

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Southcentral Region Meeting
Anchorage, Alaska
March 13-17, 2015**

On Time Advisory Committee Comment Index

Northern Norton Sound.....	AC001
Kotzebue Sound.....	AC002
Central Bering Sea.....	AC003
Upper & Lower Kobuk.....	AC004
Southern Norton Sound.....	AC005
North Slope.....	AC006
Bethel.....	AC007
Coastal Lower Yukon.....	AC008
Tyonek.....	AC009
Kodiak.....	AC010
Koyukuk River.....	AC011
Middle Nenana River.....	AC012
Northern Seward Peninsula.....	AC013
Noatak & Kivalina.....	AC014
Seward.....	AC015
Seldovia.....	AC016
Anchorage.....	AC017
Matanuska Valley.....	AC018
Cooper Landing.....	AC019
Susitna Valley.....	AC020
Copper River PWS.....	AC021

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Southcentral Region Meeting
Anchorage, Alaska
March 13-17, 2015**

On Time Advisory Committee Comment Index

Homer	AC022
Central Peninsula	AC023
Delta	AC024
Upper Tanana Fortymile	AC025
Fairbanks	AC026
Lower Kuskowim.....	AC027



**Kotzebue Sound, Northern Seward Peninsula, and Noatak and Kivalina ACs
1/6/2015
Northwest Arctic Borough**

I. Call to Order: Time 11:45 pm by Pete Schaeffer

II. Roll Call:

Members Present: Enoch Mitchell (Chair), Joe Luther (Vice Chair), Janet Mills (Secretary), Stanley Hawley, Frank Onalik, and Melford Booth

Members Absent: Thurston Booth, Enoch Adams Sr., Austin Swan Sr.

Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 5

List of User Groups Present: Fish and Wildlife Service, Subsistence Users, Fish and Game, and National Park Service

III. Approval of Agenda:
Agenda approved

IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: From meeting date 3/4/2014

V. Fish and Game Staff Present:
Jim Dau, Brandon Saito, Carmen Daggett, Meghan Nedwick

VI. Guests Present:
Bill Carter, Frank Hayes, Ty, Trooper McGinnis, Lance Kramer, Susan Georgette, Ken Adkisson,

VII. Public Comments/Concerns:
Lance Kraemer: Lots of bears, caribou population down. Would like to see a cash incentive to get 3-4 bears a year, saw 19 bears on the Noatak River and every one of them had three cubs.
Enoch Mitchell: The caribou migration corridors are being blocked by transporters. Need to protect the Cutler, Ningmiktaqunq migration path to Onion Portage.
Mike Kraemer: We need to protect our caribou, we need to remove restrictions on same day airborne for bears, push to eliminate transporters, move caribou to guided only hunts, for problem grizzly bears have hunters shoot them.

VIII. Old Business:
None

IX. New Business:



BOG or BOF	Propo- sal Numb- er	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Numb- er Suppo- rt	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOG	41	Reauthorize antlerless moose seasons in Unit 23.	
Supported	6	0	
BOG	43	Reauthorize the current resident tag fee exemptions for brown bear in Units 18, 22, 23 and 26A.	
Supported	6	0	
BOG	201	Salvage of game meat, furs and hides.	
Supported	6	0	
BOG	202	Change the caribou regulation for all game management units associated with the Western Arctic caribou herd and Teshekpuk caribou herd.	
Support with Amendments	6	0	<p>Enoch Mitchell: This fall we never got caribou again, third year in a row. I read Jim Dau's report late migration, warm weather travel to Ambler and Buckland way a number of non-local hunters 1500 + increasing most heavily on the Agashashonk, Eli, and Squirrel Rivers causing the caribou migration to divert because the corridors were plugged up with non-local hunters. We are forced to go further and further away. Only 5% of the harvest is sport hunters but for three years we have no meat in our freezers and they have antlers on their walls where is the priority given? We are forced to go further and further away by sport hunters. We spent over \$500 on a drum of gas at Noatak and it took three drums to get to where the caribou are. We need to do something about the over population of sport hunters.</p> <p>Lance Kraemer: What about using the collared caribou and use observation towers?</p> <p>Mike Kraemer: We need to lift restrictions on bears and wolves to allow people to pursue these animals and eliminate transporters.</p> <p>Percy Ballot: Agree on rules and regulations to keep caribou in a safe place.</p> <p>Amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Close non-subsistence hunter take -Close bulls October 15-Jan 15th -Close Cows April 15-June 30th -Close Aggy, Squirrel, Eli, Naulikchaig Rivers for non-subsistence hunters.
BOG	203	Close Dall Sheep Season for Unit 23.	
Supported	6	0	

Adjournment: 2:54

Minutes Recorded By: [Signature]
 Minutes Approved By: [Signature]
 Date: 2-13-15



**Noatak and Kivalina ACs
2/11/2015
Noatak IRA**

- I. Call to Order: Time 11:30 am by Enoch Mitchell
- II. Roll Call:
Members Present: Enoch Mitchell (Chair), Joe Luther, Janet Mills (Secretary), Stanley Hawley, Frank Onalik, Thurston Booth
Members Absent: Melford Booth, Enoch Adams Sr., Austin Swan Sr.
Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 5
List of User Groups Present: Subsistence Users, Fish and Game, and National Park Service
- III. Approval of Agenda:
Moved by Janet
Seconded Thurston
Amended to add ACR discussion
Agenda approved as amended
- IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: From meeting date 1/6/15
Amend to add:
 - 1) Close non-subsistence hunter take of caribou
 - 2) Close bulls Oct 15th -Jan 15th
 - 3) Close cows April 15th -June 30th
 - 4) Close Agashashonk (Aggy), Squirrel, Eli, Naqulichaiq Rivers for non-subsistence users for caribou harvest.
- V. Fish and Game Staff Present:
Jim Dau, Brandon Saito, Carmen Daggett,
- VI. Guests Present:
Trooper Justin McGinnis, Marcy Okada (NPS), Kumi Rattenbury (NPS), Ken Adkisson (NPS), Jen Schmidt (UAF), and Ben Arnold
- VII. Public Comments/Concerns:
Ben Arnold: Worked with as a trespass officer and it is a 30 mile span to Kollusk, to one of the elder's camp. I get the same comments for my responsibility and go there and stay within those boundaries, if I go beyond those boundaries. I have been working with the Northwest Arctic Borough to change these boundaries. I know we have the Fish and Game Wildlife and their responsibilities. If we can get Fish and Game Wildlife to make sure the boundaries to make sure the hunters from the outside don't disturb the migration route, sometimes I have heard hunters from Noatak say we have seen planes disturbing migrations of caribou. As a trespass officer all I can do is tell them to report to Fish and Game, Park Service, and Troopers.



Trooper McGinnis: My boundaries are the State of Alaska. I really appreciate the NANA trespass officers, when you see people doing things take pictures and video. I will follow up on your complaints. I have addressed the maneuver issues.

Enoch: We are in discussion to change the boundaries of the CUA below Thompson’s Camp.

Trooper McGinnis: Explains methods for patrolling issues.

Enoch Mitchell: We will approach this for the Unit 23 Working Group.

Alvin Ashby: Wanted to find out if Park Service hasn’t been up for five years and the boats haven’t moved. Maybe there could be a log book to enter information from different hunters.

Ken Adkisson: We can bring that up with management.

Ken Adkisson: People can participate in the RAC meeting telephonically to talk about caribou.

Enoch: Explains the value of having many people testify at RAC meetings and at Board meetings.

- VIII. Old Business:
- IX. New Business:

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Propoal Numb er	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Numb er Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOG	202	Change the caribou regulation for all game management units associated with the Western Arctic caribou herd and Teshekpuk caribou herd.	
Support with Amendmen ts	6	0	<p>Stan Hawley: We could work NANA trespass to deal with proposal. Our problem in Kivalina because of the weather is getting so warm the migrations are so late they will show up at the end of October when the bulls are rutting and we don’t bother with them sometimes young bulls but not rutting bulls. They come to area real late and we take young bulls and females. The dominate males are mating.</p> <p>Thurston: Wants to stop guide hunting on Noatak River all we see is guide hunters on the Noatak River, to stop people who fly on planes on the Noatak. People drive up the river and spend lots of money on gas and don’t get anything.</p> <p>There is concern over hunters who come to the Noatak and divert migrations and move caribou with their planes away from subsistence hunters.</p>



Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			<p>Carmen: Explains that some of the amendments suggested to prop 202 don't fall within the code you may need to make a new proposal for the CUA related amendments.</p> <p>Enoch: Kobuk River hunters don't have as much conflict as us with sport hunters.</p> <p>Frank Onalik: Mentioned the petition that was signed by the public that was submitted to stop all sport hunting on the Noatak River.</p> <p>Carmen Daggett: I will get the petition submitted as a public comment. Explains submitting that petition to the RAC.</p> <p>Frank Onalik: The council approved for me to submit it.</p> <p>Ken Adkisson: Explains the federal regulatory process.</p> <p>Ben Arnold: Explains need for land use clause. Wants to have access to the land use information.</p> <p>Carmen Daggett: Explains proposal process to the state land use versus federal land use.</p> <p>Three ACRs will be submitted to address additional measures to limit non-resident caribou harvest to be considered for the 2016 BOG meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Require spacing of non-subsistence user camps 3-5 miles apart so that caribou can cross the river in their migration. 2) Let 1,000 caribou pass the Noatak River before any non-subsistence hunters can come to the Noatak River. 3) Extend the boundaries of the Controlled Use area to Makpik Creek, extending the CUA approximately 20 miles beyond the current boundary.

Adjournment: 12:47 pm

Minutes Recorded By: Carmen Daggett & Janet Mills
 Minutes Approved By: [Signature]
 Date: 2/20/15



AGENDA CHANGE REQUEST FORM ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

The Board of Game (board) will accept requests to change its schedule under certain guidelines set forth in 5 AAC 92.005. The board will accept these agenda change requests (ACRs) only:

- 1) for a conservation purpose or reason; or
- 2) to correct an error in regulation; or
- 3) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted.

The board will not accept an ACR that is predominantly allocative in nature in the absence of new compelling information, as determined by the board [5 AAC 92.005 (a) (2)].

Please answer all questions to the best of your ability.

<p>1) CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD. If possible, enter the series of letters and numbers that identify the regulation to be changed. If it will be a new section, enter "5 AAC NEW." Alaska Administrative Code Number 5 AAC: 92.540 (9)</p>
<p>2) WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM. Address only one issue. State the problem clearly and concisely. The board will reject multiple or confusing issues. The caribou migration is being diverted from the villages of Noatak and Kivalina by people who are using aircraft and camping along the Upper Noatak River.</p>
<p>3) WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER? Or, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new or amended regulation say? Extend the boundaries of the Controlled Use Area to Makpik Creek, extending the CUA approximately 20 miles beyond the current boundry.</p>
<p>4) STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED ABOVE. If one or more of the three criteria set forth above is not applicable, state that it is not.</p>
<p>a) for a conservation purpose or reason: Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>b) to correct an error in regulation: Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>c) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted: When the orginial CUA was established it made a no fly zone in a specific area, however, this area has proved to not be accomplishing the function of allowing the movement of caribou past Noatak and Kivalina as they are being diverted out of the river corridors. Extending the CUA to Makpik Creek, extending the CUA approximately 20 miles.</p>
<p>5) WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE? The villages of Noatak and Kivalina will spend an additional year beyond the last three years not having the caribou that they need to provide for subsistence use. We ask the board to consider this for next year.</p>



6) STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

This proposal is somewhat allocative, but new information has come about.

7) IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

- Subsistence needs for caribou of the villages of Noatak and Kivalina are not being met.
- The caribou migrations are being diverted away from the villages of Noatak Kivalina have been for three years by hunters who are too densely populated along the river causing the caribou to move further out of their normal migration that would normally go through the current Controlled Use Area which was established to protect traditional hunting areas by people in Noatak and Kivalina.
- Young people are losing valuable information and time with elders who are passing on such as; caribou hide preparation, sewing and hunting skills. We are losing our identity with the caribou.
- People are spending substantial amounts of money (\$1000-1500) to try to get caribou and are unsuccessful.

8) STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR. (e.g., hunter, guide, subsistence user, trapper, etc.)
Subsistence users who trap and hunt.

9) STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING.
It has not been considered before.

Submitted by:

NAME Noatak and Kivalina Advisory Committee

Individual or Group

P.O. Box 85

Address

Noatak

City, State

99761

Zip

907-485-2455

Home Phone

907-485-5099

Work Phone

tribaladmin@nautaaq.org

Email

SIGNATURE: 

DATE: 2/20/15

Note: Addresses and telephone numbers will not be published.



