

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS
ALASKA BOARD OF GAME
Statewide and Interior Region
February 26 – March 10, 2004
Fairbanks, Alaska

DESIGNATED REPORTERS: Justin Crawford and Sherry Wright

This summary of actions is for information purposes only and is not intended to detail, reflect or fully interpret the reasons for the Board's actions.

PROPOSAL NO. 1

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Require that deer harvested in Units 1–4 have tag affixed to the carcass.

DISCUSSION: A number of issues with how the tags would be affixed was discussed. The proposal was brought in an attempt to deal with the lack of reporting in Southeast Alaska. Most of the current harvest data is the result of surveys.

PROPOSAL NO. 2

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Increase quota for peregrine falcon take statewide.

AMENDMENTS: Removed the language “No more than six Peale’s peregrine falcon per year may be taken. A permit holder may not take more than one Peale’s peregrine falcon from the wild per year” and required permit holder to have “at least” two years experience.

DISCUSSION: State regulations allow for no more than six American peregrine falcons. These have been allowed in Alaska for the last two years. The board discussed monitoring occurring on the Colville, Yukon and Tanana rivers.

PROPOSAL NO. 3

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Add conditions for falconry propagation permits.

AMENDMENTS: Transfer of raptor defined as transfer or change the possession of a raptor from one permit holder to another; transfer does not include the sale, barter, or exchange of a raptor for anything of value. Propagation permits conditions included passing an inspection of facilities, limit of no more than four individual birds originally taken from the wild or 12 birds in total. A propagation permit holder will have no limit on the number of second generation or later generation captive-bred progeny held in captive propagation and may only transfer first generation captive bred progeny to a person in Alaska who holds an Alaska falconry permit or to a person who holds an Alaska propagation permit. Second generation may be sold, bartered, exchange for anything of value to any person holding a falconry license or captive propagation permit within Alaska or outside of Alaska.

DISCUSSION: The department noted the effect of this proposal is adding a commercial enterprise aspect to propagation of raptors. At the point falconry becomes a commercial enterprise, the defense of Alaska-only participation becomes more difficult.

PROPOSAL NO. 4

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate requirement for separate registration supplement.

DISCUSSION: The department submitted this proposal in order to reduce publishing costs.

PROPOSAL NO. 5

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Base number of registration permits issued on historical harvest data.

DISCUSSION: If the harvest has not reached the harvest objectives set by the department, the the department has the flexibility of additional hunting opportunity. Over time, the department can increase the amount of permits issued. If passed, the department would no longer be able to provide this opportunity.

PROPOSAL NO. 6

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the requirement to obtain registration permits in person.

DISCUSSION: Despite the fact this proposal focuses on Kodiak Island goat hunts, it is far reaching. The application of when and where permits are issued is an important management tool used by the department. This has the potential of turning hunts into "derby-style" hunts. The department intends to re-evaluate where these might be relaxed in the future.

PROPOSAL NO. 7

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Base number of drawing permits issued on historical harvest data to harvest 100 percent of harvestable surplus.

DISCUSSION: No action based on action taken on Proposal 5.

PROPOSAL NO. 8

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Add registration hunts to failure to report list.

DISCUSSION: Follow-up on compliance of these registrations is time consuming and costly to the department. The intent is to provide greater compliance and better data gathering. The department prefers flexibility to implement this throughout the state by allowing area biologist to gain public support prior to implementing. Registration hunts are used to provide subsistence opportunity in many cases. The board requested a proposal on requiring reporting for the next statewide meeting.

PROPOSAL NO. 9

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts.

DISCUSSION: The department intends to work with the legislature on statutory changes regarding hunting fees. Although this proposal gained advisory committee support, the chances of an applicant's success will not increase because of the large number of applicants and small number of permits available. Younger hunters or new applicants may be discouraged from participating knowing their odds are even less.

PROPOSAL NO. 10

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on action taken on Proposal 9.

PROPOSAL NO. 11

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Implement a point system for sheep and bison drawing permit hunts, set minimum age, increase application fees.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on action taken on Proposal 9.

PROPOSAL NO. 12

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Implement a point or bonus system for drawing permit hunts.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on action taken on Proposal 9.

PROPOSAL NO. 13

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Implement a weighted point system with buy in option for drawing permit hunts.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on action taken on Proposal 9.

PROPOSAL NO. 14

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts, increase number of years necessary before eligible.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on action taken on Proposal 9.

PROPOSAL NO. 15

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts that increases the number of chances in the random draw.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on action taken on Proposal 9.

PROPOSAL NO. 16

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Implement a point system for drawing permit hunts based on residency, restricted weapons bison hunt.

DISCUSSION: The department recommend the board avoid creating another special hunt for bison. The Department of Law noted legal problems basing drawing permits on years of residency.

PROPOSAL NO. 17

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Restrict drawing permit holders from hunting in other game management units for the same species.

DISCUSSION: The board considered that such a restriction would be difficult to enforce.

PROPOSAL NO. 18

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Add global positioning systems (GPS) to list of allowable discretionary permit conditions.

AMENDMENTS: The permit hunt area authorized by the board may be subdivided into smaller permit hunt areas. The language requiring an operative GPS unit was removed.

DISCUSSION: The board discussed GPS use for some specific permit hunts and expressed concern with the term "operative" should a battery wear out or a person move out of working satellite range, as can occur in remote parts of Alaska.

PROPOSAL NO. 19**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit Tier II permit holders from hunting in other game management units.

DISCUSSION: Many residents live in areas where a river is used to divide game management units. Such residents may have traditionally harvested in more than one game management units. The rationale for Tier II is that people most dependent be provided an opportunity and such a limitation of that opportunity is in direct opposition to the purpose of the state subsistence law.

PROPOSAL NO. 20**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Require 25 years of resource use to obtain a Tier II permit for caribou in Unit 13.

DISCUSSION: The department noted that this proposal would create a substantial change where even more applicants would receive the maximum number of points and could effectively exclude Anchorage residents from participating. The board discussed the question on the application regarding the number of years an applicant hunted, and not just eaten, game from a population.

PROPOSAL NO. 21**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Require Tier II applicants to have qualified for a low income hunting license for the last five years.

DISCUSSION: This action is not consistent with the current criteria for eligibility set in statute. This would automatically disqualify many who have traditionally harvested. The department noted that subsistence activities are not tied to economically depressed individuals in rural Alaska. In fact, those with higher incomes tend to be the ones who harvest the most in communities.

PROPOSAL NO. 22**ACTION: Deferred to Nov. 2004**

DESCRIPTION: Require Tier II applicants to provide harvest ticket numbers and date of kills.

DISCUSSION: Board members recognized that long term users would most likely be penalized because the majority of this information would not be available, as there was no requirement for subsistence harvesters to maintain receipts. The board referred this proposal to an interim committee charged with evaluating the Tier II permitting system.

PROPOSAL NO. 23**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Require Tier II applicants to report their hunting license number for past years.

DISCUSSION: The board found that such a requirement would create an unnecessary administrative burden.

PROPOSAL NO. 24**ACTION: No action**

DESCRIPTION: Require Tier II applicants to report their hunting license number for past years.

DISCUSSION: No action based on the action taken on Proposal 23.

PROPOSAL NO. 25

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Restrict Tier II permits to individuals who have not harvested game in another game management unit during the previous 10 years.

DISCUSSION: The Department of Law noted that Tier II issues related to location of harvest are under consideration by the state supreme court. The board determined that such a restriction would be inconsistent with the rationale for Tier II and in direct opposition to the purpose of the state subsistence law.

PROPOSAL NO. 26

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Restrict Tier II permits to individuals who have not harvested game in another state during the previous 10 years.

DISCUSSION: No action based on the action taken on Proposal 25.

PROPOSAL NO. 27

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify Tier II permit point system based on place of residence being rural or urban.

DISCUSSION: The board heard that the ruling in McDowell case precludes the state from taking such an action.

PROPOSAL NO. 28

ACTION: Deferred to Nov. 2004

DESCRIPTION: Modify Tier II permit questions and score allocation.

DISCUSSION: The board referred this proposal to an interim committee charged with evaluating the Tier II permitting system.

PROPOSAL NO. 29

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Limit individuals to applying for only one Tier II hunt per species per year.

DISCUSSION: The board concluded that this limitation would unfairly limit people who have a history of hunting more than one species or in more than one area. The rationale for Tier II is that people most dependent be provided an opportunity and this kind of limitation would be in opposition to the purpose of the state subsistence law.

PROPOSAL NO. 30

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Increase Tier II points, lengthen appeal period, and standardize hunt dates.

AMENDMENTS: Retained only the language regarding extension of the appeal period; other portions of the proposal were deleted.

DISCUSSION: The department noted that general hunting seasons are not likely to coincide with all Tier II customary and traditional hunt seasons statewide. Remote communities often have irregular phone and mail service, making it necessary to have a longer amount of time for contact and resolution.

PROPOSAL NO. 31

ACTION: Deferred to Nov. 2004

DESCRIPTION: Require Tier II applicants to apply in person; present evidence of residency.

DISCUSSION: In person application could place an unnecessary burden to those applicants living in remote locations. The board referred this proposal to an interim committee charged with evaluating the Tier II permitting system.

PROPOSAL NO. 32

ACTION: Deferred to Nov. 2004

DESCRIPTION: Modify Replace the current set of questions on the Tier II application form.

DISCUSSION: Tier II criteria concerning location of harvest are under consideration by the state supreme court. The board referred this proposal to an interim committee charged with evaluating the Tier II permitting system.

PROPOSAL NO. 33

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Restrict the construction of airstrips with use of helicopters.

DISCUSSION: The board considered this a user conflict issue. There are Department of Natural Resources regulations addressing this use, although the enforcement may be limited. The board noted the difficulty in determining whether a helicopter was used for construction of an airstrip.

PROPOSAL NO. 34

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Allow the use of artificial light, with dog, to track and dispatch wounded game.

DISCUSSION: Board expressed concern over creating an opportunity where hunters may extend their hunt later into the day, but realized that this could be a good conservation measure to recover game that would otherwise be lost.

PROPOSAL NO. 35

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Limit off-road vehicle used for hunting to designated trails.

DISCUSSION: The board concluded such a limitation would be difficult to apply.

PROPOSAL NO. 36

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Require registration of off-road vehicles used in hunting game.

DISCUSSION: The board lacks authority to require vehicle registration.

PROPOSAL NO. 37

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Allow use of laser range finders.

DISCUSSION: Use of laser range finders is already allowed in current regulation.

PROPOSAL NO. 38

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Restrict use of equipment used in a federal subsistence hunt in a state authorized hunt.

DISCUSSION: The board thought this limitation would place an unnecessary restriction on hunters.

PROPOSAL NO. 39

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit transport of game harvested in a federal subsistence hunt onto state lands and waters.

DISCUSSION: The board thought this limitation would place an unnecessary restriction on hunters. Hunters who live in a nearby game management unit would be prevented from bringing the meat home.

PROPOSAL NO. 40

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit use of a motor vehicle to transport of game harvested in a Tier II hunt.

DISCUSSION: The board found that limiting vehicle use in transporting game would be difficult to enforce and would place an undue hardship on participants.

PROPOSAL NO. 41

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit the out-of-state transport of game harvested in a Tier II hunt.

DISCUSSION: The board concluded that this kind of limit would place an unnecessary burden on hunters and on subsistence activity. This would be extremely difficult to enforce. An example given during discussion was college students who would not be able to bring care packages with them to school.

PROPOSAL NO. 42

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit transport of game taken in a Tier II hunt out of the unit where harvested.

DISCUSSION: The department explained that often participants in a subsistence hunt live in a nearby game management unit and this would prevent them from bringing the meat home.

PROPOSAL NO. 43

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prevent shooting of big game from boats in marine waters.

DISCUSSION: The board considered biological and social implications in this proposal. It noted that shooting from a boat does not always provide a clean shot, but recognized the practice is a traditional means of harvest in some areas of the state.

