

ACRs 1-5

RC 026

ACR 1- Change the caribou regulations for all Game Management Units associated with the Western Arctic caribou herd (WAH) and Teshekpuk caribou herd (TCH).

SUBMITTED BY: Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G)

MEETING ACR SUBMITTED FOR: Southcentral Region in March 2015.

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 85.025 (a) (16) (17) (18) (19) (20) (21) Hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Change the regulations for all game management units (GMU) associated with the Western Arctic caribou herd (WAH) and Teshekpuk caribou herd (TCH). The affected GMUs in the overlapping herd ranges are: portions of GMU 21D; GMU 22; GMU 23; portions of GMU 24A; portions of GMU 24B; GMU 24C; GMU 24D; GMU 26A; and portions of GMU 26B.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM.

Population estimates as of July 2013 for the WAH and TCH were completed after the January 2014 report to the board at the Arctic and Western Region meeting in Kotzebue. The degree of decline in each herd was higher than expected and consistently supported through population metrics measured in each herd. Since both herds have significant range overlap during their seasonal movements, it would be best to consider both herds simultaneously when considering regulatory changes. If hunting in either herd continues with no harvest restriction, overharvest will likely occur and recovery of the population will be delayed. The department requests consideration of WAH and TCH caribou regulations to conserve the herds before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Arctic and Western Region in 2016. Taking action by ACR in 2015 will allow a more immediate response and provide regulatory protection to WAH and TCH caribou. The current status of each herd is summarized below.

Western Arctic caribou herd. Census results for the WAH show a 27% decline from 2011 to 2013, and a 50% decline from 2003 to 2013. Long term trends of increasing adult cow mortality and decreasing recruitment suggest that the herd will likely continue to decline into the near future. Results of community-based harvest surveys, and statewide harvest reports, estimate that approximately 14,000 caribou were harvested in each of the last 2 years, RY2012 and RY2013. Each year residents within the range of the herd accounted for 95% of the harvest and they took approximately 60% bulls, 30 % cows and 10% unknown sex. Hunters residing outside the range of the herd, including nonresidents, accounted for 5% of the harvest and took approximately 90% bulls, 9% cows and 1% unknown sex. At these rates, harvests of WAH cows have slightly exceeded the 2% sustainable harvest rate in each of the last 3 years (RY2011–RY2013) and harvests of bulls will likely exceed the 15% sustainable harvest rate within the next 1–3 years (RY2015–RY2017). Based on population size and composition, the current WAH harvestable surplus is estimated at 13,100 caribou, approximately 7% less than the annual harvest in the last 2 years. If the decline remains consistent, the projected harvestable surplus for RY2015 is estimated at 11,300 caribou, approximately 20% lower than total harvest during RY2012 and RY2013.

Submitted by
Board Support

The Western Arctic Caribou Herd Cooperative Management Plan (WAH PLAN; online at www.westernarcticcaribou.org/the-group/management-plan/) defines the current population status as ‘declining conservative management level’. However, the magnitude and trajectory of the decline suggests the herd could quickly change to ‘declining preservative management level’. In fall 2012 we estimated there were 42 bulls:100 cows in this herd. Given its declining trend since the early 1990s, this ratio may now be below the minimum management objective of 40 bulls:100 cows recommended in Appendix 2 of the WAH PLAN. Modeling of population parameters also suggests that within 1–3 years herd size could drop below the Intensive Management (IM) population management objective of 200,000 caribou, and the corresponding estimated harvestable surplus could go below the IM harvest range of 12,000–20,000 caribou.