AGENDA CHANGE REQUEST FORM ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

The Board of Game (board) will accept requests to change its schedule under certain guidelines set forth in 5 AAC 92.005. The board will accept these agenda change requests (ACRs) only:

- 1) for a conservation purpose or reason; or
- 2) to correct an error in regulation; or
- 3) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted.

The board will not accept an ACR that is predominantly allocative in nature in the absence of new compelling information, as determined by the board [5 AAC 92.005 (a) (2)].

Please answer all questions to the best of your ability.

1) CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD. If possible, enter the series of letters and numbers that identify the regulation to be changed. If it will be a new section, enter "5 AAC NEW."

Alaska Administrative Code Number 5 AAC: 35.540 (9)

2) WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM. Address only one issue. State the problem clearly and concisely. The board will reject multiple or confusing issues.

The caribou migration is being diverted from the villages of Noatak and Kivalina by people who are using aircraft and camping along the Upper Noatak River.

3) WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER? Or, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new or amended regulation say?

Let 1,000 caribou pass the Noatak River before any sport hunters can come to the Noatak River.

4) STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED ABOVE. If one or more of the three criteria set forth above is not applicable, state that it is not.

a) for a conservation purpose or reason:

Click here to enter text.

b) to correct an error in regulation:

Click here to enter text.

c) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:

When the orginial CUA was established it made a no fly zone in a specific area, however, the density of hunters has condensed and moved up river preventing the leader caribou from guiding the rest of the herd to the Noatak and Kivalina region. If 1,000 caribou were allowed to pass it would allow the trails to be established.

5) WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

The villages of Noatak and Kivalina will spend an additional year beyond the last three years not having the caribou that they need to provide for subsistence use. We ask the board to consider this for next year.



6) STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

This proposal is somewhat allocative, but new information has come about.

7) IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

- Subsistence needs for caribou of the villages of Noatak and Kivalina are not being met.
- The caribou migrations are being diverted away from the villages of Noatak Kivalina have been for three years by hunters who are too densely populated along the river causing the caribou to move further out of their normal migration that would normally go through the current Controlled Use Area which was established to protect traditional hunting areas by people in Noatak and Kivalina.
- Young people are losing valuable information and time with elders who are passing on such as; caribou hide preparation, sewing and hunting skills. We are losing our identity with the caribou.
- People are spending substantial amounts of money (\$1000-1500) to try to get caribou and are unsuccessful.

8) STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR. (e.g., hunter, guide, subsistence user, trapper, etc.)

Subsistence users who trap and hunt.

9) STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING.

It has not been considered before.

Submitted by:

NAME Noatak and Kivalina Advisory Committee

Individual or Group

P.O. Box 85

Address

Noatak

City, State

99761

Zip

907-485-2455

Home Phone

907-485-5099

Work Phone

tribaladmin@nautaaq.org

Email

SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: 2/20/15

Note: Addresses and telephone numbers will not be published.

AGENDA CHANGE REQUEST FORM ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

The Board of Game (board) will accept requests to change its schedule under certain guidelines set forth in 5 AAC 92.005. The board will accept these agenda change requests (ACRs) only:

- 1) for a conservation purpose or reason; or
- 2) to correct an error in regulation; or
- 3) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted.

The board will not accept an ACR that is predominantly allocative in nature in the absence of new compelling information, as determined by the board [5 AAC 92.005 (a) (2)].

Please answer all questions to the best of your ability.

1) CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD. If possible, enter the series of letters and numbers that identify the regulation to be changed. If it will be a new section, enter "5 AAC NEW."

Alaska Administrative Code Number 5 AAC: 92.540 (9)

2) WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM. Address only one issue. State the problem clearly and concisely. The board will reject multiple or confusing issues.

The caribou migration is being diverted from the villages of Noatak and Kivalina by people who are using aircraft and camping along the Upper Noatak River.

3) WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER? Or, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new or amended regulation say?

Space non-subsistence user camps apart 3-5 miles so that caribou can cross the river in their migration.

4) STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED ABOVE. If one or more of the three criteria set forth above is not applicable, state that it is not.

a) for a conservation purpose or reason:
[Click here to enter text.](#)

b) to correct an error in regulation:
[Click here to enter text.](#)

c) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:
 The effect that was unforeseen when this regulation was adopted was the change in migration route due to an increase in the number of non-subsistence hunters in the migration corridors causing the caribou to migrate away from the villages of Noatak and Kivalina. This migration change has caused a decrease in accessibility to the Western Arctic Caribou Herd which means spending more money on gas \$1000-1500 per trip and still not getting caribou. The village of Noatak has not gotten caribou in the last three years.

5) WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?
 The villages of Noatak and Kivalina will spend an additional year beyond the last three not having the caribou that they need to provide for subsistence use. We ask the board to consider this for next year.



6) STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

This proposal is somewhat allocative, however there is new information that needs to be reconsidered.

7) IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

- The subsistence needs for caribou of the villages of Noatak and Kivalina are not being met.
- The caribou migrations are being diverted away from the villages of Noatak and Kivalina have been for three years by hunters who are too densely populated along the river causing the caribou to move further out of their normal migration that would normally go through the current Controlled Use Area which was established to protect traditional hunting areas by people in Noatak and Kivalina.
- Young people are losing valuable information and time with elders who are passing on such as; caribou hide preparation, sewing, and hunting skills. We are losing our cultural identity with our caribou.
- People are spending substantial amounts of money (\$1000-1500) to try to get caribou and unsuccessful.

8) STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR. (e.g., hunter, guide, subsistence user, trapper, etc.)

Subsistence users who trap and hunt.

9) STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING.

It has not been considered before.

Submitted by:

NAME Noatak and Kivalina Advisory Committee

Individual or Group

<u>P.O. Box 85</u>	<u>Noatak</u>	<u>99761</u>
Address	City, State	Zip
<u>907-485-2455</u>	<u>907-485-5099</u>	<u>tribaladmin@nautaaq.org</u>
Home Phone	Work Phone	Email

SIGNATURE:  DATE: 2/20/15

Note: Addresses and telephone numbers will not be published.

AGENDA CHANGE REQUEST FORM

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

The Board of Game (board) will accept requests to change its schedule under certain guidelines set forth in 5 AAC 92.005. The board will accept these agenda change requests (ACRs) only:

- 1) for a conservation purpose or reason; or
- 2) to correct an error in regulation; or
- 3) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted.

The board will not accept an ACR that is predominantly allocative in nature in the absence of new compelling information, as determined by the board [5 AAC 92.005 (a) (2)].

Please answer all questions to the best of your ability.

1) CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD. If possible, enter the series of letters and numbers that identify the regulation to be changed. If it will be a new section, enter "5 AAC NEW."

Alaska Administrative Code Number 5 AAC: 35.540 (9)

2) WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM. Address only one issue. State the problem clearly and concisely. The board will reject multiple or confusing issues.

The caribou migration is being diverted from the villages of Noatak and Kivalina by people who are using aircraft and camping along the Upper Noatak River.

3) WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER? Or, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new or amended regulation say?

Let 1,000 caribou pass the Noatak River before any sport hunters can come to the Noatak River.

4) STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED ABOVE. If one or more of the three criteria set forth above is not applicable, state that it is not.

a) for a conservation purpose or reason:

Click here to enter text.

b) to correct an error in regulation:

Click here to enter text.

c) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:

When the original CUA was established it made a no fly zone in a specific area, however, the density of hunters has condensed and moved up river preventing the leader caribou from guiding the rest of the herd to the Noatak and Kivalina region. If 1,000 caribou were allowed to pass it would allow the trails to be established.

5) WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?

The villages of Noatak and Kivalina will spend an additional year beyond the last three years not having the caribou that they need to provide for subsistence use. We ask the board to consider this for next year.

6) STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

This proposal is somewhat allocative, but new information has come about.

7) IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

- Subsistence needs for caribou of the villages of Noatak and Kivalina are not being met.
- The caribou migrations are being diverted away from the villages of Noatak Kivalina have been for three years by hunters who are too densely populated along the river causing the caribou to move further out of their normal migration that would normally go through the current Controlled Use Area which was established to protect traditional hunting areas by people in Noatak and Kivalina.
- Young people are losing valuable information and time with elders who are passing on such as; caribou hide preparation, sewing and hunting skills. We are losing our identity with the caribou.
- People are spending substantial amounts of money (\$1000-1500) to try to get caribou and are unsuccessful.

8) STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR. (e.g., hunter,

guide, subsistence user, trapper, etc.)
Subsistence users who trap and hunt.

9) STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING.

It has not been considered before.

Submitted by:

NAME Noatak and Kivalina Advisory Committee

Individual or Group

P.O. Box 85

Address

Noatak

City, State

99761

Zip

907-485-2455

Home Phone

907-485-5099

Work Phone

tribaladmin@nautaaq.org

Email

SIGNATURE: 

DATE: 2/20/15

Note: Addresses and telephone numbers will not be published.

AGENDA CHANGE REQUEST FORM ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

The Board of Game (board) will accept requests to change its schedule under certain guidelines set forth in 5 AAC 92.005. The board will accept these agenda change requests (ACRs) only:

- 1) for a conservation purpose or reason; or
- 2) to correct an error in regulation; or
- 3) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted.

The board will not accept an ACR that is predominantly allocative in nature in the absence of new compelling information, as determined by the board [5 AAC 92.005 (a) (2)].

Please answer all questions to the best of your ability.

1) CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD. If possible, enter the series of letters and numbers that identify the regulation to be changed. If it will be a new section, enter "5 AAC NEW."

Alaska Administrative Code Number 5 AAC: 92.540 (9)

2) WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM. Address only one issue. State the problem clearly and concisely. The board will reject multiple or confusing issues.

The caribou migration is being diverted from the villages of Noatak and Kivalina by people who are using aircraft and camping along the Upper Noatak River.

3) WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER? Or, if the board adopted your solution, what would the new or amended regulation say?

Space non-subsistence user camps apart 3-5 miles so that caribou can cross the river in their migration.

4) STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED ABOVE. If one or more of the three criteria set forth above is not applicable, state that it is not.

a) for a conservation purpose or reason:
[Click here to enter text.](#)

b) to correct an error in regulation:
[Click here to enter text.](#)

c) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:
 The effect that was unforeseen when this regulation was adopted was the change in migration route due to an increase in the number of non-subsistence hunters in the migration corridors causing the caribou to migrate away from the villages of Noatak and Kivalina. This migration change has caused a decrease in accessibility to the Western Arctic Caribou Herd which means spending more money on gas \$1000-1500 per trip and still not getting caribou. The village of Noatak has not gotten caribou in the last three years.

5) WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE?
 The villages of Noatak and Kivalina will spend an additional year beyond the last three not having the caribou that they need to provide for subsistence use. We ask the board to consider this for next year.



6) STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE.

This proposal is somewhat allocative, however there is new information that needs to be reconsidered.

7) IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE.

- The subsistence needs for caribou of the villages of Noatak and Kivalina are not being met.
- The caribou migrations are being diverted away from the villages of Noatak and Kivalina have been for three years by hunters who are too densely populated along the river causing the caribou to move further out of their normal migration that would normally go through the current Controlled Use Area which was established to protect traditional hunting areas by people in Noatak and Kivalina.
- Young people are losing valuable information and time with elders who are passing on such as; caribou hide preparation, sewing, and hunting skills. We are losing our cultural identity with our caribou.
- People are spending substantial amounts of money (\$1000-1500) to try to get caribou and unsuccessful.

8) STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR. (e.g., hunter, guide, subsistence user, trapper, etc.)
Subsistence users who trap and hunt.

9) STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS A PROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING.
It has not been considered before.

Submitted by:

NAME Noatak and Kivalina Advisory Committee
Individual or Group

<u>P.O. Box 85</u>	<u>Noatak</u>	<u>99761</u>
Address	City, State	Zip
<u>907-485-2455</u>	<u>907-485-5099</u>	<u>tribaladmin@nautaaq.org</u>
Home Phone	Work Phone	Email

SIGNATURE: DATE: 2/20/15

Note: Addresses and telephone numbers will not be published.

