the communities of McGrath, Nikolai, Takotna, and Telida a reasonable opportunity to practice their recognized customary and traditional subsistence use of Dall sheep. Regulations currently provide for nonresident trophy hunters' needs, but are inadequate to provide for the needs of Alaska residents, especially those living in Unit 19.

For example, in 2011 79 nonresident hunters harvested 66 full-curl Dall sheep rams from Unit 19C and had an 84% success rate. 59 Alaska resident hunters from all areas harvested only ten full-curl rams and had only a 17% success rate. Four sheep hunters living in Unit 19 harvested zero sheep and had a 0% success rate.

Local residents of Unit 19 have a long term pattern of sheep hunting, recognized as customary and traditional by the Alaska Board of Game in 2010 (5 AAC 99.025(a)(10)), but most residents who wish to hunt sheep have not had a reasonable opportunity to do so for many years. Access during the current fall season is only possible via small aircraft or specialized shallow-draft boats and motors that are cost prohibitive to the majority of Alaskans, and especially to residents of Unit 19 where opportunities for cash income are very limited. In addition to the problems related to the timing of the current fall season, the full curl ram regulations in Unit 19C prevent most non-guided resident hunters from harvesting sheep, as full curl rams are scarce in the area due to regular high harvests by guided nonresident hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Residents of Unit 19 will continue to suffer from the lack of a reasonable opportunity to harvest Dall sheep, a formerly important source of food and clothing in the area. In particular, elderly community members will continue to suffer from the lack of Dall sheep, an important and desired part of their diet that some have not had access to for decades. Younger generations will not be able to learn the knowledge and skills related to traditional patterns of sheep hunting, use, and respect that have long been an important part of the culture in Unit 19. Communities in the region will continue to suffer from a lack of Dall sheep meat during important community gatherings such as funeral potlatches and holiday gatherings. Skills and knowledge related to sheep hunting that have been developed over many generations will likely be lost within the next 20 years.

There will be a greater risk of food shortage in the future, as residents of Unit 19 currently depend almost completely on moose and black bear for meat. In the past, the ability to harvest other big game animals such as caribou and Dall sheep provided security against changes in the local moose population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This season will likely reduce competition between trophy hunters and subsistence hunters, as sheep harvested under this hunt will not be full-curl rams. Subsistence hunters will no longer need to attempt to harvest full-curl rams to meet their Dall sheep subsistence needs as is required under current regulations, and it is possible that slightly more full-curl rams will be available to trophy hunters as a result. Sheep with less than ¾ curl often provide a higher quality meat than full-curl rams, and sheep harvested in this season would have a higher quality skin with thicker wool, which is more desirable for use as clothing or sleeping mats than sheep harvested in the current season.

This season would not cause harm to the Dall sheep populations in Unit 19C, as area biologists have stated that an additional harvest of ten sheep would be sustainable in the region.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents would benefit, especially residents of Unit 19 who would be able to access Dall sheep via snow machines in winter. This would benefit the majority of residents of Unit 19 who do not have access to small aircraft or specially equipped shallow water boats and motors for hunting during the current fall season. Also, trophy hunters may benefit due to less competition from subsistence hunters for full-curl rams as stated previously.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1. Leaving the current Dall sheep hunting season as it currently stands. This was rejected because it does not provide an opportunity for Alaska residents living in the communities of McGrath, Nikolai, Takotna, and Telida a reasonable opportunity to follow for their recognized customary and traditional subsistence use of Dall sheep as described under (2).

2. Extending the Dall sheep season for Alaska residents beyond the current September 20 close of season. This would provide Alaska residents more of an opportunity to harvest Dall sheep than guided nonresidents, but would not address the problem of too few full-curl rams due to high harvests by trophy hunters during the current season. This would also possibly increase competition between sport and subsistence hunters in Unit 19.

PROPOSED BY: Nikolai Edzeno' Village Council

EG042913819

(This proposal will also be considered at the Arctic/Western Region meeting in January 2014; see proposal #5).

PROPOSAL 66 - 5 AAC 85.050. Hunting seasons and bag limits for musk oxen. Create a musk oxen hunt in Unit 18 and 19 as follows:

Allow for a subsistence musk ox hunt to occur in the various populations of the Unit 18 and 19 mainland herd by close proximity communities.

ISSUE: The current musk oxen population on the mainland is growing in various location of Units 18 and 19. Increased sightings, encounters, and growing incidences of musk oxen taking refuge from predators near or in the villages suggests that the mainland musk oxen population is growing.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will continue to not know what the mainland musk ox population is and the corresponding harvestable surplus. The State of Alaska and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must determine the population and identify the harvestable surplus and allow for a hunt. The population cannot go unmonitored and harvest restriction cannot go on forever.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal would force the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to do their job in effectively monitoring the mainland musk ox populations in Units 18 and 19.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence hunters in Unit 18 and 19 initially and perhaps other hunters at a later time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one. Additional hunting opportunity is always most beneficial.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Create a Unit 18 and 19 Musk Ox Management Committee.

PROPOSED BY: Myron Naneng Sr., AVCP

EG042413785

(This proposal will also be considered at the Interior Region meeting in February 2014; see proposal # 10).

PROPOSAL 67 - 5 AAC 92.450. Description of game management units. Modify the boundaries for Units 18, 19, and 21 as follows:

Create new boundary language for Unit 18 to read:

The area draining into the Yukon River downstream from a line starting at the downriver boundary of Paimiut on the north bank of the Yukon River then across the river to the south bank to the northern terminus of the Paimiut Portage, proceed south through the Portage to the mouth of Hooking Creek on the northeast corner of Arhymot Lake, follow the northern and western bank of the lake to the head of Crooked Creek, follow the north bank of the creek downstream to the northern terminus of the Crooked Creek to Mud Creek Tramway, follow the tramway south to Mud Creek, follow its west bank downstream to First Slough, follow the west bank of the slough downstream to its confluence to the Kuskokwim River,

Create new language for Unit 19 to read: The area draining into the Kuskokwim River upstream from the confluence of the First Slough and the Kuskokwim River; and the area draining into Crook Creek's south bank upstream from the northern terminus of the Mud Creek to Crook Creek Portage Tramway. (All are clearly visible land marks.)

Create new language for Unit 21 to read: The area draining into the Yukon River upstream from the down river boundary of Paimiut on the north shore of the Yukon River and, directly across the river, the northern terminus of the Paimiut Portage on the south shore of the Yukon River. (Both clearly visible land marks.)

The area **east** of the boundary and **south** of the **High Portage Ridge** would be part of **Unit 19**, since this area drains into the Kuskokwim River. (Clear visible land marks.)

The area **east** of the boundary and **north** of the **High Portage Ridge** would be part of **Unit 21**, since this area drains into the Yukon River. (Clear visible land marks.)

ISSUE: The confusing and unclear boundary dividing Units 18, 19, and 21.

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Many hunters and enforcement personnel would still not know where the real boundaries are. There is no definite language explaining where the “straight line” begins or ends. Does the line start at the “downriver”, “center” or “upriver” boundary of Paimiut or Lower Kalskag?

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The boundaries would be clear, definite and visible. There would be no more confusion as to where the boundaries begin and end.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and enforcement personnel would know exactly what unit they are in. All hunters traveling up river on the Yukon and Kuskokwim rivers to Units 19 and 21. All hunters from Lower Kalskag and Kalskag would benefit most by regaining their customary and traditional hunting lands in Units 18 and 21. These lands are presently included in Units 18 and 21. This would also clarify the issue of “no man’s land” east of the boundary line and north of Kalskag and Lower Kalskag and south of High Portage Ridge. High Portage Ridge geographically separates the Yukon River and Kuskokwim River drainages. All drainages north of the ridge flowing into the Yukon would be in Unit 21 and all drainages south of the Ridge flowing into the Kuskokwim would be in Unit 19.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer if this proposal is adopted. The Paimiut Portage is a well-established historical trail that connects the central Kuskokwim and Yukon rivers. It is repaired, remarked and maintained annually, after freeze up, by hunters and fishers from Kalskag and Lower Kalskag. The Paimiut Portage is used daily during the fall, winter and spring seasons by all hunters, fishers, trappers and visitors from the lower and central Kuskokwim River and from the central Yukon River villages.

The Mud Creek to Crooked Creek Tramway is a part of a historical personal/commercial route connecting travelers to/from the Kuskokwim River villages and the Yukon River villages.

Residents of Lower Kalskag and Kalskag were involved in the modification of this proposal. They endorse and support this proposal and urge the Board of Game to pass it as the best choice for redefining the presently unclear and confusing boundaries of Units 18, 19 and 21.

The residents of Lower Kalskag and Kalskag live, hunt, fish, trap and gather in this land, as have their ancestors. They do so with honor and respect to the land and its first inhabitants-the water, plants, berries, trees, fish and game. They do so following what the land and seasons offer of their renewable food resources. They have always had customary and traditional seasonal use of this land and its resources.

Contrary to what you may hear from some residents of the lower Kuskokwim River area, they do not have year-round customary and traditional use of this land and its resources, for this reason residents of Lower Kalskag and Kalskag urge the Board of Game to honor this proposal to modify the boundaries, move the Kuskokwim terminal out of Lower Kalskag downstream to a known visible location, and return their customary and traditional hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering lands. They ask this especially for the benefit of our youth and young adults, who would be made criminals if this change is not adopted and passed, because they will continue to hunt in lands now classified as part of Units 18 and 21, which are really in Unit 19.

We know this land and its resources. We know how, where and when to travel on this land, to hunt, fish, trap and gather. We do not hunt, fish, trap, gather and travel by paper. We hunt, fish, trap and gather using our natural land marks-rivers, sloughs, streams, lakes, hills and trails as guides and boundaries. We use what we can see, feel, hear and taste as our guides. We are part of the land and its resources-it feeds us, clothes us, shelters us, comforts us and connects us to our Creator. It is part of us, as we are part of it, because we live on it. We are one with the land.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050613951

Galena Area – Units 21B, 21C, 21D & 24

PROPOSAL 68 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the Unit 21D moose permit hunt, DM818, to a general hunt as follows:

Remove moose hunt DM818 for the Papa Willie Creek area from the drawing permit process and return it to just a general hunt with a harvest card.

ISSUE: The drawing permit hunt, DM818, for the Papa Willie Creek area in Unit 21D is not needed. There are 25 permits available for issue and for 2013 there were only two applicants and 23 leftover permits. Every year there are a high number of leftover permits not filled. I hunted this area in 2012 and never saw another hunter or another boat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Current rules don't allow hunters who want to hunt this under-subscribed area to get a permit for the same hunt every year.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who like to hunt this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one because very few people apply for this hunt and/or hunt this area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Allow leftover drawing permits to be issued to hunters who drew the permit the year before. This should be a statewide proposal.

PROPOSED BY: Mel Erickson EG041013745

PROPOSAL 69 - 5 AAC 92.069. Special provisions for moose drawing permit hunts.

Allow moose hunting guides in Units 21D and 24 to select another client if original applicant is unable to hunt as follows:

If a successful applicant dies or is seriously injured, contracts a serious illness or is the victim of a disaster such as a tornado, flood, hurricane, fire, etc., which prevents the successful applicant from participating in the hunt, the department shall allow the contracting guide who the successful applicant was contracted to hunt with, to select another client to replace the client who cannot participate in the hunt.

ISSUE: Guides losing clients due to death, serious injury or illness,,or acts of nature such as tornadoes, hurricanes and fires, etc.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides will lose clients due to no fault of the client, or guide. The department will lose Pittman-Robertson funds.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The guide who will take the person hunting and the people who get the meat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil Umphenour

EG050313888

PROPOSAL 70 - 5 AAC 85.045(22). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Retain the winter registration moose hunt in Unit 24B (RM833) as follows:

Moose:

Unit 24B Remainder:

Residents: one bull, harvest ticket, September 1- September 25

Residents: one antlered bull by permit, available online at <http://hunt.alaska.gov> or in person in Hughes, Allakaket, or Fairbanks beginning December 14; December 15-April 15.

Nonresidents: one bull with 50-inch antlers, or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side, harvest ticket, September 5- September 25

ISSUE: The winter bull moose hunt (RM833) is due to sunset in regulatory year 2014. The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee feels this hunt should continue to provide winter bull moose hunting opportunity in a portion of Unit 24B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The regulation will sunset in 2014, and winter moose harvest opportunity will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The opportunity for winter moose hunting spreads use of bull moose harvest into areas that cannot be hunted in the fall.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who did not harvest a bull moose in the fall hunt would have additional opportunity to take an antlered bull moose while trapping or wood cutting. This is a remote area that entails expensive travel, and a low density moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There is no user group adversely affected by the current regulation that is due to sunset.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Hunting antlerless moose with this season, but the current moose population in Unit 24B cannot support cow harvest at this time.

PROPOSED BY: Koyukuk River Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG022513736

PROPOSAL 71 - 5 AAC 92.540(8)(b). Controlled use areas. Modify the Kanuti Controlled Use Area boundaries as follows:

Reinstate the original dimensions of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area to circa 2009, when the Board of Game moved to reduce the size of the Controlled Use Area.

ISSUE: The reduction of the size of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area. The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee believes that the original boundary of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area should be reinstated. The Department of Fish and Game is actively conducting predator control in the surrounding area to attempt to bolster the moose population for the people of the Koyukuk River area. Reinstating the original size of the Kanuti Controlled Use Area would help preserve the intention of the original Kanuti Controlled Use Area, which is still needed today.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The proximity of the Kanuti Flats to Bettles air taxi operations would allow too much hunting pressure for this limited moose resource. Without the entire controlled use area there is potential loss of harvestable moose by the residents of the Koyukuk River drainage, failure to meet our subsistence needs.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All people who hunt this area who are seeking quality hunting that also provides for a healthy moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who hunt exclusively with aircraft.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Koyukuk River Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG042613804

PROPOSAL 72 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow the taking of brown bears at black bear bait stations in Units 24C and 24D as follows:

Allow grizzly bears to be taken at black bear bait stations in Units 24C and 24D.

ISSUE: Grizzly bears at black bear stations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will be high predation on moose by grizzly bear, and black bear bait stations will become useless once grizzly bears start coming to them.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All moose hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Virgil Umphenour EG050313889

PROPOSAL 73 - 5 AAC 84.270(5). Fur bearer trapping. Extend the lynx season in Unit 21 as follows:

Lynx, Unit 21, November 1- **March 31** [LAST DAY OF FEBUARY]

ISSUE: Inconsistent trapping regulations. The season for trapping wolverine in Unit 21 ends March 31. The season for trapping lynx in Unit 21 ends February 28. That leaves a month in which one can incidentally catch lynx in a wolverine set. Lynx sets and wolverine sets are nearly identical and incidentally caught lynx must be forfeited to the state. In most years, the incidentally caught lynx pelts from Unit 21 in March are still prime, sellable pelts. This results in lost opportunity for those who wish to trap wolverine in March who catch a lynx in their set.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued loss of opportunity for the trappers in Unit 21 who wish to trap lynx in March. Continued loss of opportunity for the trapper who does not wish to target lynx in March, but catches them incidentally to setting traps for wolverine.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All trappers who are targeting wolverine in March in Unit 21.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Middle Yukon River Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050113859

Northeast Alaska – Units 25A, 25B, 25D, 26B & 26C

PROPOSAL 74 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Change resident season for caribou within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area and create a youth hunt as follows:

Resident only caribou season from August 1 thru August 25 with a youth hunt only for a week in that mix.

ISSUE: Increase the number of days for resident only hunts in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area so residents can hunt for a longer period of time.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We need affordable access to hunting areas such as these not only to access the resource but to teach our young people about hunting. We need to teach young people to become hunting advocates and this proposal will help to provide that opportunity which is so important to the future of hunting in this state. Residents only should be offered more time to access the resource than they are now with an August school start date in mind. Many of us cannot afford expensive fly-ins and this is a road accessible area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It will improve the quality of the hunt by keeping down the crowds from outside.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nonresidents because they will have a bit of a narrower window. The constitutional statement that the resources shall be allocated for maximum benefit of the state residents should be considered and adhered to as well.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Residents only but that is too harsh as the people of the state do benefit from nonresidents utilizing the resource as well.

PROPOSED BY: Jeff Alling EG043013848

PROPOSAL 75 - 5 AAC 85.025(22). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Change the resident caribou season and create a youth hunt in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area

Residents Only: August 13 – August 20.

Hunting in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA) is restricted to residents only from August 13 - August 20, north of the north bank of the Kanuti River.

August 13-16 is a youth hunt for Alaska residents, 17 and younger, (four days)
August 17-20 is for all Alaska residents, any legal age, (four days).

Possible Bonus: The first week in September that encompasses the entire Labor Day weekend would be a nice addition to the resident only hunting period from August 13-August 20. This would give residents an eight day period in August and a seven day period in September to enjoy a less crowded hunting environment and kids would have better opportunities.

The focus of this proposal is for caribou hunting but sheep season opens on August 10 and moose on September 1 so the Board of Game has the opportunity to include other big game species to create even more opportunity if they choose.

ISSUE: Overcrowding in the DHCMA. This caribou hunt has been featured in several outdoor articles and it has become very popular with nonresident hunters. This hunt has a generous bag limit and is open for ten months. The most popular months of hunting are August and September and eight days of resident only hunting in August before school starts is not an unreasonable request.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The board needs to start creating some opportunities for young Alaskans and their parents. With all the attacks on hunting and firearm ownership, the board has an excellent opportunity to create a positive situation for our youth. We can't lose the kids if we want our hunting traditions to continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This will result in a less crowded hunt for Alaskans and give our youth a reasonable opportunity for success. This will improve the quality or experience of hunting in the DHCMA for both residents and nonresidents. No one enjoys crowded conditions.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Alaska residents and nonresidents.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Maybe a nonresident who wants to hunt between August 13-20. The nonresidents have 40 plus weeks to hunt the DHCMA so there is ample opportunity to plan a trip.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Lamal

EG042913833

PROPOSAL 76 - 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas. Allow sidelock muzzleloading rifles to be used within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area as follows:

I would allow the use of sidelock muzzleloading rifles shooting lead round balls in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA), Units 24 and 25. The use of these weapons would be further restricted to no optical sights, muzzleloader safety course, and no shooting within 500 yards of the pipeline.