Teshekpuk caribou herd. Population counts of the TCH as of July 2013 show trends with steeper declines than the WAH, with a 42% reduction since 2011, and a 53% decline since 2008. Based on observed adult mortality (>20%), low parturition rates (<60%), low calf survival (<30%), low yearling recruitment (12–15:100 adults), and reduced bull:cow ratios, the population decline appears likely to continue into the foreseeable future. Similar to the WAH, mortality rates based on collared caribou have increased steadily since 1990. It is notable that the two highest mortality rates of adult caribou have occurred in the last two years. Decline in recruitment to 10-months of age is also nearly identical to the WAH, and this decrease in survival of short yearlings over the long-term is likely influencing the observed declines in TCH bull:cow ratios. Bull:cow ratios are currently estimated at 39:100 cows, down from 46:100 cows in 2009. Based on the 2013 estimate of abundance and composition of the herd, sustainable harvest is calculated by applying a 15% rate to bulls and 1.5% rate to cows yielding an estimated range of 1,500–1,600 caribou as harvestable surplus. Harvest is estimated based on community harvest survey data collected since 2002 and adjusted for the likely ratios of WAH and TCH in the harvest, but unadjusted for annual availability of caribou. These data imply that annual harvest is approximately 1800–1900 bulls and 400–500 cows (dataset “A”, Customary and Traditional Use Worksheet and Options for Amounts Reasonably Necessary for Subsistence Uses of the Teshekpuk Caribou Herd, GMUs 26A and 24B, Braem 2014, posted online at www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.meetinginfo&date=01-10-2014&meeting=kotzebue). Continued harvest at this level will exceed the current estimated harvestable surplus by almost 50%. In relation to IM, the estimated harvestable surplus is within IM harvest objectives of 900–2,800 caribou; however, continued declines in the herd will push the surplus towards the lower objective.

ANS. By Board of Game (board) action in January 2014, the amount necessary for subsistence (ANS) was set at 8,000–12,000 caribou for both the WAH and TCH. Currently, the estimated combined harvestable surplus is 14,600–14,700 caribou (WAH=13,100 plus TCH=1,500 – 1,600). The trends in each herd described above suggest the combined harvestable surplus will be below the upper ANS threshold in the near future. Hunt management scenarios for the Teshekpuk herd will be strongly influenced by the harvestable surplus in the much larger WAH herd. In the event that the harvestable surplus drops below the upper ANS before the next Region V board meeting, the department can close the non-resident season by emergency order.

The department will explore and recommend measures to reduce harvests and conserve the herds. Intensive Management feasibility assessments will be presented for the respective herds at the next available opportunity.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER? The department prefers implementing regulatory changes to reduce harvest concurrently in both herds because of overlapping ranges of the WAH and TCH. Changes are needed to reduce opportunity to effectively lower annual harvest to promote recovery of the population. Options include:

- 1) Change seasons:
 - a. Shorten season for bulls;
 - b. Shorten season for cows;
 - c. Close bull season after the rut (after October 1);
 - d. Keep cow season open when bulls are in rut (bull season closed);
- 2) Change bag limits:
 - a. Reduce total daily bag limit for residents;
 - b. Reduce total season bag limit for nonresidents;
 - c. Prohibit the take of calves;
 - d. Create 'bull only' bag limit during appropriate time of year;
 - e. Create 'cow only' bag limit during appropriate time of year;
 - f. Change resident daily bag limit to a total season (annual) bag limit;
- 3) Change exceptions to unlawful methods:
 - a. Discontinue same day airborne hunting in Unit 22 [5 AAC 92.085 (8)(D)];
- 4) Manage hunts by permit
 - a. Consider registration permit hunts in defined areas with harvest quotas, separately by herd.
 - b. Board of Game allocation of nonresident permits (drawing or registration) consistent with AS 16.05.258;

4) STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED ABOVE.

a) for a conservation purpose or reason: Each herd is experiencing significant population declines that are a conservation concern. Current regulations allow harvests that are no longer sustainable. Without adjustments to harvest there will be accelerated population declines and delayed recovery. Population modeling shows that when too many cows are removed from the population, reproductive potential is reduced, rates of decline increase, and population recovery is delayed. Each herd is valued by all users. Moreover, loss of harvestable surplus will have significant impacts on resident hunters who depend on caribou for food and other customary and traditional subsistence uses.

b) to correct an error in regulation: Not applicable.

c) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:
Not applicable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE? Herds will decline to a point where harvest adjustments may require

very restrictive measures or Tier II hunts. Early corrective action will benefit the herds and the users.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE: This ACR is not predominantly allocative because it does not seek to change any existing nor create any differential treatment among user groups.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGUALR CYCLE. Not Applicable.

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR. The Department of Fish and Game is responsible for managing game populations by implementing regulations passed by the Board of Game.

STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS APROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING. This ACR has not been submitted before.

ACR 2- Close Dall sheep seasons in areas of severe decline in Units 23 & 26A.

SUBMITTED BY: Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G)

MEETING ACR SUBMITTED FOR: Southcentral Region in March 2015.

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.
5 AAC 85.055 (a) (9) and (10). Hunting seasons and bag limits for Dall sheep. Close sheep seasons in areas of severe population decline.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM. Sheep populations in the western Brooks Range within Unit 23 and the western portion of Unit 26(A) experienced severe winter conditions in 2013–2014 resulting in high levels of natural mortality. Extensive icing conditions contributed to rapid declines of sheep populations in the De Long Mountains, Schwatka Mountains, and Baird Mountains. Populations are currently very low. If hunting continues, overharvest will likely occur and recovery of the populations will be delayed.

In 2014 sheep surveys were completed using distance sampling transects during late June and early July in broad areas of the western Brooks Range (Units 23 and 26A) through coordination by NPS and department biologists (see Udevitz et al. 2006). Preliminary results indicate a population decline of between 50-80% from the previous survey levels documented in 2011. A greater decline is apparent when the current estimates are compared to 2009 levels, a time when populations were similar to pre-1990 crash populations. The population estimate in the Baird Mountains declined 50% from 587 sheep in 2011 to 309 sheep in 2014. The 2014 population estimate in the De Long Mountains is 359 sheep, an 80% decline since 2011. The Schwatka Mountains were not directly surveyed, but they are adjacent to the Itkilik Preserve in the Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve (GAAR) where surveys detected a 60% population decline (1,669 sheep in 2011 down to 646 sheep in 2014).

Based on ram:100 “ewe-like” ratio, the current number of full-curl rams is calculated to be so low that hunter success is expected to be negligible in full-curl managed hunts. In registration permit hunts (RS388 and RS389), take of ‘any sheep’ in the current bag limit is ill-advised due to negative impacts on population recovery. Due to low numbers of sheep and to promote population recovery, the department recommends that hunting seasons be closed.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER? Close all Dall sheep seasons in Unit 23 and Unit 26(A) west of the Etivluk River drainage (e.g. the Brooks Range west of Howard Pass). Retain hunt areas based on sheep populations in the regulation so similar hunt regimes may be restored when the population recovers.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED ABOVE.

- a) for a conservation purpose or reason:** Populations of Dall sheep in the western Brooks Range have been severely depressed by winter icing conditions. The significant population declines are a conservation concern. Any harvest will delay population recovery. Sheep are

valued as a subsistence and general season resource and loss of harvestable surplus will have significant impacts on resident and nonresident hunters desiring to hunt sheep.

b) to correct an error in regulation: Not applicable.

c) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted: Not applicable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE? Sheep populations will be overharvested if hunting seasons are not closed by department emergency order.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE. This ACR is not allocative at all in nature, it is being submitted for conservation reasons.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGULAR CYCLE. Not Applicable.

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR. The Department of Fish and Game is responsible for managing game populations by implementing regulations passed by the Board of Game.

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. This ACR has not been submitted before.

ACR 3-Remove the trapping license requirement for falconry permits.

SUBMITTED BY: Department of Fish and Game

MEETING ACR SUBMITTED FOR: Central/Southwest Region in February 2015.

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

5 AAC 92.037(a) and 92.037(g)(1). Permits for falconry.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM. The Department of Law has determined the Board of Game does not have the authority to require residents and nonresidents to have a trapping license to submit an application, take, transport, transfer to another state's falconry program, or possess a raptor for falconry, or for practicing falconry in this state.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER?

92.037(a). A permit and valid, current Alaska hunting [AND TRAPPING] license is required...

92.037(g)(1) a permit and a valid, current nonresident hunting [AND TRAPPING] license is required...

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED ABOVE.