Seward Fish & Game Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes of December 11, 2014
Seward City Council Chambers

RECEIVED

FEB 09 2015

BOARDS
ANCHORAGE

- I. Call to Order: 1902 hours by Chairman Jim McCracken
- II. Roll Call:
Members Present: McCracken, White, Casey, Hall, Flood, Hanneman, Herbert
Members Absent: Dubuc, Hatch, Foldager, Campbell, Hubbard, Clemens
Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 6, quorum present since membership of Seward AC is now at 11 members.
List of User Groups Present: hunting, game guide, personal use, non-consumptive, sport fish
- III. Approval of Agenda: Approved without objection but to include discussion of 3 year cycle for Board of Game meetings.
- IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: From meeting of October, 23, 2014 approved; notes from meeting of November 13, 2014 distributed. This latter meeting lacked quorum and no official business was conducted.
- V. Fish and Game Staff Present: Jeff Selinger, Game Biologist Soldotna. Thanks to him for traveling a second time to Seward to help with our deliberations.
- VI. Guests Present: None
- VII. Old Business: none
- VIII. New Business: Regarding the proposed three year cycle for the BOG, most felt the two year cycle was better. Seems more people and issues kept coming up that required attention. Two years allow better reaction time. There are issues such as the annual renewal of antlerless moose hunts that need to be authorized. The state will see significant budget problems in the coming years and the legislature and various agencies will have to decide what is of greatest importance and how to pay for those services.

Casey volunteered to be Chair of the Kid's Fishing Day next spring. He will receive the fishing poles and gear from Collman. The scheduled date is May 16, 2015. Organizing, fund raising and prizes need to be taking care of before the event. We encourage all AC members to participate.

The main business for this meeting is to review and make comments on the proposal that will be considered by the Board of Game at their March 13, 2015 meeting for GMU's 6,7, and 15 as well as relevant statewide proposals.

The local area is acknowledged to have low numbers of moose which is of continued concern to many AC members. Brown bears continue to be of concern as well. Comments on proposals reflect these concerns.

Regarding votes below, when numbers do not add up to the 7 members present, assume the remaining votes abstained.

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOG	140	Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C.	
	5	1	We recognize the role of AC's in voting to keep this regulation on the books annually. It can be controversial, but we feel decisions based on good game management and not politics will drive decisions. It appears the current philosophy of F&G is to provide harvest opportunities when justifiable by population biology. Support of this proposal does not mandate a hunt, just keeps the option on the books.
BOG	149	Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt area in Units 7 and 14C.	
	6	0	See comments on #140. Historically this is a good place to hunt if population numbers allow. The main concern is overgrazing of the willows in the area. Many are already at 4-5 feet. As in other areas, when snow drives moose from higher elevations they combine with residents and this is when browse can be over grazed. Milder winters decrease the problem.
BOG	156	Shorten the moose seasons in Unit 15.	
	0	6	We are not in favor as written. Do not like the idea of special seasons for specific user groups. Feel there are ample opportunities for all in the regular season. We do have interest in moving the season later to get to cooler weather to help preserve meat and allow for better antler development [to make better call on the spike, fork, brow tine decisions]. We like the current antler regulations but acknowledge that there needs to be continued education of some hunters to clearly know what defines these standards. We like keeping all moose hunts within the same time frame and avoiding sub-area overlapping seasons for easier enforcement. We did hear that an early archery season may have had some safety advantage to allow "garden moose" in residential areas to be taken ahead of the rifle hunts but that was not a compelling enough reason for the separate season. If the season went longer, there is a fear that bulls in the rut would be more available and their meat would not be as desirable. Perhaps bowhunters would have easier access at this time rather than a separate earlier season.
BOG	157	Change the general bull moose season dates in Unit 15 to September 1-30	
	7	0	Reject as written but generally support the time frame 9/1-20 to keep it in synch with adjacent areas. See comments above #156
BOG	158	Open a nonresident moose season in Unit 15C.	

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			Discussed but no action. Noted lack of spike in this proposal suggesting it was aimed at a trophy hunt for non-residents perhaps led by a guide.
BOG	161		Change the bag limit for moose in Units 7 and 15 to 50-inch antlers with three or more brow tines.
	0	4	Local sportmen state that in area 7 finding a moose with more than 3 brow tines is exceptionally rare. This would have a marked impact on hunting opportunity here where harvests are low in the first place. One member reiterated his concerns that the large number of brown bears was the most significant issue for moose populations in Unit 7. He felt that the elimination of spikes would not matter much as these often do not over winter and are eaten by brown bears or wolves. Jeff stated ~12 moose were taken illegally due to not being the full 50" or having proper brow times. This problem needs an education solution. More importantly whatever criteria we choose for the taking of bulls will put pressure on that genetic segment of the population. For example going after large racks will tend to eliminate those genes from the breeding pool. Jeff said antler formation is highly linked to genetics and local natural and hunting pressure.
BOG	163		Eliminate the early archery season for moose in Units 15A and 15B.
	6	1	An early season with more leaves on the brush makes tracking an arrow wounded deer much more difficult. It makes the chance of meat spoilage greater because of higher temperatures early in August as well as the tracking time. We do not endorse the idea of special seasons. We like alignment of seasons in sub areas and adjacent areas whenever possible.
BOG	164		Open seven day archery seasons for moose following the general seasons in Units 7 and 15
	0	7	See above comments regarding special seasons for special groups. New archery gear can be high powered and sophisticated compared to older gear. This takes away some of the disadvantages of bow hunting. We acknowledge that bow hunter purists cannot hunt quietly and in their preferred style when they share the woods with gun hunters but they have always have the opportunity along with muzzleloaders to the regular season.
BOG	167		Issue resident moose permits for problem areas near roads during the winter in Unit 15C.
			No vote, but noted that on the Kenai Peninsula at least a share of these 'nuisance moose' are near private property which is concentrated along roads and highways. This leads to other conflicts. It is dubious that this type of special hunt would have any significant effect on road kills on the Kenai Peninsula.
BOG	168		Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.
	5	1	See comments regarding reauthorizing antlerless hunts above [#140 and #149]. Noted that 50 permits were issued this passed year as in recent years with about 18 taken. If increased permits to 100 Jeff doubted the harvest would go above 25 due to issues with private property in 15C. If two permit holders were on a cow and calf, they could both be shot. Otherwise a cow with calf is not allowed and this is one reason he sees for a lower harvest. It was brought out that non residents can apply for this permit drawing in the general season.

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOG	170		Modify of the harvest management strategy for Kenai Peninsula brown bears, Units 7 and 15.
	1	5	F+G takes no position on this refuge proposal since they have their own #171. Jeff feels the count of 42/1000km [2010 study] is better than earlier numbers that put the whole peninsula population between 350-400 animals. Still for a coastal brown bear population this is a low number when compared to SE AK and Kodiak. It is well known that the brown bears are moving on and off the refuge and this makes estimates difficult. Jeff feels the expense of a significant population survey would not be as valuable as the collared bear studies that are on going. He believes that the recent harvest of 70 bears is not sustainable without damage to the population. Liberal bait station harvests seem to have taken relatively large numbers of big males. Smaller males and females are likely to be taken under current regs in future years. Fish and Wildlife Refuge officials see what is happening on their lands as a problem now. They have a mission to "manage for natural diversity" among other things. US Forest Service lands have different management goals and policies. For example, a more aggressive harvest of brown bears around the Russian River may be in their and the public's interest.
BOG	171		Modify the brown bear harvest management strategy on the Kenai Peninsula, Units 7 and 15.
	5	2	See comments #170. Like the idea of splitting the harvest between Front Country and Back Country in an effort to reduce brown bear numbers in more heavily populated areas where troublesome interactions occur with people. We see that sustained yield as a management goal is desirable and harder to achieve with certain species like brown bears due to their slower recovery if driven to low numbers such as may have been the case in the 1990's. The 70 harvest is likely not sustainable without damaging the population and could be enforced de facto by Refuge managers on their property. The idea of a 40 bear harvest seems reasonable with 10 total females including DLP kills. One member feels that moose populations stand no chance of recovery as long as brown bear populations are high. Others see diversity as more desirable. Though it is set up as a registration hunt for management reasons, it is essentially run like a general hunt and open to all.
BOG	172		Lengthen the brown bear season in Units 7 and 15 and remove the meat salvage requirements for brown bear taken over bait.
	4	2	Submitted by a local citizen and AC member who believes the brown bear population needs to be reduced to allow for increase in moose populations. He cited historical information to show why DLP, commercial hunting, and the like kept numbers low. In the last 20-40 years with stricter regulations he feels there have been significant increases in brown bear numbers. The salvage of meat that is usually not considered desirable by most people is a negative to bear harvest over bait. Others wondered if carcasses left behind would only bring in more

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			bears. This proposal seeks to lengthen the season which has been liberalized in recent years. Fish and Game has concerns about future damage to the population due to a high brown bear harvest on the peninsula in the past few years. Non consumptive users are keen to take pictures of the bears but there is a significant conflict I they encounter one on the trail with only a camera and no protection. The status quo appealed to the dissenting votes.
BOG	173		Remove meat salvage requirements for taking brown bear over bait in the Southcentral Region.
			See previous
BOG	175		Shorten the season and reduce the bag limit for ptarmigan in Unit 15C, north of Kachemak Bay and Fox River.
	7	0	We believe the bag limit is not as important as shortening the season. The spring allows for excellent back country travel and long days. The birds are staking out territory and more tame this time of year. Homer residents do not depend on these animals for food and should share responsibility for maintaining local populations. Usually the possession limit is twice the daily bag limit. We notice the number is four times as high in the written proposal. We wonder if this is tied to the guide's own business and remote lodge. Historically this area has seen increased pressure on ptarmigan with increasing populations over the years.
BOG	176		Reduce the bag limit for ptarmigan in Unit 15C, north of Kachemak Bay and Fox River.
			See #175
BOG	178		Require trap identification in Units 7 and 15.
	2	5	While trap ID is required in SE AK and in certain other localities, it does not seem to warrant it here. It seems a bureaucratic solution to a minimal problem. It is required in the Refuge. One member recalled as a kid he was required to ID his trap in Michigan but to him it seems petty. If it does go forward we suggest an ID number and not a personal name or address. Those in favor thought it could help identify folks with poor practices that can give trapper's a poor image.
BOG	179		Establish a trapper identification numbering system for Units 7 and 15.
			See#178
BOG	180		Restrict trapping in the Cooper Landing area.
	0	5	A local vet said that in 20 years he has seen only 3 dogs brought to him form traps. One was dead the other two survived. He does not see it as a big problem. While folks like to see their dogs run free, most agree that owners must be responsible. Current law is on the side of trappers. We do not know how big a problem this is in Cooper Landing but see that there could be lots of land put off limits by the proposal. We encourage local trappers to act responsibly around populated areas and private property to avoid the conflict. We all agree you can't legislate common sense. Perhaps designating a few areas close to town near private property would satisfy the proposers while still allowing trapping in the general area.

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOG	181	Restrict trapping in the Seward and Moose Pass areas.	
	1	5	See comments above. This proposal again puts very large areas off limits to trapping. One AC member suggested that the maker of the proposal did not understand why you do not use a size 3 trap for small animals. Opposition stated that the area has many non consumptive users that like to let their dogs run free.
BOG	182	Prohibit the taking of big game from boats in Units 7 and 15 in coastal or estuarine waters, with an exception for persons with disabilities.	
	0	7	Boat hunting [not under power not moving] is allowed but may be reducing black bear populations along the shores of the outer Kenai Peninsula. It is unknown if there are strong populations away from the shore to keep the numbers up. It is a popular spring hunt already and we do not feel a special permit hunt for handicapped people is warranted. There is concern about the wide variety of conditions that qualify for handicap status. Also concern for the retrieval of animals shot from the boat.
BOG	183	Create a management area for Kachemak Bay in Unit 15C.	
	0	5	Opinion that there are other avenues for citizens and organizations to interact with F&G staff and the Board without creating a special entity. Seems like while intentions are good it is increasing the bureaucracy and possibly creating more red tape. Seems like we already have sufficient rules and regulations in place for the Kachemak Bay area.

Next Meeting May 7, 2015 unless need to coordinate with Sherry Wright for elections in January. McCracken will contact her.

Adjournment: motion by Hall, ended 2134 hours

Minutes Recorded By: J. Herbert
 Minutes Approved By: Jim McCracken
 Date: via email 2/3/2015

Seldovia Fish & Game Advisory Committee
January 12, 2015
Seldovia Community Multi-Purpose Room

Call to Order: Time by Michael Opheim, Vice Chair

Roll Call: Bryan Chartier, Michael Opheim, Walt Sonen, Keith Swick, Alvin Swick

Jordan Cameron, Dave Chartier and Allison Miller were absent excused.

Keith Gain was absent unexcused.

Fish and Game Staff Present: Sherry Wright

Old Business: None

New Business:

Officer elections were held with the following results: Michael Opheim, Allison Miller and Keith Swick were elected for 2.5 year terms and Alvin Swick was elected to fill a two year seat. There were no alternates elected.