PROPOSAL NO. 44

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow taking of game from motorized vehicles.

DISCUSSION: The board discussed how this might be applied and noted concern with hunter ethics.

PROPOSAL NO. 45

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow hunting of coyote, wolf, and bears from snowmachines.

DISCUSSION: The board expressed the need to apply particular methods where needed such as in specific predator control programs his method and did not see the need for applying this method on a statewide basis.

PROPOSAL NO. 46

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow use of laser sights, artificial light and communication equipment to hunt.

DISCUSSION: The board notes that restrictions on methods and means address fair chase concerns.

PROPOSAL NO. 47**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Repeal restrictions on arrow and broadhead weight statewide.**DISCUSSION:** The department noted that 300 grains is a minimum, not a maximum arrow weight in the current regulations.**PROPOSAL NO. 48****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Clarify restriction against shooting across roads.**DISCUSSION:** The Department of Law noted that this would require more judgment by enforcement officials because not all roads are maintained year around. The Bureau of Wildlife Enforcement expressed this liberalization of the current regulations.**PROPOSAL NO. 49****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Allow hunting lynx with dogs.**DISCUSSION:** Conflict of trappers and those hunting with dogs was a concern that was discussed. Most of the dogs used in this are short haired, so they typically would not be used in deep snow. Those hunting with dogs limited their time outside of trapping season. Dogs have also been lost from falling through thin ice, and taken by wolves. Not sure how utilized this would be. This could be made a permit. Concern of the trapping bag limits and the efficiency of the dogs was discussed.**PROPOSAL NO. 50****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Allow use of dogs for recovery of wounded game.**AMENDMENT:** A single, leashed dog under direct control of the trainer may be used to track wounded big game. Animals disturbed in the course of hunting do not count towards the bag limit and a person who has wounded game shall make every reasonable effort to retrieve and salvage that game.**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed tracking and possible abuse, given that dogs can also be used to locate an animal prior to shooting. The board found that this action will help clarify the regulations regarding take and bag limits to the hunter and that it is a good conservation measure to recover game that might otherwise be lost.**PROPOSAL NO. 51****ACTION: No action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow the same day airborne harvest for fox.**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on action taken on Proposal 62.**PROPOSAL NO. 52****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Allow the use of "mechanical/retractable" broadheads in hunting big game.**DISCUSSION:** The board noted that shot placement is the most critical variable in archery effectiveness. It expressed concern over the possibility of mechanical failure with broadheads because they may not consistently open or may lose more energy on impact resulting in less penetration than a fixed blade head.**PROPOSAL NO. 53****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Allow use of lighted nocks on arrows in archery hunts.

DISCUSSION: The board determined that illuminated nocks could aid in assessing shot placement and help in the recovery of game, particularly in low light conditions.

PROPOSAL NO. 54

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Exclude approved Civil Air Patrol missions from the restriction on same day airborne hunting.

DISCUSSION: The board considered the long term effectiveness of same day airborne restrictions as a management tool. It noted that there are others such as enforcement officers that spend time airborne in their line of work and expressed reluctance to adding exceptions to the same day airborne hunting restriction.

PROPOSAL NO. 55

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow same day airborne taking of black bear from a bait station.

DISCUSSION: The department has consistently opposed the granting of exceptions to the same day airborne. Creating additional exception may lead to increasing problems with enforcement and major perception issues associated with allowing same day airborne taking of bears from bait. The board indicated it would be more comfortable including this exemption under a predation control plan but not under methods and means.

PROPOSAL NO. 56

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow baiting of brown bear in intensive management areas.

DISCUSSION: The board expressed concern over the allowance of brown bear baiting as part of a broad-brush approach to reducing bear populations. This method should be considered under predator control management as part of a surgical approach to reducing a specific brown bear population.

PROPOSAL NO. 57

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Remove restrictions currently applied to big game when taking wolf.

DISCUSSION: The department noted wolf are classified both as big game and furbearers. Although removing the big game prohibitions would allow additional opportunity to harvest wolves, the board preferred to tailor method and means for specific situations rather than in a broad statewide manner.

PROPOSAL NO. 58

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Repeal bear tag fee, have year round season in areas where moose and caribou permit areas; allow bear baiting year round in Intensive Management areas.

DISCUSSION: The board recommended adopting these types of prescriptions as part of a more surgical approach to reducing specific bear populations in areas that are identified for predator management.

PROPOSAL NO. 59

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow same day airborne hunting of black bears over bait.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 55.

PROPOSAL NO. 60

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify minimum arrow weights for big game.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that there is an ongoing study on archery equipment. Results should be available for archers to evaluate a full array of choices. The board expressed concern over effectively eliminating young archery hunters and concluded that the current standards are adequate.

PROPOSAL NO. 61

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify restriction on archery equipment in Dalton Highway Corridor.

DISCUSSION: The board did not agree with the need to raise the minimum weights for several species and establish separate minimum weights for different classes of animals.

PROPOSAL NO. 62

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Align regulations concerning fur animals and furbearers with the recent changes made to AS 16.05.783. *Same day airborne hunting.*

DISCUSSION: The department noted that this is a housekeeping proposal to clarify the same day airborne statutes for taking of fur animals and furbearers.

PROPOSAL NO. 63

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit traps within two miles of any residence or road statewide.

DISCUSSION: The board found that this would create an undue hardship on responsible trappers. It identified potential problems with applying the terms "road" and "residence" and found a statewide approach too restrictive.

PROPOSAL NO. 64

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Require signage announcing that trapping is occurring near any publicly maintained trail or developed recreational area.

DISCUSSION: The board questioned the authority to require signage on private property or public property. It chose instead to adopt a resolution (#2004-149-BOG) recommending land managers in the state post signage near highly, multiple use trailheads alerting user groups that trapping activity may be present in the area.

PROPOSAL NO. 65

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit use of conibear-type traps within 50 yards of publicly maintained trails or developed recreational areas.

DISCUSSION: The board did not consider that this regulatory action would result in what the proponents are trying to achieve. It noted the increased burden on trappers and difficulty in clarifying just which trails would be subject to the restriction. The board also noted the responsibilities of dog owners and the value of education in solving this issue.

PROPOSAL NO. 66
2005

ACTION: Deferred to March

DESCRIPTION: Require use of breakaway snares for trapping wolves statewide.

DISCUSSION: The department noted a conservation concern related to moose caught in traps. A research project is under way to identify the breaking force that is efficient in restraining wolves and releasing ungulates. The board deferred the proposal to the March 2005 meeting in order to allow time for the research and development on breakaway snares.

PROPOSAL NO. 67**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Adopt a statewide brown/grizzly bear conservation and management policy.

AMENDMENTS: Board adopted a new regulation on the control of predation by bears, and adopted findings #2004-147-BOG, Board Brown Bear Management Policy.

DISCUSSION: The board outlined their goals and guiding principles for general bear management and bear predation management through established strategies governing conservation and management, research, and information and education. Managing bear populations to allow a wide range of human uses while ensuring the long-term conservation of bears and increasing public awareness and understanding of the uses, conservation, and management of bear and their habitat were considered the underlining goals of the bear management policy. Board members recognized the importance of providing guidelines for developing, implementing, and evaluating bear management actions designed to reduce bear specific predation in precise areas for specific time periods required by predator control implementation plans. Integral to this process will be the review, comment, and interagency coordination for bear management activities.

PROPOSAL NO. 68**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the requirement for a written transfer of possession statement.

DISCUSSION: The department noted the current requirement is helpful for enforcement purposes to aid in determining if game meat was legally harvested. The board agreed with the benefit of written transfer of possession statements.

PROPOSAL NO. 69**ACTION: No Action**

DESCRIPTION: Allow for the sale of black bear hides and skulls statewide.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 72.

PROPOSAL NO. 70**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Allow the sale of handicraft articles from fur of bears statewide.

DISCUSSION: Allowing the sale of handicraft articles made from the fur of bears would provide limited opportunity to interested participants while not influencing the conservation of bears statewide. Board members understood the potential difficulties involved with permitting these handicrafts recognizing that brown bears are listed as an Appendix 1 species under the CITES agreement. Currently there are a number of CITES species allowed as part of the handy craft trade.

PROPOSAL NO. 71**ACTION: No Action**

DESCRIPTION: Allow the sale of black bear hide, skulls and claws statewide.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 72.

PROPOSAL NO. 72**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow statewide sale of bear hides, skulls, prepared, rugs, and taxidermy mounts.

DISCUSSION: The sale of bear parts is a complex issue involving topics such as values, conservation, potential for expansion of illegal trade, bootlegging, expanding commercialization of wildlife, opportunity for cash in rural communities, opportunity for increasing bear harvest, and potential interactions with the big game guiding industry among others. The board expressed concern over opening up a market of selling parts and its desired affect to increase bear harvest statewide.

PROPOSAL NO. 73

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow harvest of sow and cub bears in active predator control areas.

DISCUSSION: Board members were convinced that allowing the take of sows and bear cubs should be considered as part of a more surgical approach to reducing specific bear populations in areas that are identified for predator management. Adopting these types of prescriptions should not be considered under general hunting provisions.

PROPOSAL NO. 74

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Redefine brown bear cub to allow take of yearlings and sows accompanied by yearlings.

DISCUSSION: The board recommended adopting these types of prescriptions as part of a more surgical approach to reducing specific bear populations in areas that are identified for predator management. Adopting these types of prescriptions should not be considered under general hunting provisions. Board members additional discussed the general basis for the legal and biological definition of a cub bear.

PROPOSAL NO. 75

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Redefine brown bear cub to allow take of yearlings and sows accompanied by yearlings.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken Proposal 74.

PROPOSAL NO. 76

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the statewide prohibition on taking moose calves.

DISCUSSION: The department indicated that this is a management tool for areas where there is no biological concern. Eliminating the prohibition standardizes regulations for moose, caribou, deer and sheep, provides greater hunting opportunity and increases management flexibility. Harvesting calves emulates nature more than "bulls only" hunts. Alaska currently has the most restrictive regulations concerning the harvest of calves. The board expressed interest in restricting calf harvest in intensive management areas or where moose populations are declining because it makes more sense to take a bull that will provide more meat. The board requested the department prepare a list of the specific areas and propose for those areas only. There are many areas of the state that specify selective harvest. Regulations regarding "one bull" need to be revisited for "one antlered bull" for clarification.

PROPOSAL NO. 77

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit calf moose hunts statewide.

DISCUSSION: No action based on action taken on Proposal 76.

PROPOSAL NO. 78**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Expand the emergency taking of game provision to include unemployed residents.

DISCUSSION: Provisions for emergency taking of game were put into place for people to sustain life when in dire straits. The board concluded that if all unemployed individuals were allowed to use this regulations, it would have detrimental impact to the wildlife populations of the state.

PROPOSAL NO. 79**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow for harvest of habituated animals under defense of life or property provisions.

DISCUSSION: The board heard that habituated animals may or may not be dangerous to humans, and that determining whether or not an animal is habituated may be problematic. Application in urban areas was also discussed.

PROPOSAL NO. 80**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Create permit for bear baiting.

DISCUSSION: The department explained that the intent of this proposal is to streamline the permitting process currently in place.

PROPOSAL NO. 81**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Remove references to the subsistence brown bear management areas, allow administration of the hunts on a unit basis, liberalize the bag limit, and reauthorize the current tag fee exemptions in the areas.

DISCUSSION: The Department explained the difficulties in administering brown bear management areas that cross regional boundaries. This proposal is part of a continuing attempt to simplify brown bear regulations. Board members supported the simplifying of registration and administration procedures while continuing to provide for subsistence and general harvesting.

PROPOSAL NO. 82**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Require that all hunters have sheep horns sealed..

AMENDMENTS: Amended to allow department flexibility for any sheep hunt where there is a horn restriction to present the horns for sealing, and to authorize Department of Public Safety to also fulfill the sealing requirement.