ISSUE: I would like to be able to use muzzleloading rifles in the DHCMA.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Only bowhunters will be able to hunt in the area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would allow more people to be able to hunt in the pipeline corridor who may not be able to use a bow and arrow.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those people who either physically can not use a bow or have difficulty shooting a bow would be able to participate in hunting in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Bowhunters who do not wish to share the resource with firearm users.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered in-line muzzleloaders and conical and/or sabot rounds. I rejected these because the effective range using conicals and sabot rounds is much further than round balls and stand a much higher chance of damaging the pipeline. Lead round balls are ballistically inefficient and firing them from 500 yards or more from the pipeline would cause any shot to hit the ground before getting to the pipeline. By not allowing optical sights or in-line firearms hunters are less likely to attempt any long range shots. Shots with round balls and open sights are generally under 100 yards as that is about the maximum effective range of lead round balls.

PROPOSED BY: James Fitzpatrick

EG042813812

PROPOSAL 77 – 5 AAC 92.450(26)(B). Description of game management units. Clarify the subunit boundary between Unit 26B and Unit 26C. Add additional language in subunits to clarify that the area described is not stand alone language, but within the larger unit boundaries as follows:

5 AAC 92.450(26)(B) Unit 26(B) consists of that portion of Unit 26 east of Unit 26(A), **and** west of **a line following** the west banks of **the Staines River branch of the Canning River**, the Canning River and [WEST OF THE WEST BANK OF] the Marsh Fork of the Canning River.

As a housekeeping measure, several subunits will have language added to clarify that the description applies only to the unit defined.

Example:(5)(A) Unit 5 (A) consists of all drainages **of Unit 5** east of Yakutat Bay, Disenchantment Bay, etc.

ISSUE: The current boundary between Units 26B and 26C is unclear due to multiple river branches near the mouth of the Canning River. The boundary line should follow the western-most branch, which is actually the Staines River branch. This proposal would clarify that line. In addition, some subunit descriptions in regulation do not clearly state that they apply only in that specific unit. For instance, if the subunit description references the area upriver, that may

actually cover areas in another unit. Adding the clarification should help focus the actual subunit description.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters may be confused by actual area boundaries and associated seasons and bag limits.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and the public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who was using the wrong boundary description.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Status quo, but maps would not delineate the actual written description.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613927

PROPOSAL 78 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the bag limit for moose in Unit 25 as follows:

Unit 25: One bull moose with 50-inch antlers or three or more brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: Change the brow tine requirement for bull moose from four brow tines to three or more brow tines on at least one side. Bull moose in Unit 25 generally do not produce huge antler spreads and therefore have to be judged by antler size. Many older bulls grow antlers in the 45 - 54 -inch class. Even a 54 inch bull is a hard judgment call, by providing an opportunity of counting only three brow tines it would provide a greater chance of harvesting a few more mature bulls. In discussions with Department of Fish and Game biologists, there is no reason it cannot be changed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Less opportunities for moose hunters to harvest legal moose in this area. Moose in this area are nutritionally stressed and generally don't produce huge antler spreads with big brow tines.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This would provide more opportunities for nonresident hunters to harvest a bull moose and possibly a few more nonresident licenses and tags would be sold. There would be more revenue for the Department of Fish And Game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This would provide more opportunities for a few nonresident hunters and guides and revenue for the Department of Fish and Game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don't believe anyone would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? 1). Changing the regulation to any bull; rejected because most nonresidents are looking for a larger bull anyway. 2). Changing the regulation to certain Unit 25 subunits but all of Unit 25 bull moose are nutritionally stressed and don't produce huge antler spreads. 3). Doing nothing but want to provide a little more of a chance for a nonresident hunters that is spending a lot of money to hunt in Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Jim Kedrowski

EG042413781

PROPOSAL 79 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Create new hunt area for moose in Unit 25A as follows:

The existing regulation is:

Remainder of Unit 25(A)

Resident hunters: 1 bull, September 5 - September 25.

Nonresident hunters: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side, September 5 – September 25.

The Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council (Council) requests the Board of Game to create another hunt area out of Unit 25A Remainder as follows:

Unit 25A, the portion consisting of Sheenjek River, upstream but not including Koness River and the drainages of the Coleen River and Old Crow Rivers

Resident hunters: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or four or more brow tines on at least one side September 5 - September 25

Nonresident nonguided hunters: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or four or more brow tines on at least one side by draw permit September 5 - September. 25

Nonresident guided hunters: 1 bull with 50-inch antlers or four or more brow tines on at least one side by harvest tag September 5 - September 25

Concerning permit requirements, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge manager already limits the number of clients a guide can take to hunt in the area, and therefore, a draw permit is not necessary to further limit participation by guided hunters. Additionally, if a draw permit is required for guided hunters, a guide will have to compete for a permit and the odds are he will not get one. Otherwise, he can apply for more clients than he is allowed to take and possibly receive too many permits. By not requiring a guided hunter to get a draw permit, guiding businesses are protected from the uncertainty of obtaining a permit.

Many of the non-guided hunters dropped off by transporters hunt while floating rivers and their harvests are prone to spoiling because they are not picked up for up to ten days after harvesting a moose. Requiring a draw permit will reduce their participation in the hunting.

ISSUE: To describe the problem that this proposal addresses, the Council referenced the testimony on February 21, 2013, by Fran Mauer:

“...The picture here is that the Kongakut and Firth are the areas that are currently closed, have been closed to hunting since 1996 and it looks like they have either recovered or are in the process of recovering, whereas the moose farther west, the Coleen and Sheenjek, have been open to hunting all these years, were never closed, and we haven't seen a real strong improvement over the last -- well, from 2000. So we're talking 12 years and numbers have remained low.

The concern that I bring forward with this closure that you're reviewing for 26C is that if 26C areas on the Firth and the Kongakut are opened, moose that are headed for the Coleen and for the Firth are going to now -- would be exposed to additional harvest pressure where currently they're not. I think that's a concern...”

(Transcript of Eastern Interior Alaska Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting in Fairbanks, February 21, 2013, Pages 65–66).

The Council also notes that there have not been consistent moose population surveys conducted in this area in recent years and stress that the slight increase in restrictions will slow the harvest rate until a more comprehensive aerial moose survey can be completed and the population deemed sustainable with the hunting regulations in place. A report by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game notes that although few surveys have been conducted in recent years in Unit 25A, moose populations in this area are considered to be some of the lowest some of the lowest in Interior Alaska (Harper, 2010).

A report by retired Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Biologist Fran Mauer, indicates that moose occurring in the upper portion of the Sheenjek River (upstream of Kones River) and most of the Coleen and Old Crow rivers in Unit 25A are a migratory population that moves across the border to Old Crow Flats in spring where they give birth to calves and remain through the summer (Mauer 1998). These moose migrate back to Alaska during late August and September where they rut and stay for the winter (Mauer 1998). Council members also cite the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Arctic National Wildlife Refuge moose survey reports below and are concerned that during the period between 1990 and 2000, the number of moose counted in fall survey areas declined sharply from previous years. For the Sheenjek area, moose declined from a previous average of about 135 to as low as 21 in 2000, a drop of 81%. In the Coleen survey area moose numbers declined from an average of 229 prior to 2000, to 116 during 2000 to 2002, a decline of 66%. The 2012 fall moose count was 26 moose and 79 moose for the Sheenjek and Coleen survey areas respectively. Moose numbers have remained low in the Sheenjek and Coleen areas for the past 12 years.

Total moose counted by fall aerial surveys during 1977 to 2012, eastern Brooks Range, Alaska.

Year	Coleen	Sheenjek
1977(1)	219	104
1978(2)	No Survey	125
1979(3)	245	151
1987(4)	No Survey	149

1989(5)	220	147
1991(6)	233	81
2000(7)	129	21
2002(8)	103	2
2008(9)	No Survey	22
2012(10,11)	79(15)	26(16)

-
- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| (1) Haggstrom, 1977 (ADF&G) | (6) Mauer and Akaran, 1991 (Arctic Refuge) |
| (2) Spindler, 1978 (Arctic Refuge) | (7) Mauer, 2000 (Arctic Refuge) |
| (3) Spindler, 1980 (Arctic Refuge) | (8) Bucholtz, 2002 (Arctic Refuge) |
| (4) Nowlin, 1987 (ADF&G) | (9) Wertz, 2008 (Arctic Refuge) |
| (5) Mauer, 1989 (Arctic Refuge) | (10) Caikoski, 2012 (ADF&G) |
| | (11) Wald, 2012 (Arctic Refuge) |

Furthermore, Council members have seen indications of increased hunting pressure occurring on both the upper Sheenjek and Coleen rivers during the past ten years. Thus there is a need to reduce the over-all harvest of moose in the upper Sheenjek and Coleen river areas to prevent further decline, and to enhance recovery of this depressed population.

LITERATURE CITED

***Most data cited in the table is in-house, unpublished reports of harvest surveys conducted by Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Arctic National Wildlife Refuge biologists that some Council members had acquired for review or through discussion with the listed biologists.**

Buchholtz, C. 2002. Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Eastern Brooks Range Moose Trend Survey 2002 Trip Report. Memorandum, 6pp. Fairbanks, AK.

Caikoski, J. R. 2011. Moose survey of the Firth, Mancha, and Upper Kongakut Drainages, Unit 26C. Unpublished report. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Fairbanks, AK. 3 pp.

Harper, P. 2010. Moose management report of survey – inventory activities 1 July 207 – 30 June 2009. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, AK.

Mauer, F. J. 1998. Moose migration: northeastern Alaska to northwestern Yukon Territory, Canada. *Alces* 34:75-81.

Wald, E. 2011. North Slope Moose Survey, April 2011. Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Fairbanks, AK.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations in the proposal area will continue to be depressed, reducing opportunity for all moose hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? By adding the antler restriction, only large mature bulls would be harvested allowing the smaller bulls to mature into large trophy size moose. This proposal will also assist in maintaining the moose population in the upper Sheenjek and Coleen which are of specific concern due to low and declining numbers. Because of the open tundra and shrub communities of the eastern Brooks Range valleys where migrating moose are funneled, these moose are very susceptible to rising hunting pressure. With numbers as low as they are currently, the migratory population could be extirpated entirely. This would represent a significant loss to the region. It is imperative that harvest pressure on this predominately migratory moose population be reduced so that it can recover and grow to its former levels of abundance. Recovery of this population of moose would result in increased opportunity for sustained use of this resource not only by local subsistence hunters but greater opportunity for all hunters in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? In the long run, the population of moose in the area will increase benefiting everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Residents of Alaska who are non-federally qualified subsistence users will have additional antler restrictions while hunting in the proposal area. Non-guided hunters will have to participate in a new drawing for permits.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? More severe restrictions were considered but taking too much harvest opportunity and displacing the present population of moose hunters that use this area may negatively affect another location through increased hunting pressure and harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Eastern Interior Alaska Regional Advisory Council EG050113866

PROPOSAL 80 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow brown bears to be taken at black bear stations in Unit 25D as follows:

5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures.

(1) a person may establish a black bear bait station, or a black and brown bear bait station in Units 12, 20(C), 20(E), and 21(D), **and 25(D)** only if that person obtains a permit under this section;

The Eastern Interior Alaska Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council (Council) concurs this regulation would apply to both resident and guided nonresident hunters.

This has been done in the area for generations. Both the Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuge manager and the biologist described the high density of black and brown bears in the area. The proposal will increase the opportunity to harvest brown bear.

ISSUE: In Unit 25D, when brown bears appear at black bear baiting stations, it is illegal to harvest them. Hunters should be allowed to harvest brown bear that show up at their bait stations. The harvest limit for brown bear is two per year. Both the Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuge manager and the biologist described the high density of black and brown bears in the area. The proposal will increase the opportunity to harvest brown bear. Subsistence users have harvested brown bear over their moose gut piles. The brown bear season is year round. A Council member explained that this has been done in the area for generations. He went on to explain:

"...In the springtime you'll find the bears just coming out of their dens and the trappers that would have their carcasses from the winter trapping would use that as bait or something along that line, whatever didn't get eaten by the dogs, they would use that for bait in the springtime to get the spring bears and you'd use whatever was left from your moose kill in the fall for bait to get a fall bear and whatever else. Generally not taken in the summer due to the weather and, of course, they're busy fishing in the summer. But those were the two times of year that they're normally taken, which the state season reflects on, but I'd just like to see it in the federal reg. book as well so I don't have to play that lawyer GPS "where am I game" to go from state and federal land and bounce around, and I could leave my bait stations where they are and not have to move camp 30 miles to get back onto federal land or back onto state land as we have a checkerboard of land ownership in the Yukon Flats..."

(Eastern Interior Council meeting transcripts, February 21, 2013, in Fairbanks, pages 255–256).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunters will continue to be frustrated when brown bears appear at their baiting stations that cannot be harvested legally.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Eastern Interior Alaska Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
EG043013847

Tok Area – Units 12 & 20E

PROPOSAL 81 - 5 AAC 92.057. Special provisions for Dall sheep drawing permit hunts and 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Establish a nonresident Dall sheep drawing permit hunt for the Tok Management Area in Units 12, 13C and 20D as follows:

- Establish a separate Tok Management Area (TMA) draw permit for nonresidents for each hunt period (DS102 and DS103).
- Allocate a fixed 10% of TMA permits to nonresidents.
- Allow up to [no more than] 50% of nonresident permits to be issued to nonresidents hunting with a second-degree of kin relative.
- All nonresident applications for TMA permit hunts must include the following information: For the guide, supply name of guide or a number assigned by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) by the hunt number, or for second degree of kindred, list name of relative and relationship to the hunter. The permit drawing hunt application form will have to be revised to accommodate this requirement.
- Nonresident hunters that choose to hunt with a registered guide will be required to have their application completed and submitted by the same registered guide that will be contracting the hunt.
- Nonresident hunters that choose to hunt with a registered guide will also be required to have a guide-client agreement that is completed and signed by both the nonresident hunter and the registered guide they will be contracting the hunt with, prior to the drawing application deadline. A copy of this guide-client agreement must be provided to the Tok department office by the contracting guide prior to the draw application deadline.
- The guide must be registered for at least one Guide Use Area (GUA) within the TMA hunt area both during the year the application is submitted and the year the permit will be valid by the draw application deadline. For example, if a hunter applied for a permit for the application period of 2014, for a hunt that will be valid for the 2015 season, the registered guide would be required to be registered for at least one GUA within the TMA during the application period of 2014 and by January 1 of 2015. Any client who draws a permit with a guide registered in only one GUA of the TMA would only be allowed to hunt that GUA of the TMA and no other.
- Both the name of the nonresident hunter and the registered guide or a number provided by the department to the guide that will be contracting the hunt must be listed on the drawing application.
- Nonresident hunters must carry the guide-client agreement (dated prior to the drawing application deadline) in the field.

ISSUE: Clarify guide-client agreement requirements and nonresident drawing permit allocations for DS102 and DS103 (Tok Management Area Dall sheep permit).

There has been significant confusion about the current TMA guide-client agreement requirements and nonresident drawing permit allocations for DS102 and DS103 by the department.

While the Board of Game (board) finding (2007-173-BOG, dated March 12, 2007) was intended to provide direction to ADF&G about nonresident drawing allocation policy, and guide-client agreements, the intent of the finding has not been implemented consistently by the department, in particular, for the TMA drawings DS102 and DS103.

This has resulted in TMA draw hunt regulations and board findings not being implemented as originally intended by the board and allocation of TMA permits to recipients who have not completed a guide-client agreement with a guide who has a current GUA registration on file prior to the drawing.

Putting this proposed language into regulation will provide direction to the department, from the board, to properly implement the TMA guide-client agreement requirements and nonresident drawing permit allocations for DS102 and DS103 as originally intended by the board.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Confusion will continue, TMA draw hunt regulations and board findings will not be implemented as originally intended and permits will continue to be issued to unqualified recipients.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will clarify the guide-client agreement requirements and nonresident drawing permit allocations for DS102 and DS103; therefore, reducing confusion by the department, hunters, and guides about the application process and reduce the potential for allocation of permits to unqualified recipients.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those applicants to the draw permit trying to follow the intent of the board regulations and findings for the draw permit areas including the TMA. Protection officers would benefit by being able to track those trying to circumvent the regulatory process.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides who prefer not to have current GUAs registered on file prior to the drawing.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Not requiring the guide-client agreement to go to the local ADF&G office in Tok. We rejected it because it helps department staff and wildlife protection officers to know the guides are following regulation and not circumventing the system. Department staff has already received complaints after the drawing which resulted in lengthy research. This would be better done before the drawing than after.

PROPOSAL 82 - 5 AAC 92.540(3)(E). Controlled use areas. Limit Glacier Mountain Controlled Use Area to a walk in only area as follows:

In this day and age where sheep areas are going to draw hunts and pressure is continually mounting, the Glacier Mountain Controlled Use Area (GMCUA) needs to revert back to the original intent when created, that makes sheep hunting in the GMCUA by walk-in only. This will put all hunters on the same playing field and result in a more limited harvest, within sustainable levels, without having to go to a permit hunt.

ISSUE: The use of pack animals in the GMCUA for sheep hunting. The original intent and creation of the GMCUA was to create a walk-in area to protect the very small population of sheep that inhabit this area.

Although the GMCUA was originally created/established as a walk in area for sheep hunting, it was later modified to allow pack animals for moose and caribou, but somehow it was left to include the sheep. This is a very unique area that was created to protect the small population of sheep, is road accessible and is very susceptible to overharvest. Use of horses to hunt these sheep has increased in recent years and in fall of 2012 there were three sheep harvested by horseback hunters and two by walk in hunters.