- a) **for a conservation purpose or reason:** Not applicable.
- b) **to correct an error in regulation:** The Department of Law has determined the Board of Game does not have the authority to require a trapping license for participation in any manner in falconry. At its January 2014 Statewide meeting in Anchorage, the board adopted into regulation the requirement for residents and nonresidents to have a trapping license in addition to a hunting license to participate in falconry. This agenda change request is being submitted at the request of the Department of Law to correct that error.
- c) **to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted:** Not applicable.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE? Regulations will remain in effect for something that cannot legally be required. The regulation will continue to conflict with the statute. The next regularly scheduled opportunity to make this change is not until January of 2018, by addressing this problem in January of 2015 the erroneous regulation will only be in effect for one year.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE. The department believes the changes to these regulations are technical corrections and do not focus on allocation of wildlife resources among users.

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

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR. The Department of Fish and Game is responsible for implementation of Board regulations.

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. This ACR has not been submitted before.

ACR 4- Allow the immediate harvest of musk ox stranded on ice for residents in Unit 18.

SUBMITTED BY: Native Village of Mekoryuk

MEETING ACR SUBMITTED FOR: Central/SW or Southcentral Regions

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.
5AAC:92.046. Permits for taking incidental or stranded musk oxen.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM. ADF&G issues permits for taking incidental or stranded musk ox on ice flow by emergency order under AAC: 92.046 (it approximately takes at least three days for a response to get a permit according local area biologist from Bethel). Nunivak Island residents have reported stranded musk ox on ice flows during spring seal hunting seasons. It would seem pointless to report a stranded musk-ox and wait three days for a permit to harvest. This request is to allow Nunivak Island residents to harvest the musk ox immediately (on the spot where they see the musk ox). This would seem most logical since the animal will most likely perish.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER? For Unit 18, (primarily Nunivak Island) residents can harvest the musk ox immediately when musk ox are seen stranded on ice flow, rather than wait for ADF&G to issue emergency order, which takes three days.

4) STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED ABOVE.

a) for a conservation purpose or reason: Without a change in regulation the musk ox will not be harvested and eventually die. The meat will be wasted and the opportunity for meat given to residents of Nunvak Iskand (Unit 18) will be nil.

b) to correct an error in regulation: N/A

c) to correct an effect on a hunt that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted: The Board of Game did not foresee the time lag (three days). During seal hunting seasons, three days is an eternity (changes in weather and ocean currents can either drown the musk ox or send it adrift further away from the island).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PRBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE? Musk ox will eventually die off, form starvation or drowning, without residents having the opportunity to harvest immediately as requested.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE: This request is to find solution to allow residents in Unit 18 (Nunivak Island) to harvest stranded musk ox, it is not allocative.

IF THIS REQUEST IS ALLOCATIVE, STATE THE NEW INFORMATION THAT COMPELS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN ALLOCATIVE PROPOSAL OUTSIDE OF THE REGUALR CYCLE. N/A

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR. This is for the residents of Unit 18 (Nunivak Island) who harvest musk ox.

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. Not that we are aware of.



THE STATE
of **ALASKA**
GOVERNOR SEAN PARNELL

Department of Fish and Game

DIVISION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

1800 Glenn Highway, Suite 4
Palmer, Alaska 99645-6736
Main: 907.861.2100
Fax: 907.861.2121

November 24, 2014

The Native Village of Mekoryuk (proposer) has submitted an Agenda Change Request (ACR) to the Alaska Board of Game requesting to change 5 AAC 92.046, Permits for taking incidental or stranded musk oxen. Under the Board's ACR policy, the Board will accept an ACR only:

- A) for a conservation purpose or reason;
- B) to correct an error in a regulation; or
- C) 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 information that is found by the board to be compelling. [5 AAC 92.005 (a) (2-3)].

With respect to allocative nature, the proposer requests Nunivak Island residents be allowed to immediately harvest musk ox(en) stranded on sea ice. As written, this ACR appears to provide allocative privileges that need to be evaluated by the Board.