DISCUSSION: The board considered that requiring sheep horns to be sealed may reduce some of the take of illegal rams. This issue first came before the board for a specific region. At that time, it was recommended this be applied statewide. The department expressed concern over financial and staff time implications for what is perceived as primarily an enforcement issue. Concern of applying the sealing in remote areas such as Northwest Alaska was discussed.

PROPOSAL NO. 83**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Create new license for nuisance wildlife control statewide.

AMENDMENTS: Amended that the department may issue the license, participant must have successfully completed a hunter education course, be able to demonstrate

background in and aptitude for nuisance wildlife control, has complied with all licensing requirements, submit a quarterly activity summary, sealing of the species, as required by other regulations, nuisance wildlife may be taken by any method, unless prohibited by other laws, except that the department may authorize prohibited methods on a case by case basis.

DISCUSSION: Legislation recently passed allows private contractors to deal with some nuisance wildlife problems. Removal of nuisance wildlife has previously been a service provided to the public by the department. Permitting the take of nuisance wildlife will give recourse to private landowners who have property that is being damaged by wildlife, and will allow staff to make more efficient use of time on higher priority issues.

PROPOSAL NO. 84

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Establish amount necessary for subsistence uses as the average Alaska resident harvest of game populations over the previous 20 years.

DISCUSSION: The board did not agree with the need to reduce the flexibility in how it determines the amount necessary for subsistence for various game populations.

PROPOSAL NO. 85

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Establish amount necessary for subsistence uses as the average Alaska resident harvest of game populations over the previous 10 years.

DISCUSSION: No action based on action taken on Proposal 84.

PROPOSAL NO. 86

ACTION: No action

DESCRIPTION: Establish amount necessary for subsistence uses as the average Alaska resident harvest of game populations over the previous 5 years.

DISCUSSION: No action based on action taken on Proposal 84.

PROPOSAL NO. 87

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Restrict antlerless moose bag limit to one moose every four regulatory years.

DISCUSSION: The board found that a more restrictive bag limit would not be consistent with providing for subsistence needs in areas that have a harvestable surplus and a winter hunt is allowed.

PROPOSAL NO. 88

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the existing cow moose season at Berners Bay.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual re-authorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 89

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the existing cow moose season in the Gustavus area.

AMENDMENTS: Authorize up to 100 permits.

DISCUSSION: Habitat concerns were discussed by the department. The department is allowed flexibility in allowing the number of permits that is believed to be an acceptable level. This is an annual re-authorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 90

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the existing antlerless moose season at Nunatak Bench.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 91

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6A.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 92

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6B.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 93

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in Unit 6C.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 94

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Units 7 and 14C.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 95

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the drawing permit hunts for antlerless moose in Unit 14A.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 96

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Fort Richardson Management Area in Unit 14C.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 97

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Elmendorf Air Force Base in Unit 14C.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 98

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Birchwood Management Area and the remainder of Unit 14C.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 99

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area of Unit 15A.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 100

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose season in a portion of Unit 15C.

DISCUSSION: The board received comment from one of the local advisory committees asking that this be designated as a calf hunt due to the number of calves in the area and concern over habitat conditions in the area. Board recommended allowing public opportunity to consider these amendments before taking action on implementing a calf hunt and invited proposals from the public for the next Region II meeting. This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 101

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt on Kalgin Island in Unit 16B.

DISCUSSION: This is an annual reauthorization, approved by a majority of the advisory committees in the affected game management unit and approved by the board.

PROPOSAL NO. 102

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption in Unit 22.

DISCUSSION: The department reported an abundant brown bear population and increased disturbance complaints from the public. The board recognized that additional harvesting of brown bears would be within sustainable limits and could also be a management tool to reduce bear predating on moose calves.

PROPOSAL NO. 103

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose seasons in Unit 22C and Unit 22D.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that moose populations in 22C and 22D can remain viable with a sustained level of harvest to the antlerless portion of the population. Board members noted that harvest numbers can be controlled through harvest registration permits.

PROPOSAL NO. 104

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt in Unit 23.

DISCUSSION: The department reported a recent decline in the Unit 23 moose population. Given the drastic reduction in the fall hunting season, Board members were convinced that this population can continue to sustain a relatively small antlerless harvest.

PROPOSAL NO. 105**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption in Unit 13.**DISCUSSION:** The department requested the exemption be reauthorized to help assist in meeting intensive management objectives.**PROPOSAL NO. 106****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption in Unit 16B.**DISCUSSION:** The department requested the exemption be reauthorized to help assist in meeting intensive management objectives.**PROPOSAL NO. 107****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Reauthorize the brown bear tag fee exemption in Unit 11.**DISCUSSION:** The department requested the exemption be reauthorized to help assist in meeting intensive management objectives.**PROPOSAL NO. 108****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Increase brown bear bag limit to one per year in Unit 20A.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 254.**PROPOSAL NO. 109****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Eliminate the TM787 moose hunt in Unit 20D.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported that overall interest in the TM787 hunt and hunter participation is low and declining. Board members saw no reason to continue to expend department resources administering this Tier II hunt with low participation and harvest. In the absence of this hunt, reasonable opportunity is still available through the general hunt.**PROPOSAL NO. 110****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Modify bag limit and motorized access in Bison Range Youth Moose Hunt in Unit 20D.**AMENDMENTS:** Delta Bison Range closed to motorized vehicles for hunting from July 1 – September 30, including transportation of hunters, hunting gear, or parts of game. Bag limit of one bull per lifetime; with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side.**DISCUSSION:** Recommendations to change the bag limit and to restrict motorized vehicles for hunting and other public access resulted from a public review of the management area regulations by the Bison Range Youth Hunt Ad Hoc Committee in response to public concerns. The department reported that prior to the creation of this youth hunt crop damage in the bison range was attributable to an increase in motorized vehicles used by moose hunters. Reducing hunting pressure has helped to reduce disturbance to bison and bison management. In creating a hunt with antler restrictions, Board members intended to provide a hunt that more closely resembles bag limits throughout the state and helps to foster the learning process of young hunters. The board further recognized and supported the long process of cooperation from the Ad Hoc Committee and department toward reaching a compromise.

PROPOSAL NO. 111**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Align moose season in southeastern Unit 20D with Unit 12; eliminate TM 787.

DISCUSSION: The Tier II moose season in eastern Unit 20D has been closed as a result of action on Proposal 109. The alignment of season dates may result in increased harvest because the season would be open for twenty-two day and would attract hunters from other areas that close on September 15. This anticipated increase is not likely to be sustainable in Unit 12. Board members agreed that this proposal does not address the confusing nature of the regulations.

PROPOSAL NO. 112**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Close winter moose hunt in the Healy River drainage, Unit 20D.

DISCUSSION: The department noted that overall interest and harvest in the hunting season is low and no moose were reported taken during this hunting season for the last five years. The board stated that the closure of this winter moose season is not likely to result in a substantial decrease in the overall harvest.

PROPOSAL NO. 113**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Establish a drawing permit hunt for antlerless moose in the Delta Junction Management Area.

DISCUSSION: The current Unit 20D moose population was reported to be below the population objective of 8,000 – 10,000 moose. Board members agreed that the majority of moose harvested would not likely be in the immediate Delta Junction Management Area, therefore this drawing hunt would not address the nuisance moose issue.

PROPOSAL NO. 114**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Update the wolf predation control implementation plan for Unit 20D.

AMENDMENTS: Amended with current population estimates of moose, caribou, and wolves; Addition of human caused mortality from bears; and department report to the Board during spring meeting. If public taking of wolves is not effective, then the department will implement aerial shooting.

DISCUSSION: This proposal was requested by the board to update the Unit 20D wolf control implementation plan, 5 AAC 92.125(3). The board noted that reducing wolf predation in Unit 20D could provide greater quantities of moose for future harvests.

PROPOSAL NO. 115**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Restrict Macomb Plateau Controlled Use Area to walk-in hunting only.

DISCUSSION: Adding additional access restrictions in the Macomb Plateau CUA would have varying degrees of impact on moose and caribou hunters. Moose hunting effort and success is not increasing and is currently minimal. Board members saw no reason to further reduce the already low moose harvest by further restricting access.

PROPOSAL NO. 116**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Extend the beaver trapping season in the remainder of Unit 20B in the fall and spring.

DISCUSSION: Beaver densities in the Fairbanks residential and roaded areas were reported to be high and current harvest is likely far below sustainable yield. Extending the beaver season could increase harvest and reduce the current level of property damage caused by beaver with little risk to over harvest because market demand is low. The board further noted that extended seasons already exist in most other units.

PROPOSAL NO. 117

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Lengthen brown bear season in portion of Unit 20B.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 254.

PROPOSAL NO. 118

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Close nonresident season for hunting of sheep, caribou, and moose in Unit 20.

DISCUSSION: The department reported the sheep, caribou, and moose taken by nonresident hunters to be minimal. Closure of these nonresident seasons in Unit 20 would have a significant economic impact on guides, resulting in their likely displacement. Board members expressed concern over the broad scope of closures this proposal requested, and recommended for future consideration addressing these allocation issues on a case-by-case basis in smaller geographic areas.

PROPOSAL NO. 119

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Allocate Unit 20A caribou drawing permits to nonresidents; apply alternate list.

AMENDMENT: Increase the number of permits authorized to 200 annually.

DISCUSSION: Currently, many of these permits go unused because of the difficulty and expense in accessing the hunt area, resulting in low hunter participation. The department stated that the Delta Caribou Herd could sustain a higher harvest of bulls. To achieve the harvest objective, board members supported increasing the number of permits in an effort to increase harvest.

PROPOSAL NO. 120

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Close cow and calf moose hunts in the Tanana Flats portion of Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 121

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Change bag limit and prohibit taking of calf moose in Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 122

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Create any bull bag limit for moose hunters under age 16 in Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: This proposal would result in increased harvest of bull moose, which may exceed sustained yield. Board members expressed concern over expanding the poorly received Take a Child Hunting concept to a new area.

PROPOSAL NO. 123

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Open muzzleloader hunt for antlerless cow moose in the Wood River Controlled Use Area portion of Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 124

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize and modify antlerless moose seasons in Unit 20A.

AMENDMENTS: General hunting season for both resident and nonresident was changed to Sept. 1 – Sept. 25. The antlerless moose hunt will be administered as a registration hunt with season dates from Sept. 1 – Dec. 10 (or closed by Emergency Order when 600 antlerless moose have been taken) and will be expanded to include all portions of Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: The department reported the Unit 20A moose population to be exceeding the current population objective of 10,000 – 12,000. Board members were convinced that limiting growth of this nutritionally stressed moose population is desired due to the current poor habitat conditions. Extending the bull moose season five days and maintaining selective harvest practices will provide additional harvest opportunity while not exceeding the sustainable bull harvest. Board members recognized the primary justification for the Unit 20A antlerless hunts are to limit growth of the moose population and to provide the opportunity to harvest a surplus of cow moose in an effort to meet subsistence and Intensive Management harvest objectives. To achieve harvest objectives, the department recommended the hunt be administered as a registration hunt with season dates from Sept. 1 – Dec. 10 (or closed by Emergency Order when 600 antlerless moose have been taken) and that the hunt be expanded to include all portions of the unit. Board members supported the continuation of calf moose hunts by including them in the antlerless hunt rather than conducted as separate drawing permit hunt. Although calf harvests have been low, these hunts provide additional hunting opportunity, reduce hunting pressure on bull moose, reduce competition among hunters, and help meet Intensive Management harvest objectives. Additionally, the board updated information to the Unit 20A Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plan, 5 AAC 92.125 (2).

PROPOSAL NO. 125

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunt in Unit 20B within the Fairbanks Management Area and the Minto Flats Management Area.

AMENDMENT: Increase the number of permits authorized within the Minto Flats Management Area to 150 annually.

DISCUSSION: Board members supported the purpose of the Fairbanks Management Area antlerless hunt to provide opportunity to harvest a surplus of cow moose and potentially reduce moose/vehicle collisions and nuisance moose problems. The moose density within the Minto Flats Management Area is currently high and well capable of sustaining an antlerless hunt intended to provide for subsistence needs.