Hunters have traditionally walked into this area until recent years, with the use of pack animals a rarity in the past. This included mostly resident hunters but also includes a few guided nonresidents walking into this area in the past. Because hunters have traditionally walked into the GMCUA to hunt sheep, sheep harvest has been maintained at sustainable levels simply due to the challenging nature of this hunt area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Unsustainable harvest levels could occur, the area may need to be converted to a permit hunt, and the original intent to have this as a walk-in area for sheep will not be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It reverts the sheep hunt part of the GMCUA back to walk-in only, which follows the “original” intent and creation of the GMCUA. It puts everyone on the same playing field and protects the small sheep population from potentially being overharvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The sheep population in the GMCUA and all walk in sheep hunters that are willing to put the time in to hunt this incredibly unique area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The very few people who use pack animals, who should not be allowed to use pack animals to hunt this area according to the original intent and creation of the GMCUA.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None, as we feel it was a mistake that led to the use of pack animals for sheep and we would like to see it revert back to the original intent and creation of the GMCUA.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050113885

PROPOSAL 83 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Limit guides to two black bear bait stands in Units 12 and 20E as follows.

In Units 12 and 20E, guides may only register up to two bait stands per guide.

ISSUE: We would like the board to change the current regulation of allowing a guide to be able to register up to ten bait stands changed to: a guide can only register two bait stands in Units 12 and 20E. We believe that the regulation that allows guides to register up to ten stands was put in place for units such as 16B that had very limited access where guides had vast amounts of country that did not compete with local bear baiters. We do not believe it was meant for Units such as 12 and 20E, that has primarily only road access, is heavily baited by locals and nonlocals, and has limited area to bait due to vast amounts of private land. Units 12 and 20E are already heavily baited by many local and nonlocal users and having a guide register ten stands and bait on top of others is simply not something that is needed nor should it be allowed. Also, it makes no sense that a guide is allowed to register ten stands when the regular baiter is only allowed to register two.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Guides will be baiting on top of local users/regular bear baiters. Units 12 and 20E have relatively small areas of state land to bait, therefore it creates situations where there are many baits all squeezed into these areas. There will be conflicts between guide/local baiters. Bear quality will be significantly reduced and many local people that depend on this source of fresh meat in the spring will suffer. Many baiters “farm” their baits by only selecting the biggest bears for harvest and also selectively passing on female bears. It will create unsafe baiting conditions for all involved by having bait sites in relative close proximity to each other. It will also create unsafe conditions for the many local people who do spring activities in the area that already know where bait sites are. We have had grizzly bears charge baiters here and this creates a serious safety issue for all baiters. Allowing a guide to register up to ten stands will create conflict that is simply not needed or wanted and should not be allowed by the Board of Game. The safety issue alone should be a viable reason to change this regulation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it still allows a guide to hunt but they may not flood the relatively small areas of state land that are open to baiting. It reduces the conflict between guides and local hunters. It will allow local users who depend on this source of fresh meat in the spring the opportunity to get it without having added competition from a guide putting bait stands all over the place. It allows baiters to be able to continue to “farm” their baits and be selective in the take of the size of bear, sex of the bear, and to see if there are cubs present. It keeps areas from being inundated with baiters which ultimately not only hurt the resource, but will cause

guide/hunter conflict, and unsafe baiting conditions for all involved. It will give baiters who like to take their families out (wife/kids) the best chance at having a safe hunt knowing there aren't many other bait stands in close proximity of one another.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All bear baiters who are selective on size and sex of bears that they harvest. All bear baiters who have had their bait stand locations for a long time, who like to take their kids out baiting and not have to worry about being "right" next to another baiter. All bear baiters who are thinking safety first when they are hunting with their families and not having to worry about other bait stands in close proximities to theirs. All baiters who depend on and need this source of fresh meat in the spring after a long winter. All baiters who simply don't want to conflict with a guide on the relatively small areas of land available to bait in Units 12 and 20E. All local people who use this land for other activities and whom know already where bait stands are.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Guides that don't care about other baiters who are already baiting areas, who want to inundate some very small areas of state land that they can bait on, therefore creating guide/user conflict, resource issues, and unsafe hunting conditions for all involved.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Having guides register stands in remote areas like in Unit 16B, which is what we believe this regulation was really meant to be, not along the road system where they would conflict with the baiters that already bait there. Identify areas in these units that aren't already heavily baited and allow them to bait in these areas where there would be no conflict.

PROPOSED BY: Mike Cronk

EG050313905

PROPOSAL 84 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow the use game meat at bait stations in Units 12 and 20E as follows:

Allow the Department of Fish and Game (department) to issue permits to take bears at bait stations with the use of game, furnished by the state, as bait in Units 12 and 20E. This is the same wording used under 5 AAC 92.040 for issuing permits for use of game for trapping.

ISSUE: The inability of the department to issue permits to allow the use of inedible game meat for bear baiting (example: road-killed moose and caribou determined by ADF&G to be unfit for human consumption). The department can already issue permits to allow the use of these game animals as trapping bait by trappers, so it makes no sense that they can't be used for bear baiting. Currently, many of these road-killed game animals end up in landfills every spring that could be used for bear bait instead.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A continued waste of a bait source that could be used by bear baiters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It would allow the use of game animals that have been incidentally killed, such as by highway collisions, and are determined by the department to no longer be edible, to be used as a source of bear bait by bear baiters rather than wasting the meat by dumping it in landfills.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Bear baiters who would like to use this sort of bait at their bait sites.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, as the incidentally killed resource is “wasted” if not used for bear baiting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None, as there are no other solutions for this issue.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050213886

PROPOSAL 85 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Establish a Tier I registration permit for Nelchina caribou in Unit 12 as follows:

Establish a registration hunt for Nelchina caribou similar to the Tier 1 caribou registration hunt (RC566) in Unit 13. Permits would be issued through the annual subsistence permit supplement.

Hunt Area: Unit 12 excluding that portion within the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve.

Season: October 21 – March 31; season should be open for Alaska residents only

Bag Limit: One caribou.

Hunt Conditions: Hunters will be restricted to taking caribou in Unit 12 only, unless the hunt is cancelled.

Harvest Quota: The harvest quota for Unit 12 should be managed within the annual Nelchina Herd quota.

ISSUE: Unit 12 has a customary and traditional finding for Nelchina Caribou but currently there is no state season for Nelchina caribou in Unit 12. The Nelchina caribou herd could support additional harvest on state and private lands in Unit 12. This proposal will allow an additional caribou hunting opportunity currently unavailable in Unit 12.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity for Nelchina caribou in Unit 12 will be lost.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This proposal will provide an opportunity to harvest caribou that is currently being lost.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This change will benefit all Alaska resident caribou hunters by allowing additional opportunity to harvest caribou in Unit 12.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who oppose opening additional caribou hunting seasons on state and private lands in Unit 12.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Opening a drawing hunt for caribou on state and private lands in Unit 12 is unnecessarily restrictive. Limit numbers of permits at one time rejected because of difficulty with hunt administration. Registration permits available in Tok only.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050213884

PROPOSAL 86 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the bag limit for resident moose hunters in a portion of Units 12 and 20D as follows:

South of the confluence of the west fork and the mainstem of the Robertson River change the resident bag limit to one bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers, or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: Moose seasons in the Robertson River drainage south of the confluence of the west fork and the mainstem are too liberal for this population to support. Due to liberal moose hunting regulations this area has attracted increasing numbers of moose hunters in recent years. This has resulted in low bull/cow ratios in the upper Robertson River drainage.

Note: This proposal is contingent on fall 2013 Department of Fish and Game moose survey results in the Robertson River drainage.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This moose population will continue to be overharvested and bull/cow ratios may continue to decline and potentially result in productivity issues.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will protect younger bull moose from harvest, which will increase the bull cow ratio.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This change will benefit all moose hunters by allowing the number of bull moose in the area to increase and by allowing more opportunity to harvest mature bull moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who prefer hunting moose in areas with no antler restrictions.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050213882

PROPOSAL 87 - 5AAC 92.113(a)(1). Intensive Management Plans III. Reauthorize the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Program as follows:

5AAC 92.113. Intensive Management Plans III. (b) is entirely deleted and replaced by the following:

(a) **Plans established.** Intensive management plans for the following areas are established in this section:

(1) Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Area in Units 12, 20(B), 20(D), 20(E), and 25(C);

...

(b) Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Area in Units 12, 20(B), 20(D), 20(E), and 25(C): the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Area (UYTPCA) is established to increase the Fortymile Caribou Herd (FCH) throughout its range to aid in achieving intensive management objectives; the control area includes that portion of Unit 12 north of the Alaska Highway, that portion of Unit 20(D) within the Goodpaster River drainage upstream from and including the South Fork Goodpaster River drainage, and within the Healy River, Billy Creek, and Sand Creek drainages, that portion of Unit 20(B) within the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including the Goose Creek drainage, and within the Middle Fork of the Chena River drainage, all of Unit 20(E), and that portion of Unit 25(C) within the Birch Creek drainage upstream from the Steese Highway Bridge, and within the area draining into the south and west bank of the Yukon River upstream from the community of Circle, encompassing approximately 18,750 square miles; this predation control program does not apply to any National Park Service or National Wildlife Refuge lands unless approved by the federal agencies; notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, and based on the following information contained in this section, the commissioner or the commissioner's designee may conduct a wolf population reduction or wolf population regulation program in the UYTPCA in Units 12, 20(B), 20(D), 20(E), and 25(C):

(1) this is a continuing control program that was first authorized by the Board of Game in 2004 for wolf and brown bear control to increase the moose population and harvest in northern Unit 12 and in Unit 20(E); in 2006 wolf control was expanded by the board to increase the FCH population and harvest in its entire range; in 2009 bear control was deleted from the program because control methods available at the time were ineffective;

(2) caribou and wolf objectives are as follows:

(A) the Fortymile herd IM population objectives established by the board are for a population of 50,000–100,000 and an annual harvest of 1,000–15,000;

(B) the wolf population control objective for the wolf control area is 88–103; the pre-control wolf population in the wolf control area was estimated in fall of 2004 at 350–410; a minimum population of 88 wolves is approximately a

75 percent reduction from the pre-control population and will assure that wolves persist in the plan area;

(3) the board's findings concerning FCH populations and human use are as follows:

(A) the FCH population and harvest are within the lower end of the range of IM objectives;

(B) continued recovery of the FCH to a higher population and harvest within the range of the IM objectives is needed to provide for high levels of human consumptive use of the herd;

(D) predation by wolves is an important cause of the failure to achieve higher caribou population and harvest levels;

(E) a reduction of predation by wolves can reasonably be expected to aid in achieving higher prey population levels;

(F) reducing predation is likely to be effective and feasible utilizing recognized and prudent active management techniques and based on scientific information;

(G) reducing predation is likely to be effective given land ownership patterns;

(4) authorized methods and means are as follows:

(A) hunting and trapping of wolves by the public in the UYTPCA during the term of this program may occur as provided in the hunting and trapping regulations set out elsewhere in this title;

(B) notwithstanding any other provisions in this title, the commissioner may:

(i) allow department employees to conduct aerial, land and shoot, or ground-based lethal removal of wolves, using state-owned, privately-owned, or chartered equipment, including helicopters, under AS 16.05.783;

(ii) issue public aerial shooting permits or public land and shoot permits using fixed-wing aircraft as a method of wolf removal under AS 16.05.783;

(5) time frame is as follows:

(A) through June 30, 2020 the commissioner may authorize removal of wolves in the UYTPCA;

(B) annually, the department shall, to the extent practicable, provide to the board a report of program activities conducted during the preceding 12 months, including implementation activities, the status of the FCH and wolf populations, and recommendations for changes, if necessary to achieve objectives of the plan;

(6) the commissioner will review, modify or suspend wolf control activities when wolf surveys or accumulated information from department personnel, hunters, trappers, and permittees indicate the need to avoid reducing wolf numbers in the UYTPCA below the control objective of 88–103 wolves specified in this subsection.

ISSUE: The Upper Yukon/Tanana Intensive Management Plan will expire on June 30, 2014. We recommend reauthorization of the program for a six year period from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2020 to continue recovery of the Fortymile Caribou Herd (FCH).

This placeholder proposal includes options for aerial wolf control conducted by public permittees and the Department of Fish and Game (department). Any changes will be included in the department's analyses and recommendations of proposals that will be made available for public review prior to the Board of Game meeting. Additional details will also be made available for public review in a separate intensive management (IM) operational plan prior to the board meeting.

The program was first authorized by the Board of Game in 2004 to benefit moose in southern Unit 20E. Wolf and bear control began in 2005. The wolf control portion of the program was expanded to include the FCH in 2006. The bear control portion of the program was deleted in 2009 because it was determined to be ineffective at removing bears from the control area due to ineffective control methods. Moose are not included in this proposal because no focused predation control efforts specifically intended to benefit moose have been conducted or are planned. However, moose will likely continue to benefit to some degree from wolf control conducted to increase the FCH.

The estimated population of the FCH in June 2010 was 51,675 and the annual FCH harvest during regulatory years 2009–2010 to 2011–2012 was 725–1,083. Public wolf control has been conducted in the majority of the FCH range since 2006, and department wolf control, focused on the FCH calving area, was conducted during the winters of 2008–2009, 2009–2010, 2011–2012 and 2012–2013. The FCH population and harvest are within the lower end of the range of IM objectives; however, continued recovery of the FCH to a higher population and harvest within the range of the IM objectives is needed to provide for high levels of human consumptive use of the herd.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The existing predation control programs will expire and predation control to benefit the FCH will stop.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The number of caribou available for harvest should increase with reauthorization.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and others interested in higher caribou numbers will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to predation control will likely suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered allowing this control program to expire because FCH population and harvest are within the lower end of IM objectives. This was rejected because of high consumptive use of this herd.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613916

PROPOSAL 88 - 5 AAC 92.113. Intensive management pans III. Change the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predation Control Area as follows:

Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee recommends:

1. Re-implement the grizzly bear control portion of the Upper Yukon/Tanana Predator Control Program (UYTPCP) in southern Unit 20E.
2. Reduce the size of the original grizzly bear control area to an 870 square mile area in the Boundary/Liberty Creek area in southeast Unit 20E where there is an extensive trail system that will provide access for bear removal and moose harvest.
3. Allow snaring using snares in buckets (similar to those approved for the Unit 16B program) and ground foot snares.
4. Allow the use of VHF trap monitoring devices to check traps to reduce the amount of time and expenses associated with daily trap checks.
5. Allow the take of grizzly and black bears, including sows and cubs.
6. Allow use of airplanes and helicopters to set and check snare sets the same day permittees fly as long as they are 300 feet from the aircraft.
7. Allow the sale of raw or tanned hides, claws (attached or removed from hide) and skulls as an incentive for permittees to participate and as a way for permittees to recoup a portion of their expenses.
8. Require Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) training prior to participation on the program.
9. Restrict the number of permittees to a limited number of trained bear trappers.
10. Allow trapping during April 1 – June 30 and September 1 – November 30.
11. Allow the department to issue permits to use moose and caribou meat that is not fit for human consumption for bait.
12. Allow an incentive payment to be given for each bear killed in this area and each wolf from packs whose territories overlap with this area.

Bears and wolves should be reduced to the lowest level possible in this area. Because the area is kept so small, reducing the bears to very low levels should not have a significant impact on the overall Unit 20E bear populations.

ISSUE: The grizzly bear control program in southern Unit 20E under the UYTPCP was originally adopted by the Board of Game (board) in fall of 2004 and implemented in spring of

2005. The grizzly bear control program was implemented in an attempt to reduce grizzly numbers in key moose calving areas in southern Unit 20E to reduce predation on moose calves to benefit the moose population. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (department) research has shown that grizzly bear predation on moose calves was the primary limiting factor to the moose population in southern Unit 20E.

Under the grizzly bear control portion of the UYTPCP, the board originally allowed baiting of grizzly bears, but did not approve the Upper Tanana Fortymile Advisory Committees' proposed snaring of grizzly bears. The grizzly bear baiting portion of the UYTPCP was suspended in Regulatory Year 2009 because grizzly bear baiting alone was deemed ineffective at achieving bear control objectives. We have submitted several proposals to the board since 2004 to allow snaring of grizzly bears in the UYTPCP, which have all been rejected by the board due to political and social concerns about the method of snaring grizzly bears.

However, with the board's recent approvals since 2011 of brown bear snaring under predator control programs in several other areas of the state, we feel it is now appropriate for the board to approve a similar grizzly bear snaring program under the UYTPCP in southern Unit 20E. During the 2012 Interior Board of Game meeting, the department asked the board to delay reauthorizing bear control under the UYTPCP so that the department could work with the Upper Tanana Fortymile Advisory Committee to develop recommendations for the board's consideration at their 2014 Interior Region meeting. This proposal is the culmination of that cooperative effort.

To ensure the grizzly bear control program is as effective as possible, we developed this proposal with the following in mind:

1. Scaling back the size of the original UYTPCP grizzly bear control area to focus efforts in a smaller area to reduce the total number of bears that would need to be removed and maximize the likelihood of successfully reducing bear numbers to desired objectives.
2. Have the area encompass the Taylor Highway corridor and trail networks used by hunters to allow for access for bear removal and harvest of moose.
3. Establish the area on state land to reduce conflict with federal and private land owners and ensure access by the public to remove bears and harvest moose.
4. Allow snaring as a means to remove bears to improve success of control permittees.
5. Allow the use of VHF trap monitoring devices to check traps to reduce the amount of time and expenses associated with daily trap checks.
6. Allow shooting bears same day airborne at trap sites.
7. Allow use of helicopters same day airborne (by the public) to check trap sites.
8. Allow the sale of hides as an incentive for permittees to participate and as a way for permittees to recoup a portion of their expenses.