With respect to ACR policy acceptance criteria:

- (A) The Department does not believe there is new information regarding conservation concerns that warrant the Board's consideration of this issue out of cycle. The current regulation allows the Department to use Emergency Order authority on a statewide basis to address situations of stranded musk oxen on sea ice or islands. The process for enacting an Emergency Order is typically shorter than the 3-day period claimed by the proposer. However, staff will endeavor to ensure that the time frame is as short as possible.
- (B) For the second criteria, the Department agrees with the proposer that the request does not address an error in regulation.
- (C) For the third criteria, one unforeseen aspect of sea-ice stranding is the eminent loss of animals stranded on an ice flow, generally considered to be ice that is moving and surrounded by water. This type of situation is witnessed occasionally during seal hunting forays and the immediacy of loss in this type of situation makes hunting by department issued permit impractical. The Board will need to determine if stranding on sea ice in the current regulation includes the circumstances associated with moving ice flows and inability to locate animals at a later time.

The department recommends that immediate harvest by Alaska residents be considered only when musk oxen are found stranded on a free floating ice flow completely surrounded by saltwater. Under these conditions a hunter would be eligible to take a bag limit of 2 musk oxen, no change from the stranded musk oxen regulation. After harvest the hunter must be able to demonstrate the ice flow conditions by submitting photographs or video to the department within 3 days of harvest. Salvage requirement would remain edible meat although the hunter may also retain the hide and head of the harvested animal.

The Department has no recommendation on the take of musk oxen by Nunivak Island residents due to the allocative nature of this part of the request.

The Department recommends revised procedures be considered for the unforeseen nature of musk oxen stranded on ice flow being lost without harvest. If not considered as an ACR, this topic should be covered at the next Arctic and Western Region board meeting (2015-2016 cycle).

Sincerely,



Bruce Dale

Deputy Director
Division of Wildlife Conservation

ACR 5 – Clarify the language for requiring hunters to retrieve and salvage of wounded game.

SUBMITTED BY: Department of Public Safety, Alaska Wildlife Troopers

MEETING ACR SUBMITTED FOR: Southeast Region in February 2015.

CITE THE REGULATION THAT WILL BE CHANGED IF THIS ACR IS HEARD.

Alaska Administrative Code Number 5 AAC: 92.220(i)

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM YOU WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO ADDRESS? STATE IN DETAIL THE NATURE OF THE CURRENT PROBLEM. The current regulation states: “a person who has wounded game shall make every reasonable effort to retrieve and salvage that game.” This creates a problem for enforcement as to what is reasonable? If someone wounds a moose are they allowed to use an airplane to locate land and shoot the moose? As currently written, this regulation allows hunters to use whatever methods they deem reasonable to retrieve game they wounded. This puts enforcement in a difficult position. The Department of Public safety has the burden of proof to prove the animal was wounded and the methods used were not reasonable.

WHAT SOLUTION DO YOU PREFER? The Alaska Wildlife Troopers asks the Board of Game to change the regulation to read: “a person who has wounded game shall make every LAWFUL [reasonable] effort to retrieve and salvage that game.” If the board changed the regulation to “lawful” this would eliminate someone from using a method or means already prohibited in regulation or statute.

STATE IN DETAIL HOW THIS ACR MEETS THE CRITERIA STATED ABOVE.

a) for a conservation purpose or reason:

b) to correct an error in regulation:

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

The current regulation has unforeseen consequences regarding the salvage of wounded animals. Each person has their own definition of what is a reasonable effort. This compels enforcement to look for a pre-existing wound and has the potential for someone to use illegal methods or means to harvest an animal but claim they were using a reasonable effort to retrieve a wounded animal.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED PRIOR TO THE REGULAR CYCLE? If the issue is not addressed at the upcoming meeting the potential for someone to use illegal methods and means to harvest an animal will continue to exist. Additional Department of Law court cases may be lost due to this issue. Defendants and defense attorneys are beginning to use this loophole as a means to avoid prosecution.

STATE WHY YOUR ACR IS NOT PREDOMINANTLY ALLOCATIVE: The Department of Public Safety feels the change to the regulation are technical corrections and do not focus on the allocation of wildlife resources among users.

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

STATE YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE ISSUE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ACR. Department of Public Safety—responsible for enforcement of board regulations

STATE WHETHER THIS ACR HAS BEEN CONSIDERED BEFORE, EITHER AS APROPOSAL OR AS AN ACR, AND IF SO, DURING WHICH BOARD OF GAME MEETING. This proposal, previously, has not been submitted.