PROPOSAL NO. 126

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Liberalize bag limit to any bull in portion of Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 127

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Close nonresident moose season in Unit 20C.

DISCUSSION: Board members saw no reason to eliminate the nonresident moose season. Nonresident hunters are harvesting a minimal number of moose in Unit 20C and are not considered to be a limiting factor on resident success.

PROPOSAL NO. 128

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Open an archery moose hunt for any bull in Healy-Lignite Management Area.

DISCUSSION: Harvest of bull moose by archery hunting in the Healy-Lignite Management Area was reported to be very low. In the absence of a public safety concern, the board saw no reason to complicate current regulations by restricting this area to archery hunting.

PROPOSAL NO. 129

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Modify antler restriction to any bull for moose hunting in Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 130

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Close antlerless moose hunt in Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 131

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Close calf moose hunt in Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 132

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Close nonresident moose hunt in Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 133

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Delete antler restriction in eastern portion of Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 134

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Delete antler restriction in portion of Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 135

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Delete antler restriction in southeast portion of Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 136

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Delete antler restriction in eastern portion of Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 137

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Restrict antlerless moose permit holders from taking bulls in Fairbanks Management Area (FMA).

AMENDMENTS: Increase the number of permits authorized within the Fairbanks Management Area to 150 annually.

DISCUSSION: The department stated their intent to continue to increase antlerless moose harvest in the FMA in order to reduce road kill numbers. Recognizing that antlerless moose harvest in the FMA appears to be more limited by the availability of barren cows; board members agreed that increasing the number of permits authorized should increase the harvest toward the objective. Restricting antlerless moose permit holders from taking bulls has worked well in Unit 20A to increase permittee success.

PROPOSAL NO. 138

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow a two-person party registration permit for any bull in Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: Dual regulations of this type would likely cause confusion for hunters and would be difficult to enforce. Liberalizing antler restrictions would result in increased bull harvesting on a segment of the population that is currently harvested near maximum sustainable levels. The board intends to monitor the recent changes to the Unit 20A moose season before considering a party registration permit.

PROPOSAL NO. 139

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Add an antler restriction for nonresident moose hunt in Unit 25C.

DISCUSSION: Population trend counts and population estimates conducted suggest the bull:cow ratios to be well above the management objective. Board members noted that selective harvest techniques are used in areas experiencing a declining bull:cow ratio with the intent of reducing the number of bulls taken. Additionally, the nonresident harvest of moose was reported to be below low, eighteen percent of the reported moose taken annually.

PROPOSAL NO. 140

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate Tier II moose hunts in Unit 20 when amounts necessary harvest is met.

AMENDMENTS: Changed the subsistence hunt within the Minto Flats Management Area to 1 moose by registration subsistence hunting permit only; up to 200 permits may be issued (60 percent of permits issued in Minto, 40 percent issued in Nenana) with a Sept. 1 – Sept. 25 and a Jan. 10 – Feb. 28 season. General hunting season dates were changed to Sept. 11 – Sept. 25.

DISCUSSION: The Minto Flats Management Area winter moose hunt provides a significant portion of the overall annual subsistence harvest of residents in Minto and Nenana. By increasing the number of permits authorized to 200 under Proposal 125, the board has addressed providing reasonable opportunity to meet subsistence needs. The moose population was reported to be in excess of its carrying capacity. Board members supported reallocating moose harvest from the Tier II hunts to registration and general hunts when a harvestable surplus of moose can be identified. By establishing a registration hunt and distributing the permits in the communities of Minto and Nenana, the needs of subsistence users will be met while providing additional opportunity to other hunters. A registration hunt additionally maintains flexibility needed to meet sustainable harvest on an annual basis.

PROPOSAL NO. 141

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Liberalize antler restrictions in Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 124.

PROPOSAL NO. 142

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Establish a winter muzzleloader drawing permit hunt in the Fairbanks Management Area (FMA).

AMENDMENTS: Issue up to ten muzzleloader permits for antlerless moose winter hunt within the Creamers Field Refuge portion of the Fairbanks Management Area.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that sufficient numbers of bow hunters exist to satisfy the current harvest goals within the FMA without liberalizing the methods and means to include firearms. Safety concerns of muzzleloader use in urban areas were discussed. The board supported providing muzzleloader users an opportunity to harvest antlerless moose on an experimental basis. Portions of the refuge are currently open to waterfowl hunting.

PROPOSAL NO. 143

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Establish a drawing permit hunt for moose calves in the Fairbanks Management Area.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposals 67 and 142.

PROPOSAL NO. 144

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Convert calf hunts to Take a Child Hunting hunts in Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 265.

PROPOSAL NO. 145

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Liberalize coyote season and bag limit in Units 20A and 20C.

DISCUSSION: The coyote seasons are currently standardized and considered liberal across all of the Interior game management units. The board encouraged maintaining consistent seasons and bag limits throughout the Interior to help hunters and trappers understand and comply with regulations. Board members were not convinced that the proposed liberalizations would result in an increased coyote harvest.

PROPOSAL NO. 146

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify spring ptarmigan season and bag limit in Units 20 and 25C.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that potential for local overharvest of birds during cyclic lows may cause slower recovery or lower population peaks in subsequent years. The Board of Game authorized the department to adjust ptarmigan bag limits in these game management units by Emergency Order to optimize hunting opportunity during population highs and to protect resident populations during lows. Board members recognized that extending the ptarmigan season into the spring could result in a potential overharvesting of breeding birds in accessible areas, and further supported the department's EO authority in changing season in response to population trends.

PROPOSAL NO. 147

ACTION: Carried.

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the current brown bear tag fee exemption for Unit 20D.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that the Macomb caribou herd and Unit 20D moose are currently below their population or harvest objectives. Board members extended support for reauthorizing the current brown bear tag fee exemption intended to help increase bear harvests and potentially lessen predation pressures on caribou and moose populations.

PROPOSAL NO. 148

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the current exemption of brown bear tag fee in a portion of Unit 20E.

DISCUSSION: Brown bear harvest is currently below sustainable levels in Unit 20E. The board understood the level of mortality that brown bears contribute to the moose population in Unit 20E and agreed that tag fee exemptions will encourage harvesting opportunistically associated with other hunting practices.

PROPOSAL NO. 149

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate brown bear tag fee for Unit 25C.

DISCUSSION: Brown bear tag fees are collected from brown bear hunters and redistributed to help manage wildlife statewide. Brown bear tag fees have been exempted in several game management units around the state that have been identified for intensive management of big game prey species where a management goal is to reduce brown bear numbers. Unit 25C is not a designated intensive management unit. Board members were not convinced that eliminating the brown bear tag fee would likely result in increased bear harvests.

PROPOSAL NO. 150

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Add Units 20A and 20C to units with Take A Child Hunting seasons.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 265.

PROPOSAL NO. 151

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Liberalize season and bag limit for Take A Child Hunting hunt in Unit 20.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 265.

PROPOSAL NO. 152

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Repeal requirement for trap identification in Fairbanks Management Area.

DISCUSSION: The trap identification requirement was implemented at the March 2002 Board meeting when conflicts with pet owners and enforcement issues were raised. Board members noted that trap identification tags have not been used to issue any citations since the implementation of this requirement and are considered an unnecessary burden on the trapping community.

PROPOSAL NO. 153

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Increase Intensive Management (IM) objectives for moose in Unit 20.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 267.

PROPOSAL NO. 154

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Increase population and harvest objectives for Delta caribou.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 267.

PROPOSAL NO. 155

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Require trophy value destruction of moose antlers in Unit 20F and portion of 20C.

DISCUSSION: The department has no way of estimating the number of hunters that would be discouraged from hunting in the area if the proposed regulation took effect. Enforcement of this regulation would be difficult without the availability of a central hunter check station to pass through. Noting that the moose harvest is below sustained yield, and a limited nonresident harvest, the board was unconvinced that this requirement would aid in the conservation of the moose population.

PROPOSAL NO. 156

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Remove wolf hunting and trapping closures by Denali National Park.

AMENDMENTS: Changed the eastern boundary of the Nenana Closed Area to one mile east of the Parks Highway. The board enacted a 6-year moratorium on boundary changes.

DISCUSSION: Scientific results suggested that the Stampede Closed Area and Nenana Canyon Closed Area would have no measurable effect on the biological parameters of the Denali wolf population. However, removal of any wolves is objectionable to those

who place a high value on the potential to view even a single animal. The board received considerable testimony in support of maintaining trapping closures near Denali National Park and noted its willingness to make allowances where possible. Trapping opportunities negated by these closures was considered to be negligible. Board members stated their willingness to protect the viewing of wolves along a relatively small area the wolves routinely visit and are viewed, while not trying to protect across their range. The National Park Service was urged to develop other areas within the park to accommodate for improved wolf viewing. In setting a six year moratorium on changes to the existing closure boundaries, the board intends to evaluate its affect on trappers and the tourism industry.

PROPOSAL NO. 157**ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Remove wolf hunting and trapping closures by Denali National Park.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 156.**PROPOSAL NO. 158****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Remove wolf hunting and trapping closures by Denali National Park.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 156.**PROPOSAL NO. 159****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Remove wolf hunting closure by Denali National Park in Unit 20.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 156.**PROPOSAL NO. 160****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Close area along Chena Slough in Unit 20B to duck hunting.**DISCUSSION:** Board members explained that issues concerning public safety and user conflicts between homeowners and hunters would be better dealt with through local authorities. The board is not authorized to close areas to hunting in the absence of a conservation concern, or solely for public safety.**PROPOSAL NO. 161****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Allow consumptive uses in all portions of Creamers Field Migratory Waterfowl Refuge.**DISCUSSION:** Creamers Field Migratory Waterfowl Refuge was established by the Alaska legislature to protect and enhance habitat for migratory birds with special emphasis on waterfowl, and to provide the opportunity to view, photograph and study plants, wildlife and geologic features typical of interior Alaska. The refuge management plan developed by the department with a local advisory group set habitat, viewing and study, and education as primary goals, with other public uses allowed if consistent with the statutory and primary goals. Hunting is currently managed to be compatible with the primary management plan.**PROPOSAL NO. 162****ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow airboat use in Minto Flats Management Area.

DISCUSSION: Board members understood that allowing airboat use in the Minto Flats Management Area would drastically increase user conflicts in the area. As a result of eliminating the Tier II hunt, action taken on Proposal 140, the board expressed concern over making additional changes to the dynamics of this hunt.

PROPOSAL NO. 163

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Expand Fairbanks Management Area (FMA) near Nordale and Chena Hot Springs roads.

DISCUSSION: The board saw no reason to expand the Fairbanks Management Area in the absence of a biological concern. A six year moratorium was issued on hearing proposals that consider changes to the FMA boundaries.

PROPOSAL NO. 164

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow airboat use in Minto Flats Management Area.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 162.

PROPOSAL NO. 165

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Allow airboat use in Nenana Controlled Use Area.

DISCUSSION: Allowing airboats to access portions of Unit 20A that currently receive minimal hunting pressure would likely help to harvest the current abundance of moose that are underutilized in addition to evenly distributing hunting pressure. Board members discussed the potential for increased user conflicts by allowing airboats to access the Nenana Controlled Use Area. Airboat use was recognized to have a minimal environmental impact. Based on increased permit opportunity in the Minto Flats Management Area and an abundant moose population in Unit 20A, the board determined that reasonable opportunity to provide for subsistence has been maintained.

PROPOSAL NO. 166

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Clarify allowable use of the Parks Highway through the Wood River Controlled Use Area in Unit 20A.

DISCUSSION: The current description of the Wood River Controlled Use Area (WRCUA) area does not provide for Parks Highway access or transport for hunting purposes. This was not the intent of the WRCUA, and was overlooked during formulation of the WRCUA. Board members considered this a housekeeping issue that helps to cleanup regulatory language.

PROPOSAL NO. 167

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Open the Wood River Controlled Use Area to motorized vehicles.