Michael Opheim was elected Vice Chair. Allison Miller was discussed as a potential secretary and the Chair position will remain open until the full committee can come together.

Sherry Wright updated the committee on the Board of Game meeting cycle which is changing to a 3 years cycle. Next year's Call for Proposals will include Statewide regulations and they combined the Cycle A and Cycle B lists into one. May 1, 2015 is the proposal deadline. According to their approved schedule, the next time for Southcentral region proposals would be May 1, 2018. This may change once they review and realize they put Statewide on a two year basis and that will need to be revised. Sherry will speak to Kristy to see if SouthCentral call for proposals can be included in 2017 to maintain every three years. BOG worksession meeting will be held March 17 2016, with the Statewide meeting following March 18-28 in Fairbanks.

RC 19 is a laundry list of Sheep proposals on the web site (under the BOG work session Meeting Information). The Joint Board changed proposals so that they were supposed to be single issues only and the proposals need to be broken out to each option as a separate proposal. Multiple issues make it unclear as to what is being supported or opposed.

RECEIVED
FEB 26 2015
BOARDS
ANCHORAGE

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOG	157		Change the general bull moose season dates in Unit 15 to September 1-30
	5	0	The moose have been going into rut later, the temperature is cooler and people would like to hunt later. Don't have to worry about hanging the meat. If other

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			areas close earlier, you might get influx of hunters, which would be the only down side that could be seen.
BOG	161		Change the bag limit for moose in Units 7 and 15 to 50-inch antlers with three or more brow tines.
	0	5	Locals like spike hunting and they believe there is enough smaller moose.
BOG	163		Eliminate the early archery season for moose in Units 15A and 15B.
	5	0	When local people go to harvest subsistence, there is more competition in the field. There should be an even playing field for all hunters.
BOG	166		Change the resident, antlerless moose season in Unit 15C to November 1-30.
	5	0	Like the later season because it's cooler, you can let it hang. Support the reasons given in the proposal.
BOG	168		Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.
	5	0	There is support for this hunt and no concern about the moose population. Recent fires have made browse and potentially more moose available. This is an annual reauthorization.
BOG	178		Require trap identification in Units 7 and 15.
	5	0	This would notify people that there is a trap in an area and may help someone prevent a domestic animal from being inadvertently trapped.
BOG	182		Prohibit the taking of big game from boats in Units 7 and 15 in coastal or estuarine waters, with an exception for persons with disabilities.
	5	0	Black bear populations seem to be down in numbers. There is a three bear limit, and very few that harvest that many, but there is concern that some may go around and shooting them off the hill. Not sure how much of a difference it will make but seems like it may help. Black bear are also noticeable smaller. There is a noticeable shortage of bear hunters as well. AMENDMENT: Would like to see the regulations go back to one bear in the Spring, one bear in the Fall. 5-0 support
BOG	183		Create a management area for Kachemak Bay in Unit 15C.
	0	5	There is already a park and the locals don't want to see avenue to implant further restrictions was the primary concern.
BOG	191		Remove the restriction against using felt sole waders while hunting in Southcentral Region Units.
	0	5	We prefer the existing regulations. Whether fishing or hunting a person could inadvertently transport an invasive species.

Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.

Minutes Recorded By: Sherry Wright
 Minutes Approved By: Michael Opheim
 Date: 2/9/2015

Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee Minutes
King Career Center, 2650 E Northern Lights Blvd
February 3, 2015

RECEIVED

FEB 27 2015

BOARDS
ANCHORAGE

- I. Call to Order: 6:34 PM, Joel Doner
- II. Roll Call:
Joel Doner, Chair, George Jacoby, Vice-Chair, Sam Albanese, Secretary, Neil Dewitt, Jim Bolgiano, Steve Flory, Phil Calhoun, Frank Neumann, Mark Campbell, Robert Peck, Kevin Taylor, Robert Caywood, Ehren Strahn, Brian Nelson, Michael Klehr

Members Absent: Dwight Johnson
Number Needed for Quorum on AC: 8
List of User Groups Present: None

- III. Approval of Agenda: Yes
- IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: Anchorage Advisory Committee Meeting
William Hernandez Hatchery
January 6, 2015
- V. Fish and Game Staff Present: Dave Battle and Dave Saalfeld, Sherry Wright
- VI. Guests Present: Ted Spraker and Robert Mumford from the Board of Game
Richard Person, Jim Stubbs, Brett Wilbank

Old Business

Wood Bison Restoration Project Management Plan

Joel spoke to this. The management plan is in near final draft. Fee for land use needed to be hashed out. The fee for Alaska residents other than shareholder will be \$300, for non-resident \$500-\$1500. A viewing fee would also apply.

Joel said Doyon owns 30% of the land. They do not allow any land use now but unanimously approved this. The board of Doyon is expected to endorse this plan. Expect to fly out 20-26 mature animals in March. Now that we know the land access we need to reiterate support. Steve motioned we support this plan. Seconded. Passed by unanimous consent.

Public testimony:

Richard Person talked to the AAC about the PWS Spot Shrimp fishery
Closely regulated fishery. Quota is established by survey conducted by dept.
40% commercial, 60% non-commercial allocation.

Opposed to proposals 253, 258, 259, and 260.

Favors proposals 253, 254, and 256.

His proposal requires Lat/Lon for each pot and to call in to Cordova office every Wednesday to report catch.

The proposals opposed either close or restrict the fishery. These are based upon the shrimp numbers going down. The graph provided indicates the shrimp numbers have slightly increased for the last 4 years for non-commercial catch. With that in mind his proposals are 255 and 256. This are a small boat fishery and they will like to fish with 5 pots on a string instead of 4 and not have to put the second buoy line on the string. This will reduce the number of buoys and the amount of line deployed.

Joel said both proposals are just the number of pots, not the pot limit. Float line entanglement can be a problem.

Robert Peck said on the personal use you have to identify your set on the buoy, do the commercial guys do. Yes, they have to have the ADFG number.

Neil, the vessel count is the number of boats, over the last few years the # of vessels have declined but the catch has gone up. Richard replied yes, the boats went down in numbers. This fishery is not for every boat, some cannot make money, other can.

The Sound is divided into 3 areas, only one is fished each year. The Whittier AC submitted proposal 254, Richard supports this proposal.

Steve asked Richard if he generally supports the Department's proposals. Richard said yes.

Joel asked Richard to explain the registration areas. Areas 1, 2, and 3 and the area E areas.

Joel said we, the Anchorage AC decided to take no action on these proposals.

Steve commented to Richard that there is a proposal for trapping to have your name on the traps.

Richard is opposed to it due to concern about anyone being able to place a name on a trap.

Steve Flory addressed the committee about the antlerless hunts. We were told these hunts would reduce collisions. Fences, lights and cutting back reduced the collisions, not killing cows. The department needs to prove with numbers that the hunts reduce collisions.

We doubt the numbers the department has provided. The department, when questioned about surveys, will say they did not get in an area. They extrapolate the numbers.

We are told to trust the experts, yet Kings, the Mulchatna and Northwest Arctic Caribou have disappeared.

We are told we can't transplant moose, yet other states have and we have in the past. The department opposed hunt 666 due to tourism. It is up to this committee to change the direction of the department.

Jim asked if funds from Robertson Pittman money to help relocate game.

Robert Peck asked what one area has numbers sufficient to support transplanting. The Portage herd is one.

Robert pointed out there is not an over-abundance of moose.

Steve said the Gustavus area is probably the one area with an abundance of moose.

Ehren questioned will the taking away of antlerless hunts result in the department devising other means. Steve said we have to start somewhere. What we are doing is not increasing moose populations.

George asked if Steve knew Dale that set up the ACs and why he set it up for the ACs to be able to stop the antlerless hunts. Watchdogs.

Steve said it was to have the department and ACs work together. This process has declined in effectiveness.

Jim asked about the road kill, and the possibility to attract the moose away from the road corridors. Steve is not a biologist. He has seen crushing efforts in other areas and this has helped. The moose will go to where it is easier to walk and feed. If the moose has nowhere to go, they will not move.

Jim Stubbs, former AC member addressed the AC about 60 foot gillnets in the Kasilof and Kenai rivers. He was the Vice Chair and Board of Fish Chair. Knows Cook Inlet well. Resigned from the AC in September.

Gill nets are indiscriminate killers.

Moose Meadows was given to them for gill nets. Then the battle started on the Kasilof. Small Steelhead numbers.

The native group was able to get a lobbyist to push this forward. It's a turf battle. He asked us to send a letter to the federal subsistence board to protest this. They are allowed 4000 reds and 1000 kings. Gill nets will catch anything.

Mark asked who monitors the catch, USFW is supposed to. There is supposedly a 24 hours from catch reporting time.

Mark asked is there a place we can read on the specifics of how this is done. Jim said we would have to find it on the Federal subsistence board website.

Neil asked if Jim will be testifying February 18th at the Dimond Hotel. Jim said he may.

Jim said it is prudent that the AC take a stance on Board nominees. He reminded us we represent all the people of Anchorage. He talked about the past history of the BOF nominee Roland and his being a drifter. Does not think he is a good fit for the board. It is too contentious. We need to focus on the health of the fishery. Whoever it is needs to represent the resource first.

Steve asked if Jim had any comments on the shrimp proposals. He is against it. In the 80s there was a severe crash and it took 20 years to recover from it.

Ted Spraker addressed the AC about the Sheep issue. He asked Christy Tibbles to review all the proposals that have gone through the ACs. 2002-2013 had 92 proposals in regards to sheep hunts, 22 more and another 7. He said we have not done much, only passed a handful

The board members are waiting on the guide concession proposals. This would be a real step up to address some of the sheep issues. He really wants to provide an insight to the upcoming meetings.

February 13th will have a town hall in Wasilla at 630 PM. Call in will be provided.

Some information will be provided, but not a tremendous amount. A few people will have information and bullet points available as a handout.

Primarily they want to listen to people.

Folks have been concerned about the board moving faster and making changes. The ACs spend a lot of time dealing with all the sheep proposals. It is time we get this to the public in a concise manner. They want to talk about establishing a working group. The department has \$150K set aside for a sheep-working group. The next part is to decide who will be on it. Will probably be run like the unit 4 brown bear management team. On this sheep issue it will be a failure to not have a strong AC voice on this board. The 5 or 6 ACs most affected should be on this working group. BOG would have 2-3, Fish and Game, Subsistence, Private land owners, current sheep hunters, AOC, SCI, the new Sheep Foundation group. The next phase, a 1976 management plan, thought Ken Taylor would be here tonight, those plans need to be updated. We are using plans that are 40 years old. F&G needs to update them. Then have the working group review it, then back to the public. This process may take 6 months to a year to complete. We need to get this moving.

22 proposals are legally noticed and published and will be looked at at the Wasilla meeting.

Ted is very uncomfortable pushing these forward until the working groups have a crack at it.

Other ACs are opting to push the proposals aside and go the working group route. Residents account for 80% of the hunters and need to be heard. Ted does not see any red flags from harvest. Cutting the harvest down will not change anything. The issue is a lot of dissatisfied hunters. Encourages us to get involved in this.

The meeting will be at the Best Western Lake Lucille.

Joel stated the working group would be vital. That will be after the town-hall meeting. Hopefully this meeting will get agreement for the working group.

Joel stated he knows this committee wants a place on this working group.

Ted said it will be a real mistake to not have ACs on this working group.

Robert Peck asked if it is true that sheep numbers are down 70%. Ted said he has heard its bout 50% in the Brooks. Resident hunters are trending down. Why are the resident hunting declining? Was it the federal subsistence? We lost 30% of the sheep hunting land.

Steve said board generated proposals and moving on them would be premature. These are statewide and we will be having a statewide meeting next year. The AC has a history of not embracing working groups. If a working group is formed, have it comprised of ACs first. The other organizations are special interest. ACs are elected and has a constituency.

Board generated proposals. When made they had attorneys there. The Board has the authority to generate a proposal on the spot and vote on it. He does not like it. He wanted to get those out since they have good ideas and options.

Second point about groups working together, whatever comes out of the working group will be reviewed by the BOG and back to the public before any decision is made.

Ted went on about the usefulness of the working groups as well as pitfalls.

Steve reiterated this is his last tour of duty on the AC and in May he will step down.

When this is all said and done, he would want people to say this has been a fair and transparent public process.

In 1986 he supported the spike fork and 50 inches or better. Steve reminded him about the 2002 appearance with regard to the Nelchina Caribou.

Robert Mumford addressed the AC about the probable end of his term on the board. He would like to stay on. He feels bad that he has not come before us enough. Its important that we get to know him. Sometimes he voted against what we wanted, and hopes he was able to articulate what and that we understood. He always tries to vote for the resource first.