While the southern Unit 20E moose population is increasing with wolf control alone, it is a slow increase and not occurring over all of southern Unit 20E. We feel grizzly bear snaring would enhance the current program tremendously and greatly improve moose calf survival and result in much more rapid increases in the moose population toward intensive management (IM) objectives. In addition, there are some areas in southern Unit 20E, like the Boundary/Liberty

Creek area, where aerial wolf control has been nearly impossible in most years due to large numbers of wintering Fortymile and Nelchina caribou and thick tree cover making aerial wolf tracking almost impossible. In areas like the Boundary/Liberty Creek area, grizzly bear snaring is the only reasonable predator control option available. Without bear snaring, this area may never achieve IM moose objectives, especially if an administration change results in elimination of aerial wolf control in the near future.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? It will take substantially longer to meet IM moose population and harvest objectives in Unit 20E and IM objectives may not be feasible in some areas like the Boundary/Liberty Creek area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. It will result in more moose and ultimately more bears in the proposed area when the program ends.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People in support of IM.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to IM.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana/Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050313887

PROPOSAL 89 - 5 AAC 92.111. Intensive management plans I. Establish a wolf control program in Unit 12 as follows:

Establish an aerial or land and shoot wolf control program in Unit 12 on state lands so the moose population will increase in Unit 12.

ISSUE: Establish an aerial or land and shoot wolf control program in Unit 12 on state lands so the moose population will increase in Unit 12.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Moose population may be at a stable population right now, but it may fall below population objectives, if there is a severe and hard winter.

The moose population should be kept at a healthy, viable and productive population. Instituting a wolf control program will aide in building up the moose herd in Unit 12 on state lands, and subsistence use needs for moose will be met.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the moose population will increase, everyone will benefit by having more moose in the area to hunt for and provide for their families.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone will benefit with the moose population being increased and kept at a sustainable, healthy population. Subsistence uses will be met. Hunters

will be able to hunt in Unit 12 and alleviate the impact in Unit 13, somewhat, if there are more moose to hunt for in Unit 12.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. Some organizations and groups of people who oppose predator control may oppose this proposal, but they will not suffer because of it.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution to consider.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Customary & Traditional Use Committee EG050313904

Delta Area – Unit 20D

PROPOSAL 90 – 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20D as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (18)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
Unit 20(D), that portion lying west of the west bank of the Johnson River and south of the north bank of the Tanana River, except the Delta Junction Management Area and the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area		
RESIDENT HUNTERS:		
1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 15 (General hunt only)	
1 bull by drawing permit; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 15 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with that portion in the Delta Junction	Oct. 10–Nov. 25 (General hunt only)	No open season.

Management Area; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf; or

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf

Oct. 10–Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

No open season.

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 5–Sept. 15

Unit 20(D), that portion within the Bison Range Youth Hunt Management Area

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or 1 antlerless moose, per lifetime of a hunter, by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf

Sept. 1–Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Sept. 30

Unit 20(D), that portion within the Delta Junction Management Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers

Sept. 1–Sept. 15
(General hunt only)

with 4 or more brow
tines on one side
by drawing permit
only; up to 30
permits may be
issued; or

1 antlerless moose by
drawing permit only;
up to 1,000 permits
may be issued in
combination with
that portion lying
west of the west
bank of the Johnson
River and south of
the north bank of
the Tanana River; a
person may not take
a calf or a cow
accompanied by a
calf; or

Oct. 10–Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit only;
a person may not take
a calf or a cow
accompanied by a calf

Oct. 10–Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

No open season.

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch
antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow
tines on one side
by drawing permit
only; up to 30
permits may be
issued

Sept. 5–Sept. 15

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Our goal is to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits, and to protect the health and habitat of moose populations. Antlerless hunts are important for improving or maintaining the ability of

moose habitat to support current populations. They also help regulate moose population growth, and help to meet intensive management (IM) objectives for high levels of harvest.

The population of moose in Unit 20D reached the IM objective of 8,000–10,000 moose in 2006. The highest density of moose in the Unit was in southwest 20D at 5.6 moose/mi². The moose population in this area was exhibiting the effects of increased competition for food, with a moderately low two-year average twinning rate of 14%. Antlerless moose hunts during 2006–2009 contributed to reducing the moose density in southwest Unit 20D to 3.9 moose/mi². The goals of the antlerless moose hunts were to stabilize population growth in the unit and to address concerns about range degradation, reduced nutritional conditions, and reduced reproductive success of moose. Future antlerless hunts are likely needed to maintain the population at the optimal density and will contribute toward meeting the IM harvest objective of 500–700 moose. Registration permits will be issued only if additional harvest is needed in specific areas to maintain optimal moose densities.

The antlerless moose hunts and their effect on moose density and population growth will continue to be evaluated. Three indices of density-dependent moose nutritional conditions—biomass removal of current annual growth on winter browse, proportion of females with twin calves, and late-winter calf weights—will be evaluated in relation to changes in moose density. Future antlerless moose hunts for Unit 20D will be implemented as needed based on this evaluation. There are currently no plans to issue permits for antlerless moose hunting in Unit 20D during the 2013 season, with the exception of that an antlerless moose (except a cow accompanied by a calf or a calf) is part of the legal bag limit in the Bison Range Youth Hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population may increase to unacceptable levels or may need reduction when new data is available and analyzed. Opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost, and our ability to meet IM harvest objectives will be compromised.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts will likely improve or maintain the ability of moose habitat to support the current moose population. Hunting opportunity and harvest will increase and allow the department to manage these moose populations at optimum levels. The additional harvest will help in meeting IM harvest objectives. It will also allow hunters to harvest moose toward meeting the IM harvest objective without reducing bull-to-cow ratios to low levels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Meat hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose. Moose populations will benefit by having moose densities compatible with their habitat. Delta Junction residents may benefit from reduced moose–vehicle collisions and moose–human conflicts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 91- 5 AAC 92.530. Management areas and 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Simplify the moose hunting regulations for DM795 in Unit 20D and change the qualification for disabled hunters applying for permits as follows:

Change DM795 as follows:

5 AAC 85.045 Hunting seasons and bag limits:

Unit 20(D), that
portion within
the Delta Junction
Management Area

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork or 50 -
inch antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow
tines on one side
by drawing permit
only; up to 30
permits may be
issued; or

Sept. 1 - Sept. 15
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose
by drawing permit
only; up to 1,000 permits
may be issued in
combination with
that portion lying
west of the west
bank of the Johnson
River and south of
the north bank of
the Tanana River;
A person may not take
a calf or a cow
accompanied by a
calf; or

Oct. 10 - Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit only;
a person may not
take a calf or a

Oct. 10 - Nov. 25
(General hunt only)

cow accompanied by
a calf;

or

**1 moose, every four
regulatory years, by drawing
permit only, no one may take a
calf or a cow accompanied by a
calf.**

Sept 1 – Sept 15

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with 50-inch
antlers or antlers
with 4 or more brow
tines on one side
by drawing permit
only; up to 30
permits may be
issued; **or**

Sept. 5 - Sept. 15

**1 moose, every
four regulatory years, by
drawing permit only, no one
may take a calf or a cow
accompanied by a calf;**

Sept 1 – Sept 15

5 AAC 92.530 MANAGEMENT AREAS

(19) the Delta Junction Management Area:

(A) the area consists of that portion of Unit 20(D) bounded by a line beginning at the confluence of Donnelly Creek and the Delta River, then up Donnelly Creek to the Richardson Highway (Mile 238), then north along the east side of the highway to the "12 Mile Crossing Trail" (Mile 252.4), then east along the south side of the "12 Mile Crossing Trail" and across Jarvis Creek to the 33-Mile Loop Road, then northeast along the 33-Mile Loop Road to the intersection with the Alaska Highway (Mile 1414), then southeast along the north side of the Alaska Highway to the bridge at Sawmill Creek (Mile 1403.9), then down the west bank of Sawmill Creek to its confluence with Clearwater Creek and down the south bank of Clearwater Creek to its confluence with the Tanana River, then down the Tanana River to its confluence with the Delta River, and upstream along the east bank of the Delta River to the point of beginning at Donnelly Creek;

(B) the area is open to moose hunting by permit only;

(C) up to 25 percent of the drawing permits will be issued to applicants who are qualified disabled veterans and qualified disabled active-duty military personnel; an applicant under this subparagraph must [EITHER]

(i) [POSSESS A UNITED STATES MILITARY PHYSICIAN'S AFFIDAVIT STATING THAT THE APPLICANT HAS A 50 PERCENT OR GREATER SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY; OR] **be certified by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs as a recipient of the Purple Heart Medal; and**

(ii) be certified by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs as having incurred a [50] **100** percent service-connected disability;

ISSUE: This proposal addresses three issues: 1.) Provide a greater opportunity for Purple Heart recipients to hunt moose. Alaska has been classified as a "Purple Heart State" by recent legislation. Changing the qualifications for the disabled hunters to recipients of the Purple Heart will recognize and honor those that have sacrificed so much for all of us. This will also provide a simpler definition/qualification for participation in the drawing permit hunt. The current qualification of 50% disabled is too often arbitrarily awarded and opposed by many of our veterans familiar with the process. 2.) Provide a small, sustainable harvest of antlerless moose as a means of population management. This proposal provides for a small, but consistent antlerless moose hunt in Unit 20D that will aid in managing the moose population and help prevent the need for much larger, periodic antlerless hunts. This change in bag limit will also increase the chance for success of our Purple Heart recipient hunters. 3.) Simplify the hunting regulations for the DM 795 hunt. It will standardize the moose hunting season in the Delta Junction Management Area for resident and nonresident hunters thereby simplifying the hunting regulations. There is no biological reason to shorten the nonresident moose hunting season. Nonresidents comprise approximately 10% of the hunters in Alaska, harvest approximately 10% of the game while contributing 70-75% of the funding for game management through their purchase of licenses and tags.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? 1) We will miss the opportunity to recognize and honor those military veterans and active duty personnel that have made significant sacrifices for freedom that we all cherish. 2) The antlerless moose population will continue to expand and we will miss the opportunity to establish a small continuing harvest of antlerless moose by our deserving Purple Heart recipients. 3) We will continue our discrimination (shorter season and thus reduced opportunity) against nonresident hunters without biological reason. The current regulation will continue to be complicated by having two different hunting seasons for residents and nonresident hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This will simplify the regulations, eliminate discrimination against nonresidents, and provide an opportunity for deserving individuals to hunt moose with a high probability of success, while also contributing to the management of the expanding moose population.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Military veterans and active duty personnel who have received the Purple Heart medal for their sacrifice to America. Those Purple Heart recipient hunters, with 100% disability, that would like to hunt with the opportunity to take any bull or antlerless moose with the exception of a calf or cow accompanied by a calf. Residents of the state and local area by implementing a gradual population control hunt that will help offset a larger, more intense, short term antlerless hunt as we've experienced in the past.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those individuals who have suffered less severe, service-connected disabilities for which they have not received the Purple Heart Medal.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The creation of a special hunt for Purple Heart recipients on Fort Greely military land. This was rejected because it increases the complexity of regulations, is subject to total control by the military and occupies a very small hunt area. It was also rejected because it could set precedence for other land owners wishing to have special hunts created on their private lands.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee & Fort Greely Garrison

EG042613800

PROPOSAL 92- 5 AAC 85.010. Hunting seasons and bag limits for bison. Modify the bag limit for bison in Unit 20D to one per lifetime; limit one permit per household awarded under a party drawing permit as follows:

Bison, Unit 20D: One bison **per lifetime of hunter by permit, one permit per household during a regulatory year** [EVERY TEN REGULATORY YEARS BY PERMIT], DI403-404, October 1-March 31

ISSUE: With over 19,000 applicants for 75 bison permits (based on 2012 applicants/permits) most will never draw a tag in their lifetime, while some will draw the hunt two, three, or four times. Also, households drawn on a party application get more meat than they can eat, while most others never receive an opportunity to taste bison. Under new restrictions like this, it would still take over 250 years for everyone to draw a permit. Sounds unreasonable, but under current ten year limitation, the drawing could continue for all eternity and many still would not draw, while others receive multiple permits.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A select few will continue to draw multiple permits over the years while the vast majority are never able to draw the hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? It spreads the precious few permits among more families/applicants.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A few of the 19,000 applicants previously not drawn will have slightly better odds of drawing a permit in the future.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those lucky applicants who would draw multiple permits over their lifetime.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A solution with the same result is creation of preference points system for drawing permits like many other states enjoy. To date, efforts to create a fair preference point system have failed. Or leave the hunt drawing as it is where hunters apply for decades and are never drawn, while others make the hunt multiple times. This existing system is unfair to the vast majority of applicants.

PROPOSED BY: Dave Machacek EG032913739

PROPOSAL 93 - 5AAC 85.025(a)(7). Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Correct a discrepancy in the bag limit for the Macomb caribou herd in Unit 12 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
...		
(7)		
...		
Unit 12, that portion west of the Glenn Highway (Tok Cutoff) and south of the Alaska Highway excluding the Tok River drainage	Aug. 10–Sept. 30	No open season.
1 bull by registration permit only; up to 100 [50] bulls may be taken in combination with Unit 20(D), in that portion south of the Tanana River		
...		

ISSUE: The Macomb caribou herd is harvested in portions of Units 12 and 20D. In 2008 the Board of Game (board) increased the harvest quota from 50 to 100 caribou for the Unit 20D portion of the hunt, as requested by the Department of Fish and Game (department). However, the department overlooked requesting the same quota increase for Unit 12. If adopted, this proposal would allow a take of up to 100 bulls in Unit 12, correcting the discrepancy in the

regulations. Annual Macomb caribou harvest ranged between 48–73 bulls during 2008–2012, and is within sustainable harvest limits of this herd of 1,373 caribou.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? A discrepancy will exist in the hunting regulations for the Macomb caribou herd that can confuse the public and the Alaska Wildlife Troopers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, the accuracy of regulations will be improved. The public and the Alaska Wildlife Troopers will have a better understanding of the department’s management of the Macomb caribou herd.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit from regulations that are not conflicting. Hunters and non-hunters will benefit from knowing harvest management regulations are accurate and reliable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Reduce the Unit 20D portion of the Macomb harvest quota to correspond with the Unit 12 quota. However, this is would unnecessarily restrict harvest.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613910

PROPOSAL 94 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Modify the season and bag limit for caribou in Unit 20D as follows:

Season dates and bag limits for caribou in Unit 20D (southern portion) - Macomb caribou herd:

Unit and Bag Limits	Residents-	Nonresidents
Unit 20D-south of the Tanana River, west of the Johnson River, and east of Jarvis Creek One bull by registration permit	August 5 – 25	No open season
Unit 20D-south of the Tanana River and east of the Johnson River One bull by registration permit	August 26-September 20	No open season

ISSUE: Since the Alaska Department of Fish and Game moved the caribou hunt from September to August “to better control the hunt, prevent overharvest and avoid emergency

closures” caribou hunting on the Macomb Plateau in in eastern Unit 20D has been poor. The caribou generally hang back in the Alaska Range and are inaccessible until the first part of September, when they begin to move down to lower ground. A September season in this area would give hunters a better opportunity to harvest a bull.

In southwestern Unit 20D (the Granite Mountains), opening the area to motorized hunting after the motorized restrictions are no longer in effect (August 26-28) has resulted in overharvest and an unpleasant hunting experience for many.

The weather in mid-August can also be hot, making it difficult to keep meat cool on an extended hunt. While the August season has provided hunting days for eastern 20D hunters, the caribou have just not shown up for the hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Caribou hunters in eastern Unit 20D will continue to be frustrated by their lack of success. Large bull caribou will die of old age or be eaten by wolves and bears, rather than be harvested to feed hunters and their families. Skilled hunters will continue to go year after year without harvesting a caribou.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I believe that the cooler temperatures in September would be more conducive to caring for a hunter’s caribou meat, and would reduce the risk of spoilage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters and their families would benefit from the harvest of caribou. The season dates designated in this proposal would make overharvest and emergency closures unlikely.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one would suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Becoming a vegetarian.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Geyer

EG042613805

PROPOSAL 95 - 5 AAC 85.025. Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Modify the season and bag limit of the Macomb caribou herd hunt in Units 12 and 20D , and require locking tags, as follows:

To address law enforcement challenges, we consulted the Alaska Wildlife Troopers and collectively suggest the Board of Game require a locking tag for this drawing hunt; as there is a concurrent moose hunt in this same area.

In addition, we propose the following changes to the Macomb caribou hunting season and bag limit.

Units and Bag Limits

**Resident
Open Season
(Subsistence and
General Hunts)**

**Nonresident
Open Season**

(7)

...

Unit 12, that portion west of the Glenn Highway (Tok Cutoff) and south of the Alaska Highway, excluding the Tok River drainage

1 bull by registration permit only; up to 50 bulls may be taken in combination with Unit 20(D), in that portion south of the Tanana River; *or*

Aug. 10–**Aug. 25**[SEPT. 30] No open season

1 bull every four regulatory years by drawing permit only; up to 25 permits may be issued

Aug. 26–Sept. 10

No open season

...

(15)

...

Unit 20(D), that portion south of the Tanana River

RESIDENT HUNTERS

1 bull by registration permit only; up to 100 bulls may be taken in combination with Unit 12 in that portion west of the Glenn Highway (Tok Cutoff) and south of the Alaska Highway, excluding the Tok River drainage; or

Aug. 10– **Aug. 25**[SEPT. 30] No open season

1 bull every four regulatory years by drawing permit only; up to 25 permits may be issued

Aug. 26–Sept. 10

No open season

ISSUE: The Macomb caribou hunt, RC835, late season August 26 - 27.

Reduce the potential for over harvest of the Macomb herd by better controlling the numbers of motorized hunters.

Reduce harassment of the Macomb herd from the increasing number of motorized hunters attempting to intercept the herd and the potential to manipulate (drive) the caribou to certain advantageous areas.

Improve the quality of the hunt by reducing the number of motorized hunters aggressively pursuing caribou in a short two-day hunt. The late season motorized hunt has had an increasing number of hunters, resulting in increased difficulty in managing the hunt and increased potential to exceed the harvest quota.