DISCUSSION: The department stated that adoption of this proposal would likely result in the increased use of the area, increased harvest of brown bears, and increased user conflicts. Current hunting restrictions would likely prevent overharvest of big game species. Board members referenced actions taken to liberalize hunting season in Unit 20A and expressed no interest in altering the long standing controlled use area.

PROPOSAL NO. 168**ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Eliminate the Wood River Controlled Use Area in Unit 20A.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 167.**PROPOSAL NO. 169****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow airboat use in Nenana Controlled Use Area.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 165.**PROPOSAL NO. 170****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Repeal all restricted areas in Unit 20.**DISCUSSION:** The board is opposed to blanket elimination of restricted areas. Controlled use areas should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.**PROPOSAL NO. 171****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Allow motorized hunting within two miles of a portion of Rex Trail in Unit 20.**DISCUSSION:** The proposed change would create a less recognizable boundary than currently exists. Therefore, hunter compliance and law enforcement would be an issue. The department explained that a small increase in use and harvest by hunters using all terrain vehicles should be expected due to the popularity of the Rex Trail. Board members noted their intent to minimize regulatory confusion.**PROPOSAL NO. 172****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Create an area closed to trapping near McKinley Village.**DISCUSSION:** Closure of this area is not expected to significantly decrease furbearer harvest in Unit 20A. There is currently no concern in the proposed area regarding overharvest of furbearers. The board recognized the minimal pressure the proposed area receives and saw no reason to eliminate trapping.**PROPOSAL NO. 173****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Open a season for arctic fox trapping in Unit 25.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 252.**PROPOSAL NO. 174****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Establish a registration hunt for moose in Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA).**DISCUSSION:** There is presently no need to limit caribou harvest in the DHCMA or Unit 26B, and thus no need for a registration or other permit system for caribou. The caribou harvest is well within sustainable levels. Board members understood that without a registration permit for caribou, it would be difficult or impossible to enforce a requirement that hunters could not hunt moose and caribou on the same trip. Additionally, moose and caribou hunting rarely occur in same area. The board supported

maintaining the present system, recognizing that it has helped to distribute and stabilize hunting pressure.

PROPOSAL NO. 175**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the current exemption of brown bear resident tag fee for Unit 25D.

DISCUSSION: Moose populations in Unit 25D have been identified as important for providing high levels of human consumption. This tag fee exemption is intended to increase harvest reporting and also to increase opportunistic harvest of brown bear to benefit moose calf and adult survival.

PROPOSAL NO. 176**ACTION: No Action**

DESCRIPTION: Reopen archery hunting within 1/4 mile of Dalton Highway in Unit 26B.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 178.

PROPOSAL NO. 177**ACTION: No Action**

DESCRIPTION: Reopen archery hunting within 1/4 mile of Dalton Highway in Unit 26B.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 178.

PROPOSAL NO. 178**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Delete archery ID requirement and eliminate the 1/4 mile closure along Dalton Highway in Unit 26B.

DISCUSSION: The current closure was considered an attempt to increase bow hunting quality and to improve the public image of hunting associated with increased hunting pressure and roadside hunting. The harvest of caribou was reported to be within sustainable limits. Board members were convinced that the current ID requirements and closure along the Dalton Highway have created enforcement difficulties and have not served as a deterrent to hunters who may attempt shots with a high probability of only wounding an animal. As a result, these changes have placed an unnecessary restriction on bow hunters. The board considered both reducing the size of the closed area corridor and limiting it seasonally, but determined any closure to be unnecessary.

PROPOSAL NO. 179**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Clarify restriction on vehicle use in Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area.

AMENDMENTS: No motorized vehicle, except licensed highway vehicles permitted on the following designated roads: 1) Dalton Highway, 2) Bettles Winter Trail during periods when BLM and the City of Bettles announce that the trail is open for winter travel, 3) Galbraith Lake gravel pit access road when the gate is open, 4) Toolik Lake Road, excluding the driveway to the Toolik Lake Research Facility, and 5) The Sagavanirktok River access road two miles north of Pump Station 2; 6) any constructed roadway or gravel pit within ¼ mile of the Dalton Highway. Hunters, their hunting gear, or parts of game may be transported within the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area by aircraft or boat; or snowmachines when needed to access land on the other side of the management area.

DISCUSSION: Board members recognized that current language appears to be confusing to the public and supported clarifying regulations by specifying individual roads on which highway vehicles can be used within the DHCMA. Driving on these established roads was considered to have minimal environmental damage to the surrounding area and was fully acceptable with the Bureau of Wildlife Enforcement. Additionally, the board corrected an oversight in the original regulation that allowed hunting gear to be legally transported by licensed highway vehicles.

PROPOSAL NO. 180

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate restrictions on the use of licensed highway vehicles in Dalton Corridor.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 179.

PROPOSAL NO. 181

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Delete archery ID requirement in Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 178.

PROPOSAL NO. 182

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Reduce size of Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area and eliminate motor vehicle restrictions.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 179.

PROPOSAL NO. 183

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Expand muskrat trapping season in Unit 21.

DISCUSSION: Early season openings of selected species have historically been an enforcement issue due to the concern of harvesting non-target species. Board members expressed concern over expanding trapping opportunities on a population that appears to have been very low throughout the 1990's to the present. Additionally, local advisory committee opposition was noted for the proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 184

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Expand beaver trapping season in Unit 21.

DISCUSSION: Early season openings of furbearers have historically been an enforcement issue due to the concern of harvesting non-target species. Early fall harvest of beaver may be detrimental to harvest by fur trappers who elect to trap beaver when furs become prime for commercial purposes. The board was concerned over expanding trapping opportunities on a population that has not been reasonable surveyed.

PROPOSAL NO. 185

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Establish a drawing permit hunt for brown bear in Unit 24 near Dalton Highway.

DISCUSSION: With the recent implementation of the drawing moose permit in the Dalton Highway Corridor, incidental harvest of bears is expected to decrease due to the decline in moose hunters. The department reported the current harvest of brown bear to below sustained yield and harvest objectives for Unit 24. Board members agreed that current population and harvest data does not support the need for more restrictive harvest regulations.

PROPOSAL NO. 186

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Close season for Galena Mountain caribou in Unit 21.

DISCUSSION: Recent survey information was reported to indicate a substantial decline in the Galena Mountain caribou herd population. The board considered the harvest of a single animal from this herd to be detrimental. The season closures in this proposal would protect the Galena Mountain caribou herd while allowing harvest of Western Arctic caribou herd.

PROPOSAL NO. 187

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Limit Koyukuk Moose drawing permit applicants to one hunt each year.

DISCUSSION: Board members considered action taken on Proposal 193 to reduce the number of responses for permits in this area. This limitation was not likely to have an effect on ones chances of drawing a permit.

PROPOSAL NO. 188

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize antlerless moose hunting seasons in Unit 21D.

DISCUSSION: The department noted that once a regulation is removed from the codified language it is difficult to get reinstated. It is the department's intent to close the antlerless moose season by emergency order when biologically appropriate. The board recognized the need to closely monitor the moose population in Unit 21D, but determined it was appropriate to allow the department to close the fall cow season by emergency order to ensure cow moose survival.

PROPOSAL NO. 189

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting seasons in Unit 24.

DISCUSSION: The department noted that once a regulation is removed from the codified language it is difficult to get reinstated. The board recognized the need to closely monitor the moose population in Unit 24, but determined it was appropriate to allow the department to close the fall cow season by emergency order to ensure cow moose survival. Local advisory committee support was noted on this proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 190

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify brow tine restrictions for moose hunting in Unit 24.

DISCUSSION: It is unlikely that nonresident harvesting of 4 brow-tine moose has altered the genetic make up of the Unit 24 moose population. Recognizing that this moose population is currently declining, board members expressed concern over the liberalizing affect this proposal would have on the harvest of bulls.

PROPOSAL NO. 191

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Close nonresident moose hunting season in Unit 21B upstream of the mouth of the Nowitna River and east of the west bank of the Nowitna River.

DISCUSSION: The board understood the nonresident harvest of moose in Unit 21B to be minimal and was convinced this closure would not significantly improve moose populations.

PROPOSAL NO. 192

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Increase brown bear bag limit to two per year Units 21B, 21C, 21D, and 24.

DISCUSSION: These liberalizations are more appropriate to be taken under a bear predation management plans concept, rather than general hunting regulations. The board stated their supported for increasing harvest of brown bears, but were convinced that recent liberalizations to the bag limit will help to potentially reduce bear numbers and bear predation on big game prey species.

PROPOSAL NO. 193

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Create drawing permit hunts for moose in Units 21B, 21C, 21D, and 24.

AMENDMENTS: Up to 250 drawing permits may be issued in Unit 21B; up to 100 permits may be issued in Unit 21C; up to 500 permits may be issued in Unit 21D outside of the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area; and up to 450 permits may be issued in Unit 24 outside of the Koyukuk CUA.

DISCUSSION: Increased hunting restrictions in the well known hunting area of the Lower Koyukuk River have displaced hunters into much of the surrounding areas of the Middle Yukon, Koyukuk, and Nowitna Rivers. Increased competition among users for the limited moose resource is occurring at the same time that the moose population throughout the area is decreasing. The board supports the intention of evenly distributing hunting effort through the implementation of drawing permits and registration hunts in drainages directly adjacent to the Koyukuk CUA and in Unit 21B. The resulting shift in participation is likely to help subsistence users that have been unsuccessful during the fall hunting season and forced to harvest a moose during the winter seasons. Board members further established the need to manage the moose population at a conservative rate to allow for increase. Distributing hunting effort was considered to help maintain reasonable opportunity to harvest for subsistence needs.

PROPOSAL NO. 194

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Shorten seasons and implement antler restrictions for nonresident moose hunters in Unit 21C.

AMENDMENT: Bag limit change only, 50-inches or four brow tines, keep nonresident season of September 5 – 25.

DISCUSSION: The department reported moose populations throughout Unit 21C to be declining. Low and declining hunter success rates are further indications that the 21C moose population is declining, and the bull harvest should be reduced moderately. The board determined that selective harvest techniques are likely to help in the conservation of this moose population and would be consistent with other regulations in the Galena Area. However, the board agreed that with implementation of antler restrictions it would not be necessary to shorten the season at this time.

PROPOSAL NO. 195**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Lengthen nonresident moose season in Units 21A and 21B.**DISCUSSION:** Hunter participation has increase substantially on the Nowitna River in recent years. The biological assessment by the department suggests the harvest in 21B should be more conservative until the population has improved. Board members were convinced that the proposed changes to liberalize the moose season would result in increase hunting pressure on the bull component of the population and would exacerbate the impact on subsistence hunters.**PROPOSAL NO. 196****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Apply the alternate list system for allocating nonresident drawing permits for moose in Unit 21D and 24.**AMENDMENT:** Apply to the Koyukuk River Controlled Use Area (KRCUA) only.**DISCUSSION:** The department expressed concern with the administrative difficulties and costs associated with maintaining an alternate list of nonresident permits. Board members stated their intent to provide a fair allocation of permits to guides, ensuring they will stay in business. Applying this system to the KRCUA only will provide a small controlled area to serve as a trial system and allow the department time to measure its affects. The board noted that the establishment of a commercial services board would be an appropriate avenue to make these decisions.**PROPOSAL NO. 197****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Shorten seasons, implement antler restrictions for nonresident moose hunters in Unit 21C.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposals 193 and 194.**PROPOSAL NO. 198****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Lengthen wolf hunting seasons in the spring in Unit 24.**DISCUSSION:** Extending the wolf hunting season into May would allow for harvesting at a period when fur quality is not optimal and wolf packs are likely to have pups in the den. Recognizing that wolf seasons are typically reserved for periods when the fur quality is prime, board members supported preserving the current hunting seasons to help maintain consistency. These liberalizations should only be considered where a wolf implementation plan has been established.**PROPOSAL NO. 199****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Eliminate brown bear tag fee in Unit 21B, 21C, and 21D.**DISCUSSION:** Board members understood that allowing for the opportunistic take of bears in Units 21B, 21C, and 21D would not likely have a negative impact on the bear population. The expected increased harvest of bears is indented to improve harvest reporting and benefit moose calf and adult survival.**PROPOSAL NO. 200****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Implement antler restrictions for Unit 21B.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 193.