Steve stated that last year we took up a proposal about black bear snaring in unit 3. It was supported by this AC and 10 others. It was supported by the Department too. The NPS opposed. Robert spoke to this proposal that he opposed it due to public testimony. Mumford said he had 3000 people in opposition of it. He does not personally support bear snaring. He has had an awful lot of people that told him they opposed it.

Robert Peck thanked him for what he does recognizing that we won't all agree.

Brett Wilbanks addressed the AC about the shrimp proposals. After Mr. Stubbs filled us in with 3rd party anecdotal testimony; it highlighted the controversy between commercial and non-commercial.

Stated the catch per unit is up as is the total poundage caught in the last several years. Close to 40% of the non-commercial harvest is right out of Whittier. The commercial effort is less than half of what is allowed. The number of the commercial participants is meager. There is a local demand that they are trying to fill.

His third priority is proposal 248 that suggested non-commercial shrimp fishers report their catch during the season so that F&G can better manage the resource. He contends the non-commercial reporting is inaccurate and thus undermines the ability to manage the fishery. If there is over fishing by the noncommercial fleet, there needs to be a mechanism to effectively manage the resource. Continue to allow commercial fishing and he is opposed to any proposal to reduce or eliminate commercial fishing and require noncommercial reporting.

Align the number of pots for both groups to 5 pots per string, (256), opposes 255.

Supports proposal 254. Limiting the catch to a statistical area has no bearing on what the area can support.

George said the department estimates the allowed catch, how. Brett said they do a survey though does not know how. He would be speculating on its accuracy.

Robert Peck asked about the 40% catch near Whittier. He asked why it is better to fish there. It must be due to an abundance of shrimp.

Ron Jordan addressed the AC about the Kenai River update USFW. Several Alaska Natives are not happy with that. They dip net along the Kenai and Kasilof Rivers. The gill nets will impact them.

The Governors appointment to the BOF is advocating shutting down the dip netting. He opposes this appointment.

F&G does a good job keeping data. Individual sportsman fill out the white card, but is it turned in and accounted for.

Fish and Game management change in the Knowles administration and we need to improve how it is managed.

Break at 810 PM to reconvene in 5 minutes.

VII. New Business: Reconvened at 8:24PM Committee Reports

Legislative Chair – Steve Flory

Suggest a few things to take up.

First thing is support or non-support for Rolland Maw for the BOF. Motion was seconded.

Steve stated he is devotedly commercial.

Does not believe this committee can support him and would like us to write to oppose his nomination.

Joel, to be clear, the Motion is to write a letter opposing his nomination to be sent to the legislature and Governor.

Neil spoke about the good we have done in northern Cook Inlet and supports bringing Chairman Johnstone back on to the BOF.

Joel talked about Mr. Stubbs appointment of Rolland Maws. There is potential for conflict between user groups. The relationship between Rolland and drift netters has been contentious. He disagrees with Neil's comments about Johnstone. He said he and Rolland Maw have not seen eye to eye on issues, but he is intelligent and knows salmon and Cook Inlet. When there is a conflict of interest, that person is conflicted out. Joel thinks he would be a great member for the BOF. The BOF with him will be better for it.

Robert Caywood stated we have to many commercial fishermen and need someone that looks out for the majority of our interests.

Question called, 11 opposed, 2 for it, 1 abstain.

Joel said it would serve the committee best if Steve drafted it. Steve said it is half done and can send it out by tomorrow afternoon. Steve will send it to the AAC through Joel.

The Governor wants to move forward with nomination for the BOG, Steve has 3.

His motion is we support:

Theresa Sager Albaugh
Al Barrette
Bethany Martin.

These are all people this committee has supported in the past. Al was previously rejected and it is unlikely he will be rejected again.

Joel stated taking up 3 at once will be cumbersome; we should take them up individually.

Motion to write a letter of support for Theresa Sager Albaugh – seconded
Robert supports her and Neil
Question called.
Passed unanimously.

Motion to write a letter of support for Al Barrette – seconded
Steve spoke in support of him.
Joel stated he has met and spoken with Al but does not know that much about Al.
Frank said he has watched Al participate at BOG meetings. He supports him.
Question called.
11 for, 3 abstained, 0 opposed.

Motion to write a letter of support for Bethany Martin – seconded
Steve spoke in support of her.
Robert said he had another person he supports. Lynn Keogh, Steve said he spoke with him and he is not interested.
Robert Peck has known her for a while and acknowledge she doesn't always agree.
Kevin asked what are we looking for in board members.
Steve said we look for those that think the same way this committee votes. Some members are definitely not looking first to the AC for their input. We want BOG members to talk to us. George asked Steve what makes him think Bethany has the knowledge to be on the BOG. Steve said she has been and stays engaged in the process and will help provide us more voice in the legislature.

5 yes, 2 oppose 7 abstain. Motion passed.

George Motioned we write a letter of support for Robert Mumford – seconded
Joel said we have a BOG meeting coming up and we have proposals we support. He will be there and we need to consider that.
Steve said he opposes Mr. Mumford. He does not attend many of our meetings, only 2 he knows of including tonight.

Neil spoke for Mr. Mumford because he has time to speak with us and is knowledgeable of the subject. Joel's perspective is when a proposal is before us, we listen, half say one way, half the other. We consider the data and input and decide based upon that and what is best for Anchorage and Alaska. He can respect what he has to say on the board.

Steve said Mr. Mumford will sit on the board regardless of what we say as the new members will not be seated until July 1. Arguing we need to appoint him because he is there now is like the department saying we need to support proposals because they already sold the tickets.

Mark asked Mr. Mumford if he supports the taking of cow moose in 14C. Depends on the public testimony and says the testimony supports it he would support it. He stated it is a case-by-case decision. Some areas yes, others no.

George asked if he believed in shooting cows with calves. At first he said yes, then he said no, then he said if it is necessary for habitat.

Neil stated that Steve Flory made a comment about moving moose and where we would get them. Knowing that shooting cows will not get the population back up. Neil lives in 16A and has no moose at all. Does he still think it is a good idea to have a cow hunt in 14C?

Robert Mumford said if it is possible to move them, we just went to a three-year cycle. The cost might make it not feasible. If we have the money and it would work yes. Sure would be worthy of trying.

Question called.

9 Yes-5 opposed-1 abstain.

Steve has the piece of legislature we want drafted is in draft now. Expects to see the first draft in short order. He will try to share it with everyone once it is done.

Fish Chair Joel Doner – Statewide Shellfish BOF Comments

Statewide shellfish was decided we would take no action until this meeting. Now would be the time to address any of the proposals we heard tonight.

Steve moved to support measure 248 – seconded

248 requires commercial to report, this would require the non-commercial to report at least once monthly while holding the permit. He thinks we should support this.

Question called.

Jim asked how this is reported numbers or weight reports it.

Mike said he supports this. We report on almost every harvest.

Robert Peck stated now we have to report, just not until the end of the season.

Proposal 248 Passed by unanimous vote.

Steve moved to support proposal 250 – seconded

Steve said we heard from those here tonight in support of the department's recommendation.

This proposal allows for only one vessel per participant

Question called passed unanimously

Steve moved we support 251 – seconded

12 yes, 3 abstain.

Steve moved we support 252 – seconded

12 yes, 3 abstain.

Steve moved we support 253 – seconded

Spoken against by constituency.

Question called.

1 yes, 13 no, 1 abstain.

Steve moved we support 254 – seconded

Steve spoke in support of 254.

12 yes, 1 abstain 2 oppose.

Steve moved we support 255 – seconded

Steve said supporting it will not be harmful.

13 yes, 2 abstain.

Steve moved we support 256 – seconded

Steve said supporting this will not be harmful.

14 yes, 1 abstain.

Steve moved we support 257 – seconded

Steve spoke in support of it.

Unanimously supported.

Steve moved we support 258 – seconded

Steve said our constituents opposed this.

George said he knows Mike.

0 yes, 10 no, 5 abstain

Steve moved we support 259 – seconded

Closes commercial shrimp fishing in PWS. Steve said there will be both commercial and non commercial.

He opposes this.

Robert Peck said he does shrimp out there. Much better near Whittier where there are not any commercial fisherman. Should we close, no.

Steve said he agrees with that. He noted he hunts in the same place year after year. Sometimes he is successful, sometimes not. You hone your skills and are better than those that don't. Experience and knowledge make a difference.

Joel stated the data shows they are more efficient.

Question called:

12 no, 3 abstain.

Steve moved we support 260 – seconded

Steve does not support it.

Question called:

12 no 3 abstain

Steve moved this committee pen a letter opposing gill net fisheries on the Kenai and Kasilof River. –
Seconded.

George said haven't they been having a gill net fishery for education before.
Steve asked if George supports this. To which George said no.

Passed unanimously.

Robert Caywood motioned we move to support proposal 243 –seconded
This has to do Cook Inlet Clam Fisheries.

Robert then motioned we amend 243 to close 2 mile sections of the beach and rotate it in three year
cycles.

Mark asked to hear from Mr. Person about this. He said there are very few clams.

Joel said there are far fewer clams at Clam Gulch and knows there is a problem. If there is a reason to
close the beach, then close it.

Steve said this is a biological concern. Closing this will result in moving clam diggers around similar to
closing hunts. He thinks we should close this completely.

Robert Caywood said people he has spoken with in Washington said they close sections of beach.

Steve asked Robert if it would do much harm to close the entire beach as opposed to sections.

Robert said there is no other place to go unless you cross the Inlet. The Sea Otters have devastated the
clams.

Frank questioned how this would be enforceable.

Question called

7 yes, 6 opposed, 2 abstain.

Vote for the proposal as amended.

13 for, 1 opposed, 1 abstain

Game Chair Frank Neumann – South Central BOG Comments

The subcommittee met Thursday night and Frank sent out an email

Take up a motion to support the subcommittees' findings for proposals 140 through 197.

Steve motioned we support the recommendations of the sub-committee. – seconded

Was voted on.

Motion passed unanimously.

Steve pointed out we should take up what the subcommittee did not vote on.

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOG	140		Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C.
	5	8	<p>Supported for reason stated in the proposals, believe the Department is doing their job in managing the resource, and favor leaving this options on the table for the Department.</p> <p>Several Committee members are Opposed to the taking of any cows. Others felt that Statewide, the moose population is down. They are wanting to see the BOG, and the Department manage that high sustainable yield. Would other options to be explored, like transplanting Moose to other areas with low Moose population.</p> <p>Those that Abstained 2, Abstained from voting did so because they have no local knowledge of Unit 18, and its current moose population. And the fact that we have no AC jurisdiction on the Reauthorization of Antlerless Moose hunts in that area.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Meeting Minutes: 2/3/2015</p> <p>Frank moved we take up proposal 140. – seconded Antlerless Moose hunt in 6C. Cordova Hunt area. Frank supports a TNA. Not in our area. Moose Mama lady is opposed to this. Sam said if we are trying to build moose population, why kill cows. Frank pointed out this is not a biologic concern. Department said it is above the target objective and the population could harm the environment. Antlerless hunts are necessary to keep the population at the objectives. Phil asked what the bull to cow ratio was for 2013. Not in the report. Steve said they have not had an antlerless hunt since 1999-2000. This is just to keep the hunts on the books. They are not having a hunt there now, they don't need this on the books. Joel said the population objective is 400 to 500 moose, they have around 600. Frank said they have not had an antlerless hunt in 14 years, leave the tool in the tool box. He supports the proposal but would rather take no action. Steve said the 2014 numbers are 600, they may or may not have a hunt. Jim asked who has the authority to authorize, area biologist. This hunt will authorize up to 12 bulls. Robert Caywood said we got to push these limits to get the highest sustainable yield.</p> <p>Question was called. Proposal 140: 5 Support, 8 Opposed, 2 Abstained.</p>
BOG	141		Restrict the taking of goat for five years when a nanny is taken in Unit 6.
	15	0	Support , for reasons stated in the proposal