Reduce the impact of the motorized vehicles on the fragile habitat and ensuing environmental degradation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? This two-day motorized hunt has been increasingly popular among hunters. As a result, the problems listed above are more significant each year as the number of hunters increases. Larger numbers of hunters result in more intense hunter competition, thereby reducing the quality of the hunt; more harassment of the caribou by motorized hunters attempting to intercept animals; and more destruction of the habitat. The current situation of increasing numbers of motorized hunters and fluctuating numbers of Macomb caribou presents a significant management challenge to the Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G). This proposal will offer a solution ADF&G can use for future management of the Macomb herd hunt.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will reduce stress on the caribou, improve the quality of the hunt, improve the ability of ADF&G to manage the herd by reducing the possibility of over-harvest, and extend the amount of time this caribou herd can be hunted. Hunter success will also improve with the longer season and reduced competition.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All hunters would benefit in the long term with ongoing hunting opportunity for the Macomb caribou hunt. Hunters looking for a quality hunt that lasts longer than two days.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Short term hunters that prefer weekend hunts (two day), hunters opposed to drawing permit hunts, unethical and aggressive hunters.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We considered eliminating the last two days (the motorized hunt) altogether, with no additional hunting opportunity. We opted not to do this and instead, propose this drawing hunt to allow additional opportunity during a late season Macomb caribou hunt.

PROPOSED BY: Delta Fish and Game Advisory Committee

EG042613801

PROPOSAL 96- 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Modify the hunt area for moose in a portion of Unit 20D to include Johnson Slough Island as follows:

Seasons and bag limits for moose in Unit 20D

North of the north bank of the Tanana River and draining into the Volkmar River east to include the Billy Creek drainage **and Johnson Slough Island**, excluding the Healy River drainage

Residents and Nonresidents - bag limit of one bull September 1-September 20

ISSUE: Johnson Slough Island is accessible only by boat. There’s no reason it shouldn’t be open to moose hunting until after September 20.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Someone may lose an opportunity to call in a bull late in the season.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Late season hunters may be able to call in a bull on the island.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Extending moose hunting on Johnson Slough Island until September 20, but making it for Alaska residents only.

PROPOSED BY: Tom Geyer

EG042613806

Fairbanks Area – Units 20A, 20B, 20C, 20F & 25C

PROPOSAL 97 – 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20A as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18) Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area	Sept. 1–Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or 1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 2,000 permits may be issued in combination with the remainder of Unit 20(A); a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	

by a calf; or

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with the remainder of Unit 20(A); or

Sept. 1–Sept. 25
(General hunt only)

1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 75 permits may be issued in combination with nonresidents in Unit 20(A)

Nov. 1–Nov. 30
(general hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 75 permits may be issued in combination with residents in Unit 20(A)

Nov. 1–Nov. 30

Remainder of Unit 20(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 2,000 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 15–Nov. 15
(General hunt only)

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 25–Feb. 28

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area;

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Our goal is to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits, and to protect the health and habitat of moose populations. Antlerless hunts are important for improving or maintaining the ability of

moose habitat to support current populations. They also help regulate moose population growth, help to meet intensive management (IM) objectives for high levels of harvest, and provide subsistence hunters with a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses without reducing bull-to-cow ratios.

The purpose of antlerless moose hunts in Unit 20A is to regulate population growth, to meet the IM mandate for high levels of harvest, and to provide subsistence hunters with a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses in Unit 20A outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area (part of the western Tanana Flats). Our goal is to protect the health and habitat of the moose population and to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits. The number of moose in Unit 20A was estimated at 17,768 in 2003. Research indicated this high-density moose population was experiencing density-dependent effects, including low productivity, relatively light calf weights, and high removal rates of winter forage.

Our objective beginning in regulatory year 2004 (Regulatory Year begins 1 July and ends 30 June, e.g., RY04 = 1 July 2004 through 30 June 2005) was to reduce moose numbers to the population objective of 10,000–12,000 moose (2.0–2.5 moose/mi²) unless indicators of moose condition showed signs of improvement at higher densities. The Unit 20A population was estimated at 12,193 moose in 2012. Based on harvest rates and population trends observed during RY96–RY11, continuation of these antlerless hunts is necessary to regulate the population at stable levels near the population objective.

The Unit 20A antlerless moose hunt provides additional harvest opportunity, which helps to meet human consumption interests and IM harvest objectives. In addition, this hunt has been successful in reversing moose population growth and in increasing moose harvest and hunter participation.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population may increase to unacceptable levels or may need reduction when new data is available and analyzed. Opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost, and our ability to meet IM harvest objectives will be compromised. Subsistence hunters in the portion of Unit 20A outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area (part of the western Tanana Flats) may not have a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts will likely improve or maintain the ability of moose habitat to support the current moose population. Hunting opportunity and harvest will increase and allow the department to manage these moose populations at optimum levels. The additional harvest will help in meeting IM harvest objectives. It will also allow hunters to harvest moose toward meeting the IM harvest objective without reducing bull-to-cow ratios to low levels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose. Moose populations will benefit by having moose densities compatible with their habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613939

PROPOSAL 98 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the bag limit of moose in Unit 20A to any bull as follows:

All Unit 20A, any bull, no restrictions. The Department of Fish and Game can regulate close to road or certain areas length due to harvest if too many bulls are taken.

ISSUE: Antler restrictions, wanton waste in Unit 20A.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose being wasted which deny other hunters meat because hunters can't always tell if 50-inch or 48-inch.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Stops wanton waste and stress out of hunt, did I shoot legal or pass up shot and meat for freezer?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Takes pressure off big bulls for anyone who can hunt Unit 20A any bull.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Jeff Barney

EG050113849

PROPOSAL 99 - 5 AAC 92.540(3)(F). Controlled use areas. Remove the Wood River Controlled Use Area as follows:

ISSUE: Eliminate the Wood River Controlled Use Area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? People will not be able to access the moose population for hunting. Every person you see on the Rex Trail tells you to call the governor to stop the cow moose hunts, because there are no moose left. Therefore, there needs to be more access to allow people to get to where all the moose are.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, more access allows for less congestion in the hunting areas and improves everyone's chances of being successful hunting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everybody that uses moose meat as their primary food source.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? A few guides that using community resources to profit from.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Get rid of all controlled use areas, but this would be a statewide issue.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Caywood EG050113851

PROPOSAL 100 - 5 AAC 92.540(3)(F). Controlled use areas. Modify the boundaries of the Wood River Controlled Use Area as follows:

Move the boundary for the Wood River Controlled Use Area (WRCUA) back to the west bank as it previously was.

ISSUE: I would prefer eliminating the WRCUA, but the guides have too much power. But at least by moving the boundary back to the west bank, it would open up huge areas that people can access to feed their families.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The trails on the east side of the WRCUA would not be accessible to hunters. It does no good to manage for abundance if you cannot get to the animals. We need to manage game not people.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, if you cannot get a moose there is no quality of resources.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who depend on moose meat to feed their families. Game management will be getting the hunters to the moose (they will never kill enough cows in that area).

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Nobody. No access to the area.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close cow hunts to force the moose back down to where the people are able to access them. Thousands of people have testified to close cow hunts, but no one listens.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Caywood EG050113850

PROPOSAL 101 - 5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Create targeted moose hunts in Units 20A and 20B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18) Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, the Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area	Sept. 1–Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	
RESIDENT HUNTERS: 1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or 1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 2,000 permits may be issued in combination with the Remainder of Unit 20(A); a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	
1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combi- nation with the Remainder	Sept. 1–Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	

of Unit 20(A); or

1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 75 permits may be issued in combination with nonresidents in Unit 20(A); **or**

Nov. 1–Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

1 moose by targeted-hunt permit only; by shotgun or bow and arrow only; up to 100 permits may be issued

Season to be announced by emergency order (General hunt only)

No open Season

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

1 bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 75 permits may be issued in combination with residents in Unit 20(A);

Nov. 1–Nov. 30

Remainder of Unit 20(A)

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more brow tines on one side; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up

Aug. 15–Nov. 15
(General hunt only)

to 2,000 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 25–Feb. 28

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 1,000 permits may be issued in combination with Unit 20(A), the Ferry Trail Management Area, Wood River Controlled Use Area, and the Yanert Controlled Use Area; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

1 moose by targeted-hunt permit only; by shotgun or bow and arrow only; up to 100 permits may be issued

Season to be announced by emergency order (General hunt only)

No open Season

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

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

Sept. 1–Sept. 25

Unit 20(B), that portion within Creamer's Refuge

1 bull with spike-fork

Sept. 1–Sept. 30

Sept. 1–Sept. 30

or greater antlers, by bow and arrow only; or

(General hunt only)
Nov. 21–Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Nov. 21–Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 bow and arrow permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area; or

Sept. 1–Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by muzzleloader by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area

Dec. 1–Jan. 31
(General hunt only)

Dec. 1–Jan. 31

Unit 20(B), remainder of the Fairbanks Management Area

1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers, by bow and arrow only; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 30
(General hunt only)
Nov. 21–Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Sept. 30
Nov. 21–Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 bow and arrow permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area;

Sept. 1–Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Nov. 27

a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area; or

1 moose by targeted-hunt permit only; by shotgun or bow and arrow only; up to 100 permits may be issued

Season to be announced by emergency order (General hunt only)

No open season.

Unit 20(B), that portion within the Minto Flats Management Area

1 bull; or

Aug. 21–Aug. 27
(Subsistence hunt only)

No open season.

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

Sept. 8–Sept. 25

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only

Oct. 15–Feb. 28
(Subsistence hunt only)

No open season.

Unit 20(B), the drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or

Aug. 15–Nov. 15
(General hunt only)

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only;

Oct. 1–Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

a person may not take
a cow accompanied
by a calf; or

1 bull; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

1 bull, by bow
and arrow only; or

Sept. 21–Sept. 30

Sept. 21–Sept. 30

1 bull by drawing
permit only; by
muzzleloader only;
up to 60 permits
may be issued in
combination with
the hunt in the
Salcha River
drainage upstream
from and including
Goose Creek

Nov. 1–Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

No open season.

Unit 20(B), that
portion of the
Salcha River
drainage upstream
from and including
Goose Creek

1 bull; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

1 bull, by bow and
arrow only;

Sept. 21–Sept. 30

Sept. 21–Sept. 30

1 bull by drawing permit
only; by muzzleloader
only; up to 60 permits may
be issued in combination
with the hunt in the
Middle Fork of the
Chena River;

Nov. 1–Nov. 30

No open season.

Unit 20(B), that
portion southeast
of the Moose
Creek dike within
one-half mile of

each side of the
Richardson highway

1 bull; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

Sept. 5–Sept. 20

1 moose by drawing
permit only; by
bow and arrow or
muzzleloader only;
up to 100 permits
may be issued; **or**

Sept. 16–Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

No open season.

**1 moose by targeted-hunt
permit only; by shotgun or
bow and arrow only; up
to 100 permits may be
issued**

**Season to be announced
by emergency order
(General hunt only)**

No open season.

Remainder of Unit 20(B)

1 bull; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 20

Sept. 5–Sept. 20

1 antlerless moose by
drawing permit only;
up to 1,500 permits
may be issued in the
Remainder of Unit 20(B);
a person may not take
a cow accompanied
by a calf; or

Aug. 15–Nov. 15
(General hunt only)

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit only;
a person may not
take a cow
accompanied by a calf; **or**

Oct. 1–Feb. 28
(General hunt only)

**1 moose by targeted-hunt
permit only; by shotgun or
bow and arrow only; up
to 100 permits may be
issued**

**Season to be announced
by emergency order
(General hunt only)**

No open Season

...

ISSUE: Targeted permit hunts have been an effective management tool in Unit 14A to address public safety and nuisance moose concerns in very small areas. We recommend the board allow these hunts in Units 20A and 20B to address similar concerns. With moose populations of 11,000–12,000 in Unit 20A and 18,000–20,000 in Unit 20B, human–moose conflicts commonly arise, including many calls each year related to injured moose along roadways and in residential areas, and aggressive moose (particularly in Fairbanks residential areas). The high moose populations could sustain harvest of these moose, benefitting both the moose populations and humans. Targeted hunts would provide meat to hunters and alleviate some of the human–moose problems now occurring. Targeted hunts would also allow the use of bow and arrow to harvest moose in areas where local ordinances or Fish and Game regulations (i.e., Fairbanks Management Area) prohibit the use of firearms.

Our intent is to use targeted hunts primarily to reduce moose-vehicle collisions by harvesting moose that habitually spend time along roadways and have a high likelihood of being injured by highway vehicles or have already been injured. Sixty to eighty moose are hit annually in the Fairbanks Management Area portion of Unit 20B. Over 150 are hit annually outside the Fairbanks Management Area in the remainder of Unit 20B and in Unit 20A. We would also like to use targeted hunts as an option for resolving nuisance situations. In the Fairbanks area we have approximately 70 of these annually.

Targeted hunts would be implemented by selecting hunters at random from an applicant pool. They will be required to respond quickly to harvest moose from specifically defined “targeted” moose–vehicle collision or nuisance areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Large numbers of moose will continue to be hit and killed unnecessarily along Interior roads.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, moose harvested under this regulation will generally have better quality meat than that provided through the state’s road salvage program.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Residents in Units 20A and 20B will likely benefit from reduced moose–vehicle collisions and moose–human conflicts while providing additional moose for human consumption. Hunters who obtain a targeted hunt permits will also benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who disagree with the harvest of moose, particularly in more populated areas.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Drawing permit moose hunts were considered, however it would be harder to harvest specific animals with drawing permits.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613911

PROPOSAL 102 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Allow in the taking of any bull in Unit 20A and portions of Unit 20B by utilizing two harvest tickets as follows:

In Unit 20A and the antler restricted portions of Unit 20B, allow the taking of any bull by utilizing two valid harvest tickets. Both holders of the tickets must be present in the field and the harvest tickets would have to accompany the animal to the point of processing. Harvest reports would be required to list both ticket numbers for the single animal taken.

ISSUE: Increase opportunity for hunters who have not received a permit or are opposed to the taking of antlerless moose to harvest one bull with two valid harvest tickets. This would be only applicable in antler restricted areas of these units.

This also may help curb the waste of game that is already down and found to not meet antler requirements. In this case a party could validate two tags and go home legally.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Department of Fish and Game would continue to issue permits trying to increase regular season harvest with a reasonable success rate. This could also be used as an early season regulation and save on issuing specific permits.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I think it would improve the chances of using the resource without impacting the harvest numbers a great deal.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who hunt with at least one other person and those opposed to taking of antlerless animals would get an increased chance for a successful hunt.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one I can think of.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I thought of a draw permit similar to a party with one animal per two individuals. Disregarded this because of more permits to issue and the fact that the permit holders have to be able to participate. I have known persons that were unable to hunt during their permit period. This would be more flexible for people that are available to fill the freezer.

PROPOSED BY: Mark Albert

EG031913738

PROPOSAL 103- 5 AAC 92.011. Taking of game by proxy. Limit proxy hunting for moose in Units 20A and 20B as follows:

...

(d) A person may not be a proxy

- (1) for more than one beneficiary at a time;
- (2) more than once per season per species in Unit 13;
- (3) for Tier II Caribou in Unit 13, unless the proxy is a Tier II permittee.

(4) more than once per regulatory year for moose in Units 20A and 20B

ISSUE: Some individuals are harvesting multiple moose during antlerless moose registration hunts. This may lead to localized overharvest of female moose in some areas. Also at issue is allocation of the resource and fair and equitable distribution of the meat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Fairness issue will continue to divide hunters resulting in deterioration of public support for antlerless hunts. Localized overharvest may also contribute to user conflicts and loss of support for antlerless hunts.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The distribution of the harvest will be viewed as more fair and equitable.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those that participate in the antlerless hunts.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Prohibit taking of moose by proxy; limit one proxy per household.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050113860

PROPOSAL 104 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow harvest of brown bear over black bear bait sites in Units 20A and 20B as follows:

We would like the Board of Game to allow the incidental harvest of grizzly bear over black bear bait in subunits 20A and 20B to allow for a reasonable opportunity to harvest grizzly bear.

ISSUE: Brown bear populations have begun taking over habitat of Units 20A and 20B which historically have been populated by black bear.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We believe these bear will begin to create problems with cabin owners and other recreational users of the area. Black bear harvest will decline because black bear baiters in the area have a hard time with grizzlies destroying baits and there have even been reports of grizzlies taking black bear after they were shot over bait.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This proposal will provide for an incidental harvest of grizzly bears in units that enjoy stable grizzly populations.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Black bear baiters will benefit from being able to incidentally harvest brown bear that come to their black bear baits. Moose hunters will benefit by the byproduct of healthier moose populations, and recreational users in the area will be kept safer as the habituated grizzlies in the area will be removed before they can become a problem.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? We cannot think of anyone who will suffer from an incidental harvest of grizzly bear over black bear baits in Units 20A and 20B. In fact this would dispose of nuisance bear that are inadvertently habituated to human feeding when visiting baits sites intended to feed black bear.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Bear trapping proposals; rejected because there has not been support for this methods and means in the past and there is no reason to believe that the Board of Game has changed their position now.

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG042613798

PROPOSAL 105 - 5 AAC 92.044. Permit for hunting black bear with the use of bait or scent lures. Allow harvest of brown bear over black bear bait sites in Units 20A and 20B as follows:

In Units 20A and 20B: One grizzly per year; female may be taken without cubs, meat must be salvaged.

ISSUE: The overabundance of grizzlies in these two units, I would like the Board of Game to allow baiting grizzlies on a black bear bait.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The lack of interest in bear baiting because of feeding grizzly bears and not being able of taking them on black bear bait.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Hunter will feel better going to their bear baits knowing that they have a chance of taking a grizzly if it comes to their bait.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunter who has been baiting his bear baits and wasting fuel and time and bait feeding grizzlies on their bear bait.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one but the grizzlies that have been feeding on the baits.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Snaring bear but being able to look at a bear from a stand and target the one that needs to be reduced with a rifle or bow.