PROPOSAL NO. 201

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Close the February season in Unit 21D and the March season in Unit 24; open a ten day, bulls only, December season in Unit 21D; and change the December seasons in Unit 24 to bulls only.

AMENDMENTS: Updated number of permits to be consistent with permits designated in Proposal 193.

DISCUSSION: Antlerless moose harvest in Units 21D and 24 can be supported by present moose populations on a limited basis only. The department reported that Emergency Order closure of the fall antlerless moose season was implemented in 2003 for the third year, but with poor recruitment and continuing declines in the population, additional measures to conserve cow moose must be taken. The board supported reducing the harvest of cows on this declining moose population to help conserve the productive component of the moose population. As moose populations decline and local hunter success declines during the fall hunt, more local hunters will hunt during the winter season and a larger portion of the winter harvest will include cows. Board members recognized that this proposal reduces subsistence opportunity during the winter seasons but agreed that actions taken on Proposal 193 will help to redistribute effort, providing additional subsistence opportunities during the fall season for harvesting moose in the Koyukuk River Controlled Use Area.

PROPOSAL NO. 202

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit use of proxies in the permit moose hunts in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area in Units 21 and 24.

DISCUSSION: The Board of Game does not have the authority to prohibit use of proxy permits. Proxy hunters are entitled to hunt animals for food, including moose.

PROPOSAL NO. 203

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow snaring and trapping of black bears in Units 21 and 24.

DISCUSSION: Harvesting of black bears through the use of snares and traps would be more appropriately used under a bear predation implementation policy. Board members expressed concern over the incidental catch of grizzlies and calf moose.

PROPOSAL NO. 204

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Expand the same day airborne restriction in Units 21 and 24.

DISCUSSION: The board recognized that it is currently illegal to assist in taking wildlife through the use of aircraft. Enforcement of this restriction would be complicated.

PROPOSAL NO. 205

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Allow baiting for the harvest of grizzly bears in Unit 21D.

DISCUSSION: Board members understood the baiting of brown bears to be more appropriately considered as part of a bear predation control implementation plan, not general methods and means.

PROPOSAL NO. 206**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Liberalize methods and season for taking black bear in Units 21B, 21C, 21D, and 24.

DISCUSSION: The department considered this wide range of very liberal methods and means to be more appropriately included in a bear predation implementation plan. Board members recognized the frustrations of Unit 21 and 24 residents who are requesting methods to reduce predation on moose, but considered this proposal to be too far reaching.

PROPOSAL NO. 207**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate "Meat on the Bone" regulation in Unit 21C.

DISCUSSION: The meat on the bone regulation can: improve the ability of law enforcement personnel to determine whether or not a moose has been completely salvaged because parts can be readily identified, improve the quality of meat because less surface area is exposed, and acknowledge customary use patterns that involve removing the entire moose from the field. The board recognized that wanton waste of game meat and improper handling of moose meat are issues of concern for fish and game advisory committees in the Galena area.

PROPOSAL NO. 208**ACTION: No Action**

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate "Meat on the Bone" regulation in Unit 21C.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 207.

PROPOSAL NO. 209**ACTION: No Action**

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate "Meat on the Bone" regulation in Unit 21C.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 207.

PROPOSAL NO. 210**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate airborne prohibition for moose hunters in Koyukuk CUA.

DISCUSSION: Board members referenced discussion and action taken on Proposal 237 in support of maintaining the Koyukuk River Controlled Use Area. The board further recognized that repealing the controlled use area would adversely affect public support for the Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan.

PROPOSAL NO. 211**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate Koyukuk and Kanuti Controlled Use Areas in Unit 21D and 24.

DISCUSSION: Board members referenced discussion and action taken on Proposal 237 in support of maintaining the Kanuti and Koyukuk River Controlled Use Areas. The board further recognized that repealing these controlled use areas would adversely affect public support for the Koyukuk Moose Management plan.

PROPOSAL NO. 212**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Decrease size of Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.

DISCUSSION: The current boundaries of the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area (KCUA) are appropriate to achieve management objectives and are integral to the regulatory strategies for that area. Modification to the KCUA boundaries was understood to adversely affect the Koyukuk Moose Management plan, potentially leading to an increase in the number of hunters accessing a declining moose population. The board does not support a change to the KCUA until it can be determined that the number of hunters accessing the KCUA has been successfully stabilized. Creating a no aircraft corridor raised concerns over enforcement and delineation of any boundary. The board directed the department to review concerns raised through this proposal with the Koyukuk Moose Management Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 213**ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Increase brown bear season and bag limit in Unit 19.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 254.**PROPOSAL NO. 214****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Align Mulchatna Caribou Herd bag limits in Units 19A and 19B with Unit 17B.**DISCUSSION:** The department reported a declining trend in the proportion of large bulls found during fall composition surveys. Board members supported aligning the season and bag limits within the range of the Mulchatna Herd as recommended by the Mulchatna Caribou Herd Management Technical Working Group. The change in Units 19A and 19B will align with previous changes made in Units 17B and 18 caribou bag limits and seasons.**PROPOSAL NO. 215****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Reduce the nonresident caribou bag limit in remainder of Units 19A and 19B.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 214.**PROPOSAL NO. 216****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify season and bag for Beaver Mountain Caribou Herd in Units 19D and 21A**DISCUSSION:** To conserve the reproductive portion of this declining herd, the department prefers harvest of bulls rather than cows on smaller Interior herds such as this. Harvest of Beaver Mountains caribou during the fall season has been less than 15 annually since 1999, and no additional loss of hunting opportunity is expected. Board members supported aligning the season and bag limit of the Beaver Mountains caribou herd with other small, interior Alaska caribou herds, while continuing to provide reasonable hunting opportunity.**PROPOSAL NO. 217****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Close the moose, caribou and sheep nonresident hunting seasons within the Post River drainage in Unit 19C.

DISCUSSION: Closing the nonresident hunting seasons on these three species was considered to have minimal impact on their population status. Nonresidents bag limits are currently restricted by regulation to small proportions of these populations

PROPOSAL NO. 218

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate the winter moose season in a portion of Unit 19D.

DISCUSSION: The department reported the current moose population and December moose harvest to be low. Recognizing that the fall moose season provides the majority of moose harvested for residents of Unit 19D, elimination of the winter moose season was not expected to affect reasonable opportunity to harvest moose. Based on the low survival and recruitment, the board was convinced that a closure of the winter season was warranted at this time. This regulatory change, in conjunction with the adoption of Proposal 219, aligns seasons within Unit 19D with other areas downriver in 19A and 19B.

PROPOSAL NO. 219

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Adjust moose season dates and bag limits in Units 19A and 19B.

AMENDMENTS: The nonresident season in Unit 19A was closed, set to sunset June 30, 2005, unless otherwise needed. Resident bag limit in Unit 19A, outside of the Live Village Management Area, was set to 1 bull by registration permit only. Within the Lime Village Management Area, 14 Tier II subsistence hunting permits may be issued to take two bulls per regulatory year; up to 28 bulls. Change nonresident hunting season in Unit 19B to September 5–20.

DISCUSSION: Since 2002, the Central Kuskokwim Moose Management Planning Committee (CKMC) has carefully evaluated the moose populations and harvest levels in Units 19A and 19B. Board members recognized the CKMC's efforts and concluded that reductions in harvest are needed to help the moose population grow. Limiting nonresident hunting in Unit 19A was considered integral to helping maintain resident hunting opportunity. Reducing harvest of cows that can often be taken in the resident winter hunts is necessary to improve productivity of the moose population. Use of registration permits in 19A and 19B is expected to improve harvest report data and ability to control harvest. The board stated their intent to provide for subsistence opportunity within the Lime Village Management Area while maintaining a conservative approach towards reestablishing the moose population. The nonresident season in Unit 19B was altered to make allowances intended to maintain the guiding industry by accommodating a few more hunters. Action taken was intended to allow equitable sharing of reductions in harvest opportunity among all user groups in order to conserve and enhance the moose resource. By reducing hunting pressure through the removal of the nonresident harvest and implementing a registration hunt in Unit 19A, board members stood convinced that reasonable opportunity to harvest for subsistence has been maintained. During their spring 2005 meeting, the board plans to review how the nonresident season closure has influenced the moose population in Unit 19A.

PROPOSAL NO. 220

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Add portion of Stony River to nonresident closed areas in Units 19A and 19B.

DISCUSSION: Referencing action taken on Proposal 219 that closed the nonresident moose season in Unit 19A, board members expressed concern over further impacting the nonresident moose season in Unit 19B.

PROPOSAL NO. 221

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Close the winter moose season in Unit 21A.

DISCUSSION: The department reported low and sporadic reported winter moose harvest and a declining moose population in Unit 21A. Travel during this time of year is difficult due to poor ice and snow conditions. Board members discussed the importance of maintaining opportunity as fall hunting success rates continue to decline and reductions in opportunity are forthcoming in adjacent areas. The board based their decision on the need to conserve the Unit 21A moose population. A federal subsistence season in Unit 21A provides ample opportunity in late August for residents of Unit 21A, 21E, McGrath, Takotna, Crooked Creek.

PROPOSAL NO. 222

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the antlerless moose hunting season in Unit 19A.

DISCUSSION: Board members recognized that eliminating cow harvests, often taken in the resident winter hunts, is necessary to improve productivity of the moose population. The board referenced their discussion and action taken on Proposal 219 in reestablishing the moose population in Unit 19A.

PROPOSAL NO. 223

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Reauthorize the current exemption of brown bear tag fee in Unit 19D.

DISCUSSION: The tag fee exemption was designed to increase the harvest of brown bear in Unit 19D to benefit moose calf survival. Calf mortality studies in the unit have indicated brown bears are a significant predator on moose calves. Board members recognized that the tag fee exemption has increased the harvest of brown bears, however the harvest is still below levels required to significantly reduce the effect of brown bears on moose calf survival. The exemption is considered a tool intended to help continue promoting the opportunist take of brown bears.

PROPOSAL NO. 224

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify season and bag limit for moose in Units 19C and 19D.

DISCUSSION: Current moose season dates in Units 19D and 19C were established to allow for maximum hunting opportunity without causing excessive harvest of bulls. The department stated that harvest would not be sustainable if the seasons are extended, or moved to later dates, even with the antler restrictions in 19C. The board expressed concern over increasing bull moose vulnerability to harvest through extending the season closer to the rut. Changing the resident bag limit in the southern portion of 19D from any bull to spike/fork 50-inch or four or more brow tines on one side would likely reduce subsistence hunting opportunity.

PROPOSAL NO. 225

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Create a resident drawing permit hunt in Unit 19C during Sept. 21-Oct. 10.

DISCUSSION: Board members understood this proposal could further decrease the bull:cow ratio by creating a limited hunt for trophy moose from the end of the current moose season into the height of the rut. Board members stated their intent to allow for the moose population composition to improve before increasing opportunity in an area considered to be readily accessible.

PROPOSAL NO. 226

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Implement fall resident moose antler restrictions in Unit 19C.

DISCUSSION: The board recognized that implementing a selective harvest in Unit 19C would decrease the fall harvest of bulls, likely increasing the fall bull:cow ratios. Board members further noted their intent to improve the moose population composition. Recognizing that the winter hunt will remain in affect and the noted support from the local advisory committee, reasonable opportunity to meet subsistence needs was considered to be maintained.

PROPOSAL NO. 227

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Shift the winter moose season in Unit 19C.

AMENDMENT: Winter moose season of Feb. 1 – Feb. 28.

DISCUSSION: Board members considered preserving harvest opportunity during the winter season to be an important component of maintaining reasonable opportunity to meet subsistence needs. To prevent a substantial increase in winter harvest, the board supported an earlier season of Feb.1-Feb. 28 because hunting conditions will be more difficult due to colder weather and shorter days. This earlier season will additionally avoid an overlap with the spring bison hunt (DI352), preventing bison hunters from hunting two species at once.