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOG	142		Reduce the nonresident bag limit for deer in Unit 8.
	0	15	Opposed , majority stated that the weather has the biggest impact on the deer population, and that the non-resident take minimal.
BOG	143		Change bag limit restriction for brown bear in Unit 8.
	15	0	Motion was made to amend, and to adopt Option #1. Proposal as amended Pass unanimously.
BOG	144		Modify the resident and nonresident hunting regulations for Unit 8 to include Arctic fox.
	15	0	Supported for reason stated in Proposal.
BOG	145		Modify the resident and nonresident trapping regulations for Unit 8 to include Arctic fox.
	15	0	Supported for reasons stated in Proposal.
BOG	146		Modify the resident and nonresident hunting regulations for Unit 8 to remove coyote and lynx.
	15	0	Supported for reasons stated in Proposal
BOG	147		Modify the resident and nonresident trapping regulations for Unit 8 to remove lynx and wolverine from current trapping regulations.
	15	0	Supported for reasons stated in Proposal
BOG	148		Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 14C.
	10	5	<p>Supported for reason stated in the proposals, believe the Department is doing their job in managing the resource, and favor leaving this options on the table for the Department. Some members do not want to see more Moose in the Anchorage area, on our roadways, or playgrounds.</p> <p>Several Committee members are Opposed to the taking of any cows. Some members voted against the reauthorization hunts because they haven't received a completed survey for Unit 14C from the Department in a couple of years. With the lack of current data, they felt it was better to vote on the side of conservation, and voted down the antlerless hunts. Others felt that Statewide, the moose population is down. They are wanting to see the BOG, and the Department manage for a higher sustainable yield. Would like other options to be explored. Transplanting Moose to other areas with low Moose population.</p> <hr/> <p>Proposal 148 Meeting minutes History. February 3, 2015 Meeting minutes. Frank moved to adopt proposal 148 – seconded Joel said we took this up, amended it to change cows to bulls. The amended proposal 148, no cow, or antlerless Moose hunts, to; any Bull Hunts Only. Proposal 148 is amended that the antlerless portion of 148 to any bull. Steve requested we add the addendum to 148. It is important to note the</p>

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			<p>department said they could have given us 148. To Steve the department has failed.</p> <p>Steve said if we vote yes to 148, then no reauthorization.</p> <p>Frank will vote no because he supports an antlerless hunt in 14C. The constituents support an antlerless hunt. He is not in favor of more moose in the Anchorage bowl.</p> <p>Robert Caywood asked a bunch of people and they don't believe we have enough moose.</p> <p>Steve pointed out the department does not listen to us. The AC is unhappy. Even if we vote yes the department will go forward. These are not just Anchorage moose; they belong to the whole state. Hard times are coming. We need more moose now.</p> <p>Robert Peck said he would agree with some of what Steve said. He is not opposed to cow hunting as long as it is done based on sound science.</p> <p>The AC is here for checks and balances.</p> <p>Mark said he grew up in Anchorage in the 60s when moose were everywhere. Never heard of anyone getting trampled or of collisions. We have a people problem, not a moose problem.</p> <p>Neil said he does not think if we vote for this we are against it. In three years we can take this up again.</p> <p>Steve called the question. George said an article says the hunts may be back because the other ACs have voted opposed to us.</p> <p>Joel said we have heard from a lot of people with opinions about this issue. They would like to be sitting at this table to vote on it.</p> <p>Proposal 148 as Amended: 10 Support, 5 Opposed.</p> <p>Steve moved to add the addendum that provides the numbers they asked us for at the previous meeting. This is just language to get on the record. It is the Possible additional Bull Moose hunt for the following Draw Hunts for fall 2015</p> <p>DM424 +5 Would become 45 bull Tags</p> <p>DM428 +5 Would become 15 Bull Tags</p> <p>DM430 +2 Would become 5 Bull tags</p> <p>DM444 +4, if expanded to the remainder of 14C. Would become 6 Bull tags</p> <p>DM666 +3, could possible happen in 2015 if the department provided to the subcommittee meeting.</p> <p>Proposal #148: Meeting Minutes: <u>November 18, 2014</u> Board of Game Proposal 148 Take up proposal 148 of the Game proposal. Discussion is because permits will be issued before the Board of Game takes up the issue. In the re-</p>

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			<p>authorization, all antlerless moose hunts (basically cow moose) were combined with bull moose hunts which are against the committee's intent. The Anchorage biologist does not have an accurate count according to testimony last year. An amendment was offered to remove Kincaid Park from an antlerless moose (cow) amendment to allow a cow hunt proposed in Proposal 150. Vote was 13-1 in favor of the amendment.</p> <p><u>Meeting Minutes: December 2, 2014</u></p> <p>Public Testimony.</p> <p>The Chair then opened the meeting to public comments. Chris Garner, a biologist at JBER, stated that he opposed the action taken by the Committee on Proposal 148, the Reauthorization of 14C Moose Hunts. Mr. Garner stated the hunts are an outlet for both recreational opportunities for disabled veterans, military personal and also voiced public safety concerns with the amount of moose present. Stated the he believes that the biologist should be the primary voice of controlling wildlife population. He was asked if he had a count of the moose population but he deferred to the ADFG but did say that the moose population was healthy.</p> <p>Lex Patton, an Anchorage Firefighter, voiced concerns over the public safety issue that would occur if these antlerless moose hunts were not allowed. He was asked the committee if the new fencing and lights have helped cut down moose accident in those areas where they were installed. He stated yes in the affirmative.</p> <p>Warren Olsen made comments that a way should be found to move excess moose that are a public safety concern by means of capture and relocation. He also discussed enhanced habitat around roadways and public facilities should not be planted with vegetation that encourages moose to browse. Mr. Olsen stated that he was against antlerless moose hunts.</p> <p>Brett Barringer spoke on behalf of antlerless moose hunts stating that the biologist should control the population and that they have the most information needed to establish the amount of moose in the Anchorage Bowl. Stacey Frost, an area hunter, stated that she wanted to be able to hunt in 14C and had applied for permits. Ms. Frost told of hunting on JBER and would like to continue that opportunity if successful in drawing a permit.</p> <p>Bethany Marcun spoke in favor of the antlerless hunts and asked the committee to reconsider.</p> <p>Heidi Hatcher gave testimony of behalf of having the hunts citing that the biologist have the knowledge to control moose populations.</p> <p>Linda Nelson spoke on being at this meeting to show how the process works for her son in attendance.</p> <p>Ira Edwards spoke of public safety concerns and requested that the Committee overturn the vote on the antlerless moose hunts being proposed. Mr. Edwards also spoke on proposal 150 regarding hunts at Kincaid Park. Mr. Edwards, a</p>

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			<p>former biologist and wildlife officer stated that he had done some informal polling of user groups at Kincaid and that most had concerns with the public safety aspect of moose in the park. The results of the survey recommended that bull moose should not be taken as it is viewed by the responders as a positive thing for the Anchorage area. He stated that most people enjoy seeing and being able to bring visitors to Kincaid to see these animals.</p> <p>Phil Cannon spoke in favor of the antlerless moose hunts.</p> <p>Boyd McFail talked about the public safety concerns with moose collisions in the bowl area. Mr. McMcFail wanted to see if the board could support a proposal to get governing agencies to stop planting moose browse in public right ways and around public buildings as this brings moose into confrontation with cars and humans.</p> <p>Kurt Norby spoke in favor of the antlerless hunts.</p> <p>Ken Thompson spoke in favor of the hunts as this would give him an opportunity to take part.</p> <p>Ron Jordan, a past member of the Committee, spoke on the number of car incidents in the Anchorage bowl area. Mr. Jordan present numbers of incidents going back to 2009. Mr. Jordan stated road kill numbers up to include the year 2013 showed a decrease in the number of moose fatalities Numbers were provide by DOT and the other law agencies. Mr. Jordan was asked if he supported antlerless hunts and responded in the negative.</p> <p>Bryan Thornton spoke in favor of the antlerless hunts.</p> <p>It should be noted that several people in their public statements stated that they believed that the committee's action on this proposal could have been the result of hard feelings between the area biologist and the committee. The Chair and other members of the committee stated they believe that this was not the case in determining their vote on the subject.</p> <p>A break in the proceedings called for by the Chair.</p> <p>The Department of Fish and Game came forward to present their view on the antlerless hunt. Speaking for the agency was David Battle and David Saalfeld. The Department distributed a handout showing counts in the 14C area and gave an overview as to the condition of the moose population in the bowl area. It was stated that the moose population was in fairly good shape and was being maintained at the lower end of sustainable range by design. The goal range was stated to be between 1800and 1500 animals with a 25 bull to 100 cow ratio. These numbers have been steady for the last three years according to the handout. It was pointed out by the committee that if the ratio is 35 bulls to 100 cows now and the standard is 25 to a 100 than there are 150 extra bulls in the area that could be hunted; thus strengthening the public safety concerns being expressed at the meeting and enhancing hunting opportunities for all.</p> <p>Several members of the committee including Steve Flory, Robert Peck, Robert</p>

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			<p>Caywood and others questioned the biologists on the accuracy of their counts since they had stated that no total count had been taken in 2013 especially in the JBER area. Mr. Battle stated that wasn't the case as only two sections of the subsections were not represented do circumstances beyond their control. Lack of snow and JBER permission to do an aerial survey was given as the reasons. Mr. Peck questioned why the aerial survey hadn't taken place since times are available to fly the area in question.</p> <p>Mr. Brell and DeWitt asked why this information had not been provided to the committee before they asked to comment on the proposals. Mr. Battle stated that the committee hadn't asked for any numbers and thus no flow of information was provided.</p> <p>Question was raised by the committee as to what the statistical means were used to get to the composite number in the 14C. Mr. Saalfeld stated that past historical information to include field counts, aerial, and hunter provided information were used to provide an estimate of the current count following accepted past measures.</p> <p>Mr. Flory then asked why the numbers in the Board Proposal Book did not match the number in the handout provided for the years 2010-2013. Mr. Battle and Saalfeld stated that it may have been a computer generated error or bad input. The both stated that they would look into it and get back to the committee with that information at the next Game sub-committee meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Campbell asked which sub units has the most bulls in it. Mr. Battle stated that it was the Thunderbird Falls area. High concentration is due to no real hunting because of limited accessibility.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the Department for their presentation and the work that they do.</p> <p>A recess was called.</p> <p>The meeting was brought back into session and a motion made by Mr. Flory to bring up Proposal 148 for reconsideration. The motion was seconded and discussion took place as to the requirements of the 2/3 affirmative vote needed to bring the proposal back to the floor. A motion to table this proposal was made by Mr. Brell and seconded. Discussion was held. Mr. Neumann stated that it be in the public interest to take a vote of the measure tonight. Mr. Strahn, Mr. DeWitt, Mr. Peck also voice that opinion. Mr. Brell asked that his motion to table the proposal be withdrawn and the motion to bring up 148 was brought up.</p> <p>Committee member gave their opinions on the subject. Most of the opinions voiced by the committee were that the public had come out to support this hunt and therefore we should vote in the affirmative. Some committee members did so with reservations but will support the reconsideration. The vote was taken and passed by a vote 11-3. After a brief recess, during which almost all public and Department representatives left the room, a motion to</p>

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			<p>reconsider the previous reconsideration was then offered by Mark Campbell and seconded. After a short, lively discussion, that motion was tabled for discussion at the next meeting of the Committee on January 6.</p> <p>January 6, 2015</p> <p>Public Testimony:</p> <p>Dana Debernardi spoke about the need to address public safety and to start transporting and growing moose for transport to other areas of the State rather than see them involved in vehicle collisions. Dana was against the antler-less moose hunts in 14C. Dana was asked if she spoke as an individual or was representing a group. She stated that this was an individual response. Tom Harris spoke against the antler-less proposal. Mr. Harris stated that he was a past member of the AC in the McGrath area and is on many Alaskan Native Village and Corporation boards. He stated that the decline of moose in many of his areas that he has represented. He believes that the surplus of moose in the 14C should be transported to other areas rather than harvested in the area. Especially in the Wasilla area as it has seen an increase of over twelve thousand native Alaskan Natives in the past few years.</p> <p>Gary Olson from the Moose Federation spoke against the antler-less moose hunt in 14C stating public safety on road ways was a major issue. He stated that the removal and transport of nuisance moose and abandoned calves should be transported to other areas in the State.</p> <p>Terrence Shanigan, a past member of the Susitna AC, spoke against the antler-less moose authorization. He stated that the removal of surplus or abandoned moose in other area would be a good for the general moose population.</p> <p>Paul Forward, retired forester, stated that he was in favor of the antler-less moose hunt proposed for 14C. Mr. Forward stated that he has walked the JBER area for many years both as a hunter and as a vocation and has seen more moose in the past and a steady amount in the last few years.</p> <p>Greg Arther stated that he would like to have access to the resource in the South Central area (14C). He believes that we should leave management of the resource to the Department of Fish and Game and let the hunts go forward as advertised at least for 2015 season.</p> <p>Tony Fuentes came to the meeting as a result of the newspaper articles that were written in the past on the 14C issue. He state that he supported local opportunity to hunt and wanted to view how the Committee worked. Mr. Fuentes spoke in favor of the hunts as they were proposed by Fish and Game.</p> <p>Frank (no last name) a long time resident and hunter who has not hunted in the last 4 years wants sustainability for all resources. He is against the antler-less hunt in 14C but believes that we should go ahead with 2015 hunt. He expressed hope that the AAC, Fish and Game, and the Board of Game could come to a timeframe that allows for a timely manner to review, approve proposals, and apply for permits.</p>