PROPOSAL 106 – 5 AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
...		
Unit 20(B), that portion within Creamer's Refuge 1 bull with spike-fork or greater antlers, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 30 (General hunt only) Nov. 21–Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1–Sept. 30 Nov. 21–Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by bow and arrow only, by drawing permit only; up to 150 bow and arrow permits may be issued in the Fairbanks Management Area; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered bull moose in the Fairbanks Management Area; or	Sept. 1–Nov. 27 (General hunt only)	Sept. 1–Nov. 27
1 antlerless moose by muzzleloader by drawing permit only; up to 10 permits may be issued; a recipient of a drawing permit is prohibited from taking an antlered	Dec. 1–Jan. 31 (General hunt only)	Dec. 1–Jan. 31

bull moose in the
Fairbanks
Management Area

Unit 20(B), remainder
of the Fairbanks
Management Area

1 bull with spike-fork
or greater antlers, by
bow and arrow only; or

Sept. 1–Sept. 30
(General hunt only)
Nov. 21–Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Sept. 30
Nov. 21–Nov. 27

1 antlerless moose by
bow and arrow only,
by drawing permit
only; up to 150 bow and
arrow permits may be
issued in the Fairbanks
Management Area; a
recipient of a drawing
permit is prohibited
from taking an
antlered bull moose
in the Fairbanks
Management Area

Sept. 1–Nov. 27
(General hunt only)

Sept. 1–Nov. 27

Unit 20(B), that portion
within the Minto Flats
Management Area

1 bull; or

Aug. 21–Aug. 27
(Subsistence hunt
only)

No open season.

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

Sept. 8–Sept. 25

No open season.

1 antlerless moose by
registration permit only;

Oct. 15–Feb. 28
(Subsistence hunt
only)

No open season.

Unit 20(B), the drainage
of the Middle Fork
of the Chena River

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader only; up to 60 permits may be issued in combination with the hunt in the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek;	Nov. 1–Nov. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season.
Unit 20(B), that portion of the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek		
1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
1 bull by drawing permit only; by muzzleloader	Nov. 1–Nov. 30	No open season.

only; up to 60 permits may be issued in combination with the hunt in the Middle Fork of the Chena River;

Unit 20(B), that portion southeast of the Moose Creek dike within one-half mile of each side of the Richardson highway

1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 5–Sept. 20
------------	------------------	------------------

1 moose by drawing permit only; by bow and arrow or muzzleloader only; up to 100 permits may be issued	Sept. 16–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	No open season.
--	---	-----------------

Remainder of Unit 20(B)

1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 5–Sept. 20
------------	------------------	------------------

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,500 permits may be issued in the Remainder of Unit 20(B); a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season.
--	--	-----------------

1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf;	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	
--	---------------------------------------	--

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunting seasons must be reauthorized annually. Our goal is to provide for a wide range of public uses and benefits, and to protect the health and habitat of moose

populations. Antlerless hunts are important for improving or maintaining the ability of moose habitat to support current populations. They also help regulate moose population growth, help to meet intensive management (IM) objectives for high levels of harvest, and provide subsistence hunters with a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses without reducing bull-to-cow ratios.

Fairbanks Management Area (FMA) — The purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide opportunity to harvest a surplus of antlerless moose in the FMA and potentially reduce moose–vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems.

The number of moose–vehicle collisions in the FMA is high and poses significant safety risks to motorists. In addition, moose nuisance issues continue to place significant demands on property owners. To increase hunting opportunity and harvest and reduce moose–vehicle collisions, the department incrementally increased the number of drawing permits for antlerless moose in the FMA during RY99–RY10. Moose–vehicle collisions and moose nuisance problems have declined during RY06–RY12, presumably, in part due to the higher antlerless moose harvests of 35–55 during RY09–RY12.

Minto Flats Management Area (MFMA) — The primary purpose of this antlerless hunt is to provide a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses and to stop growth of a high density population.

Population estimation surveys indicate the MFMA moose density is high (>4. moose/mi²). The annual reported harvest of antlerless moose taken during RY96–RY12 was approximately 1% to 2% of the MFMA moose population and is likely sustainable.

Unit 20), drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River and the Remainder of Unit 20B — The antlerless moose harvest in this area is designed to curb growth of this population that has surpassed the upper limit of the IM population objective of 12,000–15,000 moose and helps to meet IM harvest objectives for Unit 20B. Increasing population estimates (from 12,313 in 2001 to 20,173 in 2009) and high calf:cow ratios (37–43:100 during 2003–2009) indicate numbers are increasing. Moreover, moose densities are relatively high (2.2 moose/mi²) in central Unit 20B surrounding Fairbanks.

The drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose were approved by the board in 2006 to take advantage of relatively high and increasing moose numbers in central Unit 20B. The goal is to increase the cow harvest until the growth is stopped to prevent over-use of the habitat. The harvest from drawing permits has ranged from 258 and 265 cow moose in 2009 and 2010, respectively, to 294 and 271 cow moose in 2011 and 2012. In combination with the registration antlerless permits in the MFMA, we estimate the current antlerless harvest at approximately 2% of the total Unit 20B population of approximately 20,000 moose.

To mitigate hunter conflicts, we spread hunters out over space and time. Each of 16 hunt areas has permits in three time periods: one before the general hunt, one during, and one after. This way we maintain few hunters at a time in each permit area, yet expect to achieve a harvest of 400–500 cows.

Mortality from vehicle and train collisions has been high, averaging 149 moose killed annually by motor vehicles in Unit 20B. Road kill may be reduced by focusing harvest in the central Unit 20B where road density is highest.

Finally, extensive burns in northcentral Unit 20B will provide excellent habitat in the future. With improving habitat, continued high predator harvest, and relatively mild winters, we can expect continued high productivity and survival of moose, along with increased yield.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population may increase to unacceptable levels or may need reduction when new data is available and analyzed. Opportunity to hunt a harvestable surplus of cow moose will be lost, and our ability to meet IM harvest objectives will be compromised. Subsistence hunters outside the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area may not have a reasonable opportunity for success in obtaining moose for subsistence uses. Fairbanks residents may benefit from reduced moose–vehicle collisions and moose–human conflicts.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. This reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts will likely improve or maintain the ability of moose habitat to support the current moose population. Hunting opportunity and harvest will increase and allow the department to manage these moose populations at optimum levels. The additional harvest will help in meeting IM harvest objectives. It will also allow hunters to harvest moose toward meeting the IM harvest objective without reducing bull-to-cow ratios to low levels.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters will benefit from the opportunity to harvest cow moose. Moose populations will benefit by having moose densities compatible with their habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613940

PROPOSAL 107 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Open a nonresident season in Unit 20B within the Minto Flats Management Area as follows:

Moose hunting in Unit 20B within the Minto Flats Management Area:

Nonresidents: eight drawing permits of which half are issued to guided hunters who have a signed contract with a registered guide licensed for the area (20-01).

Season Dates: September 8- 25 one bull with 50-inch antlers or four brow tines on at least one side.

ISSUE: There is no nonresident moose season within the Minto Flats Management Area in 20B. The overabundance of moose and the very liberal harvest that exists for residents indicate that the area could now support some nonresident opportunity.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Nonresidents will continue to be excluded.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; the current management plan calls for reducing the moose population in this area and other surrounding areas in Unit 20B. Allowing nonresidents some opportunity could help.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? A very limited number of nonresident hunters and the guide/s operating in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? I don't know about suffer but some resident hunters may see a nonresident hunter.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered asking for a 10% nonresident allocation based on 10 % of the past resident harvest. I figured that would be politically unacceptable. I considered restricting the nonresidents to an area south of Swan Neck Slough (between Swan Neck and the Tanana River and the mouth of the Tolovana River. I rejected it because there is now two lower mouths to Swan Neck Slough a considerable distance apart. It could be confusing. It would also eliminate areas to the west off the river and lakes system that receive little hunting pressure.

PROPOSED BY: Ken Lamb

EG050113881

PROPOSAL 108 - 5 AAC 92.530(8). Management areas. Eliminate the Minto Flats Management Area restrictions on airboats as follows:

Delete the controlled use area in Minto Flats and allow the use of airboats for the harvest of moose.

ISSUE: Controlled use area Minto Flats; closed to the use of airboats.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? With the overabundance of moose in the area and the lack of getting to areas in the Minto Flats area with regular boats, and spreading the harvest throughout the area.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes it would spread the harvest throughout the area where regular boat traffic can't go and reduce crowding on the river corridors.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The hunters with airboats who can hunt bears and ducks there and who can fish there, but are restricted from moose hunting there, when there is an abundance of moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Close it to everyone or open it to everyone to be fair.

PROPOSED BY: Lee Olsen

EG042613792

PROPOSAL 109 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the muzzleloader moose drawing hunt in Unit 20B to a registration hunt and modify the season dates and hunt area as follows:

Moose, Unit 20B, Salcha River drainage upstream from and including **Butte Creek** [GOOSE CREEK]; one Bull by muzzleloader only [BY PERMIT], **registration permit** [DM782], **November 10-December 10** [NOVEMBER 1—NOVEMBER 30]

ISSUE: Muzzleloader moose hunt (DM782) is located in an extremely difficult and remote area to access. Most years there is insufficient snow on 1 November to successfully make this hunt. Starting later and ending later will allow more time for rivers to freeze and more snow to fall. December Bull only moose hunts have been successful under a general harvest ticket for decades in Unit 20F, with a low impact harvest. I believe this portion of 20B is more difficult to access than the portion of 20F open in December. Hunter success has been zero to one on DM782. Permit holders learning the area must wait 2 years to reapply for a drawing permit despite the fact there are extra unissued drawing permits. A registration hunt would eliminate this waiting period and still allow active Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) oversight of hunt.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunter success will continue to be near zero and ADF&G will likely cancel this muzzleloader opportunity.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, going from no harvest to a few animals taken.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Any hunter desiring an extremely challenging late season hunt. Also, moose hunters not getting a September moose and muzzleloaders drawn in prior year wouldn't be restricted from hunting the same area the following year.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Staying with current drawing with very few hunters attempting to access the area has not worked over past two seasons, we need to expand the group to find access. The department can carefully monitor a registration type hunt. We considered lengthening the season, but trappers would be more impacted with a longer season. This proposed season is the same number of days, so the impacts of hunters opening trails for trappers would stay at the same level.

PROPOSAL 110 – 5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Eliminate the muzzleloader hunt for bull moose in the Middle Fork of the Chena River and Upper Salcha River in Unit 20B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18)		
...		
Unit 20(B), the drainage of the Middle Fork of the Chena River		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 300 permits may be issued; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
[1 BULL BY DRAWING PERMIT ONLY; BY MUZZLELOADER ONLY; UP TO 60 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED IN COMBINATION WITH THE HUNT IN THE	[NOV. 1–NOV. 30] [(GENERAL HUNT ONLY)]	[NO OPEN SEASON.]

SALCHA RIVER
DRAINAGE UPSTREAM
FROM AND INCLUDING
GOOSE CREEK]

Unit 20(B) that portion of
the Salcha River drainage
upstream from and
including Goose Creek

1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 1–Sept. 20
1 bull, by bow and arrow only; or	Sept. 21–Sept. 30	Sept. 21–Sept. 30
[1 BULL BY DRAWING PERMIT ONLY; BY MUZZLELOADER ONLY: UP TO 60 PERMITS MAY BE ISSUED IN COMBI- NATION WITH THE HUNT IN THE MIDDLE FORK OF THE CHENA RIVER]	[NOV. 1–NOV. 30]	[NO OPEN SEASON.]

...

ISSUE: The Department of Fish and Game (department) recommends eliminating the November muzzleloader drawing permit hunt (DM782) for bull moose in the Middle Fork of the Chena River and upper Salcha River because interest and harvest have been very low. This hunt was adopted by the Board of Game in 2010 as a replacement for a popular November muzzleloader moose hunt in Unit 20A that had been modified. The DM782 hunt in Unit 20B began in 2011 when 60 “any moose” permits were issued. Of the 60 permits issued, 28 people hunted and 1 cow moose was harvested. In 2012, in response to several public proposals, the board changed this hunt to “bull only”. Only 32 of the 60 permits were issued in 2012, 7 permit-holders hunted, and no moose were harvested. For the 2013 season, 60 permits were offered in the drawing and 15 people applied. Access into the hunt area is extremely difficult, especially during November when travel conditions are poor and hunters have difficulty getting into the good moose habitat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The department will continue to invest time and effort into administration of a hunt that has little hunter interest or success.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? This does not apply.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The department will benefit by not administering a hunt that has minimal hunter interest and harvest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who are looking for muzzleloader hunting opportunities.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Changing the hunt to a registration hunt was considered, although due to the difficult access, harvest rates may still be minimal. Another solution to consider would be to just add more opportunity to the fall general season.

PROPOSED BY: The Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613912

PROPOSAL 111 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Lengthen the moose season in a portion of Unit 20B as follows:

Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek:
One bull September 1 - September 25 [20], or
One bull by bow and arrow only, September 26 - September 30

ISSUE: To lengthen the general moose season in Unit 20B in the Salcha River drainage upstream from and including Goose Creek from September 1- September 20 to September 1- September 25.

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

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Cooler weather will improve quality of meat. Distribute hunters over a longer period of time.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Rifle hunters who don't get a moose September 1 - September 20.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Likely no one; very few hunters hunt this late season and they would still have the last five days all to themselves.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: John Giuchici EG042613793

PROPOSAL 112 – 5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose and 92.530. Management Areas. Create a youth drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 20B, and create a Unit 20B Youth Hunt Management Area that specifies hunt conditions as follows:

5AAC 85.045(a)(18). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(18) ...		
Remainder of Unit 20(B)		
1 bull; or	Sept. 1–Sept. 20	Sept. 5–Sept. 20
<u>1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 200 permits may be issued within the Unit 20(B) Youth Hunt Management Area; or</u>	<u>Aug. 5–Aug. 14</u>	<u>No open season</u>
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1,500 permits may be issued in the Remainder of Unit 20(B); a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf; or	Aug. 15–Nov. 15	No open season.
1 antlerless moose by registration permit only; a person may not take a cow accompanied by a calf	Oct. 1–Feb. 28 (General hunt only)	
...		

5 AAC 92.530. Management Areas.

(XX) Unit 20(B) Youth Hunt Management Area;

(A) the area consists of the Remainder of Unit 20(B);

(B) in addition to other legal seasons, the area is open to moose hunting by a drawing permit issued to a child; the department may issue a permit to a child, as follows:

(i) a permit may be issued to a child aged 10 to 17 who will be accompanied in the field by an adult 21 years of age or older, with the child being the permittee;

(ii) a moose harvested under a permit issued under this section will count against the bag limits of both the child and accompanying adult;

(iii) only the child may shoot a moose, except that the accompanying adult may shoot the animal only to prevent the animal from escaping after having been wounded by the child;

(iv) in addition to the permit specified in this section, the child and accompanying adult must have the licenses, harvest tickets, hunter education certification, and tags required under this title and AS 16 in possession while in the field.

ISSUE: At their Interior/Eastern Arctic meeting in 2012, the Board of Game encouraged the Department of Fish and Game (department) to identify hunting opportunities for youth in the Interior. Unit 20B has approximately 18,000–20,000 moose and the department issues about 1,000 antlerless moose permits in the central and western portions of the unit outside the Fairbanks Management Area. This provides ample opportunity to allocate a portion of the drawing permits to youth hunters. We recommend that the unit-wide number of antlerless moose permits not increase, but that a percentage (about 20%) of the available permits be allocated to an early season, youth drawing hunt for hunters that are ages 10 to 17. Creating this hunt would give young people a greater chance to harvest a moose before school starts, and it could easily be integrated into the department’s Unit 20B moose harvest strategy.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Youth hunters will have to continue applying and competing for regular drawing permits in which they receive no advantage in obtaining a permit.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Youth hunters and their families will benefit.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Adult hunters would suffer because fewer antlerless drawing permits would be available to them.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613913

PROPOSAL 113 - 5 AAC 85.055. Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Create a youth Dall sheep hunt in 20B remainder as follows:

Sheep, remainder of Unit 20

One sheep, drawing: July 20 – August 5

Qualified youth hunters, one drawing permit per lifetime of hunter.

Youth hunters must have successfully completed a Alaska Department of Fish and Game approved Hunter Education Course and must be accompanied by a licensed resident adult that is at least 21 years of age or older. Proxy hunting is not allowed during this hunt. Biologists to determine the appropriate amount of permits to be offered.

ISSUE: Create an interior of Alaska youth sheep hunt. Currently youths can participate in regular season sheep hunts, but often are unable to compete in the field with older more seasoned adults.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Our hunting tradition will decline over time as our youths interest moves to other activities.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? No, only provides a quality hunting experience without heavy competition from adults for our resident youth.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Youths ages 10 to 17, who draw a permit and are given this opportunity to hunt with an adult, often a parent, for several days above tree line.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Youths turning 18 or older would not eligible for drawing or the hunt.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Considered asking for a ram only hunt, but creation of a ram or ewe only hunt has the potential to make their ultimate youth hunt into a horrible experience should they accidentally take ram on a ewe hunt or if ram is one inch short. We can avoid the possibility of that happening with an any sheep hunt. Also considered starting the season later, but Yukon Territory starts their sheep hunt July 15, why not in Alaska?

PROPOSED BY: Dave Machacek EG032913741

PROPOSAL 114 - 5 AAC 92.150. Evidence of sex and identity. Repeal the requirement to leave evidence of sex on black bears in Unit 20B as follows:

5 AAC 92.150(d) In those areas where sealing is required, until the hide has been sealed by a representative of the department, no person may possess or transport the hide of a bear that does

not have the penis sheath or vaginal orifice naturally attached to indicate conclusively the [sex]gender of the bear.