PROPOSAL NO. 228

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Change the Unit 19D East moose registration permit season to a single season.

AMENDMENTS: Unit 19D, that portion of the Takotna River drainage upstream of Takotna village, 1 bull by registration permit, Sept. 1-Sept. 20.

DISCUSSION: The proposed season changes are anticipated to simplify season dates and increase opportunity to harvest moose outside of the EMMA while it is closed to all moose hunting. These changes also will not likely result in large increases in harvest and will likely facilitate redistribution of hunters from the EMMA to other areas. The board determined the Takotna River drainage upstream of Takotna village needed a reduced season due to the high vulnerability of bull moose that move into the valley during late September. Additionally, the board updated information to the Unit 19D East Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plan, 5 AAC 92.125 (1).

PROPOSAL NO. 229

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Modify brow tine requirement for nonresident moose hunters in Units 21A and 21E.

DISCUSSION: Nonresident bag limits over most of the interior are currently one bull with 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more brow tines on at least one side. This bag limit directs nonresident harvest to larger bulls and allows the flexibility for hunters to

assess legal bulls based on either antler spread or number of brow tines. The board saw no reason to restrict harvest opportunity and felt it unnecessarily to complicate regulations in the Interior by introducing another variation in antler size restrictions.

PROPOSAL NO. 230**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Increase the wolf hunting season and bag limit in Units 19A, 19B and 19C.

AMENDMENTS: Ten wolves per day bag limit and Aug. 1-May 31 season in all Unit 19.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that fur quality of most wolves will have depreciated and that wolf packs have pups in the den by May. Board members recognized the ethical issues of taking wolves during May but considered using normal methods and means to increase hunting opportunity to be vital in reducing the predator population and helping to conserve the moose population. The year round interaction of wolves and Unit 19 communities also raised public safety concerns for children and pets. By establishing Unit wide bag limits and seasons, the board intends to maintain consistency within the unit.

PROPOSAL NO. 231**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Remove the tag fee requirement for brown bear in Unit 19C.

DISCUSSION: Brown bear tag fees have been exempted in several game management units around the state that have been identified for intensive management of big game prey species where a management goal is to reduce brown bear numbers. The board understood that Unit 19C has not been identified for intensive management and saw no reason to eliminate the tag fee.

PROPOSAL NO. 232**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow brown bear baiting and bait stations in Units 19A and 19B.

DISCUSSION: Board members understood the baiting of brown bears to be more appropriately considered as part of a bear predation control implementation plan, not general methods and means.

PROPOSAL NO. 233**ACTION: No Action**

DESCRIPTION: Allow wolf control by aerial/land and shoot methods in all of Unit 19.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 234.

PROPOSAL NO. 234**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Create wolf predation control plan for Units 19A and 19B

AMENDMENT: Include lands administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service.

DISCUSSION: The board has identified moose in Units 19A and 19B as being important for providing high levels of moose for human consumptive purposes. The current moose population and harvest estimates are well below the Intensive Management population and harvest objectives established by the board. There is strong evidence that the moose population is being controlled by wolves, necessitating a more proactive approach toward predators. In addition to restrictions placed on

moose hunting seasons, wolf predation control was considered essential to help rebuild the moose population in and better provide for human consumptive uses of moose. By establishing the Central Kuskokwim Wolf Predation Control Area, the board hopes to set boundaries that more closely resemble drainages recognized by Unit 19 fauna. The board recognized that administering control plans on federal lands is vital to reducing the impacts predators have on prey populations. Board finding #2004-150-BOG was adopted to authorize wolf predation control in the Unit 19A portion of the Central Kuskokwim Wolf Predation Control Area. During their spring 2005 meeting, the board plans to review the merits of implementing a potential predator control plan in Unit 19B.

PROPOSAL NO. 235**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Create a wolf implementation plan for Unit 19C; legalize use of snowmobiles.

DISCUSSION: The use of snowmobiles for hunting wolves is currently legal in Unit 19C, provided the animals are not shot from a moving snowmobile. Board members recognized that Unit 19C has not been identified as a wolf control implementation area, and that expansion of control programs at this time would jeopardize achieving goals in Units 19A, 19B, and 19D East because of limited personnel and funding.

PROPOSAL NO. 236**ACTION: No Action**

DESCRIPTION: Remove the 40 horsepower boat motor restriction in the Holitna Controlled Use Area in Unit 19.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 238.

PROPOSAL NO. 237**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Repeal Koyukuk and Paradise Controlled Use Areas.

DISCUSSION: Board members noted that the Koyukuk and Paradise controlled use areas are functioning appropriately to achieve management objectives and are integral to the regulatory strategies of their respective areas. Repealing these controlled use areas would potentially increase the number of hunters accessing these areas, thus changing hunting patterns and demand. The board understood that adoption of this proposal would adversely affect the Koyukuk Moose Management Plan and jeopardize the consensus that was achieved among a broad constituency.

PROPOSAL NO. 238**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Repeal Upper Kuskokwim and Holitna-Hoholitna Controlled Use Areas.

DISCUSSION: Both controlled use areas are functioning appropriately to achieve management objectives and are integral to the regulatory strategies of their respective areas. Board members determined that lifting the boat motor restriction in the Holitna-Hoholitna CUA and the aircraft restriction in the Upper Kuskokwim CUA would likely increase the number of hunters in both these areas and further decrease moose populations.

PROPOSAL NO. 239**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Increase resident and nonresident brown bear bag limit in Unit 20E to three bear per regulatory year.

AMENDMENTS: Include in-unit sealing, removed the two year sunset clause, and changed the bag limit to two bear per year, not counting against the 1 bear in 4 years limit established in other game management units.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that the current harvest of brown bears in Unit 20E is below sustainable objectives. Brown bears have been reported to take greater than fifty percent of moose calves during the spring. Board members supported adjusting normal bag limits in the general hunt to increase bear harvest and help reduce predation on prey animals. Although interior brown bears are not considered to be large trophies, an increase in bag limits is expected to provide more clients to the guiding industry. The board noted the impact of increasing the bag limit on brown bears will likely be minimal without further incentives, such as the sale of handicraft items.

PROPOSAL NO. 240

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Increase the bag limit for brown bears in Unit 20E to 2 bears per regulatory year.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 239.

PROPOSAL NO. 241

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Simplify Fortymile caribou herd registration permit hunts.

DISCUSSION: The board considered this a housekeeping proposal that would facilitate combining the three fall registration permit hunts for Fortymile caribou into one hunt to simplify hunter use and department administration of permits. The harvest quota would continue to be distributed between the three geographic areas included in current fall hunts, as described in the 2001-2006 Fortymile Harvest Management Plan.

PROPOSAL NO. 242

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Add a portion of the Middle Fork of the Fortymile River drainage into the existing Unit 20E registration permit hunt.

DISCUSSION: Hunters in Unit 20E are currently restricted, under the rules of the RM865 registration hunt, from hunting both moose and caribou at the same time, except in that portion of the unit draining into the Middle Fork of the Fortymile River upstream from the North Fork of the Fortymile River. In recent years, increasing numbers of Fortymile caribou hunters have begun to access this portion of the Middle Fork drainage, resulting in an increase in the number of moose harvested. Board members expressed their intent to control incidental harvest of moose to prevent over-harvest of this low density moose population by a rapidly increasing number of Fortymile caribou hunters.

PROPOSAL NO. 243

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Close nonresident moose hunting season in portion of Units 12 and 20E.

DISCUSSION: The department reported that although numbers of nonresident hunters in this area have increased slightly in recent years, nonresident harvest has remained stable. With harvest levels well below sustainable harvest and a strong bull:cow ratio, board

members saw no biological data indicating overharvest of this moose population. Additionally, neither the department nor the Bureau of Wildlife Enforcement have verified any cases of wanton waste of moose in the proposed area in recent years.

PROPOSAL NO. 244**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Eliminate brown bear tag in Unit 20E, Yukon-Charley Rivers, and Unit 25B.

DISCUSSION: Brown bear tag fees have been exempted in several game management units around the state that have been identified for intensive management of big game prey species where a management goal is to reduce brown bear numbers. Board members understood that Unit 20E within the Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve and Unit 25B have not been identified for intensive management.

PROPOSAL NO. 245**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Prohibit use of electronic calling devices for moose hunting in Units 12 and 20E.

DISCUSSION: The current annual harvest of moose in Units 12 and 20E has remained stable and well below the available harvestable surplus. The board recognized that no supporting evidence exists that associates the use of electronic calls to an increase in moose harvest in these units.

PROPOSAL NO. 246**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Authorize a predator control program in Unit 20E.

DISCUSSION: The Unit 20E moose population within the Ladue and Fortymile Drainages has been identified by the BOG as important for providing high levels of human consumptive use. The moose population is currently below population objectives and has been declining slowly since the late 1990s, despite the efforts of a nonlethal wolf control program in western Unit 20E and liberal bear regulations. Research has shown that habitat, harvest, and disease are not major limiting factors to moose population growth in Unit 20E. Board members expressed concern over the declining nature of harvest opportunity in Unit 20E and indicated their intent to take a proactive approach to improving the moose population. The board requested the department draft a predator control implementation plan that includes wolves and brown bears for Unit 20E to be reviewed before the end of July 2004 for possible inclusion on the agenda for the November 2004 board meeting. Implementation of a predator control program is a step process that requires additional background information be brought before the board. Additionally, the board updated information to the Fortymile Wolf Predation Control Implementation Plan, 5 AAC 92.125 (4).

PROPOSAL NO. 247**ACTION: No Action**

DESCRIPTION: Authorize a predator control program in Unit 20E.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 246.

PROPOSAL NO. 248**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow the sale of bear hides in Units 12 and 20E.

DISCUSSION: Board members understood that allowing the sale of bear hides under certain circumstances could provide additional incentive to harvest a bear. The selling of bear hides and skulls was considered to be more appropriately examined as part of a bear predation control implementation plan, not general harvesting.

PROPOSAL NO. 249

ACTION: No Action

DESCRIPTION: Allow the sale of bear hides in Units 12 and 20E.

DISCUSSION: No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 248.

PROPOSAL NO. 250

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Extend wolf trapping season in Units 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26B and 26C from August 1 to May 31.

DISCUSSION: Furbearer trapping seasons have been set to optimize pelt quality. Wolf pelts are of low quality in August and May and would have little market value. The few wolves trapped would have little impact on overall wolf numbers and predation rates on ungulates. The board recognized that without restrictions on methods during the early and late portions of the season, incidental catch of other furbearers would likely increase and could exceed sustainable harvest.

PROPOSAL NO. 251

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Standardize statewide wolf trapping seasons to end on April 30.

DISCUSSION: Board members indicated that Interior trapping seasons for wolves already end on April 30. Trapping seasons and bag limits in other areas of the state are not under consideration at this meeting.

PROPOSAL NO. 252

ACTION: Carried

DESCRIPTION: Open a trapping and hunting season for arctic fox in Units 24 and 25.

DISCUSSION: Currently no open season exists in Units 24 and 25 for a small number of arctic fox that periodically disperse south of the Brooks Range and are sometimes encountered by hunters or are caught in traps set for other species. The department reported that arctic fox are not likely to establish viable populations south of the Brooks Range, even in the absence of hunting and trapping. Board members understood that allowing hunters and trappers to harvest dispersing fox will not harm established populations and will enable trappers to keep furs of arctic fox that are caught south of the Brooks Range.

PROPOSAL NO. 253

ACTION: Failed

DESCRIPTION: Standardize Interior region black bear regulations, modify sealing requirements.

DISCUSSION: Board members expressed concern over modifying sealing requirements that provide population status information to the department and assist the Bureau of Wildlife Enforcement in detecting violations. This proposal would additionally limit those areas that currently have more liberal regulations designed to accommodate abundant black bear populations and local hunting practices. Removing sealing requirements of

black bears exported from Alaska would place those hunters in violation of the CITES agreement.