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			<p>Steve Ellis supports the reauthorization of the antler-less moose hunt and believes that the committee should take away any tools that supports the managing the moose resource that could alter the stated F&G goal of 1500-1800 moose in the 14C area.</p> <p>The Chair than asked if any other member of the audience would like to give testimony.</p> <p>Matt Madden, a member of the AAC in 1977, stated that he supported the reauthorization as it gives an opportunity to take part in the hunting process. Tyler Harder stated that the AAC had a moral and ethical to ensure that the resource was renewable. He stated that he is in support of the reauthorization.</p> <p>Mr. Brell stated that he had receive a letter of support for the reauthorization in 14C and wanted to place Kyle Pudge support on the record. The letter addressed to the committee was sent to F&G and forward by Sherry Wright to the whole committee.</p> <p>Mike Masong questioned if the hunt could be reauthorize the hunt by emergency order and received information that F&G can stop any hunt by emergency order.</p> <p>The Chair than asked the Fish and Game Biologists to come forward to discuss proposals 148, 149, and 150. Ira Edwards was asked to join the discussion group. Ms. Coltrane, Mr. Battle and Saalfeld represent F&G during this discussion.</p> <p>After a brief welcome by the Chair of the group, a quick discussion was held on status of the reconsideration of Proposal 148. The original amended proposal called for the removal of the word antler-less and being replaced by the words bull only. This would make all moose hunts in 148 a bull only hunt. That proposal is up for reconsideration</p> <p>The Chair asked if any member had any additions to the proposed Amendment to #148. Mr. Flory than present a supplement proposal which both increased the amount of permits to be issued in the sub sections of 14C to include DM422 (20 permits extended season), combined DM423 with 422, DM427 moved into DM424, DM426(25 permits) DM444 (5 permits) DM446 (15 permits) DM447 15 permits, DM 448 (10 permits) DM666 (30 permits). This proposal also change some of the original dates of the hunts but kept them at bull only. The author asked the biologists on their opinion on the numbers present. After a brief terse discussion on how and why these numbers and dates were presented, a recess was asked for to allow for a 5 minute break. It was granted by the Chair. After reconvening Mr. Brell stated that this was the first time he had seen these numbers for the proposal and that the F&G acknowledged that this was the first that they had seen these ideas. It was suggested that both sides have a time to study these numbers.</p> <p>After the break, Mr. Brell offered his resignation to the committee sighting</p>

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			<p>that the disrespect shown by some members of the committee was beyond the scope of civility. At this point any other information as to the minutes will need to be provided by the rest of the committee.</p> <p>Steve Flory nominated Sam Albanese to serve as the secretary. Sam agreed to serve in this capacity and the AC approved this by unanimous consent.</p>
BOG	149		<p>Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Twentymile/Portage/Placer hunt area in Units 7 and 14C.</p>
	7	7	<p>Support 7, Opposed 7, Abstained 1.</p> <p>Supported for reason stated in the proposals, believe the Department is doing their job in managing the resource, and favor leaving this options on the table for the Department.</p> <p>Several Committee members are Opposed to the taking of any cows. Others felt that Statewide, the moose population is down. They are wanting to see the BOG, and the Department manage that high sustainable yield. Would other options to be explored, like transplanting Moose to other areas with low Moose population.</p> <p>Abstained 1, Abstained from voting.</p> <p>Meeting minutes; 1/6/15</p> <p>We moved on to discussion of proposal 149, the reauthorization of the antler less moose hunt that overlaps 14C and 7 in the Placer, Portage, Twenty mile drainages.</p> <p>ADF&G stated this is a herd prone to bust boom cycles heavily dependent on the winter snow pack. If we vote not to reauthorize they will take this hunt off the books. The number of permits varies from year to year to as little as none to as many as 25.</p> <p>Joel stated this does not have a population objective, to which Jesse replied the objective is based on snow load. They seek a 25 to 100 bull to cow ratio. Last year there were 155 moose in the count, 20 permits were given out, and 7 antler less moose were killed.</p> <p>Dwight pointed out the supplement states 30 permits last year. He asked how many will be issued this year. Jesse said that depends on winter kill, maybe 20 to 30.</p> <p>Steve asked how many? Jesse replied it will be survey dependent. If the numbers support it, both cows and bull permits would increase.</p> <p>Joel asked if fewer cows are shot, what would happen? ADF&G responded that antler less hunts need to be part of the management plan.</p>

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			<p>Neil asked what the calf mortality rate is. ADF&G responded there was a 27 to 100 ration but did not know what the mortality rate was.</p> <p>Michael asked what was the highest number of moose counted? ADF&G said 333. Of which the majority of those dies the following winter.</p> <p>Steve said we do not need to complete this until 2/27/15 and wanted to table this.</p> <p>Jesse said reauthorization of this does not guarantee issuance of permits.</p> <p>Robert Peck asked about the quality of the survey, to which ADF&G said it was high.</p> <p>Joel said the main concern is this area has a higher risk of winter kill than others, to which ADF&G agreed.</p> <p>Steve made a motion we delay this until the sub committee meets, the motion was seconded by Jim.</p> <p>Kevin said he trusts ADF&G to make the decision about this, and we don't need to wait for another count. Robert Peck agreed we should trust the 2013 count number. Herein agreed with Robert.</p> <p>Robert Caywood said we need to change the tool in the tool box.</p> <p>Question was called. Proposal to delay consideration of 149 Failed to pass. 2 YES and 13 NO.</p> <p>The discussion followed and Robert stated we need to use this place to grow moose to be relocated. Michael agreed. Steve said we need to take a stand to change the management technique. He cited the poor management of caribou herds and king salmon as examples.</p> <p>Robert Peck asked if the representatives of ADF&G would support looking into transplanting moose. ADF&G said this was above their level. Robert asked how long it would take to develop a plan to transplant moose. ADF&G said it would take many years, but that is only a guess.</p> <p>Michael said we need to change this. Joel said ADF&G needs to be able to react quickly to avert high winter kill.</p> <p>The question was called and 149 failed 7 YES, 7 NO, 1 abstention.</p>

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
BOG	150	Establish an antlerless moose drawing permit hunt for physically disabled residents in Kincaid Park, Unit 14C.	
	14	1	<p>14 Supported, 1 Opposed Supported for reason stated in the proposal. Opposed, objected to the taking of Cows. Would like this to be a Bull only hunt.</p> <p>Meeting Minutes; from 1/6/15 Ira provided an overview of 150, the proposal to have an antler less moose hunt in Kincaid Park. He explained the need to reduce moose within the park due to increased human activities and thus an increase in negative moose/people encounters. This hunt will be modeled similar to the Hillside hunt. The state statute for disabled is 70%. The details of the rules of this hunt will be worked out once it has been approved by all parties required to approve it. Ira believes the public will not agree to a bulls only hunt as bulls are more desirable for viewing.</p> <p>Joel expressed concern with getting the Municipality of Anchorage to agree to allow this hunt. Ira stated the MOA is generally opposed to hunts on park lands, the current administration does oppose it. Joel asked the Department of Fish and Game if they believe the MOA would be more agreeable to an antler less moose hunt as opposed to an any bull hunt.</p> <p>Jesse from the Department of F and Game stated this is also an allocation of resources issue and the department is neutral on this hunt. She did not answer definitively about whether the Department believed the MOA would be more supportive of an any bull hunt.</p> <p>Steve asked if we do not approve antler less moose hunts for 148 and 149, does this take 150 off the table as an antler less moose hunt? Since 150 is a separate proposal, the decisions for 148 and 149 do not impact it.</p> <p>Jesse stated the Anchorage management area allows for up to 50 antler less permits, the department plans to issue 14.</p> <p>Gary stated we need to add language to 148 prohibiting the shooting of cows with calves.</p> <p>We moved back to the full committee meeting. Steve made a motion for us to discuss 150. Joel laid out the rules for this discussion to limit everyone to 2 opportunities to speak about it.</p> <p>Steve stated he heard from people that opposed and supported the hunt. He does not like the numbers and information we received from DF&G.</p> <p>Robert Peck stated this is an urban scenario that is different than the remainder</p>

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			<p>of 14C. Robert Caywood made a motion to amend 150 to change antler less to any bull. The motion was seconded, question was called. The motion failed on a voted of 4 YES to 11 NO.</p> <p>Phil asked what is the possibility of changing this later to bulls only? Ira responded the public would have to approve it. Jesse said this would require regulatory changes. Steve said, many things can change, let's get this hunt on the books.</p> <p>Joel said he is interested in urban/rural public safety. He does not think an urban setting is the place to grow moose for rural Alaska. We should hunt the cows in the urban area of 14C and let's not jeopardize this hunt by adding bulls to it.</p> <p>The question was called and proposal 150 passed: 14 Support, 1 Opposed. Opposed; Jim stated it should be bulls only.</p>
BOG	151	Change the any sheep bag limit for Unit 14C to any ram, for draw hunts DS140, DS141, DS240 and DS241.	
	15	0	Unanimously Supported for reasons stated in the proposal.
BOG	152	Establish a resident only sheep hunt area in Chugach State Park, Unit 14C.	
	15	0	<p>Supported for reasons stated in the Proposal.</p> <p>Opposed vote, supported the idea of the proposal, but objected to the idea of allowing the Governors Tags access to the Park.</p>
BOG	153	Limit the number of next of kin nonresident sheep tags in Unit 14C.	
	0	14	<p>Opposed- Majority support the current system of second degree kin tags being pulled out of the non-resident allocation of tags.</p> <p>The One Abstained Vote wasn't fully aware on how the second degree kin language really worked in allocating tags.</p>
BOG	154	Increase the number of nonresident goat drawing permits on Unit 14C.	
	0	15	Opposed , objected to the idea of setting aside additional tags in the Chugach State Park to non-resident hunters.
BOG	155	Add a drawing permit hunt for black bears within the JBER Management Area in Unit 14C.	
	15	0	Supported Unanimously , the Anchorage Advisory Committee not only supports this, but hopes to see the Department, and the Wildlife Conservation Officers at JBER to continue to work closely together and one day expand this to include Brown Bear.
BOG	156	Shorten the moose seasons in Unit 15.	
	0	15	Opposed , favor the current season
BOG	157	Change the general bull moose season dates in Unit 15 to September 1-30	

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
	0	15	Opposed , favored the current season dates. Didn't like the idea of having the season ending date being so late in the season.
BOG	158	Open a nonresident moose season in Unit 15C.	
	0	15	Opposed , the committee favored leaving the non-residents on the sideline. That there is more than enough local hunters looking for opportunity to hunt 15C without adding non-resident hunters to the mix.
BOG	159	Open nonresident moose drawing hunt in Unit 15.	
	0	15	Opposed , to a Unit wide draw hunt for the non-resident hunter in Unit 15, same reason as stated in Proposal 158
BOG	160	Open a nonresident moose season in Unit 15C or implement predator control.	
	0	15	Opposed to a non-resident hunt in 15C, as stated in Proposal #158
BOG	161	Change the bag limit for moose in Units 7 and 15 to 50-inch antlers with three or more brow tines.	
	15	0	Amended. Supported . Was amended to keep the current spike fork rule in place. Striking that one line from the proposal. The committee favor's going to the 3 Brow tine, 50 inch, or Spike Fork antler restrictions.
BOG	162	Eliminate all early and late season start dates for archery, muzzleloader, and shotgun hunts in Unit 15.	
	0	15	Opposed , Committee favored the current language. There's currently only an early hunt for Archery hunters in 15A, and 15B, for 7 days starting August 7 th .
BOG	163	Eliminate the early archery season for moose in Units 15A and 15B.	
			TNA due to action taken on Proposal 162.
BOG	164	Open seven day archery seasons for moose following the general seasons in Units 7 and 15	
	0	15	Support , Like the idea of having a chance to hunt Moose late in the season close to, or in the rut. Opposed . Didn't want to see the season extending into the rut.
BOG	165	Open an archery moose season for residents and nonresidents in Unit 15C.	
	0	15	Opposed to adding a nonresident moose hunt in 15C.
BOG	166	Change the resident, antlerless moose season in Unit 15C to November 1-30.	
	0	15	Opposed ; Favored keeping the current season dates.
BOG	167	Issue resident moose permits for problem areas near roads during the winter in Unit 15C.	
	0	15	Supported , the opinion being that the author of the proposal is looking to establish a Hot Spot Type hunt in Unit 15C. Opposed , thought the author didn't make his attention clear enough the way the Proposal was written.
BOG	168	Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.	
	5	10	Supported for reason stated in the proposals, believe the Department is doing their job in managing the resource, and favor leaving this option on the table for the Department. Several Committee members are Opposed to the taking of any cows. Others felt that Statewide, the moose population is down. They are wanting to see