(i) except in Unit 20B

ISSUE: Repeal the leaving of evidence of gender on black bears, until sealing has taken place in 20B.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In Region III, 20B is the only sub-unit that still requires that evidence of gender must stay attached to the hide until sealed. This is not really necessary. An individual reports what gender of black bear they have taken on their black bear harvest report. It is also reported on the black bear sealing form which is signed and dated and is a certified statement, per AS 11.58.210(a). There is no statistical loss of data pertaining to gender of bears harvested.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? I cannot see the correlation between having a mandatory requirement of leaving evidence of gender on black bears. Whereas regulations do not require the same on wolves (otters, wolverine, and martin also). Wolves are most likely even managed at higher levels of maximum sustained yield than black bears. Furthermore, evidence of gender is usually associated with a bag limit of a certain gender of species being taking. Unit 20B has a three black bear bag limit, no closed season, and all black bears can be harvested except sows with new born cubs.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those harvesting black bears. The entire region would be unified on evidence of gender. The Division of Wildlife Conservation (DWC) still has to seal black bears taken in subunit 20B, if there is any question about gender at that time. Our well educated personnel at DWC Fairbanks can, with high confidence, distinguish between a male or female black bear. Any bear that is too difficult to determine gender would not affect the compiled data, as this would be rare.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Al Barrette

EG050113863

PROPOSAL 115 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the season dates and bag limit for moose in Unit 20C as follows:

Unit 20C:

Resident moose season, spike fork or 50-inch antlers or three brow tines, September 1-25.

Nonresident moose season, September 1-25 one bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with four brow tines, on at least one side.

ISSUE: Moose season in Unit 20C for residents and nonresidents. Currently, Unit 20C has six moose/square mile while across the rivers in Unit 20A and 20B densities are as high as 4.4 moose / square mile. Unit 20C has had some recent burns in the area and the Board of Game has allowed grizzly baiting. This should allow the moose population to grow to what it should be. However the long any bull season for residents targets all age groups and is more in line with a management plan that stabilizes or reduces the population. I believe a better strategy for this area at this time would be the spike fork, 50-inch strategy. The spike fork, 50-inch strategy is supposed to grow the moose population while increasing hunting opportunity for both meat and trophy hunters. Prior to the last Board of Game cycle, the nonresident moose season ended September 15 but was for any bull. If the board wants to stay with the 50-inch nonresident requirement, the season date should be changed to September 25.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Targeting all age classes of bulls for the new longer hunting season may not have the desired effect of growing the population.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? The proposed change is supposed to provide more moose and opportunity for meat and trophy hunters and increase the moose population in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who want more moose whether they are trophy or meat hunters.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Hunters who want to shoot any bull without worrying about antler size.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered leaving the nonresident season at closing September on 20. I rejected this because the later season will allow them to hunt when chances are better for taking that size bull. I did not feel it would infringe on the resident priority because the residents can take smaller meat moose or moose with only three brow tines. And Unit 20C has always been (before the last cycle) an area where the local nonresidents could hunt for any bull without antler restrictions and the board has taken that away so a longer season should be in place for compensation.

PROPOSED BY: Smokey Don Duncan EG050113872

PROPOSAL 116 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Create the Nenana-Totchaket Resource Development Corridor Controlled Use Area in Unit 20C as follows:

In the following areas, access for hunting is controlled as specified:

Unit 20C Nenana-Totchaket Resource Development Corridor Controlled Use Area:

(i) consists of the portion of Unit 20C along the Nenana-Totchaket Resource Development Corridor, and any extensions to this corridor made accessible by new road completion, and within two miles of the road.

(ii) the area is closed to the use of highway and ATV/ORV for moose hunting, including the transportation of moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose, from September 1 through September 25, except on private property.

ISSUE: The development of the Nenana-Totchaket Resource Development Corridor threatens to allow hunter access to a large area of interior Alaska (Unit 20C) that has been, until now, difficult to access. The continued expansion of this road and the possibility of a bridge, across the Nenana River, from the 10th Street boat launch area to the land on the opposite bank make it very likely that hunting pressure will increase dramatically. This area already has low moose densities that cannot support an increased number of hunters. Units 20C and 20F have a combined annual amounts necessary for subsistence of 100 – 130 moose and a total harvest objective of 150-400. With the development of the new road corridor, it is likely that a higher success rates will be enjoyed in the vicinity of the road way causing the population objective to fall to an unhealthy level. This is also likely to result in greatly skewed sex ratios due to this being an any bull area. Additionally, it is likely that without regulation highway vehicles, ATVs and large track rigs will create new trail systems through the area that will damage or destroy key habitat and lowlands. The area already contains a large number of recreational property and cabins that will have their remoteness infringed upon by new users. I would like the board to adopt a controlled use area along the new road corridor that limits all highway and off highway vehicle traffic originating from the new road corridor for moose hunting, including the transportation of moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose, from September 1 through September 25, until an impact study can be completed.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose densities in Unit 20C will remain low, population objectives will decline, sex ratios will decline, habitat will be destroyed, subsistence users of the area will not have reasonable opportunity to harvest moose, and recreational property owners will be disenfranchised as they purchased “remote recreational property” not road accessible property.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, this proposal protects moose populations in the area from over harvest potential created by new access opportunities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Subsistence and recreational users of the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? In writing this proposal, I considered reinstating the Nenana Controlled Use Area with a change to include ORV and ATV, restricting the area to residents only, placing antler restrictions, and shortening the season but decided that each of these options may reduce opportunity to an unacceptable level.

PROPOSED BY: Adam Lammers

EG042913817

PROPOSAL 117 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Reinstate the Nenana Controlled Use Area as follows:

5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas.

In the following areas, access for hunting is controlled as specified:

(3) Units 13 and 20

(J) the Nenana Controlled Use Area:

(i) the area consists of those portions of Units 20A and 20C bounded by a line beginning at the confluence of the Wood and Tanana Rivers, then southerly along the west bank of the Wood River to the Rex Trail, then west along the Rex Trail to the Parks Highway, then west along the Bear Paw Trail to the Kantishna River, then northerly along the east bank of the Kantishna River to the Tanana River, then easterly along the south bank of the Tanana River to the point of beginning;

(ii) the area is closed to the use of airboats for moose hunting, including the transportation of moose hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of moose, from September 1 through September 25, except within the main channels of the Taklanika, Toklat, and Nenana Rivers and at the public boat launch in Nenana;

ISSUE: We would like the board to reinstate the Nenana Controlled Use Area (NCUA) to protect our traditional subsistence hunting areas. Areas of comparable habitat, size and accessibility remain available to airboat hunters in adjacent areas of Unit 20A and Unit 20C. This adjacent area has traditionally been less important for subsistence hunters and more frequently used by airboat hunters than has the NCUA. This area is a low density moose area and the additional pressure from these types of vehicles will make it very difficult to maintain a healthy moose population, and provide the reasonable opportunity required to meet the amounts necessary for subsistence (ANS) for the area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The Totchaket Nenana Resource Corridor will provide new access to this area, and will allow airboaters to haul their boats across the river and drop them right into swamps and wet lands they previously had no access to. This will allow exploitation of this area in a manner which will prove to be inconsistent with sustained yield practices. We are concerned that this over exploitation will result in future shortening of seasons, antler restrictions, and other limitations that would reduce the reasonable opportunity of subsistence users to harvest moose.

The board previously concluded that a conflict existed between moose hunters using airboats and moose hunters using the more traditional spot and stalk and still hunting methods, and that this conflict detrimentally affected the subsistence use of moose from the area, although game levels remain stable.

The Alaska Supreme Court has examined such means and methods restrictions and found them to be time-honored management tools accepted as legitimate by the framers of the Alaska Constitution. See Fish Spotters Ass'n v. State, 838 P.2d 798 (Alaska 1992).

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes, it will ensure that a low density moose population is not over utilized to the point where the ANS cannot be met.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All users of the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The airboat community.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Requesting a road corridor like on the north slope; requesting antler restrictions in the area to protect sex composition; r-equesting shorter seasons to protect the moose population.

PROPOSED BY: Minto Nenana Fish and Game Advisory Committee EG050313893

PROPOSAL 118 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the season dates for moose hunting in Unit 20F as follows:

Unit 20F, Yukon River drainage and Tanana River drainage, moose hunting season: September 10-30.

ISSUE: With the change in temperature caused by global warming, it is becoming more difficult to shoot a moose because moose are not rutting during the hunting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The hunters who hunt in Unit 20F, Yukon River drainage, Tanana River drainage will continue to have a hard time bagging a moose because the moose aren't rutting because it is too warm.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If we were able to hunt during September 10-20 there would be more moose taken by subsistence hunters because the moose would be in rut and mating calls would lure them out.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Most people who hunt in Unit 20F Yukon River drainage, Tanana River drainage.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The hunters who like to go out hunting during the Labor Day weekend.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We thought of changing the season from September 5-25, but the first week of September is just too warm to keep meat hanging without it getting spoiled.

PROPOSED BY: Tanana Native Council

EG042413783

PROPOSAL 119 - 5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Change the season dates for winter moose season in Unit 20F as follows:

The winter moose hunting season in Unit 20F: December 1-15.

ISSUE: The winter hunt in Unit 20F needs to be extended. The weather at this time of year is unpredictable; it could be 40, 50 below zero for weeks at a time. That is too cold to have to go out and butcher a moose.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the dates are not extended then people who didn't get meat during the fall hunt may not be able to get moose meat during the winter hunt either.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the dates are extended it gives the residents more time to get the moose meat that they need for their winter food.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people who hunt during the winter moose hunt in Unit 20F will all benefit from the regulation change.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? There would be no negative effect caused by the regulation change.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We wanted to extend the hunting season ten more days but it is not likely a hunting season would be doubled.

PROPOSED BY: Tanana Native Council

EG042913818

PROPOSAL 120 - 5 AAC 92.151. Destruction of trophy value required in specific areas.

Require trophy destruction for all moose taken in Unit 20F as follows:

The trophy value is to be destroyed from all moose taken in Unit 20F, Yukon River drainage and Tanana River drainage.

ISSUE: There has been an increase in trophy hunters in Unit 20F since other game units passed the regulation to destroy trophy value. There are a lot of people who live in this game unit who rely on moose meat to subsist on for the winter, who have not been able to get their yearly meat supply. There is a lot more competition with hunters who are traveling great distances to trophy hunt in Unit 20F.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The subsistence hunters will continue having a difficult time shooting their moose because of the competition with trophy hunters.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the trophy value of the antlers were destroyed then there

would be no competition with trophy hunters, in turn there would be more moose for the subsistence hunters of Unit 20F Yukon River and Tanana River drainages.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All subsistence hunters in Unit 20F would benefit from this proposed change.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? The trophy hunters will have to hunt somewhere else.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We thought about having a subsistence hunt for rural residents but that is not allowed by the State of Alaska.

PROPOSED BY: Tanana Native Council EG042513787

PROPOSAL 121 - 5 AAC 92.540. Controlled use areas. Create a controlled use area around the Road to Tanana in Unit 20F as follows:

Create a controlled use area with a two-mile corridor on both sides of the new Manley to Tanana road wherein no hunters in motorized vehicles are allowed to hunt that have originated from the Manley to Tanana Road.

ISSUE: Strong potential for biologically unsustainable harvest and population declines in the Unit 20F moose herd due to improved access and increased hunting effort and success rate as a result of construction of a new road between Manley Hot Springs and the Yukon River.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Increased public access by a new road to inland portions of Unit 20F poses a potential to result in greater unit harvest than can be sustained under current regulations. This could result in a reduction in the overall population size and significantly reduce subsistence harvest by residents of Tanana and Yukon river communities that access this area almost exclusively by boat along the Yukon and Tanana rivers.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR THE PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. The Unit 20F moose population will be maintained or improved by protection from over-harvest during a general season developed in the absence of public road access to the Yukon River near Tanana. Further, the potential for a decline in the quality of the resource harvested will be avoided.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? This proposal is designed to allow for sustained hunting by those hunters that have hunted this area for many years.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one is likely to suffer, as this will simply be protecting an area that was not hunted by road traffic in the past. Hunting within the two-mile corridor on either side of the road would not be available to motorized vehicles hunting by local and nonlocal hunters that originate from the Manley to Tanana road.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We thought of a proposal with a five-mile corridor, like the Dalton Highway has but we thought that it was too large on an area to have as a corridor.

PROPOSED BY: Tanana Native Council

EG043013845

Antlerless Moose Hunts and Brown Bear Tag Fees for other Regions

PROPOSAL 122 - 5 AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemption. Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemptions for Region IV (Central/Southwest) as follows:

5AAC 92.015. Brown bear tag fee exemption

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

- (1) Unit 11;
- (2) Units 13 and 16(A);
- (3) Unit 16(B) and 17;

(11) Unit 9, within the following areas, unless a smaller area is defined by the department in an applicable permit:

(A) Unit 9(B), within five miles of the communities of Port Alsworth, Nondalton, Iliamna, Newhalen, Pile Bay, Pedro Bay, Pope Vanoy Landing, Kakhonak, Igiugig, and Levelock;

(B) Unit 9(C), within five miles of the communities of King Salmon, Naknek, and South Naknek;

(C) Unit 9(D), within five miles of the communities of Cold Bay, King Cove, Sand Point, and Nelson Lagoon;

(D) Unit 9(E), within five miles of the communities of Egegik, Pilot Point, Ugashik, Port Heiden, Port Moller, Chignik Lake, Chignik Lagoon, Chignik Bay, Perryville, and Ivanof Bay;

(12) Unit 10, within three miles of the community of False Pass, unless a smaller area is defined by the department in an applicable permit.

(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:

- (1) Unit 9(B);
- (2) Unit 9(E), that portion including all drainages that drain into the Pacific Ocean between Cape Kumliun and the border of Unit 9(D) and Unit 9(E);
- (3) Unit 17;

...

ISSUE: Brown bear tag fee exemptions must be reauthorized annually or the fee will be automatically reinstated.

General Season Hunts: The Board of Game (board) liberalized brown bear hunting regulations including the tag fee exemption to increase the harvest of brown bears in Units 11, 13, and 16 during the March 2003 board meeting and in Unit 17 during the March 2011 board meeting. The tag fee exemption in these Units provides greater opportunity to harvest of brown bears by allowing opportunistic.

The board also exempted brown bear tag fees for bear hunts near communities in Unit 9 to

address public safety concerns in communities during the board meeting in March 2011. Brown bears are abundant in Unit 9 and are managed as a trophy species. Brown bears are frequently observed communities where they destroy property in search of food or garbage and occasionally kill pets. The liberalized bear seasons and bag limits adopted along with the elimination of the tag fee were intended to allow people to take bears before they destroy property, to promote a greater acceptance of the unit's bear population, and to resolve some of the compliance issues associated with the take of defense of life or property bears.

Subsistence Brown Bear Hunts: The board waived the brown bear tag fee requirement for subsistence brown bear hunts in Unit 17 and portions of Unit 9. Subsistence brown bear harvest rates are low and well within sustainable limits. Exempting the resident tag fee has not caused an increase in subsistence harvest in these units. Continuation of the exemption accommodates cultural and traditional uses of brown bears in these units and provides an alternative for hunters who take brown bears primarily for their meat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? If the board does not reauthorize the tag fee exemption the fee will be reinstated and hunters will not be able to legally harvest a bear unless they purchase a \$25 brown bear tag.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? In Unit 9 the exemption is intended to increase local acceptance of the high-density brown bear population and preserve a management strategy designed to maintain a high quality of bears being harvested.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who are reluctant to purchase the \$25 brown bear tag, opportunistic hunters who encounter a brown bear while hunting other species, and residents who've expressed concerns about brown bears that are frequently observed in rural communities.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613945

PROPOSAL 123 --5 AAC 085.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Berners Bay and Gustavus in Unit 1C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Open Season Nonresidents Open Season
-----------------------------	---	---

(1)

...

Unit 1(C), Berners Bay drain- ages	Sept. 15–Oct.15 (General hunt only)	Sept. 15–Oct.15
---------------------------------------	--	-----------------

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

...

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 by drawing permit only; up to 100 permits may be issued

Nov. 10–Dec. 10
(General hunt only)

Nov. 10–Dec. 10

...

ISSUE: Berners Bay

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. The Department of Fish and Game (department) 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 ten bull permits and ten antlerless permits to seven bull permits and no 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 2007-2013.

The number of moose counted during the fall aerial surveys determines the number of drawing permits issued. The mean number of moose observed during aerial counts from 1990 to 2006 was 77 moose (range: 59-108). Severe winter weather in 2006, 2007 and 2008 resulted in this population decreasing. The number of moose counted during 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. In 2012, under excellent survey conditions, 102 moose were detected (21 bulls, 81 cows, and 14 calves). Based on the 2012 survey and sightability data from collared moose, the Berners Bay moose population is estimated to be 113 ± 11 moose. While the Berners Bay moose population is not increasing rapidly the population has reached management objectives for overall number of moose and bull to cow ratios.

As a result of the severe winters and the impacts they have had on this moose herd, we did not issue any permits between 2007 and 2012, and due to the timing for drawing permit applications, there will not be a hunt in fall 2013. 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. Very likely a limited number of bull only permits will be available 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.

Gustavus

The Gustavus moose population (Unit 1C) increased rapidly from just a few animals during the 1980's and 1990's peaking at 404 moose observed in 2003. By 2002 the department estimated the winter range moose density at Gustavus exceeded five moose per km^2 , 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, department 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. Antlerless hunts were not held in the Gustavus area between 2009 and 2013.

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 2012, with excellent survey conditions, 274 moose (33 bulls, 201 cows, and 40 calves) were observed. Using sightability data collected from collared moose, the Gustavus area moose population was estimated to be 317 ± 37 moose. In 2008, Gustavus calf survival decreased significantly to $<10\%$. Surveys in 2010 and 2011 indicate calf numbers are increasing and the survival estimate for the period was 20% and 40%, respectively. The annual adult female survival estimate is 90% for the period 2004-2011. Improving calf numbers and stable adult female survival suggests the Gustavus moose population has the potential to increase.