PROPOSAL NO. 254**ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Modify bear seasons and bag limits for brown/grizzly bear regionwide.**DISCUSSION:** Brown bear regulations in much of the Interior and eastern Arctic are more complicated and conservative than necessary for management of populations, resulting in confusion among hunters and lost hunting opportunity. Interior brown bear populations were reported to be in healthy condition. The board understood that season and bag limit adjustments will result in minimal additional harvest, and will likely be within sustained yield and not cause declines in most bear populations.**PROPOSAL NO. 255****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Standardize brown bear seasons and bag limits in all Interior units.**DISCUSSION:** Concern was raised over harvesting two brown bears per year and the likely detrimental impact on the bear population. Board members recognized the proposal intent to reduce bear predation on moose calves and referenced their action and discussion on Proposal 254 in standardizing and liberalizing brown bear seasons in Interior units.**PROPOSAL NO. 256****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Revise the Fortymile Caribou Harvest Management Plan's harvest objectives and season recommendations.**DISCUSSION:** The board understood that the current Fortymile Caribou Herd Harvest Plan will sunset in 2007 and saw no reason to make modifications to the harvest objective and season structure at this point. The process for developing a new harvest management plan will include coordination between five fish and game advisory committees, ADF&G, BLM and USF&WS personnel and representatives from Yukon, Canada.**PROPOSAL NO. 257****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Establish drawing permit hunts for caribou in Units 12 and 20.**DISCUSSION:** Board members saw no reason to establish a drawing permit hunt for either the McComb or Fortymile caribou herds and considered subsistence participation restrictions to be unnecessary.**PROPOSAL NO. 258****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Open sheep seasons earlier in Units 20, 25, 26B, and 26C.**DISCUSSION:** Opening the sheep season earlier would likely result in increased harvest because of better weather in early August, and additional opportunity compared with the remainder of the state. Increased harvest could result in more full curl and larger rams being harvested, which could diminish the quality of the hunt and reduce hunter satisfaction. Concerns were raised over the greater likelihood of meat spoiling due to warmer weather in early August. Board members supported maintaining the current standardized sheep season of Aug. 10-Sept. 20 and noted their preference to standardize seasons and simplify regulations whenever possible.

PROPOSAL NO. 259**ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Standardize wolf seasons and bag limits in all Interior units.**DISCUSSION:** Extending the hunting season to include May through early August would conflict with other important uses of wolves and have little impact on wolf numbers or wolf predation rates on ungulates. The board saw no clear justification to increase wolf harvest region wide and noted that wolf seasons should be evaluated on an individual area basis.**PROPOSAL NO. 260****ACTION: Carried as amended****DESCRIPTION:** Shorten coyote season and liberalize bag limit in Units 12 and 20.**AMENDMENT:** Change the bag limit to 10 coyotes per day in Units 12, 19, and 20.**DISCUSSION:** Coyote predation has been identified as a significant source of lamb mortality. The board recognized that increasing the coyote bag limit would not likely have a great impact on the coyote population but will increase opportunity for interested individuals and aid the sheep population. Establishing a set bag limit was considered to maintain consistency with general hunting practices.**PROPOSAL NO. 261****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Shorten season for ptarmigan in Units 12, 20, and 25C.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 146.**PROPOSAL NO. 262****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Reduce season and bag limit for grouse in Units 12 and 20.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 146.**PROPOSAL NO. 263****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Reduce season and bag limit for ptarmigan in Units 12 and 20.**DISCUSSION:** No action taken based on the discussion and action taken on Proposal 146.**PROPOSAL NO. 264****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Modify and expand the Take A Child Hunting program.**DISCUSSION:** Portions of this proposal pertaining to age requirements, residency, and relationship to the child are covered by statute, and are not under Board of Game authority. Interior advisory committees and board members agreed that taking children hunting is important, but people in their area take children hunting during the regular hunting season. The board recognized the merit in examining the expansion of the TACH program on a case-by-case basis to ensure that the added August seasons do not harm specified populations. Board members expressed concern over expanding the TACH program to other areas in region without the review and full support from the locally affected advisory committees.**PROPOSAL NO. 265****ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Expand the Take A Child Hunting program to additional units.

AMENDMENTS: Discontinue the Unit 20B TACH hunt.

DISCUSSION: Board members stated their interest in seeing the TACH program used on a broader scale but recognized the importance of gaining local acceptance before applying it to specific areas. The board fully supports taking children hunting but saw no merit in maintaining a TACH hunt in a single area that attracts users statewide.

PROPOSAL NO. 266

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Allow use of helicopters for trapping wolves in Units 19 and 20 in areas designated for Intensive Management.

AMENDMENTS: Allow helicopter use for trapping only under a permit for taking wolves using aircraft, 5 AAC 92.039.

DISCUSSION: The department recommended the use of helicopters for trapping wolves be allowed only as part of aerial wolf control activities permitted under 5 AAC 92.039. Board members understood this method could increase the efficiency of removing wolves in areas not suitable for ground based trapping due to difficult access or for aerial or ground gunning due to habitat features. Helicopter use is not expected to substantially increase wolf harvest because of the few privately owned helicopters and the expense of operation. The benefit would be in targeting of selective packs in areas where conventional removal efforts are ineffective, and minimizing potential conflicts with established trappers.

PROPOSAL NO. 267

ACTION: Carried as amended

DESCRIPTION: Review intensive management population objectives for Interior region.

AMENDMENTS:

Central Arctic Caribou Herd:	Population Objective 28,000-32,000 Harvest Objective 1,400-1,600
GMU 19D East moose:	Population Objective 6,000-8,000 Harvest Objective 400-600
GMU 20A moose:	Population Objective 10,000-12,000 Harvest Objective 1,400-1,600

DISCUSSION: This regulation was presented for review of intensive management objectives at the request of the board. The department stated their interest in retaining range values for objectives citing they better reflect the precision of population data collected and variability of harvest data. The board intended to consider changes in objectives for populations that are near or exceeding current objectives. Board members supported increasing objectives for the Central Arctic Caribou Herd based on recent expansion and growth of the herd. Biological data suggested that the habitat in Unit 19D East could supporter a greater number of moose. Additionally, the board is mandated to provide for a high level of human harvest in intensive management areas based on the sustained yield principle. In recognition of the relatively high moose population and successful management strategies the board intends to increase the harvest objective to provide for additional moose harvests to reduce the population. Board members supported retaining the current population objective of 10,000 – 12,000 moose to be in accordance with the current habitat quality.

PROPOSAL NO. 268**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Allow the use of crossbows in the Fairbanks Management Area, Creamers Field Refuge, and the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area.

DISCUSSION: The department noted that harvests are already high in some of these areas and that there is currently no certification program for crossbows as required for bow hunting. The board considered aspects of the issue dealing with access for handicaps.

PROPOSAL NO. 269**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Replace brown bear drawing permit hunt in Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA) with a registration permit hunt in Unit 26B.

AMENDMENTS: Allow 1 bear every regulatory year by drawing permit only, up to 20 permits may be issued for Sept. 1-Dec. 31 resident season, and Sept. 1-May 31 nonresident season. Resident hunters: One bear harvested every regulatory year during Mar. 1-May 31 general season.

DISCUSSION: Board members recognized that a registration permit would not be an efficient way to manage either the fall or spring hunt. The harvest of brown bears in Unit 26B is near the estimated sustainable harvest level. The board recognized the importance of limiting the bear harvest as hunting pressure within the DHCMA increases. Increasing the number of drawing permits available to 20 will enhance hunting opportunity, while minimizing concerns over opportunistic take of bears by fall caribou hunters.

PROPOSAL NO. 270**ACTION: Failed**

DESCRIPTION: Require annual registration for all Dalton Highway archery hunters and repeal North Slope Closed Area in Unit 26B.

DISCUSSION: The department reported the harvest of caribou in the Dalton Highway Corridor Management Area (DHCMA) within Unit 26B to be well within sustainable levels. Board members saw no need to establish a harvest quota for caribou and thus no need for a registration or other permit system. A registration permit is not an appropriate tool for conducting what would amount to an additional hunter education effort. Hunters are currently required to have an International Bowhunter Education Program certification card to hunt within the DHCMA.

PROPOSAL NO. 271**ACTION: Carried as amended**

DESCRIPTION: Restrict use of muzzle-loading rifles less than .50 caliber statewide.

AMENDMENTS: Amended to require a minimum of .45 caliber to take big game.

DISCUSSION: The board noted that a re-evaluation of the standards could be conducted when more information on ballistics and penetration is available.

PROPOSAL NO. 272**ACTION: Carried**

DESCRIPTION: Modify the size restriction on conibear-type traps and re-name to "killer" style traps.

DISCUSSION: The board heard that this type of trap was designed to exceed the humane trapping standards. If used for beaver and in underwater placements, it has been reported to be very effective. Conibear is a brand name of a type of trap.

MISCELLANEOUS BUISNESS

Board findings concerning Americans with Disabilities Act exemptions

Board finding #2004-146-BOG was adopted to provide department policy on handling methods and means accommodations under ADA. These findings were necessary for responding to a civil rights complaint with regard to crossbow exemptions.

Amend 5 AAC 92.110(j), Control of predation by wolves

Board members recognized that successfully implementing a wolf predation control plan is contingent on involvement from federal agencies. Activities involving a wolf population reduction or wolf population regulation potentially involving federal lands will, to the maximum extent possible, be coordinated with the appropriate federal agencies.

Unit 16B predator control plan findings

The board adopted findings #2004-148-BOG, authorizing predator control in the Western Cook Inlet Area in Unit 16B with airborne or same day airborne shooting. This five year plan was based on the population and the harvest components presented by the department. The board reviewed the amount necessary for subsistence needs in Unit 16B and determined that the minimum subsistence needs have not been met for the last five years. Board members expressed their intent for implementing this control plan beginning fall 2004.

Resolution encouraging signage for traplines on public lands

Board finding #2004-149-BOG was adopted to encourage land management agencies to erect signs at trailheads on public lands in areas where trapping is allowed to notify trail users that trapping may be occurring along the trails and suggest that domestic animals be harnessed or leashed to avoid conflicts.

Tier II committee assignments and charge

The board made relatively minor adjustments to Tier II regulations and chose to wait until after the expected state Alaska Supreme Court ruling in Manning vs. State of Alaska before considering more extensive changes. Board members Somerville, Judkins, and Spraker were named to an interim committee to review the Tier II scoring system and the four Tier II proposals (Proposals 22, 28, 31, and 32) that were deferred to the November 2004 meeting.

Petition from Emmonak Tribal Council and Orutsararmiut Native Council regarding snowmachine use in Unit 18

During the November 2003 meeting, the board allowed the taking of wolves from snowmachines in a portion of Unit 18 subject to a five-year moratorium on moose hunting. Residents along the Yukon River portion of Unit 18 are interested in having the snowmachine provision extended unit wide. The board recognized the need reexamine the issue and added to proposal to the agenda for the November 2004 meeting.

Statutory change regarding auction of donated hides

The board discussed supporting language to the legislative that would allow a person who has legally taken a brown bear to donate the hide or skull to a qualified organization, or to the department, for auction or raffle. Board members considered donating hides a means to provide hunters incentive to harvest brown bears. Members Buist and Somerville were selected to work with department staff on further development.

Nuisance moose bill – SB 329

The board drafted a letter of support for the intent behind SB 329, recognizing that a moose relocation effort could reduce automobile collisions and possibly help breeding stock in areas experiencing declining moose numbers. The board cautioned against placing a cost burden on the Department of Fish and Game as a result of a program.

Allocation of bears to bait hunters

The board adopted findings #2004-151-BOG, allocating at least 1,000 bears to bear baiters, for harvest in eighteen Game Management Units across the state where regulations have been developed specifically to allow for such harvest. The harvest of black bears using bait is considered a critical component in the effort to reduce predation and rebuild ungulate populations needed for human use.