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			the BOG, and the Department manage that high sustainable yield. Would other options to be explored, like transplanting Moose to other areas with low Moose population.
BOG	169		Open a nine day, resident archery season in August for Dall sheep in Units 7, 14C and 15.
	0	15	Opposed to any longer Sheep hunting season on the current sheep population.
BOG	170		Modify of the harvest management strategy for Kenai Peninsula brown bears, Units 7 and 15.
	0	15	Opposed. Favored/Supported Proposal 171
BOG	171		Modify the brown bear harvest management strategy on the Kenai Peninsula, Units 7 and 15.
	15	0	Supported, for reasons stated in the Proposal
BOG	172		Lengthen the brown bear season in Units 7 and 15 and remove the meat salvage requirements for brown bear taken over bait.
	15	0	Supported for reason stated in Proposal
BOG	173		Remove meat salvage requirements for taking brown bear over bait in the Southcentral Region.
	15	0	Supported for reason stated in Proposal
BOG	174		Remove meat salvage requirements for brown bear taken over bait in the Southcentral Region.
	15	0	Supported for reason stated in Proposal
BOG	175		Shorten the season and reduce the bag limit for ptarmigan in Unit 15C, north of Kachemak Bay and Fox River.
	15	0	Supported for reason stated in Proposal
BOG	176		Reduce the bag limit for ptarmigan in Unit 15C, north of Kachemak Bay and Fox River.
			TNA due to action taken on Proposal 175
BOG	177		Shift to an earlier opening date for beaver trapping in Units 7 and 15.
	15	0	Supported for reason stated in Proposal.
BOG	178		Require trap identification in Units 7 and 15.
	0	15	Opposed, Favored keeping the current requirements. Adding this language, and requirement could lead to harassment of trappers, and vandalism of trappers sets.
BOG	179		Establish a trapper identification numbering system for Units 7 and 15.
	0	15	Opposed, not necessary. See comments on Proposal 178
BOG	180		Restrict trapping in the Cooper Landing area.
	0	15	Opposed, to the loss of trapping opportunity for local trappers. Proposal is written with allegation, and assumptions.
BOG	181		Restrict trapping in the Seward and Moose Pass areas.
	0	15	Opposed, to the loss of trapping opportunity for local trappers. Proposal is written with allegation, and assumptions.
BOG	182		Prohibit the taking of big game from boats in Units 7 and 15 in coastal or estuarine waters, with an exception for persons with disabilities.

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
	0	15	Opposed , thought this to be a unnecessary proposal, or requirement.
BOG	183	Create a management area for Kachemak Bay in Unit 15C.	
	0	15	Unanimously Opposed to the establishment of another Special Management area with the Kachemak Bay area.
BOG	184	Begin resident sheep seasons seven days earlier than nonresident seasons in the Southcentral Region.	
	0	15	Opposed to the idea of opening the Sheep season early for residents. The current Sheep season is long enough, we don't want to see any additional stress on the Sheep population.
BOG	185	Begin resident sheep seasons seven days earlier than nonresidents in Units 7, 14, and 15.	
	0	15	Opposed to the idea of opening the Sheep season early for residents. The current Sheep season is long enough, we don't want to see any additional stress on the Sheep population.
BOG	186	Limit nonresident sheep hunts in the Southcentral Region with shorter seasons, drawing permits, or other methods.	
	0	15	Opposed as written, view the author as too vague, and didn't spell anything out.
BOG	187	Allow a maximum of 10% of nonresident sheep hunt participation for the Southcentral Region.	
	15	0	Supported for reasons stated in the Proposal.
BOG	188	Limit sheep harvest by nonresidents to 10% of total harvest in Units 7, 14, and 15.	
	15	0	Supported for reasons stated in the Proposal.
BOG	189	Limit allocation of nonresident sheep permits to 10% in the Southcentral Region Units.	
	0	15	Opposed . Against the one time draw portions for residents.
BOG	190	Allocate 10% sheep harvest for nonresidents in Southcentral Region Units.	
	0	15	Opposed , author had to many different issues in the proposal.
BOG	191	Remove the restriction against using felt sole waders while hunting in Southcentral Region Units.	
	6	9	Supported for reasons stated in the proposal. Meeting minutes. 1/6/15 Robert Peck motioned we reconsider proposal 191. The subcommittee unanimously supported this. Motion seconded. Robert Peck spoke on this. Seldom we have a floatplane that goes to the lower 48. People from the lower 48 can transmit disease through felt soled boots. Steve said we don't need to reconsider this. He is satisfied with the vote and does not think we should be regulating soles. Regulate them all, or none at all. 6 yes, 9 no.
BOG	192	Require harvest reporting of migratory birds by species in Southcentral Region Units.	
	0	15	Opposed , Another unnecessary requirement.
BOG	193	Require certification for big game hunters using crossbows in Southcentral Region Units.	

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form

BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
	2	12	<p>Supported 12, Opposed 2, Abstained 3; Support, Felt that the crossbow is more equivalent to a bow than a rifle, and that the Cross Bow has its own limits of effectiveness. If we are requiring Bow hunters to be certified due to its limitations then the same should hold true to the use of the Cross Bow.</p> <p>Opposed, adding another requirement to hunters, just because you been certified once in your life, doesn't make you proficient for life!</p> <p>Meeting Minutes; 1/6/15</p> <p>Frank moved we reconsider proposal 193. Crossbow certification.</p> <p>Frank voted against bow certification statewide. The AC previously voted against bow certification and it was enacted anyway.</p> <p>Steve said we heard from a constituent that questioned whether we will be certifying all sorts of weapons. This boils down to limiting use of cross bows.</p> <p>Neil made a comment to Steve that at the joint board one of the board members asked who would teach his kid. He did not have time.</p> <p>Steve said we need to ask who pays for this course.</p>
BOG	194	Prohibit the use of hunting dogs for taking upland game birds after October 31, in Southcentral Region Units.	
	0	15	Opposed , we see this as a non-issue.
BOG	195	Remove the requirement to clean up contaminated soil from bear bait stations in Southcentral Region Units.	
	15	0	Supported for reasons stated in the Proposal
BOG	196	Add five days to all resident hunting seasons and allocate 75% of the drawing permits to residents in the Southcentral Region.	
	0	15	Opposed , opposed to the 75% allocation to non-residents.
BOG	197	Allocate 90% of big game drawing permits to residents for Southcentral Region Units.	
	15	0	Supported for reasons stated in the Proposal
BOG	202	Change the caribou regulation for all game management units associated with the Western Arctic caribou herd and Teshekpuk caribou herd.	
	11	3	<p>Supported 11; Supported for reasons stated in proposal, a small step in the right direction. Would of like to of seen less</p> <p>Opposed 3, didn't think this proposal did enough in turning the population decline around.</p> <p>Abstained 1, doesn't know enough about the area or the issue.</p> <p>Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Frank motioned we adopt proposal 202 about Caribou in the heard near Kotzebue.</p> <p>Neil was at the meetings with George. The Caribou heard has been decimated. He supports this proposal.</p> <p>Steve said he would vote against this. It is too broad and too reaching. It is an improper proposal. Draw the line when they do it wrong.</p>

Mandatory- Please Summarize Your Proposal Comments in this Form			
BOG or BOF	Proposal Number	Proposal Description	
Supports or Opposes?	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments/Discussion (list Pros and Cons)/Amendments to Proposal
			<p>Kevin agrees with Steve. It is too broad. Robert Caywood said it is 11 pages long. George said they worked on this for 2 days. It will help, but is not the total answer. It's a start. Steve questioned how would this be implemented. Neil stated the first sheet is the basic overview. Neil for the record, the department of F&G has to hire individuals to survey the locals because the refuse to fill out the tag like others are suppose to. George would like this to change to have no shooting of cows and calves and a shorter season. Robert asked why this did not eliminate this already. George said they did. It is a start. Kevin stated they are only looking to change the non-resident and us. Frank supports this, as this is a small step in the right direction.</p>
BOG	205	Allow the immediate harvest of musk ox on stranded ice flows in Unit 18.	
	1	14	<p>Supported 1. Opposed 14. Supported for reasons stated. Opposed. Could see this being an enforcement issues. Meeting minutes. Frank moved we support proposal 205. Neil is in favor of this. If the musk ox is on Ice it is going to die anyway. Steve said musk ox swim. He opposes this proposal. Joel said this about musk ox that get on the ice pack and end up going out to sea. The musk ox will not survive. Phil said he was in Unalakleet in the early 80s. Frank asked if Bob would comment based on his enforcement days. 1 yes, 14 no.</p>

Frank moved we support proposal 203.
 Steve said this is another sheep proposal in the Brooks Range.
 This is an ACR. It covers more than Steve would like to see. We will have a sheep-working group that will allow for more comment and work. He supports we take no action.
 Steve motioned we take no action on 203.
Support 11, Opposed 4. TNA

Frank moved we support proposal 205.
 Neil is in favor of this. If the musk ox is on Ice it is going to die anyway.
 Steve said musk ox swim. He opposes this proposal.

Joel said this about musk ox that get on the ice pack and end up going out to sea. The musk ox will not survive.

Phil said he was in Unalakleet in the early 80s.

Frank asked if Bob would comment based on his enforcement days.

1 yes, 14 no.

Frank moved we support **Proposal 201** – seconded.

Clarify the language of salvaging wounded game.

Steve explained that the definition of take is when an animal is wounded.

He used an airplane to find the wounded animal, then he killed the wounded animal.

The letter of law does not match the intent. The intent is to finish off the wounded animal.

Support 0, Opposed 14, Abstain 1.

Frank moved to support proposal 207. Seconded.

This proposal is to change use of aircraft.

Steve motioned we take no action on this for reasons previously stated about sheep hunting.

Support 9, Opposed 6, TNA

Frank moved to support **Proposal 208**. Seconded.

Steve moved we take no action.

Support 15, Opposed 0, TNA

Frank moved we support **Proposal 209**. Seconded.

Frank stated we don't know much about this area.

The Whittier AC said they have had a lot of bear harvest and F&G supports this. The allowable harvest has increased.

Steve asked has the cost to the local community been considered.

Robert Peck said quite a few of us hunt there. We should consider it. There are not as many bears as there used to be in PWS. He does not think this is a bad idea.

Phil said you would see all the bears you want in the fall along the salmon streams.

The season is already limited.

Steve motioned we take no action.

Support 3, Opposed 12. Motion Failed

Robert Caywood said it used to be a lot more bears. Joel said in his opinion going to a bear once every three years will limit us. Until there is a proposal to limit non-resident, this will only limit us. Robert Caywood said this might take bear hunters out of one area and into areas where we need more bear hunting. Robert Peck said at Coghill Lake you could choose a bear 6 years ago, now there are not that many.

Steve asked Mumford if this would be an enforcement problem.

Support 6, Opposed 8, Abstained 1.

Frank moved we support **Proposal 210**. Seconded.
This one establishes a registration hunt in PWS.

Supported 14, Opposed 1

Frank moved we support **Proposal 211**. Seconded.
Shorten the season to Sept 25 through June 10.
Steve said this would reduce the harvest. We don't have enough bear in this area.

Supported 14, Opposed 1

Frank motioned support for **Proposal 212**. Seconded.
It is a controlled use area proposal.
Steve hates controlled use areas. It is a NIB idea.
Robert Peck motioned we take no action. Seconded
Passed unanimously. **TNA**

New Business

Steve motioned the AC authorize him to find an attorney for an injunction to stop the neighboring ACs to over-ride our vote with respect to antlerless moose hunts in 14. Seconded.
Frank supports Steve on this. Only the local AC has jurisdiction.
Sherry noted the BOG when they did that proposal that listed the jurisdiction of the ACs. This is an opportunity for us to define which units we have jurisdiction in.
Joel asked why not wait for Legislative Legal to opinion.
Steve believes this will fall into a grey area. This needs an answer one way or another.
Robert Caywood commented about the 20A thing. The only way they could do it was to change the law. We got to find out what the law is for this.

Motion passed unanimously.

Steve motioned we write a letter to support Bruce Morgan. Seconded.
14 yes, 1 abstain.

The next Anchorage AC meeting place and time; March 3rd at the William Hernandez Hatchery, 941 Reeve Blvd @ 6:30PM.

Adjournment: **11:25PM**

Minutes Recorded By: Sim Albanese / Frank Neumann
Minutes Approved By: Joel Down
Date: 2-27-15