Research 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 populations 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 within the available habitat.

Although an antlerless hunt was not held during 2009-2013, biologists believe it is important to keep this tool available to implement should the moose population increase to a point where there are detrimental impacts to available habitat.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Moose populations could increase and exceed the carrying capacity of the habitat as they have done in the past. 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 in relation to their habitat.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613928

PROPOSAL 124 -5 AAC 85.045. Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose. Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season in Unit 5A 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	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15	Nov. 15 - Feb. 15

Russell and Nunatak
Fiords, and east of
the east side of East
Nunatak Glacier to
the Canadian
Border (Nunatak Bench)

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 time a decline in moose numbers was observed. During the period 2005-2011 (no surveys were conducted in 2010 and 2012) the number of moose counted has ranged from eleven to fourteen, with only one to two 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 the 1997-2004 hunting seasons, an average of twelve permits were issued, with only four people actually hunting each season. An average of eight days of hunting was expended each year to kill zero–four 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 of Fish and Game (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 observed during aerial surveys). 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 the 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? Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED: None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and EG050613929

PROPOSAL 125 - 5 AAC 085.045(4). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
 Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C as follows:

Seasons and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(4)		
...		
Unit 6(C)		
1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 40 permits for bulls and up to 20 permits for antlerless moose may be issued; or	Sept. 1-Oct. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season.
1 moose by registration permit only;	Nov. 1-Dec. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season.

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The population objective is 400 moose. A census completed during February 2012 yielded an estimate of 600 moose, 21% of which were calves. Because the available antlerless harvest quota in Unit 6C is currently harvested under a federal subsistence season administered by the U.S. Forest Service, we have not held the antlerless hunt since the 1999-2000 season. We recommend reauthorizing the state antlerless hunt as a backup to the federal subsistence hunt. Continuation of the antlerless hunts will be necessary to hold the population at objective levels.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Hunting opportunity will be lost, and the population may exceed the objective, which is based on the availability of adequate habitat during severe winters.

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

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters desiring to take a moose in Unit 6C.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613930

PROPOSAL 126 - 5 AAC 085.045(5). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt area in Units 7 and 14C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(5)		

...

Unit 7, the Placer River drainages, and that portion of the Placer Creek (Bear Valley) drainage outside the Portage Glacier Closed Area, and that portion of Unit 14(C) within the Twentymile

River drainage

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with nonresident hunts, and up to 70 permits for antlerless moose will be issued

Aug. 20—Oct. 10
(General hunt only)

NONRESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits for bulls will be issued in combination with resident hunts

Aug. 20—Oct. 10

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. A November 2011 aerial composition count of moose in the Twentymile, Portage, and Placer river drainages found 178 moose with a bull:cow ratio of 21 bulls per 100 cows and a calf:cow ratio of 29 calves per 100 cows. This population has a history of rapid increase following mild winters; consequently, in 2009, antlerless permits were issued for the first time since 2004. Thirty antlerless permits per year were issued for 2009, 2010, and 2011, and twenty antlerless permits were issued for 2012. Harvests for 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 were 25 bulls and 17 cows, 15 bulls and 15 cows, 19 bulls and 8 cows, and 12 bulls and 7 cows, respectively. Twenty permits were issued for 2013 and permits for 2014 will be determined based on surveys in the fall of 2013.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The population will probably increase and could suffer major losses during a severe winter. Habitat may be overbrowsed, reducing carrying capacity in subsequent years, and road and train kills will increase.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who obtain a drawing permit, wildlife viewers and motorists driving in the Portage area. Visitor use is high and viewing is an important activity in this area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People who are opposed to antlerless moose hunting.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSAL 127 - 5 AAC 85.045(11). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 13 as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(11)		
Unit 13		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 200 permits may be issued; a person may not take a calf or a cow accompanied by a calf	Oct. 1 – Oct. 31 Mar. 1 – Mar. 31 (General hunt only)	No open season
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game (board). This regulation allows hunters to take a limited number of cows in specific areas to keep the population within objectives.

This Unit 13 antlerless hunt was initially adopted in March 2011, and the first Unit 13 antlerless hunt under this regulation took place in September 2012. Ten permits were issued for a western portion of Unit 13A, and four cow moose were harvested. In regulatory year 2013, ten permits will be issued for the same area with an October and March season based on new season dates adopted by the board in February 2013.

Moose in Unit 13 have generally increased at a rate of 3-5% per year in the intensive wolf management area during the past 10 years. As anticipated, moose increased in some portions of the unit faster than others.

The population objective for Unit 13A is 3,500 – 4,200; the population estimate was 3,530 moose in 2009, 3,490 in 2010, and 3,890 in 2011. These numbers are based on conservative extrapolation of count data and sightability estimates. There is also a good possibility there are more moose in the area that are not included in our estimate.

The number of cows in western Unit 13A is expected to continue increasing given reduced predation. To maintain a healthy density and balance of moose in this area, a limited antlerless harvest opportunity in western Unit 13A may be necessary to slow the growth of this population as it approaches a level that will be sustainable in the long-term. Providing an antlerless hunt opportunity will maximize the annual sustained yield.

Based on this analysis, we intend to continue offering a limited antlerless hunt in portions of Unit 13A. No additional antlerless opportunities in other portions of Unit 13 are recommended at this time.

If this antlerless moose hunting opportunity is not reauthorized in Unit 13, the intensive management program and objectives will likely need to be restructured to maintain the moose population within a population size range that does not result in nutritional limitations for the moose and to achieve the harvest objectives recommended by the public, advisory committees, and the board.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Portions of the Unit 13 moose population could outgrow available habitat, leading to nutritional stress, lower productivity, and higher mortality. Substantial harvest opportunity could be lost for many years to come. If antlerless hunts are not approved and Unit 13 moose begin to show signs of nutritional stress due to overpopulation, intensive management efforts will need to be curtailed, reducing hunt opportunities for bulls and cows.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; by keeping the population within objective, harvest can be maximized, while avoiding nutritional stress which leads to increased susceptibility to adverse weather events, predation, parasites and disease.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People that want to maintain a healthy, productive moose population in the Copper River Basin and utilize moose for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Anyone who disagrees with the harvest of antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613931

PROPOSAL 128 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 14C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits (12)	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
-------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------

...

Unit 14(C), Joint Base
Elmendorf-Richardson
(JBER) Management (General hunt only)
Area

Day after Labor Day
—Mar 31

Day after Labor Day
—Mar 31

1 moose per regulatory year by
drawing permit, and by muzzleloading
blackpowder rifle or bow and arrow
only; up to 185 permits may be issued

Unit 14(C), that portion
known as the Birchwood
Management Area

Day after Labor Day
—Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

Day after Labor Day
—Sept. 30

1 moose by drawing permit, by
bow and arrow only; up to 25
permits may be issued

Unit 14(C), that portion
known as the Anchorage
Management Area

Day after Labor Day
—Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

No open season

1 antlerless moose by drawing permit
only, and by bow and arrow, shotgun,
or muzzleloader only; up to 50 permits
may be issued

Unit 14(C), that portion
of the Ship Creek drainage
upstream of the Joint Base
Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER)
Management Area

1 moose by drawing permit
only; up to 50 permits may
be issued; or

Day after Labor Day
—Sept. 30
(General hunt only)

Day after Labor Day
—Sept. 30

1 bull by registration permit
only

Oct. 1—Nov. 30
(General hunt only)

Oct. 1—Nov. 30

...

Remainder of Unit 14(C)

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; or	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 60 permits may be issued; or	Day after Labor Day —Sept. 30 (General hunt only)	No open season
1 bull by drawing permit only, by bow and arrow only; up to 10 permits may be issued	Oct. 20—Nov. 15	No open season

...

ISSUE: Moose in Unit 14C are managed intensively for a population objective of 1,500-1,800 moose and an annual harvest objective of 90-270 moose. In 2011, we estimated a moose population of approximately 1,500 moose. At this population level, we have experienced a dramatic decline in human-moose conflicts and decreased winter mortalities. Harvesting cow moose is paramount to maintaining the population at the low end of the objective while providing adequate harvest opportunity.

Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. During summer, an estimated 200-300 moose inhabit the Anchorage metropolitan area. This number can increase up to 700-1,000 moose during the winter, when moose move into the metropolitan area from the surrounding mountain valleys. As a result, high moose densities cause severe overbrowsing in some areas and lead to an increased incidence of moose-vehicle collisions and conflicts with humans. The number of antlerless permits we issue depends on the current population estimate and bull:cow ratios, as well as estimated winter mortality (Table 1).

Table 1.

Regulatory Year	Either Sex Permits	Antlerless Permits	Cows Harvested
2003	55	60	32
2004	57	80	20
2005	100	46	33
2006	110	46	33
2007	110	40	37
2008	110	35	36
2009	110	25	29
2010	110	23	31

2011	67	23	25
2012	58	23	18
2013	58	23	

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? We will be unable to maintain the moose numbers at the low end of the population objective. As a result, moose will continue to overbrowse winter habitat and mortality of moose attributable to collisions with vehicles and starvation during severe winters will continue.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Moose populations that are not stressed by winter food shortages are healthier and more productive.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? People who acquire permits for antlerless moose hunts. People who believe there are too many moose in the Anchorage Bowl.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? People opposed to hunting antlerless moose.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None. These hunts have been successful in creating additional moose hunting opportunity in the state’s most heavily populated area with little or no controversy. They may also ameliorate overbrowsing in the limited winter range and reduce vehicle collisions and conflicts with residents in nearby urban areas.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613933

PROPOSAL 129 - 5 AAC 85.045(12). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 14A, and the existing targeted winter hunt for antlerless moose in Units 14A and 14B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season (Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(12)		
Unit 14(A)		
1 moose per regulatory year, only as follows:		
...		
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; up to 1000	Aug. 20-Sept. 25 (General hunt only)	No open season

antlerless moose permits
may be issued; or

Nov. 1-Dec. 15
(General hunt only)

1 moose by targeted
permit only; by
shotgun or archery only; up to 200
permits may be issued

Winter season to
be announced
(General hunt only)

No open season.

Unit 14(B)

1 moose per regulatory year,
only as follows:
...

1 moose by targeted
permit only; by
shotgun or archery only; up to 100
permits may be issued
...

Winter season to
be announced
(General hunt only)

No open season.

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game. Moose surveys conducted in November 2011 resulted in an estimate of 7,467 moose in subunit 14A. This estimate was greater than the post-hunt objective of 6,000 – 6,500 moose and is an increase from the results of the 2008 survey that produced an estimate of 6,613 moose. A 2012 composition survey estimated the bull ratio to be 26 bulls:100 cows and the calf ratio to be 28 calves:100 cows.

Based on current projections, the subunit 14A moose population is expected to grow and continue to exceed population objectives. If the density of moose is allowed to increase, we anticipate an increase the number of moose-human conflicts, and moose may experience nutritional stress as the population nears carrying capacity. Cow harvests are warranted to prevent control the moose population’s growth and recommended as a way to provide additional moose hunting opportunity in the Mat-Su Valley.

The targeted moose hunt in subunits 14A and 14B is an effective tool to address public safety concerns related to moose-vehicle collision and nuisance management issues.

Moose-vehicle collisions result in property damage and may result in human injury or death. An average of 266 moose per year were killed in the Mat-Su Valley area during the last few years of average snowfall and substantially more were killed during higher snowfall years. The Department of Fish and Game (department) also receives periodic complaints from the public about crop depredation and aggressive behavior that can be mitigated by this hunt structure.

The department uses this hunt to mitigate public safety concerns by issuing permits to selected hunters and assigning them to hunt areas that correspond with areas of high moose-vehicle

collisions or reoccurring nuisance issues. Eligible hunters are selected randomly from a list of pre-registered hunters.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Portions of the Unit 14A moose population could grow beyond the ability of the habitat to sustain the population. Increased cases of starvation, conflicts with humans, and vehicle collisions will occur.

Portions of the subunit 14A and 14B moose populations will continue to be killed on the roads and highways of the Matanuska – Susitna Valley area. Increasing conflicts with humans and vehicle collisions will occur as the human population of the Mat-Su Borough continues to grow.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes; excessively high moose density can lead to nutritionally stressed animals in the harvest, and moose harvested under the targeted hunt regulation will generally have better quality meat than that provided through the state’s road kill program.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All who wish a healthy, productive moose population in the Mat-Su Valley, wish to reduce motor-vehicle/moose collisions and conflicts with humans, and those who wish to use antlerless moose for human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who oppose the harvest of antlerless moose and/or winter moose hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Winter drawing antlerless moose hunts.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613932

PROPOSAL 130 - 5 AAC 085.045(13). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.
Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
-----------------------------	--	------------------------------------

(13)

...

Unit 15(C), that portion south of the south fork of the Anchor River and northwest of Kachemak Bay

1 bull with spike antlers or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on one side; or	Aug. 20—Sept. 20 (General Hunt only)	No open season
1 antlerless moose by drawing permit only; the taking of calves, and females accompanied by calves, is prohibited; up to 100 permits may be issued	Aug. 20—Sept. 20	Aug. 20-Sept. 20

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose seasons must be reauthorized annually. The Homer benchland in Unit 15C often holds high moose densities in winters when deep snow pushes the moose down into human populated areas. Even without deep snow, a high number of moose die due to malnutrition and negative interactions with humans are common as moose become more aggressive in their search for food around human residences.

In February 2013, 1218 moose were counted during a population survey in the northern portion of Unit 15C, of which 13.7% were calves (19 calves:100 cows). Fall composition counts in November 2012 provided a bull ratio of 22 bulls:100 cows. The number of permits issued will depend on the fall 2013 survey information for this area. Fifty permits were issued in each of the last 10 years resulting in an average harvest of 23 cows per year.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Deep snow winters will result in a high number of moose deaths due to malnutrition and continued conflicts between aggressive moose and humans.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? A limited antlerless moose hunt may improve overall browse quality.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Wildlife viewers and hunters receiving permits.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Individuals opposed to antlerless moose hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613935

PROPOSAL 131 - 5 AAC 085.045(14). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
(14)		
...		
Unit 16(B), Kalgin Island		
1 moose per regulatory year, by registration permit only	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20	Aug. 20 - Sept. 20
...		

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually. The population objective for this predator-free, 23-mi² island is 20-40 moose, a density of 1-1.75 moose/mi². During a December 2012 survey, Department of Fish and Game (department) staff counted 104 moose, approximately 4.5 moose/mi². Because of concerns of over-population and deteriorating habitat conditions, a drawing permit hunt for cows was initiated in 1995. In an attempt to reduce the population quickly, the Board of Game established a registration hunt for any moose for the fall 1999 season. The population of moose on Kalgin Island is high at this time and remains above the objective of 20-40.

The "any moose" registration hunt is recommended to provide additional mortality on this predator-free island population. A registration hunt also allows the department to continue gathering biological information from specimens provided by successful hunters. The difficult hunting conditions and limited access will minimize the danger of over-harvest.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Without a liberal harvest including cows and calves, the population will continue to exceed the island's carrying capacity, resulting in habitat damage and ultimately decline in moose numbers through starvation.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? If the island population size is kept at or near objective levels, moose will have adequate available forage and therefore, show less sign of being nutritionally stressed.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Hunters who make the effort to get to Kalgin Island will have the opportunity to take any moose.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Seasonal residents of Kalgin Island have been concerned about hunters trespassing on their land and cabins. The current season dates concentrate hunter activity when most seasonal residents are present.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? A general season for any moose will also work to lower moose densities, but would diminish the ability to collect biological information.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game EG050613936

PROPOSAL 132 - 5 AAC 85.045(15). Hunting seasons and bag limits for moose.

Reauthorize the existing winter hunt for antlerless moose in Unit 17A as follows:

Units and Bag Limits	Resident Open Season Subsistence and General Hunts)	Nonresident Open Season
-----------------------------	--	------------------------------------

(15)

...

Unit 17(A)

Up to 2 moose per regulatory year only as follows:

RESIDENT HUNTERS:

1 bull by registration permit only; or	Aug. 25-Sept. 20 (Subsistence hunt only)
--	---

Up to 2 moose by registration permit; during the period Dec. 1 - Jan. 31, a season of up to 31 days may be announced by emergency order	(To be announced) (Subsistence hunt only)
---	--

...

ISSUE: Antlerless moose hunts must be reauthorized annually by the Board of Game (board). The board adopted an antlerless moose hunt in Unit 17A in support of the Unit 17A Moose Management Plan, which was modified during a meeting of the Unit 17A Moose Management Planning Group in December 2012. The planning group consists of entities interested in the management of this moose population and includes representatives from the Bristol Bay Federal

Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, the Nushagak and Togiak Fish and Game Advisory Committees, the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Unit 17 management office.

According to the third goal of the revised Unit 17A Moose Management Plan, antlerless moose hunting opportunity can be offered when the population is above 600 moose and increasing. The revised plan also recommends that a bag limit of up to two moose when the population exceeds 1,200 moose. Based on the most recent surveys, there were 1,166 moose in Unit 17A during March 2011.

The moose population in subunit 17A is growing and can sustain additional harvest; however, the objectives for this population include allowing it to expand into neighboring areas as well as provide for additional harvest opportunity. The population is currently contributing to the growth of moose populations, especially to the north and west.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The moose population in Unit 17A will continue to grow and could eventually experience nutritional limitations. Any potential antlerless moose hunting opportunity that could be realized at this stage of the population's growth would be forgone.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? Yes. Reauthorizing the antlerless moose hunts in Unit 17A will help control population growth with the goal of promoting continued high recruitment rates and widespread distribution of moose in the area.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Anyone who participates in this hunt and anyone who thinks this population should be managed for long-term sustained yield and human consumption.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who oppose the harvest of antlerless moose and/or winter moose hunts.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

EG050613937
